

Judicial (1895.) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 612.

DATED 25th Mar 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

CIVIL JUSTICE.

Recording, with remarks, letter from the Registrar, High Court replying to certain remarks in G.O., dated 26th. September 1894, No. 2338, reviewing the report on the administration of- during the year 1893.

incl.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	4014		1895				

{1895.} Department.

No.

FROM

The Registrar of the High Court
of Judicature, Appellate Side,
Madras.

So 457: 2393

14 paper

14 paper

So 2338/9 26 Sep 94 se,
626 24.3 93 Nus
457 2.3 93 se
1081 2.8 87 DC
Record for for

In view

Dated 14th February } 1895.
Received 16 "
Recd 18 "

No. 432
Encs. 1

Submitting a reply to
certain remarks in G.O. dated
26th September 1894, No. 2338,
judicial reviewing the report
on Civil Justice for 1893
and requesting to be informed
what portions of the Report
Government considers
superfluous.

N^o. 432. High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 14th February 1895.

From

H. W. Foster Esquire,
Registrar of the High Court
of Judicature, Appellate Side,
Madras

To

The Honorable J. F. Price, C. S. I.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

Honorable Sir,

As desired by Government
in para. 4, sub-para. 5, of G. O., dated 26
September 1894, No. 2338, Judicial,
reviewing the report on the adminis-
-tration of civil justice for 1893, I am
directed to forward herewith the expla-
-nations of the Subordinate Judges of
Palghat, Ellore and Madurai (East) -
regarding the high average duration
of suits disposed of in their Courts.

1. With

Every letter, whether printed or in manuscript, should be doc-
keted and abstracted on the back ;
and the abstract should state clearly the purport of the letter and
not merely its title subject.

Enclosures and statements also, whether sent with letters, or
merely under cover, should be numbered, docketed and abstracted.
The headings of statements should be written in full to prevent
mistakes, (G. O., 8th April 1893, No. 239, Public.)

2. With reference to the observation of Government in the first paragraph of the said G.O. that 'North' should apparently be read for 'South', I am to invite attention to the description of the Madura Munsifi in the notification published at page 1734, part II, Fort Saint George Gazette, dated 15th December 1891, wherein the word 'South'—not 'North'—occurs.

A complete list showing the jurisdictions of all the District, Subordinate Judges, and District Munsifs' Courts will be appended to future reports and a list of the several District and Subordinate Judges who have had charge of each Court during the year will also be furnished in future as suggested by Government in the concluding para. of the review under reply.

3. The

3. The increase in the average value of suits in District Courts noticed in the third paragraph of the review is due partly to the institution of a suit valued at 55½ laos of Rupees in the Godavari District Court and of one valued at 10 laos in the Ichinopoly Court. The number of suits filed in District Courts is not so great but that the institution of one suit of unusually large value produces a marked effect upon the average value.

4. There will be no difficulty in meeting the Government's wish that the length of the report should be reduced, but I am to say that as the report is prepared chiefly for the information of the Government

and follows a plan that was
settled several years ago, the Judges
would be glad to receive some
indication what particular portions
are considered superfluous.

I have the honor to be,

Honorable Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

W. A. L. B.

Registrar,
Appellate Side.

[G.]
[24]
100-20-12-94.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 26 Sept

Again G.O., dated

Current No. 1117

of 1895, dated

Current No.

of 18, dated

Ind. DEPARTMENT.

1894, No. 2338, Ind.

18, No.

from the High Court.

from

Order 25 March 1895 No 612

Note
Delayed, as papers
were not immediately
available.
It seems unnecessary
to trouble H. M. with
this.

Recorded.
2. The ~~intention~~ ^{intention of the remark} in para. 4
(15) of G.O. of 26 Sept 1894, No.
2338, Ind., was that the High
Court should cause explanation
to be sent to itself by
the Sub-judges mentioned.
The wording was not, however,
clear.

3. The Govt. does not wish
to trouble the High Court
to give, every year, full details of
all the local jurisdictions
in Statement A. All that
is necessary is that the
changes should be shown.
In the Statement appended
to the Report for 1893, the
words "Same as in 1892"
should have appeared
against each item, there
having been no changes
in local jurisdictions
during 1893.

4. With regard to the last
para. of Mr. Foster's letter,
it was intended to suggest

10
22/3/50 10 Mar. 50 M
The Hon Mr. C. A. Smith
27 MAR 50
Enclosed
U.S.

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only