

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 919

Dated 4th May 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

APPEAL AGAINST AN ACQUITTAL.

Stating that the case is not of sufficient importance to warrant an appeal to the High Court against the order of acquittal passed by the Sessions Judge of Vizagapatam in Criminal Appeal No. 1 of 1895.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[V. C. P. -17-11-94.-700.]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

FROM *District Magistrate*
THE COLLECTOR OF VIZAGAPATAM.

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt.
Madras

Dated 30 } *March* 1895
Received 4 }



Re. C. No. 1175
Dis.

ENCLOSURES. *bundle of*
records.

Subject.
Requesting to direct the Public
Prosecutor under Sec. 417 C.P.C.
to present an appeal to the
High Court against the order of
acquittal passed by the
Sessions Judge of Vizagapatam
in Criminal Appeal 1 of 95 on
his file.

R. C. No. 1175
Disposal.

1706
District Magistrate's
VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE.

Dated 30th March 1895

From

F. D'A. O. WOLFE-MURRAY Esq^r.

Ag. Collector, Magistrate,

Vizagapatam District.

To

The Honorable J. F. Price,

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Judicial DEPARTMENT,
MADRAS.

SIR,

In sending enclosed the records noted
in the margin, I have the honor to request that

C. C. No 77 of 1894, on the file
of the Principal Assistant
Magistrate. Copy of Judgment
in Criminal Appeal No. 1 of
1895 on the file of the Sessions
Court at Vizagapatam.

the Government may be pleased
to direct the Public Prosecutor
under section 417 C. P. C. to present
an appeal to the High Court
against the order of acquittal
passed by the Sessions Judge

Vizagapatam in Criminal Appeal no 1 of 1895 on
his file.

2. The facts of the case are:-

On the 29th of November 1894 one Ramacharan
of Hyderabad complained to the Station House
Officer of the Vizianagram Town in writing
alleging that he went to Ilaru with a view
to get some contract work on the East Coast
Railway

Page 2

Railway, that he came back to Vizianagaram by the Tilam train at 11 A.M. on the date of the offence being baffled in his attempts to get business on the Railway line, that he cooked his meal and breakfasted in a garden close to the Vizianagaram Cantonment, that during the night he went to a Sweet meat shop situate in the Verandah of the 'Kanyakammawis' temple and sat in the Verandah with the intention of getting some cakes prepared by the shopkeeper placing his bundle of cloths behind him and that some one had stolen the bundle containing the following:-

(1) Laced white turban having imitation of mangonuts in lace on the four corners worth Rs 12.

(2) One white Coat the cloth of which had black stripes worth Rs 2.

(3) One white cloth worth Re 1/2.

The Police traced the theft and charge-sheeted the accused two in number before the 2nd class Taluk Magistrate of Vizianagaram. Seven witnesses were examined for the prosecution.

Page 3

The 1st witness (Complainant) and the 2nd witness who was a fellow traveller with the 1st corroborated on oath the facts set forth in the Complaint and identified the stolen property mentioned in the Complaint with only one discrepancy, viz; the one regarding "Pancha" noticed by the Judge.

The Complaint stated that the bundle stolen contained a "Pancha" whereas the witness asserted that it was a "Duppatti".

The 3rd witness who is a resident of the Vizianagaram Cantonment deposed that three days previous to the date of the trial at day break while he was going out to ease in the morning constables were questioning the accused something, that the accused gave different names and said once they belonged to ~~Bobbili~~, once to Anakapalli and once to Ettamanchili, that thereupon the Police saying that these were suspected persons began to search them, that in the search they found a bundle of cloths with the 1st accused, that they untied it and on looking into it there were a turban with a laced border and mangonuts in

x means 'waist cloth' in colloquial Telugu.

x means 'sheet cloth' according to British Telugu - English Dictionary page 428.

Yes.
CD translate
9/4/95

x Bhimunipatam not Bobbili vide deposition

CD translate
9/4/95

in the corners and a cloth with a seam across it, that the cloths in question were those before the court, that the 2nd accused had a Coat on, the one before the court, the cloth of which has some black lines, that the Police took them to the Station and that he did not give a

x Chembu and tumbles out of his house to the Police in order that they might make another case against the accused.

x Chembu & Cap. (So in the deposition) C/ 9/4

The 4th witness who is also a resident of the Vizianagaram Cantonment corroborated the 3rd.

The 5th witness is the Head Constable who arrested the accused. He deposed that he and Constables Nos 337 + 124, 8 were returning from their beat on the night of 29th November 1894, that it was in the last watch at 4 O'clock while they were in the Gajapatnagar and Cantonment Road the accused were coming in the opposite direction, that when they asked them (accused) to what village they belonged they once said Pimlipatam, once Ellamanchili and once Anakapalli, that when they asked their

this case the accused said once 'Kapur', once 'Reddiki', that they gave different names in the same way, that the 3rd & 4th witnesses were present, that on a search being at once made the turban and the sheet before the Court were found, that the 2nd accused had the coat on, that he took them to the station where he heard that the property in question had been stolen, that the Station House Officer sent for the 1st witness who identified the cloths, that when he was drawing up the charge sheet the 1st accused said that his name was Kommali Rama-

swamy, that the 2nd accused said that his name was Chinta Venkataswamy,

x and that he learnt from the Anakapalli police that the real names of the 1st & 2nd accused were Chinta Swami & Chinta Appala-Swami respectively C/ 9/4

¶ The 6th witness states that he knows (only) the 2nd accused, having been one of those who worked in the detection of his old offence. but states nothing about the 1st accused C/ 9/4

¶ The 7th witness states nothing about the 2nd accused but states that he knows the 1st having been one of those who detected an old offence committed by him

¶ The 6th & 7th witnesses who are Constables of Anakapalli and Ellamanchili respectively identify the 1st and 2nd accused as old offenders. They were brought

from their respective stations to Vizianagaram

for identifying the accused.

The 1st accused pleaded not guilty and attributed the charge to Police concoction. He admits that he has given a false name because the Police had beat him and that he was an old offender having had four previous convictions.

The 2nd accused pleaded guilty implicating the 1st and admitted that he was also an old offender having one previous conviction.

The accused have not examined any defence witnesses.

The 2nd class Magistrate believing the aforesaid evidence sent up the accused to the Divisional Magistrate for enhanced punishment under Section 349 C.P.C.,

the accused being old offenders. The Principal Assistant Magistrate also credited the evidence recorded and convicted and sentenced the 1st accused to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 18 months and the 2nd for 2 months

under

under Sections 379 + 75 I.P.C.

Against this decision the 1st accused alone appealed to the Sessions Court and he was acquitted on the following grounds:-

(1) That as regards the white waist cloth there is a discrepancy, that the 1st, 2nd, 4th and 5th witnesses say it was a "Duppati" which was found with the 1st prisoner, that 1st witness claims it as his though his Complaint states that it was a waist cloth (Pancha) which was stolen and that no native would be likely to confound the two.

(2) That the 2nd accused was said to be wearing the coat which he had stolen a few hours before, that he would not parade the streets wearing the coat which he had just stolen.

(3) That the way in which the Police are said to have happened to question the accused without any apparent reasons seems suspicious.

(4) That the said circumstances created a doubt in his mind and that the

beneficial

benefit of doubt should therefore be given to the 1st accused.

3. With reference to discrepancy No. 1. I beg to state that the offence was committed at 8 P.M. on 29th November 1894, and the occurrence was reported to the Station by the Complainant at 10 O'Clock. At that late hour the complaint might have been drawn up in haste and the complainant

being unacquainted with Telugu or knowing it smatteringly might have failed to detect the slight discrepancy.

The Complaint bears only the mark of the Complainant's name whereas in the sworn deposition made before the

Taluk Magistrate he has affixed his signature. A reference to it will show that it is not easy to say

whether it is Telugu or any other language.

I would therefore attach more importance to his sworn deposition in which he clearly stated that it was a "Duffati" having a seam across it. Moreover the

is he unacquainted with it? His signature is apparently in Telugu characters

The office Teluk. It is said Seluk.

Why not? if he is a Telugu speaker he would.

the Complainant belongs to Hyderabad and might not very likely have known the difference

between "Pancha" and "Duffati" although the Judge scoffs at the idea of any one not

knowing the difference between the two, true enough perhaps of a native of this

District, but not of a foreigner, for "Duffati" is a purely Telugu word and probably is

entirely unknown in Hyderabad, where Complainant comes from, and where

Hindustani is the language. It may be that this point did not occur to

the Judge; for so certain did I consider the issue of the case that I did not instruct the Government Pleader to oppose the appeal.

Three other witnesses also stated that it was "Duffati".

As regards No. 2. I beg to submit that a Coat of the description mentioned in

the Complaint is a very common one and consequently very difficult to be easily

identified. The accused had not paraded the streets as remarked by the Sessions Judge

in broad day light but he was only passing as a traveller on the Cantonment

If so, the complaint identification of it is not of much value.

road at L.A.M. on a morning at the
 end of November, when of course it is
 pretty dark, and moreover the Cantonment
 road is not "a street of the town", but
 entirely cut off from it, and would
 at that time be but very sparsely occupied.
 They might have finished their depredations
 at Vijayanagram and have been leaving
 it for some other place. Moreover if the
 accused had chosen to wear the coat
 instead of concealing it in a bundle
 how could the Police or any one else
 account for it? The 2nd accused him-
 self admitted that he had worn the
 coat. The Judge has not assigned
 reason to discredit it.

As regards No. 3. I beg to state that the
 fact that the Head Constable had
 purposely gone to Anakapalli and
 Ellamanchilli to bring Police Constables
 to identify the accused clearly indicates
 that neither he, nor any other constable
 attached to the station was acquainted
 with the accused previously and that

Handwritten notes:
 The fact that the Head Constable had purposely gone to Anakapalli and Ellamanchilli to bring Police Constables to identify the accused clearly indicates that neither he, nor any other constable attached to the station was acquainted with the accused previously and that

the accused were confirmed strangers
 in Vijayanagram. The mere fact that they
 were strangers might have induced the Head
 Constable and his companions, whose sa-
 duty is to detect and prevent crime, to
 question them who they were or their faces
 which were then indexes of their guilty
 minds might have shown something to
 arouse their suspicion or they might have
 by chance questioned them who they
 were and the prevaricating answers the
 accused had given might have confirmed
 their suspicions that they were suspected
 characters. In my own experience many
 such cases of apprehension by the Police
 have occurred.

In reply to No. 4. I beg to say that
 Prosecution witnesses nos 3 & 4 excluding
 No 5, the Head Constable who arrested
 the accused with the stolen property
 clearly saw the accused being arrested
 red-handed. The two accused are not
 residents of Vijayanagram but they belong
 to Anakapalli and Ellamanchilli which

not adjacent villages. The Police and the above witnesses were not even aware that the accused were known depredators until they were recognised by the Constables of Inakapalli and Ellamanchili. No enmity was alleged between the aforesaid witnesses and the accused. Moreover the manner in which the witnesses happened to meet the accused and the Constables, was not Extraordinary inasmuch as they met them at no unusual hour but at a time when everybody in a village gets up to go out for easing himself. I think that the above circumstances and the evidence on record were enough to convict the accused and they should not have created doubt in the mind of an impartial Judge.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Day for Dy Magistrate

DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1706

From the Dist. Magistrate
Vizagapatam

FOR ORDERS.

I agree with the C.S. that I should not have let the case off. But it is rather a stumping case in which to appeal - we have been appealing in a great many cases lately if we go on we may produce a bad effect on the minds of the Judges. I think we had better let it alone.

RS

29/4/95

Order 4 May 1895, No. 919.

The Govt., while agreeing with the Dist. Magistrate in ^{thinking} ~~considering~~ that the appellate judgment ^{is much open to objection} ~~was incorrect~~, do not consider the case to be of sufficient importance to warrant an appeal to the High Court.

(from order) RS

DEPARTED 30.4.95 2/5785 10 MAY 95

The D.M. (950121)

The Dist. Magistrate recommends an appeal against an appellate Judge's findings. The Principal Asst. Magistrate had convicted two old offenders of a theft of certain articles of cloth. The evidence consisted of the statement by the complainant corroborated by 2nd witness that a bundle of clothing placed by the former on a temple pile had been removed during their temporary absence, and of the deposition by a head constable (5th witness) & two private individuals that the two accused were seen in possession of the same property a few hours later & unable to account for it. - The 2nd accused pleaded guilty & incriminated the 1st accused. They were both convicted & the 1st accused alone appealed. 2. The session Judge has acquitted him on two grounds. viz. (1) Whereas in the original complaint the missing articles were said by the 1st witness to be a turban, coat & pancha (or waist cloth), his deposition in Court declared them to be a turban coat dabbati or shirt & the articles.

at

yards (ii) I confess I can see nothing
peculiar in a policeman's questioning
men passing along a road at 4 a.m.
nor to satisfy himself of their
na fides: it is surely part of his
duty & is a thing which ought to
be every day.

2
24. 285

no harm in trying an approach
there is some fog for preference
"Wade" -

acquittal

FOR ORDERS.

H. M.

For orders.

"I went as far as Tilaru with a view to obtain work on the Railway, but being unable to secure any I came back here (Vizianagaram) by the 11 O'clock train ^{at noon}, cooked & took my meal in a ^{at noon} ~~top~~ ^{room} adjoining the Cantonment. During the night I went to a sweet-meat shop located in the verandah of the "Kannika Am-mavaram" temple and ^{while sitting} ~~sat~~ in the verandah with the object of getting "puris" (cakes) prepared by the Shopkeeper. Some one took away ~~the~~ my bundle of clothes which I kept near myself;

While I was sitting there some people whom I could not recognize passed up & down

mark of Ramacharan

CU -
12/4

Deposition by ³⁻¹²⁻⁹⁴ witness (Com-
-plainant) Ramacharan of
Hyderabad. of Kshatriya Caste.
On the 29th November the
2nd witness & myself arrived
came here by train from Ra-
-manadapuram. In the
evening as we felt hungry (we
went to the Sweet meat shop) near
near "Kannikaammavaram"
temple) seated ourselves
in the porch & having placed
the bundle of cloths detailed
in the charge sheet at a
distance we were bargain-
-ing with the shop keeper
for a good supply of good por-
-ries (cakes). Just then
the two accused were passing
to & fro by that way twice or
thrice. There were some other
persons seated in the above
porch. While we were engaged
in conversation the bundle
which was lying behind us
at a distance of $\frac{1}{2}$ yard, was
carried away by some one.
The bundle was searched for
by us, only in vain. Imme-
-diately we reported the
matter in the station (Police).
The next morning the Police
sent for me and showed
the bundle of cloths to me.
I told them that it was
the cloths were mine.
They are now before the
Court.

2
Court.

One Laced turban with
imitation mangoes in
lace on the four corners.

One "Sayinu Duppati"
(sheet cloth) with stitches
in the middle.

One Striped Coat.

Though I did not see the
accused taking away the
above cloths, I saw them
loitering there when we
were engaged in conversa-
-tion. I am not aware
from whom the Police
recovered these cloths.

Signature of

Ramacharan

23-12-96

Deposition by the 2nd witness
G. Venkataswami of Chicacole

On 29/11/96 we myself +
1st witness came here by
the Tilarn train. In the
evening we both went to the
Sweet meat shop near Kaamma
Kaamma varu temple +
having placed our bundles of
baggage at a distance of
half a yard from us, we
were conversing (with the shop-
keeper) while purchasing
Sweet meats. In a short
time one of the baggages (ie)
that which contained the
cloths of the 1st witness was
missing.

Description of the cloths:-
One "Sajina" Duppate.
One Coat. + one laced
turban with imitation
mangoes in lace on the cor-
ners. ~~I know these cloths~~
~~Since~~ ^{As I} travelled with the
1st witness from Tilarn, I
had occasion to know what
the bundle contained. We
searched for the bundle but in
vain. Thereupon we reported
the matter to the police.
The next day the police disco-
vered the stolen property
of with some one. It is now
before the court. The cloths
belong to the 1st witness.

Signature of
G. Venkataswami

CO/12/96

D 3/12/14

Deposition by the 4th witness
Muhammad Saha of Cantonment.
At 4 o'clock on the night of
last Thursday I went out
to ease myself. While returning
I noticed the Head Constable &
these accused engaged in some
dispute (?) on the road. Curio-
sity led me to the spot. The
Hd Constable was then questioning
the accused as to their native
village. They once said it was
Shimilipatan, once Ellaman-
chili & once Anakapalli. They
refused to give out their names
when questioned. The Hd Const
searched their persons say-
ing that they were suspected
characters & found with the
1st accused a laced turban
with imitation mangoes in
lace in the corners & a Dup-
-pati (sheet cloth). They are
those before the Court. The 2nd
accused was wearing the striped
coat which is now before the
Court. After the search the Con-
-stable took the accused to the
Station.

mark of
Muhammad Saha

Co
18/4

Deposition by the 2nd witness
M. Adanna of Cantonment
Three days ago while I was
going out to ease before sun-
-rise, the Constables detaining
the accused on the road ~~the~~
were questioning them some-
-times. The accused beside
giving out different names
said once they belonged to
Bhimilipatam, once to
Anakapalli & once to
Ellamanchili. Thereupon
the Police saying that these
were suspected persons be-
-gan to search them. They
discovered a bundle of cloths
with the 1st accused which
when opened contained a
turban with laced borders
& mangoes in lace in the
corner, and a cloth stretched
across (?). The cloths are
those before the Court. The
2nd accused wore the coat
which is with black stripes
which is now before the Court.
The Constables & the 1st Constable
took the accused to the Sta-
-tion saying that they were
suspected characters.
The Police suspected them
since they gave different
names. I did not give them
-but or cup out of my house
to the Police in order to
get them convicted of other
offences.

Signature of
M. Adanna

CV/
18/4

a. o. 11a. 101.

Deposition by the 5th witness
G. Venkataswami 1st Const
No 191 — 3/12/94

At 6 o'clock on the night
of the 29th November 1894,
myself & constables nos 337
and 1248 were returning from
our beat. After crossing the
Rajapatinagarum warp (2)
we were walking on the Canton-
ment road when these ac-
cused were coming in an op-
posite direction. When we
asked them what their na-
tive village was both of them
said once it was Bhimilip-
tam, once Ellamanchil-
i & once Anakapalle. When
questioned as to their Caste
they once said it was "Kapon"
once "Reddiki" & thus gave dif-
ferent answers. They gave
out different names in the
same way. The 3rd & 4th
witnesses were ~~present~~ then
present on the spot. In
their presence a search was
made & the turban & the
duppatti (sheet) before the
Court were found with the
accused. The 2nd accused
wore the Coat before the
Court. Having suspected
them I took the accused to
the station along with the
property. I learnt at the

2

the Station that it had been reported that the very cloth (found out by me) had been stolen. The Town Station Officer sent for the Complainant who on being shown the cloth; identified them as his own. When the charge was made against these accused, the 1st accused said that his name was Kammara Ramaswami, & the 2nd accused said that his name was Chintak Venkataswami. Having learnt from the 2nd accused that the 1st accused was an old offender, I repaired to Anakapalli to ascertain the details of the old offence & learnt from the Anakapalli police that the real names of the 1st & 2nd accused were Chintak Swami and Chintak Appalaswami respectively. The Constables who know the accused are witnesses in the case.

Signature of
H. Venkataswami

CN
18/4

3/12/94
Deposition by the 6th witness
A. Venkataswami Constable
No 767 B Dm Anakapalli.

I know ~~the~~ the 2nd ac-
-cused. His real name is
Chintā Appalarwami. He
was sentenced to suffer one
week's rigorous imprisonment
in Calendar Case No 507 of
1890 in the file of the Taluk
Magistrate of Anakapalli
for having stolen a pair of
shoes (2) worth Rs 1-8. I know
the 2nd accused very well since
I was one of those who worked
in the detection of the above
offence.

(Sd) A Venkataswami

Cy
19/4

Deposition by the 7th witness
K. Mallayya (2nd) Constable No 1001
B division. — d 3/12/94

I know the 1st accused.
His real name is Chintla
Swami. He was tried by
the Taluk Magistrate of
Ellamanchili for having
stolen the 1st in the Ellamanchili fair ^{on 15-9-92} was com-
mitted to the Ad Asst. Magis-
trate's Court for enhanced
punishment & received a
sentence of 3 months' rigorous
imprisonment. I know the
1st accused very well by rea-
son of having worked with
some other Constables in the
detection of the above offence.
In the above case the
accused was arrested
at 5 o'clock in the eve-
ning.

(sd) K Mallayya.

CD
19/12

Examination of the 1st-
accused, Chinta Swami of
Tummapala. 8/4.12.94.

Question:- It is alleged that
yourself & the 2nd accused
stole the clothes of one Rama-
charan which are now be-
fore the Court on 29.11.94.
Did you commit the offence?

Answer:- No. I did not
steal them; nor was I in
possession of any of the
above clothes when arres-
ted by the police. The police
concocted the case simply
because I am an old op-
-fender.

Q. Did you say to the
Police that your name
was Komma Ramaswami?

A. Yes. I said so be-
-cause the police beat me.

Q. What is your real name?

A. Chinta Swami. This
my true name is entered
in the Police Register in Con-
-nection with the ~~old~~ offence.
punishment I have hi-
-thereto undergone. As I
have been fostered in the
Kommana family I at
first gave out to the
Police

Police that my name was
Kommara Ramaswami.
The fact of my connection
with the Kommara fa-
-mily is not entered in
the Police Registers.

Further Enamts. of 7/12/94

Q. You said that you have
been punished for old offen-
-ces. I shall read them
out to you. Who is the person
referred to in them as Chinta
Swami & Chinta Swami
gadu. Is it you?

A. Heard. Of these Chinta
Swamigadu referred to in
(Case) no 472 of 1881 on the
file of the Anakapalli Jk
Magistrate's Court is none other
than myself. I am usually
known by the name Swami

But some how it has been
entered as there as Swami
gadu. Chinta Swami refer-
-red to in the following cases
is also myself :- Case no 379
of 1881 on the file of the Jk Magistrate's
Court at Uyyalapattanam.
no 17 of 92 on the file of P.L.
Magistrate's Court. no 34
of 92 - do - do - do. I
have been sentenced to pen-
dery

3.
depos rigorous imprisonment
for 1 month, 6 months, 1 year
& 8 months respectively in the
above cases. Though I appealed
against all these sentences, none
of them were ~~reverted~~ either
remitted or reduced. I suffered
the punishments fully.

Q. Have you heard the
charge framed against
you?

A. Yes I have heard.

Q. Did you commit the
offence?

A. No I did not.

Q. Do you cite witnesses
for your defence?

A. I have no witness.

-Sec.

(57) Chintan Swami

CU
19/4

Examination of the 2nd
accused Chintā Appalaswami
of Tummapala 8/4/12/96.

Question. A complaint has
been lodged that on the 29th
Nov 96 yourself & the 1st-
accused stole the cloths of
Ramachariam. Did you
Commit the offence?

Answer. Yes. Myself &
the 1st-accused came to this
town together. We stole these
cloths when we were lying
down near the Kannikam
-mavaru temple. I took
the cloths from the pile. The
1st-accused knows. He kept
I had a hand in it. Of these
cloths I wore the coat. While
myself & the 1st-accd were
walking on the ~~Cantonment~~
Road with the remaining
cloths the Constables seized
us ~~near~~ ⁱⁿ the Cantonment.
The cloths were in my pos-
session when we were
arrested. The 1st-accused
was then in my company.
It is true that we gave out
false names on that
occasion. My real name
is Appalaswami. This
man's (1st-accd) name
is Swami

Further

Further Examination

7/12/94.

Q. Have you hitherto been punished for theft?

A. Yes. I have undergone punishment. The Chunta Appalawanni who referred to in C. Case No 507 of 90 on the file of the 2nd class magts of Anakapalli read out to me just now, is myself. I was there punished with rigorous imprisonment for a week for theft.

Q. Have you heard the charge framed against you?

A. Yes. I have.

Q. Did you commit the offence?

A. Yes. I did.

Q. Do you cite any witnesses for defence?

A. There are no witnesses.

(Mark of Appalawanni)

Cl
19/4

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

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.
- F = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.