

- 1) Number of pages. 118
- 2) Date of repair 24.5.88
- 3) Initial of the Ref. 604

Tamil Nadu Archives:

Govt of Tamil Nadu:

Judicial Dept.

Go No. 1531
10.7.875

mm

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
10th July 1875.*

Courts.

Read the following papers:—

No. 69. From F. H. WOODROFFE, Esq., Acting District Judge of Madura, to the Honorable D. F. CARMICHAEL, Officiating Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madura, 1st July 1875, No. 238. do myself the honor to submit the following matter for the immediate consideration of Government.

2. On the file of the Sub-Court here, there is a large number of connected suits stated to involve eight lakhs of Rupees worth of property in the aggregate and known as the Padamatur suits. Certain of these came on for final hearing before the Subordinate Judge Mr. Streenivassa in the early part of March last. Just before that efforts had been made to have six of these suits transferred to the file of the District Court (*vide* enclosures Y and Z). Owing apparently to the difficulty of securing Madras Counsel's attendance at a deferred hearing in this Court, motions for withdrawal were not pressed, and so these suits remained for disposal with Mr. Streenivassa. Amongst the suits then finally heard by him were Original Suits, Nos. 89, 105, and 107 of 1873, and before closing the Court for the annual recess (which commenced on the 19th of April), Mr. Streenivassa appears to have given oral judgment therein in favor of the plaintiff (the same in all three).

3. In consequence of information received I issued proceedings to the Subordinate Judge on the 26th instant requesting him to submit by the hands of bearer, without delay, the entire records in the said Original Suits, Nos. 89, 105, and 107, for my consideration. I received the bundle of records along with a forwarding letter (enclosure E) from Mr. Streenivassa. Subsequently, same day, a petition (copy enclosed marked A) was presented to me on behalf of Ramasami Chettiar, defendant in the said Original Suit, No. 89, in which he charges Mr. Streenivassa with making attempts, both before and after the final hearing, to extract money from him and the co-defendants in the suit for pronouncing judgment in their favor. Petitioner himself was in attendance, and I immediately examined him, having first written demi-officially to Mr. Streenivassa, requesting him to attend at my house, where I then was, at once, and adding that the matter was a most important one. By the time Mr. Streenivassa arrived, petitioner's statement had been taken down, but it was subsequently read over to him in Mr. Streenivassa's presence. On his arrival I handed the petition to Mr. Streenivassa to peruse. After perusal, he observed that as he was unexpectedly asked to attend he desired to be furnished with a copy of it and put in reply on Monday, but that the charge was without foundation. I also then explained to Mr. Streenivassa that inquiry was being conducted by me as Controlling Judicial Officer of the district, that it was not a judicial investigation, that as I thought it desirable that he should be in attendance, I had sent for him, but that he would understand that he was not obliged to attend or answer any question. I may mention here that throughout inquiry has been conducted privately, and this being so, and the inquiry not being a Judicial one, there is reluctance on the part of some at least of those who made statements in support of the petition, that their statements should be given forth as emanating from them until they are placed in a witness-box before a competent tribunal and so protected in what they may state. In deference to this reluctance, I abstain from transmitting copies of such statements, reduced by me to writing. Certain others were examined by me on the same day, and then I adjourned the inquiry to Monday the 28th.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
10th July 1875.*

4. In the course of resumed inquiry, a deponent stated that he wished to answer a certain question to me without anybody else being present. On my asking Mr. Streenivassa to withdraw for a moment, he expressed an opinion to the effect that it was useless for him to attend at all unless allowed to attend throughout, and so withdrew altogether. Same day was presented another petition (enclosure B) by Ramasami Chetti, asking me to admit evidence of report as to conduct of Mr. Streenivassa in the case in question, and the general character and reputation he bears in the district. On this petition I noted as follows: "I decline at present to receive evidence as to general character." At the same time was presented another petition (enclosure C) on behalf of Ramasami Chetti, and in accordance therewith I requested and obtained the attendance of some of the gentlemen therein named, and statements were taken from them. In the afternoon of the same day it was brought to my notice (vide also enclosed copy of petition on behalf of Ramasami Chetti marked D) that documents purporting to be the judgments in the said three suits were then in the Subordinate Court as though they had been brought and pronounced there on the 26th instant before my proceedings calling for the records reached Mr. Streenivassa, whereas, in reality, they were drawn up after receipt of my proceedings. Mr. Streenivassa's Javabnaviss, one Subbasami Aiyar, being then in attendance, I immediately examined him and recorded his statement (copy enclosed marked F). The same evening I despatched proceedings to Mr. Streenivassa as follows:—

"The District Judge is given to understand that there are in the Subordinate Court documents purporting to be judgments in Original Suits Nos. 89, 105, and 107 of 1873 on Subordinate Court's file, the entire records wherein were called for in this Court's proceedings, dated 26th instant. If this be so, the Subordinate Judge is requested to send up such documents immediately and explain fully how they have come to remain in his Court."

5. Next day the documents in question were received from Mr. Streenivassa with a letter and an explanation by Subbasami (copies enclosed marked G and H). As none of these three suits can come before me on appeal, I may here express my opinion that the explanations offered are so improbable and inconsistent, while other suspicious facts also exist, that I cannot but regard the documents as finally drawn up after the receipt of my proceedings of the 26th ultimo—a most significant fact, if the case be so.

6. On the same day (Tuesday) and yesterday certain others were examined on behalf of petitioner and their statements noted down.

7. As to the value of the statements made, they undoubtedly contain legal evidence, however, is not likely to be forthcoming in these cases unless and until only of the offence of demanding bribes from Ramasami Chetti... but also of that of receiving indirectly a certain valuable article without consideration.

8. The statements made to me also clearly indicate the existence of other cases in which Mr. Streenivassa appears to have behaved corruptly. Adequate legal evidence, however, is not likely to be forthcoming in these cases unless and until Government may see fit to promise protection to those who come forward from the penal consequences of the parts taken by them in such corrupt acts. Not a few of the participants are principal men in Madura, and cannot, I fear, be expected to undertake any risk, however small, of their own safety in the public interest.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
10th July 1875.*

9. Further, rumour of Mr. Streenivassa's corruption and belief in his corruptibility appear very prevalent, and if they be found so, I submit that they alone would necessitate Government's action against Mr. Streenivassa. In connection with this part I enclose copies of twenty-two petitions (marked I to DD) put into this Court for withdrawal of suits from Mr. Streenivassa's file subsequent to the extension of his jurisdiction in April 1873.

Since the suggestions I would respectfully offer to Government are as follow:—

(a.) That Mr. Streenivassa be immediately suspended from office pending result of inquiry into his alleged misconduct under Act XXXVII. of 1850, or the Indian Penal Code, or otherwise as the Government may deem most appropriate;

(b.) That Government should express itself prepared to protect forthcoming witnesses from penal consequences as mentioned above;

(c.) That Government should thereafter, as soon as it may appear that it is in possession of all the charges forthcoming against Mr. Streenivassa, issue a commission under Act XXXVII. of 1850;

(d.) That the Government would be pleased to take the District Judge's opinion as to whom prosecution of such inquiry should be conducted by; and

(e.) That, at the close of such inquiry, Government should, if they see sufficient ground, sanction Mr. Streenivassa's prosecution criminally.

to draw the attention of Government to the desirability of telegraphing the fact of suspension and promise of protection to witnesses, if so ordered by Government, and to mention the name of Audeppa Chettiar, first-class District Munsif of Madura, to take Mr. Streenivassa's place during his suspension.

12. Two copies of this letter are in course of preparation—one for communication to the High Court, and the other for transmission to Mr. Streenivassa for his information.

No. 70. Telegram from the District Judge of Madura, to the Officiating Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madura, 7th July 1875.

Sub-Judge Streenivassa committed suicide on Monday night, 5th. Please expect letter.

No. 71. ORDER THEREON, 10th July 1875, No. 1531. full account of the circum-

2. Meanwhile, they think it proper to direct that when a Subordinate Judge is accused of misconduct and the District Judge deems it desirable to make a report thereon, such report should be addressed to the High Court, instead of to the Government direct.

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Officiating Chief Secretary.

Ed. J. Wright.

3
 I put the matter before the Chief
 Justice. It was thought ~~advisable~~
 to have Mr. Kernans opinion
 Hence some delay - so we did
 not get the papers back until
 late last night.

You will have learned ere this
 that the unfortunate man has
 fled to the difficulty
 by making away with himself.

I may mention however that the
 High Court did not intend to
 take the course suggested in
 the telegram - Act III of 1873
 (Indian Civil Courts Act) Section 18
 declares the duty of Government
 to Section 19. The High Court

may include
 a 'substantial'
 opinion that the
 'Sheshband' case
 'the matter comes
 Court says no?
 I remain

suggest necessity of
 up. The Judge's view of
 the given in Section 19 is
 that the Court is not
 to be free of the High
 Court's view of it.
 I remain
 Yours

P.S. I shall send you tomorrow in 80. The High Court's report
 by the Government of India about the High Court's decision
 in the case of the information from the Court

No. 238
1875

Madras District Court
18th July 1875

From,
S. H. Woodroffe Esquire
District Judge of
Madras.

To,
The Honorable Dr. E. Carmichael
Officiating Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George.

Honorable Sir

1. I do myself the honor to submit the following matter for the immediate consideration of Government.

2. On the file of the Sub Court here, there is a large number of connected suits stated to involve lands of Rupees worth of property in the aggregate and known as the Padarnatus Suits. Certain of these came on for final hearing before the Subordinate Judge Mr. Stronach in the early part of March last just before that efforts had been made to have some of these suits transferred to the file of the District Court (vide Encls. 1 & 2) owing apparently to the difficulty of securing Mr. Madras Carmichael's attendance at a deferred hearing in this Court, motions for withdrawal were not pressed and so these suits remained for disposal with Mr. Stronach. Amongst the suits then finally heard by him were Nos. 89, 105 & 107 of 1873. and before closing the Court for the annual recess (which commenced on the 19th of April) Mr. Stronach appears to have given oral judgment therein in favor of the Plaintiff (the same in all three).

3. In consequence of information received I should

(Proceedings)

Proceedings to the Subordinate Judge on the 26th
instant requesting him to submit by the hands
of his own without delay, the entire Records
in the said Nos 89, 105 and 107 for my con-
sideration: About 3 P.M. I received the bundle
of records along with a forwarding letter from
Mr. Strinivasan. Subsequently same day a Peti-
tion (Copy enclosed marked A) was presented to
me on behalf of Ramasami Chettiar Defendant
in the said No 89 in which he charges Mr.
Strinivasan with making attempts both before
and after the final hearing to extract money
from him and the Co-defendants in the suit
for pronouncing Judgment in their favour:
Petitioner himself was in attendance and I
immediately examined him having first
written demur. Officially to Mr. Strinivasan re-
questing him to attend at my house where
I then was, at once and advised that the
matter was a most important one. By the
time Mr. Strinivasan arrived, Petitioner's state-
ment had been taken down but it was subsequent-
ly read over to him in Mr. Strinivasan's pres-
ence. On his arrival I handed the Petition
to Mr. Strinivasan to peruse. After perusal, he
observed that as he was unexpectedly asked
to attend he desired to be furnished with a copy
of it and put in reply on Monday but that
the charge was without foundation I also
then explained to Mr. Strinivasan that enquiry
was being conducted by me as controlling
Judicial authority in the District, that it
was not a judicial investigation, that as
I thought it desirable that he should be
in attendance, I had sent for him, but that

-he-

he would understand that he was not obliged
to attend or answer any question: I may men-
tion here that throughout enquiry has been
conducted privately and this being so and the
enquiry not being a Judicial one, there is
reluctance on the part of some at least of
those who made statements in support of
the Petition, that their statements should
be given forth as emanating from them
until they are placed in a witness box
before a competent tribunal and so protected
in what they may state: in deference to this
reluctance, I abstain from having written copies
of such statements, reduced by me to writing.
Certain others were examined by me on the
same day then I adjourned the enquiry to Monday the 28th.

In the course of the enquiry
a deponent stated that he intended to
answer certain question to me without any
body else being present. On my asking
Mr. Strinivasan to withdraw for a moment,
he expressed an opinion to the effect that
it was useless for him to attend at all
unless allowed to attend throughout and so
withdraw altogether. Same day was presented
another Petition (Enclosure B) by Ramasami
Chettiar asking me to admit evidence of
repute as to conduct of Mr. Strinivasan in
the case in question, and the general char-
acter and reputation he bears in the
District. On this Petition I noted as follows:
"I decline at present to receive evidence as
to general character." At the same time was
presented

presented another Petition (Enclosure C) on behalf of Ramasami Chetti and in accord-
ance therewith I requested and obtained the attendance of some of the Gentlemen there-
in named and Statements were taken from them - In the afternoon of the same day it was brought to my notice (vide also enclosed copy of petition on behalf of Ramasami Chetti marked D) that documents purporting to be the judgments in the said 3 suits were then in the Subordinate Court as though they had been brought and pronounced there on the 26th instant - Before my Proceeding, calling for the Records reached Mr. Stronivas-
whereas in reality they were drawn up after receipt of my Proceedings. Mr. Stronivas being then in attendance, I immediately examined him and recorded his statement (copy enclosed marked E) - The same evening I despatched Proceeding to Mr. Stronivas as follows -

"The Mr. District Judge is given to under-
stand that there are in the Subordinate Court documents purporting to be judgments in Nos 105 & 107 of 1913 in Subordinate Court file, the entire Records wherein were called for in this Court's Proceedings dated 26th instant. If this be so, the Subordinate Judge is requested to send up such documents immediately & explain fully how they have come to remain in his Court."

5- On the same day the documents in question were received from Mr. Stronivas with a letter

3
Letter and an explanation by Subordinate (Copies enclosed marked C & H) - As none of these 3 suits can come before me on appeal I may here express my opinion that the explanations offered are so improbable and inconsistent with other suspicious facts as to lead me to conclude that I cannot but regard the documents as finally drawn up after the receipt of my Proceedings of the 26th instant - it is most sig-
nificant fact, if the case be so -

6- On the same day (Tuesday) & yesterday certain others were examined on behalf of Petitioner and their statements noted down.

7- As to the value of the Statements made, they undoubtedly contain legal evidence constituting if more fully proved, proof of Mr. Stronivas' Commission not only of the offence of Re-
manding bribes from Ramasami Chetti and another Defendant - but also of that of receiving indirectly a certain valuable article without consideration -

8- The statements made to me clearly indicate the existence of other cases in which Mr. Stronivas appears to have behaved corruptly. Adequate legal evidence however is not likely to be forthcoming in these cases unless and until Government may see fit to promise protection to those who come forward from the penal consequences of the part taken by them in such corrupt acts. As a few of the participants are principal men in Madurai and cannot I fear be expected to undertake any risk however small of their own safety in the public interest.

9- Further, rumours of Mr. Stronivas' corruption

Corruption and belief in his corruptibility appear very prevalent and if they be found so, I submit that they alone would necessitate Government's action against Mr. Stronach. In connection with this fact I enclose copies of 22 Petitions (marked I to DD) put into the Court for withdrawal of Suits from Mr. Stronach's jurisdiction subsequent to the extension of his jurisdiction in April 1853.

10 In these circumstances the suggestions I would respectfully offer to Government, are as follows:-

(a) That Mr. Stronach be immediately suspended from office pending result of inquiry into his alleged misconduct under Act XXXVII of 1850 or the Indian Penal Code or otherwise as the Government may deem most appropriate.

(b) That Government should expeditiously proceed to take the Commission into consideration as mentioned above.

(c) That Government should thereafter as soon as it may appear that it is in possession of all the charges for the coming against Mr. Stronach, issue a Commission under Act XXXVII of 1850.

(d) That the Government would be pleased to take the District Judge's opinion as to whom prosecution of such inquiry should be conducted by.

(e) That at the close of such inquiry Government should if they see sufficient ground sanction Mr. Stronach's prosecution criminally.

11 In conclusion may I be permitted

permitted to draw the attention of Government to the desirability of telegraphing the fact of suspension and promise of protection to witnesses, if so ordered by Government, and to mention the name of a Judge of the First Class District Judge of Madras, to take Mr. Stronach's place during his suspension.

12 Two copies of this letter are in course of preparation, one for communication to the High Court and the other for transmission to Mr. Stronach for his information.

I have the honor to be
Honorable Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. M. P.
District Judge

S. F. W. Droppie Esquire
District Judge of Madras.

The humble petition of (Ramasami)
Chetty of Demicottat, Dindur, in
No 89 of 1873 on the file of the Sub
Court of Madras presented through
his Counsel A. G. Palu Esquire.

Remett,
That one Salagayasingu Pillai in a
suit in 1873 in the said Court
claiming what he alleged to be the (Palapat)
of Padamator as the only surviving son of
a former Nannidar who died in 1831 is
forty four years ago.

That after more
the suit was finally heard by him on the
2nd & 13th March 1875 and about 17 days
afterwards i.e. on the 31st March 1875 the
Sub Judge came to Court and after giving
a judgment in a suit relating to the
same property against the (Plff) in that
suit asked the (Plff) to take in No 89 of
1873 why they had not claimed to be in
possession of the property in their (Plaint)
whereupon they as a matter of course
petitioned to be allowed to make the said
addition which was accordingly allowed
and then done.

That about 19 days after this
i.e.

by mail
70 Madras Telegram
from same office, 11/75
is done.
The said suit is the subject
of the present full account.
of the circumstances attending
the said judge's decision.
2. Meanwhile, they have
it is proper to state that
when a Sub Judge is asked
if he is satisfied with the
judge's decision it is desirable
to make a report thereon,
and report that he is not
satisfied with the judge's
decision to the Sub Judge.

performed 25/7-9/75
to the Sub Judge, No 89 of 1873

Ag. Chetty
(Signature)
Respectful to the Hon. Judge, with the
transmission of the documents, with the
This is done, with its enclosures, with the

Urgent
1875
Large Department
The District Judge of
Madras

To the Chief Secretary
to Government
Madras
Dated 1st July 1875
No 238
Sue Cases 30 D
No 1859.

Submitting for the in-
one note containing
Government the addition
has been made by me
(Ramasami) etc etc against
the Sub Judge's decision
per done
into return with

is on the 19th April 1835 the Sub Judge pronounced an oral judgment in favor of Plff in Rs 80 88 of 1834 in the following words as nearly as possible "Judgment for Plff with all costs" and up to this amount no written judgment has been delivered.

That your petitioner has to draw your honor's attention to the peculiar nature & origin of the suit; the great value of the property at stake and the position of the parties concerned.

The value of the property is estimated at about Eight Lacs. The Plff who is a pauper is maintained & his suit is supported by two rich Mullaokallie Chetties

who are speculators & have no other interest whatever as will appear from the registered agreement which Plff has executed & there undertaking to pay two and a half lacs of Rupees in case of success they agreeing on their part to maintain him and pay the whole costs of this litigation & its termination. The Defendants also rich Mullaokallie Chetties on the other hand have been in possession of the whole of the property (consisting of eight villages) for above thirty years and are still in possession. It was on mortgage

on mortgage & pledged by the owner at various times previous to the year 1823 and it was subsequently sold in satisfaction of Debt to cover above 10 or 20 years ago.

That both before & after the final hearing of this suit the Sub Judge made attempts to extract money from your petitioner & other Co-defendants in the same suit for pronouncing judgment in their favor but your petitioner being unwilling and also unable from the nature of the case to raise and give so large a sum as was demanded failed to satisfy him and the Sub Judge has subsequently pronounced Judgment in favor of Plaintiff having received as rumoured the large sum of Rupees 25,000 for so doing.

That it is also rumoured that the delay in delivering a written Judgment is owing to his demanding a further gratification for strengthening the said Judgment still more in their favor and also for delivering it without delay.

That your Petitioner therefore humbly prays that your honor will receive the evidence he is prepared to submit and will immediately call for the record of the said

suit.

suits and the suits connected therewith
and direct the Sub Judge to suspend
further proceedings and desist from
taking any further action whatever
in them and will pronounce a fresh
Judgment upon the evidence recorded
ed. therein and render him justice.

And your Petitioner shall
as in duty bound ever
pray.

Madras
26th June 1875 } (Signed) Alexander C. Poles
Counsel for Petitioner

(A true copy)

F. W. Duff
District Judge

Remanance

S.O. 710 July 15/81

Copy of a Petition
dated 26 June 1875
presented by one
Remanance Chetty
against the District
Judge

1875
1877
1879

Encl: No 1
a letter from
District Judge
dated 10 July
1875 No 238

12
The District Court
Madras

The humble petition of (Remanance)
Chetty by his Counsel A. C. Poles Esqrs
Sheweth

1. That your petitioner has charged
the Sub Judge with an attempt to obtain a
gratification from him and has also com-
plained of, a rumour (which he believes)
that he obtained such a gratification from
the Plaintiff in C.S No 89 of 1873, for pronouncing
a judgment in his favor.
2. That, in support of such charge, your
petitioner begs to point out that it is of
the greatest importance to prove the conduct
of the said Judge as reported in this partic-
ular case as also the general character
and reputation he bears in this District
and he therefore prays that such evidence
of character being admissible under the
Evidence Act, may be received.
3. That your petitioner further prays
that in case your Honor should (assuming
the evidence submitted to be satisfactory)
recommend to the High Court, the suspension
of the Sub Judge from office, and the issue
of a commission to make an enquiry into
his conduct, that your Honor will
act.

and the High Court to arms the said
 Commission with power to receive
 evidence as to general character in
 case it has no power to do so under
 this Act and your petitioners further
 pray that his Counsel may be heard
 on the subject of para 2 of the petition.

For which acts of power
 your petitioners shall,
 as in duty bound

ever pray

Assented
 28 June
 1875

Signed Alexander & Poles

(A true copy)

[Signature]
 Registrar of Deeds

Commenced

No District Court
Madurai

The humble petition of Karmasamy
Chetty by his Counsel, A. E. Valer Esquire
Sheweth:

That it is necessary to examine
the following witnesses on his behalf,
with regard to the petition presented
by him on the 26th June 1875 -

- Karmasamy
- 1 M R. Roy
 - 2 " Vasudhara Pillai
 - 3 " Karmasamy Chetty's Agent (Kata
per Chetty)
 - 4 " Rosakumar Pillai
 - 5 " V. Subramania Iyer High Court Vakil
 - 6 " S. Subramania Iyer High Court Vakil
 - 7 " R. Seshiah High Court Vakil
 - 8 " Seshadray Iyer Esquire Executor to the
estate of M R. Roy
Late Karmasamy
Senior
 - 9 " Karmasamy Shastri, District Court
Vakil. Member of Dewastanam Com
mittee
 - 10 " A. J. Esquire Barrister at Law
 - 11 " E. J. Esquire Barrister at Law
 - 12 " M. R. Esquire Additional Member
of the Minatchy Dewastanam
Committee
 - 13 " H. Esquire of the Revenue
Survey

Encls. No 2

In a letter from the
M. R. Esquire dated 1st
July 1875 No 238-

(Copy of Deed of Sale)
28 June 1875 to witness
and one of report as
to the conduct of the
sale. Dated in a
Criminal Case.

14. W. M. Dubae Esquire Collector
Madurai
15. P. O. Sullivan Esquire Barrister
at Law
16. Shepherd Esquire Barrister at Law
17. Mr. F. M. Scott District Court Vakil
18. Saloo Gossamy Senar Plaintiff in
O.S. No. 89 of 1873
19. Gov. P. J. 100 Velan Chetty
20. Gov. P. J. Kristian Chetty of Karakudi
21. M. C. Raj Andendolam Pillay of
Madurai
22. Muttusamy Serray Agent of
Plaintiff in O.S. No. 89 of
1873

Therefore your honor is requested
to send a notice to the above mentioned
persons to appear this day and give
their evidence.

For which act of favour
as in duty bound Petitioner
will ever pray

(Signed) Alexander C. Polo
(Attorney)

[Signature]
A. C. Polo

Received
28/2/75

[Signature]

That your Petitioner further
prays that a notice or order may
be issued to Andimoolun Pillay
and Theoboga Nairs to come
and give evidence in this case.

Madina } and your Petitioner
28 June } shall, as in duty bound,
1875 } ever pray.
(Signed) Alexander E. Cole

That Mr. S. Lookiammar
Jgt. High Court Valuel, may be noticed
not to deliver out of his possession
certain letters written by Nursing Row
to one Ponnasawmy Pillay.

(Lina Com)

Wm. W. W. W.
Ag. Dist. C. Judge

Adm. v. P.

That your Petitioner further
prays that a notice or order may
be issued to Andimoolun Pillay
and Theoboga Nairs to come
and give evidence in this case.

Sublunarian Law Law Law in the
Sub Court states as follows:-

On 26th Instant, Sub Judge came to Court at 10.30 & Mr. & M. at about 10.45 he took his seat on the Bench. 2 or 3 minutes after, I came with the Cause list & the papers connected therewith: As No 8, 9 of 1873 was not down in the Cause list: the Subordinate Judge was the first to speak to me about the cases. He asked me who were the Parties in it: I replied "Mrs Scott and R. Seshiah for Plaintiff and P. Subramanian for Defendant." They were not in Court then: he then handed me over the Judgment, telling me acquaint the Parties, that the Judgment was according to what he had orally stated. I put down the Judgment on the Bench table, along with other papers: the Subordinate Judge proceeded with the day's work: & afterwards after the Proceedings of the District Court, as the Subordinate Judge remained on the Bench about $\frac{1}{2}$ hour and then left for home desiring me to follow him. I tied up the Judgment and other papers in a bundle and placing it on my table went to the Subordinate Judge's house. On receiving the Proceedings, the Subordinate Judge asked

Enclosure No 5
In a letter from the
Subordinate Judge of Pondicherry
dated 19th July 1873 No 285

Copy of letter from the
Subordinate Judge of Pondicherry
dated 19th July 1873 No 285
and 107 of 1873 on the 11th
of the Subordinate Court
of Pondicherry

what were what suits were those
mentioned. I told him they were the
Padamulla suits disposed of by him
on 17th April at his Bangalore he
handed over the Proceedings. I did
not know at first why he called me
to his Bangalore: he got there before
me, as he draws. I found the Records
in the three suits tied up in three
separate bundles - lying on his bed
room floor. He dictated a draft reply
to the District Court and after correc-
tion it was fair copied by me. The
whole time I was at his house was
1/2 hour or thereabouts. For the last
5 or 6 months I go to the Subordinate
Judge's house to assist when he pre-
pares Judgments. I last went there
on that account on Saturday at
about 7 A.M. and remained till
9-30 A.M. about. During those 2 1/2
or 3 hours the Subordinate Judge was
engaged in dictating to me his Judg-
ment in O.S. 105 of 1873, one of the Pada-
mulla suits. He finished the Judgment
that morning. He began it about
Saturday Week and worked at it every
morning with my help except a
couple of mornings. The Judgment in
O.S. 89 of 1873 contains about 38 Pages
of

of matter. Each page has about 1/2
half of it in margin. The Judgment
in 89 of 1873 was also written last
Saturday morning. The part of the
Judgment in O.S. 105 of 1873 written on
the same morning occupied 10 or 5
half pages. The same morning he
wrote Judgments in connection O.S. Nos
104, 106 and 107. The Subordinate Judge
brought all five Judgments to Court
with him - all were handed to me
on the Bench at the same time and
all were tied up by me in the bundles.
I left on my saddle. The Judgments
in O.S. Nos 105 and 107 as well as that
in No. 89 of 1873 have not been sent to
the District Court.

I took the District Court from
who brought the Proceedings here to
the Subordinate Court so as to
get a corner for the Subordinate Judge
letter. When I came to Court, I went
first to the Head Writer and then
to my table where I handed the
records and letter to the District
Court from. I was in such a hurry
that I forgot altogether about the
Judgments there. About 1/2 hour after
I

I discovered that the Judgments had been left behind. I tied them up with the daily papers. It did not occur to me to forward them at once to the District Court or to get the Subordinate Judge's orders about them.

When I left the Subordinate Judge's house on Saturday morning, all the records were tied up.

When I left the Subordinate Judge's house on Saturday afternoon, he told me attend there on Sunday at 7 A.M.; he did not give me any reason. I went there; the Subordinate Judge was sitting in the lower stairs Verandah. I saluted him. I remained there survial for couple of hours.

He then called me and bade me come again at 11 o'clock when we could go on with our work: did so and from 11 to 12 or 1 o'clock we were going through the record in A. No 147 of 1873 or review: he did not write any order: after one o'clock I went home.

Did not see Mr Johnson Head Writer of the District Court the whole of yesterday.

The Judgments have not yet been

21
been entered in fair Diary as that has not yet been prepared.

I handed over the Judgments to the Sheristadar early this morning and he to the Head Writer to be fair copied.

None of the five Judgments was entered in the Cause list of the 26th Instant. I am employed in the Judicial Department since August 1891.

Signed V Subbaramaiah
Head to Dependent & declared correct.

Signed J. B. Woodroffe
28 June 1895 Affirmed Judge

Recalled. I did not communicate what the Subordinate Judge told me to the Vahils in the Sinto. I did not see them afterwards till I saw them here to day. I know V Subbaramaiah Aiyar. he is in the habit of taking orders for his cousin

Submonia Lige but it did
not seem to me to look whether
he was present when the Sub.
Judge handed me the said goods

Signed V. Submonia after
Read to defendant & declared correct
(Signed J. L. Woodruff)

Note. above was recorded in
the presence of the said

Signed J. L. Woodruff
Justice of the Peace

(Alone (Sd))

[Signature]

Justice of the Peace

N^o 105 Subordinate Court
Madura 29 June 1875

From A. P. Theenivasa Esquire
Subordinate Judge of
L. Madura
S. H. Woodroffe Esquire
Sg District Judge of
Madura

Sir,
I have the honor to forward
herewith the judgments referred to
in your proceedings of yesterday's date.

The above proceeding was
received by me between 7 & 8 o'clock
last night, and this morning on
my calling upon my jailer to
account for his not having sent
the judgments with the records, he
has submitted the accompanying
explanation which I believe to be true.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant
(Signed) A. P. Theenivasa
Subordinate Judge

(A true Copy)

S. H. Woodroffe
District Judge

Received

Enclosure 6

In a letter from the
Sg District Judge of
Madura dated 1st July
1875 to 238.

Copy of statement given
by V. Subramaniya
Javeda Nair of the
Court.

The Subordinate Court
Madura

(Report most respectfully made
by V. Subbarami Aiyar, Javabannis of the
said Court.)

I was this day directed to
explain why the Judgments in C.S. 89, 105,
& 107 of 1873 on the file of the said Court
were not sent up along with the records
in the said suits to the District Court on
the 26th Instant and I respectfully offer
the following explanation regarding it.
On the 26th Instant directly after the
Court took its seat on the Bench and
after I attended on the Bench with the
records connected with the work posted
for that day, as usual, the Judgments in
the said 3 suits and in 2 others were
handed over to me - after leaving them
with the papers connected with suits
posted for that day, I was answering the
questions put to me by the Court regarding
suits posted for that day - While almost
half of that day's work had been gone thro
the District Court's Proceedings were received.
After the receipt thereof the Court finished
the remainder of that day's work with great
haste and went to its Bangalore when I was
directed to follow soon. Accordingly I tied
up and left as they were, the papers connect-
ed with the suits posted for that day and
the said Judgments &c and immediately
came up to the Court's Bangalore. According

Enclosure No. 7

In a letter from
District Judge of
Madura dated 13 July 1875 No.
238

Copy letter from the
Subordinate Judge of
Madura forwarding the
Judgments in C.S. 89, 105, 89,
and 107 of 1873 on the file of the
Subordinate Court and also
the explanation submitted
by the Javabannis for not
sending said Judgments
with the records of the said
suits.

to the orders given by the Court to expedite
transmission to the District Court of the
Records in the said suits &c which were
handed over to me by the Court together with
the Courts forwarding letter prepared there.
I came to Court and transmitted forthwith
without a moments delay the said Records,
and the letter which was enclosed in a
cover after numbering it. As the said Judge-
ments &c were delivered to me only on that
day and as it did not strike me in that
hurry that the said Judgments which had
been tied up by me with that day's papers
should be transmitted along with the
records, the same were not put with the
records. Moreover the practice in this
Court is that directly after a Judgment
is handed over to me by the Court it is entered
in the rough diary of that day, then handed
over through Sheristadar to the writer's office
for fair copying and that it is only after it
is fair copied that it is put on the records.
Accordingly after making entry in the Diary
I handed over (the Judgment) to Sheristadar
on Monday directly after I came to Court.

I therefore, lay before your honor
the foregoing facts and most humbly beg
to be excused.

27th June 1875

(signed) V. Subbasamiraj
Javahar Rao.

(at true translate)

[Signature]
District Judge

[Signature]

Civil Miscellaneous (Petition No
92 of 1874. 26

The District Court of Madras.

Petition respectfully presented under Section 6
of the Code of Civil Procedure by Mrs. General Vakeel
on behalf of Muthukannamma, Thammachis, widow
the Defendant of Panjyore & Defendants in & 8. 96 of 1873
on the file of the Subordinate Courts of Madras.

1. No notice has been given to the Defendant's
Vakeels though they have engaged one, in the matter
of an application (No. 45 of 1874) for issue of
an injunction presented to the Subordinate Judge
by Plaintiff's Vakeels.

2. A notice has been served on the Defl
residing at Panjyore about 36 miles off on the 5th
February 1874 in person to appear on the 7th.

3. No notice was given even on the 7th to
Defendant's Vakeels but his name was simply
called out in open Court. The papers had been
separately presented together with the copy of the
order passed against Defendant without
ascertaining whether or not the notice was served
in time.

As there is not the slightest belief that the
Court which thus conducted proceedings will
do the Defendant justice it is prayed that the said
suit may be called up & disposed of in this Court.

7th February 1874.

(Signed) J. General

Filed 4th February 1874 Pleader

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

Ag District Judge

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

(Signed) P. P. Muthukannamma

H

Encls. No 4

Done before me this 23rd

Notarial Judge of

Madras dated

1st July 1874

English and date 23rd

By Plaintiff dated

23rd June 1874

By Plaintiff dated

23rd June 1874

By Plaintiff dated

23rd June 1874

Civil Miscellaneous Petition, No. 157 of 1874.

Madura

28th February 1871.

To P. P. Atchano Esquire

District Judge, Madison

The humble Petition of Mootoo

Kumarasamy Thevarachy

Maikoa, Zemiendar of Paraisos
born 1811 - b. P. 1811

presented through his agents
Mr. J. L. L. L.

Mr. John Branch under section
6 of the Civil Rights Act

6 of the Civil Procedure Codes.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

That Petitioner is Defendant in A. S. No 96 of 1873 on the file of the Sub Court of Madras, that the plaint was filed on the 22^d November 1873, and a written statement put in by 29th on the 20th December 1873, which was the date fixed for the first hearing; that up to this date no issues have been settled.

2. That the plaintiff seeks a diversion of the income of the Zernindary for the benefit of the minor son of the Deft. that in January 1874, plaintiff presented a petition praying for an injunction to restrain the Zernindar from cutting down certain trees, and for the appointment of a Receiver to secure the income of the Zernindary; that on the 21st January 1874 notice was issued from the Court and

N.

Good-bone!
In a letter from the
W. D. Brewster & Sons of Boston
dated 100 July 1875 they say

Travelle
Copy of Oration put on
by William the Sumner of
Massachusetts. Made at
Boston 1879 for several
years ago and sent from
the office of the end ranch.

and served on the Defendant person
sally at Parayoor on the 5th February,
desiring him to show cause against
the application of Plaintiff on the 7th
Idem; that no notice was given of this
measure to the Defendants Vakil, but
Defendants having been personally
served with the notice on the 6th at a
distance of 36 miles from the Court,
was expected to travel all that distance
in such haste as to make an appear-
ance in Court by the morning of the
7th February; that on the morning of
the 7th, although Defendants Vakil had
only five minutes before argued an
appeal before the Sub Court, Plaintiff
petition asking for the injunction and
the appointment of a receiver was
called up, when Defendants Vakil
happened to be out of Court, and
without ascertaining whether Deft. had
engaged a Vakil in the case, or had had
sufficient time to put in an appear-
ance, Defendants name was called
out and an order issued restraining
him from cutting down any trees on
his estate.

3. That on the 9th February Defendants
put in a petition setting forth the
aforesaid

28
aforesaid circumstances and praying
that the order of the 7th February might
be set aside; that this prayer was com-
plied with, and the question whether or
not the injunction should be granted
was argued on both sides on the 17th
Instant; but that up to this date no
order has been yet passed.

4. Petitioner submits that he has
not been properly dealt with by
the Sub Court, and the delay in settling
the issues coupled with the haste in
which the injunction was originally
granted, induces in him a belief that
his case has not received and will
not receive that consideration to
which he is entitled; wherefore he prays
that O.S. No 96 of 1873 may be with-
drawn from the file of the Sub Court
and referred to the Additional Sub
Court or disposed of by the District
Court.

(Signed) John French

Filed 28 February 74
(Signed) P. P. Pauline
Dist. Judge

(True Copy)

Edw. W. [Signature]
Dist. Judge

Civil Miscellaneous Petition, No 196 of 1874.

Madura 29
18th March 1874.

To

F. H. Woodroffe Esquire
Acting District Judge,
Madura

The humble Petition of Nagap-
pala Chetty presented through
his vakils Mr John French
under Section 6 of the Civil
Procedure Code.

Respectfully sheweth,

That Petitioner is Plaintiff
in O. S. No 38 of 1873 on the file of the
Sub Court of Madura; that the Plaintiff
which sued for recovery of Rupees
3679-4-10 on a note of hand payable on
demand was presented on the 4th June
1873; that the Sub Court fixed the 16th
August following for the final hearing
of the case as deeming a first hearing
unnecessary; that on the 16th August
aforesaid Plaintiff and 4 of his witnesses
were present, but an adjournment
to the 30th September 1873 was granted
on the application of Defendants Vakils;
that on the 30th September aforesaid
Plaintiff and all his witnesses were
present in Court, when the case was
again

Enclosure 10

In a letter from the
Acting District Judge of
Madura dated 14th Aug
1875. No. 235

Copy of Petition before
Acting District Judge
by Mr John French
Plaintiff's Vakils
presented on 4th June
1873 and fixed for
final hearing on 16th
August 1873. The
case was adjourned
to 30th September
1873 on application
of Defendants Vakils.

again adjourned to the 30th October as
following; that on the 30th October as
aforesaid Plaintiff and all his wit-
nesses were again present in Court
and in daily attendance till the 11th
November 1873 when the case was
again adjourned to the 21st January
1874; that on the 24th January aforesaid
Plaintiff and all his witnesses again
presented themselves and continued to
be in daily attendance up to the 20th
February when (Plaintiff alone) was
examined as to the value of hand notes
having been drawn up on stamp paper;
and that since then, nothing further
has to (Petitioner's knowledge) been
ordered as to the further conduct of the
Case.

2. Petitioner submits he is a mer-
chant carrying on business at Negapa-
palam; that he has come to Madras
on 14 occasions on account of his
suit; and that his travelling expenses
alone have amounted to 100 Rupees,
while the latter he has paid his witness
so has on the other hand received the
sum of Rupees 112; that besides this
Petitioner was on the 11th March last
ordered to pay a sum of 40 Rupees
as latter due to one witness alone; that his

his repeated absence from ³⁰ Negapa-
palam interferes with his business, and
while the protracted delay in the dis-
posal of his case is daily increasing
the expenses of his suit; wherefore
Petitioner prays that his case may
be remitted and referred to the
Additional Sub Court or disposed of by
the District Court.

(Signed) John French
Pleader

Filed 28 January 74

1 signed J. B. Woodroffe
J. B. Woodroffe

(True Copy) J. B. Woodroffe
J. B. Woodroffe
J. B. Woodroffe

Civil Miscellaneous Petition
No 486 of 1874. 31

The District Court of Madras.

Application respectfully
presented by S. Subramania aiyar,
on behalf of Reverend S. B. Trincall,
Plaintiff in O.S. 21 of 1870 on the file of the
District Court and Defendant in O.S.
172 of 1874 on the file of the Sub Court.

In Suit No 21 the Petitioner
was Plaintiff and Vinakithan alias
Vallayan Chetty, 2^d Defendant. It was
a suit brought for the sum due under
a bond and under the Decree in O.S.
3 of 1852 on the file of the Civil Court.
Suit 172 of 1874 in which the said Vallayan
Chetty is Plff and the Plff, Defendant
has been instituted for recovery of the
amount which has been collected
by means of precept under the decree
in the said suit No. 3.

As the said two suits are
connected the Petitioner prays the
Court to withdraw the latter from
the Sub Court and proceed with them
jointly in this Court.

28th August 1874. /Signed/ S. Subramania aiyar

Valid

Filed 29th August 1874

/Signed/ J. H. Woodroffe
(Sec. Secular)

Asst. Judge

Conclusion "

In a letter from the
Sd District Judge of
Madras dated 10th Aug
1875. No 285

Copy of Petition and
order of withdrawal
to be kept in file of
the said suit No 21
and the said
order of withdrawal
to be kept in file of
the said suit No 172

Petition
Civl Miscellaneous (Petition No
506 of 1874. 32

The District Court of Madras

Application respectfully
presented by V. Subramaniam,
Government Pleader on behalf of
Mr. Mr. Rukar Rukar, Collector of
Madras and Agent to the Court of
Wardens in charge of the (Ranmad Rukar)
Office of 1702/24 on the Sub Court file
immediatly under section 6 of the Code
of Civil Procedure.

1. The said suit has been instituted
for the cancellation of the Court
alleged to have been obtained by the
(Defendant and for recovery of a village
worth Rs 10,000 with its income
3,000 Rs.

2. The 1st hearing of the said suit
has been posted for the 10:

(Petitioner therefore prays
that the Court will call up the said
from the file of the Subordinate Judge
in view to the same being disposed of
by this Court.

7th September 1874: /Signed/ V. Subramaniam

7th September 1874
/Signed/ J. H. H. H. H.
(True Translate)
J. H. H. H. H.
J. H. H. H. H.

Enclosure 12
Letter from the
District Judge
Madras dated 18/9/74
1875 No. 238

Remitted to
Collector dated 20/9/74
1874 sent in by Collector
of the District 18/9/74
S. Subramaniam, Agent to the
Court of Wards, 18/9/74
File of the said Court

Civil Miscellaneous Petitions
no 608 of 1874. 33
S.

The District Court of Madras

Application respectfully
presented by V. Subramania aiyer
Vatil for Defendant in os. 171 of 1874
on the file of the Sub Court under section
6 of the Civil Pro Code.

1 The said suit has been brought
by One Ramasami Chetti against
the minor zamindars of Ramnad
and the Collector of Madras for the
recovery of Rs 16 2 6 83-13-3

2 The first hearing of this suit
is to be held on 21st Instant

3. I have received a gadash from
the Collector instructing me to move
the Court to withdraw the suit for
being disposed of here.

17th October 1874. (Signed) V. Subramania aiyer
Vatil

Let 20th October 1874

(Signed) J. H. Woodroffe
Sd Dist Judge

(In translation)

F. W. Woodroffe
Sd Dist Judge

M

Enclosure 13

In a letter from the
Sd District Judge
Madras dated 17th Oct
1875 no 238

Transcribed by
H. C. Woodroffe
1874 and in 1875
Order for withdrawal
of suit from the file
of the Sub Court

Civil Miscellaneous Petition
 No. 43 of 1875. 34
 The District Court of Madras

Petition respectfully presented by Siva
 alias Chetty 1st Defendant in C.L. 26 of 1872
 on the file of the Subordinate Court of Madras
 which has been brought by the Plff.
 to recover Rs. 698-11-12 to be paid
 petitioner of a certain sum due to him by
 the said Plaintiff. Petitioner's written state-
 ment is to the effect that a sum of Rs. 698-
 13-31-12 being balance after deducting
 payments is due on account of the value
 of his goods. Petitioner has filed many
 documents on his behalf and the evidence
 of many Europeans taken before the
 Sub Judge of Nagapattam has been
 applied to the case.

The Plaintiff was summoned and
 appeared at petitioner's instance; the Court
 below has not examined him and has
 directed the Plaintiff to do so. On the 17th
 December 1874, the case will be
 dealt with under Sections 118 and 120. It
 is stated as follows in the above order "as
 they have not come to an amicable
 settlement among themselves" petitioner
 never appeared before the Court below
 for a compromise nor
 did he present a motion & that offer.
 The Court below did not examine him.

N

Enclosure 14
 In a letter from the
 AG Assistant Judge of
 Madras dated 11th
 1875. No. 238

General
 Secretary of the
 in the AG's
 to the Court of
 in charge of
 Remondary
 Mr. J. C. O. S. S. S.
 the AG's Office
 in the AG's Office

though he made his appearance in court:
dancer of the above named (Bleeker)
has therefore no hope of getting justice
done to him by the Court below.

Though an on Quilness was occa-
sioned on September 18th by his depo-
sition he was not called by the Court.
Petitioner and the other witnesses about
therefore he examined before this Court
on 22d of Sept. Court and not before Sub
Court.

Illegal acts have been committed
in this Sub Court in Oct. Dec. 1871 &
1872 on the part of the Judge of the
Sub Court, about which petitioners have
presented motions to this Court.

1 signed / I am a page of 14
18 December 1872

He therefore ^{the student} progg. many
be called up and transferred to the Sub
Sub Judge for disposal in that
in order may be issued to the Sub Judge
Judge directing him to stay further
proceedings in the case till Court time.

Filed 13 January 1873
1 signed / J. P. Woodroffe
as Sub Judge
(True Daniel)

Woodroffe
as Sub Judge

The District Court of Madras

Petition respectfully presented by
Karnalingum Pillai 27th Defendant
in O.S. 27 of 1872 on the file of the Principal
Sudr Arneens Court under section 6 of
the Civil Procedure Code.

1. A suit was brought by Sheikh
Ali Subadar son of Mahomed ali in
paternal aunts in No 142 of 1855 on the
file of the Mufti Sudr Arneens Court
alleging that the land in dispute was
brought from the said Mahomed ali
who died issueless; and an appeal
was ^{also} preferred in 1856 in which the
decision was in favor of these Defend-
ants &c. In O.S. No 19 of 1863 and in Ap-
peal Suit No 154 of 1864 it was alleged
by the said Subadar in collusion with
the Plaintiffs father that Mahomed ali
had no issue; that the Plaintiff and
16 others were Dayadees; that they have
relinquished their claim in favor of
Mahomed Imam one of the Dayadees
and so winnow of the said Subadar.
The said suits were dismissed. Now
Plaintiff has brought this suit alleg-
ing that she is the daughter of the said
Mahomed

350
In the Court
of the District
Judge of Madras
Dated 15th July 1873
910, 238

In a

1 Mo.
Harcourts
Petition No
661 of 1873.

To The District Court of Madras
Petition respectfully presented
by Valliammal alias Vireimulla & Son
vs. Cairndiffin B.S. No 88 of 1873 in the file
of the Subordinate Court of Madras.
2nd Defendant is my father.
He was married to the 7th Defendant my
mother and begot myself and 2 other
daughters.

1st & 2nd & 3rd Defendants and the
father of the 6th Defendant executed an
agreement to the 7th Defendant settling
her to the house ground Pungah and
Pungah lands of Meluramian at the vil.
lage for the maintenance of myself
and others and put her in possession
thereof.

2nd Defendant having preferred
a complaint to the Head Nivistan
Magistrate regarding the said house
ground it was decided that I and
others alone should occupy it.

The 2nd Defendant instituted
a suit in No 136 of 1871 before the Perma-
nent Magistrate regarding the said
house ground which came subsequent
ly before the Principal Sessions
and then before the Additional Magistrate
where it was numbered 27 of 1873. The
2nd Defendant on the 18th July 1873 with-
drew the suit.

The 2nd Defendant filed a
Summary

Enclosure 16

In a letter from the
District Judge of Madras
dated 24 July 1873 No 238

Copy of the letter from the
District Judge of Madras
dated 24 July 1873 No 238
to the 2nd Defendant
No 238 of 1873
to the 2nd Defendant
No 238 of 1873

Summary Suit in No 137 of 1871 was
paying half the regular Stamp duty
before the Permanent Commission which
Suit & stated in No 57 Kalams of Sec 8
Munajah land forming a portion
of the property mentioned in the said
agreement. On the 1st February 1872 the
Munsif passed a decree contrary to
law taking exception to the entire right
created under the said agreement
and in relation thereto. The Munsif
gave sanction on the 20 August 1872

In view to have the agreement
established in other instances a
Suit No 96 of 1872 Principal Sudder Amies
Court. The action was referred to the Munsif
at Munsif Court. The Munsif numbered
26 of 1873. The Munsif dismissed it on
the ground that cause of action did
not arise while the witnesses had
been in attendance, the Munsif of
Appeal from the said decree was pro-
posed and fair copies which he caused
not to be presented in Court. Subsequently
on receiving an application for a
review he posted it for 15 October. In
order to prevent the witnesses from
being in attendance on the day fixed
the 2nd Defendant caused a complaint
No 403 of 1873 to be presented to the Sub
Magistrate of Simla by his own
bandy

bandyman. 9 individuals were ar-
rested and fined 100 Rupees. Warrant
was issued against many more and
others. 2nd Petition was presented to the
Munsif alluding to the foregoing
particulars and stating that latter
will be paid for Defendant's witnesses
instead of passing orders accordingly
he told the Plaintiff to withdraw from
the Suit with leave to institute a fresh
Suit. On the 15 October 1873 the Suit was
accordingly withdrawn.

In Suit No 246 of 1870 in the Perma-
nent Munsif's Court it was alleged that
division had taken place between the
2nd Defendant and his brothers the 1st
Defendant and others and recovery
of the balance of only Rupees 1000 was
sought for & presented a petition under
Section 73 but without effect.

By M.P. 810 of 1873 on the file of the
Sub Court I applied for leave to sue in
forma pauperis but the petition was
dismissed on the 17 September by the
Sub Judge in his office room. He there-
fore knew that the 2nd Defendant was
galled that same day.

The 2nd Defendant both personally
and thro his son has preferred to
complaints against the Police
and others thereby subjecting him
to

to trouble them with the intention
of committing murders, can so
disobey laws having sent for un-
paid salaries and salaries who have
been convicted of high light robbery
in foreign districts and kept them
in the surrounding villages.

I have borrowed 1250 Rupees
from my father-in-law for the
purpose of the suit of 6000 Rupees
still they are prepared to establish
the false plea that I am not the
son of the 2nd Defendant and that
my mother is not his wife. There
are many servants and debtors
to give false evidence. Moreover
the Defendants have property in the
place.

I have to cite as witnesses
the Sub-Magistrate, Head Assistant
Magistrate, Deputy Collector, and
Permagandy, Munsif, Additional
Munsif, Sub-Judge and other respec-
table Hindustani to prove that I am
the son of the 2nd Defendant. Petitioner
therefore prays that the Court will
call in the said suit for being
disposed of in the District Court.

and under justice. The motion
presented on the 20th Instant was re-
turned on the 28th as being prolix.

Petitioner therefore prays
that the said suit may be called
up for being disposed of in the District
Court.

29th October 1873 { Signed/ Villachoni alias Simallu Dura

1873 { Peter Koush/173

Signed P. P. Koush
Dist. Judge

(True Translation)

Handwritten
Signed Dist. Judge

In the District Court of Madurai

Motion presented by Mr. Seshier Vakil on behalf of Vellasaamy alias Sirai mitta, Sevan, son of Pasumbur Mathiramaalinga, Sevan, residing at Malacca-manathe village, Kammuthi Taluq, in the Zemmindary of Kammad.

1. The Petitioner has instituted O.S. No 288 of 1873 in the file of the Sub Court of Madurai against his father and 6 others for partition to the amount of Rs 65000.

2. Ever since 1870 when Petitioner first asked for his share the said Petitioner's father Mooltooramalinga Sevan, the first Defendant and others have been harassing him and his witnesses with nearly 40 Magisterial and other complaints with the object of preventing him from prosecuting his claim.

3. As numerous suits have been instituted in the said Sub Court, hearing dates are fixed at long intervals and suits are decided after a great length of time.

4. It is therefore prayed that the said suit may either be withdrawn to this Court or referred for trial to the Small Cause Court, that it may be brought to

a

Enclosure 17
In a letter from the
Jag. Mohan Singh
of Madurai dated
17 July 1873 No 238

Remitted
Copy of Petition put
in by one Vellasaamy
alias Sirai mitta
Sevan on the 29th
October 1873 for trial
of a suit for Rs 65,000
Sub Court.

a speedy determination without affording
petitioners opponents any more oppor-
tunity of causing him any annoyance.

11th November } (Signed) Leschins
1873 } Vakil

Filed 14th November 1873

(Signed) R. R. Spalding
District Judge.

(True Copy)

R. R. Spalding

Acting District Judge

Madura
20th November 1873
43

S.
P. P. Hutchins Esquire
District Judge, Madura

Civil Misc.
cellaneous
Petition No
732 of 1873

The humble petition of Law-
thar Adomay, sole admin-
istratrix to the estate of her
deceased husband, Santhoo-
wardhoo Pillay presented through
her Vakil, Mr John French
Respectfully sheweth,

That Petitioner has filed
a suit in the Sub Court (No 86 of 1873) against
one Viswasum Pillai praying that she
might be declared entitled to the estate
of her late husband, which the said Vis-
wasum Pillay has wrongful possession
of, and that the said Viswasum Pillay
be declared not entitled to hold the same
as against Petitioner; that the suit in
question involves a consideration.

1. Of the law applicable to the case;
2nd the construction of a bond obtained
by Viswasum Pillay from Petitioner,
and which he sets up as a bond of
remuneration.

2. That the District Court having
given its opinion on both these points,
it would be anomalous to have a con-
trary opinion on the same points should
the Sub Court entertain any such a
contrary

Conclusion is

In a letter from the
Sd District Judge of
Madura dated 10th 11th
1873. No 205

Copy of Petition for
12th November 1873 by L. in P.
by Willing alias the
Nalla Swam through his
Vakil P. P. French for
recovery of a debt
from the estate of the de-
ceased Santhoo Pillay

contrary opinion, wherefore (petitioner
prays the District Court will call for
affidavits of 1873 from the Sub. Court and
dispose of the same itself

Feb. 21, 1873 (Signed) John, Lincoln
Wm. P. Phillips (Plunder.
Wm. P. Phillips

(True Copy)

Wm. P. Phillips

Attorney District Judge

To

The District Court of
Madurai.

Petition respectfully presented by
Serugan Chetty Defendant in O.S. No 91
of 1873 on the file of the Sub. Court of Madurai.

1. Owing to some ill feeling that exists
between the Petitioner and Ichiadamharam
Chetty Plaintiff in the said suit the latter
first brought a suit fraudulently in
No 152/69 on the file of the late Principal
Sudra Amma's Court against the Petition-
er for Rupees 5137-3-7 as if it was
due under a note of hand.

2. As the Petitioner did not once a
single pie and as the Plaintiff pro-
duced no evidence a petition was pre-
sented to the Court praying that the hear-
ing of the case may be postponed until
both parties have the said matter settled
before the Panchayats composed of three
Caste people within 2 months. According-
ly an order was passed. The said Plff
did not appear before the Panchayats
within the above prescribed time.

Afterwards a withdrawal motion
was presented stating that the matter
has

Enclosure 19

in a letter from the
Sd. District Judge of
Madurai dated 10th 1873
No: 235

Copy of the Petition
sent in by Serugan
Chetty on the 30th
November 1873
for withdrawal of the
said suit from the file
of the Subordinate
Court, Madurai held
before the District Judge

Civil Miscellaneous Papers No. 91 of 1875.

The District Court of Bangalore
 Shown respectfully presented in
 the case of *Shri Channarayana*
Shri Channarayana vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 and *Shri. Venkataramaiah* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 of *Shri. S. S. S. S.* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 in the case of *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 on the file of the Subordinate Court of Bangalore.

The said suit has been instituted
 against one *Shri. Channarayana* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
Shri. S. S. S. S. (who has been declared
 by this Court and the High Court the
 future heir to succeed to the *Shri. Channarayana*
Shri. Channarayana by one *Shri. Channarayana* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 who was *Shri. S. S. S. S.* the great *Shri. Channarayana* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 case and who enjoys all the income
 of the said *Shri. Channarayana* vs. *Shri. S. S. S. S.* for
 recovery of the past dues &c.

Providence has been to him in the
 said suit up to date.

It will be clear that this suit
 is an important one in this District and
 one that should be investigated by the
 highest judicial authority.

For the above reasons, I have
 not hesitated with the least hesitating
 in the Sub. Court and therefore I have
 signed the order.

20 January 1875
Shri. Channarayana
Shri. Venkataramaiah

Filed 26 January 1875
 Signed by *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 of the Court

Shri. Channarayana

T

Received June 20

In a letter from the
 AG. Secy. dated 1 July
 1875 - No. 238

Immediate attention
 to be given to the
 in the case of *Shri. S. S. S. S.*
 on the 5th of June 1875
 of a suit from the file
 of the Subordinate Court

u

Enclosure 21
in a letter from the
District Judge
of Madras dated
1 July 1875 No 238

Transcript
of Petition in part
in L. 101/1875
alias J. J. J. J. J.
through his Vakils
S. S. S. S. S.
Mr. J. M. Scott and
Mr. S. S. S. S. S.
the 20th January
1875 for withdrawal of
suit from the file of the S. S. S.

10/1/75

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No 96
of 1875.

48

for A. Woodroffe Esquire

District Judge of
Madras

The humble petition of Shandusamy Tansen
first defendant in C. S. No 101 of 1873 on the
file of the Subordinate Court of Madras
Thowatt;

That the plaintiff in the said suit is
one Shastri Chetty, a member of well known
& one of the wealthiest & most influential families
of Kuttavallu Chetties of this Presidency & one
of the defendants is Tansen alias Annasamy
Tansen the chairman to the Rannade zemindary

That the claim is for Rs 37400 alleged
to be advanced for the expenses of the great
Rannade case (C. S. No 20 of 1871) tried in this
Court & now pending in appeal before the
Princely Council

3 That among the issues recorded in the
said C. S. No 101 of 1873 are the following

"2 That the 2d defendant (Tansen alias
Annasamy Tansen) adopted by the first
defendant's father & if so whether the
adoption is valid"

"4 That the former litigation unnecessary
improper & opposed to public
policy"

49

5: That your petitioners submit that the
single writ of habeas corpus is one which ought
to be tried in the highest courts of this District
in respect fully to the fact that the same has been
transferred to the files of the Honorable Court.

28th January 1875. Aids your petition with all my

(Lignosus) *S. Yunnanensis*

(Lignos) *P. Galbanum* ^{infer}

Feb 26. Jan'y/75

1 signed J. H. Woodruff
of Astoria

(True Copy)

Lawrence
ingest Judge

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No
161 of 1875. 50

The District Court of Madras

Petitioner respectfully prays to be
admitted to the said Court of Madras
in order to file the following petition
Court of Madras.

The Plaintiff in this suit is a woman.
It has been brought against
the Defendant for recovery of a garden in
and the enjoyment during the last 20
years and purchased by him in an auction
held in the Sub Court.

Though the sum due for rent is since
not claimed in excess.

The garden in dispute is being enjoyed
by many poor families.

The facts relating to the garden
are very intricate.

Many such suits relating to the
said garden have been filed in the
Court. The suit must be for disposal of the
disposal here on transfer to the said Court.
1875

Filed 17th January 1875
By S. R. S. S. S.
(S. R. S. S.)

The District Court of Madras

V

Enclosure 22
in a letter from the
S. R. S. S. S.
of Madras dated 18th
1875 No. 238

Copy of a
letter from the
S. R. S. S. S.
of Madras dated 18th
1875 No. 238

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No 134 of 1875
Madras 28th January 1875.

P.

51

Fr. H. Woodroffe Esquire,

Sitting District Judge, Madras

The humble petition of Senthur Adomay,
widow of the late Senthuramathu Pillay residing in
Madras, presented through her Vakils Mr. John
Pinnock under Section 6 of the Civil Procedure Code.

Respectfully Sheweth.

That Petitioner's late husband died
on the 13th December 1872 leaving property worth
28000 Rupees; that Petitioner & her deceased husband
being converts to the Roman Catholic Faith and
her husband having died intestate, Petitioner was
granted letters of Administration on the 23rd August
1873 as being governed by the Indian Succession
Act; that one Sivasam Pillay & others having
taken wrongful possession of the deceased's estate,
Petitioner on the 1st October 1873 filed a suit
No 86 of 1873 in the Sub Court of Madras, praying
for a decree declaring her right to the possession
of the estate of the deceased as sole Administratrix
& also her right to one half of her late husband's
property under the Indian Succession Act, that
the 15th November 1873 was fixed for the
settlement of issues, but that the issues were
really settled on the 24th January 1874; that the
final hearing of the case was posted for the
2nd April 1874 & witnesses cited for the occasion

that

Enclosure 23

Since taken from
the Sec District Judge
of Madras dated
1st July 1875 No 1238

Remitted to District Judge
of Madras dated
1st July 1875 No 1238
for settlement of issues
under the Act of 1873

that the case was undisputedly adjudged from time to time till the 2nd December 1874 when the Court called for his arguments on the 1st issue whether the case was or proper one for a declaratory decree; that on the same day the Sub Court intimated an opinion that the suit was not maintainable, and the 31st December 1874 passed a formal decree to that effect.

2 That on the 17th December 1874, Petitioner filed a fresh plaint as Administrative, and the proper steps asking for possession of the property of the deceased; that on the 21st December 1874 she presented an application under Section 47 of the Civil Procedure Code asking for the appointment of a receiver; that on the 22nd January 1875 the question as to whether there was any necessity for the appointment of a receiver in regard to the movable property was argued; that up to this date no orders have been passed on the subject.

3 That the 21st January 1875 was passed for the settlement of issues in the second case, which was numbered as 20212 of 1874; that up to this date no issues have been recorded; that two years have elapsed since the death of Petitioner's husband; that a large portion of the deceased's effects consists of bonds and promissory notes; that if the Petitioner's suit is delayed in the manner set forth above,

many

many of the bonds & promissory notes are likely to become valueless as being barred by lapse of time; that the Defendants being people of straw & possessed of no property worth mentioning beyond that in dispute even a judgment in Plaintiff's favour would be utterly valueless after the bonds & promissory notes have been allowed to stand unrecalled beyond the period of limitation; that from a statement put into the Sub Court by Thomas P. P. Petitioner sees that an appreciable portion of the personal property of the deceased husband has already disappeared.

Therefore Petitioner prays that the suit may be withdrawn & either referred to the Additional Sub Court or disposed of by this Court.

(Signed) John French

Filed 5 Feb 75
Signed J. H. Woodroffe
(True copy)
J. H. Woodroffe
Clerk of Court

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No
209 of 1875

To

The District Court of Indiana

The Petition of the Plaintiff in C.S. No 93
of 1873 over the file of the Sub. Court by R. Thomson
Barrister at Law.

Respectfully sheweth

- 1 That the said Sub No 93 & the other connected
Suits are filed to recover possession of
Pachamuthoos Premises.
- 2 That the decision of the said Sub involves
very nice & intricate points of Law.
- 3 That the Defendants in the said Sub belong
to the most wealthy & influential class of natives.
- 4 That the importance of the case & the position
of the parties concerned therein demand that the
enquiry there of should be conducted by the highest
tribunals in the District.
- 5 Your Petitioner therefore prays that the
said cases might be withdrawn from the file
of the Subordinate Court.

22nd February 1875. (Signed) R. Thomson
Plaintiff Counsel

Filed 25 January 75
by J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff
(True Copy)
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff

Shelburne 24
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff

Copy of
Shelburne 24
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff
J. H. Woodruff

Civil Miscellaneous Petition, No. 207
of 1875

The District Court of Indiana

The humble Petition of J. W. Foster & Co.

Look into Deakins for Plaintiff, in 6-239-104p.
105-106 & 107 of 1873 on the files of the Land Court.

Schmitt

1 That the said suits & their connected suits have been instituted for the recovery of the whole remainder of Padanathoor.

2. That the defendants in the said suits were
Ramaswamy Chetty & Cothens (in 89) Venkataswamy
Kailas (in 104) Ramaswamy alias Cotten Chavara & Cothens
by Lebadnis Ranganar (in 105) Sundra Pandi
Chavara & Cothens (in 106) & Chavara Sundra Pandi;
(in 107) belong to the richest & most influential
classes of people in the Madras & Malabar Districts.
Hindus & Pillays.

3. That the decision of the said Exchequer Commissioners may be a point of importance to the public, and may be a point of importance to the public, and may be a point of importance to the public.

4. That the importance of the cases & the position of the parties makes it desirable that the said suit should be heard & determined by the highest tribunal of the District.

petitioners think for any that the said
jurists or any one of them might be withdrawn
from the Del Court & tried by this Court & that

180 The Judge might be directed to proceed
with the trial of the connected suits & to this court
be referred & determined by the said court

22nd February
1875

(Signed) G. W. Foster

(Signed) G. W. Foster

Filed 25 February
1875
J. H. Woodroffe
Agent

(True Copy)

Woodroffe
Agent

Copy of Petition filed in
by Plaintiff on 18th Feb 87.
186, 187, 188 & 189 of 1873, on the
file of the said court. Also the
file of the said court & the
on the 22nd February 1875 & the
will be made of the said court
at the said court.

Enclosure 26
In a letter from the
District Judge of Madras
dated 1st May 1875.

Civil Miscellaneous Petition
No 259 of 1875.

The District Court of Madras

(Petition respectfully presented by R. La
Theer Vakil on behalf of Ananda Perum
mahar Defendant in S. 133 of 1874 on the
file of the Subordinate Court of Madras)

The suit has been brought contrary
to the Proceedings conducted in S. 11 of 1866
on the file of this Court, by Plffs.

At the time of conduct of such no
proofs the Plffs. having made sufficient
endeavour by means of proper documents
to take possession of the property in dispute
and finding that at last it ended in fr
voulably - have now instituted this suit
fraudulently as if they do not know
the former proceedings.

The suit is a big one and the side
the Chelliam having ventured to lay out
a unjustly large sum of money with a
view to derive much gain have set up the
suit and conduct the same from their
own funds for the above reasons
it is requested that the suit be dismissed
by this Court which is the highest
tribunal in the District. The suit is therefore
proper to be called off.

8 March 1875 / Signed R. La Theer
Plaintiff
Filed 19 February
1875
(Signed) J. H. Woodroffe
(Agent)

: 22^o :

Civil Miscellaneous Petition
No 331 of 1875. 56

The District Court of
Madison

Respectfully presented by Mr.
D. Fisher Counsel for Parsa to the
Kachiair Poff in S. No. 210 of 1874 on the
file of the Subordinate Court of Madras
having been formerly settled

Issues having been framed & settled
in this suit by the Court it has been
ordered for examination of witnesses.
A list of the records & witnesses

Certain legal points records & witnesses
 have to be examined. Besides the Aff
 is a woman and the Defendant is a man.
 Nattucottai Chettiv.

It is therefore prayed that the writ
may be called from the file of the Subor-
dinate Judge in view of its being disposed of
by this Court or transfer it to the adst.
Sub. Court for disposal.

8th April 1855. / depd R. Fischer
Counsel.

Filed 9 April 1855.
/s/ Geo. D. Woodruff
reg. Dist. Clerk
(Lancaster)

For Mr. [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]

Ex latine 27

Ena letter from the

of Doctor's study of

Produce dated 1st Aug

1876. Dec. 238

Ernestine

John G. Ballou
June 10, 1875

Christiana B. B. B.

through the Middle

1880

1 of a dead horse in
the road

of the two subjects

the fall of the last count.

So 372 of 1875. 5

The District Court of Madras

Petition respectfully presented under section 6 of the Code of Civil Procedure by Mr. S. M. Scott Vakil for Plaintiff (the name of Sheungeneah) in C.S. No 197 of 1874 on the file of the Subordinate Court of Madras.

The said suit has been posted for final hearing in the Sub Court and the Bangalore on the northern side of the river at Madras belonging to Plff's daughter who is under her protection has been submortgaged to the Subordinate Judge who lives there. Censure is ~~therefore~~ ^{there} ~~may~~ ^{may} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~made~~ ^{made} ~~by~~ ^{by} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~court~~ ^{court} ~~as~~ ^{as} ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~justly~~ ^{justly} ~~as~~ ^{as} ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~will~~ ^{will} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~open~~ ^{open} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~objection~~ ^{objection} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~censure~~ ^{censure}. It is therefore prayed that the said suit may be called up from the file of the Subordinate Judge and disposed of by this Court or referred to the Additional Subordinate Court for disposal. 5

26th June 1875 (Signed) S. M. Scott

Sd/- S. M. Scott
Header.
(The Plaintiff)

[Signature]
District Judge

BB

Enclosure - 28

In a letter from
the Dg District
Judge of Madras
dated 1st July 1875
No.

Remitted
Copy of Petition
with Petitioner's
affidavit & supporting
documents
has been deposited
with the Dg District
Judge of Madras
for disposal of the same
in accordance with the
order of the Court.

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No
373 of 1875. 58
To

The District Court of
Madras

Petition respectfully presented by
C. Seshiah Vakil on behalf of Annam
Chellum Chetty Defendant in O.S. 211 of
1874 on the file of the Subordinate Court
of Madras

This Defendant had purchased
certain properties in the auction held
in O.S. 106 and 107 of 1871 on the file of Sub.
Court and obtained possession of them
having paid the purchase money.
also Plaintiff in the said O.S. 107 of 1871
endeavoured to have the said property
~~restored~~ satisfaction of another independent
debt due to him.

3. This Defendant presented an ob-
jective motion setting forth the above
facts but it was rejected and the prop-
erty in his possession directed to be deliv-
ered over to Plaintiff with the produce
which was done accordingly.

4. Disputes having arisen in this
O.S. 211 regarding the same property, this
Defendant represents that he is not
satisfied with its remaining there.

The

Enclosure 29

do a letter from Mr. C.
District Judge of Madras
dated 1st July 1875.

17. 1875
C. Seshiah Vakil
on behalf of Annam
Chellum Chetty
Defendant in O.S. 211 of
1874 on the file of the
Subordinate Court of
Madras

57
The Defendant further represents
that decrees have been passed against
him in S. No. 4 and 75 of 1872 on the file
of the Sule Court.

It is therefore prayed that the
said suit may be called up to this
Court.

(Signed) R. Seshiah

Vakiel.

I Venkatachellam Chetty, the un-
divided younger brother of the Defendant
hereby declare that the circumstances
herein mentioned are true.

29th June 1875 (Signed) Venkatachellam Chetty

(Signed) R. Seshiah

(True Translation)

[Signature]
Sd District Judge

FD

Enclature 30

In a letter from Henry
Richard Wadley of Providence
dated 10 July 1875. Received

July 1875/1876

From: "July 1875-1876"
Encl. 30/17

Transmitted
to the Hon. Secy of the
Dept. of the Interior
by the Hon. Secy of the
Interior, A. A. Phelps
for the Hon. Secy of the
Interior, A. A. Phelps
for the Hon. Secy of the
Interior, A. A. Phelps

Witnessed by
Subordinate Judges

Chief

11 of 1875 1876

1883 1885 No. 1531

No. 69-71-

with the letter of the
District Judge having
containing an account
of the circumstances
attending the case
he was directed to
investigate and also
District Judge he
was directed to make
with the District
Judge in the