

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	783	Press
		Mis.
Dated	31 - 3 -	1888

Not to be folded or roughly handled

23.5.12

5-12-14 Government of Madras.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

25-1-18

30-11-16

22-12-17

G.O., No. 783, 31st March 1833.

Process Service Establishments.

Passing orders on the proposals of the High Court for improving the status, without increasing the strength, of the — in the mofussil at an enhanced cost.

3

Government of Madras:

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1888.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 783, 31st March 1888.

N.P.

Process Service Establishments.

Passing orders on the proposals of the High Court for improving the status, without increasing the strength, of the — in the mofussil at an enhanced cost.

3. It may here be pointed out that the profit which the Government is sometimes supposed to make from the administration of justice is not real. It would be reasonable to set off against the excess receipts under civil justice, a portion of the heavy expenditure incurred in the maintenance of the public force, on which the administration of civil justice depends for its existence. If this were done, the surplus of receipts over charges recorded in the accounts under civil justice would be covered many times over but even without including this item, if the cost of pensions, interest on capital expended in judicial buildings, and other similar charges are allowed for, no surplus under civil justice will be found to remain. On account of the Nazarat system itself separate and additional accommodation is now provided in the type designs for court buildings.

4. Apart from these considerations, which would make the acceptance of the High Court's proposals impossible, the Government are not prepared to accept the scheme submitted. It would seem that the expenditure is proposed rather to get rid of the assumed surplus than because the measures suggested are necessary. It is at least doubtful whether peons and amins would become more trustworthy or efficient because they received a rupee or two extra all round. Taluk peons even under Mr. Garstin's scheme are only to get Rs. 6 per mensem. As regards the Nazirs, it is not asserted that their pay is too low nor is it proposed to add to their work, while in the case of Deputy Nazirs it is not an universal rule that work at head-quarter stations is heavier than elsewhere.

5. Instead of the High Court's proposals relating to peons and amins, the Government consider that a better plan would be to add small classes on higher rates of pay, to which each man might hope to rise by good conduct and activity. Under such a scheme the stimulus would be at least as great and the cost much less. The present rule is that not more than one-quarter of the peon and amin establishments shall get Rs. 7 and 14, respectively. This proportion might be raised to one-third and to a quarter of this third Rs. 8 and Rs. 16, respectively, might be given. The Government will be glad to have the remarks of the Honourable the Judges on this proposal and its probable cost. As regards Nazirs, where there are only two courts, the work of a Central Nazir hardly differs from that of a Deputy Nazir, and it may be doubted whether the pay of such Central Nazirs should not be brought down to a level with that of Deputy Nazirs, if any change at all is to be made. Lastly as already pointed out, the work of a Deputy Nazir at a head-quarter station is only different from that of a Deputy Nazir elsewhere from the tendency of litigation to increase in inverse ratio with the distance of the court and at some head-quarters is much lighter than at some outstations. The work of the Deputy Nazirs at Chittoor and Kurnool, for example, is not comparable with that at such heavy courts as Ongole or Permangudi.

6. His Excellency the Governor in Council is, therefore, unable to accept the present proposals of the Honourable the Judges, but he will be prepared to consider suggestions for utilizing some part of the surplus on the lines indicated in the foregoing remarks.

(True Extract.)

H. E. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

No. The original scheme did not.

H.E.S.

Of. however section 20 (iii) of Act VII of 1870. It is proposed by rule to increase the pay of process-servers.

P.P.H.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 783, JUDICIAL, DATED
31st MARCH 1888.

[SUBJECT.—*Process Service Establishments.*]

From the Registrar, High Court, dated 3rd February 1888, No. 303.

For orders.

This is a proposal from the High Court to spend a sum of Rs. 1,26,634 a year extra on the existing process-service establishments, by raising their pay, without increasing their strength.

The existing process-service rules received the virtual sanction of India in Home Department letter recorded in G.O., No. 256, dated 29th January 1884, and in the High Court's Registrar's letter of the 24th June following, proposals were submitted for revising the process-service establishment, which were approved by Government in G.O., No. 2373, dated 16th September 1884. The cost of the establishment then fixed was Rs. 5,63,700 per annum, but under the sliding scale which allows increase of establishment to be given on a certain scale of increased work, additional hands have been from time to time sanctioned, and the present cost of process-service establishment (including pensions) is Rs. 6,57,476 or some Rs. 20,000 more than it stood at before the revision of 1884. In spite of increased expenditure large annual surpluses have accrued, and the High Court now therefore propose to distribute Rs. 1,26,634 per annum of the surplus among the establishment, raising the future total cost.

The following are details:—

	Present.			Proposed.			Extra cost per annum.
	Rs. 6.	Rs. 7.	Total.	Rs. 7.	Rs. 8.	Total.	
Peons	3,736	1,220	4,956	2,497	2,469	4,966	Rs. 79,114
Amins	Rs. 12.	Rs. 14.	Total.	Rs. 14.	Rs. 16.	Total.	Rs. 44,484
	1,018	330	1,348	681	667	1,348	
Central Nazirs	When in place where more than two courts to be raised from 50 to 60. only two courts 40 to 50. 8 at head-quarter stations to be raised from Rs. 25 to 35						Rs. 3,035
Deputy Nazirs							

These proposals will meet or will not meet with the approval of the Government according as the Government consider the principle of devoting process-fees to process-serving establishments a binding one, and according as they consider it necessary or desirable to offer pay amounting to Rs. 7,84,110 for the same work which is now being done for Rs. 6,57,476. It would certainly seem that, as, in 1884, strength and salaries were carefully adjusted to actual requirements (paragraph 12 of Mr. Davies' letter in Government Order of 16th September 1884), there can be no necessity to raise, all round, the pay of peons and amins and partly of the Nazirs. It would seem the more proper course, as there is so considerable a surplus, to reduce the fees which suitors are called on to pay. Nor does there seem any special reason why whatever surplus does accrue should not be

This has been the view ever since 1870, when the process-service funds till then existing were absorbed—G.O., No. 694, dated 18th May 1870. See also letter No. 3121, dated 18th December 1871, in G.O., No. 464, dated 5th April 1872. It was laid down that fees should be settled so as to cover charges but that was all.

H.E.S.

Probably this is the correct principle, but High Court might reply that they all along said that the present rates were minima and to be increased if possible. They have also the power to reduce the charges for processes and so the surplus.

P.P.H.

	In thousands of rupees.			
	Court Fee Stamps.	Process fees.	Charges.	
			Finance accounts.	High Court.
1883-4	33,72	769	..	613
1884-5	33,54	740	570	565
1885-6	34,80	795	598	590
1886-7	34,46	839	598	590

I altered the whole system of charges about 1885. Litigation has not increased since to any great extent.

P.P.H.

The Government want to improve the position of Station House officers, and cannot, I submit, afford to undertake this expenditure, which is not urgently required. Why should process peons be paid Rs. 7 and 8 when taluk peons can be had for Rs. 6? It is however proposed to spend Rs. 79,114 a year on increasing the pay of the process peons. This would suffice to give every Station House officer in the Presidency Rs. 3½ nearly per mensem. There appears equally little reason for increasing the pay of amins at a cost of Rs. 44,484.

H. E. STOKES.

The Government Order may point out that our contract includes the surplus, or the greater part thereof, which cannot therefore be spared. Advantage may be also taken of this to state that we do not really make a profit out of judicial receipts when pensionary charges, interest on judicial buildings, etc., are taken into account. The Nazarat system requires a separate room which is now provided in the type designs.

I submit that the proposals should not be sanctioned. They are avowedly submitted not because the increased charge is required to secure efficiency but in order to expend the surplus of a fund which is an imaginary one. The process fees are part of the general revenues, and are not credited to any special fund, and in the settlement of the Provincial contract they have been so treated. The proposal therefore means that a Provincial contract of 1½ lakhs is to be assumed. In the contract the receipts are amalgamated with the stamp revenue which was estimated for the contract at the amount entered at 6.20 lakhs. Accordingly the contract assumes a surplus to Provincial of 2.19 lakhs or thereabouts; and the Provincial finances do not admit of this being thrown away. There is no possibility of checking the figures of receipts which are based on certain registers kept in the courts, but it is curious that the charges as given by the High Court do not agree with the finance accounts (when they are shown separately) and that the continued increase in process-fee receipts is not paralleled by increase in total revenue from court fee stamps, or in the number of suits instituted in mufassal courts to which alone the High Court figures relate.

	1883	1884	1885	1886	Institution in mufassal courts.	Increase in Small Cause Suits.
.. .. .	..	..	..	..	1,57,410	..
.. .. .	..	..	..	..	1,52,062	..
.. .. .	..	..	..	..	1,54,409	..
.. .. .	..	..	..	..	1,63,028	..

And apart from this I would not be disposed to accept the present proposals which seem to be made as pointed out in the note rather in consequence of our remarks of November 1887 and to get rid of a surplus than because they are really necessary.

Taking them seriatim. I do not believe that peons and amins are likely to be improved by getting a rupee or two extra all round, good, bad and indifferent, nor a bit less likely to demand or accept petty tips in the way of food or batta. Taluk peons even under Mr. Garstin's scheme are only to get Rs. 6. It would probably do quite as much good and cost much less to add a small class of peons and amins on the higher pay now proposed, to which each man may then hope to rise by good conduct and activity. The present rule is that not more than ¼ shall get Rs. 7 and 14. We might increase this to ½ and let ¼ of that ½ get Rs. 8 and 16. I have calculated the cost of this roughly for amins and peons to be 12,600 a year. India's sanction is necessary, I believe.

Next as to Central Nazirs. It is not proposed to add to their work nor is it asserted that their pay is too low. Where there are only two courts the work of a Central Nazir hardly differs from that of a Deputy Nazir at head-quarters, and only from other Deputy Nazirs so far as litigation generally varies to some extent in inverse ratio to the distance of the court. It may therefore be doubted whether the pay of such Central Nazirs should not be brought down to that of Deputy Nazirs, if any change at all is to be made!

Again as to Deputy Nazirs at head-quarters their work would be exactly like that of other Deputy Nazirs but for the tendency just noticed of work to increase in the near vicinity of a court. The work of the Deputy Nazirs at Chittoor and Kurnool, e.g., could not compare with that at such heavy courts as Ongole or Permangudy.

From these notes probably a sufficient order can be drafted but I wish to see it, without however these heavy books. In the introductory remarks it may be pointed out that the figures of income are taken from registers made by clerks or by the process-service establishments themselves and cannot be checked. It is curious, though not altogether unintelligible to me, that the institution fees have not increased while the process fees have.

P. P. H[UTCHINS]—19-3-88.

Draft passed by Honourable Member.

[G.O., No. 783, Judicial, dated 31st March 1888.]

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

Letter—from H. T. Ross Esq., Registrar of the High Court of Judicature at Madras.

To—the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Accountant-General).

Dated—Madras, the 3rd February 1888.

No.—303.

I am directed to submit, for sanction, the accompanying proposition statement *
 * With three spare copies. for improving the status, without increasing the strength, of the process-service establishment in the mufassal at an enhanced cost of Rs. 1,17,660 per annum. This is exclusive of pensionary charges. Including the percentages allowed on account of pensionary charges, the extra cost involved in the present proposals amounts to Rs. 1,26,634 per annum.

2. In making these proposals, the principle followed has been, first, to improve the position of the low-paid peons whose monthly pittance offers a strong temptation to dishonesty and indolence; next, to raise the status of the amins; and lastly, that of the Deputy Nazirs at head-quarter stations, and the Central Nazirs.

3. Instead of 3,736 peons on Rs. 6 and 1,230 on Rs. 7 per mensem, it is proposed to pay 2,497 peons at Rs. 7 and the rest at Rs. 8 per mensem, that is, to give the higher pay of Rs. 8 to one-half, or as nearly as possible one-half, of the number of peons in each district and the lower pay to the remainder. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs. 79,114 per annum.

4. On the same principle, instead of 1,018 amins on Rs. 12, and 330 on Rs. 14 per mensem, it is proposed to pay 681 amins at Rs. 14 and 667 at Rs. 16 per mensem. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs. 44,484 per annum.

5. Of the 15 Central Nazirs, 8 are in places where there are more than two, and 7 in places where there are only two, courts. It is proposed to increase the pay of the former from Rs. 50 to Rs. 60, and of the latter from Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 per mensem. In consideration of the heavier work, as compared with that of Deputy Nazirs in outlying courts, which falls upon 8 of the Deputy Nazirs at head-quarter stations, it is proposed to raise the pay of these 8 officers from Rs. 25 to Rs. 35 per mensem. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs. 3,036 per annum.

6. The total extra cost, including pensionary charges, of the present proposals will therefore be Rs. 1,26,634. The annual charges of the present establishment, including pensions, amount to Rs. 6,57,476. The receipts from process fees were :—

	RS.
In 1884	7,40,451
In 1885	7,94,778
In 1886	8,39,059

the increasing annual surplus having thus reached more than Rs. 1,83,000 already. The present proposals, including pensionary charges, will still leave a surplus of not less than Rs. 56,000 per annum, which the High Court considers ample as a provision for all likely contingencies. Increasing annual receipts will, it is anticipated, result in an actual surplus considerably above this estimate.

7. These proposals necessitate an alteration of rule III (a to d) of the process-service rules of 8th November 1883, sanctioned in G.O., No. 256, Judicial, dated 29th January 1884. The High Court has accordingly altered that rule as shown

Submitted
for approval

24-1-11
25-1-11

Sum
26/1

below subject to the confirmation of His Excellency the Governor in Council and the sanction of the Government of India, under clause (iii), section 20, of the Court Fees Act, 1870:—

Rule III.—Except where the High Court may otherwise direct—

- (a) the pay of each Central Nazir shall be Rs. 60 a month where there are more than two courts, and elsewhere Rs. 50;
- (b) that of each Deputy Nazir at the head-quarter station of the district shall be Rs. 35, and elsewhere Rs. 25;
- (c) not more than one-half of the amins shall receive Rs. 16 and the rest Rs. 14;
- (d) not more than one-half of the peons shall receive Rs. 8 and the rest Rs. 7.

All these charges shall be debited to the Process Service Fund.

II

Accountant-General's report, No. A.D.S./475, dated 16th February 1888.

The entries in the column of "Present scale" have been compared with the registers of this office and are correct with the following exceptions:—

The establishment consisting of one amin on Rs. 1½, two process-servers on Rs. 7 each, and six process-servers on Rs. 6 each originally sanctioned for the Additional District Munsiff's Court, Madura, is shown under Madura instead of under Tinnevely to which district it has been transferred under G.O., No. 2054, dated 4th August 1886. Eight additional process-servers on Rs. 6 each sanctioned for the District Munsiff's Court, Tiruppattūr, in G.O., No. 2905, Judicial Department, dated 21st December 1887, and one amin on Rs. 12 for the Chingleput Munsiff's Court, and one amin on Rs. 12 and six peons on Rs. 6 each for the Poonamallee Munsiff's Court sanctioned in G.O., No. 1158, Financial Department, dated 31st October 1887, have not been included in the "Present scale."

Order—Mis. No. 783, Judicial, dated 31st March 1888.

In the foregoing letter the Honourable the Judges of the High Court submit proposals for improving the status, without increasing the strength, of the process-service establishments in the mofussal by an increased annual expenditure, including pension charges of Rs. 1,26,634 and in consequence of these proposals they also submit for approval a modification of rule III of the process-service rules framed under section 20 of the Court Fees Act, 1870. It is pointed out that the receipts from process fees have presented an increasing annual surplus since 1884 amounting in 1886 to Rs. 1,81,583 and that the present proposals, if sanctioned, would still leave a surplus of not less than Rs. 56,000 a year which the High Court considers ample provision for all contingencies.

2. The figures relating to receipts under process-service fees are taken from registers maintained by the process-service establishments themselves or by clerks in the court and are not capable of any check, while the increase in process-fee receipts is not paralleled by increase in the total revenue from court-fee stamps nor in the institution fees. Assuming, however, that the figures relating to process-fees as given by the High Court are correct, still a surplus under this head cannot be treated as though it belonged to a separate fund. The Government of India were at pains to point this out in paragraph 3 of Mr. Mackenzie's letter, communicated in G.O., No. 256 dated 29th January 1884, and the High Court acquiesced in that view in their reply. The process fees are part of the general revenues and accordingly in the settlement of the Provincial contract, the surplus accruing was treated as an asset for general expenditure. The Provincial finances cannot bear so considerable a loss as involved in the present proposals.

Paragraph 4 of Mr. Davies's letter, No. 616, dated 21st February 1884.

The process fees are part of the general revenues and accordingly in the settlement of the Provincial contract, the surplus accruing was treated as an asset for general expenditure. The Provincial finances cannot bear so considerable a loss as involved in the present proposals.

3. It may here be pointed out that the profit which the Government is sometimes supposed to make from the administration of justice is not real. It would be reasonable to set off against the excess receipts under civil justice, a portion of the heavy expenditure incurred in the maintenance of the public force, on which the administration of civil justice depends for its existence. If this were done, the surplus of receipts over charges recorded in the accounts under civil justice would be covered many times over but even without including this item, if the cost of pensions, interest on capital expended in judicial buildings, and other similar charges are allowed for, no surplus under civil justice will be found to remain. On account of the Nazarat system itself separate and additional accommodation is now provided in the type designs for court buildings.

4. Apart from these considerations, which would make the acceptance of the High Court's proposals impossible, the Government are not prepared to accept the scheme submitted. It would seem that the expenditure is proposed rather to get rid of the assumed surplus than because the measures suggested are necessary. It is at least doubtful whether peons and amins would become more trustworthy or efficient because they received a rupee or two extra all round. Taluk peons even under Mr. Garstin's scheme are only to get Rs. 6 per mensem. As regards the Nazirs, it is not asserted that their pay is too low nor is it proposed to add to their work, while in the case of Deputy Nazirs it is not an universal rule that work at head-quarter stations is heavier than elsewhere.

5. Instead of the High Court's proposals relating to peons and amins, the Government consider that a better plan would be to add small classes on higher rates of pay, to which each man might hope to rise by good conduct and activity. Under such a scheme the stimulus would be at least as great and the cost much less. The present rule is that not more than one-quarter of the peon and amin establishments shall get Rs. 7 and 14, respectively. This proportion might be raised to one-third and to a quarter of this third Rs. 8 and Rs. 16, respectively, might be given. The Government will be glad to have the remarks of the Honourable the Judges on this proposal and its probable cost. As regards Nazirs, where there are only two courts, the work of a Central Nazir hardly differs from that of a Deputy Nazir, and it may be doubted whether the pay of such Central Nazirs should not be brought down to a level with that of Deputy Nazirs, if any change at all is to be made. Lastly as already pointed out, the work of a Deputy Nazir at head-quarter station is only different from that of a Deputy Nazir elsewhere from the tendency of litigation to increase in inverse ratio with the distance of the court and at some head-quarters is much lighter than at some outstations. The work of the Deputy Nazirs at Chittoor and Kurnool, for example, is not comparable with that at such heavy courts as Ongole or Permangudy.

6. His Excellency the Governor in Council is, therefore, unable to accept the present proposals of the Honourable the Judges, but he will be prepared to consider suggestions for utilizing some part of the surplus on the lines indicated in the foregoing remarks.

(True Extract.)

H. E. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

G.O., No. 783, 31st March 1888.

Process Service Establishments.

Passing orders on the proposition statement of the High Court for improving the status, increasing the strengths of the — in the mofussil at an enhanced cost.

mofussil

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 783, JUDICIAL, DATED
31st MARCH 1888.

[SUBJECT.—Process Service Establishments.]
From the Registrar, High Court, dated 3rd February 1888, No. 303.

For orders.

This is a proposal from the High Court to spend a sum of Rs. 1,26,634 a year extra on the existing process-service establishments, by raising their pay, without increasing their strength.

The existing process-service rules received the virtual sanction of India in Home Department letter recorded in G.O., No. 256, dated 29th January 1884, and in the High Court's Registrar's letter of the 24th June following, proposals were submitted for revising the process-service establishment, which were approved by Government in G.O., No. 2373, dated 16th September 1884. The cost of the establishment then fixed was Rs. 5,63,700 per annum, but under the sliding scale which allows increase of establishment to be given on a certain scale of increased work, additional hands have been from time to time sanctioned, and the present cost of process-service establishment (including pensions) is Rs. 6,57,476 or some Rs. 20,000 more than it stood at before the revision of 1884. In spite of increased expenditure large annual surpluses have accrued, and the High Court now therefore propose to distribute Rs. 1,26,634 per annum of the surplus among the establishment, raising the future total cost.

The following are details:—

Present.				Proposed.			
	Rs. 6.	Rs. 7.	Total.	Rs. 7.	Rs. 8.	Total.	Extra cost per annum.
Peons	3,736	1,230	4,966	2,497	2,469	4,966	Rs. 79,114
	Rs. 12.	Rs. 14.	Total.	Rs. 14.	Rs. 16.	Total.	
Amins	1,018	330	1,348	681	667	1,348	Rs. 44,484
Central Nazirs	When in place where more than two courts to be raised from 50 to 60.						Rs. 3,036.
Deputy Nazirs	8 at head-quarter stations to be raised from Rs. 25 to 35						

These proposals will meet or will not meet with the approval of the Government according as the Government consider the principle of devoting process-fees to process-serving establishments a binding one, and according as they consider it necessary or desirable to offer pay amounting to Rs. 7,84,110 for the same work which is now being done for Rs. 6,57,476. It would certainly seem that, as, in 1884, strength and salaries were carefully adjusted to actual requirements (paragraph 12 of Mr. Davies' letter in Government Order of 16th September 1884), there can be no necessity to raise, all round, the pay of peons and amins and partly of the Nazirs. It would seem the more proper course, as there is so considerable a surplus, to reduce the fees which suitors are called on to pay. Nor does there seem any special reason why whatever surplus does accrue should not be

No. The original scheme did not.

H. E. S.
Cf. however Sec. 20 (ii) of Act VII of 1870. It is proposed by rule to increase the pay of process servers.
P.P.H.

Submitted for approval

24-1-4
M.L.
26/1/11

Strike

26/1

NOTES TO G.O., No. 783, JUDICIAL, 31st MARCH 1883.

This has been the view ever since 1870, when the process-service funds till then existing were absorbed—G.O., No. 694, dated 18th May 1870. See also letter No. 3121, dated 18th December 1871, in G.O., No. 464, dated 5th April 1872. It was laid down that fees should be settled so as to cover charges but that was all.

H.E.S.

Probably this is the correct principle, but High Court might reply that they all along said that the present rates were minima and to be increased if possible. They have also the power to reduce the charges for processes and so the surplus.

P.P.H.

devoted to general revenues. The Government of India implied that this was their view in paragraph 3 of Home department letter in G.O., No. 256, dated 29th January 1884. The principle that a department may spend what it earns is not applied to other allied departments such as that of Registration and it is not clear why it should be applied to a special Branch of the Judicial administration. However, it is observed, that in paragraph 17 of the Review of the Civil Justice Report, 1886 (G.O., No. 2593, dated 11th November 1887), the Government contemplated some utilization of the surplus, and the High Court's proposals may, therefore, be in accord with the Government's views. The details of the proposals seem, so far as they can be judged without any knowledge of the working of a Civil Court's process establishment, satisfactory enough.

A.G.C.—23-2-88.

I submit that the proposals should not be sanctioned. They are avowedly submitted not because the increased charge is required to secure efficiency but in order to expend the surplus of a fund which is an imaginary one. The process fees are part of the general revenues, and are not credited to any special fund, and in the settlement of the Provincial contract they have been so treated. The proposal therefore means that a Provincial charge of 1½ lakhs is to be assumed. In the contract the receipts are amalgamated with the stamp revenue which was estimated for the contract at the amount of the budget of 1886-1887, and the expenditure per contract is entered at 6.20 lakhs. Accordingly the contract assumes a surplus to Provincial of 2.19 lakhs or thereabouts; and the Provincial finances do not admit of this being thrown away. There is no possibility of checking the figures of receipts which are based on certain registers

	In thousands of rupees.			
	Court Fee Stamps.	Process fees.	Charges.	
			Finance account	High Court.
1883-4	33,72	769	..	613
1884-5	33,54	740	570	565
1885-6	34,80	793	593	590
1886-7	34,46	839	593	590

kept in the courts, but it is curious that the charges as given by the High Court do not agree with the finance accounts (when they are shown separately) and that the continued increase in process-fee receipts is not paralleled by increase in total revenue from court fee stamps, or in the number of suits instituted in mufassal courts to which alone the High Court figures relate.

I altered the whole system of charges about 1885. Litigation has not increased since to any great extent.
P.P.H.

	Institution in mufassal courts.
1883	1,57,410
1884	1,52,062
1885	1,54,409
1886	1,52,028

Increase in Small Cause Suits.

The Government want to improve the position of Station House officers, and cannot, I submit, afford to undertake this expenditure, which is not urgently required. Why should process peons be paid Rs. 7 and 8 when taluk peons can be had for Rs. 6? It is however proposed to spend Rs. 79,114 a year on increasing the pay of the process peons. This would suffice to give every Station House officer in the Presidency 3½ nearly per mensem. There appears equally little reason for increasing the pay of amins at a cost of Rs. 44,484.

H. E. STOKES.

E
21
NOTES to G.O., No. 783, JUDICIAL, 31st MARCH 1883.

The Government Order may point out that our contract includes the surplus, or the greater part thereof, which cannot therefore be spared. Advantage may be also taken of this to state that we do not really make a profit out of judicial receipts when pensionary charges, interest on judicial buildings, etc., are taken into account. The Nazarat system requires a separate room which is now provided in the type designs.

And apart from this I would not be disposed to accept the present proposals which seem to be made as pointed out in the note rather in consequence of our remarks of November 1887 and to get rid of a surplus than because they are really necessary.

Taking them seriatim. I do not believe that peons and amins are likely to be improved by getting a rupee or two extra all round, good, bad and indifferent, nor a bit less likely to demand or accept petty tips in the way of food or batta. Taluk peons even under Mr. Garstin's scheme are only to get Rs. 6. It would probably do quite as much good and cost much less to add a small class of peons and amins on the higher pay now proposed, to which each man may then hope to rise by good conduct and activity. The present rule is that not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ shall get Rs. 7 and 14. We might increase this to $\frac{1}{3}$ and let $\frac{1}{3}$ of that $\frac{1}{3}$ get Rs. 8 and 16. I have calculated the cost of this roughly for amins and peons to be 12,600 a year. India's sanction is necessary, I believe.

Next as to Central Nazirs. It is not proposed to add to their work nor is it asserted that their pay is too low. Where there are only two courts the work of a Central Nazir hardly differs from that of a Deputy Nazir at head-quarters, and only from other Deputy Nazirs so far as litigation generally varies to some extent in inverse ratio to the distance of the court. It may therefore be doubted whether the pay of such Central Nazirs should not be brought down to that of Deputy Nazirs, if any change at all is to be made!

Again as to Deputy Nazirs at head-quarters their work would be exactly like that of other Deputy Nazirs but for the tendency just noticed of work to increase in the near vicinity of a court. The work of the Deputy Nazirs at Chittoor and Kurnool, e.g., could not compare with that at such heavy courts as Ongole or Permangudy.

From these notes probably a sufficient order can be drafted but I wish to see it, without however these heavy books. In the introductory remarks it may be pointed out that the figures of income are taken from registers made by clerks or by the process-service establishments themselves and cannot be checked. It is curious, though not altogether unintelligible to me, that the institution fees have not increased while the process fees have.

P. P. HUTCHINS—19-3-83.

Draft passed by Honourable Member.

[G.O., No. 783, Judicial, dated 31st March 1888.]

20

[7.]

PRESS SLIP.

ORDINARY.

PREFERENCE.

URGENT.

DEPARTMENT.

Current No....., dated.....190

G.O., No. 783, dated 31. 3. 1888

Number of MS. pages sent { Correspondence.....9
(b)
Notes.....4

Brief subject...Process service establishment

Number (c) of copies required when struck off (not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press).	E. T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes
FOR RECORD.*			
Madras Records ...	12	12	
Ooty Records ...	3	3	
For filing with original ...	1	1	
Total ...	16	16	

FOR ISSUE.†

	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	Special issue copies of G.O.		Notes.
			No.	Papers.	
Signature copies.....					
India Office.....					
Govt. of India.....Dept.					
Revenue Department.....					
Public Works Department.....					
Local and Municipal Department.....					
Educational Department.....					
.....Dept.					
Public Dept.....					
Judicial Dept.....					
Political.....					
Financial Dept.....					
Marine Dept.....					
Ecclesiastical Dept.....					
Total.....					
Spare copies					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
The.....					
Total ...					

* Copies distributed on.....†(Press Clerk.)
† Copies distributed on.....†(Press Despatcher.)

† To be initialed and dated.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently, the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item has been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b¹) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the Office Manual.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for one week, and larger papers for two weeks only. The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by the Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

C. M. SCHMIDT,
Registrar,
Chief Secretariat.

A Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.	TO PRESS, MADRAS, GOVT. B Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.	C As the matter is in clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (b) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated.
Type may be released after usual interval at once	Type may be released after usual interval at once	Type may be released after usual interval
.....<i>C.R.</i>.....Referencer. 28.12.10 <i>29.12.10</i>.....Supdt.	Referencer..... Supdt.....	Referencer..... Supdt.....

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

For the Press

Please handle the manuscripts very carefully, as they are in a bad condition

TO BE FILLED IN BY THE PRESS.				
Diary.				Initials of Press official.
Received in Press on.....				3.1.11
First proof furnished on.....				
Call for revised proof received on.....				
Revised proof furnished on.....				23.1.11
Corrected proof received for striking on.....				26.1.11
Final copies supplied on.....				2.2.11
Account of copies.	Complete copies.	Notes.	Issue copies.	Special E.T. edition.
Supplied to Secretariat for Record.....	10			
" " " Issue.....				
" " " Extra E.T. copies to supply requisitions for sale to the public.				4
For Volumes.....				
For supply to newspapers and institutions admitted to the privileges of the E.T.				
Total				

303. High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 3rd February 1888.

From

H.T. Rao Esquire,
Registrar of the High Court of
Judicature at Madras.

To

The Honourable W. E. Stokes,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George
(through the Accountant-General)

Sir,

I am directed to submit, for consideration, the accompanying Proposition Statement for improving the status, without increasing the strength, of the Process Service establishment in the Mojmeeil at an enhanced cost of Rs 117,660 per annum. This is exclusive of pensionary charges. Including the percentages allowed on account of pensionary charges, the extra cost involved in the present proposals amounts to Rs 126,634 per annum.

2. In making these proposals, the principle followed has been, first, to improve the position of the low-paid peons who monthly pittance offers a strong temptation to dishonesty and indolence; next, to raise the status of the Amins; and lastly, that of the Deputy Tahsils at headquarter stations, and the Central Tahsils.

Instead of 3736 pawns on Rs 6 and 1230 on Rs 7 per mensem, it is proposed to pay 2497 pawns at Rs 7 and the rest at Rs 8 per mensem, that is, to give the higher pay of 8 Rs to one half or as nearly as possible one half of the number of pawns in each District and the lower pay to the remainder. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs 79,114 per annum.

4. On the same principle, instead of 1018 Amirs on Rs 12, and 330 on Rs 14 per mensem, it is proposed to pay 681 Amirs at Rs 14 and 667 at Rs 16 per mensem. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs 14,484 per annum.

5. Of the 15 Central Magis, 8 are in places where there are more than two, and 7 in places where there are only two, Courts. It is proposed to increase the pay of the former from Rs 50 to Rs 60, and of the latter from Rs 40 to Rs 50 per mensem. In consideration of the heavier work, as compared with that of Deputy Magis in outlying Courts, which falls upon 8 of the Deputy Magis at headquarters or Stations, it is proposed to raise the pay of these 8 officers from Rs 25 to

PROCESS-SERVICE
ESTABLISHMENTS.

Statement of Proposition for

No.	Date.	Government of Department.	Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
				PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
				No.	Designation.	Pay.	Maxi- mum.		No.	Designation.	Pay.	Maxi- mum.	
						Rs.	A.	Rs.	A.		Rs.	A.	
					ARCOOT (NORTH).					Chittoor Munsif's Court.			
					1 Deputy Nazir	25	0			1 Deputy Nazir	25	0	
					11 Amins					11 Amins			
					15 Peons					45 Peons			
					Vellore Munsif's Court.					Vellore Munsif's Court.			
					1 Deputy Nazir	25	0			1 Deputy Nazir	25	0	
					10 Amins					10 Amins			
					40 Peons					40 Peons			
					Arni Munsif's Court.					Arni Munsif's Court.			
					1 Deputy Nazir	25	0			1 Deputy Nazir	25	0	
					11 Amins					11 Amins			
					30 Peons					30 Peons			
					Sholinghur Munsif's Court.					Sholinghur Munsif's Court.			
					1 Deputy Nazir	25	0			1 Deputy Nazir	25	0	
					8 Amins					8 Amins			
					37 Peons					37 Peons			
					Tirupati Munsif's Court.					Tirupati Munsif's Court.			
					1 Deputy Nazir	25	0			1 Deputy Nazir	25	0	
					11 Amins					11 Amins			
					50 Peons					50 Peons			
					Total subordinate establishment for the District.					Total subordinate establishment for the District.			
					12 Amins on Rs. 14	168	0			25 Amins on Rs. 16	400	0	
					39 " " 12	468	0			26 " " 14	364	0	
					56 Peons on " 7	392	0			112 Peons on " 8	896	0	
					169 " " 6	1014	0			113 " " 7	791	0	
						2042	0				2451	0	
						2167	0				2586	0	

G.O. No 2973, Judicial
 G.O. No 1281, Civil
 16th September 1884
 15th May 1886

Rs 35 per mensem. The extra cost, including pensionary charges, will be Rs 3036 per annum. W 27

6. The total extra cost, including pensionary charges, of the present proposals will therefore be Rs 126,634. The annual charges of the present establishment, including pensions, amount to Rs 65,177. The receipts from Process Fees were,

in 1884—Rs 740,451

in 1885—Rs 794,778

in 1886—Rs 839,059.

the increasing annual surplus having thus reached more than Rs 1,83,000. The present proposals, including pensionary charges, will still leave a surplus of not less than Rs 56,000 per annum, which the High Court considers ample as a provision for all likely contingencies. Increasing annual receipts will, it is anticipated, result in an actual surplus considerably above this estimate.

7. These proposals necessitate an alteration of rule III (a to d) of the process and service rules of 8th November 1883, sanctioned in G.O. No 256 Judicial dated 29th January 1884. The High Court has accordingly altered that rule as shown below subject to the confirmation

48
40
50
37
50
56
28
56
—
22

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Government of Department.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
					PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
No.	Date.	No.			Designation.	Pay.		No.		Designation.	Pay.			
						Maxi- mum.					Maxi- mum.			
				ARCOOT (SOUTH).	RS.	A.	RS.	A.						
				District Court.	District Court.									
		1	Central Nazir	...	40	0	1	Central Nazir	...	50	0			
		16	Amins	...			16	Amins	...					
		45	Peons	...			45	Peons	...					
				Chidambaram Munsif's Court.	Chidambaram Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0			
		14	Amins	...			14	Amins	...					
		35	Peons	...			35	Peons	...					
				Vilupuram Munsif's Court.	Vilupuram Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0			
		14	Amins	...			14	Amins	...					
		39	Peons	...			39	Peons	...					
				Vridhachalam Munsif's Court.	Vridhachalam Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0			
		11	Amins	...			11	Amins	...					
		29	Peons	...			29	Peons	...					
				Tirukovilur Munsif's Court.	Tirukovilur Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0			
		11	Amins	...			11	Amins	...					
		29	Peons	...			29	Peons	...					
				Total subordinate establishment for the District.	Total subordinate establishment for the District.									
		16	Amins on Rs. 14	...	224	0	33	Amins on Rs. 16	...	528	0			
		50	" " 12	...	600	0	33	" " 14	...	462	0			
		41	Peons on " 7	...	308	0	88	" " 8	...	704	0			
		133	" " 6	...	798	0	89	" " 7	...	623	0			
					2070	0					2467	0		

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

Statement of Proposition for										
Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.							
			PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.			
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.	
	Maximum.				Maximum.					
No.	Date.									
			BELLARY.	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			
			Sub-Court.							
			No Deputy Nazir.							
			5 Amins							
			12 Peons							
			Bellary Munsif's Court.							
			1 Deputy Nazir							
			17 Amins		25	0			35 0	
			75 Peons							
			Narayanadevarkera's Munsif's Court.							
			1 Deputy Nazir							
			7 Amins		25	0			25 0	
			38 Peons							
			Gutti Munsif's Court.							
			1 Deputy Nazir							
			11 Amins		25	0			25 0	
			55 Peons							
			Penukonda Munsif's Court.							
			1 Deputy Nazir							
			10 Amins		25	0			25 0	
			48 Peons							
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.							
			12 Amins on Rs. 14	168	0			25 Amins on Rs. 16	400 0	
			38 " " 12	456	0			25 " " 14	350 0	
			57 Peons on " 7	399	0			114 Peons on " 8	912 0	
			171 " " 6	1026	0			114 " " 7	798 0	
					2049	0			2460 0	
					2149	0			2570 0	

G.O. No 2373, Madras.

16 September 1934.

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.											
			PRESENT SCALE.						PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.					
	Maxi-mum,				Maxi-mum.									
No.	Date.													
			CANARA (SOUTH.)	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	RS.	A.	
			District Court.							District Court.				
		1	Central Nazir	...		50	0			1	Central Nazir	...	60	0
		16	Amins	...						15	Amins	...		
		60	Peons	...						60	Peons	...		
			Udipi Munsif's Court.							Udipi Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0
		7	Amins	...						7	Amins	...		
		30	Peons	...						30	Peons	...		
			Kassergode Munsif's Court.							Kassergode Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0
		6	Amins	...						6	Amins	...		
		30	Peons	...						30	Peons	...		
			Puttur Munsif's Court.							Puttur Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0
		8	Amins	...						8	Amins	...		
		42	Peons	...						42	Peons	...		
			Karkal Munsif's Court.							Karkal Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0
		7	Amins	...						7	Amins	...		
		30	Peons	...						30	Peons	...		
			Kundapur Munsif's Court.							Kundapur Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0
		8	Amins	...						8	Amins	...		
		38	Peons	...						38	Peons	...		
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.							Total subordinate establishment for the District.				
		12	Amins on Rs. 14	...	168	0				25	Amins on Rs. 16	...	400	0
		39	" " 12	...	468	0				26	" " 14	...	364	0
		57	Peons on " 7	...	399	0				115	Peons on " 8	...	920	0
		173	" " 6	...	1038	0				115	" " 7	...	805	0
							2073	0						2489
							2248	0						2674

G.O. No 2373, Incorporated

G.O. No 51, Incorporated

16 September 1884.

9 January 1885

G.O. No 457

9 April 1887

on of Establishments.

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
Government of Department.			PRESENT SCALE.				PROPOSED SCALE.						
No.	Date.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
						Maximum.				Maximum.			
		CHINGLEPUT.											
		District Court.											
		1	Central Nazir	...	40	0	1	Central Nazir	...	50	0		
		10	Amins	...			10	Amins	...				
		50	Peons	...			50	Peons	...				
		Trivellore Munsif's Court.											
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0		
		7	Amins	...			7	Amins	...				
		36	Peons	...			36	Peons	...				
		Punamalli Munsif's Court.											
		1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...	25	0		
		7	Amins	...			7	Amins	...				
		28	Peons	...			28	Peons	...				
		Cantonment Court of Small Causes.											
		1	Amin	...			1	Amin	...				
		2	Peons	...			2	Peons	...				
		Total subordinate establishment for the District.											
		6	Amins on Rs. 14	...	84	0	12	Amins on Rs. 16	...	192	0		
		19	" " 12	...	228	0	13	" " 14	...	182	0		
		29	Peons on Rs. 7	...	203	0	58	Peons " 8	...	464	0		
		87	" " 6	...	522	0	58	" " 7	...	406	0		
						1037	0					1244	0
						1127	0					1344	0

G.O. No 2373, 1903

G.O. No 2176, 1903

G.O. No 580, 1903

16.12.1903

4.1.1904

4.1.1904

18.12.1903

18.12.1903

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
No.	Date.		PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.			
						Maxi- mum.				Maxi- mum.		
			COIMBATORE.									
			Sub-Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...			1	Deputy Nazir	...			
		3	Amins	...		25	0	3	Amins	...	25	
		10	Peons	...				10	Peons	...	0	
			Coimbatore Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...				1	Deputy Nazir	...		
		11	Amins	...		25	0	11	Amins	...	35	
		48	Peons	...				43	Peons	...	0	
			Erode Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...				1	Deputy Nazir	...		
		10	Amins	...		25	0	10	Amins	...	25	
		44	Peons	...				14	Peons	...	0	
			Karur Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...				1	Deputy Nazir	...		
		8	Amins	...		25	0	8	Amins	...	25	
		32	Peons	...				32	Peons	...	0	
			Udamalpettai Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...				1	Deputy Nazir	...		
		8	Amins	...		25	0	8	Amins	...	25	
		24	Peons	...				24	Peons	...	0	
			Kollegal Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir	...				1	Deputy Nazir	...		
		2	Amins	...		25	0	2	Amins	...	25	
		5	Peons	...				5	Peons	...	0	
			Gudalore Munsif's Court.									
		2	Amins	...				2	Amins	...		
		2	Peons	...				2	Peons	...		
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.									
		11	Amins on Rs. 14	...	154	0		22	Amins on Rs. 16	...	352	
		33	" " 12	...	396	0		22	" " 14	...	308	
		3	Peons " 11	...	33	0		3	Peons " 11	...	33	
		7	" " 10	...	70	0		7	Peons " 10	...	70	
		39	Peons " 7	...	266	0		77	" " 8	...	616	
		117	" " 6	...	702	0		78	" " 7	...	546	
					1621	0					1925	
					1771	0					2085	

Order sanctioning present Establishment.

Government of Department.

No.

Date.

Office to which the proposition refers.

COIMBATORE.

Sub-Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

3 Amins ...

10 Peons ...

Coimbatore Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

11 Amins ...

48 Peons ...

Erode Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

10 Amins ...

44 Peons ...

Karur Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

8 Amins ...

32 Peons ...

Udamalpettai Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

8 Amins ...

24 Peons ...

Kollegal Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

2 Amins ...

5 Peons ...

Gudalore Munsif's Court.

2 Amins ...

2 Peons ...

Total subordinate establishment for the District.

11 Amins on Rs. 14 ...

33 " " 12 ...

3 Peons " 11 ...

7 " " 10 ...

39 Peons " 7 ...

117 " " 6 ...

154 0

396 0

33 0

70 0

266 0

702 0

1621 0

1771 0

COIMBATORE.

Sub-Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

3 Amins ...

10 Peons ...

Coimbatore Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

11 Amins ...

43 Peons ...

Erode Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

10 Amins ...

14 Peons ...

Karur Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

8 Amins ...

32 Peons ...

Udamalpettai Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

8 Amins ...

24 Peons ...

Kollegal Munsif's Court.

1 Deputy Nazir ...

2 Amins ...

5 Peons ...

Gudalore Munsif's Court.

2 Amins ...

2 Peons ...

Total subordinate establishment for the District.

22 Amins on Rs. 16 ...

22 " " 14 ...

3 Peons " 11 ...

7 Peons " 10 ...

77 " " 8 ...

78 " " 7 ...

352 0

308 0

33 0

70 0

616 0

546 0

1925 0

2085 0

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

S. C. No 2373, Judicial.
16th September 1884.

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

G. A. No 2373, purchased
16th September 1884.

5

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment. Government of Department.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		Maxi-mum.	
						Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.		
No.	Date.											
KURNOOL.												
				Kurnool Munsif's Court.	RS.	A.		Kurnool Munsif's Court.	RS.	A.		
				1 Deputy Nazir ...			25	0			35	0
				6 Amins ...								
				40 Peons ...								
Nandial Munsif's Court.												
				1 Deputy Nazir ...			25	0			25	0
				10 Amins ...								
				40 Peons ...								
Cumbum Munsif's Court.												
				1 Deputy Nazir ...			25	0			25	0
				6 Amins ...								
				28 Peons ...								
Total subordinate establishment for the District.												
				5 Amins on Rs. 14 ...	70	0						
				17 " " 12 ...	204	0						
				27 Peons " 7 ...	189	0						
				81 " " 6 ...	486	0						
					949	0						
					1024	0						
Total subordinate establishment for the District.												
				11 Amins on Rs. 16 ...	176	0						
				11 " " 14 ...	154	0						
				54 Peons on " 8 ...	432	0						
				54 " " 7 ...	378	0						
					1146	0						
					1225	0						

S.O. No 2373, Judicial
S.O. No 2302, P.W. Secy.
16 September 1884
24 September 1886

Revision of Establishments.

Establishments.										Net result.	Grounds of Proposi- tion.	Local Government's recom- mendation.	ORDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.					
PROPOSITION.					TEMPORARY.								DEPART- MENT.	FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.				
PERMANENT.		INCREASE PER MONTH.			DECREASE PER MONTH.			Period.	Amount.					Period.	Amount.	Remarks.	Remarks.	Orders.
Amount.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.											
RS.	A.	RS.	A.		RS.	A.		RS.	A.									
201	0																	

51

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
Government of Department.			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
No.	Date.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.			
						Maximum.				Maximum.		

G. A. No 2373, finished
G. A. No 921.
16th September 1887.
20th August 1887.

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
Government of Department.			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
						Maxi- mum.				Maxi- mum.			
No.	Date.												
			MALABAR (SOUTH).	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	RS.	A.
			District Court.							District Court.			
		1	Central Nazir ...			50	0	1	Central Nazir ...			60	0
		23	Amins ...					23	Amins ...				
		110	Peons ...					110	Peons ...				
			Palghat Sub-Court.							Palghat Sub-Court.			
		1	Central Nazir ...			40	0	1	Central Nazir ...			50	0
		17	Amins ...					17	Amins ...				
		83	Peons ...					83	Peons ...				
			Shernad Munsif's Court.							Shernad Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		9	Amins ...					9	Amins ...				
		53	Peons ...					53	Peons ...				
			Temelpuram Munsif's Court.							Temelpuram Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		9	Amins ...					9	Amins ...				
		53	Peons ...					53	Peons ...				
			Betutnad Munsif's Court.							Betutnad Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		8	Amins ...					8	Amins ...				
		49	Peons ...					49	Peons ...				
			Kutnad Munsif's Court.							Kutnad Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		7	Amins ...					7	Amins ...				
		33	Peons ...					33	Peons ...				

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
Government of Department.			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					
No.	Date.		No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
					Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.				
			MALABAR (SOUTH) (Continued.)	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	RS.	A.
			Ohavakad Munsif's Court.			190	-						
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		8	Amins ...					8	Amins ...				
		53	Peons ...					53	Peons ...				
			Ernad Munsif's Court.										
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		8	Amins ...					8	Amins ...				
		53	Peons ...					53	Peons ...				
			Angadipuram Munsif's Court.										
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		7	Amins ...					7	Amins ...				
		33	Peons ...					38	Peons ...				
			Nedunganad Munsif's Court.										
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		7	Amins ...					7	Amins ...				
		28	Peons ...					28	Peons ...				
			Vyteri Munsif's Court.										
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		5	Amins ...					5	Amins ...				
		24	Peons ...					24	Peons ...				
			Anjengo Munsif's Court.										
		2	Peons ...					2	Peons ...				
			Cochin Sub-Court.										
		8	Amins ...					8	Amins ...				
		10	Peons ...					10	Peons ...				
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.										
		27	Amins on Rs. 14 ...	378	0			55	Amins on Rs. 16 ...	880	0		
		84	" " 12 ...	1008	0			56	" " 14 ...	784	0		
		147	Peons " 7 ...	1029	0			294	Peons " 8 ...	2352	0		
		442	" " 6 ...	2652	0			295	" " 7 ...	2065	0		
						5067	0					6081	0
						5382	0					6416	0

L. A. No 2373, Judicial

16 September 1887.

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
	Maxi- mum.				Maxi- mum.								
No.	Date.												
			NELLORE.	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	RS.	A.
			Nellore Munsif's Court.							Nellore Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...	25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...			35	0
		20	Amins ...					20	Amins ...				
		72	Peons ...					72	Peons ...				
			Ongole Munsif's Court.							Ongole Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...	25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		17	Amins ...					17	Amins ...				
		61	Peons ..					61	Peons ...				
			Kavali Munsif's Court.							Kavali Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...	25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0
		15	Amins ...					15	Amins ...				
		36	Peons ...					36	Peons ...				
			Total subordinate es- tablishment for the District.						Total subordinate es- tablishment for the District.				
		13	Amins on Rs. 14 ...	182	0			26	Amins on Rs. 16 ...	416	0		
		39	" " 12 ...	468	0			26	" " 14 ...	364	0		
		42	Peons " 7 ...	294	0			84	Peons on " 8 ...	672	0		
		127	" " 6 ...	762	0			85	" " 7 ...	595	0		
						1706	0					2047	0
						1781	0					2132	0

G. O. No 2373. Judicial.

16th September 1884.

G. O. no 2373. Judicial.
16th September 1884.

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

G.O. No 2373, Judicial.

G.O. No 2908, Judicial

16 September 1884.

21 December 1887

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.			
						Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.		
No.	Date.											
G.O. No. 2389, dated 23.9.1885 G.O. No. 928, dated 23.9.1885 82 September 1885 10.11.1885 G.O. No. 2373, dated 16.10.1884 G.O. No. 1055, dated 23.9.1885 16 September 1884 23.9.1885												
TANJORE (Contd.)												
Sub-Court, Nega-patam.												
1 Central Nazir ... 40 0												
24 Amins ...												
80 Peons ...												
Tiruturapundi Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
9 Amins ...												
30 Peons ...												
Tiruvarur Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
14 Amins ...												
43 Peons ...												
Mayavaram Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
11 Amins ...												
40 Peons ...												
Shiyali Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
7 Amins ...												
27 Peons ...												
Total subordinate establishment for the District.												
38 Amins on Rs. 14 ... 532 0												
116 " " 12 ... 1392 0												
138 Peons on " 7 ... 966 0												
414 " " 6 ... 2484 0												
5374 0												
5659 0												
Sub-Court, Nega-patam.												
1 Central Nazir ... 50 0												
24 Amins ...												
80 Peons ...												
Tiruturapundi Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
9 Amins ...												
30 Peons ...												
Tiruvarur Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
14 Amins ...												
43 Peons ...												
Mayavaram Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
11 Amins ...												
40 Peons ...												
Shiyali Munsif's Court.												
1 Deputy Nazir ... 25 0												
7 Amins ...												
27 Peons ...												
Total subordinate establishment for the District.												
77 Amins on Rs. 16 ... 1232 0												
77 " " 14 ... 1078 0												
276 Peons on " 8 ... 2208 0												
276 " " 7 ... 1932 0												
6450 0												
6795 0												

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
						Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.			
No.	Date.												
			TANJORE.	ES.	A.	ES.	A.			ES.	A.	ES.	A.
			District Court.							District Court.			
		1	Central Nazir ...		50	0			1	Central Nazir ...		60	0
		22	Amins ...						22	Amins ...			
		85	Peons ..						85	Peons ...			
			Kumbhakonam Sub-Court.							Kumbhakonam Sub-Court.			
		1	Central Nazir ...		50	0			1	Central Nazir ...		60	0
		26	Amins ...						26	Amins ..			
		104	Peons ...						104	Peons ..			
			Tiruvadi Munsif's Court.							Tiruvadi Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0
		12	Amins ...						12	Amins ...			
		40	Peons ...						40	Peons ...			
			Mannargudi Munsif's Court.							Mannargudi Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0
		14	Amins ...						14	Amins ...			
		53	Peons ...						53	Peons ...			
			Pattukottai Munsif's Court.							Pattukottai Munsif's Court.			
		1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0			1	Deputy Nazir ...		25	0
		15	Amins ...						15	Amins ...			
		50	Peons ...						50	Peons ...			

[illegible]

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.										
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.				
						Maximum.				Maximum.			
No.	Date.												
			TINNEVELLY.	ES.	A.	ES.	A.			ES.	A.	ES.	A.
			District Court.							District Court.			
		1	Central Nazir	...		50	0	1	Central Nazir	...		60	0
		20	Amins	...				20	Amins	...			
		67	Peons	...				67	Peons	...			
			Temporary establishment.						Temporary establishment.				
		3	Amins	...				3	Amins	...			
		18	Peons	...				18	Peons	...			
			Srivilliputtur Munsif's Court.						Srivilliputtur Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0
		19	Amins	...				19	Amins	...			
		59	Peons	...				59	Peons	...			
			Ambasamudram Munsif's Court.						Ambasamudram Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0
		20	Amins	...				20	Amins	...			
		62	Peons	...				62	Peons	...			
			Srivaikuntam Munsif's Court.						Srivaikuntam Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0
		17	Amins	...				17	Amins	...			
		58	Peons	...				58	Peons	...			
			Tuticorin Munsif's Court.						Tuticorin Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0	1	Deputy Nazir	...		25	0
		18	Amins	...				18	Amins	...			
		62	Peons	...				62	Peons	...			
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.						Total subordinate establishment for the District.				
		23	Amins on Rs. 14	...	322	0		47	Amins on Rs. 16	...	752	0	
		74	" " 12	...	888	0		50	" " 14	...	700	0	
		77	Peons on " 7	...	539	0		154	Peons on " 8	...	1232	0	
		249	" " 6	...	1494	0		172	" " 7	...	1204	0	
							3243	0				3888	0
							3393	0				4043	0

G.O. No 2373. Judicial
G.O. No 2407. His
16 September 1884
4th September 1886

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.									
			PRESENT SCALE.					PROPOSED SCALE.				
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.			
						Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.		
No.	Date.											
			TRICHINOPOLY.	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	
			District Court.									
		1	Central Nazir ...			50	0	✓	1	Central Nazir ...	60	0
		24	Amins ...						24	Amins ...		
		100	Peons ...						100	Peons ...		
			Kulittalai Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	✓	1	Deputy Nazir ...	25	0
		11	Amins ...						11	Amins ...		
		45	Peons ...						45	Peons ...		
			Ariyalur Munsif's Court.									
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	✓	1	Deputy Nazir ...	25	0
		10	Amins ...						10	Amins ...		
		45	Peons ...						45	Peons ...		
			Total subordinate es- tablishment for the District.							Total subordinate es- tablishment for the District.		
		11	Amins on Rs. 14 ...	154	0			✓	22	Amins on Rs. 16 ...	352	0
		34	" " 12 ...	408	0			✓	28	" " 14 ...	322	0
		47	Peons " 7 ...	329	0			✓	95	Peons " 8 ...	760	0
		143	" " 6 ...	858	0			✓	95	" " 7 ...	665	0
						1749	0				2099	0
						1849	0				2209	0

G.O. No. 2373, Judicial

16 September 1884.

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Statement of Proposition for

Order sanctioning present Establishment.		Office to which the proposition refers.	NATURE OF CHARGE.											
			PRESENT SCALE.						PROPOSED SCALE.					
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Pay.					
	Maxi-mum.				Maxi-mum.									
No.	Date.													
			VIZAGAPATAM.	RS.	A.	RS.	A.			RS.	A.	RS.	A.	
			District Court.							District Court.				
		1	Central Nazir ...			40	0	1	Central Nazir ...			50	0	
		23	Amins ...					23	Amins ...					
		63	Peons ...					63	Peons ...					
			Bimlipatam Munsif's Court.							Bimlipatam Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	
		9	Amins ...					9	Amins ...					
		20	Peons ...					20	Peons ...					
			Vizianagaram Munsif's Court.							Vizianagaram Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	
		11	Amins ...					11	Amins ...					
		30	Peons ...					30	Peons ...					
			Razam Munsif's Court.							Razam Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	
		11	Amins ...					11	Amins ...					
		31	Peons ...					31	Peons ...					
			Parvatipur Munsif's Court.							Parvatipur Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	
		10	Amins ...					10	Amins ...					
		30	Peons ...					30	Peons ...					
			Rayavaram (Yelamanchili) Munsif's Court.							Yelamanchili Munsif's Court.				
		1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	1	Deputy Nazir ...			25	0	
		13	Amins ...					13	Amins ...					
		35	Peons ...					35	Peons ...					
			Total subordinate establishment for the District.							Total subordinate establishment for the District.				
		19	Amins on Rs. 14 ...	266	0			38	Amins on Rs. 16 ...	608	0			
		58	" " 12 ...	696	0			39	" " 14 ...	546	0			
		52	Peons " 7 ...	364	0			104	Peons " 8 ...	832	0			
		157	" " 6 ...	942	0			105	" " 7 ...	735	0			
						2268	0					2721	0	
						2433	0					2896	0	

G.O. No 2373, Judicial

16 September 1884.

Revision of Establishments.

[illegible]

Enclosure to High Court's
letter dated the 3^d Feb.
1888.
n^o 303.

(with 3 spare copies)

88-789758

11. 6. 29-1-87 No. 256
 14. 8. 26 No. 257
 12. 12-87 No. 258
 Fml 31-10-87 No. 1158
 Jml 26-9-84 No. 2373
 15-5-86 No. 1281
 17-2-86 No. 432
 19-1-85 No. 81
 14-12-82 No. 21-5
 1-3-85 No. 580
 4-3-87 No. 295
 12-3-85 No. 588
 21-10-82 No. 2535
 4-2-87 No. 185
 12-11-87 No. 2388
 Fml 17-9-87 No. 22
 Jml 26-1-87 No. 2
 27-8-86 No. 2352
 20-8-87 No. 221
 21-12-87 No. 222
 5-1-88 No. 2382
 10-2-88 No. 928
 23-4-88 No. 105
 7-1-88 No. 22

CURRENT NO. 489
 Judicial { 1888 } Department.

No.

FROM

THE REGISTRAR OF THE HIGH COURT
 OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS,
 APPELLATE SIDE.

Dated 3rd February
 Received } 1888

No. 303.
 Encs. 1/2
 (Revised statement of the
 Process service Estab^t)
 (only 3rd B. 2).

Submitting for sanction
 the Proposition statement
 for improving the status,
 without increasing the strength
 of the Process service Estab^t.
 in the Mofussil at
 an enhanced cost.

11/10/87

Accountant General's Report

No. A. G. S. 475

The entries in the column of "Present Scale"
 have been compared with the Registers of this
 Office and are correct with the following exceptions:-
 The Establishment consisting of one Amin on Rs. 12,
 Two Process Servers on Rs. 7 each, and six Process
 Servers on Rs. 6 each originally sanctioned for
 the Additional District Munsiff's Court Madurai
 is shown under Madurai instead of under Tinnevely
 to which District it has been transferred under
 G. O. No. 2054 dated 21st August 1886. Eight additional Process
 Servers on Rs. 6 each sanctioned for the District Munsiff's
 Court Tirupattur in G. O. No. 2905 dated 21st Decr/86,
 and one Amin on Rs. 12 for the District Munsiff's
 Court, and one Amin on Rs. 12, and six Process
 Servers on Rs. 6 each for the Poonamallee Munsiff's Court
 sanctioned in G. O. No. 1152 dated 31st Oct/87
 have not been included in the "Present Scale".

Accountant General's Office
 Fort St. George
 16th February, 1888

Offg Dy. Accountant General

14 = 84 x 12 = 1008
 0 24 x 12 x 12 = 288

with para 3 of the act of 1874
 passed in 1874. 25-6-1874
 July 1874. 2 para 4 of the act
 passed in 1874. 25-6-1874.
 25-6-1874. 2 para 4 of the act
 passed in 1874. 25-6-1874.
 25-6-1874. 2 para 4 of the act
 passed in 1874. 25-6-1874.

Receipts from the
 sale of stamps

Year	Receipts	Expenditure	Balance
1874-75	740,451	564,742	175,709
1875-76	1,196,778	592,135	604,643
1876-77	1,339,057	579,727	759,330

The amount of the
 stamps sold in the
 year 1876-77 was
 Rs. 1,339,057.

Set-aside
 (for the
 year 1876-77)

Receipts from the
 sale of stamps

Year	Receipts	Expenditure	Balance
1874-75	153,946	168,067	14,121
1875-76	168,067	191,569	23,502
1876-77	191,569	182,328	9,241

The Finance Account
 does not show the receipts
 from process service fees,
 which are almost entirely
 realized in stamp,
 separately, but merge them
 into the ordinary stamp
 revenue of the Province. (The
Sale of Court fee stamps.)

The charges are given in the
 Finance accounts accounted
 to Rs. 5,70,230 in 1874-75
 5,98,214 in 1875-76
 5,98,127 in 1876-77
 against Rs. 6,20,078 in the
 Budget of 1876/77 which was taken
 as the contract grant.

2. According to the provision of the
 Salary of the (i.e. attached
 Subordinate & submagistrate officers)
 are paid Rs. 6 (i.e. per month),
 (except in hill tracts & special
 localities, where slightly higher
 rates are allowed.)

Cultural Nazirs { when in place where more than 2 lts. to be raised } 50 to 60.
 Deputy Nazirs - 8 at head quarters. { 2 Courts. " " 40 to 50 } Rs. 30 30
 to be raised for Rs. 25 to 35

Read 29th

These proposals will meet or will not meet with the approval of the Govt. according to the Government consider the principle of devoting process fees to process serving establishments a binding one, and according as they consider it necessary & desirable to offer pay amounting to Rs. 7, 84, 110 for the ^{same} work which is now done for Rs. 6, 57, 476. It would certainly seem that, as, in 1884, the salaries were carefully adjusted to actual requirements (para. 12 of Mr. Davies' letter in G.O. 16th Sept 84), there can be no necessity to raise - all round the pay of peons & amins & partly of Nazirs. It would seem the more proper course, as there is so considerable a surplus, to reduce the fees which suitors are called on to pay. Nor does there seem any special reason why the over surplus does accrue should not be devoted to general revenues. The Govt. of India implied that this was their view in para. 3 of some Dept. letter in G.O. 29th Jan 84. No. 256. The principle that a Dept. may spend what it earns is not applied to other allied Depts. such as that of Registration & it is not clear why it should be applied to a special branch of the Judicial admn. However, it is observed, that in para. 17 of the Rev. of the Civil Justice Report 1886 (G.O. 11th Nov. 1887. No. 2573) the Govt. contemplated some utilization of the surplus. & the High Court's proposals may therefore, be in accord with the Govt's views. The details of the proposals seem, so far as they can be judged without any knowledge of the working of a civil court's process establishment satisfactory enough.

23/2

Read

The Principal Secy
G.O. 11/70. 20th Nov. 1887
cf. however Sec 20(III) of Act VII/70. 20th Nov. 1887
by rule to increase the pay of process serve

There have been the view even since 1870, when the process serving funds were being raised. G.O. 18 Aug 70. No. 3121 in G.O. 5 April 72. No. 464. It was laid down that fees should cover charges but that was all.

But this is the correct principle. The Act does not imply that they all along said that the present rates were a minimum & to be increased if possible. They have also the power to reduce the charges on process & so the surplus.

Read 9.1.11

rule is that not more than $\frac{1}{4}$ shall set Rs. 7¹⁴ he might say $\frac{1}{3}$ shall increase this to $\frac{1}{3}$ & let $\frac{1}{4}$ of that $\frac{1}{3}$ set Rs. 8¹⁶. I have calculated the cost of this roughly for Amins & peons to be 12,600 a year. India's sanction is recd, I believe next as to Central Nazirs. It is not proposed to add to their work nor is it asserted that their pay is too low. Where there are only 2 Courts the work of a Central Nazir hardly differs from that of a Dep. Nazir at Headquarters, so far as the ^{to some extent} ~~the~~ ^{generally varies in inverse ratio to} the distance of the Court. It may therefore be doubted whether such Central Nazirs should be brought down that of Dep. Nazirs, if any change is to be made!

Again as to Dep. Nazirs at Headquarters their work would be exactly like that of other Dep. Nazirs but for the fact that they are in the vicinity of a Court. The work of the Dep. Nazir at Clifton & Karachi e.g. is not comparable with that at such heavy Courts as Bangalore or Benares.

From these notes probably a sufficient basis for a draft can be drawn. In the interim remarks it may be pointed out that the figures of income are taken from registers made by clerks in the Process Service & to themselves & cannot be checked. It is curious, too, that the figures are so unintelligible to me, that I do not feel sure that the figures are not in error, while the Process fees have.

29th

29th 87

I submit that the proposals should not be sanctioned. They are avowedly submitted not because the increased efficiency but in order to expend the surplus of a fund which is an imaginary one. The process fees are part of the general revenues, and are not credited to any special fund, and in the settlement of the provincial account they have been so treated. The proposal therefore means that a provincial charge of 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs is to be assumed. In the context the receipts are amalgamated with the Stamp revenue which was estimated for the centenary at the amt. of the budget of 1886-7, & the expenditure for Centenary is entered at 6.20 lakhs. According to the central estimate a surplus to provincial of 2.19 lakhs or thereabouts, & the provincial do not desire of this being thrown away. There is no possibility of checking the figures of 1886-7.

Judl. Department



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper

From the Reg^t, High Court, 3rd Feb: 1888, No. 3.

Order 31. 3. 88, No 783-111

In the foregoing letter the Honble the Judges of the High Court submit proposals for improving the status, without increasing strength, of the Processo-service establishment in the Mofussil by an increase of annual expenditure, including provision of Rs. 125,034 and also submit proposals for modification of Rule 1 of the Processo Service Rules framed under the Court Fees Act 1870. ~~and propose~~ It is pointed out that the receipts for process fees have presented an increasing annual surplus since 1884 - ~~and that~~ amounting in 1886 to Rs. 181,583, & that the present proposal, if sanctioned, would still leave a surplus of not less than Rs. 56,000 a year which the High Court considers ample provision for contingencies.

The figures relating to receipts

Judicial Process-service Establishments

C. 12/3.
R. 19/3.

For Order

	In thousands of rupees.	Court Fees Stamp	Process	Change
1883-4	33.72	769	570	613
1884-5	32.57	740	570	565
1885-6	37.50	775	598	570
1886-7	37.46	839	598	570

Institutions in Mofussil Courts.

83	157940	Number in Mofussil Courts.
1884	152062	
1885	157409	
1886	163028	Number in Mofussil Courts.

which are based on certain registers kept in the courts; but it is curious that the charges are given by the High Court do not agree with the finance accounts (when they are shown separately) and that the continued increase in process receipts is not paralleled by increase in total revenue from Court Fee Stamps, or in the number of suits instituted in Mofussil Courts to which alone the High Court figures relate.

The for^{er} want to improve the position of Station Station officers, and cannot I submit afford to undertake this expenditure, which is not urgent required. Why should process fees be paid 708 Rs. a year? Why should process fees be paid for Rs. 5? It is proposed to spend Rs. 79,114 on increasing the pay of the process fees. This would suffice to give every Station Station officer in the Presidency 3½ paise per mensem. Then appears equally little reason for increasing the pay of Amildars at a cost of Rs. 44,584.

1165

process-service fees are taken from registers
 maintained by the process-service established
 themselves or by clerks in the court and are
 subject to no check, it is noteworthy
 that the charges given by the High Court
 must agree with the figures supplied by the
 registers where they are separately shown
 while the increase in process fees receipts
 not paralleled by increase in the total
 revenue of Court fee stamps nor in the
 institution fees. Assuming, however
 that the figures relating to Process fee
 given by the High Court are correct
~~there is~~ a surplus under this head
 not be treated as tho' it belonged to
 the ~~Government~~ The Govt of India
 points to point this out in para. 30
 of its letter commd in G.O. 29
 of 250, & the High Court acquiesces
 in that view in their reply. The process
 is part of the general revenues and
 highly in the settlement of the Province
 extract, the surplus accruing was
 is an available asset for general ex-
 penses, & Provincial finances cannot
 bear the loss of so considerable a sum
 It may here be pointed out that
 what the Govt is supposed to mean
 is the admⁿ of Justice & equity

Para. 4. Mr. Innes's letter
 no. 616-21st Feb 1884.

J.D.
 11/2/84
 11/2/84
 11/2/84

In the maintenance
 of the law in force
 which the adminis-
 tration of civil justice is
 kept in existence
 when done, the law
 of justice does change
 in the account and
 would be covered many times

the rules that there
 is absolutely no difference
 work of a central mag-
 strate when there are
 courts & it is of a deputy
 which has to serve the purpose
 two courts within the same area
 the litigation has to be done
 in the same state district
 there is probably no com-
 munication the work at such
 stations is almost a chattering
 as a second outlying station
 of the same family.

58
 It would be quite reasonable
 to set off against the excess receipts from
 civil justice, the heavy maintenance
 expenditure incurred under criminal
 with its accessories of Police & jails
 even without having regard to the
 prison, mainly the civil justice
 be brought and drop in the ocean, if the
 charges the interest on capital
 expended in judicial buildings; & other
 charges are allowed for, no surplus
 for civil justice will be found to remain
 On the matter of process service, the Nagas
 have a separate and additional
 which is now provided in the type
 of the court fees.

from these considerations
 the acceptance of the High
 proposals impossible, the Govt are
 forced to accept the scheme
 it would seem that the Govt
 had rather to get rid of the surplus
 the measures suggested are
 It is at least doubtful
 remains will be still more in-
 sufficient because they all receive
 or two extra all round. Take
 under Mr. Justice's scheme
 at Rs. 0 per cent as regards the
 it is not possible that the
 to Lord nor is it proposed to
 new work, while in the case
 Nagas it is ~~clearly~~ not an universal
 at head quarters station is he
 at head quarters station

BAL. No.

FURT. PAPER, No. 1871

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, dated
188 ; No. MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURE.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITIO

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITIO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

M.E.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- C = Copy abstract only.
- D = Copy heading only.