M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Madras Record Office.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2576-77 Press Mis.

Dated 20 - 12 - 1888.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

K.V

24

Further papers

G.O. No. Ms. 4092 Home dt/ 14.10.89

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper :—

G.O., dated 17th November 1888, Mis. No. 2397, Judicial.

Read—the following papers :—

From A. P. MACDONNELL, Esq., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Judicial), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 12th September 1888, No. 1465.

With reference to paragraph 7 of your letter, No. 1027, dated the 14th May 1887, I am directed to address the Government of Madras on the subject of the office of Sheriff in Madras.

2. Paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee's note on the expenditure of the Madras High Court shows that the Sheriff is in receipt of a salary of Rs. 10,776 per annum, out of which he pays the Deputy Sheriff; that his office establishment and contingencies involve an annual expenditure of Rs. 5,870; and that the fees realized by him are credited to Government. It is understood that the intention of the Government of Madras is to make the office of Sheriff honorary, and to appoint a permanent Government officer for the conduct of the duties now performed by the Deputy Sheriff; and that with this object, legislation was recommended in a letter from that Government to the Finance Committee, dated the 7th August 1886. The Government of India, after a careful consideration of this proposal, is of opinion that it is opposed both to the spirit and the letter of the existing law, inasmuch as the provisions of the charters of the various Supreme Courts, taken with those contained in section 15 of Statute 24 and 25 Vict., Chapter 104, and also those of Act VIII of 1852, appear to be framed on the assumption that the Sheriff will be a paid officer, who will accordingly be held personally liable for the due performance of the duties imposed on him by the law.

3. With reference to the proposal of the Madras Government to entrust the work of the Deputy Sheriff to an officer of Government, I am to say that the Government of India considers it desirable that the Deputy Sheriff, who is the officer of the Sheriff, not of Government, should continue to be appointed by him. The arrangement by which the Deputy Sheriff indemnifies the Sheriff, and is generally indemnified by the suitor who puts him in motion, has obvious advantages. If the Deputy Sheriff were an officer of Government, the Government would be considered responsible for his acts, and indemnity might not be so readily given. This would probably cause inconvenience and be productive of litigation. For the foregoing reasons, the Government of India is not prepared to take steps to make any change in the existing law relating to the office of Sheriff or in the present system of appointing Deputy Sheriffs.

4. As regards the financial aspect of the case, I am to intimate that it seems to the Government of India that in the determination of the existing strength of Sheriffs' establishments in the Presidency towns, insufficient account has been taken of the modifications which the law has undergone during the last twelve years. Since the passing of section 86, Act X of 1877, processes from the mofussil, which used to be served by Sheriffs, are served by Presidency Courts of Small Causes. The work of

the Sheriffs' establishments will be still further reduced to some extent by the operation of sections 22 and 61 (2) of Act VII of 1888. In these circumstances the Governor-General in Council is of opinion that the most suitable arrangement for the future will be to give the Sheriff of Madras his fees, and to discontinue the practice of paying him a salary and the cost of his establishment from Government revenues. His Excellency in Council at the same time desires that the acceptance of the office should not expose the holder of it to pecuniary loss; and I am therefore to add that, should the fees in any year be insufficient to pay for the necessary establishment, the difference between the fees and the cost of establishment should, in the opinion of the Government of India, be recouped to the Sheriff by Government. I am therefore to request that this arrangement may be brought into force on the occasion of the next vacancy in the office of Sheriff, and that, with the permission of the Governor in Council, a statement may be submitted to show the fees realized by the Sheriff in each of the past five years. The Government of India would also be glad to learn at an early date what expenditure on establishment (including the Deputy Sheriff) should, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, be sanctioned for the Sheriff of Madras on the adoption of this change.

From the Officiating Accountant-General, Madras, dated 12th October 1888, No. I.B.G.-195.

From Sir SAVALAY RAMASAMY MUDELLIAR, *Kt.*, C.I.E., Sheriff of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th October 1888, No. 133.

With reference to the Under Secretary's letter, No. C. 4082 of 1888, Judicial Department, handing me copy of a letter, No. 1465, dated Simla, 12th September 1888, Home Department, Judicial, from the Chief Secretary to the Government of India, to the Government of Madras, I have the honor to state, in reply to the inquiry made in the former letter, as to what establishment will be necessary should the change proposed by the Government of India be adopted, that I cannot see my way to suggest any change in the present establishment, which is just sufficient to manage the business of the office.

2. With reference to paragraph 4 of the letter from the Chief Secretary to the Government of India, regarding the operation of section 86 of Act X of 1877, I have the honor to point out to Government that, when the mofussil process-serving business was transferred to the Small Cause Court, the clerk and the bailiff who were on the establishment at the time were also transferred to the Small Cause Court, thus reducing my establishment. As regards the operation of section 22 of Act VII of 1888, I beg to state that, although the number of suits on the Original side has been much reduced, yet attachments and sales of immovable property under decrees of the Court of Small Causes are executed through the Sheriff only. As to section 61 (2) of the said Act, I do not see that it has in any way materially diminished the office work.

3. I beg to submit herewith the following statements asked for in the Under Secretary's letter referred to above:—

(1) Statement showing the actual expenditure on the establishment for the past five years.
(2) Statement showing the actual remuneration paid to the Deputy Sheriff.
(3) Particulars of work done during the above period.

4. I may add, for the information of Government, that the average monthly income of my office, including fees on pauper suits, amounts to Rs. 300 only, which, however, can be increased by adopting the following measures.

5. All decrees and orders of the Court directing the sale of the property not previously attached (which were formerly sold by the Sheriff) are now entrusted to receivers, who are allowed to charge commission on the sale-proceeds. If such sales

are entrusted to the Sheriff as is done in the District Court to Nazirs, as the proper officer of the Court to conduct such sales, and commission allowed to be charged, as was done prior to the introduction of the new scale of fees, it would be the means of enhancing the present small monthly income to a great extent, so much so that it would result in a surplus being left after paying the establishment.

6. As a motive to induce parties concerned in sales to put the business into the hands of the Sheriff, Government would do well to draw their attention to the fact that, by entrusting the sales to shop-keepers, they incur a great risk, which would result in heavy losses should any of the auctioneers fail in business; for which loss the Court is not responsible. They are, I believe, under the impression at present, that the Court is liable for any loss, because it appoints a seller. It must be clearly pointed out to them, that the Court simply complies with their request by appointing the auctioneer they name, and is therefore not responsible for any loss in case of failure.

7. I also beg to draw the attention of Government to the fact that when the new scale of fees came into force omitting poundage on above sales among other charges, the then Sheriff was not asked his opinion.

8. Subpœnas that are at present served by Attorneys and Vakils, who charge their fees for the work, if served through the Sheriff, which was the case formerly, would also be a very good source of income. To conduct this business I would require the services of a few additional hands whose salaries would not exceed Rs. 50 per mensem.

9. With reference to the Deputy Sheriff's remuneration, I have only followed the practice of my predecessor. I may add, for the information of Government, that he is at present dangerously ill. Should necessity arise to appoint another in his stead, I think the services of a competent man can easily be secured on a salary of about Rs. 250.

10. Should Government be pleased to carry out my suggestions, I need hardly say that there will be a credit, instead of a debit, balance as at present.

11. I also enclose a list showing the strength of my present establishment, &c.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing the actual expenditure on Establishment and Contingencies during each of the last five years.

Time.	Establishment.	Contingencies.	Total.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
From April 1883 to March 1884	5,673 11 0	172 11 9	5,846 6 9
„ 1884 to „ 1885	5,680 10 7	189 9 6	5,870 4 1
„ 1885 to „ 1886	5,684 9 0	185 0 0	5,869 9 0
„ 1886 to „ 1887	5,685 9 0	185 0 0	5,870 9 0
„ 1887 to „ 1888	5,685 6 0	184 7 1	5,869 13 1
Total ..	..	..	29,326 9 11
Average for each year ..	..	..	5,865 5 2
Average for each month ..	..	..	488 12 5

STATEMENT showing the Salary of the Deputy Sheriff for the last five years.

	Rs.
From April 1883 to December 1884, 21 months, at Rs. 370 per month ..	7,770
„ Jan. 1885 „ March 1888, 39 „ at „ 390 „ ..	15,210
60 months	22,980
Average for each year ..	4,596
Average for each month ..	383

PARTICULARS of Work done during each of the following five years.

Different Processes.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	Total.	Remarks.
1. Summonses, copies	681	914	709	551	666	3,720	In addition to the daily work and to the periodical returns, my department is fully engaged in the Sessions work for nearly a month in every quarter, and for more than a month once a year in preparing and compiling Jury Lists for the Clerk of the Crown.
2. Notices ,, ...	109	122	144	107	146	628	
3. Warrants of arrest	50	43	65	31	23	202	
4. Do. of possession	41	22	44	17	19	143	
5. Do. for sale	18	20	25	7	22	92	
6. Do. of attachment	67	64	60	57	42	290	
7. Insolvent attachments	33	26	35	33	6	133	
8. Do. subpœnas	42	32	20	34	57	185	
9. Crown side subpœnas (copies)	65	50	59	130	87	391	
10. Original side subpœnas	16	16	7	8	6	53	
11. Insolvent warrants	2	6	6	2	7	23	

STATEMENT showing the Strength of my present Establishment.

One Manager, cashkeeper, and custodian of all valuable movable property attached.
One Deputy Manager.
One Accountant.
One Assistant clerk.
Three European bailiffs.
Three Native do.
Seven peons.
One sweeper.

Order—dated 17th November 1888, Mis. No. 2397, Judicial.

Ordered that the following telegram be despatched to Government of India:—

"Home Department letter, No. 1465, dated 12th September. Examination of Sheriff's fees, &c., shows Government of India's suggestion to be impracticable. Appointment of Sheriff coming year must be made immediately and for full year: see Letters Patent, 26th December 1800. Solicit sanction to appoint as usual for another year."

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

READ—also the following paper:—

Telegram from the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Calcutta, 28th November 1888.

Number 1760. Your message 17th. No objection to appointment of Sheriff for another year on existing terms. Please report without delay why Government of India's proposal is considered impracticable.

ORDER—dated 20th December 1888, No. 2596, Judicial.

Ordered that the following letter be addressed to the Government of India:—

(Here enter No. 2597, dated 20th December 1888.)

2. The Honorable the Judges of the High Court will be requested to favor the Government with their remarks on the suggestions in paragraphs 4 to 8 of the Sheriff's letter, No. 163, dated 29th October 1888, recorded in G.O., 17th November 1888, No. 2397.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Honorable the Chief Justice, with C.L.
Copy to the Sheriff of Madras.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 20th Dec. 1888, No. 2596.

DECEMBER.

Sheriff of Madras.

Ordering that the Government of India be addressed on the subject of proposals for the future maintenance of the office of —, and requesting the Honorable the Judges of the High Court to favor Government with their remarks on the suggestions referred to.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—from

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, HOME DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Judicial Department telegram to the Government of India, dated 17th November.
Home Department telegram from the Government of India, dated 28th November, No. 1760.

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I am directed to address the Government of India on the subject of the proposals for the future maintenance of the office of Sheriff of Madras.

2. In Home Department letter, No. 1465, dated 12th September 1888, the Government of India, after stating that it understood the intention of the Government of Madras was to make the office of Sheriff honorary, to appoint a permanent Government officer to conduct the duties now performed by the Deputy Sheriff, and to legislate with these objects, intimated that this proposal was in its opinion opposed both to the spirit and letter of the existing law, as both the charters of the High Court and section 15 of Statute 24 and 25 Vict., C. 104, and Act VIII of 1852, assumed that the Sheriff would be a paid officer personally liable for the performance of his duties. It was not, therefore, prepared to make any change in the existing law relating to the office of Sheriff, and, as regards the Deputy, it considered it undesirable that the Deputy should be an officer of Government and was averse to any change in the present system of appointing Deputy Sheriffs. The Government of India, then, drew attention to recent modifications in the law tending to reduce the work falling on Sheriffs' establishments, and proposed, as the most suitable arrangement for the future, to discontinue the payment of salary to the Sheriff and of the payment of the cost of his esta lishment out of Government revenues, allowing him to retain the fees realized, and making up to him any difference between the amount of fees and the cost of establishment, in order to prevent the holder of the office from being exposed to loss. In my telegram of the 17th instant, it was stated that an examination of the Sheriff's fees showed this suggestion of the Government of India to be impracticable, and the Government of India, in reply, has asked to be informed of the reasons for this opinion.

3. Before proceeding to answer this inquiry, I am to invite attention to Mr. Stokes' letter to the Finance Commission, dated 7th August 1886, No. 776, Financial, in which three alternative courses were suggested, viz.—

(1) to abolish by legislation the office of Sheriff and to provide for the work being done by a Government officer; or
(2) to make the office of Sheriff honorary, and to provide for the work being done by a Deputy appointed and paid by Government; or
(3) to appoint a paid officer of Government to be Sheriff without extra remuneration.

The first of these alternatives was recommended for adoption by this Government, and I am to submit that the description contained in your letter under reply is founded on a misapprehension of the proposal really made, viz., that the office should be abolished by legislation. That proposed in Mr. Stokes' letter of the 7th August 1886, No. 776, would have included the repeal of those parts of Act VIII of 1852 which related to Madras, and though it would not be within the competence of the Council of the Governor-General to amend 24 and 25 Vict., C. 104, it does not appear certain that the occurrence in that enactment of an incidental reference to the post of Sheriff should prevent the abolition of the appointment.

4. The Government of India, however, has now decided that there shall be no legislation, that the Sheriff must be a paid officer, and that the Deputy Sheriff must continue to be appointed by him; thus negativing all three of the arrangements suggested as possible by this Government. As regards the proposals made by the Government of India, His Excellency the Governor in Council is not clear that he has rightly apprehended them, for, while it is stated in paragraph 2 of the Home Department letter, that the Sheriff must be a paid officer, it is proposed in paragraph 1 to withdraw his salary and to allow him only his fees and any difference which may exist between his fees and the cost of his establishment. So that his remuneration will really be *nil* unless the fees exceed the charges. It will be observed from the enclosed copy of a letter* from the Sheriff that the average cost of his establishment during the last five years has been Rs. 5,865 per annum. The average payment to the Deputy Sheriff has been Rs. 4,596, and even assuming that a Deputy can, in future, be obtained for Rs. 250 per mensem, the total outlay would still be Rs. 8,865 per annum. The fees to be set against this appear, from a return furnished by the Accountant-General, to have averaged only Rs. 3,431 during the preceding five years, and it will thus be seen that, if the Government of India's suggestions were carried out, there would be an annual deficiency of fees below receipts amounting to Rs. 5,500, which would have to be made good to the Sheriff, while his liability would be in no way diminished. He would, in fact, receive no remuneration, and would cease to be a paid officer. To find any person willing to accept this liability without salary or any prospect of pecuniary advantage would, it is believed, be out of the question, and it was for this reason that His Excellency in Council came to the conclusion that the Government of India's scheme was impracticable.

*No. 133, dated 29th Oct. 1888 (and enclosures).

5. The present Sheriff, Sir Ramaswami Mudelliar, has shown that the reductions in the work of his office, to which the Government of India makes reference, are either inappreciable or do not exist in this Presidency. But he has offered certain suggestions by which he believes the fee income of the office may be increased; these have been referred for the remarks of the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and the result will be communicated in due course. Meantime, I am to state that, under the sanction conveyed in Home Department telegram of the 28th ultimo, His Excellency the Governor has appointed another gentleman to be Sheriff for the next 12 months commencing from the 20th December, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Letters Patent of the 26th December 1800, and His Excellency in Council trusts that the advisability of legislating for the abolition of the office may be again taken into consideration by the Government of India.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Chief Secretary.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th December 1888.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Regr. No.

HOME 1888 DEPT.

[ ]

From the Government of Fort St. George.

Issued

Encl.

Read.

Letter, 20th Dec. 1888, No. 2597.

DECEMBER.

Sheriff of Madras.

Addressing the Government of India on the proposals for the future maintenance of the office of —.

13

NOTE FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY.

15

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

As directed by C.S. : a draft G.O. and Letter to India - on C No 5094. regarding the office of Sheriff are put up.
The question of appt.ᵗ will no doubt, be separately dealt with.

Asp.
29 Nov.

Memorandum on Bills is available.

No. 1665

FROM

A. P. MACDONNELL, ESQ., C.S.I.,
Secretary to the Government of India,

20 SEP 88
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Home Department.
Judicial.

Simla, the 12th September 1888.

SIR,

WITH reference to paragraph 7 of your letter No. 1027, dated the 14th May 1887, I am directed to address the Government of Madras on the subject of the office of Sheriff in Madras.

2. Paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee's Note on the expenditure of the Madras High Court shows that the Sheriff is in receipt of a salary of Rs. 10,776 per annum, out of which he pays the Deputy Sheriff; that his office establishment and contingencies involve an annual expenditure of Rs. 5,870; and that the fees realized by him are credited to Government. It is understood that the intention of the Goverrment of Madras is to make the office of Sheriff honorary, and to appoint a permanent Government officer for the conduct of the duties now performed by the Deputy Sheriff; and that with this object legislation was recommended in a letter from that Government to the Finance Committee, dated the 7th August 1886. The Government of India, after a careful consideration of this proposal, is of opinion that it is opposed both to the spirit and the letter of the existing law, inasmuch as the provisions of the charters of the various Supreme Courts, taken with those contained in section 15 of Statute 24 and 25 Vict, Chapter 104, and also those of Act VIII of 1852, appear to be framed on the assumption that the Sheriff will be a paid officer, who will accordingly be held personally liable for the due performance of the duties imposed on him by the law.

3. With reference to the proposal of the Madras Government to entrust the work of the Deputy Sheriff to an officer of Government, I am to say that the Government of India considers it desirable that the Deputy Sheriff, who is the officer of the Sheriff, not of Government, should continue to be appointed by him. The arrangement by which the Deputy Sheriff indemnifies the Sheriff,

and is generally indemnified by the suitor who puts him in motion, has obvious advantages. If the Deputy Sheriff were an officer of Government, the Government would be considered responsible for his acts, and indemnity might not be so readily given. This would probably cause inconvenience and be productive of litigation. For the foregoing reasons, the Government of India is not prepared to take steps to make any change in the existing law relating to the office of Sheriff or in the present system of appointing Deputy Sheriffs.

4. As regards the financial aspect of the case I am to intimate that it seems to the Government of India that in the determination of the existing strength of Sheriffs' establishments in the Presidency towns, insufficient account has been taken of the modifications which the law has undergone during the last twelve years. Since the passing of section 86 Act X of 1877, processes from the Mofussil, which used to be served by Sheriffs, are served by Presidency Courts of Small Causes. The work of the Sheriffs' establishments will be still further reduced to some extent by the operation of sections 22 and 61 (2) of Act VII of 1888. In these circumstances, the Governor General in Council is of opinion that the most suitable arrangement for the future will be to give the Sheriff of Madras his fees, and to discontinue the practice of paying him a salary and the cost of his establishment from Government revenues. His Excellency in Council at the same time desires that the acceptance of the office should not expose the holder of it to pecuniary loss; and I am therefore to add that should the fees in any year be insufficien. to pay for the necessary establishment, the difference between the fees and the cost of establishment should, in the opinion of the Government of India, be recouped to the Sheriff by Government. I am therefore to request that this arrangement may be brought into force on the occasion of the next vacancy in the office of Sheriff, and that, with the permission of the Governor in Council, a statement may be submitted to show the fees realized by the Sheriff in each of the past five years. The Government of India would also be glad to learn at an early date what expenditure on establishment (including the Deputy Sheriff) should, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, be sanctioned for the Sheriff of Madras on the adoption of this change.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

A. P. MacDonnell

Secretary to the Government of India.

Judicial Dept
CURRENT NO.

From.

The Govt. of India

No 1465

dt 12th September 1888

Regarding the office of Sheriff, Madras.

Referred to the Acct Genl who will furnish the necessary statement of the fees realized by the Sheriff in each of the past 5 years, and to the Sheriffs who will state what establishment will in his opinion be necessary should the changes proposed by the Govt of India of [illegible] be adopted. The Sheriff will also furnish at an early date a statement showing the actual expenditure on establishment during each of the last 5 years, the actual remuneration given to the Dy Sheriff, and the particulars of work done during each of the last 5 years.

dy Secy

dy Secy
22 Sept.
Acct Genl
Sheriff of Madras } dcs 20 9/8

Note.
The establishment, without including the Dy Sheriff, has hitherto cost Rs. 5870, & the fees are said to be as below: Rs 4000 + 5000 (Letter of 7 aug. 86). Even if the difference is made up to the Sheriff, he himself will get nothing, & it will be erroneous if anyone is found to do the work & take the responsibility (sometimes enormous) for nothing. The serving of mofussil processes is a small matter compared with the executing &c.

Statement showing the Fees realized by the Sheriff of Madras for the past 5 years from 1883-84 to 1887-88.

Year	Amount		
1883-84	3798	"	"
1884-85	3502	2	"
1885-86	2971	4	"
1886-87	2651	10	"
1887-88	2732	4	"
Total Rupees	15655	4	"

Average 3131 -- 0 -- 9 p.a.
÷ by 12 = 260 - 14 - 8 p.m.

Fort St George
Accountant General's Office
12th October 1888.

Offg: Accountant General

Book DEPARTMENT.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
S.B.G. 12 October 1888.
No. 195

From E. W. Keller Esqr.
Offg. ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL.

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To THE Chief Secretary
to Government
Judicial Department.

SIR,

With reference to Proceedings of Government No. C/4082 dated the 27th September 1888, I have the honor to forward herewith, a Statement of the fees, paid by the Sheriff of Madras into the Bank of Madras, during the past five years, from 1883/84 to 1887-88.—

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most Obedient Servt
E. W. Keller
Offg Accountant General.

MCL

1438

Judicial (1888) Department.

From

The Accountant-General,

Madras,

To

The Chief Secy to Govt
Judicial Deptt

No.

Dated

Received 31/10/ October 1888.

No. 1126 / 195 Encl. 1

Subject.

Forwarding a statement of the fees paid by the Sheriff of Madras during the years 1883-84 to 1887-88.

To await reply of the Sheriff
S.P.C.
17/11

No. 133 of 1888.

Madras 29th October, 1888

From

Sir Savalay Ramasamy Mood. Kt CIE
Sheriff of Madras

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Madras

Sir,

With reference to the Under Secretary's letter No. C 4082 of 1888 Judicial Deptt. handing me Copy of a letter No. 1465 dated Simla, 12th September, 1888, Home Deptt. Judicial, from the Chief Secretary to the Government of India, to the Government of Madras, I have the honor to state in reply to the Enquiry made in the former letter, as to what, the Establishment will be necessary should the change proposed by the Government of India be adopted, that I cannot see my way to suggest any change in the present Establishment which is just sufficient to manage the business

quire the services
salaries would

Dy. Sheriff's
ved - the practice
for the
he is at present
arise to
& think the
an easily be
Rs 250/-
shown in
ned hardly say
instead of
nt:-
List showing
Establishment,

98/39

Statement showing the strengths
of my present establishment.

One Manager, Cash Keeper & Custodian of
all valuable moveable
property attached.
One Dy Manager.
One Accountant.
One Assistant Clerk
Three European Bailiffs
Three Native —do—
Seven Peons, &
One Sweeper.

Sheriff's Office
Madras
October 1888

A Ramasamy
Sheriff of Madras

Jud. 468/88
3

business of the Office.

2. With reference to para 4 of the letter from the Chief Secretary to the Government of India regarding the operation of Section 61 of Act X of 1877, I have the honor to point out to Government that when the Mofussil Process serving business was transferred to the Small Cause Court, the Clerk & the Bailiff who were on the Establishment at the time were also transferred to the Small Cause Court, thus reducing my Establishment. As regards the operation of Section 22 of Act VII of 1888, I beg to state that although the number of Suits on the Original side has been much reduced, yet attachments & Sales of immovable property under decrees of the Court of Small Causes are executed thro' the Sheriff only. As to Section 61 (2) of the said Act, I do not see that it has in any way materially diminished the Office work.

3. I beg to submit herewith the following Statements asked for in the Under Secretary's letter referred to above.

(1) Statement showing the Actual Expenditure on the Establishment for the past 5 Years

(2) Statement showing the actual remuneration paid to the Dy. Sheriff.

(3) Particulars of work done during the above period.

4. I may add for the information of Government that the Average monthly Income of my Office including fees on Pauper Suits, amounts to Rs 300 only, which however can be increased by adopting the following measures.

5. All Decrees & Orders of the Court directing the Sale of the property not previously attached, (which were formerly sold by the Sheriff) are now Entrusted to Receivers who are allowed to charge Commission on the Sale Proceeds. If such Sales are Entrusted to the Sheriff as is done in the District Court to Nazir, as the proper Officer of the Court, to Conduct such Sales, and Commission allowed to be charged, as was done prior to the introduction of the new Scale of fees, it would be the means of Enhancing the present Small monthly Income to a great Extent, so much so, that it would result in a Surplus being left after paying the Establishment.

6. As a motive to induce parties Concerned in Sales to push the business into

the

the hands of the Sheriff, Government would do well to draw their attention to the fact that by Entrusting the Sales to Shop Keepers they incur a great risk, which would result in heavy losses should any of the Auctioneers fail in business; for which loss the Court is not responsible.- They are I believe, under the impression at present, that the Court is liable for any loss, because it appoints a Seller. It must be clearly pointed out to them, that the Court simply complies with their request by appointing the Auctioneer they name, and is therefore not responsible for any loss in case of failure.

7.- I also beg to draw the attention of Government to the fact that when the new Scale of fees came into force omitting poundage on above Sales among other charges, the then Sheriff was not asked his opinion.

8.- Subpoenas that are at present served by Attorneys & Vakils, who charge their fees for the work, if served thro' the Sheriff which was the case formerly, would also be a very good source of Income. To

Conduct

31

5P

Conduct this business I would require the services of a few additional hands whose salaries would not Exceed Rs 50 per mensem.

9.- With reference to the Dy. Sheriffs remuneration, I have only followed the practice of my predecessor.- I may add for the information of Government, that he is at present dangerously ill.- Should necessity arise to appoint another in his stead, I think the services of a Competent man can easily be secured on a salary of about Rs 250/.

10.- Should Government be pleased to carry out my suggestions, I need hardly say that there will be a credit, instead of a debit balance as at present.

11.- I also Enclose a List showing the strength of my present Establishment,

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt
A Ramaswamy Pillai
Sheriff of Madras

Enclosure

Statement showing the actual expenditure on Establishment & Contingencies during each of the last 5 years.

Time.	Establishment			Contingencies			Total		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
From April 1883 to March 1884.	5673	11	"	172	11	9	5846	6	9
—— Do —— 1884 to —— do —— 1885	5680	10	7	189	9	6	5870	4	1
—— Do —— 1885 to —— do —— 1886	5684	9	"	185	"	"	5869	9	"
—— Do —— 1886 to —— do —— 1887	5685	9	"	185	"	"	5870	9	"
—— Do —— 1887 to —— do —— 1888.	5685	6	"	184	7	1	5869	13	1
						Rs	29326	9	11
				Average for each year.			5865	5	2
				—— Do —— for each month.			488	12	5

Sheriff's Office
Madras
October 1888

A Ramasamy Mudaliar
Sheriff of Madras

1888 April 24 Encl.

Statement showing the salary of the Deputy Sheriff for the last 5 years.

From April 1883 to December 1884 = 21 Months at Rs 370 per Month = Rupees 7770—
—4—January 1885 to March 1888 = 39—" ——" " 390 ——" ——" 15210—

60 Months Rupees 22.980—

Average for each year Rs 4,596—
—Do— for each month —" 383—

Sheriff's Office
Madras
October 1888

A Ramaraoyudu
Sheriff of Madras

Pub. 4682/88
2

Particulars of work done during each of the following five years.

No.	Different Processes	1883	1884	1885	1886	1887	Total	Remarks.
1	Summonses Copies	881	914	708	551	666	3720	In addition to the daily work & to the periodical returns, my department is fully engaged in the Sessions work for nearly a months in every quarter, & for more than a month once a year in ~~the~~ preparing & compiling Jury Lists for the Clerk of the Crown.
2	Notices ——— " ———	109	129	144	107	146	635	
3	Warrants of arrest —	50	43	55	31	23	202	
4	Warrants of possession	41	22	44	17	19	143	
5	—— Do —— for sale ——	18	20	25	7	22	92	
6	—— Do —— of attachment	67	64	50	57	42	280	
7	Insolvent attachments	33	26	35	33	6	133	
8	— Do — subpœnas —	42	32	20	34	57	185	
9	Crown side — do — (copies)	65	50	59	130	87	391	
10	Original side — do —	16	16	7	8	6	53	
11	Insolvent Warrants.	2	6	6	2	7	23.	

Sheriff's Office
Madras
October 1888

A Raveendranath
Sheriff of Madras

378

9?-3?

Statement showing the strength of my present establishment.

One Manager, Cash Keeper & Custodian of all valuable moveable property attached.
One Dy-Manager.
One Accountant.
One Assistant Clerk
Three European Bailiffs
Three Natives —do—
Seven Peons, &
One Durwan.

Sheriff's Office
Madras
October 1888

A Ramasamy Mudaliar
Sheriff of Madras

Jud. 4682/88
3

1888

From

4682

Sir Sankay Ramasamy Mood. B.A. B.L.
Sheriff of Madras

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Madras

Despatched 29th October 1888.
Received 29th do

Enclosures - 4 -
No. 133.-

C.P.S. 4682/88

CHIEF SECRETARY
29 OCT 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Subject

Stating that he cannot suggest any changes in the present Establishment - Giving his opinion with regard to the operation of Section 86 of Act X of 1877. & of Sect. 22 & 62(2) of Act VII of 1888.- Submitting Statement showing the actual Expenditure of the Establishment. remuneration paid to the Dy Sheriff & the particulars of work done for the last 5 years. - Suggesting some measures which if adopted will be good sources of Income to Government.- Enclosing List of present Establishment.-

Pwd. 4682/88
4

Madras 10th Novr 88.

CHIEF SECRETARY
12 NOV 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

My dear Sir, 41

With reference to my letter to Government of 29th ult. in reply - & the Under Secretary's letter re- my Office, & containing some suggestions, I beg to inform you, that should Government be pleased to reappoint me as the Sheriff of Madras for the ensuing year, I shall lodge a Security of One Lakh of Rupees × if required, to indemnify parties

× in 4% Govt. Securities

parties Concerned in Sales of movable
& immovable Property against loss;
so as to induce them to put
the business into my hands instead
of Entrusting same to private
individuals. I also think I shall
be able to work the suggestions
offered by me, should Government
be pleased to Carry such same,
satisfactorily, & to the benefit of
Government.

I may add for your
information that there are

of Sheriff having held Office for
4 or 5 Years successively, and
such you will be in a
position to put the above before.
Government

Col. Inspect held Office from 1862/66
W.D.E. Dalrymple Esqre —"— 1867/70
—"— Again —"— 1871/74
Between the period of 70/71.
another Sheriff acted for a few
months only.

With my best respects

Yours very Sincerely,
Remain
A Macdonald

CURRENT No.

[9]

DEPARTMENT.

D/c 448.

From

Sir Savalai Ramasawmy Mudaliar

No.

Dated 10 - 11 - 88

Received 12 - 11 - 88

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Stating that should he be reappointed sheriff for the ensuing year, he will lodge a security of one lakh of Rupees.

G.O. No: 2595/7, 7, 20/12. 88

C.15/11

E.

Circ.d to H.E. the Govr - in continuation of file already sent.

MGP 15 Nov.

15 NOV.

W1

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

I think this had better be sent to H.E. on his return, & then considered in Council, nothing being done further in the meantime.

MGP 16 Nov

16 NOV

Jud. Department.

C. Nos 4082. 4438 & 4682.

49

From

The Govt of India has hardly taken the trouble to understand, or to allege events & state correctly, the proposals of this Govt. They say our intention was

(1) to make the Sheriff honorary;

(2) to appt a permanent Govt Officer to do it;

(3) to legislate with this object =

which are really same 3 alternatives, viz.

either (a) legislation to abolish the Sheriff & provide for the work being done by a Govt Officer;

or (b) that the Sheriff be honorary & his Dept paid by Govt

or (c) that a paid Officer of Govt be appd Sheriff without extra remuneration.

The final proposal made was (c) viz. that the Sheriff should be paid & continue personally liable & that the D.y Sheriff should continue his Officers: that there should therefore be no legislation.

The Sheriff has shown that the reduction in his work anticipated by India either does not exist or is inappreciable; also that the fees fall short of the charges by no less than Rs 7330 or, if the pay of the Deputy & Establishment be reduced, by about 5000. The proposal suggested as "the most suitable under the circs" is substantially that this deficiency shall be made good by Govt i.e. that the Sheriff's liability shall continue to its full extent but his salary be taken away. The base of the suggestion in this light

188

FOR ORDERS.

These papers, relating to the office of Sheriff, are submitted for orders.

The Sheriff's pay is Rs.898 p.m. or Rs. 10776 p.a. out of this, he has been paying on an average Rs.383 p.m. or Rs 4596 p.a. to his Deputy, leaving the net value of the office at Rs.6180 p.a. or Rs. 515 p.m., not Rs. 300 as Sir Ramaswami Sarj.

The present cost of the Sheriff & his establishment to Govt averages

Rs 10776 + 5865-5-2 = Rs. 16641 per annum. (See also Budgets in the File just put up) From this has to be deducted an average of Rs. 3131 credited to Govt in fees, leaving the present net cost at Rs.13510.

If the Govt of India's plan were adopted, the cost would be -

Dy Sheriff - Rs. 4596	
Establishment Rs. 5865	
	Rs. 10461
deduct fees.	Rs. 3131
	Rs. 7330.

or a saving of Rs. 6180 - on present expenditure.

The Govt of India Letter is peremptory

+its instructions are to be brt into force "on the occasion of the next vacancy" - ie. now. The Accts Genl has evidently recd similar orders, for he has appended a note on p. 136 of the last Quarterly Civil List saying that "on the occurrence of the next vacancy the Sheriff is to draw no salary". For orders - as to what form of answer is to go to India. If any one can be found annually willing to do the work for nothing, India's proposal will effect a large saving without trouble, + now seems a good time to try. Might they not be told, in forwarding the Statements called for, that this Govt is trying to find a candidate for the post! Should these efforts not succeed, India can be told that its plan won't do.

ALP
5 Nov.

E
6 Nov.

* This is impossible under sec. 15 of the Letters Patent of 26 Dec. 1800. Vol: infra. ALP 8 Nov.

E

I think it would be well to try and get something to go upon from the Govt of India before Council - could be sent in a telegram point out the impossibility of complying with the request, and say that I wish to make the appointment immediately and cannot do so if the condition is to be adhered to [illegible]

E.

FOR ORDERS.

Office of Sheriff

shows it to be impracticable because no time to nominate. Govt appoint a Sheriff as usual but on the condn

* [that the appt is to terminate on the receipt of a telegram from India. and Govt report to India what we have done & why & ask the High Court to favour us with their remarks on the Sheriff's suggestion. India says the Statute requires the Sheriff to be a paid officer & then proposes that his pay shall consist of fees + what is necessary to make good the excess of his outgoings over his receipts, i.e. nil.

PPH
7 Nov.

1
2

I accept the view the Hon'ble Chief Justice & Mr Justice Collett take of the Under Secretary's note of 8 Nov.

C 8 Nov.

C. 7/11 R. 8/11 N. 8/11 R. 10/11 C. 12/11 C. 16/11

* This is impossible under sec. 15 of the Letters Patent of 26 Dec. 1800. Vol: infra. ALP 8 Nov.

[25]

Jud Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper
C.Nos 4082, 4438 & 4682.

Order. 17 November 1888 No 2397

Ordered that the following telegram be desp to Govt of India:-

"Home Department Letter no. 1465 dated 12 September - Examination of Sheriff's fees etc shows Govt of India's suggestion to be impracticable. Appointment of Sheriff coming year must be made immediately and for full year, see Letters Patent 26 December 1800 x Solicit sanction to appoint as usual for another year."

ALP 16 Nov. 16 Nov

(3)

55

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

Madras, 14. XI. 88

CHIEF SECRETARY 17 NOV 88 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

My dear Mr. Price,

I am desired to re-turn this bundle with an intimation that His Excellency thinks that it might be considered with the other papers concerning the Shrotriemalty at the next Council.

Yours sincerely,

J. O. Rees

Hon'ble J. F. Price
&c &c &c

116

I C

Class C | INDIAN TELEGRAPH. | Local No. 2336

To (Station) Fort St George | From (Station) Calcutta 59

Words.	Days.	Hour.	Minutes.	Official Instructions.
36/8	28	13	10	C.No. 5094

To (Person) Madras | From (Person) Secretary

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS CHIEF SECRETARY

1 Number 460 your message
2 I have no objection to appoint-
3 -ment of Sheriff for another
4 year on existing terms please
5 Report without delay why govern-
6 -ment of indias proposal is
7 Considered impracticable
8
9
10
11
12
13

RECD. FROM	L. N.	SENT TO	L. N.
At Hrs.	Mts., By	At Hrs.	Mts., By

Date VIADRAS FORT 28-11-68 Telegraph Master.

Read also the following pages:-
Telegram form - ——

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures, is reckoned as one word
Ordinary "	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

CURRENT No. 5094

[9]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

Telegram

From

The Govt of India

Home

No.

Dated

Received 28. 11. 88.

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Re appointment of Sheriff for another year.

From

Chief Secretary

To

Private Secretary

India wires "No objection to appointment of Sheriff for another year on existing terms. Please report without delay why Government of Madras proposal is considered impracticable"

28-11-88 bbr

Contents

CHIEF SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
29 NOV 30

29/11/30

Dear Mr. Price,

His Excellency would be much obliged if you would circulate this to Hon'ble members.

His Excellency would now propose to write to Mr. Aggiebotham, but would be glad to have his Hon'ble colleagues views before doing so. If possible will you kindly arrange to place the Secretary in possession of them

views before he leaves at

5 o'clock for the 7 Paper

Jud.
Office of Sheriff

Addressed

I believe Mr Simon that Mr Higginbotham is the best choice.

I do not understand what the last part of the telegram from Indra refers to.

Jaspen. Cecil 29 Nov.

Indra has written to Mendon a proposal from honorary sheriff which was upon inside. HCS 29 Nov.

Writ list of Jud. for Jan 1874 containing "The Sheriff's Bill"

12 C

Jud. Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read again G.O. 17 Nov: 88 No. 2397

also

READ the following paper

Telegram fr. Govt. of India - Home Dept. no. 1760 dated 28 ult.

Order. 20·12·88 No: 2596

Ordered that the following Letter be addressed to the Govt. of India — (H.S. no. 2597).

2. The Honble the Judges of the High Court will be requested to favour the Govt. with their remarks on the suggestions in paras. 4 to 8 of the Sheriff's Letter no. 133, dated 29th Oct. 88, recorded in G.O. 17 Nov. 88. No 2397.

Jud 17 Dec

Ucc 18 Dec

Rgl. 29 Nov. 29 Nov.

The Hon. the Chief Justice with the L. of Dep. to the Sheriff of Madras. 3 Dec. 8/1/89.

71

It is requested that the following department and number may be quoted in the reply to this letter:—

5 Boxes Cabin Dep. with Ltr. 8/1/89

No. 2597

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Chief Secretary's Office,

FORT ST. GEORGE, 29th Dec 1888

Letter — To the Secy. to the Govt. of India, Home Dept.

SIR,

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I am directed to address the Government of India on the subject of the proposals for the future maintenance of the office of Sheriff of Madras.

Jud. Dept. telegram to the Govt. of India, dated 17 Nov.
Home Dept. telegram fr. the Govt. of India dated 28 Nov. no. 1760.

2. In Home Dept. Letter, no. 1465, dated 12th September 1888, the Govt. of India, after stating that it understood the intention of the Govt. of Madras was to make the office of Sheriff honorary, to appoint a permanent Govt. officer to conduct the duties now performed by the Dy. Sheriff and to legislate with these objects, intimated that both the charters of the High Court + sec. 15 of Statute 24 + 25 Vict. c. 104 + Act VIII of 1852 assumed that the Sheriff would be a paid officer personally liable for the performance of his duties. It was not, therefore, prepared to make any change in the existing law relating to the office of Sheriff; and as regards the deputy, it considered it undesirable that the deputy should be an officer of Govt. + was averse to any change in the present system of appointing Dy. Sheriffs. The Govt. of India then drew attention to recent modifications in the law tending to reduce the work falling on Sheriffs' establishments, and proposed, as the most suitable arrangement for the future, to discontinue the payment of salary to the sheriff + of the payment of fees

Jud 17 Dec

Ucc 18 Dec

this proposal was in its opinion opposed both to the spirit + letter of the existing law, as

To be in no way diminished. To fixed

cost of his establishmt. out of Govt revenues, allowing him to retain the fees realized, & making up to him any difference betw: the amount of fees & the cost of establishment;

in order to prevent the holder of the office from being exposed to loss, In my telegram of the 17th inst. it was stated that an examn: of the Sheriff's fees showed this suggestion of the Govt of India to be impracticable, & the Govt of India if in reply has asked to be informed of the reasons for this ~~decision~~. Please

3. Before ~~proceeding~~ proceeding to ~~reply to~~ Amend this enquiry, I am to invite attention to Mr Stokes' Letter to the Finance Commission, dated 7 Aug 86, no. 776 Fin: in which three alternative courses were suggested, viz -

(1) to abolish by legislation the office of sheriff and to provide for the work being done by a Government officer, or
(2) to make the office of Sheriff honorary, & to provide for the work being done by a Deputy appointed & paid by Govt: or
(3) to appoint a paid officer of Govt: to be Sheriff without extra remuneration.

The first of these alternatives was recommended for adoption by this Govt: and it will, therefore, be observed that the statement as to this Govt's proposals made in Home Dept: Letter no. 1460 of the 12th Sept: 1888, is hardly in accordance with the facts of the case.

4. The Govt: of India has now decided that legislation shall not be undertaken, that the Sheriff must be a paid officer, and that the Deputy must continue to be appointed by him. His Excellency the Govt: in Council regrets this decision and is uncertain whether it may not have been arrived at in consequence of the misapprehension of

I am to submit that the description contained in your letter under reply is founded on a misapprehension of the proposal really made; viz. that the office should be abolished by legislation. That proposal in Govt: Stokes' Letter of [illegible]

Note

Please see Schedule to the Bill of 1874 - wh: actually proposed to repeal Act VIII of 1852 - & such clauses of the Letters Patent of 1800 as referred to the Sheriff. Mgf.

The Govt of India however has now decided that there shall be no legislation, that the Sheriff must be a paid officer, and that the Deputy appointment continues to be appointed by him thus negativing all three of the possible arrangements suggested as possible by this Govt

H. E.'s proposals just noticed. The legislation suggested in Mr Stokes' Letter of the 7 Aug: 1886, no. 776 would have included the repeal of those parts of Act VIII of 1852 wh: related to Madras, & tho' it wld: not be within the competence of the Council of the Govt: Genl to amend 24 & 25 Vict c. 104 ~~as to the Sheriff of the High Court~~, it does not appear certain that the occurrence in that enactment of incidental references to the post of Sheriff should prevent the abolition of the ~~post~~ appointment

5. As regards the proposals made by the Government of India, H.E. the Govt: in Council is not clear that he has rightly apprehended them, for, while it is stated in para. 2 of the Home Dept Letter that the Sheriff must be a paid officer, it is proposed in para. 4 to withdraw his salary and to allow him only his fees and any difference which may exist betw: his fees & the cost of his establishment. It will be observed from the enclosed copy of a letter* from the Sheriff that the average cost of his establishmt during the last 5 years has been Rs. 5865 per annum. The average payment to the Deputy Sheriff has been Rs. 4596, & even assuming that a Deputy can, in future, be obtained for Rs. 250 pm, the total outlay would still be Rs. 8865 pm. The fees to be set against this appear, from a return furnished by the Accountant Genl, to have only averaged Rs. 3131 during the preceding 5 years, and it will thus be seen that

* No. 133, dated 29 Oct 88 (enclosures)

(So that his remuneration will really be the fees deducted by the Govt of India in the manner laid down by the Govt of India is thus infringed. As to the financial aspect, the fees leave a large deficit to Govt, a large deficit.

He would in fact receive no remuneration, & would cease to be a paid officer

If the Govt of India's suggestions were carried out, there wld be an annual deficiency of fees below receipts amounting to Rs. 5500 wh: wld have to be made good to the Sheriff, while his liability would in no way diminished. To find

~~[illegible]~~ any person willing to accept this liability without salary or any prospect of pecuniary advantage would, it is believed, be out of the question, & it was for this reason that H.E. in Council came to the conclusion that the Govt. of India's scheme was impracticable.

5. The present Sheriff, Sir Ramaswami Mudeliar, has shown that the reductions in the work of this office, to wh. the Govt. of India makes reference, are either inappreciable or do not exist in this Presidency. But he has certain suggestions by which he believes the fee income of the office may be increased; and these have been referred for the remarks of the Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court, and the result will be communicated in due course. Meantime I am to state, that under the sanction conveyed in the Home Dept. Telegram of the 28th ult., H.E. the Govt. has appointed another gentleman to be Sheriff for the next 12 months commencing from the 20th Dec. in accordance with the provisions of Sec 15 of the Letters Patent of the 26 Dec. 1800 and H.E. in Council would suggest to the Government of India whether the proposal for the abolition of the office of Sheriff and the apportionment of its duties among paid servants of Govt. might not still be the best solution for future years.

trust that the advisability of finally for the abolition of the office may be again taken into consideration by the Govt of India

2nd No.

Rld. 29th Nov.

Lett. 1. 1. 5 A

c. 29/11

ORDINARY, MS.

Judicial Department.
G.O., dated 17 November 1858
No. 2397.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Appointment of Sheriffs of Madras.

77

1292
12-2-1859

11

2596:16
2597:29

21/11/14 22-1-21

22.1.300

ORDINARY, PRINTED

Judicial Depart.

G.O., dated 20.12.8

No. 2596. 17

Last copy sent to Press. 20/12

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

[Despatch Abstract]

Sheriff of Madras.

Informs that the G. has addressed on the subject of proposals for the future maintenance of the Office of —— X regretting that the Judges of the Supreme Court both with the remarks on the subject referred to.

Sheriff of Madras.

Addressing the G. of I. on proposals for

2596 : 10