

(1) Number of pages 18
(2) Date of repair 14-9-46
(3) Initials of the Referencer E

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1443	Press Mis.
Dated	15-7-	1893.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

17TH MAY 1892, No. 929, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From P. G. MELITUS, Esq., Officiating Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Judicial), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, the 4th May 1892, No. 584.

I am directed to forward a draft Bill which has been prepared to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure and certain other Acts, and to extend certain sections of the said code to the Police in the towns of Calcutta and Bombay. As the Bill, if it is passed into law, will also have the effect of extending to the Commissioner of Police in Madras certain powers under the code which he already possesses as a Magistrate under the local law, I am to request that the Governor in Council may be moved to favour the Government of India with an expression of opinion on the provisions of the Bill.

ORDER—dated 17th May 1892, No. 929, Judicial.

Copies of the Bill received with the foregoing letter from the Government of India will be forwarded to the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, the Advocate-General, the Chief Presidency Magistrate, the Inspector-General of Police, and the Commissioner of Police, Madras, with the request that they will favour the Government with their opinions on the provisions of the Bill at the earliest possible date.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Hon'ble the Chief Justice, with C.L.,
" Government Solicitor,
" Chief Presidency Magistrate, Madras,
" Inspector-General of Police,
" Commissioner of Police, Madras, } with copy of Bill.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 17th May 1892, No. 929.

MAY.

Alb. J. S.
Bills—Legislative.

Requesting opinions on the Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1882, and certain other Acts and to extend certain sections of the code to the Police in the towns of Calcutta and Bombay.

6200 *Zakutnet*
28TH JULY 1892, Nos. 1346, 1347, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 17th May 1892, No. 929, Judicial.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Chief Presidency Magistrate, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 30th May 1892, No. 123.

As directed by G.O., No. 929, Judicial, dated 17th May 1892, I have the honour to submit my opinion on the Bill forwarded therewith.

2. With the exception of sections 15, 18 and 19, the Bill, as far as it affects Madras, will merely invest the Commissioner of Police under the code with some of the powers he already possesses under the City Police Act.

3. The amendments of sections 127 and 128 (section 14 of the Bill) and of sections 496 and 497 (sections 20 and 21 of the Bill) appear to be unnecessary, as the Commissioner of Police, being a superior Police officer, has already the powers of an "officer in charge of a police station" (*vide* section 550 of the Criminal Procedure Code). A similar remark applies to the amendment of sections 498 and 499 (section 22 of the Bill). The Commissioner being a Police officer, it is not clear what advantage there will be in inserting the words "or Commissioner of Police" after "Police officer."

4. Section 15 of the Bill extends power to act under section 144 of the code to the Commissioner of Police and Stipendiary Presidency Magistrates. This section is only intended to be acted upon when immediate steps are necessary, and it will, no doubt, be an advantage for these officers to have the power to act under it in emergent cases.

5. Section 18 of the Bill substitutes new sections for 169 and 170 of the code. As to the new section 169, the alterations would be necessary if section 170 were altered as proposed. The new section 170 would, in my opinion, have the astonishing effect of preventing the trial of all prisoners arrested by the police in the Presidency Town. The present section 170 of the code is the one under which the police bring all their prisoners before a Magistrate for trial; under the proposed section, they are, in Presidency towns, to send them to the Commissioner of Police. What is he to do with them? He cannot try them himself and there is no provision for his sending them to Presidency Magistrates for trial. Under section 173 of the code the report or charge sheet is to be sent to the magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the offence; this section is not amended by the Bill, therefore the accused persons will go to the Commissioner of Police and the charge sheet to the magistrate. The result is a dead block.

6. Assuming that it may be intended that the Commissioner of Police should forward accused persons to Presidency Magistrates for trial (although I do not see under what provision of law he could do so), great delay will be caused and there seems no object in accused persons being sent to, or bailed to appear before, the Commissioner of Police when the police investigation is complete and the cases ready for trial. As head of the police the Commissioner has always the opportunity during investigations to direct any measures he thinks necessary or to have a case brought before him for enquiry, and under the proposed addition to section 167 of the code

(section 17 of the Bill) he will have—in Madras he has now—all the powers of a magistrate as to granting remands, and under section 467 of the code (section 21 of the Bill) of releasing on bail.

7. All Police "night cases" as well as Penal Code cases are investigated by the police under Chapter XIV of the Criminal Procedure Code; therefore, there would be a large number of accused persons—possibly hundreds—to be sent to, or bailed to appear before, the Commissioner of Police daily. He could not possibly see them all, read the report in each case and pass an order on it, much less hear the complainants and witnesses, which seems to be contemplated as they are all to be sent to his office.

8. For the reasons given in paragraph 5, I think the proposed new section 170 would result in the deposit daily at the office of the Commissioner of Police of a large number of prisoners with whom he has no legal power to deal further, and, as shown in paragraphs 6 and 7, even if he could send them on to Presidency Magistrates for trial, great delay and inconvenience to all parties would be caused without any apparent object or advantage. I therefore consider the proposed amendment to section 170 to be a mistake and consequently those of sections 169 and 171 of the code to be unnecessary.

9. There are other powers of a magistrate with which it is very desirable that a Commissioner of Police should be invested and which are exercised by the Commissioner of Police in Madras, but as to which the present Bill is silent.

(Signed) O. R. JONES,
Chief Presidency Magistrate.

From the Inspector-General of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 4th June 1892, No. 3344.

I have the honour to state that I have no remarks to make on the copy of the Bill (proposing certain amendments in the Code of Criminal Procedure) forwarded to me with G.O., No. 929 (Judicial), dated 17th May 1892, as such amendments do not, in any way, affect Police procedure in the mofussil, but are entirely confined to the City Police.

(Signed) C. A. PORTEOUS, Colonel,
Inspector-General of Police.

From the Government Solicitor, dated 3rd June 1892, No. 246.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Advocate-General:—

[In the matter of the Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1882, and certain other Acts.]

OPINION.

The proposed amendments seem to me to be advisable.

MADRAS,
2nd June 1892.

(Signed) J. H. SPRING-BRANSON,
Advocate-General.

From the Commissioner of Police, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 9th June 1892, No. 34.

I have the honour to submit the following remarks on the draft Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1882, &c. forwarded to me with G.O., dated 17th May 1892, No. 929, Judicial:—

1. I suggest that the addition to section 4 should run as follows:—

(f) The words "Commissioner of Police" include also a Deputy or Assistant Commissioner of Police.

The appointment of Assistant Commissioner of Police is, I believe, peculiar to Madras, which probably accounts for the omission from the draft Bill. The additions proposed to sections 60, 61 and 167 deprive the Assistant Commissioner of the powers

of remanding prisoners which he now possesses under section 8 of the City Police Act. The necessity for granting such powers to the Assistant Commissioner was recognized by Government in G.O., dated 18th September 1888, No. 1979, Judicial.

2. The proposed modification of section 170, Criminal Procedure Code, would cause considerable inconvenience and waste of time to witnesses and others. The majority of cases to which this section applies are of an exceedingly simple nature involving no difficult questions either of fact or of law and it is on every account desirable that the present practice of forwarding the accused to, and binding over witnesses to appear before, a Presidency Magistrate, should be continued in all cases in which the police investigation can be completed within 24 hours.

I may mention that Madras G.O., dated 28th December 1882, Mis. No. 2251, provides that the report to be sent under section 170 is the received charge sheet, which form is also sent under section 173 when the accused person has been remanded. In Madras practice, section 173 is regarded as the complement to section 167, whereas section 170 applies to cases in which the investigation can be completed within 24 hours.

3. I think that in the second paragraph of section 155, Criminal Procedure Code, the words "a Commissioner of Police or" should be inserted before the words "a Magistrate of the first or second class." The Commissioner of Police, being a Presidency Magistrate, has power to authorise the police to investigate non-cognisable cases, and it is desirable that the Deputy Commissioner should have the same power which he now exercises under the powers given to him under section 8 of the Madras City Police Act.

4. A similar addition should be made to section 191.

(Signed) H. W. H. COX, Colonel,
Commissioner of Police.

From the Deputy Registrar of the High Court of Judicature, Appellate Side, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 18th June 1892, No. 1659.

With reference to G.O., dated the 17th ultimo, No. 929, Judicial, forwarding, for the opinion of the Honorable the Judges, a Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure and certain other Acts, and to extend certain sections of the said code to the police in the towns of Calcutta and Bombay, I am directed to forward herewith a transcript of the minute recorded by the Honorable Mr. Justice Best and to state that the Honorable Justices Parker and Wilkinson have no remarks to make on the Bill.

2. Any minute that may be recorded by the Honorable the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Muthusami Aiyar will be duly submitted.

(Signed) W. MORGAN,
Deputy Registrar.

ENCLOSURE.

Minue.

Mr. Justice Best.—The main object of the Bill appears to be to confer on Commissioners of Police in the Presidency towns certain powers at present conferred by the Code of Criminal Procedure on Magistrates. So far as this object is concerned, I have no addition or amendment to suggest. But it has frequently occurred to me that when the code was amended, the opportunity might be availed of for altering section 232 so as to allow a discretion to the judge as to the trial being proceeded with in the case of a juror dying or his further attendance being found impracticable after the trial has commenced. According to the law as it is at present, in every such case "the trial shall commence anew." If it were the law that the verdict of a jury could only be

accepted in case of the jury being unanimous, section 282 could not be altered in the manner now suggested. But as section 306 allows the judge to accept the verdict of a majority of the jury, it seems to me that a judge might similarly be allowed a discretion as to proceeding with the trial in the absence of one of the jury whose further attendance becomes impossible, the verdict to be accepted in such case being the unanimous finding of all those who remain, or that of a majority calculated on the original number.

It is in cases occupying several days in the trial that the contingency is most likely to occur, and it is a lamentable waste of time to begin *de novo* a trial which is drawing to its close after a duration of a week or more, merely because of the death or inability to attend of one of the jurors whose difference from the verdict of the majority, if he had continued to attend, would not have been a bar to the verdict being accepted.

ORDER—dated 28th July 1892, No. 1346, Judicial.

In his letter read above the Commissioner of Police, Madras, proposes certain amendments in sections 155 and 191 of the Code of Criminal Procedure; his remarks on this and other points require notice.

By virtue of section 7 of the Madras City Police Act, 1888, the Commissioner of Police is a Presidency Magistrate and in section 8 of that Act the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner are declared to be Justices of the Peace subject to the proviso that they shall act as such so far only as may be necessary for the preservation of the peace, for the prevention of offences, for the detection, apprehension and detention of offenders and for the performance of the duties assigned to the Commissioner by the Act. It is plain from Colonel Cox' letter that he understands these provisions to empower the Deputy and Assistant Commissioners to perform all the magisterial functions exercisable by the Commissioner as Presidency Magistrate. This view is entirely incorrect. The Code of Criminal Procedure confers no powers upon Justices of the Peace as such and the Deputy and Assistant Commissioners cannot exercise any of the powers conferred upon Presidency Magistrates by the Code merely on the ground that they are Justices of the Peace. If it has been the custom for these officers to exercise such powers the practice must at once cease. The Commissioner's remarks upon the subject of amending section 191 of the Code are also founded upon a misconception of the law. Colonel Cox assumes that the Commissioner of Police, in his position as Presidency Magistrate, is a Magistrate empowered under section 191 of the Code to take cognizance of offences. The term "to take cognizance" is nowhere defined in the Code but it is throughout assumed that the Magistrate who "takes cognizance of" a case is a Magistrate who has power to try or to commit it for trial. But section 7 of the Madras City Police Act, 1888, prohibits the Commissioner from acting under chapters XVIII, XX and XXI of the Code of Criminal Procedure and, *ipso facto*, he is incompetent to take cognizance of any offence within the meaning of section 191. Colonel Cox' proposal to amend this section falls therefore to the ground.

Colonel Cox is correct in saying that the Commissioner has power under the existing law to direct the investigation of non-cognizable cases by the Police under section 155 of the Code of Criminal Procedure but the Government is doubtful whether the Commissioner, who has no authority to take cognizance of cases, should continue to exercise this power. The further consideration of the subject will however be deferred until the question of amending section 155 has been settled.

2. The Government of India will now be addressed.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Commissioner of Police, Madras.

Copy to the Chief Presidency Magistrate.

LETTER—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated Ootacamund, 28th July 1892, No. 1347, Judicial.

I am directed to place you in possession of the views of this Government upon the draft Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure and certain other Acts which was forwarded with Mr. Melitus' letter, dated the 4th May 1892, No. 584, Judicial.

2. The sections which call for remarks are dealt with in detail below and it will be observed that in the opinion of His Excellency in Council the proposed measure is, with the exception of a few provisions, unobjectionable but unnecessary so far as Madras is concerned:—

(1) Section 4.—This section defines the word "Commissioner" to include a Deputy Commissioner of Police and it has perhaps not been noticed that the effect of this definition will be to invest the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Madras, with powers which he does not at present possess. This officer is not empowered under the existing law to exercise any magisterial functions, and His Excellency in Council does not consider it advisable that he should be so empowered. I am therefore to suggest that the phrase "Commissioner of Police" should be restricted to its natural meaning. Throughout this letter, wherever the remark is made that a specified section of the Bill makes no change in the existing law, the observation is to be understood as subject to the reservation that the term "Commissioner of Police" refers to the Commissioner alone.

(2) Section 7.—Under section 60, Code of Criminal Procedure, a Police officer who arrests a person without warrant must produce him before a Magistrate having jurisdiction or before the officer in charge of a Police station; it is proposed to enact that the person arrested should also be producible before the Commissioner of Police.

The effect of this will be to invest the Commissioner of Police, Madras, with powers which he does not now possess for although a Magistrate he is not a Magistrate "having jurisdiction."

His Excellency in Council has no objection, I am to say, to this proposed extension of powers but regards the change as unnecessary.

(3) Section 8.—The amendment of section 61 of the Code which this section of the Bill contemplates is consequential upon the proposed amendment of section 167 of the Code which is referred to below.

(4) Section 9.—The proposed amendment of section 62 of the Code commends itself to this Government; the present law seems defective in that it contains no distinct provision as to the method of reporting arrests without warrant in the Presidency town.

(5) Sections 10, 12 and 13.—These sections will make no change in the existing law and, though unnecessary so far as concerns Madras, are considered unobjectionable.

(6) Section 14.—This section also will not effect any change in the existing law so far as regards Madras, for the Commissioner being a Magistrate has already the power to act under Chapter IX of the Code. The Chief Presidency Magistrate points out however that the amendment of sections 127 and 128 of the Code is unnecessary in any case inasmuch as the powers conferred thereby on Station-house officers are exercisable by the Commissioner of Police, his Deputy and Assistant, by virtue of section 550 of the Code.

(7) Section 15.—The omission of all reference to Presidency Magistrates in section 144 of the Code is an obvious defect which it appears as well to remedy and His Excellency in Council considers it desirable that power to issue temporary orders in urgent cases of nuisance should be conferred upon the Commissioner of Police also. The Bill however goes further and confers like powers upon the Deputy Commissioner of Police; this change however does not commend itself to His Excellency the Governor in Council and he would consequently omit clause (iv) of section 15.

(8) Section 16.—Section 157 of the Code requires the Station-house officer in every case where he has reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence to report the same to a Magistrate having power to take cognizance of the offence on a

Police report. As the law stands the Commissioner of Police, Madras, is not such a Magistrate and therefore he could not require that a report under this section should be made to him. It is now proposed to place the Commissioner of Police in the same position as the Magistrate having power to take cognizance of the offence upon a Police report for the purposes of section 157 of the Code.

No reason has been shown for the change and it seems to this Government to be open to various objections. For example it is not clear whether it is intended that in the Presidency town the report shall go to the Commissioner of Police alone or that it shall go to him and also to the Magistrate; if the former be the meaning then section 159 of the Code will be deprived of all force so far as concerns the Presidency town; if the latter then the additional labour of a double report is involved. As the amended section stands it leaves it to the discretion of the Station-house officer whether he shall report to the Commissioner or to the Magistrate; this is manifestly objectionable. It has perhaps not been observed that section 158 of the Code gives the Local Government power to direct if it sees fit that all reports under section 157 to the Magistrate shall be submitted through the Commissioner. If the object of the proposed amendment of section 157 is to ensure the Commissioner's knowledge of all cases where the commission of a cognizable offence is suspected it seems to His Excellency in Council that the provisions of section 158 of the Code are ample and that no alteration in section 157 is requisite.

(9) *Section 17.*—There is no objection to this clause of the Bill.

(10) *Section 18.*—The proposed amendment of section 169 of the Code depends upon that of section 170. This latter section requires that the Station-house officer, if upon investigation he finds reasonable grounds for suspecting the accused, shall forward him to the Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the case upon a Police report or shall bail him to appear before such Magistrate. As the law stands this section does not apply to the Commissioner of Police, Madras, who is not a Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of a case upon a Police report and the object of the amendment proposed in section 18 of the Bill is to require the production of the accused before the Commissioner of Police in all cases that arise in the Presidency town.

In this connection I am directed to invite particular attention to the remarks of the Chief Presidency Magistrate and the Commissioner of Police with which His Excellency in Council is in complete accord. Mr. Jones shows clearly that the result of the proposed alteration in the law will be a dead-lock, and so far as this Government can see there is no object to be gained by the change.

A minor objection to the second clause of amended section 170 is that the Station-house officer is given absolute discretion in the Presidency town as to whether the complainant and witnesses shall or shall not be bound over to appear to prosecute or give evidence; it can hardly be supposed that this result was contemplated; if not the wording of the clause requires revision. This Government would recommend the omission of section 18 and, consequently, of section 19 also from the Bill.

(11) *Sections 20, 21 and 22.*—As pointed out by the Chief Presidency Magistrate in paragraph 3 of his letter these sections are quite unnecessary. The Commissioner already possesses under the Code the powers which it is now proposed to confer upon him; in the case of sections 20 and 21 by virtue of section 550 of the Code and in the case of section 22 by virtue of the fact that he is a "Police officer" within the meaning of sections 498 and 499 of the Code.

(12) *Section 23.*—This seems unobjectionable.

(13) *Section 24.*—The Commissioner of Police, Madras, is already a Magistrate for the purposes of sections 523 and 525 of the Code so the amendments proposed, though unobjectionable, are not necessary so far as Madras is concerned.

3. The Commissioner of Police, Madras, suggests that the words "a Commissioner of Police or" should be inserted before the words "a Magistrate of the first or second class" in section 155 of the Code. In connection with this point I am to invite attention to the Proceedings of Government accompanying this letter. The Commissioner of Police, Madras, is already a Magistrate for the purposes of section 155 and the amendment of this section proposed by the Commissioner would give no new power

and would be in keeping with the rest of the Bill. So far the Commissioner's suggestion is unobjectionable. But this Government is disposed to doubt whether the Commissioner of Police, Madras, ought to be allowed to take action under section 155 seeing that he has no power to take cognizance of cases and if it is determined not to amend section 155 in the manner suggested this Government proposes to issue an order with reference to section 7 of the Madras City Police Act, 1888, withdrawing from the Commissioner his power of acting under section 155, Code of Criminal Procedure.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.

Gobt. of {1892} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., &c., 28th July 1892,
Nos. 1346, 1347.

JULY.

Bills—Legislative.

Passing orders on letter from the Commissioner of Police proposing certain amendments in sections 155 and 191 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and directing that the Government of India be addressed on the Bill to amend the Code and certain other Acts.

Recd. also the following

No. 706

GP

From

G. J. LALAN, BSC., C. S. I., C. I. F.,
Secretary to the Government of India.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of Madras.

Home Department.

(Judicial)



Simla, the 24th June 1892.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ^{ending} with your letter No. 1347, dated the 28th July 1892, on the subject of the Draft Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure and certain other Acts and to extend certain sections of the Code to the Police in the Towns of Calcutta and Bombay, I am directed to state for the information of the Government of Madras that, in view of the divergence of opinion among the Local Governments consulted, and the differences of system in Police administration in the three Presidency towns, the Governor General in Council has come to the conclusion that it is not desirable to have a general Act regulating Police Procedure in those Towns.

2. His Excellency in Council has therefore decided not to proceed further with the Draft Bill circulated with my letter No. 524, dated the 4th May 1892.

I have the honour to be,

Sir

Your most obedient Servant.

Chall

Secretary to the Govt. of India.

MC

CURRENT MONTH

From G.O. 1346 of 28.7.92
929:17.5.92

The Govt. of India

Home Dept. (Judicial)

No. 706

Dated 24 June 1893

Recd 30. 11. 92

Hon.

order

11/7/93

Communicated to the Hon. the C.J.,
the Govt. Solicitor, Chief Pres. Mag., the J.G. of
Police and the Commissioner of Police Madras
in continuation of G.O. 917.5-92 No 929 Sub

To the Hon. the C.J. (a/c)
Govt. Solicitor (")
Chief Pres. Mag. Madras (")
J.G. of Police (")
Commissioner of Police (")

Stating that it is not desirable
to extend certain sections of the
Code of Criminal Procedure to
the Police &c

1/2

[5]

Ind. DEPARTMENT

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

(attracted) 14 May 1892, No 929, Sub. }
Again G.O., dated 28 July 1892, No 1346-7 }
Again G.O., dated 18, No. }

Current No. 2746 of 1893, dated 24 June from the G.O. of I.

Current No. of 18, dated from

Order 15 July 1893, No 1443.
In Lyall's letter will be comm. to
the Chief of Police Hon. the
Judges of the High Court, the
Chief Presidency Mag., the
Commissioner of Police, Madras,
and the Adv. General with
reference to their replies to
G.O. 917.5.92, No 929, Sub.
2. With advantage to the remarks
contained in G.O. 917.5.92, No 1346, Sub. 4 in exercise
of the power conferred upon
him by Section 7 of the Madras
City Police Act, 1888, the
Governor in Council is pleased
to declare that the Commissioner
of Police, Madras, shall not,
in his ^{capacity} as a Presidency
Magistrate, exercise any of the
powers conferred upon Presidency
Magistrates by sections 155 &
191 of the Code of Criminal
Procedure.

(Trans. Sec.)

Letter to C.J. & C. 6 }
Chief Pres. Mag. 6 }
Com. of Police, Madras }
Adv. Gen. Govt. Sec. 3 }
12/7/93
27-7-93

*United States
C. C. [unclear]
[unclear]*

Q1 [unclear]

*For the [unclear]
Please see [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
[unclear]*

1 [unclear] [unclear]

HEAD-AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
IN No.

ENCLOSURES

CURRENT NO.

By [unclear]

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER, NO., OF GOVERNMENT—A.

ALLIES KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DISPATCH IN ORIGINAL
(not pagod.)

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED
Order complete. **80.**
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volumes.

BACK PAPER, No.

FURTHER PAPER, No.

1338
2-6-94.

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 15-7-93
No. 1448.

INDEXED

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

257
27-7

[Despatch Abstract.]

Police procedure
in Presidency towns

Cons to the Honble.
the Judge of the High
Court & certain of-
ficers. Letter from
the Govt of India
concerning it was
directed to have
a general Act re-
specting — &
declaring that the
Crime of Police Ma-
drian shall not
be for capacity as
a Presidency Ma-

Magistrate, & covered
any of the power
conferred upon the
Presidency Magistrate,
& section 155-159
of the Code of Cr-
iminal Procedure

17-9-11

5-9-11

16-1-15

17-11-27 R

10-3-11

MS-5-2

25/2/6