

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 12
(2) புத்தித் திருப்பிப் பதர் 3-96
(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

JUDICIAL DEPT. துறை

அரசாணை எண்.	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்:	பலவகை
Gonsan 2193	
Dt 20.10.1893	
நாள் :	199

மடிக்கலோ கண்டயடி

ஆவண, கா. 1-18,006-6-9-90.

மாண

to 300 D D Kusaia 5th September 189.

Leon

The Public Prosecutor,

Kaduna

£

The District Magistrate,

Kaduna

Sein.

In reply to your endorsement dated the 21st July 1893, No 220, I have the honor to state that I calculated my fee at the rate of Rs 75 per day. I was in Kodakhanal when I received your telegram and left it on the 27th May 1892. The time occupied, i.e. travelling and staying at Dindigul for the case was more than 6 and less than 7 days and therefore I have claimed a round sum of Rs 500. The Government Orders quoted in your endorsement under reply do not apply to the present case as they relate to payment of fees for the conduct of cases at the head quarters of the District. It has always been understood that Public Prosecutors are entitled to special fees when they are required to conduct cases away from the head-quarters. I understand that 2 of my predecessors were accordingly paid special fees when

9.9. x

செப்பெருபவர் பெயர்
செப்பெருவதற்காக எடுத்த
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாளி
செப்பெரு முடிந்த நாளி
சரிபார்க்கும்
மு. பாரதி
கையொப்பம்
கொய்ச்சு
உதவியாளர்
கையொப்பம்

when they were required to leave Madras on
duty, viz., Mr. V. Subramania Aiyar when he went
to Madras in connection with a case of forgery
against the late Zemindar of Polur, and Mr.
John French when he went there in connection
with another case of forgery. I do not know the
amount paid to Mr. V. Subramania Aiyar, but
I learn that Mr. French was paid Rs 600 for
trips to Madras, each occupying 3 days, that
at the rate of Rs 100 per day including travelling
allowance.

2. I have another consideration to put
forward before you which will show that the
rate claimed is very reasonable and moderate.
The Public Prosecutor, Madras, is, I believe, paid a
fee of Rs 30 per case in the High Court, and if
he leaves Madras on duty, he is paid at the rate
of Rs 175 per day exclusive of travelling allowance
which is separately granted. Allowing the
analogy, who are paid a fee in case should
get not less than Rs 100 a day when they leave Madras.

on duty 2/2/93

2/2/93

3. I may further be permitted to mention
that High Court Vakils of my standing at the
Bar, when they are engaged by clients to go
out of Madras, do not accept a fee of less than
Rs 100 per day.

4. In these circumstances, I have the
honor to request you will be so good as to
recommend to Government to sanction a fee
of Rs 500 for my services considering that I
brought to a successful termination a serious
case of robbing in an important place like
Periyakulam.

I have &c

(Signed) M. S. Karamasawier
Public Prosecutor

(True Copy)

P. S. S. S.

District Magistrate

2/2/93

no 457

CURRENT

NO. 1/1657

Madura District Magistrate's
office, (Camp Manamadurai)
Dated 26 September 1893

3/2/93

From

3/2/93

E. Turner, Esquire,
District Magistrate,
Madura.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Judicial Department,
Madras.

Sir,

Mr. K. S. Karainasami Aiyar, the
Public Prosecutor Madura, requests me to order
payment to him of Rs 500 for his fees for conducting

Prosecution fees	Rs 500
Double 2 nd class of train from Madura to Dindigul	1 - 10 - -
— do from Dindigul to Madura	1 - 10 - -
Daily allowance for 4 days at the rate of Rs 2 per diem	12 - - -
Cost of a telegram sent to the joint Magistrate in connection with the case.	3 - - -
	Rs 518-4 - -

the prosecution
in the Periyakulam
rioting case in
May 1892, and
Rs 18-4 - - for
his travelling
expenses and
telegram charges

as particularized in the margin.

2. I asked him to state clearly as to
how he came to calculate the fee of Rs 500.

3. In his explanation (vide copy of letter
no 300, dated 5 September 1893 enclosed) the Public

Prosecutor

Prosecutor states the reasons for his charging the
fee of Rs 500 for the case.

4. Considering that he brought to a
successful termination a serious case of rioting
in an important place like Periyakulam, and
the reasons adduced by him at length for availing
of his fee, I have the honor to recommend that
the Government may be pleased to sanction the
amount of Rs 518-4-- for his services.

5. G.O. No 1041 dated 14 June 1892 and
G.O. No 801 dated 7 July 1892 relate to this
subject.

I have the honor to be,

your most obedient servant.

[Signature]
District Magistrate

6/2/93

4165
1893- Department

1041: 1-6-92 mi
801: 7-7-92. L.R.
7A1: 2-5-93 SC
2153: 18-8-85 Mms

From

The District Magistrate
Madurai



Enclosure one.

Dated 26th September
Received 29th 1893.

no. 4

Subject

Recommending that
Sanction may be accorded
for the payment of Rs. 518-4-0
to the Public Prosecutor
being his fee for conducting
the prosecution in the
Periyakulam rioting
case in 1892.

H.M.

Order

Payment of an aggregate fee

of Rs. 500/- to the P.P. Madurai in Sanctioned

To the D.M. Madurai (970)
A.G. (P.O.)

Not. This is a copy of P.P. Madurai

For Order

Subm. - this claim should not
be acceded to; it will be a
bad precedent. The P.P. may
be paid his travelling expenses
plus a fee calculated at Rs. 25
for 7 days i.e. Rs. 18-4-0 plus
Rs. 175. There is no understanding
that P.P.s are entitled to special
fees when they leave headquarters.
The delay in making this ap-
plication has not been explained.
The P.P. says he left Kodaikanal
to attend at Dindigul; if this is
so he might be allowed his travel
expenses from that place as a
special case; the D.M. allows for
fare from Madurai to Dindigul
only.

The papers to S. L. are the
put up. There is a copy of 30 Oct. 1893
his receipt cannot be traced. There is a copy of
the papers to S. L. are the
put up. There is a copy of 30 Oct. 1893
his receipt cannot be traced. There is a copy of
the papers to S. L. are the
put up. There is a copy of 30 Oct. 1893
his receipt cannot be traced. There is a copy of

101
LAD. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:-

Again G.O., dated

18, No.

Again G.O., dated

18, No.

Current No. 4165 of 1893, dated 26 Sept from D.M. Madurai.

Current No.

of 18

dated

from

Order 20 Oct 1893. No. 2193.

The Govt. is not prepared to
sanction payment of the
fee recommended by the
D.M. The P.P. may be paid
a fee calculated at Rs. 25
per diem for seven days &
also travelling expenses; nothing
more can be sanctioned. The
Govt. does not admit that
P.P.s are entitled to special
fees when they leave headquarters
& the case of the Govt. Pleader
Madurai, has no analogy with
that of Municipal Law Officers.
The delay in making this
application ought to have
been explained.

(From order)

20/10/93
To the D.M., Madurai. (970)
25 Oct 1893
24/10

[^o/_{II}]

5/2/94 R.H.

7/24

6
2193

ORDINARY, MS.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 20-10-93
No. 2193

INDEXED.

When given for copying. 23/3

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining with remarks to
sanction payment of the
fee (Rs 518-4-0) recommended
by the District Magistrate
Himra, to the Public Prosecutor
for conducting the prosecu-
tion in the Bhangarwan
roasting case in 1892, desisting
the submission of a revised
bill.