

(1) Number of pages 46(2) Date of repair 12. 10. 57(3) Initials of the Referencer WJ

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

judicial

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

1132

Press

B.P. No.

Mis.

Dated

11-5-1894

195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

RWJ

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read— the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 10th February 1894, Mis. No. 664.

Read—the following letter from K. C. MANAVEDAN RAJA, Esq., Acting Collector of Anantapur, to the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue), dated 31st January 1894, Ref. on C. No. 4215 :—

I have the honour to submit the following report on the working of clauses 2 to 8 of section 9 of Act I of 1889 (Madras) in this district.

2. The extension of these clauses to the district was sanctioned in G.O., No. 1462, dated 10th August 1892, Judicial Department, and village courts were formed accordingly at all the head-quarter stations of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars. Lists were prepared under clause 2 of section 9 of persons qualified to serve on the bench and were hung up in all the court-houses. These clauses may be said to have been in operation for a little over a year.

3. Divisional officers had been requested to watch the operation of the clauses and to submit a report at the end of a year. These have now been received and they show that the experiment was a failure.

4. I call it an experiment because it would appear from the records that the Divisional officers were averse to the introduction of the clauses on the ground that the people of the district were too illiterate to appreciate the benefits of the Act or to provide suitable persons to sit on the bench under the Act. No suits were filed in the village courts of Anantapur, Gooty, Uravakonda, Yádiki and Penukonda. A statement is appended showing the number and disposal of suits in the other village courts. These statements were furnished to me by the District Munsifs of Gooty and Penukonda. I adopted them in preference to those furnished by Tahsildars because these were obviously incorrect. A second statement is appended showing the number of suits of the value of Rs. 20 and under filed in the District Munsifs' courts of Gooty and Penukonda. It will be seen that there were 102 suits in the village courts under the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Penukonda against 94 in the Munsif's court during the year 1893, while there were 46 suits, all in Tadpatri village court, against 206 in the District Munsif's court of Gooty.

5. From reports received from Tahsildars it would appear that, notwithstanding the publicity given to the institution of benches and the extension of the clauses under reference to the district, there were no benches in any of the courts, all the suits having been heard by village munsif sitting alone. This state of things is explained

by the fact that neither the plaintiff nor the defendant claimed that the suit should be tried by a bench, the parties being quite contented with the unaided a judication of the munsif alone. I should also think that a good deal of difficulty is felt in inducing respectable ryots to serve on benches when they have their own business to attend to. Even in advanced town life, it has been found on experience that, a fair degree of capability and knowledge existing, such benches could hardly be framed owing to the unwillingness of a pretty large number of townsmen to serve on them. In addition to all this, it is no exaggeration to say that almost every village in the district would be found divided into two distinct factions and few could be found to adopt a line of action independent of the leading of the reddy or of the karnam. These facts would, in my opinion, explain the circumstance that a large number of suits which are within the powers of a village court to decide still continue to find their way to ordinary courts. Spread of education is, as far as I can see, the only means by which the village courts can gain in popularity, and I respectfully beg to submit that it is nearly hopeless, as far as this district is concerned, to expect any appreciable improvement in this direction for the next ten years. There is, of course, another remedy, namely, by rendering the reddy's jurisdiction exclusive instead of concurrent with regard to suits of the value of Rs. 20 and under. This, however, is a matter on which I do not deem myself justified in dwelling.

ENCLOSURES.

STATEMENT showing the number of suits of the value of Rs. 20 and under disposed of in the following village courts during 1893.

Serial number.	Name of Court.	Number of suits.	Remarks.
1	Tadpatri Village Court	46	102
2	Dharmavaram Village Court	30	
3	Kalyandrug Village Court	13	
4	Bukkapatnam Village Court	10	
5	Hindupur Village Court	47	
6	Madakasira Village Court	2	
Total		143	

STATEMENT showing the number of suits of the value of Rs. 20 and under filed in the District Munsifs' Courts of Gooty and Penukonda during the year 1893.

Serial number.	Name of Munsif's Court.	Number of suits.	Remarks.
1	Munsif's Court, Gooty	206	
2	Munsif's Court, Penukonda	94	
Total		300	

Resolution—dated 10th February 1894, M.S. No. 664.

Forwarded.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed)

L. M. WYNCH,
Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Judicial Department.

From J. THOMSON, Esq., District Magistrate of Chingleput, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Saidapet, 2nd March 1894, Ref. on No. 790-Eng.

With reference to memorandum from Government, Judicial, No. 2211, dated 11th December 1893, I have the honour to report that the provisions of clauses 2 to 8 of section 9 of Act I of 1889 were extended to the villages and groups of villages constituting the 15 local fund unions in the district marginally given and to the municipality of Conjeeveram under the sanction conveyed in G.Os., Nos. 1231 and 2017, dated 4th July 1892 and 29th September 1893, respectively, but the benches have not as yet actually commenced to work in any.

2. I enclose a statement showing the dates of submission by Divisional officers, revision and publication of the lists of persons eligible to sit as members of the benches, from which it will be observed that the members have already been selected except for the six courts in the Saidapet division. The earliest list published was for the Tiruvallūr court in March 1893, but for want of instructions to the village munsifs (which the Divisional officer or the Tahsildar ought to have given) the benches did no work.

3. The Sub-Collector reports that in the four courts of Madurantakam, Karunguzhi, Cheyur and Uttramerur the lists of members were hung up in the court-houses only towards the close of December 1893 or the beginning of January 1894, and no suits have since been received for disposal; while as regards the remaining courts in his division, the village munsifs have not understood the provisions of the Act. He adds that the Tahsildars have been directed to instruct them properly.

4. In respect of the village courts in the Saidapet division, no lists have as yet been published. The Deputy Collector reports that the Tahsildars of Ponnéri and Saidapet furnished their nominations on the 9th September and 20th October 1892, but the lists having been found imperfect were returned for revision on the 29th August 1893. This extraordinary delay in that office has not been explained as yet and the lists are still under revision.

5. The delay to make use of the provisions of the Act even in places where court lists have already been published seems to be due to ignorance on the part of the courts and the public, and to no sufficient attention given by the superior local officers of Government.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing particulars of dates of submission of lists of members for village courts.

Benches of Village Courts.	Date of receipt of list from Divisional officer.	Date of return for revision.	Date of resubmission after revision.	Date of publication in the District Gazette.	Remarks.
Tiruvallūr	23rd Dec. 1892	16th Jan. 1893	8th Feb. 1893	20th Mar. 1893	Tiruvallūr division.
Madurantakam	17th Apr. 1893	6th May "	8th June "	23rd Oct. "	Chingleput sub-division.
Cheyur	17th "	6th "	8th "	7th "	
Karunguzhi	28th May "	"	"	5th Aug. "	
Uttramerur	19th Sept. "	"	"	4th Nov. "	
Chingleput	22nd July "	"	"	18th Sept. "	
Tiruppur	31st Mar. "	"	"	6th May "	Saidapet division.
Walajabad	3rd Dec. "	13th Dec. 1893	19th Feb. 1894	"	
Conjeeveram	"	"	"	"	
Sriperumbudūr	"	"	"	"	
Ponnéri	"	"	"	"	
Pulicat	16th Feb. 1894	"	"	"	Saidapet division.
Saidapet	"	"	"	"	
Tiruvottiyur	"	"	"	"	
Kunnathur	"	"	"	"	
Sembiyam	"	"	"	"	

Referring to the Under Secretary's memorandum, No. 2211, dated 11th December, I have the honour to report that clauses 2 to 8 (both inclusive) of section 9 of I of 1889 (the Madras Village Courts Act) have been extended to the following villages and groups of villages in this district by a notification published in the District Gazette, dated 9th January 1893, under G.O., No. 2253, Judicial, dated 7th December 1892:—

Taluk.	Villages.
Vizagapatam	1. Vizagapatam.
	2. Kattimandupalem,
	Donlaparti,
	Dibbalapalem,
	Allipuram and
	Guntaboginapalem.
Srungavarapukota	3. Srungavarapukota.
Bimlipatam	4. Bimlipatam.
Vizianagram	5. Vizianagram.
Palkonda	6. Palkonda.
	7. Rajam.
Párvatipuram	8. Párvatipuram.
Bobbili	9. Bobbili.
Sálúr	10. Sálúr.
Savasidhi	11. Payakrowpeta.
	12. Koruprolu.
Anakápalle	13. Kasimkóta.

5. No suits were tried by a bench in any of the courts except in Vizagapatam, Srungavarapukota and Korupolu. * During 1893, 20 * suits were tried and disposed of by a bench of three judges in Vizagapatam, Srungavarapukota and Korupolu. In three cases on the file of

6 None of the members summoned to sit as judges failed to attend the court and there were no prosecutions under section 8. To sum up, clauses 2 to 8 worked well in Vizagapatam and Srungavarapukota taluks owing to the personal interest taken in the matter by the Huzur Deputy Collector. In the other villages the working was not satisfactory as this was the first year of their extension. I trust, however, that as the provisions of the law are more widely known to the public they will be more largely availed of.

With reference to the memorandum from the Under Secretary, No. 2211, dated 11th December last, and to reminder, dated 1st March, I have the honour to report that the provisions of clauses 2 to 8 of section 9 of the Madras Village Courts Act I of 1889 were extended to all the municipal towns and local fund unions in the district. Lists of members eligible to sit on the village benches were received from the Divisional officers and after scrutiny were returned to them duly approved with instructions that they should be hung up in the courts of the respective village munsifs.

Names of villages or groups of villages.						Number of suits disposed of by the village benches during 1893.
Coimbatore Village (South)	..	..	..	..	..	8
Do. (North)	..	..	..	..	..	8
Kuniamuthur	..	..	..	..	..	3
Gopichettipalayam	..	..	..	..	r.	1
Bhavani	..	..	..	..	..	1
Dhárāpuram	..	..	..	..	..	5
Pollachi	..	..	..	..	..	1

3. I have now issued a circular drawing the attention of the Divisional officers and Tahsildars to the matter and calling on them to issue the necessary instructions to the monigars.

2. Copies of this proceedings will be laid upon the Editors' Table and furnished to the Hon'ble K. Kalyanasundaram Aiyar, B.A., B.L., with reference to his questions at the Legislative Council meeting held on the 12th December last.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the District Magistrate, Anantapur.
 " " " Chingleput.
 " " " Vizagapatam.
 " " " Coimbatore.
 " Hon'ble K Kalyanasundaram Aiyar, B.A., B.L.
 Editors' Table.

Govt. of {1894} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

G.O., 11th May 1894, No. 1132.

MAY.

Act I of 1889 (Madras Village
Courts).
Recording, with remark, reports on the results
of the working of —

E

proposed to be
meeting of the

II (a). To the
Presidency of
of the Madras
for the constitution
been extended, by

(b) Have
of any District
to sit on such

(c) Have
been actually
results?

Dept. for the
of the Honble Member

For 1893
4 Dec 1893

To,

The President

10

Kalyanasundaram Aiyar
question at the next
meeting.

parts of districts in the
clauses (2) to (8) of section (9)
to Act (I of 1889) providing
of village benches
in Council?

two or Divisional officers
lists of persons eligible

1 to (8) of the said section
any Districts and with what

referred to the Judicial
tion of notes for the information

Attestation
Secretary to the Council

From the Legist.

Dated 4th }
Read 5th } December.

Forwarding copy of the govt.
which the Honble. E. R. R. R.
and from his office
ask at the next meeting
the Legislative Council

Judicial Dept.

Cur 5250 of '93 from the
Legislative Dept of 4th Decr.

Please file in answers as amended
in margin of printed copy sent
me of questions

MS
8/12/93

Quest: II (a)

A. Clauses (2) to (8) of Sec 9
of Act I of 1909 have been extended
to the following districts or parts of
the districts:-

- ✓ Coimbatore.
- ✓ Chingleput.
- ✓ Cuddalore.
- ✓ Vizagapatnam.
- ✓ Villore.

A.D. In no case have
the said clauses been
extended to the whole
district.

✓ Bellary

Quest: II (b)

A. Govt. has no information
A. There are no papers to show
that any list of premises have been
prepared; but it is to be assumed that
they have been prepared as required
by law for villages to which section 9
has been applied.

Quest: II (c)
A. There is no report yet the
required thing
has been with that results the
clauses (2) to (8) of the said section have
been actually worked or whether
they have been actually worked
at all anywhere. A report
on the subject ~~has been~~
called for from the
Collectors of those districts
in which sec. 9 has been in
operation for more than a
year.

Please call for the report
at once - we may as
well have it
MS

The Madras Village Court Act 1908

[6/69]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.



Memorandum.

Read the following

Reference No. 11 of 1908 No. 2211

The Dm. of — is requested to submit to Govt. at an early date a report showing with what results clauses (2) & (3) of Sec 9, of the Madras Village Court Act (1908) have been actually worked in his district.

(From orders)

To the Dm. Coimbatore 11/11/08.
 " Chingleput 11/11/08
 " Anantapur 11/11/08
 " Viz. appatur 11/11/08
 " Bellary 11/11/08

Note: The reference has been sent only to those Dist. where Sec. 9 has been in operation for more than a year.

#

Note for the information of the Hon. W. P. B. to whom His Excellency has delegated the duty of replying to the questions II (a), (b) & (c) of the Hon. K. Kalyanaswami Aiyar

4/7 Dec.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 10 February 1894,

No. 664

Mis.
Roumo

4P

Read letter from K. C. Manavadan Raja Rao
Acting Collector of Anantapur, dated
31st January 1894, Ref. on C. No. 4215 to
the Chief Secretary to Government Judicial
Department through the Secretary to the
Commissioners of Land Revenue

4P

Resolution of 10-2-94 Mis No 664

Forwarded to the Chief Secretary to Govt. Judicial Dept.

(Enc. Extract) to the

Secretary

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt. Judicial Dept.
with the letter & its enc. in
original.

22/4

CURRENT NO. 7
Judicial 1894. Fourth
Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue),
MADRAS.

Ref no 2211/93.
1462: 10-8-92-
920: 17-5-92-
820: 3-5-92-82

To

The Chief Secretary
to Govt. Judicial
Deptt.
2 Enclos

Proceedings, dated 10-2-1894
No. 664, Mis. Revenue

Subject.

Forwarding to the Chief Secretary to Govt. Judicial Deptt. letter from the Collector of Anantapur reporting on the results in which clauses 2 to 8 of Section 9 of Act I of 1889 have been actually worked in the District.

16/1 ✓

Anantapur Collector's Office,

Dated the 31st January 1894.

No.

Enclosure

193

84

From K. C. Manavedan Raja Esq
Ag Collector of

Anantapur.
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Judicial Department
Through The Secretary to the Commissioner of

Land Revenue.

MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit the following report on the working of Clauses 2 to 8 of Section 9 of Act I of 1889 (Madras) in this District.

2. The extension of these clauses to the District was sanctioned in G. O. No. 1462/108.92 Judicial Department and Village Courts were formed accordingly at all the Head Quarter Stations of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars. Lists were prepared under Clause 2 of Section 9 of persons qualified to serve on the Bench and were hung up in all the four houses. These clauses may be said to have been in operation for a little over a year.

3. Divisional officers had been requested to watch the operation of the clauses and to submit a report at the end of a year. These have now been received and they show that the experiment was a failure.

4. I call it an experiment because it would appear from the records that the Divisional officers were averse to the

introduction of the clauses on the ground that the people of the district were too illiterate to appreciate the benefits of the act or to provide suitable persons to sit on the Bench under the act. No suits were filed in the Village Courts of Anantapur, Gooty, Uruvakkunda, Gaditla and Penutkonda. A statement is appended showing the number and disposal of suits in the other Village Courts. These statements were furnished to me by the District Munsiffs of Gooty and Penutkonda. I adopted them in preference to those furnished by Tahsildars because these were obviously incorrect. A second statement is appended showing the number of suits of the value of Rs 20 and under filed in the District Munsiffs' Courts of Gooty and Penutkonda. It will be seen that there were 102 suits in the Village Courts under the jurisdiction of the District Munsiff of Penutkonda against 94 in the Munsiff's Courts during the year 1893 while there were 46 suits, all in Tadpatri, Village Court against 206 in the District Munsiff's Court of Gooty.

5. From reports received from Tahsildars it would appear that notwithstanding publicity given to the institution of benches and the extension of clauses under reference to the District there were no benches in any of the Courts, all the suits having been heard by Village Munsiffs sitting alone. This state of things is explained by the fact that neither the plaintiff nor the defendant claimed that the suit should be tried by a bench, the parties being quite discontented with the unsaided adjudication of the Munsiff alone. I should also think that a good deal of difficulty is felt in inducing respectable

2

6 ryots to serve on benches when they have their own business to attend to. Even in advanced town life, it has been found on experience that a fair degree of capability and knowledge existing, such benches could hardly be framed owing to the unwillingness of a pretty large number of townsmen to serve on them. In addition to all this, it is no exaggeration to say that almost every village in the District would be found divided into two distinct factions and few could be found to adopt a line of action independent of the leading of the Reddi or of the Kurnam. These facts would, in my opinion, explain the circumstance that a large number of suits which are within the powers of a Village Court to decide still continue to find their way to ordinary Courts. Spread of education is, as far as I can see, the only means by which the Village Courts can gain in popularity and I respectfully beg to submit that it is nearly hopeless as far as this District is concerned to expect any appreciable improvement in this direction for the next 10 years. There is of course another remedy, namely, by rendering the Reddy's jurisdiction exclusive instead of concurrent with regard to suits of the value of Rs 20 and under. This however is a matter on which I do not deem myself

justified in dwelling

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

Statement Showing the number of suits of the value of
Rs 20 and under disposed of in the following Village
Courts during 1893.

7 5

Serial No.	Name of Court	Number of Suits	Remarks
1	Jadpatry Village Court	46	102
2	Dharmavarani Village Court	30	
3	Kalyandrug Village Court	13	
4	Bukkapatnam Village Court	10	
5	Hindupur Village Court	47	
6	Madakasira Village Court	2	
Total - - - - -		148	

2) Statement Showing the number of suits of the value
of Rs 20 and under filed in the District Munsiff's
Courts of Gooty, and Pennkonda, during the year 1893.

Serial No.	Name of Munsiff's Court	Number of Suits filed	Remarks
1	Munsiff's Court Gooty	206	
2	Munsiff's Court Pennkonda	94	
		300	

Anantapur
Collector's office
94

1/12-193/94

M. M. M. M.
For Ag Collector

Ad.
2/11

Chingleput District MAGISTRATE'S OFFICE,

Station, Saidapet,

February 1894

DESPATCHED

FROM

J. Thomson

ESQUIRE,

District MAGISTRATE OF

Chingleput.

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Judicial Department,
Madras.

SIR,

With reference to Memorandum

1. Tiruwallur
 2. Madurantakam
 3. Cheyur
 4. Karungudi
 5. Uttaramerur
 6. Chingleput
 7. Tiruporur
 8. Wallajahabad
 9. Sriperumbudi
 10. Ponneri
 11. Pulicat
 12. Saidapet
 13. Tiruottiyur
 14. Kumbalur
 15. Sembayan
- from Government, Judicial, No 2211 dated 11th December 1893. I have the honour to report that the provisions of clauses 2 to 8 of section 9 of Act I of 1889 were extended to the villages and groups of villages constituting the 15 Local Fund Unions in the District marginally given, and to the Municipality of Conjeevaram under the sanction conveyed in Government Order No. 1231 and 2017, dated 4th July 1892 and

and 29th September 1893, respectively, but the Benches have not as yet actually commenced to work in any.

2. I enclose a statement showing the dates of submission by Divisional officers, revision and publication of the list of persons eligible to sit as members of the Benches from which it will be observed that the members have already been selected except for the 6 Courts in the Saidapet Division. The earliest list published was for the Tiruvallur Court in March 1893, but for want of instructions to the village Munsiffs (which the Divisional officer or the Tahsildar ought to have given), the Benches did no work.

3. The Sub Collector reports that in the four Courts of Madurai, Talam, Karungudi, Chelvi and Ottaramerur, the lists of members have been put up in

9
in the Court houses only towards the close of December 1893, or the beginning of January 1894, and ^{no} suits have since been received for disposal: while as regards the remaining Courts in his Division, the village Munsiffs have not understood the provisions of the Act. He adds that the Tahsildars have been directed to instruct them properly.

4. In respect of the village Courts in the Saidapet Division, no lists have as yet been published. The Deputy Collector reports that the Tahsildars of Ponneri and Saidapet furnished their nominations on the 9th September and 20th October 1892, but the lists having been found imperfect were returned for revision on the 1st August 1893. This

This extraordinary delay in that office
has not been explained as yet, and
the lists are still under revision.

5. The delay to make use of the provisions of the Act even in places where Court lists have already been published, seems to be due to ignorance on the part of the Courts and the public, and to no sufficient attention given by the superior local officers of Government.

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

Wm. B. ...
for District Magistrate.

ad

just

MAGISTERIAL DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE DIST. MAGISTRATE OF

Chingleput

TO

THE Chief Secy to Govt.

Ind. Dept.

Madras

Dated

29. March

Despatched

29. March 1894

Received

3. 4

No.

790

SECRET

EXCISE DEPT. MAR 1894

DESPATCHED

MAR 11

SUBJECT.

Submitting a report on the
working of the Village Courts.
Feb. 1889. Called for in Govt.
Memorandum No. 2211
11th Dec 1893.

1) Statement showing particulars of dates of Submission of
lists of members for Village Courts

Benchers of Village Courts.	Date of receipt of list from Divisional Office.	Date of return for revision.	Date of resubmission after revision.	Date of publication in the District Gazette.	Remarks.
Tiruwallur	23-12-92	19-1-93	8-2-93	20-3-93	Tiruwallur &c.
Madurantakam	17-4-93	6-5-93	8-6-93	23-10-93	Chingleput Sub-Division
Bheyur					
Karungali					
Eltaramerur	28-5-93	-	-	5-8-93	Chingleput Sub-Division
Chingleput	28-5-93	-	-	5-8-93	
Tiruporur	19-9-93	-	-	4-11-93	
Walajabad	22-7-93	-	-	18-9-93	Saidapet Division.
Conjeveram	31-3-93	-	-	6-5-93	
Shiperumbudur	31-3-93	-	-	6-5-93	
Ponneri	3-12-93	13-12-93	19-2-94	-	Saidapet Division.
Pulicat	3-12-93	13-12-93	19-2-94	-	
Saidapet	3-12-93	13-12-93	19-2-94	-	
Tiruvottiyur	19-2-94	19-2-94	19-2-94	19-2-94	Saidapet Division.
Kannathur					
Sembiyam					

For District Magistrate,
2nd March 1894

In a letter from
the Director of
the Department to the
Chief Secy to Government
P. O. Madras No. 790
72-3-94

Statement showing
particulars of dates
of submission of lists
of names of Village
Courts.

1894
JULY
1
1149

No. 499

Collector
VIZAGAPATAM GOVERNOR'S AGENT'S OFFICE.

Dated 22nd March 1894

From J. D. A. O. Wolfe Murray Esq.
W. A. WILLOCK Esq.
Agent to the Governor.

Vizagapatam District.

To The Honorable J. J. Price,
CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Judicial Department
MADRAS.

SIR,
Referring to the under Secretary's Memorandum No. 2211 dated 11th December last, I have the honor to report that clauses 2 to 8 (both inclusive) of section 9 of Act I of 1889 (the Madras Village Courts Act) have been extended to the following villages and groups of villages in this District by a notification published in the District Gazette dated 9th January 1892 under G. O. No. 2253 Judicial dated 7th December 1892.

Taluk	Villages
Vizagapatam	1 Vizagapatam
	2 Mattamandupalem
	Dondaparte
	Dibbalapalem
	Allipuram and
	Guntabogunapalem
Spungavaripukota	3 Spungavaripukota
Bimlipalem	4 Bimlipalem
Vizianagaram	5 Vizianagaram

Palakonda

Palakonda _____	6	Palakonda.
	7	Rajam.
Parvatipur _____	8	Parvatipur.
Bobbili _____	9	Bobbili.
Salur _____	10	Salur.
Savaiidhi _____	11	Payakroopeta
	12	Koruprolu
Anakapalli _____	13	Khassimketa.

2 The villages of Kattimandupalem, Dondaparti Dibbalapalem, Allipuram and Guntaboginapalem have been grouped together to form a single village and constitute the jurisdiction of a single village court in lieu of the several courts previously existing by a notification published in the District Gazette dated 1st August 1893 under G.O. No. 1174 dated 9th June 1893.

3 In this group clauses 2 to 8 have not however worked as yet as no munsiff has been appointed. Sanction has lately been applied for to appoint a salaried munsiff for the group as under G.O. No. 87 of this Revenue dated 31st January 1893 as persons other than the heads of any of the villages comprising the group should be appointed as munsiff and the matter was reported to Government for orders in Board's Proceedings No. 701 dated 15th December 1893.

In all the other villages lists of persons residing in the villages

7
 Visagapatam 8
 Spongavarapukota 10
 Koruprolu - 2.

13
 villages and qualified to sit as members of a bench for the trial of suits brought under the Act have been prepared and hung up in the respective court houses as required by clause 2.

5 No suits were tried by a bench in any of the courts except in Visagapatam, Spongavarapukota and Koruprolu. During 1893, 20 suits were tried and disposed of by a bench of 3 judges in Visagapatam, Spongavarapukota and Koruprolu.

In 3 cases on the file of the Spongavarapukota court the village munsiff had to make a selection from the list of persons eligible to serve as benchers owing to the failure of the parties to nominate and in all others the parties themselves nominated members of the bench. Of the 20 cases disposed of 11 were decided by the unanimous verdict of the bench and the rest by the opinion of the majority.

6 None of the members summoned to sit as Judges failed to attend the courts and there were no prosecutions under Section 8. To sum up, clauses 2 to 8 worked well in Visagapatam and Spongavarapukota Taluks owing to the personal interest taken in the matter by the Honourable Deputy Collector. In the other villages the working was not satisfactory as this was the first year of their extension. I trust however that as the provisions of the law are more widely known to

to the public they will be more largely availed of.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant

Wm. M. Bennett

Dy for Dy collector

XIV

1587

Judl Dept

From

The Ag collector

Vizagapatam

To

The Chief Secretary to

Government

Judicial Department

Madras

Dated 22 March 1894.

Recd

Regd 28/3.

Sic 429



Submitting report on
the working of clauses 2
to 8 of Sec 9 of Act I of
1889.

Refce on No 42.
mis.

Coimbatore collector's
office 31st March 1894

From 15

R. D. Broadfoot Esqre,
Ag. collector of Coimbatore

To
The Chief Secretary to Govern-
ment, Judicial Dept.
Madras.

Sir,
With reference to the
memorandum from the Under-
Secretary No 2211, dated 11th December
last, and to reminder, dated 1st
March, I have the honor to report
that the provisions of clauses 2 to 8
of Section 9 of the Madras Village
Courts Act I of 1889, were extended
to all the Municipal Towns and
Local-Trust Villages in the District.
Lists of members eligible to sit
on the Village benches were received
from the Divisional officers and
after scrutiny were referred to
them duly approved with
instructions

instructions that they should be hung up in the Courts of the respective Village Munsiffs.

2. From the reports now received, it appears that the progress made in working the clauses in question has not, on the whole, been satisfactory. They were worked only in the undermentioned places, viz.

Names of villages or groups of villages -	no of suits disposed of by the Village Munsiffs during 1893.
---	--

Loukatabe village (South)	8
---------------------------	---

Do (North)	8
------------	---

Kumamuthur	3
------------	---

Eppichettipalayam	1
-------------------	---

Bhavani	1
---------	---

Dharapuram	5
------------	---

Pollachi	1
----------	---

In other places the clauses referred to were not at all worked owing, I think, to apathy on the part of the Munsiffs who have evidently neither given publicity to the new

new system nor exerted themselves to popularize it.

3. I have now issued a circular drawing the attention of the Divisional officers & Tahsildars to the matter and calling on them to issue the necessary instructions to the Munsiffs.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant

For the Secy to the
Collector

17: 29-7-73
 74: 7-6-73
 281: 28-2-73
 253: 7-12-72
 462: 10-8-72
 765: 1-8-72
 281: 4-7-72
 726: 17-5-72

(1894)
 From,
 The Collector of
 Coimbatore
 The Chief Secretary
 to Government
 Judicial Dept.
 Madras

Ref. on No. 42 of 1894

Dated 31st March

Recd 1894



Subject

Reporting the results
 of the working of clauses
 2 to 8 of Section 29
 of the Madras Hill
 Courts Act I of 1882

250-12-12-91

From

Dated

189

FOR ORDERS.

It will perhaps suffice if
 this correspondence is
 recorded with the remark that
 delay which has occurred
 in Chingleput in bringing
 the scheme into working order
 is not creditable to the
 local officers. The
 G.O. may also be laid on
 the Editors' Table & a copy
 sent to the Hon. K. Kalyana-
 Sundaram Aiyar with reference
 to his questions in the
 Legislative Council on the
 12th Dec. 1893?

by 14 May.

VP
 CS

Order of 11th May 1894, No. 442

P.S.
 Recorded with the remark
 that there has been discreditable
 delay in bringing the system
 into operation in the
 Chingleput District.

To the St. Insp. of
 Ammanapur, Chingleput;
 Puzos & Coimbatore;
 Hon. K. Kalyanasundaram Aiyar, M.L.A.
 Editors' Table.

Copies of this P.O. are being
 furnished to the Hon. K.
 Kalyanasundaram Aiyar, M.L.A.,
 with reference to his question
 at the Legislative Council meeting
 held on the 12th Dec. last.
 (Transposed)

Working of Village
Branches

1/2

P.L.

(70 orders)

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

J. J.
DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED *11th May 1894*
No. *1132*

INDEXED.

First copy sent to Press. *14/5*

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print. *18/5*

[Despatch Abstract.]

Act I of 1887 (Madras Village
Customs)

Recording, with some
reports on the results
the working of —

R. S. Wamy