[L. & M.
9,000-8-8-96.]

Local & Munl. (1895-) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2011 L

DATED 22d Oct 1895

[**Despatch Abstract.**]

Administration Report.

Recording, with remarks, explanation of points noticed in the ---- of the Salem district board for 1894-95.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G O.	No.	Department.	Date.

---

[7]

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 22-10-95
No. 2011 L

INDEXED.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Administration Report

Recording with remarks, explanation of points noticed in the —— of the Salem Dist. Bd. for 1894-95 !

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED 189 , No , MISCELLANEOUS.

BACK PAPER, No. OF 189

FURTHER PAPER, No. OF 189

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—
A — Copy in full.
B — Not to be copied.
P — Copy abstract only.
Q — Copy heading only.

Copied by V.S.P. 24/8
Examined by R.

Current No: 1909 L. of 1895.

O.M. $\frac{1179}{23/8/95}$

The following points are noticed in the President's and the District Medical and Sanitary Officer's reports and in the statements submitted with the former:—

(1) In Statement I-A the receipts from the sale of "produce on L. F. lands" ~~amounting to~~ (Rs. 223) and of "vegetables in gardens" (Rs. 34) should have been credited to "5. Miscellaneous, (i) Rents, and produce of land" and not to "(l) Sundry receipts."

(2) In the same Statement the fee of R. 1 levied for distress warrants should have been credited to "5. Miscellaneous (f) Fees, and fines" and not to "(l) Sundry receipts"

(3) In column 1 of Statement I-B the item given under Grant I "(g) Miscellaneous" should have been "Refund of receipts" and not "Refund of Expenditure."

(4) In Statement II-B, the sale-proceeds and rent of manure (Rs. 484) should have been shown under "Miscellaneous" in column 5 and not under "Fees" in column 4, while the receipts from Scavenging fees (Rs. 176), fees on temporary bazaars (Rs. 25) and Distress warrant fee (R. 1) should have been shown

shown under the latter and not under the former head.

(5) Details should have been given for the sum of Rs. 137 shown as "Miscellaneous receipts" in note (a) to the same statement.

?

(6) The sum of Rs. 5 entered as "Fishery in Unions" in the details of "Sundry receipts" given in the last column of Statement I-A does not appear to have been included in column 5 of Statement II-B.

d.

(7) In col: 19 of Statement II-B the closing balance in favour of the Taramangalam union is given as Rs. 140 instead of Rs. 143, being the difference between the entries in columns 7 and 18.

e.c.

(8) In the same statement the total charges under "Miscellaneous Public Improvements" in the Nāmakkal and Tiruchengōdu unions are shown as Rs. 569 and Rs. 1,064 respectively, whereas according to Statement VI the amounts allotted for Public Works, connected with the markets under the~~ir~~ control of the Panchayats concerned were Rs. 695 and Rs. 1,420 respectively.

d.

(9) It is not clear under what heads the two sums of Rs. 238 and Rs. 102 shown as the cost of supervision, and tools and plant relating to the markets at Tiruchengōdu & Nāmakkal, which are under the control of the local union Panchayats of those places, are included in Statement II-B.

(10) In Statement III the works relating to each union should have been shown separately.

(11) In the same statement a sum of Rs. 83 is shown as Expenditure up to the close of 1893-94 on the construction of a shed for the Board School at Mallasamudram, but no such work appears in the statement for that year.

d.

(12) In the same statement the expenditure of Rs. 323 incurred on the repairs of the travellers' bungalow at Adamankottai, which is valued at Rs. 1,000 in Statement XV, should have been shown under "New works," with reference to Art. 23 of the L. F. P. W. Rules, and not under "Repairs."

e.c.

(13) In col: 3 of Statement IV-A the number of miles of road in charge of the local boards at the beginning of the year in the Nāmakkal, Dharmapuri, and Uttangarai taluks

is shown as 156 3/4, 98 and 157 3/4 respectively whereas the length of the roads in their charge at the close of the year 1893:94 according to the Statement for that year is 154, 86 1/2, and 149 1/2 miles respectively.

(14) In columns 17 & 19 of Statement IV-A the average cost of maintaining each mile of road is incorrectly given in the cases noted below:—

	As given in the Statement	Correct figure
Atur District roads,	Rs. 148	Rs 149
Nāmakkal " Do "	" 171	Rs. 169
Tiruchengōdu Village "	" 102	" 106
Tiruppattur " Do "	" 96	" 77
Uttangarai " "	" 135	" 116

(15) In column 2 of Statement V the authority for the establishment of the Pujarippatti toll-gate is given as G.O. d/ 20th January 1884 No. 1353 instead of G.O. d/ 18th June 1884, No. 1353 Fin. Mis.

(16) From column 21 of Statement VI it appears that the fees, amounting to Rs. 142, collected in the Slaughter-houses at Atur and Yercaud have not been included under "Market rents" in Statement I-A: It is not clear under what head they have been credited in the latter Statement.

(17) In Statement VII the total collections under land-cess are shown as Rs. 192,900, whereas the amount given under this head in Statement I-A is Rs. 197,616. Deducting from the latter the sum of Rs. 5,000, which is stated in para. 9 of the report to have been erroneously credited to this head, the amount is Rs. 192,616 or Rs. 284 less.

(18) In column 2 of Statement VIII the demand under Arrears of House-tax is shown as Rs. 4,126 whereas the uncollected balance of this tax at the close of 1893:94, according to the Statement for that year, was Rs. 4,105-9-6.

(19) In column 7 of Statement VIII the total collections under house-tax are shown as Rs. 29,807 or Rs. 8 less than the amount credited under this head in Statement I-A.

(20) According to the foot-note to Statement VIII the outstanding balance of the arrears of avenue rents relating to the years 1890-1891 and 1892:93 amounted to Rs. 37 and Rs. 1,220 respectively, but these sums are not shown in the statement for 1893-1894.

(21) In the footnote to same Statement a sum of Rs. 56 is shown as the outstanding balance of arrears under ~~the~~ money rent of land relating to 1891:92, but this is not given in the Statement for 1893:94.

(22) In column 22 of Statement IX the average cost of educating each pupil in the Sessional School at Omalur, the Upper Secondary department of the Namakkal High School, and the Lower Secondary department of the Dharmapuri Lower Secondary School is given as Rs. 25-3-4, Rs. 8-5- and Rs. 6-1-6 respectively instead of Rs. 25-3-2, Rs. 8-6-7, and Rs. 6-1-5.

(23) In the foot-note appended to the same statement only 53 pupils are shown as having appeared for the Primary Examination, whereas according to para. 28 of the report, 56 students were presented by the Sessional Schools alone for this Examination.

(24) In ~~the~~ same statement the transactions relating to the Industrial department attached to the Namakkal High School have not been shown separately.

(25) In Col: 4 of Statement IX-A the number of pupils on the rolls of the Rasipuram school on the 31st Mar 1895 is given as 95 instead of 121, according to the details furnished in Statement IX.

(e.c.)

(26) The statistics relating to the two Girls' schools, which received aid from Local funds, should have been shown in Statement X — vide para. 2 of G.O. 8-5-88, No. 859 L.

(27) In the foot-notes (a) & (b) appended to the portion of Statement XI relating to Bungalows, it is incorrectly stated that the amount shown in columns 5, 10 and 11 correspond with the receipts and expenditure on account of markets instead of those on account of bungalows given in Statements I-A and I-B.

(28) According to Statement XIV the total charges on Sanitation in the Tiruppáttúr, Salem and Hosur Local fund taluks are Rs. 1,738, Rs. 9,231 and Rs. 8,605 respectively, whereas according to Statement XVIII they are Rs. 1,739, Rs. 9,229 and Rs. 8,607 respectively: and the total charges on scavenging establishments amount to Rs. 21,171, whereas the amount given in Statement I-B is Rs. 21,172.

(29) In Statement XVI the average attendance of the elected official members of the District Board should have been shown separately and not together with that of the elected non-officials.

(30) In the same statement the average attendance of all classes of

of members of the District Board is shown as 18·5 instead of 18·6, as in Statement XVI-A. l.c

(31) In column 10 of the same statement (XVI) the names of the several members have not been numbered in accordance with the instructions issued in para. 4(4) of G.O., dated 28th May 1890, No. 1273 L. l.c.

(32) In Statement XVI the number of members on the Tiruppattúr Taluk Board on the 31st Mar. 1895 is shown as 12 instead of 13, as in Statement XVI-A and para. 4 of the President's report. l.c.

(33) In Statement XVI-A the strength of the Tiruchengódu Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 is shown as 3 ex-officio and 6 nominated members, whereas on the 31st Mar. 1894 there were 1 ex-officio and 8 nominated members, according to the Statement for 1893-94, and from Statement XVI-B it appears that there were no alterations whatever in the personnel of this Panchayat during the year under report. d

(34) In col: 11 of Statement XVI-A the number of official members on the Táramangalam Panchayat on the 31st Mar. 1895 is given as 2, whereas according to column 7 the number of ex-officio members alone was 3. d

(35) In cols: 7 and 8 of the same statement the numbers of ex-officio and nominated members on the Tátaiyangarpet and Móhanúr Panchayats at the end of the year are shown as 2+6 and 3+5 respectively, whereas according to columns 11 to 13 of Statement XVI-B the corresponding figures were 3+5 and 2+6. d

(36) In column 3 of Statement XVI-B the number of ex-officio members on the Rasipuram Panchayat at the beginning of the year is shown as 5, whereas according to Statement XVI-A for 1893-94 there were 6 such members on the 31st Mar. 1894. d

(37) The details given in columns 3-5 of Statement XVI-B against the Nanjai Edayar Panchayat do not agree either with the total entered in column 6 or with the strength of the Panchayat on the 31st Mar. 1894, as shown in Statement XVI-A for 1893-94. d

(38) The reasons for (1) appointing officials other than medical subordinates as members of the Panchayats, (2) the removal of Asan Ibrahim Sahib from the Krishnagiri Panchayat and (3) the vacancies which occurred on several of the Panchayats have not been given in the last column of the same Statement (XVI-B), as required in the notes printed at foot of the form. o

(39) The entry of the remark "Transferred" in the last column of the same statement against Sultan Khan Sahib a member of the Palakodu Panchayat is not understood, as he was not an official member.

(40) In column 18 of Statement XVII the average incidence per house taxed has not been correctly calculated in the following cases:-

	As given in the Statement. As. P.	Correct figure As. P.
Atur	12..	11.8
Gangavalli	7.6	7.10
Tammampatti	9.5	9.7
Vengarai	6..	6.5
Nanjai Edyar	7.6	7.8

(41) In Statement XVIII the General Local Fund receipts appertaining to the District and Taluk funds are shown as Rs. 1,09,443 and Rs. 2,36,346 respectively, whereas according to the details given in the last column of that Statement and the distribution of the receipts according to columns 8 & 9 of Statement I-A they amount to Rs. 1,19,443 and Rs. 2,26,346 as shown below:-

	District Rs.	Taluk Rs.	Total Rs.
Total receipts	1,71,642	2,47,532	4,19,174
Deduct-			
Govt. Contributions	16,034	7,803	23,837
Debt head receipts	33,754	–	33,754
Total of cols: 5 to 7 of Statement VI.	2,411	13,383	15,794
	52,199	21,186	73,385
Net receipts	1,19,443	2,26,346	3,45,789

(42) In paras 8 and 15 (g) of the President's report the dates of the Govt. orders relating to the adjustment of famine expenditure and the distribution of avenue receipts among the District and Taluk funds have been wrongly quoted, as shown below:

G.O. 25-2-95, No. 293 L. for G.O. 15-2-95, No. $\frac{293}{L.\ Mis.}$

" 6.7.87, No. 1009 L. for G.O. 6.6.87, No. 1009 L.

(43) In para. 15 (c) the number of markets under the control of Local Boards during the year is given as 48, whereas according to Statement VI there were only 38.

(44) In para. 21 the total length of the roads in charge of the local boards at the beginning of the year is given as 2,041 7/8 miles instead of 2041 1/8 miles as in Statement IV-A.

(45) In para. 34 the strength of the Denkanikottai Lower Secondary School on the 31st March 1894 is given as 85, whereas according to Statements IX and XVIII for 1893-94 it was 83.

(46) The names of the several schools abolished or established during the year have

have not been given, with information as to whether the former were entirely abolished or converted into aided or unaided schools, and whether the latter were altogether new or had been previously aided.

(47) The contribution paid by the Tiruppattur Taluk Board for the municipal hospitals was Rs. 1133 and not Rs. 1132 as stated in para. 55.

(48) In the paragraph on Sanitation in the District Medical and Sanitary Officer's report, the number of villages in which conservancy establishments were maintained is given as 59 instead of 58, as in para. 51 of the President's report and in Statement XIV.

(49) In the paragraph on Vaccination in the Dt. Medical and Sanitary Officer's report, the percentage of successful cases to the total number of operations performed by L.F. vaccinators and by medical subordinates is given as 93.65 and 89.54 respectively instead of 90.3 and 84.6.

(2. The necessary corrections have been made with reference to clauses (1) to (4), (7), (12), (14), (15), (22), (25), (27), (29) to (32) and 40 of the preceding paragraph: the discrepancies noticed in clauses (6), (8), (11), (13), (17) to (21), (23), (28), (33) to (37), (41), (43) and (45) should be explained and the omissions referred to in clauses (24), (26) and (46) and the information required in clauses (9), (16) and (39) should be supplied as soon as possible.

× in G.O. 14-11-94, No 2344 L.

3. Notwithstanding the remarks in para 3 of the Govt. memorandum dated 5th Octr. 1894, No. 933, the statements submitted with the report have again been carelessly prepared. ~~This is not satisfactory.~~ The President is requested to see that greater attention is paid to this matter in future.

V.R.
8/8/95

prom

To
The President, District Board, Salem.

Desp^d 23/8/95

mistakes in figures (6), (8), (11), (13), (17) & (21),
(22), (28), (33) & (37), (41), (43) and (47) [illegible]
be explained and the necessary [illegible]
to the columns (24), (26) and (46) and the
[illegible] in columns (7), (14)
and (39) should be supplied [illegible]
[illegible]

3. [illegible] the remarks [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] the statements [illegible]
the report [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Points noticed in the Report on the Administration of Local funds in the Salem Dt in 1894-5 & its accompanying statements &c.

O.M. 1179 / 23.8.95

R / O.M.

3 D.S. sch. founded
one failed

[illegible] at Salem & Tirupattur

The details of alterations to be made in No XIV Statement of annual statements of Salem District for 1894-95.

Column No	Names of items	Figures already given	Correct figure	Remarks
12	Salem Taluk Board	992	991	
"	Namakkal "	353	352	
"	Tiruppattur "	138	139	
"	Total	1822	1821	
14	Hosur Taluk Board	396	397	
	Total	521	522	
15.	Salem Taluk Board	1092	1091	
"	Namakkal "	378	377	
"	Hosur "	735	736	
"	Tiruppattur "	188	189	
18	Kaverpatnam Union	502	503	
"	Hosur Taluk Board	6408	6409	
"	Total District	16,619	16,620	
22	Suramangalam	390	389	
"	Salem Taluk Board Total	1422	1421	
"	Sunkaridrug	345	346	
"	Namakkal Taluk Board Total	898	899.	

For President

12/10

12/10

1/3006 L/95

Ref **No.** Govt.

Salem District Board's Office,

Dated 10th October 1895.

Desp 14th October 95

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 3006 L

From

G. Stokes
~~G. MacWATTERS~~, Esq.,
President, District Board, Salem.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to Government memorandum dated 23rd August 1895 No 1179, I have the honor to state as follows:-

Enc = 1

1. Item No 6. The sum of Rs 5 entered as "Fishery in Unions," is included in the sum of Rs 137 referred to in Item No 5.

Remark (1)

2. Item No 8. The markets of Namakkal and Tiruchengodu, are, in accordance with the resolutions of the Namakkal Taluk Board, under the management

of

of the Union Panchayats of the respective places, and the receipts and expenditure of these markets, are in consequence shown in the accounts of the Union Fund and of the market fund. But the differences of Rs 126, and Rs 356 pointed out by Government are the amounts adjusted from the market fund, towards the expenditure incurred by the Taluk Board in repairing the roads leading respectively to the markets of Namakkal and Tiruchengodu and are shown only in statement No VI (Endowment Statement). The Treasury Deputy Collector Salem says that these amounts cannot be shown in the statement No II B (Union statement) as they

are

are transfer items deducted from the Balance of the markets concerned. If this view is correct, the whole of the transactions relating to these markets cannot be brought into the Union statement. But however to simplify the matter and at the same time to maintain correct balances both under Union and Endowment funds, I shall ask the President Taluk Board Namakkal to retransfer the management of these markets to the Taluk Board.

3. Item No 9. The cost of supervision and tools and plant is not brought into statement No II B. But the recurrence of this kind of mistake will be

avoided

furnished for 1894-95 are revised figures.

10. Item 19. The difference of Rs 8 pointed out by Government represents the excess collection of 1894-95.

11. Items nos 20 & 21. The Treasury deputy Collector Salem states that the figures now reported are correct.

12. Item 23. The figure contained in the report is correct.

13. Item 24. The particulars furnished by the Assistant Inspector of schools 8th Division with regard to the Carpentry class at Namakkal are as follows

No of Students on 31st March 1895 —	35
	Rs. a. p.
Government Grants —	48 - " - "
Expenditure —	144 - 14 - 11
Net cost of the school	96 - 14 - 11

14. Item 28. The revised figures are now submitted.

15. Item 33. The strength of the Tiruchengodu Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 was one exofficio and 8 nominated members.

16 Item 34. The numbers of official and non official members on the Tharamangalam Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 were 3 and 4 respectively.

furnished for 1894-95 are revised figures.

10. Item 19. The difference of Rs 8 pointed out by Government represents the excess collection of 1894-95.

11. Items Nos 20 & 21. The Treasury Deputy Collector Salem states that the figures now reported are correct.

12. Item 23. The figure contained in the report is correct.

13. Item 24. The particulars furnished by the Assistant Inspector of schools 8th Division with regard to the Carpentry class at Namakkal are as follows.

No of Students on 31st March 1895	35
	Rs. a. p.
Government Grants	48-–-–
expenditure	144-14-11
Net cost of the school	96-14-11

14. Item 28. The revised figures are now submitted.

15. Item 33. The strength of the Tiruchengodu Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 was one ex officio and 8 nominated members.

16 Item 34. The numbers of official and non official members on the Tharamangalam Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 were 3 and 4 respectively.

furnished for 1894-95 are revised figures.

10. Item 19. The difference of Rs 8 pointed out by Government represents the excess Collection of 1894-95.

11. Items Nos 20 & 21. The Treasury Deputy Collector Salem states that the figures now reported are correct.

12. Item 23. The figure Contained in the report is correct.

13. Item 24. The particulars furnished by the Assistant Inspector of schools 8th Division with regard to the Carpentry class at Namakkal are as follows.

No of students on 31st March 1895 ——	35
	Rs. a. p.
Government Grants ——	48 - " - "
expenditure ——	144 - 14 - 11
Net cost of the school	96 - 14 - 11

14. Item 28. The revised figures are now submitted.

15. Item 33. The strength of the Tiruchengodu Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 was one exofficio and 8 nominated members.

16 Item 34. The numbers of official and non official members on the Tharamangalam Union Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 were 3 and 4 Respectively.

17. Item 35. The numbers of exofficio and nominated members of the Union Panchayats of Kathingarpatt and Mohanur were 3 and 5, and 2 & 6 as shown in statement No XVI B.

18 Item 36. The numbers of exofficio and nominated members of the Rasipuram Panchayat were 6 and 8 respectively at the commencement of the year and there was no other official member on the Panchayat on the 31st March 1895.

19. Item 37. There was a vacancy on the Union Panchayat of Nunjai Edayar on the 31st March

1894 (vide report for 1893-94). The strength of the Panchayat on that date was 2 exofficio and 5 nominated non official members. The vacancy was filled up in 1894-95 and the strength of the Panchayat on the 31st March 1895 was therefore 2 exofficio and 6 nominated non official members.

20 Item 39. Sultan Khan Sahib referred to in this item was appointed to the seat vacated by the death of Pattikhan Sahib.

21. Item 41. The General Local fund Receipts appertaining to the Hosur Taluk Board were Rs 78,281 & not Rs 8828/95 given in the Statement.

22. Item 43. The markets for which

there

(in which no fees were levied) or which had no balance in their favour)?

there were no endowments were excluded from statement No VI as per statement of 1893-94.

23. Item 45. The strength of the Denkani-Cotta Lower Secondary school on the 31st March 1894 was 83.

24. Item 46. The schools opened during the year 1894-95 were those that were newly started and schools closed were those that were entirely closed.

25. Item 26. The information will be supplied as soon as it is received from the Sub Assistant Inspector of Girls' Schools.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

For President

11/10

Local and Municipal Department.

& Municipal ...NT No. 3006 L

MS

From

THE PRESIDENT,
DISTRICT BOARD,
SALEM.

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt.
Local & Municipal Dept.
Madras

~~Dated~~ Desp 14th October 1895
16 OCT. 95
Ref No. 142
Govt.
Enclosure 1

SUBJECT.

Submitting ~~replies to~~ the information &c. called for in the first memo. noticing certain points in the statements &c. submitted with the Administration Report of the Salem D.B. for 1894-5 ~~objections on the report for 1894-95~~

D.B.O. No. 13.
20-6-95—250.

---

[5]
1,000—17-11-93.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 3006 L of 1895, dated 14th Oct. '95 from the President, Dt. Board, Salem

Order. No. 2011 Luis. 22-10-95

Recorded with the following remarks:—

(1) Fishery rents collected in unions should have been included under "Miscellaneous Receipts" in column 5 of Statement II-B and not under "Fees" in column 4.

(2) There is no necessity for retransferring to the Taluk Board the management of the markets at Namakkal and Tiruchengodu, as proposed by the President in para. 2 of his letter. The total receipts from the markets, the amounts contributed therefrom to the Panchayats for their management under Sec. 142 of the Local Boards Act and the remaining balance should be included in the Taluk Board's accounts, while the receipt of this contribution and its expenditure should be shown in Statement II-B.

(3) In Statement I-A the receipts from slaughter-houses should be shown separately under "Market rents" and not included under "Fees and Fines."

(4) If the amount erroneously credited to land-cess be Rs. 5,284, as stated in para. 7 of the President's letter, then the collections

under this head according to Statement VII, would be Rs. 192332, but the amount shown in column 7 of Statement VII is Rs. 192900. This discrepancy should be explained.

(5) The difference of Rs. 8 referred to in para. 10 of the President's letter should have been explained by means of a foot-note in Statement VIII.

(6) The information regarding Girls' schools, promised in para. 25 of the President's letter, should be expedited.

V.R.
21/10/95

21.10.95

To
The President, District Board, Salem.

Despt 25/10/95

Explanation [illegible]
Salem [illegible]
Statements submitted [illegible]
Admn. Report for [illegible]

3006 L

N
[illegible]

2011 L

---

hen given for copying ______
hen copied ______
hen examined ______
Vhen signed ______ } 189 .

D AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

URRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

26/3/09

& M
8-8
[4]
5000—29-9-08.

DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer.

Press
Miscellaneous
Routine
No. 2011 L, dated 22/10/ ~~190~~ 95

Date taken out.	FOR WHAT PURPOSE.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
26/3/09	Lfm	846	L/09	N	14-4-09	Y.H.