

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 3268/M



From

The Chairman Delegate
Municipal Council,
Quinter.

No. 641

Order No 2121 received 17-12-96

The Chairman's query will
be answered in the affirmative.

V.R.
16/12/96

[Handwritten signature]

Dated 3rd December 1896

Received 7-12-96

Registered 7-12-96

Enclosures

Spare copies

Note. Please see the notes & orders in
Ep. No 864 14 27 21 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

SUBJECT.

orders
~~Soliciting the~~ ^{orders} ~~ratings of Government~~ ^{audits}
~~Engquiring whether a person~~
~~who has obtained 10 votes out of 19. may be~~
~~of votes would constitute "more than~~
~~considered to have a majority of votes~~
~~half" of 19 under rule 2 of the rules~~
for the election of Chairman.

To The Chairman, M.C. Quinter P.O.
That the Col. of Kistua
Depd 19/12/96

[Handwritten notes and signatures at bottom right]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 641

Municipal Office, Quatar
24th December 1896

To

From

3268M

From

A. P. Fernandez Begue,
Chairman Delegate,
Municipal Council,
Quatar.

To

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

Sir,

I have the honor to solicit your decision
on the following question:-

At a meeting of Municipal Councillors (with
a strength of 19 members on the Council) convened for
the purpose of electing a Chairman, one of the candidates
obtains 10 votes.

Can this candidate be considered to have been
duly elected under rule 2 of the election rules?

I raise this question as I am doubtful whether
for purposes of reckoning $\frac{1}{2}$ votes, in the light of
instructions conveyed in G.O. No 297 M dated 18th July 1886
10 is not half of 19, $\frac{1}{2}$, whether it is not necessary
to constitute "more than half" as required by the