21-7-10

[L. & M. / 10—4—4—97.]

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1691 M.

DATED 30-7-97

INDEXED. O.K.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Encroachments

Ordering with remarks that the instructions issued in G.O. No. 1744 M d/12-10-96, with regard to Coverings over drains in front of houses in the Madura Muny be carried out at once, and requesting the Chairman to report thro' the Collector the action taken in the matter of such encroachments without delay.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
[illegible]	3488 M/97						

Coverings over drains in [illegible] municipality

[5]
700—6-4-96.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 12th October 1896, No. 1744 M.

Current No 180 M of 1897, dated 14-1-97 from the Collector of Madura.

Current No. of 189 , dated from the

Misc Order. No. 1691 M. mis. d/ 30-7-97.

The Government agrees with the Collector in considering that the Chairman's proposal to defer action in regard to the existing encroachments (coverings over drains) until a drainage scheme for the town is sanctioned and to charge a rent on them in meantime, is inexpedient. The order passed in para 2 of G.O. No. 1744 dated 12th October 1896, should theref be carried out immediately, case [illegible] peculiar hardship such as those referred to by the Collector being dealt with specially, as suggested by him.

Flag E

2. The Municipal Council ha ample powers to proceed against th encroachments in question und sections 168 and 210 of the Dis Municipalities Act IV of 1884 a -ed by Act III of 1897, and His Ex

Note. This portion will probably have to be altered with reference to the [illegible] written [illegible]

[illegible]

~~the Governor in Council is of opinion that if things are properly worked the twelve years rule need not cause much trouble~~

2. In this connection, the Collector's attention is drawn to the decision of the Bombay High Court in Framji Cursetji vs. Goculdas Madhowji reported at page 338 of vol XVI. I.L.R. Bombay Series, in which it has been held that occupation which is ~~was~~ merely casual will not onstitute adverse possession. It s probable that here are several cases in which the coverings over ins and similar encroachments are of a flimsy character nd never really intended as indicating a claim to ownership-

2 ~~The District Magistrate~~ It is desirable ~~should see~~ that Magisterial cases ~~be placed~~ rising out of action taken for removal of Encroachments shd be placed ~~do not~~ before a more experienced tribunal than the Bench Magistrates. ~~[illegible] before the more experienced court of the Divisional Magistrate~~. The Dt. Magte. shd. therefore take steps to have such cases tried by a court of the grade of a Divisional Mgte. He hould also consider whether ses of recent encroachment hould not at once be prosecuted th reference to the orders of the Court in Criminal appeal

Hay G

This para has been newly added.

No. 424 of 1896, communicated with G.O. No. 160 Judicial, dated 4th February 1897.

~~3.~~ 4. The Chairman should report through the Collector by the 1st ~~September~~ October next, the action taken by him in pursuance of this Order.

(From Orders)

V.R
12/7/97

To
The Chairman M.C. Madura
(through the Collector
" District Magistrate of Madura
(through Judicial Department

Despd. 5/8/97

[L&M. 500—3-12-96.]

NOTE FOR THE SECRETARY.

With reference to para. 2 of the draft as it now stands, it is submitted that the words "lawfully made" were embodied in subsection (3) of Section 168 of Act IV of 1884 itself and were not newly inserted by ~~section~~ Act III of 1897. The only alteration made in section 168 by the amending Act III of 1897, is the omission of the words "before the coming into operation of this act", occurring in subsection (1). Please see also the portion marked with read chalk in the note flagged H.

V.R.
20/9/97

I see. The Adv. Gen. has already answered all the qns. we can put to him.

I suppose orders were sent to the Mily. on the main point. If not issue at once. I have been assuming that this has been done & that they

(Why is the paper not ruled the right way? Never use this in this Dept (A.)

Merely a side reference

G.K.

Orders have already been issued to the municipality on the main point. Vide G.O. No. 1691 M 30th July 1897 in the linked file. Orders are solicited as to whether it is necessary to issue the proposed reference to the Advocate-General.

P.R.
12/10/97

No necessity to raise any further questions. I misunderstood the position: I thought the words "lawfully made" were inserted in the new Act.

The A.G. has already given an opinion on all the pts that it is possible to raise

G.K. 14/10

Noted. 11/10/97

[L & M.]
150—20-6-97.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings :—

Coverings over drains — Madras City

Again G.O., No. dated 189 .

Again G.O., No. dated 189 .

Current No. of 189 , dated , from

" " " 189 , " , "

" " " 189 , " , "

Reference ~~ORDER.~~ No. 976 dt 16.9.97.

v. G. No. 863 M. 21.5.96 pages 8.49

D

In Government memorandum No. 1682, dated 25th November 1895, the following questions were referred to the Advocate General for his opinion

(1) whether the occupiers of encroachments of longer standing than twelve years on public streets and roads in municipalities can be evicted by the municipal Councils

(2) whether section 168 of Act IV of 1884 can override the Limitation Act with reference to encroachments made before the passing of that Act and [illegible]

(3) whether ~~they~~ such encroachments can be removed by proceeding under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

These questions were answered by the Advocate Gen in the negative.

2. ~~On a further consideration~~ ~~of the provisions of~~ Under section 168 of Act IV of 1884, as recently amended by Act III of 1897, ~~however, it seems to Government that~~ the words "lawfully made" ~~occurring~~ have been inserted in clause (3) ~~implying~~ ~~and the question~~ arises whether ~~the~~ application implies that, in order to entitle ~~the~~ present owner to ~~any~~ compensation, an encroachment must have been lawful ~~at the beginning, and~~ in its inception or origin; ~~that~~ if it was not then lawful no compensation ~~can~~ being now ~~be~~ claimable on the ground that the owner had subsequently obtained a prescriptive right to it.

3. Numerous cases have been brought to notice in which drains on the sides of public roads and streets have been covered over without permission or authority y private individuals, ~~and~~ the owners of the~~se~~ structures pleading tat they have acquired a prescriptive right to them. It seems Government that the municipal council can proceed to therwise improve" these drains nder clause (4) of section 210 of e Act by removing the coverings them without paying any compensation to the owners of such coverings.

4. The Advocate General is requested to give his opinion on these points. His attention is at the same time invited (From orders) to I L R XVI Bo page 338.

V.R.
7/9/97

H.H. Insert the No. case wh. has once a twice been decide

To
The Advocate General.

Encroachments on Public Street in Municipalities

[L. & M. 100—8-8-96.]

H

NOTE FOR THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY.

In his note on C. No. 180 M of 1897 date 2nd June 1897, the Honorable Member observes as follows:—

"I am of opinion that if thing "are properly worked, the twelve years' "rule need not cause much trouble "Under Sec. 168, the Municipal Council "may remove all obstructions subject t "the liability to pay compensation, if the "have been lawfully made. The Municipa "Council would of course refuse to pay "any compensation, unless it knew that "the obstruction had been lawfully ma "(N.B. The Section does not speak of the "obstruction being now lawful, which "would bring in the twelve years' rule, "but refers back to its origin as having "been lawful."

From the above, it appears that the Honorable Member is of opinion that all encroachments, whatever may b the period during which they have been in existence, can be removed by the Municipal Council under Section 168 of Act IV of 1884, as amended Act III of 1897, or, in other words, that the provisions of Sec. 168 practically

override

override the ordinary law of limitation and prescription. The same question was raised, in connection with the encroachments in Conjeeveram, by the Sub-Collector of Chingleput, who, while drawing the attention of Government to the provisions of Sec. 168 of Act IV of 1884, ~~stated~~ × as follows:-

× Vide para 7 of his letter G.O. 863 R / 21-5-96 (D) p.6

"I presume, all encroachments made "prior to the Act must be considered to have "been unlawfully made, unless the "occupiers can produce permission granted by a competent authority to occupy "the land in the first instance. Usually "the only title to be relied upon, if any "documentary evidence is forthcoming, is "a sale-deed from some other person; but "of course no vendor can transfer a better "title than he possesses himself. I am "not confident, but I feel fairly certain, "that civil courts ignore this Section in "favor of the Limitation Act. Can this "Section override the Limitation Act? If "so, there is no limitation at all, not "even 60 years".

The Advocate-General who was asked to state whether the provisions of Sec. 168 of Act IV of 1884 can override the Limitation Act, with reference to encroachments made before the passing of Act IV of 1884, opined, that, the Section "cannot override the Limitation Act" - Vide G.O. No. 863 R, dated 21st May 1896.

Vide cl.(3) of para 30 of R. Rd. Advocate Genl. (p.19) D 1682 / 25-11-95

Vide para 4 of his opinion printed page 4 of G.O. 863 R / 21-5-96 D

It will thus be seen that the question now raised by the Honorable Member has already been considered and disposed of by the Advocate-General's opinion. Orders are therefore solicited as to whether any further reference to the Advocate-General is now necessary on this point.

V.R.
12/7/97

I don't think there is much doubt about it, but as the Hble M. has raised the qn. draft a reference to the Adv. Gen. (~~Adee made~~) under the Section as amended by the Act of 1897. Meantime the draft to the Colln ~~[illegible]~~ of Madura may be issued as revised; & if necessary separate instructions that all encroachments on a public street (drains are part of the street) are *ipso facto* illegal & punishable as nuisances, whether or not proved to inconvenience the public or any person — Indeed, there are two such decisions — I ordered in the J. D. that they should be printed & circulated & I believe that they were —

Again, under S. 210 (4) the M.C. may alter and "otherwise improve" all drains — In this case they can proceed to "otherwise improve" them by opening them out, & if they do so under this Section no compensation is payable.

I think then, that the M.C. has ample powers to proceed & shd. do so — cautiously, as the Collr. says. The Chairman must of course be backed by the D.M. who should see that Magt. cases arising out of action taken for the removal of encroachments don't go to the Bench Magtes, but to the Dist. Magte, and who should consider whether cases of recent encroachment shd. not at once be prosecuted with refce. to the recent orders of the H.C. above referred to.

If there is any doubt on any of these points a refce. might be made to the Adv. Genl. — The case now put in

The ordinary law operates

a different way from the Conjeeveram case, which it may be advisable to reopen in the light of the further consideration now given to the matter.

B.A.
2/6/97

provide the [illegible] limitation

arise where inconvenience would be felt from the want of power to remove an obstruction which had previously been sanctioned. Subsection (3) affords sufficient protection to those who have encroached with permission and will prevent any misuse of the enlarged powers which we now propose to grant. We have therefore omitted the words "before the coming into operation of this Act". This ~~is~~ appears to be the only additional power in regard to encroachments which the new Act gives to the Municipal Council and it will be seen that while the amended Act empowers the Council to deal with all recent encroachments or with such of the old encroachments as have been lawfully made, it does not provide for cases falling under the latter class in which the first entry was unlawfully made, but in respect of which the plea of adverse possession is now set up.

It does not appear that the position will be materially improved by postponing action until a drainage scheme is sanctioned. The Council cannot then, as now, deal with cases of more than 12 years standing in respect of which adverse possession is claimed, and if the scheme provides for the alteration or reconstruction of the existing drains, the Council will have to

acquire all these ~~structures~~ encroachments under the Land Acquisition Act.

[The paper was received in the office on the 16th January and owing to the great press of work connected with budgets and the plague, to which unusual preference had to be given, over all other work of an ordinary nature, it was not possible to send it up to the Secretary before the 5th March. The file was returned to the office by the Secretary on the 9th April, asking for a Bombay decision referred to in a Conjeeveram paper which was not available until the 21st on which date it was returned to the Secretary.]

V.R.
28/5/97

Several heavy cases which were not urgent were left over for Ooty owing to the pressure at the end of the financial year

H.M.

On the whole it seems inadvisable to defer matters longer. It is much gained to get rid of such encroachments as it may be practicable to remove &

will be fewer cases remaining to deal with by way of compensation where realignment is necessary

S. K. 1/5/97

Coverings over drains — Madura Municipality.—

Read again G.O. No. 1744 M / 12-10-96.

C. No. 180 M. of 1897.

For Orders.

× flag. A.

I am not sure that the Chairman is not right & that it ~~is~~ ~~not~~ will not be a mistake to remove now a few only (those of recent date) of the almost universal encroachments which have covered up the drains in Madura. What powers does the new Act give in such matters? and what will the position be under it when the drainage of the place is taken up?

HS
18/5/97

Why has there been 4 mths delay in sending this paper up?
HS

On the 11th August 1896, the Municipal Council of Madura× passed a resolution to the effect that the covering over of drains in front of houses and bazaars to a maximum length of seven feet should be permitted free, and that all structures over drains which exceed this length should be charged at the rate of two Rupees for every 50 square feet in the case of approaches to dwelling houses and at four Rupees for every 50 square feet in the case bazaars.

2. The Government, however, in its order read above, cancelled this resolution of the Council under Section 36(1) of the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, observing that the maximum ~~[illegible]~~ length of drains allowed to be covered over should not exceed four feet, and directed the Municipal Council to take immediate steps to deal with cases in excess of this limit as encroachments under Section 167 or 168 of the Act, unless the structures were of the open pattern prescribed* by the Sanitary Commissioner in his letter printed in G.O. No. 1341 M., dated 27th September 1894.

× flag. B.

3. The Chairman has not as yet placed this order of Government before the Municipal Council to give effect to the instructions contained therein, but has come up to Government asking practically for its reconsideration. He says that more than one half of the structures in question have been in existence for more than twelve years and that the Council is consequently barred from taking action in respect to them. As regards encroachments of recent dates also, he fears that any attempt to enforce their removal would cause universal discontent, that the persons interested would join in a common

cause and let in evidences, of adverse possession for more than twelve years, by the free use of money or other influences, and that the Council will have to fight single handed against these tremendous odds, with doubtful results. He further states that when a similar attempt was made in 1881, the bazaars were closed, a riot was apprehended and the matter had to be dropped by the authorities. Having regard to these circumstances, the Chairman suggests that until the drainage scheme is sanctioned, the existing encroachments may be allowed to stand subject to the imposition of such a rate of

Note
No papers are traceable in the office on this point.

of tax as the Government thinks fit, as has been done in the Conjeeveram Municipality. Vide G.O. No 863 M., dated 21st May 1896.

Flag D

4. The Collector, however, does not agree with the Chairman, but is of opinion that the removal of the coverings over drains of less than twelve years' standing must be insisted upon in "all really objectionable cases", but he states that the matter should be worked with discretion and that where it would be hard to compel the removal of a solid structure on the ground that it exceeds the prescribed limit by a foot or two, the Chairman m be permitted to levy a

heavy rent.

As in the case of the Conjeeveram Municipality, nothing can be done to remove the encroachments which have been in existence for more than twelve years, but on those made within this period, a rent can be levied by the Council under Section 268 of the Act. The question now for consideration is whether the Chairman's suggestion to levy a rent on all the existing encroachments, pending the sanction of a drainage scheme should be accepted. The Council was anxious to have a drainage scheme drawn up by the Sanitary Engineer, but the Government in its order ×No. 1370 M., dated 15th August

Put up the Bombay case referred to in the Conjeeveram file lately. J.H.

× Flag. C.

1896 said that it was "not prepared at present to direct the Sanitary Engineer to prepare plans and estimates". The preparation and adoption of a drainage scheme for Madura may probably take some years and it is therefore a question whether the structures which are condemned by the Sanitary Commissioner should be allowed to stand until that time.

As regards the Collector's proposal that removal should be insisted upon "in all really objectionable cases", it is submitted that it is not an easy matter to draw the line of demarcation and that the decision of the question cannot be entrusted to the Chairman

According to the Sanitary Commissioner, all structures which exceed 4 feet in length and are not of the open pattern are objectionable on Sanitary Grounds.

P.R.
5/3/97

Put up the Bombay case referred to lately in a Congeveram file - as to cases in which an encroachment is made but not as of right.

S.P.B. 6/4/97

Please see I. L. R. XVI. Bombay page 338.

P.R.
21/4/97

H.O.

It seems no use deferring the matter longer until a drainage scheme is drawn up & sanctioned. The Govt. may affirm with the Collector: the previous order of Octr. 1896 being carried out & ~~special~~ case of hardship such as he refers to being dealt with specially.

With regard to the 12 Year rule the Mas's attention ma be called to the Bombay case at p 338 of Vol XVI I.L.R. Bo. series. There ar probably several cases in which the coverings may be merely of a flimsy charact ~~but~~ never really intended as indicating a claim to ownership.

S.P.B. 14/5/97

23
1 4
127

L. & M.

Local and Municipal ~~Revenue~~ (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 180 M

Order

From The Collector of Madura

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
16. JAN. 1897
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

N°. Dis **No.** 5757/Genl of 96.

Dated 14th January 1897
Received 16-I-97
Registered 16-I-97
Enclosures 10 encls sent to Chair
Spare copies Vide po 2076M/22.9.97

SUBJECT

Submitting with remarks letter from the Chairman Municipal Council Mad No. 59 dated 23d December 1896, submitting copies of correspondence relating to covering etc over drains and soliciting instruc regarding the same.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
fo	1744	Mun	12-10-96
fo	1591	L	18-7-96
fo	1370	L	15-8-96
fo	863	L	21-5-96
fo	507	Mul	21-3-96
fo	261	L	12-2-96
fo	1370	Mun	19-8-95
fo	1341	L	27-9-96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

L. & M.

1896.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 5757/Genl of 1896
Date 26-12-96

FROM THE CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, Da
MADURA.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
25 DEC. 1896
MADURA

No.

ENCLOSURE. 8 Ten - Returned vide Cur 3215/97

Dated 23rd } December 1896.
Received }

No. 59

SUBJECT.

Submitting Copies of Correspondence relating to Coverings &c. over drains and Soliciting instructions regarding the Same.

L. Dis. No 5757/Genl of 1896 dated 14th January 1897 (10)

Submitted.

The Chairman's reasons for wishing to charge rent for, instead of removing encroachments of less than 12 years standing do not appear to be sound. At the same time the matter should be worked with discretion. The four foot limit has only now been fixed, and it would be harsh to insist on the removal of a solid structure because it exceeded by a foot or two the recently prescribed width. In such cases the Chairman might be permitted to levy a heavy rent at so much a running foot. In all really objectionable cases removal should be insisted upon. The Chairman should deal with cases himself after personal inspection.

Madura Collector's office }
14th January 1897 }

Collector

83/C18

DESPATCHED
14 JAN. 97

Confidential.

Municipal Office,

No. 59.

MADURA 23rd December 1896.

ENCLOSURES 19

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 180 M

From,

R. Fischer Esquire,

Chairman,

Municipal Council,

Madura.

To,

The Secretary to Government,

Local and Municipal Department,

Fort St. George,

Madras.

Sir,

Thro: The Collector of Madura.

Referring to G.O. No: 1774 M. Mis: dated 12th Octobe 1896, cancelling the resolution of the Municipal Counci No. 230 dated 11th August 1896, and directing it to take steps to deal with cases in excess of the limit therein prescribed as encroachments, I have the honour to request, before placing the Government Order in questio before the Council for formal Sanction, to issue noti to the parties concerned and before taking any acti under the Municipal Act, to be favoured with Specific instructions for my guidance in the matter which seems to be beset with some difficulties.

+ 1744?

2. I am quite prepared to carry out the peren -tory orders of Government, seeing that they relate to a

important subject, i.e., the preservation of public drains and streets from encroachments, past or future. There is no doubt that there are numerous structures all over the town, either in the shape of slab stones, platforms, or coverings whereby perflation of air, action of the sun, the flushing of the drains, and removal of silt from them as often as is necessary is prevented; and it is also beyond doubt that a major portion or at least more than half of them is unauthorized, but they have been in existence for *more than twelve years*. The decision of the High Court in the Municipal Commissioners for the City of Madras *versus* Parangapani Mudali has set at rest all doubts on the question of limitation applicable to such cases. It is further clear from the papers read in the G.O. no. 863 M, dated 21st May 1896, that a Municipality is powerless to effect the removal of encroachments of older dates than twelve years, by process of law. That being so, there is no other course open to the Council than to leave the long standing encroachments untouched, in order to save loss, viz., the cost of litigation that is likely to ensue.

3. There remain then encroachments of recent creation, i.e., within the last twelve years.

Th

These, of course, can be removed with some trouble; but such a partial and one-sided procedure is likely to cause universal discontent. Even in these cases, the Municipality will have to be prepared to face an organized opposition on the part of the persons interested and who, as workers in a common cause, will, by the free use of money and other influences, endeavour to let in evidence of adverse possession for more than the statutory period of *twelve* years, whilst the Council will have to fight single handed against these tremendous odds. As matters now stand, prosecutions for violation of Municipal laws, and encroachments of recent dates fail before the Bench of Magistrates wherein the accused are wealthy and influential; and the Municipal administration is thereby very much weakened. Even in ordinary cases where convictions follow, the punishments are generally very lenient.

4. In this connection, I would bring to the notice of Government, that so far back as 1881, when an attempt was made by Mr. H. J. Stokes, the then Collector and President of this Municipality, and Mr. V. Doraisawmi Iyer, the then Deputy Collector and Vice President (both of

of whom were also Magistrates) to remove the coverings over drains in the East Masi or bazaar Street, a general discontent ensued, all the bazaars were closed and a riot was apprehended and the authorities had to let the matter drop.

Papers? not reported to Govt. No paper can be traced in 1880 to 1888.

5. In view to avoid these complications and difficulties, and in order to enforce by a side-wind, the time-barred claims of the Municipality to the sites on which the encroachments have been run up, the resolution No: 102 dated 16th March 1895 was passed which formed the foundation for several subsequent resolutions. (Copies enclosed.)

6. When the drainage scheme is sanctioned (and it must be done sooner or later in the interests of this large and populous city) all encroachments will have to be removed as a matter of necessity; and the encroachers themselves will see their way to removing them of their own accord.

7. Till then, I think the existing encroachments may be allowed to stand as they are, subject however to the imposition of such a rate of tax per annum as the Government thinks fit, as has been done in the Conjeevaram Municipality — vide G.O no. 863 M dated 21st May 1896.

8. I hope the Government will excuse the liberty I have taken in bringing this matter again for its consideration.

Papers relating to this subject are forwarded herewith, as per list enclosed, for the information of Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Chairman

L. & M.

List of Enclosures.

1. Proposal of Councillors Messrs. M. Subba Nayadu, Saiyid Mahomed Ebrahim Sahib and Muthusawmi Pillai dated 2nd March 1896 and the resolution of the Municipal Council no: 102 dated 16th March '96 passed thereon

2. Letter from the Chairman Municipal Council Madura to the Chief Secretary to Government Madras No. 34 dated 14th June 1895 forwarding copy of resolution of the Municipal Council No. 102 dated 16th March 1895.

3. Copy of G. O no: 1370 M mis: dated 19th August 1895.

4. Proposal of Messrs. Sriraman Chettiar and Ananthakrishna Naidu dated 18th March 1896.

5. Copy of resolution no: 323 dated 2nd November 1895 of the Municipal Council passed on G.O no: 1370 M. mis: dated 19th August 1896.

6. Proposal of the Chairman dated 12th November 1895 and the resolution of the Municipal Council no: 24 dated 21st January 1896 passed thereon.

7. ~~Copy~~ proposal of Messrs. P.R. Venkatesalu Nayadu and Saiyid Mahomed Ibrahim Sahib dated 23rd January 1896 and the resolution of the Municipal Council no: 121 dated 2nd May 1896 pas

8. Proposal of the Chairman-Delegate dated 24th July 1896 and the resolution of the Municipal Council No. 230 dated 11th August 1896 passed thereon.

9. Letter from the Chairman, Municipal Council to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras No. 41 dated 17th August 1896 forwarding copy of resolution of the Municipal Council No. 230 dated 11th August 1896.

Municipal Office
Madura, 20th December 1896}

Chairman

L. & M.

When given for copying ______
When copied 4/8/97
When examined ______
When signed 14/8/97
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189

CUMENT No.

CLOSURES TO C. No.

DER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

TTER OF GOVERNMENT

MENT WITH DITTO

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

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