

Govt of Indt St George
Legre Dept

No. 21 Papers

Relative to

A Bill further to amend the Madras
Rent Recovery Act VIII of 1865.

(Communicated to the Select Committee)

Legislative (1897) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 20

DATED 2. 3. 97

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Bill further to amend the Madras Rent Recovery Act VIII of 1865

Communicating to the Select Committee on the
_____, Copy of letter from the Govt of India, Legislative
Dept, containing certain suggestions with reference
to the provisions of the Bill.

Go S No. 19 Legre D 26 February 1897.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government { 1897 } of Madras. LEGISLATIVE.

Recd.

Enclosures

Regd.

} 1897.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 20, 2nd March 1897.

MARCH.

Bill further to amend the Madras Rent Recovery Act VIII of 1865.

Communicating to the Select Committee on the —, copy of letter from the Government of India, Legislative Department, containing certain suggestions with reference to the provisions of the Bill.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. M. MACPHERSON, Esq., Secretary to the Government of India, Legislative Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Legislative Department, dated Calcutta, the 20th February 1897, No. 375.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement, No. 112, dated the 19th December last, with which was forwarded a copy of your Government's despatch to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India intimating the intention of the Hon'ble V. Bhashyam Aiyangar to introduce into the Madras Council a Bill to amend Madras Act No. VIII of 1865 regarding the recovery of rent.

2. In reply, I am in the first place to remark that, the period of two months prescribed in the second clause of paragraph 1 of the letter from the Home Department, No. 1130, dated the 7th July 1875, having expired, and no reply to the despatch in question having been received, it may be assumed that the Secretary of State has no intention of interfering with the measure at its present stage. I am, however, at the same time to communicate the following observations on the contents of the measure.

3. Clause 4 of the draft provides for the postponement, till the beginning of another agricultural year, of the operation, *as against the landlord*, of a transfer made without the landlord's consent. If this provision, the language of which is somewhat involved, were so drawn as to prevent such a transfer from taking effect at all till the time mentioned, then the Government of India would have no objection to it, it being in some of the other provinces of India already the law that a transfer of agricultural occupancy can be effected only at the end of the agricultural year. But as the clause stands it will, in the opinion of the Governor-General in Council, entail considerable hardship on the transferor—hardship which will be all the more pronounced and the less justifiable when the transfer is a compulsory one, while it will put the landlord in a much stronger position than he is reasonably entitled to. It might be argued that the presence of the limiting words "against the landlord" shows that the transfer will be postponed only in so far as it prejudicially affects that person, the result being that he will lose none of his rights, but will be able, until another revenue year has begun, to proceed against the transferor as well as against his new tenant *de facto*, the transferee. To this the Governor-General in Council would be constrained to take exception; and, even if the words in question could be construed as postponing the operation of the transfer in so far as the landlord is concerned, the provision would be one of which the Government of India could not approve. The most that should be secured to the landlord is that no transfer made behind his back shall in any way interfere with his remedy against the only person from whom he is equitably entitled to a remedy, namely, his new tenant; and for this the second paragraph of the clause is apparently intended to provide. To continue to him his remedy against the transferor would appear to be unnecessary and, in the case of a forced transfer in execution of a decree, to be even unjust. The Government of India do not admit the claim of the private landlord to occupy the same position in regard to rent as is assigned to the State in respect of revenue by Madras Regulation XXVI of 1802; for the right of the Government as collector of the public revenue to exceptional powers and privileges is recognized by the law of every province in India;

and the Regulation cited furnishes one of the means by which the maintenance of registers of public utility is secured. In these circumstances, I am to commend the whole clause to the careful consideration of the Government of Madras, and I am further to add the suggestion that it might, perhaps, with advantage be enacted that the notice referred to in it should be served by means of a registered letter, such service being proved, as in the case of proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (see section 45), by the production of the addressee's receipt.

4. Clause 5 purports to amend the first paragraph only of section 69 of the Act and omits to propose any corresponding amendment of the proviso and the remaining paragraph. This is a detail which will doubtless not escape notice during the progress of the measure through Council.

5. As regards clause 6 of the Bill, I am to suggest that it would be more correct to follow the language of section 470 of the Code of Civil Procedure and to speak of public officers in this connection as "being in possession of estates in which their interest is that of mere stakeholders".

ORDER—No. 20, Legislative, dated 2nd March 1897.

The letter from the Government of India, Legislative Department, No. 375, dated 20th February 1897, will be communicated to the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend Madras Act VIII of 1865.

(True Extract.)

G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Hon'ble V. Bhashyam Aiyangar, C.I.E., Diwan Bahadur,
in charge of the Bill.

MADRAS RECORDS OFFICE

CURRENT No.

From

The Legislative Dept

7th Order

Legislative Dept

I see no objection to communicating
the letter of the Govt of India to the
Select Committee on the Bill.

No.

Dated _____

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

Order No. 20 Legislative dated 2nd March 1897

The letter from the Govt of
India by Dep^t no 375
d 20th Feb 1897 will be
communicated to the
Select Com^{ee} on the Bel
tained and had Act^{ed} 1888
1865 JH

SUBJECT.

Re Bill to amend the Madras
Rent Recovery Act VIII of 1865

To the Hon. Sharkey as Secy. D.
in charge of the Bill,

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

A BILL

FURTHER TO

Amend Madras Act No. VIII of 1865.

WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend Madras Act No. VIII of 1865, it is enacted as follows:—

1. In section 7, for the words "no suit brought and no legal proceedings taken", there shall be substituted the words "no suit or legal proceedings brought or taken under this Act". 5

And in the same section, after the words "to dispense with pattahs and muchilikas" the words "or either of them" shall be added. 10

2. In section 10, after the words "directing the defendant", the words "to accept the pattah and" shall be omitted. 15

In the same section, for the words "ought to be offered", the words "ought to have been offered" shall be substituted. 20

After the words "ordering the defendant" the words "to accept such pattah and" shall be omitted;

And for the words "in accordance with it" immediately preceding the words "If within ten days", there shall be substituted the words "in accordance with such pattah". 25

The last paragraph of the section beginning with the words "If within ten days" and ending with the words "for ejecting the defendant" is hereby repealed. 30

3. In section 12, for the words "section ten or" the word "section" shall be substituted. 35

4. The following shall be inserted after section 48, namely—"48-A. Whenever the holding of a tenant or any portion thereof is transferred by sale or gift on a day other than the day on which a Revenue year commences, or is sold in execution of a decree or order of a Civil Court

passed against him, such transfer shall not in the absence of the landlord's consent to the contrary signified by him in writing take effect as against the landlord before the commencement of the Revenue year immediately following that in which such transfer takes place. And such transfer shall have no operation against the landlord unless and until notice of the transfer is given to him by the transferor and transferee in writing, or by the production of a certified copy of a decree or order of Court establishing such transfer and in cases in which the sale takes place in execution of a decree or order of a Civil Court, by the production of the certificate of sale issued by such Court or a certified copy thereof.

And all proceedings commenced or had against the tenant under this Act prior to the giving of such notice or the production of such copy of decree or order or certificate of sale, shall be as valid and effectual against the transferee, as if they were commenced or had against himself.

Provided that when such notice is given on a day other than that on which a Revenue year commences such notice shall be deemed to have been given only on the day on which the Revenue year immediately following that in which notice is given commences."

5. In section 69 after words "passed by a Collector under this Act", the following shall be added namely "and from all orders passed by him under section 58, refusing to set aside a judgment passed ex-parte against a defendant or to revive a suit in which judgment has been passed against a plaintiff by default for non-appearance".

6. In section 85, between the words "public officers" and the words "holding lands in attachment" the words "being in possession of estates as stakeholders or" shall be inserted.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

The operation of section 7 of the Madras Rent Recovery Act, as construed by a Full Bench of the High Court of Madras (7, M. H. Reports, p. 312, Holloway J. dissenting) has been very prejudicial to landholders by depriving them in many instances of the rents justly and admittedly due to them by their tenants in cases in which the pattahs tendered by them were open to some objections, however trivial and insignificant they may have been. The tenant, when the pattah is tendered to and refused by him, is not bound to state his objections to it, nor even in cases in which he may choose to state the same can be restricted to them alone when the propriety of the pattah presents itself for adjudication either in proceedings under the Act or in suits in Civil Courts. In the great majority of such cases, however *bona fide* and substantially correct the pattah may be, a pleader will find no difficulty in detecting in the pattah that was tendered some flaw or defect which has escaped the notice of the tenant or which would not strike him, although the substantial objections which the tenant himself takes may be untenable. In some cases the rent or cess charged in the pattah may be slightly in excess of what is actually chargeable if a correct calculation is made. Yet in all the above cases the pattah being one which legally the

* I.L.R. 12, Mad., p. 467.

tenant was not bound to accept, the result as held by the High Court in several cases has been that the distraint or a civil suit for rent is not maintainable even to the extent of the rent justly found payable, and the whole rent is forfeited. It may be a question, which the Council will have to consider when the expected Tenancy Bill is introduced, whether the stringent and compulsory provisions as to the exchange of pattahs and muchilikas should not be altogether dispensed with as has been done in Bengal. But in the meanwhile, there can be no real hardship in subjecting the exercise of summary powers conferred upon landholders for realizing the arrears of rent due to them to the stringent provisions of section 7, provided the ordinary remedy for the recovery of such arrears by a civil suit is unaffected by such provisions.

It is, therefore, proposed to amend section 7 by restricting its operation in accordance with the view taken by Justice Holloway in his dissenting judgment to suits brought and proceedings taken under the Rent Recovery Act.

The landholders of course will, as a general rule, desire to have the summary powers of distraint and attachment in addition to the ordinary remedy of recovering arrears of rent by a civil suit. There can, therefore, be no ground for apprehending that the practice of exchanging pattahs and muchilikas will be discontinued by reason of the proposed amendment. Nor is such amendment in any way calculated to prejudice the tenant; for when a civil suit is brought against him by the landlord for recovery of arrears of rent without having exchanged pattahs and muchilikas or without having tendered a pattah or such a pattah as the tenant was bound to accept, the Civil Court, which has, under section 87 of the Act, to follow the rules prescribed by section 11 for fixing the rates of rent, will determine the amount of rent justly due by the tenant. No doubt it is open to a landlord, when the tenant refuses to accept a pattah tendered by him, to bring a summary suit under section 9 of the Act to enforce the acceptance of the pattah, and if the pattah tendered is not a proper one it is provided that in such a suit the Revenue Court shall determine what the terms of the pattah ought to be and direct the tenant to accept the amended pattah and execute a muchilika in accordance with it. Such a suit has to be brought within two months from the date of tender. And section 72 provides that a judgment passed against the tenant in such a suit shall be of the same force and effect as a muchilika executed by him. If this procedure were adopted by the landlord in every case in which a tenant refuses to accept the pattah tendered, he can have the pattah amended if necessary, and, subject to the law of limitation, he may not forfeit his rents and may realize the same either by summary process or by a civil suit. But in many cases, before the summary suit is decided on appeal or second appeal, the period of three years prescribed for recovery of rent under Article 110, Schedule II, Limitation Act, expires, and it has been held by the High Court of Madras in several cases recently (*vide* I.L.R. 19, Mad., p. 21) that a suit for arrears of rent based upon such judgment is barred by limitation if brought more than three years after the arrears accrued due, notwithstanding that such suit was brought soon after the passing of the final judgment. Again, during the pendency in the Revenue Court and in the Appellate Civil Courts of such summary suits which in most cases are brought only after the expiration of the fasli to which the pattah tendered relates, several subsequent faslis expire, and the landlord is obliged to go through the form of tendering pattahs for each one of such faslis. The pattahs so tendered by him may be strictly in accordance with the judgment of the Revenue Court or of the lower Appellate Court (as the case may be) which was in force at the time of the tender of such pattahs, and yet he may forfeit the whole of the rents due for such faslis if the judgment in accordance with which he

tendered the patta for such subsequent fasli should eventually be modified on appeal or second appeal on a point, however small or insignificant it may be. Instances are not uncommon in which the so-called summary suits for exchange of patta and muchilikas brought against numerous tenants take upwards of three years to run their course through the various Courts.

Again, it often happens in cases of disputed succession to proprietary estates that one of the claimants gets into possession and is eventually evicted by decree of Court in favour of the rival claimant. The patta and muchilikas which may have been exchanged between the rival and the tenants or the patta which may have been tendered by him during the years he remained in possession cannot be availed of by the successful claimant as he does not derive his title from the wrongful holder. The result in such cases has been that the successful claimant can only realize from such wrongful holder on account of mesne profits such rents as he may have actually collected, and has to forego the arrears of rent due by tenants, unless he himself had also been tendering patta during the period he was kept out of possession—a course which, especially in large estates, is manifestly impracticable.

The proposed amendment will enable landlords in such and other similar cases to recover the rents justly due to them by means of a civil suit, and the tenant, while fully at liberty to raise all the contentions open to him as to the rates of rent and other terms of the tenancy, will be precluded from defrauding the landlord of his just dues by reason that no patta was tendered or that the patta tendered was objectionable or defective in one or more respects.

A minor amendment which is proposed to be made in section 7 is to make it clear that by agreement of parties not only both patta and muchilikas, but either of them, may be dispensed with.

Section 10 of the existing Act provides that in the case of a tenant who is directed by the judgment in a summary suit to accept the patta which had been tendered by the landlord or a patta as amended in accordance with such judgment, the tenant shall, on application made by the landlord, be ejected from his holding if within ten days from the date of such judgment he shall not have accepted the patta as approved or amended as aforesaid and shall not have executed a muchilika in the terms of such patta.

This is an extremely penal provision altogether uncalled for in these times and opposed to principles of modern legislation. It is peculiarly obnoxious in that it becomes the interest of the landlord that the tenant should not accept the patta and execute the muchilika as directed by the judgment. It affords a great temptation to the landlord to evade an honest tender by him at the right time and place of the patta or amended patta as the case may be. The time fixed is very short and there are no provisions as to the mode of tender of the patta or of the muchilika, or as to submitting the amended patta for the approval of the Collector after giving opportunity to the tenant to show that the amended patta is not in accordance with the judgment. This penal provision gives great facilities to powerful landlords to get rid of tenants having right of occupancy. In the converse case of judgment being given against a landlord under section 8 directing him to grant a proper patta to a tenant, there is no penalty of any kind prescribed for the landlord's failure to grant the patta. But section 71 provides that in default of the landlord granting the patta the Collector may grant a patta under his hand and seal—a procedure performance of a contract of sale, &c.

The corresponding provision in the Rent Recovery Act in regard to a tenant failing to accept a patta and execute a muchilika in accordance therewith is contained in section 72, which prescribes that the judgment itself shall be of the same force and effect as a muchilika executed by the tenant. This provision seems sufficient to meet the ends of justice, and there is no reason why the tenant should be visited with the extreme penalty of being ejected from his holding.

The Bill, therefore, amends sections 10 and 12 so as to give effect to this view.

Under the existing Act there is no provision made for giving notice to the landlord of transfer of holdings, though such transfer may be valid and binding upon the landlord either by reason of express contract or by the usage of the country (*vide* section 38). If the landlord, therefore, in ignorance of such a transfer, exchanges patta and muchilikas with the transferor or tenders a patta to him or takes proceedings against him for the realization of arrears of rent and brings to sale his interest in the holding under sections 38 and 39 of the Act, the transferee is not bound by such patta and muchilika or by such proceedings or sale. The whole proceedings amount to a nullity because the transferor ceases to be a tenant from the date of the transfer and the transferee becomes a tenant from such date (*vide* definition of "tenant" in section 1 of the Act).

Landholders are often put to serious inconvenience and loss by the absence of any provision corresponding to section 3, Regulation XXVI of 1802, which declares, in the case of lands paying revenue to Government, that all private transfers not registered in the Collector's register shall be null and void as against Government. In cases in which the transfer takes place after the commencement of a fasli, it will be very inconvenient to compel the landlord to recognize such transfer before the commencement of the next ensuing fasli, as it will involve questions of apportionment of rent and the determination of the person or persons in whose name the patta is to be issued. Section 4 of the Bill accordingly provides that in the

absence of an express contract with the landlord, the transfer shall take effect as against him only at the commencement of the next ensuing fasli and that in no case shall the transfer be binding upon the landlord unless and until due notice is given to him of such transfer and that all proceedings commenced or had under the Act prior to such notice shall be as valid and effectual against the transferee as if they were commenced or had against himself.

In the matter of appeals under the Act though section 69 gives a right of appeal against all judgments passed by a Collector, yet this section is controlled by section 58 which expressly provides that no appeal shall lie from a judgment passed *ex-parte* against a defendant or from a judgment against a plaintiff by default for non-appearance. The latter section, however, provides that application may be made to the Collector for just and sufficient cause to set aside such judgment and dispose of the suit in due course. It has been held that no appeal lies against an order refusing to set aside such judgment inasmuch as the former section (section 69), which provides for appeals, is limited only to judgments and does not include orders, and section 76, which impliedly gives a right of appeal from orders, is limited to orders passed after judgment in relation to the execution of decrees.

When the party affected is not allowed to appeal from a judgment passed against him, it is only fair and reasonable that he should be allowed to appeal against an order declining to set aside such judgment.

The Bill proposes also to amend section 85 so as to include within its purview estates which are in the possession of public officers merely as stake-holders. In recent years several instances have occurred in which, owing to the death of a disqualified proprietor who was a ward under the Court of Wards, the Collector as Agent of the Court of Wards has been obliged to retain possession of the estate as a mere stake-holder in consequence of a reasonable doubt as to which of the rival claimants was lawfully entitled to the succession. The Court of Wards and its officers become *functi officio* on the death of the ward, and their possession of the estate until the dispute is settled by a competent Civil Court in favour of the one or the other of the rival claimants is simply the possession of stake-holders having no legal interest in the estate. In a long batch of rent suits, involving several thousands of rupees relating to the Uthumalai estate which was in charge of the Collector of Tinnevely after the death of the ward, the High Court on revision threw out all the suits as unsustainable because subsequent to the death of the ward, and before the appointment of the Collector as receiver in Manager under the Collector had no interest to

C.R.P. No. 174 of 1893 and cases therewith connected.

the interpleader suit which he had to bring, the Collector had no interest to maintain a suit for recovery of rents due by tenants.

(Signed) V. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.

9th December 1896.

Government of Fort St. George.
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

ANNEXURE

TO

A Bill further to amend Madras Act VIII of
1865.

(Statement of Objects and Reasons.)

Government of Fort St. George.
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

ANNEXURE

TO

A Bill further to amend Madras Act VIII of
1865.

(Statement of Objects and Reasons.)

Government of Fort St. George.
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

A

BILL

FURTHER TO

Amend Madras Act No. VIII of 1865.

(The Hon'ble V. Bhashyam Aiyangar, C.I.E.,
Diwan Bahadur.)

(Introduced

1897.)

Cno 494 before of 1897

No. 375.

FROM

J. M. MACPHERSON, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of India,
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Legislative Department.

Calcutta, the 20th February, 1897.

SIR,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement No. 112, dated the 19th December last, with which was forwarded a copy of your Government's despatch to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India intimating the intention of the Hon'ble V. Bhashyam Aiyangar to introduce into the Madras Council a Bill to amend Madras Act No. VIII of 1865 regarding the recovery of rent.

2. In reply, I am in the first place to remark that, the period of two months prescribed in the second clause of paragraph 1 of the letter from the Home Department, No. 1130, dated the 7th July, 1875, having expired and no reply to the despatch in question having been received, it may be assumed that the Secretary of State has no intention of interfering with the measure at its present stage. I am, however, at the same time to communicate the following observations on the contents of the measure.

3. Clause 4 of the draft provides for the postponement, till the beginning of another agricultural year, of the operation, *as against the landlord*, of a transfer made without the landlord's consent. If this provision, the language of which is somewhat involved, were so drawn as to prevent such a transfer from taking effect at all till the time mentioned, then the Government of India would have no objection to it, it being in some of the other provinces of India already the law that a transfer of agricultural occupancy can be effected only at the end of the agricultural year. But as the clause stands it will, in the opinion of the Governor General in Council, entail considerable hardship on the transferor—hardship which will be all the more pronounced and the less justifiable when the transfer is a compulsory one—, while it will put the landlord in a much stronger position than he is reasonably entitled to. It might be argued that the presence of the limiting words "against the landlord" show that the transfer will be postponed

only in so far as it prejudicially affects that person, the result being that he will lose none of his rights, but will be able, until another revenue year has begun, to proceed against the transferor as well as against his new tenant *de facto*, the transferee. To this the Governor General in Council would be constrained to take exception; and, even if the words in question could be construed as postponing the operation of the transfer in so far as the landlord is concerned, the provision would be one of which the Government of India could not approve. The most that should be secured to the landlord is that no transfer made behind his back shall in any way interfere with his remedy against the only person from whom he is equitably entitled to a remedy, namely, his new tenant; and for this the second paragraph of the clause is apparently intended to provide. To continue to him his remedy against the transferor would appear to be unnecessary and, in the case of a forced transfer in execution of a decree, to be even unjust. The Government of India do not admit the claim of the private landlord to occupy the same position in regard to rent as is assigned to the State in respect of revenue by Madras Regulation XXVI of 1802; for the right of the Government as collector of the public revenue to exceptional powers and privileges is recognized by the law of every province in India; and the Regulation cited furnishes one of the means by which the maintenance of registers of public utility is secured. In these circumstances, I am to commend the whole clause to the careful consideration of the Government of Madras, and I am further to add the suggestion that it might, perhaps, with advantage be enacted that the notice referred to in it should be served by means of a registered letter, such service being proved, as in the case of proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (see section 45), by the production of the addressee's receipt.

4. Clause 5 purports to amend the first paragraph only of section 69 of the Act and omits to propose any corresponding amendment of the proviso and the remaining paragraph. This is a detail which will doubtless not escape notice during the progress of the measure through Council.

5. As regards clause 6 of the Bill, I am to suggest that it would be more correct to follow the language of section 470 of the Code of Civil Procedure and to speak of public officers in this connection as "being in possession of estates in which their interest is that of mere stakeholders."

I have the honour to be,
SIR,
Your most obedient servant,

J. M. Macpherson
Secretary to the Government of India.

NOTE FOR THE SECRETARY.

DEPARTMENT.

The only portion, if at all,
which may be considered objectionable
to communicate to the Select
Committee, appears to be the
sentence, in para 3 of the Govt of
India letter, marked in pencil
which runs as follows:—

"The Government of India do not
admit the claim of the private
landlord to occupy the same position
.....
is secured"

AR.

1/3/97

I. In no objection to
communicating this
letter? Submit to
H.M.
H. J. S.

Is there any
after the letter to be

C. No.

SUBJECT.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.
THE HON'BLE MR. BLISS, C.I.E.
THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

Bill to amend the Madras Rent Recovery
Act VIII of 1865.

FOR ORDERS.

* 9 spare copies
have been received

A spare copy of a letter from the Govt
of India, making certain suggestions
regarding the Hon. Mr. Shashy and Anuganti
bill to amend the Madras Rent Recovery
Act VIII of 1865, is herewith submitted.
No signed copy of the letter has yet
been received in the office.

Orders are respectfully solicited
as to whether formal orders may now
be passed on the letter as a Communica-
tion to the Select Committee on the Bill
& the ~~to~~ G.O. printed as a paper relating
to the Bill communicated to the Select
Committee.

A spare copy of the letter has just
been sent to press to be put in the
The Select Committee is to sit on Monday next

CRV
26/2/97
Rev Sept

Is there any objection
to communicating the letter to the
1/3/97

10,000 13-12.

10,000 13-12.

sent to Press.
signature.
ed in print.

Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

Sign copy —
Specimens — 35.

Then please send 50 copies
with paper docket. See on
the reverse —
6 copies with paper docket
required today.

PRINT No. Letter from India in type.

No.

MENT

MENT.

WITH DITTO.

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DETACH
ORIGINAL.

Print in full.
Not to be printed.
Print abstract only.
Print heading only.