

(1) Number of pages 50

(2) Date of repair 11-7-64

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. <i>443</i>	Press
<i>274-276</i>	~~Mis.~~
Dated <i>12-2-</i>	<i>18 64</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
12th February 1864.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 274. From Captain F. J. MOBERLY, R. E., Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Tirooppavanum, 2nd February 1864, No. 1,835.

SIR,

1 Copy of Decree.

1 Do. of Judgment.

1 Written statement.

* G. O. No. 598, dated 28th March 1862.

I have the honor to enclose decree* of the Principal Sudder Ameen in the case of Ramabudra Naick vs. Captain Ryves and others.

2. This was instituted in December 1861, to prevent the Officers of the Department Public Works from altering the Anicut across the Kukalaur, from which lands rented by plaintiff were watered, the plaintiff's ancestors were formerly the proprietors of this work and the lands.

3. After the property came into the possession of Government a front wall was built with vents for the passage of sand, but an opening 60 feet long was left $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet below the general level of the work, this of course materially increased the supply to the plaintiff's tank.

4. In 1858 Captain Ryves by way of settling a dispute between the plaintiff and the villagers of Kykalancolum (the other defendants in this suit) arranged that 42 feet of this opening should be entirely blocked up and a sill put to the remaining 18 feet, so as to make it $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet deep; by mistake in execution this was so far built up, that the vent was only $1\frac{1}{4}$ feet deep.

5. In 1861 Captain Ryves again inspected the work, and in his report to the Collector, he observes that this error must not only be corrected, but that further alterations will be required as "the dam is unnecessarily and unsafely high."

6. He therefore proposed to make the vent 43 feet long $\times$ $1\frac{1}{4}$ deep with a portion 12 feet in length, $\frac{3}{4}$ feet below that level or $2\frac{1}{4}$ in all; to this the plaintiff demurred as being opposed to the settlement made by Captain Ryves in 1858.

7. I am at a loss to understand how Captain Ryves arrived at the conclusion of 1858, for taking the top of the Anicut as the level of the river the discharge through the opening to the lower villagers would be as follows:—

Before Captain Ryves saw the work... 39,391 cubic feet per Min.

By the arrangement he proposed in 1858... 8,106 "

By the work executed... 4,893 "

By the arrangement he proposed in 1861... 18,982 "

8. From this it appears that even the last arrangement would give the plaintiff a much larger supply than he was entitled to, of course diminishing by so much the supply to the lower villagers, his co-defendants in this suit.

9. The written statement, drawn up I believe by the Government Pleader, omits to mention Captain Ryves' error, as acknowledged in his letter to the Collector above quoted, which was however filed in Court, and only alludes to the mistake by the Executive agent who built the sill $\frac{1}{2}$ foot too high.

10. The Principal Sudder Ameen, therefore, ignores the letter, and abiding by the written statement, has decreed that the arrangement made in 1858 shall hold good, and we shall only lower the sill $\frac{1}{2}$ foot over 18 feet in length. I am informed that the omission in the written statement rendered Captain Ryves' share in the defence difficult, but this omission was remedied by the plea of the co-defendants who, by the arrangement of 1858, have been deprived of a considerable quantity of their proper supply, but the decree completely overlooks any thing they might have had to say, and desires them to file a separate suit.

11. From all I can gather, the Government Vakeel's argument in Court was to the effect that the Government having inherited the Zemindary have with it received the general right to alter as they please the Anicut built by the Zemindar's ancestor; this the Principal Sudder Ameen denies, as I believe, correctly, except under the provision that nobody's interests are prejudiced.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
12th February 1864.*

12. But the arrangement of 1858 has injured the co-defendants to the great advantage of the plaintiff; so that it is not surprising that he now assents to so much as will still leave him a very much larger quantity of water than he is entitled to.

13. The co-defendants will I doubt not appeal; I am not clear as to the utility of the Government doing so, but I shall be obliged by their early consideration of the subject and instructions, the appeal period expires on 23rd February. My difficulty is how to get rid of this large body of water in case of any extraordinary fresh, as of course with diminished waterway the danger to banks, &c., above the Anicut is very much increased.

MEMORANDUM.

Referred to the Government Pleader for his opinion. It is observed that the "appeal period" will expire on the 23rd instant.

Chepauk,
9th February 1864.

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government, D.P.W.

To the Government Pleader with a copy of G. O. No. 598 of 1862.

No. 275. From C. DALE, Esq., Government Pleader, Madras, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Madras, 10th February 1864, No. 33.

SIR,

9th February 1864, Public Works Department.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt at half past 6 o'clock yesterday evening of the Order of Government under the date noted in the margin.

2. You have omitted to send me a copy of the plaint in this suit, as also to lay before me a copy of the evidence adduced by the parties before the Principal Sudder Ameen; I am therefore left in ignorance of the precise claim put forward by the plaintiff, and also how far he has proved such case; and yet in the absence of such information I am asked for my opinion; how under these circumstances I am to arrive at any safe and satisfactory conclusion, I am at a loss to understand.

3. I cannot suppose that Government are under the impression that when once a case is laid before their Law Officers, the facts of such case are retained in the memories of the Law Officers. I would however observe that it is most unsafe for a professional man to advise or act on memory after papers have left his hands for only a few days. In this case it is nearly two years since the papers were before me, and before I can undertake to advise, I require to peruse the whole of the papers afresh, and with as much care as when originally laid before me.

4. I have perused all the papers you have now sent me, and from the tenor of the judgment given by the Principal Sudder Ameen, I entertain no doubt that there are legal grounds on which an appeal could be supported; and if it be the wish of the Honorable the Governor in Council to appeal, he may give the necessary instructions; and on the necessary papers being laid before me I will advise the course to be pursued.

5. I observe, however, that Captain Moberly says, paragraph 13, he is not clear as to the utility of the Government appealing.

6. On this point I cannot form any opinion. The Court has directed the plaintiff to pay the costs of the defendants; so far therefore the Government are not damnified by the suit. Whether the alteration directed to be made will prejudice Government I cannot advise, that is the duty of your Department. Important questions are raised by the written statement which the Principal Sudder Ameen has left undecided, but I can scarcely think it would be worth while for Government to appeal merely to have a decision on those questions. If Government is in any manner injured by this decision, then I advise an appeal should be made, but not otherwise.

7. In the second paragraph of Captain Moberly's letter to yourself, No. 1,835, that Officer says "the plaintiff's ancestors were formerly the proprietors of this work and the lands;" such declarations as these should not be made by Officers of Government, unless on the most conclu-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
12th February 1864.*

sive evidence of their being in accordance with the real facts. In the present case it is the more inexcusable, because it is diametrically opposed to the case put forward on behalf of Captain Ryves.

8. Referring to paragraphs 5, 9 and 10 of Captain Moberly's letter to yourself, I observe that Captain Moberly does not give the date of the letter referred to. I cannot now ascertain whether such letter was ever laid before me, from my notes I gather that it was not; but from the impression left on my mind by a re-perusal of the written statement, I am inclined to think, if it had been before me, I should not have noticed in the written statement what Captain Moberly styles "Captain Ryves' error," as it does not appear to me, it had any thing to do with the questions raised in this suit. I can testify to the fact that Captain Ryves most carefully and intelligently went through the written statement, and on the information afforded by him that paper was finally settled. I hardly think any important omission would have escaped his notice.

9. I observe Captain Ryves' letter "was filed in Court;" Captain Moberly does not say by whom. If it were applied for by the plaintiff, his application should have been resisted. It was a letter from one Officer of Government to another, and as such a privileged communication. If filed on behalf of the defendant the conduct of the Government Vakeel is more blameable. A letter written by the defendant could not be made evidence for him; although if filed on his behalf might be used as evidence AGAINST him. It is astonishing that so elementary a principle should have been so entirely lost sight of. Vakeels have not now the same excuse that formerly existed. Mr. Norton's work on Evidence is within the reach of all, and if studied with the most ordinary attention, I should think no person could fall into such an error. It displays an amount of ignorance for which I am at a loss to find the slightest excuse, and I am inclined to think if any difficulty arose in the defence it must have arisen from the improper filing of that letter.

10. The time allowed for appeal is 30 days: Code, section 833. The calculation is to be made "from and EXCLUSIVE of the day on which judgment was pronounced." In the case under consideration the judgment was pronounced on the 25th of January, there were left in that month 6 days, and 24 days in February, would make 30 days; the Principal Sudder Ameen is therefore in error in naming the 23rd as the day on which "the term of appeal expires."

11. Thirty days may probably be time enough in the generality of cases, where all the parties reside within the jurisdiction of the Court, and can conveniently communicate with their Vakeels, &c., but it is not sufficient if the parties are resident at a distance, or where Government or their Officers are parties; and communications have to be made to Government, and generally through some other Department.

12. In the present case great delay has arisen in communicating with me. The decree was pronounced on the 25th, and 8 days were allowed to elapse before copies of the judgment and decree were despatched from Madura. In the regular course of the post those copies would reach Madras on the morning of the 6th. The Order of Government was not delivered to me till the time I have mentioned in the first paragraph of this letter; thus half the time allowed for appealing had expired; and as I received from the High Court, simultaneously with that order the copy of the Criminal record in the murder case in which Government wish me to appear on Thursday, I immediately saw that unless I then took up the papers in the Madura case, I should not have the opportunity of addressing Government in time for anything to be done in the event of an appeal being decided upon. I therefore had no alternative but then and there at that late hour to take up the papers, the perusal of which, &c., detained me at Chambers till a very late hour; I feel confident that it cannot be the wish of His Excellency in Council that Officers of Government should be overtaxed in that manner, especially where a slight exertion might have prevented the necessity.

13. I return all the papers which accompanied the Order noted above.

No. 276. ORDER THEREON, 12th February 1864, No. 443.

1. Communicated to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, with reference to his letter of the 2nd February 1864, No. 1,835.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department.
12th February 1864.

2. As the Government Pleader is of opinion that there are legal grounds on which an appeal can be supported, the Governor in Council authorizes the Superintending Engineer to give notice, through the Government Vakeel, of his intention to appeal from the decision in the case, and to apply for an extension of time, provided Captain Moberly be satisfied that the interests of Government have been injuriously affected by that decision to such an extent as to warrant the adoption of this course. The Government will expect to receive from Captain Moberly immediately on the receipt by him of these Proceedings a distinct assurance on this point, and to enable the Government Pleader to advise the course to be pursued, Captain Moberly will, at the same time, forward all papers connected with the subject. The non-submission of these, especially when time is of moment, was a grave omission.

3. Captain Moberly's letter and accompaniments were referred to Mr. Dale on the same day on which they were received.

4. Captain Moberly's attention is particularly called to paragraph 7 of Mr. Dale's letter, and it will be communicated to all Superintending Engineers for guidance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, with written statement.
To all other Superintending Engineers.

Madura Principal Sudder Ameen's Court.
Present M. Sadasiva Pillay Principal Sudder Ameen.
Original Suit No. 55 of 1863.

<u>Plaintiff</u>	<u>Defendants.</u>
Ramabudra Aich	1. Captain J. H. Ryces
Vakeel.	2. Panyanum
Ramaswamy Aich.	3. Moyandy Chetty.
	4. Arumugam Pillay.
	5. Caler.
	6. Sevarama Chetty.
	7. Ramalingam.

8. Mootvorseemay Pillay 9. Sanyanath Pillay and 10. Thandaram - Government Vakeel Ramaswamy Aich for 1st Defendant Vakeel Hanpharaim for 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th & 10th Defendants.

This suit is brought for a Decretal injunction to prevent the Defendant from lowering the present height of an Aicut and Tambogy over a length of 20 yards thereof, the said Aicut being situated on the River Pukalam and built for the purpose of turning off water to the lands of the Plaintiff.

Decree

The Court Decrees that the Aicut and Tambogy be altered in the manner aforesaid to have been resolved on in 1858 and as described in Paras 9 and 10 of the 1st Def^t's Statement. - The costs however must clearly be borne by the Plaintiff alone, that is the costs of the several Def^ts, as well as of himself.

Costs

Costs incurred by Plff.

Value of Stamp paper - 59 . 8 . .

Poon's Batta - 14 . 10 . .

Batta to Witnesses - 10 . .

Vatkeel's fee - 62 . 11 . 2

Total Rs. 137 . 7 . 2

Costs incurred by Defendant.

Value of Stamp paper - 12 . . .

Poon's Batta - 3 . 6 . .

Batta to Witnesses - 4 . 4 . .

Vatkeel's fee - 62 . 11 . 2

Total Rs. 78 . 5 . 2

Grand Total Rs. 215 . 12 . 4

Deduct.

Costs borne by Plff. - 137 . 7 . 2

Balance due from D. to Plff. - 78 . 5 . 2

Witness under my hand & the seal of the Court was

25th day of January 1864.

The term of Appeal expires on the 23rd day of February 1864.

/ Signed / M. Laksmin Pillai

Pl. Sudder ameer

Plaint filed 11 April 1863.

Final hearing 25th January 1864.

Decree passed 25th D. D.

/ True Copy / -

/ Signed / Raminasawami Iyer.

Govt. Vatkeel.

/ True Copy /.

J. H. Mobery. Captain V.S.

Superintending Engineer & P.

Suply Engr's Office & Division

1. 73
Enclosure in a letter
from the Supy Engineer &
Division dated 2nd February
1864, No. 1835.

To the Secy to Government
P.W. D.

605
7/579/64

Decree by the Principal
Sudder Ameer of Madurai
in the case of alterations to
the ancient across Kulkalai
in the Madurai District.

entirely

96
Supty Engr's Office & Division
Trisappavannam 2^d February 1862

No 1835
From,

To,

Captain F. J. Moberly R. E.
Superintending Engineer & Division
Colonel G. A. B. R. E.
Secretary to Government I. P. W.

Public

Sir,

Encls. 3
1. Copy of Dever
1. Copy of Judgment
1. Written statement
x No. 598 dated
28th March 1862.

I have the honor to enclose deers
of the Principal Sudder Ameen in the case of
Ramaudra Naik v. Captain Pyres & others.

2 This was instituted in December 1861 to
prevent the Officers of the I. P. W. from altering the
ancient crops the Pukhalam from which lands
rented by plaintiff were watered the plaintiff's
ancestors were formerly the proprietors of this work
and the lands.

3. After the property came into the possession
of Government a fresh wall was built with
vents for the passage of sand, but an opening 60 ft.
long was left $2\frac{1}{4}$ ft. below the general level of the work
this of course materially increased the supply to
the plaintiff's tank.

4 In 1858 Captain Pyres by way of settling
a dispute between the plaintiff and the villagers
of Pukhalam, (the other defendants in this
suit) arranged that $42\frac{1}{2}$ ft. of this opening should be
entirely

entirely blocked up and as will be seen by the remaining 18 ft. - so as to make it 18 1/2 ft. deep, by mistake in execution this was so far built up, that the vent was only 1 1/2 ft. deep.

The 1851 Captain Rymer again inspected the works, and in his report to the collector he observed that this error must not only be corrected, but that further alterations will be required as the dam is unsafely and unsafely high."

He therefore proposed to make the vent 48 ft. long x 1 1/4 ft. deep with a portion 12 ft. in length, 3 ft. below that level. To this the plaintiff demurred as being opposed to the settlement made by Captain Rymer in 1858.

It now remains to be seen how Captain Rymer arrived at the conclusion of 1858 for taking the top of the ancient as the level of the river the discharge through the opening to the lower villages would be as follows

Before Captain Rymer saw the	39,391 Cbts. per min:
works	
By the arrangement he proposed	8106
in 1858	
Now the work executed	4,893
By the arrangement he proposed	18,382
in 1851	

From this it appears that even the last arrangement would give the plaintiff a

much

much larger supply than he was entitled to, of course diminishing by so much the supply to the lower villagers; his co. defendants in this suit.

9 The written statement, drawn up I believe by the Government pleader, omits to mention Captain Rymer's error, as acknowledged in his letter to the collector above quoted, which was however filed in Court - and only alludes to the mistake by the Executive agent who built the sill 1/2 ft. too high.

10 The Principal Sudder Ameen therefore ignores the letter and abiding by the written statement, has decreed that the arrangement made in 1858 shall hold good, and we shall only lower the sill 1/2 ft. over 18 ft. in length. I am informed that the omission in the written statement rendered Captain Rymer's share in the defence difficult - but this omission was remedied by the plea of the co. defendants who, by the arrangement of 1858, have been deprived of a considerable quantity of their proper supply - but the decree completely overlooks any thing they might have had to say, and desires them to file a separate suit.

11 From all I can gather the Government Pleader's argument in Court was to the effect that the Government, having inherited the ferry duty

have

have with it received the general right to alter as they please the ancient built by the Zemindar's ancestor; this, the Principal Sudder Ameen denies, as I believe, correctly - except under the provision that no body's interests are prejudiced.

12 But the arrangement of 1858 has injured the Co. defendants to the great advantage of the plaintiff; so that it is not surprising that he now asserts to so much as will still leave him a very much larger quantity of water than he is entitled to.

13 The Co. defendants will I doubt not appeal. I am not clear as to the utility of the Government but as I am obliged by the early consideration of the subject and instructions - the appeal period expires on 23rd February - my difficulty is how to get rid of this large body of water in case of any extraordinary fresh as of course with diminished waterway, the danger to banks on above the ancient is very much increased.

I have &c.

J. Jacoby Captain R.E.

Superintending Engineer &c &c

Supty Aris Office
2nd Division
2nd February 1864

Lo.

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.

Secretary to Government S.F.W.

615 No. 10, 10th February 1864
The Principal Sudder Ameen
8th Division
The Secy to Government
P.W.D.
Dated 2nd February 1864
Recd 9
Enclos. a copy of the
Enclosures cleared by the
Principal Sudder Ameen
of Bradwardine & Co. Capt. W. C. P.
Bradwardine & Co. Capt. W. C. P.
Alleges and offers regarding
alterations to the ancient
across the Mucka Loo and
requests instructions on
the subject.
8th 1443-12th February

CD 9th 6.30 p.m.
No 274
Referred to the Govern-
ment Pleader for his opinion -
It is observed that the "appeal period"
will expire on the 23rd Instant.
Chepauk } To the Govt Pleader with a copy of f.d. no 598 of 62
9 February 1864 }
Colonel R.E.
Secretary to Government

From Clement Dale Esquire Government Pleader & Madras
S. W. A. Orr P. E. Secretary to Government Depar^t Public Works.

Madras 10th February 1864.

Sir,

Para 1

I have the honor to acknowledge ^{the receipt,} at half past 6 o'clock
yesterday evening of the Order of Government under the
date noted in the Margin.

9th February 1864
Public Works, Secy to Govt

2. You have omitted to send me a copy of the plaint in
this suit, & also to lay before me a copy of the evidence
adduced by the parties before the Principal Sudder Ameen; I
am therefore left in ignorance of the precise claim put
forward by the Plaintiff, and also how far he has proved
such case; and yet in the absence of such information I
am asked for my opinion; how under these circumstances
I am to arrive at any safe and satisfactory Conclusion.
I am at a loss to understand.

3. I cannot suppose that Government are under
the impression that when once a case is laid before their
Law Officers, the facts of such case are retained in
the memories of the Law Officers; I would however
observe that it is most unsafe for a professional man

To be sent by S. W. A. Orr P. E.

to advise or act on memory after papers have left his hands for only a few days; In this case it is nearly two years since the papers were before me, and before I can undertake to advise, I require to peruse the whole of the papers afresh, and with as much care as when originally laid before me.

4 I have perused all the papers you have now sent me, and from the tenor of the judgment given by the Principal Sudder Ameen, I entertain no doubt that there are legal grounds on which an appeal could be supported; and if it be the wish of the Honorable the Governor-in-Council to appeal, he may give the necessary instructions; and on the necessary papers being laid before me I will advise the course to be pursued.

5 I observe however that Captain Moberly says - para 13 - he is not clear as to the Utility of the Government appealing.

6 On this point I cannot form any opinion, The Court has directed the Plaintiff to pay the costs of the Defendants; so far therefore

19
the Government are not damaged by the suit, whether the alteration directed to be made will prejudice Government. I cannot advise, that is the duty of your Department. Important questions are raised by the written statement which the Principal Sudder Ameen has left undecided, but I can scarcely think it would be worth while for Government to appeal merely to have a decision on these questions. If Government is in any manner injured by this decision, then I advise an appeal should be made, but not otherwise.

7 In the 2 para of Captain Moberly's letter to yourself A^o 1835, that officer says "the Plaintiffs' ancestors were formerly the Proprietors of this work and the lands;" Such declarations as these should not be made by officers of Government, unless on the most conclusive evidence of their being in accordance with the real facts; In the present case it is the more inexcusable, because it is diametrically opposed to the case put forward on behalf of Captain Ryves.

8 Referring to paras 5, 9 and 10 of Captain Moberly's letter to yourself; I observe that Captain Moberly does not give the date of the letter referred to, I cannot now ascertain whether such letter was ever laid before me, from my notes I gather that it was not, but from the impression left on my mind by a refusal of the written statement, I am inclined to think, if it had been before me, I should not have noticed in the written statement what Captain Moberly styles "Captain Ryves' Error", as it does not appear to me, it had any thing to do with the questions raised in this suit. I am testifying to the fact that Captain Ryves most carefully and intelligently went through the written statement, and on the information afforded by him that paper was finally settled; I hardly think any important omission would have escaped his notice.

9 I observe Captain Ryves' letter was filed in Court; Captain Moberly does not say by whom; If it was applied for by the Plaintiff, his application should have been resisted; It was a letter from one officer of Government to another, and as such a privileged

193
communication. If filed on behalf of the Defendant for the conduct of the Government Vakil is more blameable: A letter written by Defendant could not be made evidence for him; although if filed on his behalf might be used as evidence against him. It is astonishing that so elementary a principle should have been so entirely lost sight of: Vakils have not now the same excuse that formerly existed; Mr Norton's work on evidence is within the reach of all, and if studied with the most ordinary attention, I should think no person could fall into such an error: It displays an amount of ignorance for which I am at a loss to find the slightest excuse, and I am inclined to think if any difficulty arose in the defence it must have arisen from the improper filing of that letter.

10 The time allowed for appeal is 30 days. Code Section 333. The calculation is to be made "from and exclusive of the day on which judgment was pronounced" In the case under consideration the judgment was pronounced on the 25 of January there were left in that month 6 days, and 24 days in February would make 30 days; the Principal Subdar Aman is therefore in error in naming the 23 as the

8 day on which "the term of appeal Expires".

11 Thirty days may probably be time enough in the generality of cases, where all the parties reside within the jurisdiction of the Court, and can conveniently communicate with their Counsel; but it is not sufficient if the Parties are resident at a distance, or where ^{or their Officers and Parties,} Government, and Communications have to be made to Government, and generally thro' some other department.

12 In the present case great delay has arisen in communicating with me: The Decree was pronounced on the 25, and 8 days were allowed to Elapse before copies of the Judgment and Decree were despatched from Calcutta. In the regular course of the post these copies would reach Madras on the Morning of the 10. The order of Government was not delivered to me till the time I have mentioned in the first para of this letter; Thus half the time ~~was~~ allowed for appealing had expired; and as I received from the High Court, simultaneously with that order the copy of the Criminal Record in the Murder Cases in which Government wish me to appear on Thursday, I immediately saw that unless I then took up

the papers in ^{the} Calcutta Case, I should not have the opportunity of addressing Government in time for any thing to be done in the event of an appeal being decided upon: I therefore had no alternative but then and there at that late hour to take up the papers the perusal of which I detained me at Chambers till a very late hour; I feel confident that it cannot be the wish of His Excellency in Council that Officers of Government should be overtaken in that manner especially where a slight exertion might have prevented the necessity.

13 I return all the papers which correspond to the order noted above.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Yours Most Obedient Servant

Wm. L. L. L.
Government Pleader
Madras

1827

8-443-12 Feb 11

Moving On 21
No 35 of 1863 on the
file of the Principal
Sudder Duns Court
Madras.

(with 4 Subduns)
5-
No 33

1864
Sudder Duns Court
to Secretary to Govt
Dated 10th February 1864
Recd 11

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 22nd Feb/64

From the Superintending
Encloses decree of the Principal
Sudder Duns of Madras in the case
of Ramabundha Nair v-
Capt. M. Nigral and others regard-
ing alterations to the ancient across
the Kankalaur requests instructions
on the subject

From Govt Reader.
Advising on original suit No
35 of 1863 on the file of the
Principal Sudder Duns Court
at Madras

No 443 Public Works Sept 10
No 33
No 3. 2nd Feb 1864 No 1835

No 10 Feb/64 No 33.

Communicated
to the Superintending
3rd Division with reference
to his letter of the 2nd
February 1864 No 1835.

As the Govern-
ment Pleader is of
opinion that there are
legal grounds on which
an appeal can be sup-
ported, the Governor
in Council author-
izes the Superintending to
give notice, thro the
2nd or 3rd

South 1259/4

Franchiser 1032 of 1864

of 1864 August
of No. of Good Friday
No. of the Franchiser
of 12 July 1864

1864

of 1864 August
of No. of Good Friday
No. of the Franchiser
of 12 July 1864

of 1864 August
of No. of Good Friday
No. of the Franchiser
of 12 July 1864

of 1864 August
of No. of Good Friday
No. of the Franchiser
of 12 July 1864

of 1864 August
of No. of Good Friday
No. of the Franchiser
of 12 July 1864