

R.N. 657 of 29.11.82

No 1385 D of 28th Nov/82
To C

For remarks.

28.11.82

D.W.

Recd 12.12.82

No 728 of 30.11.82

To W.

The Local Accountant General is
the "Pay Department" concerned, in com-
munication with the Master Attendant.
No action is I consider necessary in
the P.W. Department.

DCG

G.

89

3 No 3174 of 2nd Dec/82
Copy of the remarks of the Examiner
P.W. is forwarded to the Secy.
Dept in reply to G.O. in that
Dept: No 1753 of 21st Nov/82
Sof R. J.

Recd 2.12.82



Gobt. of 1882 Madras.
FINANCIAL.

M.C. 8087

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 21st November 1882, No. 1753.

NOVEMBER.

No 3174 of 2nd Dec/82

Stores.

Referring for report Resolution of Government
of India forwarding copy of despatch from Secre-
tary of State suggesting that, when the value of
short-deliveries of, or of damage to, Government
stores is recoverable from freight or from the
owners of the ship carrying the stores, the Return-
ed Packing Accounts be stamped or certified by
the Pay Departments so as to indicate that the
recovery has been dealt with.

With
Sd/- in Receipt of

21st NOVEMBER 1882, No. 1913, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 15th October 1881, No. 2133, Judicial.

G.O., dated 19th April 1882, Mis. No. 316, Judicial.

Read—the following papers:—

From T. WEIR, Esq., Acting Registrar of the High Court of Judicature at
Madras, Appellate Side, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras,
13th April 1882, No. 675:—

In forwarding to Government the accompanying letter addressed to the Chief
Secretary by the District Judge of Tinnevely, I am to point out that the High Court
has not been consulted on the question of the proposed transfer of the Subordinate
Court to the site at Palamecottah, and that, in addressing Government directly on the
subject as appears to have been done from the reference to G.O., dated 15th October
1881, No. 2133, Judicial Department (not communicated to the High Court), the
District Judge appears to have overlooked the instructions conveyed last year in
G.Os., dated 24th August 1881, No. 1733, and 27th August 1881, No. 1771.

2. I am to add that had the High Court been consulted as to the proposal, it
would not have recommended its adoption till it was satisfied that the change met
the convenience of the public, which appears doubtful.

From J. C. HUGHESDON, Esq., District Judge, Tinnevely, to the Chief
Secretary to Government, dated Tinnevely, 29th March 1882, No. 245.

I have the honor to inform you, with reference to G.O., dated 15th October 1881,
No. 2133, Judicial Department, that a site has been selected at Palamecottah for the
new Sub-Court by the Collector, the Sub-Judge, and myself, and that the Palamecottah
Municipality have agreed to make such site over to Government. A copy of the
Collector's letter, No. 205, dated 22nd instant, is enclosed.

2. I have also to submit, for the consideration of Government, a memorial from
the residents of Tinnevely and others against the removal of the Court from Kokara-
kulam. I fear the memorialists are too late, for the matter seems to have been fully
discussed in the Proceedings of Government, dated 15th October last, and to have
been finally decided then. However, the memorial is *bona fide* and does not exag-
gerate either the advantages of the present site or the inconveniences of removal.

3. But if the Sub-Court be retained at Kokarakulam, the Court-house will have
to be enlarged. In his letter to me, No. 71, dated 13th ultimo (copy enclosed), the
Sub-Judge says, "three rooms—one for the clerks, one for the records, and another
for the Judge (as he has no private room at present)—are required. These may be built

on the adjacent vacant ground lying to the east of the present Court-house. The floor of the building requires to be raised a little and the roof to be repaired."

4. Though the Executive Engineer, in his letter recorded in the above-mentioned Proceedings of Government, has shown that a case has not been made out for the immediate removal of the public offices now located at Kokarakulam, his letter seems clearly to indicate that the buildings are in such a condition that their abandonment is only a question of time. I would venture therefore to suggest, for consideration, whether it might not probably be the most economical course to make at once to the existing Sub-Court the additions indicated by the Sub-Judge as necessary, and when the day arrives for the removal of the District Court and the Collector's Cutcherry to construct a block of buildings at Palamcottah, which will accommodate all the establishments now collected at Kokarakulam. This, in the mean time, will obviate the inconveniences which the memorialists anticipate from the removal of one office only. The convenience to the people of having all the public establishments kept together can scarcely be over-estimated.

Order—dated 19th April 1882, Mis. No. 316, Judicial.

The District Judge's letter will be communicated to the Public Works Department, with request that a rough estimate of the additions to the Court, suggested by the Sub-Judge, may be obtained and sent to this department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.

G.O., dated 5th October 1882, Mis. No. 1488, Judicial.

Read—the following letter from Colonel J. BEATTY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Sixth Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Palamcottah, 14th September 1882, No. 452-T.N.

With reference to G.O., No. 1050 W., of 28th April 1882, I have the honor to inform you that, in my opinion, the extensions and improvements of the Sub-Judge's Court at Kokarakulam (Tinnevely), approved by the Judge and Sub-Judge, would probably cost Rs. 20,000.

- 1 Plan.
- 1 Tinnevely Executive Engineer's letter, No. 213, dated 10th July 1882.
- 1 Tinnevely Executive Engineer's letter, No. 355, dated 4th September 1882.

2. I send, herewith, a plan of the additional buildings and alterations proposed and two letters of the Acting Divisional Officer. Mr. Manson thinks they might be done for Rs. 15,000, but, considering the cost of buildings lately erected in the same locality and the necessity for deep broad foundations, I am of opinion that the detailed estimate would probably not be much, if at all, under Rs. 20,000.

No. 782.

Endorsement on the above.

Forwarded to the Judicial Department with advertence to G.O. in that department, Mis. No. 316, dated 19th April 1882.

21st September 1882. (Signed) ROSS THOMPSON, Lt.-Colonel, R.E.,
Acting Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

Order—dated 5th October 1882, Mis. No. 1488, Judicial.

The correspondence recorded in the papers read above relate to the erection of a new Sub-Court at Palamcottah, and with advertence to the remarks made by the Honorable the Judges in their Registrar's letter of the 13th April 1882, No. 675, the subject will be laid before them for favor of their opinion.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Honorable the Judges of the High Court with covering letter.
,, Public Works Department.

READ—also the following paper:—

From T. WEIR, Esq., Registrar of the High Court of Judicature at Madras, Appellate Side, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 24th October 1882, No. 2499.

Adverting to the Proceedings of Government, dated 5th October 1882, No. 1488, Miscellaneous, I am directed to communicate to Government the opinions of the High Court on the question of the proposed removal of, or repairs to, the Court-house of the Subordinate Judge of Tinnevely.

2. In the opinion of the High Court, there can be no question that both for purposes of economical administration and public convenience, it is desirable that the Courts at each head-quarter station should be in proximity to one another and as near as conveniently may be to the Public Treasury and the residences of suitors or to the choultries in which suitors resident in the outlying parts of the district find accommodation.

3. The High Court would therefore strongly deprecate the removal of the Court from Kokarakulam, unless (a) the Government have in view within a not distant period to remove all the Courts to Palamcottah, or (b) the expenditure of 20,000 rupees on the present Subordinate Court building would not result in securing so commodious and valuable a building as might be secured for that or a slightly increased sum elsewhere.

4. I am to add that the sum named by the Superintending Engineer as the probable cost of the works proposed appears to the Chief Justice high, although allowance be made for extraordinary foundations, and to suggest that a detailed estimate should be called for.

ORDER—dated 21st November 1882, No. 1913, Judicial.

Forwarded to the Public Works Department with reference to endorsement in that department, dated 21st September 1882, No. 782, and for compliance with the suggestion of the Honorable the Judges made in the last paragraph of their Registrar's letter.

(True Extract.)

C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department, with plan.
Copy to Registrar, High Court, Appellate Side.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

JUDICIAL.

Communicated
to the Supg Engineer, South
Circle for early submission
of the detailed estimate
called for.

(True extract)
by Ross Thompson & Co
Ag Under Secy to Gov
D. W. DeFets

Encl.

G.O., 21st November 1882, No. 1913.

No 3173 w of 2. Dec 1862

Forwarding to the Public Works Department letter from the Registrar, High Court, communicating the Court's opinion on the question of the proposed removal of, or repairs to, the Court-house of the Sub-Judge of Tinnevely.

To The Sup^rg Ego, In the Circ^{le}
with plan
a Judicial Dept^t

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Kokarakulam, the Court-house will have
dated 13th ultimo (copy enclosed), the
clerks, one for the records, and another
(ent)—are required. These may be built

To W. J. Papers Submitted
Please see references
marked on G.O. 2946 W.

R.S.

— We must await
reply of the Judicial
Dept.

~~Blut~~

14/11/50