charged to Government.

4. The services of a pleader may be engaged.

The following telegram will be despatched to the Superintending Engineer

" Your letter 715 T.N. d/ 13 January 188. Apply for postponement of suit for another month.

19.1.88

20/1/88.

(There is no necessity whatever for the coll^r being made a party x in any case it wd not be for the Dept but for the pff to join him)

R.S. 19.1.88
H.W. 21.1.88
R 23.1.88

file
P.W. 2322/88

No 278 W d/ 23^d January 1888

23/1

To

Supg Engr VI circle with Endos.
Exar. P.W. accts.
Revenue Dept.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 278 W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 23rd January/88

Letter from the Supg Engr VI circle

READ the following

H.E. No. 715 T.N. of 13 January 1888.

1. The defence of the suit is authorised at the public expense in the first instance. It is stated that compensation for the land in dispute was settled and paid for by the Revenue Department. The Collector should therefore be made a joint defendant in the suit.

2. The suit is brought to recover a strip of land measuring $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles from the head sluice of 15 feet in breadth, alleged to have been taken up about October 1881. The defence seems to be that this strip was included in the land taken up & paid for in 1869-70 & has in any case been in the possession of Govt. for more than 12 years. It is presumed that the Collector has been consulted and approves of this defence & is prepared to establish it. If he has not been consulted reference should be made to him forthwith and an adjournment obtained to enable him to consider the case.

~~Adjournment has been applied for — Refer to Collector as reqd~~

[illegible]

23.1.88

3. The proceedings of the Court should be submitted in due course when a final decision will be given as to whether the costs shall be finally charged

The defence of the suit is authorised at the public expense in the first instance. The proceedings of the Court should be submitted in due course when a final decision will be given as to the costs of the suit.

The services of a pleader may be engaged

[illegible]

No. 905 I d/16.11.83 [illegible] 18.1.88
" 16 I d/7.1.84.

S E VI Circle with Encls
Ex [illegible]

C. No. 500

To L.W.

If the G.O. issues as shown in the re numbering of the paras. the Hon. Member's instructions will, I think, be carried out. The draft telegram which it was proposed to send, has been struck out of the draft by the Hon. Member. It had not issued.

R.S.
23.1.88.

Proposed to show the amended draft to I under whose instructions the original draft was altered.

R.S.

Issue as corrected

[illegible]

H.C.
Soon
R.S. 23-1-88

C No. 500
R.S. & Hon
19.1.88

There is a G.O. I shd say in 1884 about an ex casi regarding Land in a bank of the Wyandum channel in Trichinopoly district in which it was ordered I believe that in all cases against G.W. the Collector in Land cases shd be made Joint deft.
In this case the Collector perhaps not settle the compensation and the evidence &c of his deft is most unpertinent.
Please look it up

[illegible]

x 905 I d 16-11-83
169 I d 7-1-84
Dt 18-1-88

H.C. B

The defence of the suit is authorised at the public Expense in the first instance. The proceedings of the Court should be submitted in due course when a final decision will be given as to the costs of the suit.
The Services of a pleader may be engaged

[illegible]

No. 905 I d 16.11.83 out 18.1.88
" 169 d 7.1.84.

S E VI Circle with Encls
Ex P.W.D.

P.W.C. No. 500

P. W. D. 3rd Circle.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
~~3rd~~ 6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 715 T.N.

Dated 13 } January 1888.
Received 16 }
18.1.88

Enclosures. ~~2~~ 4

Suit against Mr. Baker Asst. Engr. in Srivaikuntham Distt Munsif's Court —

Requests sanction for the defence of the — at the Govt. expense. —

With order

25/1

Executive Engineer" received notice on the 15th Augt 1887".

2 Mr Baker's draft answer to be filed in reply to the Plaint was received by me on the 11th Instant, and is herewith submitted. I consider that either in the draft reply, or in his explanatory Covering Letter, Mr Baker should have stated what evidence he proposes to produce to establish the allegation in para 2 of the draft reply, that Compensation for pits was accepted in 1883, and that the widened bank stood on land occupied in 1869 or 1870 and paid for at that time. I have drawn the Executive Engineer's attention to the deficiency of information on this point, but do not like to delay the papers any longer, as the case is posted for hearing on the 1st proxo.

3 The Executive Engineer has recommended the employment of a pleader named C. Soobbaraya Mudr of the District Munsiffs' Court to defend the suit. I request that you will be good enough to sanction the defence of the suit at the Govt expense, and return the enclosures for retransmission to the Executive Engineer.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servant

J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 4th/5 CIRCLE,

Madura 13th January 1888.

No. 715 T.N.

From

S.W. Rundall Esquire
M.I.C.E.

Superintending Engineer, 3rd/4th Circle,

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Departt.
Madras.

Sir,

Enclosures viz
1 Tamil plaint with an English translation
1 Draft of the answer to the plaint.

I have the honor to state that the Executive Engineer, Tinnevelly Division, in his R. No. 1992 29-9-87 reported "that one Sami Nadan, alias Mayavan "di Nadan has filed a suit in the "Court of the District Munsiff, Srivaikunthum, against Mr. Baker as "1st defendant, and the Superintendent of the North Main Channel of "the Srivaikunthum Anicut System, "as 2nd defendant, for taking up lands "without permission, to form the Left "Flood Bank of the Tambraparni "from the Anicut to 1¾ miles below "it, and for not settling the Compensation for the same"; and that the

Executive