

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் தேவரி 20
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/2

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொது பணித்
துறை

அரசாணை எண்.	2580(ய)	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.		பலவகை
நாள் :	1-10-1890	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்படி கையாளவோ கூடாது

செ

Letter from the Executive Engineer Tanjore
Division to the Superintending Engineer
VI Circle No. 3576 of 29th August 1890.

2580

I have the honor to inform you that
in November last year, Maistry Kunnasamy
Pillai was ordered by the Taluk Officer to
cut some bamboos for the purpose of
protecting a set in the Kodamurti at
41 M. 1. f.

2. The bamboos were growing on our padugay
along the left margin at 39 M. 3. f and
as the Maistry was having them cut by
the Cavalgars some mirasidars of Kalliana
puram came and prevented the work.

3. On the departure of the Maistry and
Cavalgars these mirasidars set fire to
the bamboo clumps and then filed a
suit against the Maistry and Cavalgars
for having illegally cut the bamboos
and set fire to the clumps.

4. The case was heard by the Sub

Magistrate of Trivadi, who found that the bamboos belonged to the D.W. Department, and that the clumps had been set on fire by the plaintiffs, the Divasidars of Kaliaapuram.

5. The Maistry and Cavalgars were put to some expense in defending themselves and requests that they may be paid their costs.

6. I enclose copy of the judgement and the Maistry bill. It seems strange that the plaintiffs were not ordered to pay all the costs of the case.

7. Some explanation of the delay in reporting this case appears necessary.

A copy of the judgement was received at the end of March, and Mr. Whitely sent it to the Government Pleader for his opinion as to whether it would be advisable for the Maistry to prosecute the plaintiffs for defamation.

8. The Government Pleader's reply came last month and I then had

to ask Mr. Whitely for a brief report of the whole case. I do not think myself it is worth while prosecuting the plaintiffs for defamation.

114673
10.7.90
2/12/9

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer D.W. with copy of the judgement & Maistry Bill for Rs 13-15-3. for orders.

2. The Executive Engineer reports that in this case the Vakil was engaged by the Maistry without referring the matter to him or to the Sub Division officer, as the date fixed for hearing the case gave him - the Maistry - no time for such reference, and as moreover the latter was not likely to have any knowledge of G. O. No. 2050 W of the 7th July 1888 under which application should have been made to the District Magistrate to appoint a Vakil.

3. As regards prosecution of the complainant for defamation, the

Copied

Enclos: 2

1. Judgement

1. Bill

2

Magistrate of Trivadi, who found that the bamboos belonged to the D.W. Department, and that the clumps had been set on fire by the plaintiffs, the Durasidars of Kaliaapuram.

5. The Maistry and Cavalzars were put to some expense in defending themselves and requests that they may be paid their costs.

6. I enclose copy of the judgement and the Maistry bill. It seems strange that the plaintiffs were not ordered to pay all the costs of the case.

7. Some explanation of the delay in reporting this case appears necessary.

A copy of the judgement was received at the end of March, and Mr. Whiteley sent it to the Government Pleader for his opinion as to whether it would be advisable for the Maistry to prosecute the plaintiffs for defamation.

8. The Government Pleader's reply came last month and I then had

to ask Mr. Whiteley for a brief report of the whole case. I do not think myself it is worth while prosecuting the plaintiffs for defamation.

N. 114673
10.7.90
2/12/90

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer D.W. with copy of the judgement & Maistry Bill for Rs 13-15-3. for orders

2. The Executive Engineer reports that in this case the Vakil was engaged by the Maistry without referring the matter to him or to the Sub Division officer, as the date fixed for hearing the case gave him - the Maistry - no time for such reference, and as moreover the latter was not likely to have any knowledge of G. O. No. 2050 W of the 7th July 1888 under which application should have been made to the District Magistrate to appoint a Vakil.

3. As regards prosecution of the complainant for defamation, the

Copied

Enclos: 2

1. Judgement

1. Bill

2

Magistrate of Trinadi, who found that the bamboos belonged to the D.W. Department, and that the clumps had been set on fire by the plaintiffs, the Durasidars of Kaliaapuram.

5. The Maistry and Cavalzars were put to some expense in defending themselves and requests that they may be paid their costs.

6. I enclose copy of the judgement and the Maistry's bill. It seems strange that the plaintiffs were not ordered to pay all the costs of the case.

7. Some explanation of the delay in reporting this case appears necessary. A copy of the judgement was received at the end of March, and Mr. Whitely sent it to the Government Pleader for his opinion as to whether it would be advisable for the Maistry to prosecute the plaintiffs for defamation.

8. The Government Pleader's reply came last month and I then had

to ask Mr. Whitely for a brief report of the whole case. I do not think myself it is worth while prosecuting the plaintiffs for defamation.

114673
10.7.90
12/9

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer D.R.W. with copy of the judgement & Maistry's Bill for Rs 13-15-3 for orders.

2. The Executive Engineer reports that in this case the Vakil was engaged by the Maistry without referring the matter to him or to the Sub Division officer, as the date fixed for hearing the case gave him - the Maistry - no time for such reference, and as moreover the latter was not likely to have any knowledge of G. O. No. 2050 W of the 7th July 1888 under which application should have been made to the District Magistrate to appoint a Vakil.

3. As regards prosecution of the complainant for defamation, the

Copied

Enclos: 2

1. Judgement
1. Bill
2

Government vakil's opinion does not appear favorable. He states that as the case was thrown out as not proved by proper evidence, if the accused can show by positive and clear evidence that the charge was unfounded and malicious and that it was made falsely Complainant knowing that there was no just and lawful ground for such a proceeding and that the false charge was made with intent to injure the accused then alone a prosecution for false charge may be made and an application made to Government for sanctioning the prosecution. The Executive Engineer does not therefore consider it worthwhile prosecuting the complainant.

4. It is very likely that the Ministry was not aware of G. O. No. 2050 W of the 7th July 1888

It

It is therefore recommended that the charge incurred by him in the case be ordered to be reimbursed.

2580
3

Aldrich Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
of the Circle

ad

2448-87131

Sum

The Sup'ty: Legation
11 July

In
The Chief Legation
P. H. B.

N. 44679

his 2
R. 15.9.90
criminal prosecution
against Maistryt-
of Rodimuntz band

Submits copy of judgment
of costs
of bill incurred by the
Maistryt for orders

21419
02079

13 Aug 2000 2 7-7-00

102580 Report October

2/15/14
In the Circumstances
brought to notice,
Sanction is accorded
to the Charge of
Rs 13. 15. 3 for the
defence of the suit
at the Government
expense.

16.9.90

L 19.9

2/10- 2/10
SEVI. with 2 letters.
Exam P. W. A. G. to
O. B. R. 17. 14. 20. 14
25. 14