(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 6

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/91

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1742

~~அச்சகம்~~
பல்வகை

நாள் : 11.6.1892

198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

1742/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 4th April 1892, No. 167 :—

MR. E. GIBSON.

Read—the following letter from W. DUMERGUE, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Calicut, 3rd March 1892, Ref. on C. No. 147—P-92 :—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1892, Mis., No. 203 (Land Revenue), I have the honour to request that the sanction of Government may be obtained for the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry, Calicut, to the District jail buildings recently vacated.

2. In its Order, dated 10th October 1883, No. 1262, Revenue, embodied in G.O., dated 17th December 1883, No. 3595 W., Public Works, the Government approved of Mr. Galton's proposal to provide the Calicut Tahsildar and the Town Sub-Magistrate with proper accommodation on the premises purchased from Messrs. Stanes and Co., and now occupied by the District Court, Sub-Court and the two Munsifs' Courts. This arrangement was subsequently abandoned on the representation of Mr. Logan, who wrote as follows in paragraph 5 of his letter, dated 12th February 1886, No. 577, embodied in Board's Proceedings, dated 18th March 1886, No. 644 :—

"If my recommendation in paragraph 4 is approved, the necessity for constructing a new cutcherry for those * officers can be avoided and the late Huzur cutcherry buildings can be adopted for their use at a moderate cost. In fact a portion of the *main* building in which the arms collected in the late disarmaments are now stored and which is considered by the Public Works Department to be sufficiently strong (*vide* paragraph 2 of Mr. Davidson's letter recorded in G.O., dated 8th May 1884, No. 1168-W.A.) may be used as a court-room, &c., of the Tahsildar-Magistrate, while the remaining blocks may, with slight alterations, be converted into an excellent sub-jail—a desideratum which has long been felt at Calicut. The present Town sub-jail is entirely unsuited for the purpose and has been condemned by all Inspecting officers."

* Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar.

These proposals had the entire approval of the Board—*vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 18th March 1886, No. 644.

3. The main building above referred to has since been dismantled, and owing to the necessity of providing accommodation for the Currency office in the new building, it has been decided to let the District press remain where it is and to convert the proposed Printing office in the new Huzur cutcherry into a Currency office—*vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd July 1891, Mis. No. 4547, and 8th August 1891, Mis. No. 5668. Thus the accommodation available at the old Huzur office buildings will be (1) the building occupied by the present Treasury and Currency office, and (2) a part of the Printing office which is now used as the record-rooms. This is insufficient for a Taluk office and much more for a Tahsildar's and Deputy Tahsildar's office as originally proposed.

4. Now that the District jail has been abolished, the transfer of the Tahsildar-Magistrate's office from Chevayur, the inconveniences of which locality are already known to the Board and Government, to the jail buildings will be a distinct advantage, especially as the sub-jail, which is in charge of the Tahsildar-Magistrate, has also been ordered by Government to be located in them.

5. The removal of the Deputy Tahsildar's cutcherry to the jail buildings would be a source of inconvenience on account of the distance of the buildings from the town, and I am therefore of opinion that the Deputy Tahsildar's cutcherry should remain where it is at present or be removed to the Treasury building of the old Huzur office. I request that the transfer of the Calicut Taluk cutcherry to the District jail buildings may be approved and sanction accorded for the sale of the buildings at Chevayur now used at the Taluk cutcherry.

Resolution—dated 4th April 1892, No. 167.

Submitted for the orders of Government with reference to the last sentence of paragraph 5 of G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391 (Judicial Department), communicated with G.O., dated 17th December 1891, No. 6417, Revenue Department.

2. For the reasons stated by the Collector, the Board supports his proposals that the District jail buildings may be transferred to the Revenue Department for the occupation of the Tahsildar of Calicut and his establishment, and that the present Taluk office building at Chevayur may be sold.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

READ—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 8th April 1892, Mis. No. 2156 :—

Read—the following letter from W. DUMERGUE, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Calicut, 26th March 1892, Ref. on C. No. 1043—P. 92 :—

In submitting, herewith, a copy of letter, dated 18th instant, Ref. on No. 80-C. & D.—M., from the Deputy Magistrate, Calicut, I have the honour to request that the Board will be pleased to obtain the early orders of Government on my letter of the 3rd instant, Ref. on C. No. 147-P., requesting sanction forthe transfer of Calicut Taluk cutcherry to the old District jail buildings.

2. The sub-jail is more than a mile from the Deputy Tahsildar and Magistrate's office and the present Taluk cutcherry is about three miles from the sub-jail. The inconvenience of the existing arrangement will be obvious, but no other arrangement is possible unless and until the Taluk cutcherry is moved from Chevayur as proposed.

ENCLOSURE.

From V. CHAPPAN MENON, Deputy Magistrate, to the District Magistrate of Malabar, dated Calicut, 18th March 1892, Ref. on No. 80-C. & D.—M.

I have the honour to inform you that I have, as a temporary measure, put the Town Magistrate, Calicut, in charge of the sub-jail, as the Tahsildar is engaged on jamabandi duties with me and because the Taluk Sheristadar, who is in charge of the Treasury at Chevayur, cannot conveniently visit the sub-jail daily and attend to the various duties connected therewith.

2. If the Board and Government are asked to kindly expedite the disposal of the proposals relating to the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry to the late District jail buildings, a considerable amount of inconvenience now being experienced will be saved.

Resolution—dated 8th April 1892, Mis. No. 2156.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 4th April 1892, No. 167, with the request that early orders may be passed on the subject of the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry at Calicut to the District jail buildings at that place.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with letter and enclosure, in original, to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

READ—also the following G.O., dated 11th April 1892, No. 712, Judicial.

Read—the following papers :—

From the Surgeon General, Madras, dated 22nd December 1891, No. 755.
From the Inspector-General of Jails, dated 15th March 1892, No. 88.

With reference to paragraph 5 of G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391, I have the honour to submit a further report regarding the utilization of the buildings of the late Calicut District Jail, which was finally closed on the 29th of last month.

2. . . . it is necessary that the new sub-jail should remain in the District jail buildings. The District Magistrate has expressed approval of this, and this is, therefore, the first use to be made of the District jail buildings. The sub-jail thus located will contain the classes of prisoners referred to in paragraph 3 of this office letter, No. 418, dated 5th November 1891, recorded in G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391, and the daily average population may be taken at about 35. For this population two blocks of the District jail will be needed.

3. As regards the use to which the remainder of the District jail buildings are to be put, there are now two rival proposals. The District Magistrate proposes that the cutcherry of the Tahsildar and Sheristadar Magistrates of the Calicut taluk should be removed from Chevayur and placed in the District jail. He remarks that this "will be a distinct advantage," and I believe that proposals to this effect must have been submitted by him as Collector in the Revenue Department. On the other hand it has been suggested that the buildings might be used as an asylum for all the criminal lunatics of the Presidency. The District Magistrate of Malabar is opposed to this idea. . . .

4. . . . I expect that the report of the Medical authorities will be adverse to exposing East Coast lunatics to the trying climate of the West Coast, and there would not be enough West Coast lunatics to justify the creation of an additional asylum for them at Calicut.

5. If then the concentration of criminal lunatics at that place has to be abandoned, the proposal to locate in the old District jail buildings offices of the Tahsildar and Sheristadar of Calicut taluk seems suitable, and the question whether any other offices in Calicut can be likewise transferred may be left for the consideration of the Collector in the Revenue Department.

Order—dated 11th April 1892, No. 712, Judicial.

It is understood that the new criminal ward in the Madras Lunatic Asylum is approaching completion and for this and other reasons the Government considers it advisable to definitely negative the proposal to utilize the abandoned District jail buildings at Calicut as an asylum for criminal lunatics.

2. The Government approves of the proposal to locate the subsidiary jail in the disused buildings; the question of also removing the Taluk cutcherry thither will be considered in the Revenue Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. BUTTERWORTH,
Acting Under Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ the District Magistrate of Malabar.
„ the Inspector-General of Jails.
„ the Surgeon-General.

ORDER—dated 13th May 1892, No. 494, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The transfer of the Taluk cutcherry, Calicut to the District jail buildings recently vacated is approved.

2. Orders will issue in the Public Works Department as regards the disposal of the old Taluk cutcherry building at Chevayur.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with two enclosures returned.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ the Public Works Department.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

65 Copies.

1748/3 1748/3

P. W. CURRENT No. 6044

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. 16-VI-92 Encl.

G.O., 13th May 1892, No. 494.

MAY.

Taluk Cutcherry, Calicut.

The transfer of the — to the District jail buildings recently vacated, approved.

Ry. 1400. W dy 27-5-89
~~-- 2640. W dy 19-12-91~~
-"- 1357. W dy 15-5-91
-"- 3197. W dy 30-11-91
-"- 3300. W dy 8-12-91
-"- 3440. W dy 19-12-91

No. 1742 W dy 11 June '92

B

Communicated to the Supt. Engr. W Circle, who will submit proposals for the disposal of the old Taluk office buildings at Calicut.

D43
11-6-92

8 1/16

3

2 Specifications

S.E. IV Circle.

S. IV Circle 8 7/6

Exd. 8 7/6

S 14/6 J.C. 14/6.

APPENDIX.

G.O., dated 8th November 1869, *Public.*

From E. C. BAYLEY, Esq., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George, dated Simla, the 28th October 1869, No. 4952.

It having been brought to the notice of His Excellency the Governor-General in Council that it is not sufficiently well understood that uncovenanted as well as covenanted servants of Government are not to be permitted to borrow money from natives resident in the district in which they may be employed, I am directed to draw the attention of His Excellency the Governor in Council to the point and to request that, if orders have not already been issued on the subject, they may now be promulgated in the sense of those of the Hon'ble the Vice-President in Council, No. 1372, dated 14th July 1834, a copy of which is herewith forwarded for facility of reference.

ENCLOSURE.

No. 1372, dated the 14th July 1834.

Ordered by the Honorable the Vice-President in Council, Judicial and Revenue Department.

The Principal Sudder Ameens, Sudder Ameens, and Moonsiffs, and the Deputy Collectors appointed under the provisions of Regulation IX of 1833, are hereby prohibited, under pain of dismissal from office, from employing or retaining on their establishment any person being their private creditor, or any relative, dependant or surety of such creditor; and from borrowing money from, or in any way incurring debt to, any zemindar, talookdar, ryot, or other person possessing real property, or residing in, or having a commercial establishment within, the city, district, or division to which their authority may extend.

If any of the Principal Sudder Ameens or other of the officers above mentioned, who may be now in debt, shall, at the expiration of one year from the publication of this order, be still indebted to any person from whom it would, at such period, be illegal for him to borrow under the above rule, it shall be incumbent on such officer to make known the circumstances to the Zillah or City Judge, or to the Collector to whom he may be subordinate, for communication to the Government, if the officer be a Principal Sudder Ameen, Sudder Ameen, or Deputy Collector, and to the Sudder Dewanee Adawlut, if the officer be a Moonsiff; and in the event of intimation not being so given, the same penalty shall attach to the said officer as if the debt had been incurred subsequently to the publication of this order.

In like manner, if any person who may be a candidate for the office of Principal Sudder Ameen, Sudder Ameen, Moonsiff, or Deputy Collector, shall, at the time of applying for such office, be indebted to any person with whom it would be illegal for him to contract a loan while holding it, it shall be incumbent on such person, in preferring his application, to make known the circumstance to the Judge of the City or District, or to the Collector, for communication to superior authority, as before stated; and failing to do so, he shall, in the event of his being appointed to the said office, be subject to the same penalty as if the debt had been contracted subsequently to his appointment.

ORDER THEREON, 8th November 1869.

Recorded, with reference to the Notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 26th August 1869, page 289.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

G.O., dated 13th May 1892, *No.* 594, *Public.*

No. 46. Read the following letter from the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the Chief Commissioner of Oudh, dated Fort William, 25th April 1872, No. 1899:—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 3980, dated the 28th August last, on the subject of the ruling by which uncovenanted officers are prohibited from borrowing money from natives of the districts in which they are employed, and in reply to state as follows.

2. What the Government of India intended in the orders of the 28th October 1869 by the words "Uncovenanted officers" was generally all officers to whom the Uncovenanted Service Leave and Pension Rules are applicable, including members of ministerial establishments. And such a definition is, no doubt, better than the one suggested in paragraph 3 of your letter, viz., officers whose names appear in the Oudh Civil List. Such a limit would exclude from the operation of the rule many uncovenanted officers whom it is expedient to subject to it. That subordinate officers employed in the Revenue Settlement should consider themselves exempt from the general prohibition would be anomalous and possibly mischievous.

3. It is so difficult to fix a limit, including some and excluding others of the uncovenanted class, that the Governor-General in Council considers it right to maintain the rule as applicable to all to whom the Uncovenanted Pension and Leave Regulations apply. But it should be clearly understood that this will not interfere with the discretion of the Head of an Office in allowing his subordinate ministerial officers to borrow, in exceptional circumstances, from persons with whom transactions would under the rule be ordinarily inadmissible.

No. 1900.

Copy of the correspondence forwarded to the Government of Madras for information in continuation of letter, No. 4952, dated the 28th October 1869.

(Signed) E. C. BAYLEY,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 47. ORDER THEREON, 13th May 1872, No. 594.

Ordered that copies of the foregoing papers be furnished to the several Departments of the Secretariat for information and guidance.

2. Ordered, also, that the papers be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* for general information.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Revenue Department.
" Military Department.
" Public Works Department.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 20th June 1892, No. 424.

JUNE.

Public Servants.

Communicating to the Departments of the Secretariat and to all Heads of Departments letter from the Government of India explaining the difference between certain orders prohibiting Public officers from taking loans from persons subject to their official authority or influence.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 20th June 1892, No. 424.

JUNE.

Public Servants.

Communicating to the Departments of the Secretariat and to all Heads of Departments letter from the Government of India explaining the difference between certain orders prohibiting Public officers from taking loans from persons subject to their official authority or influence.

fo 1742 vr dy 29-7-92
11-6-92

APPENDIX.

G.O., dated 8th November 1869, *Public.*

From E. C. BAYLEY, Esq., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George, dated Simla, the 28th October 1869, No. 4952.

It having been brought to the notice of His Excellency the Governor-General in Council that it is not sufficiently well understood that uncovenanted as well as covenanted servants of Government are not to be permitted to borrow money from natives resident in the district in which they may be employed, I am directed to draw the attention of His Excellency the Governor in Council to the point and to request that, if orders have not already been issued on the subject, they may now be promulgated in the sense of those of the Hon'ble the Vice-President in Council, No. 1372, dated 14th July 1834, a copy of which is herewith forwarded for facility of reference.

ENCLOSURE.

No. 1372, dated the 14th July 1834.

Ordered by the Honorable the Vice-President in Council, Judicial and Revenue Department.

The Principal Sudder Ameens, Sudder Ameens, and Moonsiffs, and the Deputy Collectors appointed under the provisions of Regulation IX of 1833, are hereby prohibited, under pain of dismissal from office, from employing or retaining on their establishment any person being their private creditor, or any relative, dependant or surety of such creditor; and from borrowing money from, or in any way incurring debt to, any zemindar, talookdar, ryot, or other person possessing real property, or residing in, or having a commercial establishment within, the city, district, or division to which their authority may extend.

If any of the Principal Sudder Ameens or other of the officers above mentioned, who may be now in debt, shall, at the expiration of one year from the publication of this order, be still indebted to any person from whom it would, at such period, be illegal for him to borrow under the above rule, it shall be incumbent on such officer to make known the circumstances to the Zillah or City Judge, or to the Collector to whom he may be subordinate, for communication to the Government, if the officer be a Principal Sudder Ameen, Sudder Ameen, or Deputy Collector, and to the Sudder Dewanee Adawlut, if the officer be a Moonsiff; and in the event of intimation not being so given, the same penalty shall attach to the said officer as if the debt had been incurred subsequently to the publication of this order.

In like manner, if any person who may be a candidate for the office of Principal Sudder Ameen, Sudder Ameen, Moonsiff, or Deputy Collector, shall, at the time of applying for such office, be indebted to any person with whom it would be illegal for him to contract a loan while holding it, it shall be incumbent on such person, in preferring his application, to make known the circumstance to the Judge of the City or District, or to the Collector, for communication to superior authority, as before stated; and failing to do so, he shall, in the event of his being appointed to the said office, be subject to the same penalty as if the debt had been contracted subsequently to his appointment.

ORDER THEREON, 8th November 1869.

Recorded, with reference to the Notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 26th August 1869, page 289.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

G.O., dated 13th May 189 *No.* 594, *Public.*

No. 46. Read the following letter from the ecretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the hief Commissioner of Oudh, dated Fort William, 25th April 1872, No. 399 :—

I am directed to acknowledge the recei of your letter, No. 3980, dated the 28th August last, on the subject of the rulir by which uncovenanted officers are prohibited from borrowing money from natis of the districts in which they are employed, an l in reply to state as follows.

2. What the Government of India inteed in the orders of the 28th October 1869 by the words " Uncovenanted officers was generally all officers to whom the Uncovenanted Service Leave and Pension ules are applicable, including members of ministerial establishments. And such a deition is, no doubt, better than the one suggested in paragraph 3 of your letter, vi officers whose names appear in the Oudh Civil List. Such a limit would exclu from the operation of the rule many uncovenanted officers whom it is expedien to subject to it. That subordinate officers employed in the Revenue Settlement ould consider themselves exempt from the general prohibition would be anomalous a possibly mischievous.

3. It is so difficult to fix a limit, includ some and excluding others of the uncovenanted class, that the Governor-Gen al in Council considers it right to maintain the rule as applicable to all to who the Uncovenanted Pension and Leave Regulations apply. But it should be clearlyunderstood that this will not interfere with the discretion of the Head of an Offic en allowing his subordinate ministerial officers to borrow, in exceptional circumstanc, from persons with whom transactions would under the rule be ordinarily inadmissi e.

No. 190.

Copy of the correspondence forwarded o the Government of Madras for information in continuation of letter, No. 4952, d ed the 28th October 1869.

(Signed) E. C. BAYLEY,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 47. ORDER THEREON, 13th May 1872, No. 594.

Ordered that copies of the foregoing papers be furnished to the several Departments of the Secretariat for information and guidance.

2. Ordered, also, that the papers be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* for general information.

(True Ext act.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Revenue Department.
" Military Department.
" Public Works Department.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

20th June 1892, No. 424, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From C. J. LYALL, Esq., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department (Public), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, the 31st May 1892, No. 12-1556, Public.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 193, dated the 24th March 1892, inquiring whether the orders contained in Home Department Resolution No. 22-637-53, dated the 16th March 1888, prohibiting public officers, under pain of dismissal, from taking loans from persons subject to their official authority or influence, should be regarded as cancelling the orders marginally noted, and whether uncovenanted officers holding non-gazetted appointments are permitted to borrow money from their subordinates.

Home Department Circular Nos. 4952-60, dated 28th October 1869.
Home Department letter, No. 1899, dated 25th April 1872.

The question has arisen with reference to the case of Mr. _____, late sub-registrar of _____, in the _____ district, who was dismissed from his appointment after inquiry into a charge drawn up against him of having borrowed money from one of his subordinates. Mr. _____ argues that, being a sub-registrar only, he was not an uncovenanted officer holding a gazetted appointment, and that the orders of the Government of India issued in March 1888 do not therefore apply to him.

2. In reply I am to say that, assuming that Mr. _____ was a non-gazetted officer, the orders contained in the Resolution of 16th March 1888 had reference to gazetted officers only and were not intended to cancel the orders of the 28th October 1869 and the 25th April 1872, which apply to uncovenanted non-gazetted officers. I am to explain that the difference between the orders of the 16th March 1888, affecting gazetted officers, and those in the circular of the 28th October 1869 and 25th April 1872, affecting non-gazetted officers, is that in the former case the prohibition is absolute, while in the latter it may be relaxed in exceptional cases at the discretion of the head of the office (subject to the control of the Local Government) as explained in paragraph 3 of Home Department letter, No. 1899, of the 25th April 1872.

ORDER—dated 20th June 1892, No. 424, Public.

Ordered to be communicated to the Departments of the Secretariat and to all Heads of Departments for guidance, with reference to G.O., dated 7th April 1888, No. 375.

2. The orders of 1869 and 1872 quoted by the Government of India will be printed as an appendix to these Proceedings.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Judicial Department (with special reference to G.O., dated 25th April 1892, No. 788, Judicial.)
„ other Departments of the Secretariat.
„ all Heads of Departments.

[Appendix.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 13th May 1892, No. 494.

MAY.

Taluk Cutcherry, Calicut.

The transfer of the — to the District jail buildings recently vacated, approved.

No: 1742 dtd 11 June '92

Communicated to the Supdg Engineer IV Circle, who will submit proposals for the disposal of the old Taluk office building at Cheraya.

(Signed) C.V.B.

To the S.E. IV Circle
.. Ex. & W Accts.

Order—dated 11th April 1892, No. 712, Judicial.

It is understood that the new criminal ward in the Madras Lunatic Asylum is approaching completion and for this and other reasons the Government considers it advisable to definitely negative the proposal to utilize the abandoned District jail buildings at Calicut as an asylum for criminal lunatics.

2. The Government approves of the proposal to locate the subsidiary jail in the disused buildings; the question of also removing the Taluk cutcherry thither will be considered in the Revenue Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. BUTTERWORTH,
Acting Under Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ the District Magistrate of Malabar.
„ the Inspector-General of Jails.
„ the Surgeon-General.

ORDER—dated 13th May 1892, No. 494, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The transfer of the Taluk cutcherry, Calicut to the District jail buildings recently vacated is approved.

2. Orders will issue in the Public Works Department as regards the disposal of the old Taluk cutcherry building at Chevayur.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with two enclosures returned.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ the Public Works Department.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

65 Copies.

4. Now that the District jail has been abolished, the transfer of the Tahsildar-Magistrate's office from Chevayur, the inconveniences of which locality are already known to the Board and Government, to the jail buildings will be a distinct advantage, especially as the sub-jail, which is in charge of the Tahsildar-Magistrate, has also been ordered by Government to be located in them.

5. The removal of the Deputy Tahsildar's cutcherry to the jail buildings would be a source of inconvenience on account of the distance of the buildings from the town, and I am therefore of opinion that the Deputy Tahsildar's cutcherry should remain where it is at present or be removed to the Treasury building of the old Huzur office. I request that the transfer of the Calicut Taluk cutcherry to the District jail buildings may be approved and sanction accorded for the sale of the buildings at Chevayur now used at the Taluk cutcherry.

Resolution—dated 4th April 1892, No. 167.

Submitted for the orders of Government with reference to the last sentence of paragraph 5 of G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391 (Judicial Department), communicated with G.O., dated 17th December 1891, No. 6417, Revenue Department.

2. For the reasons stated by the Collector, the Board supports his proposals that the District jail buildings may be transferred to the Revenue Department for the occupation of the Tahsildar of Calicut and his establishment, and that the present Taluk office building at Chevayur may be sold.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

READ—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 8th April 1892, Mis. No. 2156 :—

Read—the following letter from W. DUMERGUE, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Calicut, 26th March 1892, Ref. on C. No. 1043—P. 92 :—

In submitting, herewith, a copy of letter, dated 18th instant, Ref. on No. 80-C. & D.—M., from the Deputy Magistrate, Calicut, I have the honour to request that the Board will be pleased to obtain the early orders of Government on my letter of the 3rd instant, Ref. on C. No. 147-P., requesting sanction forthe transfer of Calicut Taluk cutcherry to the old District jail buildings.

2. The sub-jail is more than a mile from the Deputy Tahsildar and Magistrate's office and the present Taluk cutcherry is about three miles from the sub-jail. The inconvenience of the existing arrangement will be obvious, but no other arrangement is possible unless and until the Taluk cutcherry is moved from Chevayur as proposed.

ENCLOSURE.

From V. CHAPPAN MENON, Deputy Magistrate, to the District Magistrate of Malabar, dated Calicut, 18th March 1892, Ref. on No. 80-C. & D.—M.

I have the honour to inform you that I have, as a temporary measure, put the Town Magistrate, Calicut, in charge of the sub-jail, as the Tahsildar is engaged on jamabandi duties with me and because the Taluk Sheristadar, who is in charge of the Treasury at Chevayur, cannot conveniently visit the sub-jail daily and attend to the various duties connected therewith.

2. If the Board and Government are asked to kindly expedite the disposal of the proposals relating to the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry to the late District jail buildings, a considerable amount of inconvenience now being experienced will be saved.

Resolution—dated 8th April 1892, Mis. No. 2156.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 4th April 1892, No. 167, with the request that early orders may be passed on the subject of the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry at Calicut to the District jail buildings at that place.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with letter and enclosure, in original, to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

READ—also the following G.O., dated 11th April 1892, No. 712, Judicial.

Read—the following papers :—

From the Surgeon-General, Madras, dated 22nd December 1891, No. 755.
From the Inspector-General of Jails, dated 15th March 1892, No. 88.

With reference to paragraph 5 of G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391, I have the honour to submit a further report regarding the utilization of the buildings of the late Calicut District Jail, which was finally closed on the 29th of last month.

2. . . . it is necessary that the new sub-jail should remain in the District jail buildings. The District Magistrate has expressed approval of this, and this is, therefore, the first use to be made of the District jail buildings. The sub-jail thus located will contain the classes of prisoners referred to in paragraph 3 of this office letter, No. 418, dated 5th November 1891, recorded in G.O., dated 21st November 1891, No. 2391, and the daily average population may be taken at about 35. For this population two blocks of the District jail will be needed.

3. As regards the use to which the remainder of the District jail buildings are to be put, there are now two rival proposals. The District Magistrate proposes that the cutcherry of the Tahsildar and Sheristadar Magistrates of the Calicut taluk should be removed from Chevayur and placed in the District jail. He remarks that this "will be a distinct advantage," and I believe that proposals to this effect must have been submitted by him as Collector in the Revenue Department. On the other hand it has been suggested that the buildings might be used as an asylum for all the criminal lunatics of the Presidency. The District Magistrate of Malabar is opposed to this idea. . . .

4. . . . I expect that the report of the Medical authorities will be adverse to exposing East Coast lunatics to the trying climate of the West Coast, and there would not be enough West Coast lunatics to justify the creation of an additional asylum for them at Calicut.

5. If then the concentration of criminal lunatics at that place has to be abandoned, the proposal to locate in the old District jail buildings offices of the Tahsildar and Sheristadar of Calicut taluk seems suitable, and the question whether any other offices in Calicut can be likewise transferred may be left for the consideration of the Collector in the Revenue Department.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 4th April 1892, No. 167 :—

MR. E. GIBSON.

Read—the following letter from W. DUMERGUE, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Calicut, 3rd March 1892, Ref. on C. No. 147—P-92 :—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1892, Mis., No. 203 (Land Revenue), I have the honour to request that the sanction of Government may be obtained for the transfer of the Taluk cutcherry, Calicut, to the District jail buildings recently vacated.

2. In its Order, dated 10th October 1883, No. 1262, Revenue, embodied in G.O., dated 17th December 1883, No. 3595 W., Public Works, the Government approved of Mr. Galton's proposal to provide the Calicut Tahsildar and the Town Sub-Magistrate with proper accommodation on the premises purchased from Messrs. Stanes and Co., and now occupied by the District Court, Sub-Court and the two Munsifs' Courts. This arrangement was subsequently abandoned on the representation of Mr. Logan, who wrote as follows in paragraph 5 of his letter, dated 12th February 1886, No. 577, embodied in Board's Proceedings, dated 18th March 1886, No. 644 :—

"If my recommendation in paragraph 4 is approved, the necessity for constructing a new cutcherry for those * officers can be avoided and the late Huzur cutcherry buildings can be adopted for their use at a moderate cost. In fact a portion of the *main* building in which the arms collected in the late disarmaments are now stored and which is considered by the Public Works Department to be sufficiently strong (*vide* paragraph 2 of Mr. Davidson's letter recorded in G.O., dated 8th May 1884, No. 1168-W.A.) may be used as a court-room, &c., of the Tahsildar-Magistrate, while the remaining blocks may, with slight alterations, be converted into an excellent sub-jail—a desideratum which has long been felt at Calicut. The present Town sub-jail is entirely unsuited for the purpose and has been condemned by all Inspecting officers."

* Tahsildar and Deputy Tahsildar.

These proposals had the entire approval of the Board—*vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 18th March 1886, No. 644.

3. The main building above referred to has since been dismantled, and owing to the necessity of providing accommodation for the Currency office in the new building, it has been decided to let the District press remain where it is and to convert the proposed Printing office in the new Huzur cutcherry into a Currency office—*vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd July 1891, Mis. No. 4547, and 8th August 1891, Mis. No. 5668. Thus the accommodation available at the old Huzur office buildings will be (1) the building occupied by the present Treasury and Currency office, and (2) a part of the Printing office which is now used as the record-rooms. This is insufficient for a Taluk office and much more for a Tahsildar's and Deputy Tahsildar's office as originally proposed.