

7630  
Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 2691X

DATED 21<sup>st</sup> September  
1896.

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Reuts: The request of - in advance noted  
not to be insisted on in the case of  
Barristers as for accommodation available  
of by them in the new Law Courts buildings,  
Madras.*

| FURTHER PAPERS. |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |
|-----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
| G.O.            | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|                 |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

CURRENT No. 7630

The recovery of  
rents in advance need not  
be insisted on in the case  
in question.

From The Examiner  
P. W. Beckwith  
Madras.

No. 249/2A

Dated 21 August 1896.

Received 24-8-96

*Enclosures* 2.

*Spare copies*

SUBJECT.

Pknts - Requesting  
to obtain orders of  
Govt regarding recovery  
of \_\_\_\_\_ in advance  
from Barris Aero Fee  
for accommodation avail-  
able by them in the New  
Law Court Buildings  
in Madras.

Ch  
C.A. to Wm. ✓  
Gen. Wm. ✓

old 361 R 7/9

22/8

(En: 2)

19 AUG 1896

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Chepak, 17 August 1896.

No. 2613

Copy of a communication from the Registrar of the High Court of Judicature, Madras to the Consulting Architect to Government, No. 267 dated 11 August 1896.

Adverting to your letter No. 2452 dated 7<sup>th</sup> Instant, referring me to para 55c of Chapter II, Vol. II of the P. W. Code, I have the honor to inform you that I am unable to agree with you that the case comes within the sections of the Public Works Code quoted in your letter of 22 Ultimo. I should state that, were it necessary to collect the rents in question in advance I should require extra establishment. As it is, the collection is a matter of considerable difficulty.

Forwarded to the Examiner, P. W. Accounts, Madras, for information with the request that he will be good enough to state whether he considers the contention of the Registrar correct.


17.8.96

Lt: Colonel M

Ag: Consulting Architect  
to Govt.

No.

Chepak, \_\_\_\_\_ 189 .



Copy of a communication from the Consulting Architect to Government to the

Registrar, High Court of JudicatureNo. 2452, dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 1896.

With reference to your No. 44 of 7.1.8.96 I have the honour to refer you to P. W. Code Vol II Chap. II para 55c (S.O. No. 67 of 7.3.12.95) The term "private individual" as used therein is opposed to "public individual" i.e. public servant. I do not consider Barristers, Attorneys &c are "public servants" tho they may under special orders be termed as officers of the High Court. In this sense therefore, it appears to me that the rule should be applied to them.

(True copy)

C. A. M.

17.8.96

Lt. Colonel M.

By: Consulting Architect  
to Govt.

Dec. 1  
7630/96

u/2

Old 2  
7630/96