

Pension (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 307

DATED 1-6-99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Granting an *invalid* pension of Rs. *6-0-0* per mensem to *G.*
Kesavulu Shetty late *1st C. C. No. 72* of the
Nellore D.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

([3])
300-24-8-94.

C. No. 34/
PENSION DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following papers:—

From the Inspector-General of Police, dated 22nd April

1899, No. $\frac{81}{P.R.}$

ORDER THEREON, 1st June 1899 No. 307.

UNDER Articles 485, 513 (6) & 552 sub B
of the Civil Service Regulations (2nd Edition),
the Right Honorable the Governor in Council is
pleased to grant to Yadala Kesavalu
Chetti late 1st B. C. No. $\frac{72}{229}$ of
the Nellore D^{ist}, an Indian

Character - Fair
N^o of years service = 20 $\frac{3}{4}$
N^o of defaults = 8
Please see defaults sheet
flagged D.
Fined = 5 times

Reduced in Dec 1881
from 2nd to 3rd C. C. for
deserving his super and
overstaying his 3 days annual
leave by 17 days.
pension — of Rupees (6-0-0) Six
only per

Reduced in Aug 1898
from 1st to 4th G. H. C. for
hushing up a theft case
payable at Atmakur
from 2nd March 1899
in consideration of his qualifying Police
service of 20 years,
9 months and 14
days.

Reduced in Jan 99
from 4th G. H. C. to 1. C. C. for
hushing up a theft case
2. The full pension admissible under the
rules has not been granted as the applicant's
conduct and character have not been thoroughly
satisfactory.

Max^m pension = Rs 7-2-6 per
M^{rs} retired practically to
To the Accountant-General, with the Register and L. P. C.
Inspector-General of Police.

Escape the consequences of his misconduct.
Rs 8 is the full pay of a 1. C. C. M^{rs} may
get Rs 6⁰⁰ 15/10/99

19/5/99
C. 17/5/99

APPLICATION FOR PENSION OR GRATUITY.

1. Name of Applicant. *Jadala Kesavulu Chetty*
2. Father's name. *Jadala Chennappa Chetty*
3. Race, Sect and Caste. *Balija. Vaishnava, Atmakur Taluq.*
4. Residence showing Village and Pergunnah. *Kulloor, Atmakur Taluq.*
5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment. *1st C.B. No 72 229 Nellore D.L.*
6. Date of beginning of service. *1.5.78*
7. Date of ending of service. *1.3.99*
8. Length of service, including interruptions Y. M. D.
 of which superior or Police *20-10-1*
 inferior *20-9-14*
 non-qualifying and interruptions *17*
9. Class of pension or ~~gratuity~~ applied for, and cause of application. *Invalid*
10. [Average] emoluments or pay. *Rs 21.7.7*
11. Proposed pension. *Rs 7.2.6*
12. Proposed gratuity. *" Nil "*
13. Date from which pension is to commence. *2.3.99*
14. Place of payment. *Atmakur, Nellore District*
15. Date of Applicant's birth by Christian era.† *1-7-54*
16. Height. *5ft. 8 inches*
17. Marks. *A scar above the right eye-brow, 2 raised scars on the middle of the chest, a scar on the palm or surface on each wrist and a mole between the eye brows.*
18. Date. *22d March 1999*

* If the application is for a compensation, pension or gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† If not known exactly, must be stated on the best information or estimate.

Thumb

[Signature]
 Ag. Superintendent of Police
 SIGNATURE OF HEAD OF OFFICE.

HISTORY OF THE SERVICE (SHOWING INTERRUPTIONS) OF 1st C.B. No 72 yadala Kesavudu Chetty.

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting Allowance.	Date of beginning.	Date of ending.	Period reckoned as service.	Period not reckoned as service.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by the Audit Officer.
Nellore Police Force	3rd C.B.	RS. 6-8-0	RS.	1-5-78	16-2-79	Y. 9 M. 16 D.				
	2nd C.B.	7-0-0		17-2-79	11-12-81	Y. 2 M. 25 D.				
	Generaly 3rd C.C.	6-8-0		12-12-81	4-7-83	Y. 1 M. 6 D.	17	Promotion		
	2nd C.B.	7-0-0		5-7-83	12-11-83	Y. 4 M. 8 D.		Reduction		
	1st C.B.	8-0-0		13-11-83	31-10-84	Y. 11 M. 18 D.		Promotion		
	4th G.H.C.	12-0-0		1-11-84	30-11-87	Y. 3 M. 1 D.		do		
	3rd G.H.C.	15-0-0		1-12-87	31-7-91	Y. 3 M. 8 D.		do		
	2nd G.H.C.	20-0-0		1-8-91	12-5-96	Y. 4 M. 12 D.		do		
	1st G.H.C.	25-0-0		13-5-96	15-10-97	Y. 1 M. 5 D.		do		
	Leave without pay.			16-10-97	14-8-98	Y. 9 M. 29 D.		do		
	4 G.H.C.	14-0-0		15-8-98	27-1-99	Y. 5 M. 13 D.		reduction		
	1st C.C.	8-0-0		28-1-99	1-3-99	Y. 1 M. 4 D.		reduction		
Total period of Superior Service						20 9 14	17			

By pay bills and monthly returns in the District Police Office

This Constable had no service in any other Department previous to his entering the Police

1. As to character and past conduct of Applicant.

2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation.

3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by Applicant. (See Chapter XXI.)

4. Explanation under Article 469 so far as the Head of the Office can give it.

5. Any other remarks.

6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not. (See Article 991 (b).)

REMARKS BY HEAD OF OFFICE.

12-12-81 Reduced to 3rd C.C. for deceiving his superior and overstaying his 3 days casual leave by 17 days.

15-8-98 Reduced to 4th G.H.C. by D.S.G. for hushup as a theft case.

28-1-99 to 1st C.C. by S.G. of Police for. do.

Nil

Nil

CERTIFICATE AND REPORT OF THE AUDIT OFFICER (1).

CERTIFIED that (subject to the remarks below recorded) qualifying service in inferior or superior grades has been duly proved for days; and that a (pension or gratuity) not exceeding Rs. months of the Civil Service Regulations. The calculations have been duly verified. The (pension or gratuity) is chargeable to (here specify whether to General Revenues, or to what Fund).

SIGNATURE.

DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT

(1) In the case of Civil Engineers and Telegraph Officers who are eligible for the additional pensions authorized in Article 714, the following addition should be made to the usual form of certificate:— He has served for three years as (Chief Engineer, Superintending Engineer, &c., as the case may be) and is eligible for a special additional pension of Rs. $\frac{1,000}{2,000}$, if he is considered to have rendered "approved service" under Article 714 of the Civil Service Regulations.

Pension (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 341

From *W. J. A. Sullivan Esq.*
Ag. Surgeon of Office
Madras

Order



No. 81
P.R.

Dated *22 April 1899.*

Received

Registered

Enclosures *8.*

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submits an application for
the grant of Pension to Yadala
Kesava Chetty Lakshmi 1 class
Canal No 72 of Bellary District
229

APPLICATION FOR PENSION OR GRATUITY—

Date of Application.

Name of Applicant.

Last Appointment.

Class of pension or gratuity.

Amount of pension sanctioned.

Amount of gratuity sanctioned.

Date of commencement.

Date of sanction.

Cur. 341/99

S.D.
30/4/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(Certificate for retirement on invalid pension or gratuity.)



CERTIFIED that I have carefully examined

Yathala Kesavalu Chetti

son of Yathala Chennappa Chetti

a 1st class Constable

in the Police Department, Nellore

His age is by his own statement 46 years and by appearance about 46

years.

I consider Yathala Kesavalu Chetti

to be completely and permanently incapacitated for further service of any kind or in

the Department to which he belongs in consequence of *Diabetes and defective vision.*

His incapacity does not appear to me to have been caused by irregular or intemperate habits.

STATION *Nellore* } *W. W. L. Beau* Name.
 Date *2nd March 1899.* } Rank.
 Designation.

NOTE.— the incapacity is obviously the result of intemperance, substitute for the words in italics "In my opinion his incapacity is the result of irregular or intemperate habits.)

Countersigned.

Surgn.-Major-Genl.,
 Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras.

STATEMENT OF CASE.

- Rank. 1st Class Constable No. 72.
- Name. Yathala Kesavaiah Chetty
- Department or Office. Police
- Marks of identification. a scar above the right eye brow, two raised scars on the middle of the chest, a scar on the palmar surface of each wrist & a mole between the eyebrows
- Age. 46
- Service. 20 years & 10 months
- Sick leave granted during the service. Two months
- Disease or cause of disability. Diabetes & defective vision
- Abstract statement of case showing how the disease or disability was contracted, the results of the treatment adopted. In case the disease or disability is believed to have been caused by irregular or intemperate habits, the reasons for such belief should be stated.

He suffers from frequent flow of urine in a large quantity & consequent debility - It is said to be of about a year's duration. Specific gravity of his urine is 1028 & sugar present. Any exertion exhausts him soon & he is weak particularly about the lower limbs & thus not able to walk long. His eye sight is defective & he has to strain his eyes to look at a thing at some distance. Under the reasons he is not fit for further service.

K. W. L. M.
2.3.99

Form No. 126.

Defaulter sheet of Yathala Kesavaiah Chetty Name

1st C.C. Rank

72/229

No.

Brief description of offence.	Date when committed.	PUNISHMENT.		By whom ordered.	Date of order.
		Black Marks.	Other Punishments.		
(1) For not shaving before coming on parade	11.6.78	..	Fines 2.00	Supdt of Police	
(2) For coming without dress on parade	29.4.81	..	Fines 4.00	do	
(3) For deceiving his superiors and over staying his leave by 3 days	12.12.81	..	Reduced to 3rd CC	do	
(4) For keeping his arms in a dirty state as found by H. Prob. Magt	30.3.87	..	Fines 1 Rupee	do	
(5) For sending a case of Forest Act referred to him on 2.1.94 for enquiry by Sub Magistrate to the Local Director for disposal instead of investigating into it, in spite of a previous warning for adopting a wrong procedure in Cr. No 19 of his station	17.2.94	..	Fines 1 Rupee	do	
He entered in his crime Register a wrong theft reported to him as a civil case (Crime No 28/1893) instead of registering it under proper section of I.P.C. and then withholding his investigation under sec. 157 K.I.C.P., if he found proof for the same. He for failing to answer in person before the Court at the Superintendent's Examination on 17.2.94 and for not producing teaching the same to his men. He for hasty & improper behaviour in a village. Whereby he came into conflict with the villagers 20-8-86					
				Fines 1 Rupee	do

PUNISHMENT.		By whom ordered.	Date of order.
Black Marks.	Other Punishments.		

Brief description of offence.

Date when committed.

Certificate.
 Certifies that the finger prints
 have been taken in my presence
 and under my personal Superintendence
 from the left hand of the individual,
 whose services are entered in this extract
 or whose pension forms the subject
 of the application

District Police Office
 Nellore. 22d March 1899

Sub-Inspector for
 Supt. of Police Nellore.

9
4
341

Under Secs. 401-00

- VI Madras Police Gazette Received a reward of Rs 5/- offered by the District Magistrate Nellore for saving a boy from drowning. dated 22.2.96
- VII M. P. Gazette Received a reward of Rs 15 offered by a private individual for detecting a house breaking and theft. of 10.10.96

9
6
341

District Police
 Office Nellore
 22d March 1899

Ag. Superintendent of Police

much delay. A Sndra's marriage ceremony takes up 5 days only. I reduce D.C. 229. Kasavulu to 3^d C. C. for deceiving his Inspector and over-staying his leave by 17 days. He will further forfeit 17 days pay for the 17 days he was absent from duty.

(sd) W. J. A. Sullivan
Supt of Police
12.12.81.

(True Copy)

District Police
Office Bellare
22^d March/99

Ag Superintendent
of Police

Office of the Deputy Inspector General of Police
Central Range

23rd July 1898

Order on Appeal Petition No 113 of 1898

1. Read appeal petition dated 4th June 1898 of late 1894 No 229. Kasavulu of Bellare District - appealing against his dismissal by the Superintendent of Police, Bellare, with all the connected papers.

2. Read Copy of minute and extract from defaulters register.

A lot of discrepant evidence has been given by the policemen. examined as witnesses in this case but the reason for this is not far to seek. They naturally wished to screen their Station House Officer as long as they thought it safe to do so without incurring any personal risk. As soon as they saw matters taking a dangerous turn for themselves, they eventually blurted out what apparently actually happened.

II

The points for consideration are (a) was a theft committed (b) was any person arrested in connection with the theft (c) if arrested, why was he not charged? III

III. I hold that a theft of cloths did take place and that the dropping down of the bundles from a bandy is a cock-and-bull story to which no credence whatever can be attached. There can be no doubt that the weavers had the bundles with them in Ramatchiam's house on the night they slept there and that they did not lose them on the way toellore. It is pretty clear that this woman was first saddled with the Commission of the theft and the ground for the police suspecting her was the fact of the owners of the cloths having slept in her house and her moral character not being above suspicion.

IV. As regards the arrest of a person in connection with the theft, there can be no doubt whatever that a yanadi was arrested and brought to the station. He was seen being escorted by the police in the direction of the station with a bundle of cloths by 3^d class Inspector v. Subbapillai then Audit Inspector, and now acting Head Quarter Inspector. This Inspector has no object whatever in lying on this point. His evidence is corroborated by the 8th witness who was being

being driven in the same carriage. He is a master of arts and totally unconnected with the police. It is immaterial how long the prisoner was detained in the station. This point cannot affect the actual question of arrest.

V. The prisoner having been once arrested, it was the duty of the police either to charge him, or, if the evidence was insufficient to release him on his own recognizance. It is proved by the records that they did not adopt either course.

VI. Appellant wishes me to believe that he was perfectly ignorant of all that happened. It is simply absurd for him to advance this plea. As Station House Officer he must have been cognizant of the whole matter and there is evidence to show that he came to the station and saw the accused in confinement there. Neither his subordinate Head Constables nor Constables could have done what they did without his moral support.

VII. The question of punishment now remains. Though as Station House Officer a appellant deserves more severe punishment than his subordinates for the bad example he has set them. I am of opinion that dismissal would be too harsh a measure in the case of an officer of his long service. I consider reduction from 1st to 4th Grade Head Constable will meet the requirements of the case and substitute this order for that of dismissal. He will be permitted to return to duty at once and the period from the date of his suspension to the date of his return to duty will be treated as absence on leave without pay.

(sd) W. J. A. Sullivan
Dy Inspector General
of Police

(True copy)

Sellone }
22.3.99 }

Ag Superintendent
of Police

Chief office of the Inspector General of Police,
Madras. 14th January 1899.

No 182.

Official Memorandum

Order of the Inspector General of Police on
petition from J. Kesavulu 4th Grade Head
Constable No. 229 of Bellare, appealing
against his reduction from 1st Grade.

The appellant was 1st Grade Head Constable
and Station House officer of Bellare Town until
the 28th October 1897, when he was reduced to
the rank of 1st class Constable by the Superintendent
for conniving at the hush up of the arrest
and subsequent release of a prisoner. He appealed
to the Deputy Inspector General, who ordered
his prosecution as well as that of the other
Police officers concerned with him. He was then
prosecuted accordingly and he and another Head
Constable and the Station writer were acquitted
by the Sessions Court, while a third Head
Constable was convicted; but on appeal to
the High

the High Court the last mentioned was acquitted. After the Conclusion of the trial in the Sessions Court, the Superintendent again considered the Case of the appellant, and on the additional evidence that was forth coming, he came to the Conclusion that the appellant had taken a more active part in hurrying up the Case than appears at the original enquiry in October. The appellant was accordingly dismissed by the Superintendent, but this order was modified by the Deputy Inspector General, who reduces the appellant to 4th Grade Head Constable. Against this order the appellant now appeals to me.

2. The first point to be decided is whether the yanadi prisoner was ever arrested and brought to the Station on the 24th August 1897. Of this I have no doubt at all. Constable no. 913 has stated from the beginning that he arrested the yanadi and took him to the Station with the bundle of cloths. The yanadi was seen in this Constable's custody by the Ag. Head Quarter Inspector of Police and by

Mr.

Mr. Venkatasubbiah M. A. pleader. When Mr. Thomas held his first enquiry Shopkeeper after Shopkeeper in the Bazaar Street told him that they had seen the Constable taking the yanadi and the cloths to the Station. The witnesses Seshachari and Appayya actually saw the prisoner in the Station. Moreover the supposition that the Constable no. 913 released the yanadi before he got to the Station is so highly improbable that it may be rejected, for he knew that he had been seen by the Head Quarter Inspector of Police with whom he had spoken regarding the arrest and by a large number of the Bazaar people and there is no conceivable reason why he having taken the prisoner through the Bazaar Street nearly up to the Station should then release him. The evidence of the witnesses Seshachari and Appayya that they saw the prisoner at the Station has not been shaken and therefore as already stated I have no hesitation in finding that the yanadi was taken to the Station and placed in the lock-up. No entry of this arrest or of the subsequent release of the yanadi appears in the

in the Station records.

3. The appellant admittedly was not present at the Station at the time of the arrest, but he was there an hour later. There is some evidence that the yanadi was not released until the morning of the 25th August 1897, the day after the arrest, but I agree with the Sessions Court and the High Court in considering that this evidence cannot be relied upon, as the witnesses did not come forward at once and they have given conflicting accounts of what transpired. There is, however, an entry, in the appellant's handwriting on the 25th August to the effect that the owners of the cloths had come to the Station that morning with the cloths saying that the bundle had fallen from the cart on the 23rd and that they had found them in a place which was frequented by hundreds of people. It may well be asked why the cloth merchants should come to report this at the Station; they had not reported the loss and therefore there was no necessity to report the recovery. It is suggested that the report

report was made because the borders had been torn off, but it does not appear that the cloth merchants laid any complaint nor that the report was treated as a complaint. The appellant however against himself under the plea of absence and says that the entry was made by him from a written note given to him by Head Constable Jakursing. The accounts given by the appellant, by Jakursing and by the Station writer as to what actually transpired differ essentially and there can be little doubt that the story is untrue. There is no conclusive direct evidence that I can accept that the appellant saw the yanadi prisoner in the lock up but having regard to the facts that he came to the Station an hour after the man was brought there that he made in the Crime register on the following day an entry of an untrue story and that he, if anybody, as being the Station House officer was interested in suppressing the case, for it is he, and not the other Head Constable, who is interested in the detection results of the Station it is impossible to resist the

the inference that the omission to register the arrest of the prisoner and the illegal release were committed either by or at the instigation of the appellant. But be this as it may, it is clear that the appellant ought to have known what had transpired and the acceptance of his plea that he was ignorant of it all leads naturally to the conclusion that he is quite unfit for the charge of a large Station and therefore unfit for the higher grades of Head Constable, for as he is fit for only a light charge he cannot be given the higher pay. I therefore concur in the decision of the Deputy Inspector-General reducing him from the 1st to the 4th Grade.

4. It is desirable to point out that I have accepted none of the evidence which is rejected by the Sessions Court and the High Court. From that evidence was tainted in that it was not given at once at the Superintendent's first enquiry and that several of the witnesses then made statements

statements which were inconsistent with their later depositions. I may here remark that if the Sessions Judge's judgment had not been so confused and if the facts for the prosecution had been properly placed before the High Court at the hearing of the appeal, I have no doubt that the Honourable the Judges would have confirmed the conviction of the Head Constable who was found guilty by the Sessions Court.

5. The appellant urges in his appeal petition that the case had been concealed by the Head Quarter Inspector of Police, Suburban. There is not a tittle of evidence in support of this allegation. He also criticises the evidence of the Sentries who are said to have made a clean breast of the whole matter to the Superintendent and urges that he was not given an opportunity to cross-examine them. The answer to this is that I have not taken the evidence of these men into consideration. Thirdly he points out that the evidence of constables 361, 500, 20, 890 and 913 was disbelieved by the Sessions Court. This is not true as regards the

the evidence of 913 the Constable who arrested the yanadi, and as regards the other Constables, I have followed the Sessions Court in declining to put any reliance on their evidence. Lastly, he urges that he is a man of good character and has 20 years service. I have given every consideration to these facts. But for their existence I should have dismissed him.

6. There is one more point to be dealt with. As stated above the appellant alleges that this case has been concocted by the Head Quarter Inspector of Police who bears enmity against him because the appellant refused to subscribe to a purse which the Head Quarter Inspector was making up for a singing girl from Bellary. He refers for evidence in support of this very serious charge to the depositions given by the Head Quarter Inspector and the pleader Venkatasubbiah. I have been carefully through these as well as other depositions and as recorded above, I have found not a little of evidence in support of these charges. Moreover if
the

the Head Quarter Inspector were a man of this character and had wished to concoct a case against the appellant, he would have brought something more direct than this charge, in which the appellant is not so clearly implicated as Head Constable Raminah. The alleged ground of enmity is denied by the Head Quarter Inspector, but even if the incident put forward were true, it is absurd to suppose for a moment that a man in the Inspector's position would, for a cause so trivial, have deliberately concocted a charge which involves a number of other people besides the appellant and involves them or some of them in a greater degree than him.

The practice of bringing reckless charges of this nature in appeal petitions is by no means uncommon, and it is a practice which cannot be permitted for a moment. If the appellant was a man of less service, I should have dismissed him; but, as it is, I think it will be sufficient to order his

reduction

reduction to the rank of 1st class Constable.
 This reduction is a specific punishment
 for recklessly bringing an entirely untrue
 charge against the Head Quarter Inspector.

Signed H. Douglas Robertson
 for Ag. Insp. Genl. of Police

(True Copy)

Police office,
 Bellary 22.3.99 }
 Ag. Superintendent of Police.

Memorandum
 Calculation of 6 months
 5 years average emoluments from 2nd March 1904 to 1st March 1909

	Rs	As	P
26 31 March 1904 @ 20 p.m.	19	5	8
1 April 1904 to 30 April 1906 @ do	500		
16 12 May 1906 @ do	7	11	10
13 31 May 1906 @ 25 p.m.	15	5	2
1 June 1906 to 31 July 1908 @ do	650		
15 14 Aug 1908 @ do	11	4	7
15 31 Aug 1908 @ 14 p.m.	7	10	10
1 Sept 1908 to 31 Dec 1908 @ do	56		
16 27 Jan 1909 @ do	12	3	
28 31 Jan 1909 @ 8 p.m.	1		6
16 28 Feb 1909 @ do	8		
1 March 1909 @ do	4		2

Rs 1288-13-9
 Rs 21-7-8

Pension is 20
 60 of 21-7-8
 = Rs 7.2.6

9
 10
 341

MR

Douglas Robertson
 Ag. Asst. Super. Genl. of Police

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

No. *81*
PA

MADRAS,

22 April

1899.

FROM

W. J. A. Sullivan Esquire.
M. HAMMICK, Esq., I.C.S.,

Ag. INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

Madras,

To

THE UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PENSION DEPARTMENT,

Fort St. George.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit for orders of Government an application for the grant of a *pension to* *Yadala Kesavalu Chetti* late a 1st class Constable No. *72* of the *St. George* District.
229

2. He has served in the Police Department for *20* years *9* months and *14* days, and has borne a *fair* character. He is now unfit for further effective service of any kind as certified by *the Surgeon on the* *2nd March 1899.*

3. He is entitled to *an invalid monthly pension of* *Rupees (7. 2. 6) Seven Annas two and pice Six* payable at *Attur* from *2nd March 1899.*

according to

of the Police Superannuation Fund

Rules and Articles *485, 518* ^{*(h)*} and *552* *Scale B* of the Civil Service Regulations (*Third* ~~Second~~ Edition).

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most Obedient servant,

W. J. A. Sullivan

for Ag. Insp. Genl. of Police.

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED _____
189 _____

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

• ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.