

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 84.85 Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated 7-2-1861

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
7th February 1861.*

No. 12. Read the following letter from A. PURVIS, Esq., Magistrate of the Godavery District, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Dowlaishwarum, 1861, No. 28.

With reference to the Order of Government under date the 6th ultimo, No. 722, I have the honor to report that the offence charged against the 6 British Subjects therein referred to, does not, from a communication I have received from the Chief of Yanam in reply to a reference made to him, appear to fall under any of the 3 descriptions specified in the 8th and 9th paragraphs of the Advocate General's letter of the 28th November 1860. The individuals in question are accused of having purchased in the English Territory, at low prices, property which they knew had been stolen in the French Territory, but this is, according to the opinion of the Advocate General, not a punishable offence. The accused deny the charge and the Yanam authorities have sent no evidence to establish it. The principal in the case of the robbery, who would appear to have criminated the above parties and on whose information their extradition was demanded, subsequently died of Cholera in the Jail of Yanam.

2. I venture to remark with reference to paragraph 13 of the Advocate General's letter of the 28th November, that I did so far act under Section XIX of Act VII of 1854, as to apprehend the accused, or as many of them as could then be found, but as the Yanam authorities adduced no evidence, I was unable to proceed further in the matter.

No. 13. ORDER THEREON, 7th February 1861, No. 84.

*From Magistrate of Godavery District, 5th November 1860.
Government Order, 22nd Nov. 1860, No. 685.
From Advocate General, 28th November 1860,
omitting paragraph 12, and the list subjoined.
Government Order, 6th Dec. 1860, No. 722.*

Resolved, that a copy of the above report, and of the papers noted in the margin be furnished to His Excellency the Governor of the French Establishments in India, in reference to his communication under date 17th October last, and that the following letter be despatched.

(Here enter 7th February 1861, No. 85.)

2. It is presumed that the individuals referred to by the Magistrate are not under detention—but if they are, they should at once be released.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 14. To His Excellency M. D'UBRAYE, Governor of the French Establishments in India, &c., &c., &c., dated Fort Saint George, 7th February 1861, No. 85.

I have had the honor of receiving your Excellency's letter of the 17th October last, representing that a difference of opinion had arisen between Mr. Purvis, Magistrate of the Godavery District, and M. le Chef de Service at Yanam, in respect of certain parties, inhabitants of Ingeram, charged with having been accomplices by concealment in a robbery committed in French territory, whose extradition had been demanded by M. le Chef, but declined by Mr. Purvis.

*From Magistrate of Godavery District, 5th November 1860.
Government Order, 22nd Nov. 1860, No. 685.
From Advocate General, 28th November 1860.
Government Order, 6th Dec. 1860, No. 722.
From Magistrate of Godavery District, 23rd January 1861, No. 28.*

2. In reply I beg to forward for your information a copy of the correspondence, as per margin, which has passed upon the subject between the Government, Mr. Purvis, and the Advocate General.

3. From this it will be seen that on receipt of your Excellency's letter, the Magistrate of the Godavery District was at once called on for a report upon the circumstances of the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
7th February 1861.*

case, and that, on his explanation being received, it was submitted to the Advocate General, who was requested to state his opinion whether the Magistrate would be legally warranted in delivering up the parties claimed, this Government at the same time remarking that it was clearly to the interest of both nations, that the extradition of criminals should be carried out to the fullest extent that the law would allow.

4. Your Excellency will perceive from the Advocate General's reply and the further report from the Magistrate, that the act charged against the accused parties does not fall within any of the classes of offences for which they could be delivered up.

(Signed) W. MOREHEAD.

Political
Judicial Department.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following letter
from the Magistrate of the
Godavery District.

(Here enter 23^d Jan'y. 1861,
1.028.)

order thereon 7th February 1861. No. 84.

From Magt^e of Godavery District
5th November 1860.
Govt. Order—22nd—do—1860, No. 685.
From Advocate Genl. 25th—do—“—omitting
para. 12 and the list subjoined.
Govt. Order—6th Dec^r—1860, No. 722.

Resolved that a copy of the above report, and of the papers noted in the margin be furnished to His Excellency the Governor of the French Establishments in India, in reference to his communication under date of the 17th October last, and that the following letter be despatched:-

Here enters
2. It is presumed
that the individuals referred
to by the Magistrate, are
not under detention - but
if they are, they should
at once be released.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

to the Magistrate Godavery Distt. Dec^r 8th 2. 1861. 5
 F. H. Maresch
 Fol No. 1. Letter to
 F. H. Maresch
 also print separated
 of the letter
 B. R. R. R.

Decr 8-2-61.

4

Political Department.

No. 85.

To, His Excellency M. D'Ubray
Governor of the French Establishments
in India.

Sea. Sea. Sea.

Sir,

I have had the
honor of receiving your
Excellency's letter of the
17th October last, repre-
senting that a difference
of opinion had arisen
between Mr. Purvis
Magistrate of the Go-
davery District and
M. le Chef de service
at Yanam, in res-
pect of certain parties
inhabitants of Ingeram,
charged with having
been accomplices by
concealment in a
robbery committed in
French Territory - whose
extradition had been
(demanded)

W. M.

Pl. Department 1861.

No. 84.

Proceedings of the Madras

Government.

Dated, 7th February 61.

12844

demanded by M. le
Chef, but declined by
Mr. Purvis.

2. In reply I beg to
forward for your infor-
mation a copy of the
correspondance as per
margin which has
passed upon the sub-
ject between the Govt.,
Mr. Purvis and the
Advocate General.

3. From this it will
be seen that on receipt
of your Excellency's letter
the Magistrate of the
Godavery District was
at once called on for
a report upon the
circumstances of the
case, and that, on
his explanation being
received, it was submit-
ted to the Advocate
General, who was re-
quested to state his
opinion whether the
Magistrate would be
legally warranted in

delivering

delivering up the par-
ties claimed. This Govt.
at the same time re-
marking that it was
clearly to the interest
of both nations, that
the extradition of cri-
minals should be
carried out to the full-
est extent that the
law would allow.

4. Your Excellency
will perceive from the
Advocate General's re-
ply and the further
report from the Ma-
gistrate, that the act
charged against the
accused parties does
not fall within any
of the classes of
offences for which
they could be delivered
up.

Fort St George } Signed W. M.
7 February 1861. } Governor.

W. M. Meane

Amr...

Patented 1861. D. J. M. H.

1861.

1861

Patented 1861. D. J. M. H.

Specimen of the much valued

in India

1861

Patented 1861. D. J. M. H.

12014

Patented 1861. D. J. M. H.

1861