

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4-8

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

செனது துறை

அரசாணை எண். 958.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள எண்.

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 26-11-1889

1989

மடிக்கலோ கண்டபடி கையாளலோ கூடாது.

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 26/11/89
No. 959

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Re appeal petition against
the judgment of the High Court
in the suit for compensation for
acquisition
of rocks for the protection
of the Seasm Pagodas.*

Recd
28/11

CL 2380/89

28/3/88 ✓

19-1-05 ✓

5-2-06 ✓

20-2-07 ✓

1-7-08 ✓

28-7-10 ✓

24-11-10 ✓

2-1-11 ✓

FURTHER PAPER, No.

2980/09

OF 188 .

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
188 , No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

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

O P i

I These papers
2nd instant. The time
expired on the followt:
prepared the grounds o.

Government Pleader to
and presented to the H

2 The petition
Pleader and signed by
was. I presume filed


3 It seemed to
Judgment would be usel
open to Government but
as to that, the greate
fore, drew two grounds
method of computation
second objecting to th

4th November

1889

Governor

() (ed) E. B. Powell.



No. 577

Madras 14th November 1889

From,

Ernest Barclay,

Government Solicitor,

Madras

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government

Public Department

Fort Saint George

Sir,

As requested in your Reference C.No.3507 of the 12th instant
I send you herewith copy of the Appeal Petition filed against the
Judgment of the High Court

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor.

Public (No. 3596)

From

The Govt. Solicitor

No. 577

Dated 16 Nov. } 1889
Recd. 15 - }

Forwarding copy of appeal
Pet. against the judgment
of the High Court in the suit
for compensation for acquisition
of rocks for the protection
of the Seven Pagodas.

For order

C. 3596

Submitted to the members
with ref. to the notes on

C. 3507

Learn
16/11

The petition seems to me very unsat-
isfactory and we are likely to lose
the case on its merits. I think
perhaps I should considerably em-
plified the reasons for the joint opinion
of our law-officers on the case. This
has been not yet, but must have.
I would call for a joint report on
the case after consultation with
Subramanya Iyer who I presume
appeared in it.

Res

17 Nov.

Yes. Both Mr. Justice & Mr. Justice
J. L. J. in the case of the
compensation for acquisition
of rocks for the protection
of the Seven Pagodas.

C. 16/11
1889

[5]

Public

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated

188 , No.

Again G.O., dated

188 , No.

Current No. 3507 of 1889, dated 5/11/89 from the Govt. Solicitor

Reference Order No. 3507 & 12 Nov. 89.

Current No. 3596 of 1889, dated 14/11/89 from the Govt. Solicitor

Order:— 26th November 1889 No. 959.

H.E. the Governor
in Council is pleased to
direct ~~that~~ the Advoc-
ate General and Govt.
Pleader to at once hold
a consultation in view
to the Govt. being in-
formed at an early
date ~~of their~~ of their
opinion on the case
and the possibility
of obtaining from the
Privy Council an
order reversing the
judgment of the High
Court. Mr. S. Subramanya
Iyer - who it is under-
stood appeared in
the case - should be

Home order

consulted.

2. The appeal petition
filed by the Govt
pleader is very meagre
but that is probably
owing to the short
time available in
which to file it. If
there is no objection
to an amplified
petition being filed
in substitution of
the original the latter
should be at once
revised and a draft
submitted for the
approval of Govt.
The first ground of
appeal is very barely
stated. The revised
petition should be
considerably more
in detail.

2/11/88

For the Govt Solicitor
with the papers for reference
and return. Despatch
No. 111/88