

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Public</i> DEPARTMENT.	
G.O., DATED	10-11/91
No.	944. ✓

INDEXED.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

*by Specifications of invention
sent to the local posts
are not required under
the present law to bear the
signatures of the parties
filing them —*

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

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPER NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

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

From The Government of India
Rev. & Agal. 1891.

No. 2499-P.

Dated 30/10 } 1891
Received 3/11 }
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

stating that the law as it stands
does not require the signature of the
party filing the Specification

Order 10 Nov 91 R 944

Recorded.

S.
Mr.

For Office

Specify the Specification

Nil

The G. of S. says that the law
as it stands does not require the copy
the Specification to be signed. The information
from Section 9(1) & 11(1) & 11(2) of
Act II of 1888 certainly appears to
be that the copy should be attested
in some manner. If under § 9(1)
the specification filed with the G. of S.
must be signed, it seems to
follow that the copy furnished under
§ 11(1) should be signed or attested.
It is a curious fact too that all
the 8 copies of the specifications put up, taken
at hazard from the bundles, are
attested in some manner.

Chiefly speaking India seems right.
for the law does not require attested
copies. There can be no doubt that
the rule observed is that the copies
are signed. This was evidently the
case and the Baboo when he
over the coals looked up the law
gave us a ruling based on the text.
If India is correct I don't see how
it could be any other way. B.H.

W.O.

Communications relating to the In-
dian Designs Act, 1888, should be
sent to the Revenue and Agricultural
Department at Calcutta.

No. 2499 P.

FROM

Secretary to the Government of India,

TO

The Secretary to the Government of India



Revenue and Agricultural
Department.

(Patents.)

Calcutta, the 30th October 1891

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 5
dated the 3rd August, I am directed
to return the accompanying
of a specification purporting
to be filed by Mr. Nathaniel Lazarus
under Section 9 of the Inventions
and Designs Act 1888. I am to point
out that the law as it stands
does not require the signature of the
party filing the specification
to the copies forwarded to Local
Governments. The statement
that the specification is in

It does not say
that they are not to be signed
by the copyist or the copy
must be signed.
Cf