

ds

Date taken out.	FOR WHAT PURPOSE.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year			

Pub.
311
1896-1897-98.

Public (1897) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 1083

DATED 18. 8. 97.

12/11/97

1896-97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Malabar Marriage Act IV of '96

Reviewing the report on the
work done under the — during
1896

Date

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

2273/78.

Government {1897} of Madras.
PUBLIC.

Recd.

Enclosures

1897.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 1033, 18th August 1897.

AUGUST.

Malabar Marriage Act IV of 1896.

Reviewing the report on the work done under the — during 1896.

Nay

usurability

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From the Hon'ble P. RAJARATNA MUDALIAR, Diwan Bahadur, Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 5th June 1897, No. 265-G.

With reference to paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 1292, Public, dated 8th December 1896, I have the honour to submit a brief report on the work done under the Malabar Marriage Act IV of 1896 during the year 1896-97.

2. The registering officers of the districts of South Canara, Tellicherry and Calicut and the Registrar of Assurances, Madras, were appointed *ex-officio* marriage registrars under the Act by Public Department Notification No. 24, dated 8th December 1896, published at page 3, Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 5th January 1897; and the necessary books and forms were supplied from the Government Press by the beginning of February following. The present report accordingly relates to a period of less than two months.

3. During this short period, no less than 36 notices were received, of intention to register sambandhams as marriages under the Act, and 10 of the sambandhams were registered before the close of the year. Twenty-nine out of the 36 notices came from South Malabar or Calicut district, 5 from Tellicherry or North Malabar, and one each from South Canara and Madras.

4. The sambandham registered in the Madras district was that of the Hon'ble Mr. Sankara Nayar, who was the first to avail himself of the provisions of the Act. At the outset, a doubt was raised as to whether the sambandham could be registered in this district, as it had been actually formed in the Walavanad taluk of Malabar. As, however, the Hon'ble Mr. Sankara Nayar stated that, at the time of the sambandham, he was permanently residing in Madras (with his wife), the registration was effected in that district.

5. The following abstract shows the caste and profession of the persons who have applied for the registration of their sambandhams :—

Districts.	Caste.					Profession.				
	Nayars.	Tiyyars.	Veluthadam or washermen.	Others.	Total.	Government servants and pensioners.	Vakils.	Ryots.	Merchants.	Others.
Madras	1	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	1
South Canara	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	1
Tellicherry	3	2	..	..	5	3	2	..	..	..
Calicut	24	4	1	..	29	15	6	3	1	4
Total	28	6	1	1	36	18	9	3	1	5

It will be seen that the Act has been taken advantage of chiefly by the educated classes.—Government servants, pensioners and vakils,—mostly Nayars. Six Tiyyars from Anjengo and one washerman from Tirtala, and three ryots of the Calicut district,

also applied for registration. The registrar of South Canara mentions it as worthy of notice that one man residing in the jungle tracts at the foot of the Western Ghats appeared before the marriage registrar of Beltangadi and applied for the registration of his sambandham.

6. No objections have been received in any of the cases registered under the Act, nor has any suit been filed for cancellation of the registration.

7. A sum of Rs. 107-15-0 was collected during the year, of which Rs. 29 (attendance fees) were retained by the registrars, and Rs. 31-8-0 were disbursed to process-servers. Of the balance, Rs. 43-5-0 were remitted to the treasuries before the close of the official year, and the remaining Rs. 4-2-0 in April 1897. Rs. 21-5-0 were spent in making notice boards for the marriage registrars of the Calicut district.

8. As the Act has been in operation for only a short time, it is too early to pronounce any definite opinion on the various points mentioned in paragraph 10 of the Government Order referred to above. As regards, however, the appointment of adigaries and representative members of Tarwads as marriage registrars, there is a consensus of opinion that such a measure is not called for at present. The acting district registrar of Calicut, who is a Nayar of considerable experience, goes even further and states that these men are illiterate and conservative, and will do more harm than good as marriage registrars, as they are not likely to conduct themselves with the tact and discretion necessary to ensure the successful working of the Act. He therefore suggests that, when the necessity for appointing additional registrars actually arises owing to increase of work, Government pensioners might be appointed to assist.

9. No difficulty has been experienced in serving processes through temporary process-servers, nor has it been found necessary to grant any clerical assistance in any of the offices. The subject, however, will be duly considered when the next report is submitted.

10. The marriage registrars of Calicut and Tellicherry have brought to notice that, in some cases, owing to the restrictive provisions of section 5 as to local jurisdiction, considerable hardship has been caused to persons who wish to register their sambandhams, but could not conveniently go all the way to the registrars having jurisdiction. In the case of a sambandham already formed, the Act provides that the registration shall be effected only by the registrar "within whose local jurisdiction either of the parties resided at the time when the sambandham was formed." In one of the cases referred to, the Tahsildar of Cannanore could not register his sambandham at that place, as both he and his wife were residents of Tellicherry when the sambandham was formed. Similarly it may happen that a vakil practising at Mangalore may have to go all the way to Calicut to register his sambandham if he or his wife or both were residents of that district. On the above ground, a High Court Vakil of Tellicherry, who wished to register his sambandham there, was actually referred to the registrar of Calicut.

11. I understand from the Hon'ble Mr. Sankara Nayar that sambandhams are usually formed at the house of the bride, but the registrar of Tellicherry points out that there may be cases (though rare) in which the sambandhams might have been formed at places other than those where the parties resided. In such cases it seems doubtful whether the sambandham can be registered by the registrar within whose jurisdiction it took place if the parties happened to have resided beyond his jurisdiction. From the heading of the last column of Form A (notice of marriage) appended to the Act, it may be urged that the legislature probably intended to provide for the registration of marriages by the registrar within whose jurisdiction the sambandham took place. This is obviously the more natural course to adopt, but I do not think that the wording of the form of notice can be held to override the plain provisions of the Act as contained in section 5, which distinctly makes the residence of the parties the basis for determining the jurisdiction of the registering officer. In view of the difficulties pointed out above, I venture to think that the Act should be amended so as to afford greater facilities for registering the sambandhams. There is no reason why the parties should not be allowed to register their sambandhams before the

Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.



From The Registrar General
of Births, Deaths
and Marriages
Madras.

G. No. 265-

Dated 5 June 1897

Received 7 2

Registered 9 6-97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on
the work done under the
Malabar Marriage Act
IV of 1896 during 1896-97.

No. 1083, PUBLIC, 18th August 1897.

registrar within whose jurisdiction the sambandham was formed, or is intended to be formed; or before the registrar within whose jurisdiction either of the parties may be residing at the time the sambandham is proposed to be registered.

12. If the Act is amended as proposed above, it would be necessary also to amend the wording in the last column of the form of notice (A). The registrar of Calicut also suggests that columns 2 and 3 of the form should be amplified so as to show the addresses of the persons referred to therein. He states that, in the absence of this information, it has been found difficult to serve the notices in many cases.

ORDER—No. 1083, Public, dated 18th August 1897.

Recorded.

2. With regard to the proposals of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages in paragraphs 10 and 11 of his letter, the Government considers that until further experience is gained no amendment of the Act in the direction suggested is advisable. It has, however, been brought to notice that in two sections early amendment is required. In clause 3 of section 8 an error has crept in. That clause alludes to "a notice of objection under section 7", while section 7 contains no reference to any such objection. It is proposed to amend the section by substituting for the word "section" and the figure "7" the words "the foregoing clauses". Again, in section 19, it is provided that a petition for dissolution of a marriage should be presented in the Court of the District Munsif having jurisdiction. There being no District Munsif's Court in the City of Madras, it is necessary to specify some other courts, and it is therefore proposed that such petitions should be presented in the City Civil Court. A Bill containing these amendments will be introduced into the Legislative Council during the ensuing Session.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages.
" Collector of Malabar.
" of South Canara.
" Hon'ble C. Sankaran Nayar.
" Legislative Department.

End. W. D. M.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
for	74	Pub	19-1-97
for	1292	..	8-12-96
	1021	..	18-9-96
	733	..	11-7-96
In accordance with Act IV of 1896			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

NOTES.

...
...
... and section
... the report

Re: workings of the
Malabar Marriage Act. Public Department
C No 212 of 1897

Note

The Registrar General
of Births, Deaths and Marriages
submits the report on the
working of the Malabar
Marriage ~~for~~ Act called for
in G.O. No 1292, Public, dated
8th December 1896. This report
relates to a period of less than
two months during which 36
notices under section 5 were
received and 10 sambandhams
registered. An abstract table
showing the caste and pro-
fession of the persons who had
applied for the registration
of their sambandham is
given in para 5 and it will
be seen there from that the
act was ~~mainly~~ taken ad-
vantage of ^{chiefly} by the educated
classes - Govt servants, per-
sioners and Vakilis - mostly in the

Resubmitted to the
Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss K.C.J.C.

* and principally
in South Malabar.

As regards the ~~de~~ and ~~and~~

of appointing adbhigaries and
and representative members of
Jarwads as additional Registrars
the Registrar Genl. ^{states that there is a}
~~expression of opinion~~ ^{opinion} that such a measure
is not needed at present, and
adds that, ^{in his opinion,} ~~according to the~~
~~views~~ of the St Registrar
of Calicut, a Nayar of con-
siderable experience, these
classes of men, being illiterate
and conservative, ^{and devoid of the necessary tact & discretion,} will do more
harm than good as marriage
registrars. ~~A suggestion has~~ This District Registrar suggests
~~that, when it is found~~
absolutely necessary to appoint
additional registrars, Govt
pensioners might be tried. ^{This suggestion, it is submitted,}
~~The suggestion may, it is~~ ^{needs no orders at present.}
submitted, be accepted ~~if~~
~~it being however understood~~
that only such pensioners
as possess a certain amount
status and educational
qualifications ~~would be~~

~~The Registrar General~~
resolves the subject of process
service and clerical assistance
referred to in para 10 ^{of the govt}
undersecretary for consideration
in the next report.
In para 10 at seq of
~~the report~~ ^{the report} ~~contains~~ ^{contains} ~~apparent~~
~~difficulties~~ ^{difficulties} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~act~~ ^{act} ~~are~~ ^{are} ~~being~~ ^{being} ~~discussed~~ ^{discussed}
Thus in the case of
Sambandham already formed
section 5 requires that notice
of intention to register, the
Sambandham shall be given
to, that is, the registration
shall be effected by, the
registration within whose local
jurisdiction either of the party
~~intended~~ ^{intended} at the time when
the Sambandham was
formed, while the form of
notice A at page 8 of the act
requires information only
as to the place where
Sambandham is ^{formed}
and

took place. ~~It is said that~~ ^{X the Reg is in general observed}
~~that it may be urged~~ ^{that judging from the heading}
~~that the legislative pro-~~ ^{of the last column of Jan A}
~~bably intended to provide~~
for the registration of
marriages by the Registrar
within whose jurisdiction
the Sambandham was effected,
but ~~the Registrar~~ ^{he doubts whether the wording of}
~~points out, with form of the law~~
~~which cannot, it is said,~~
be held to override the other
provisions of the ~~act~~ ^{thought} section
5 of which fixes the juris-
diction of the registering
officer by the residence of
the parties.

A real difficulty is
that pointed out by the re-
gistrars of Calicut and
Tellicherry according to
~~whom~~ ^{that} owing to the restrictive
provisions of section 5 as
regards local jurisdiction,
considerable hardship is
caused to parties who wish

register their Sambandham,
who cannot ^{conveniently} go all the
the registrars having

will do so. For instance,
~~it is said that~~ ^{it is said that} ~~it is said that~~
a valid practicing at Mar-
low to perform a tedious
journey to Calicut for the
purpose of having his ^{own} ~~own~~
Sambandham ^{or his wife, or both,} ~~registered~~
at the latter place at the
time of the Sambandham.
The Registrar of Calicut
states that ~~there is no~~
~~reason why the parties~~
should not be allowed to
register their Sambandham
before the Registrar within
whose jurisdiction the Sam-
bandham was performed ~~it~~
~~is said that~~ ^{it is said that} ~~it is said that~~
the Registrar within
whose jurisdiction either
of the parties may be residing
at the time the Sambandham
is proposed to be registered
and suggests that the
be amended so as to confer
greater facilities for the
registration of Sambandham.

It is submitted that there can be no objection ~~to acting~~ on the views of the R. G. in ~~this behalf~~, because the provision in the Act as it stands at present, in regard to residence at the time of the sambandham, is quite without point, the question of residence being not referred to anywhere else, either as affecting the validity of a marriage or any legal consequences arising therefrom. If therefore section 5 be ~~therefore~~ amended by substituting the words "resides at the time when the sambandham is proposed to be registered" for the passage commencing with the word "resided," all possible objections would be met. Information ^{as to} the residence of the parties at the time of the registration is, it is necessary,

(which the Registrar of Calicut would require vide para 12 of report)

~~for the registration~~
in order to ascertain the ~~validity~~ of the ~~former~~ ~~document~~

Should the amendment proposed above be approved the last column of the form of notice A ^{could} be omitted altogether, unless a suggestion made later on in this note be accepted.

In this connection a few other defects observable in the Act which have not been noticed by the Registrar General are set forth below.

I. The preamble says that the object of the enactment is to enable persons following the brammakha tarjam or the Ajyasantana Law of Shuntavel to contract marriages which shall be recognised by courts of law as legal marriages and to provide for the issue of such marriages, and in the body of the preamble

unouncing
~~that~~ ~~Sambandham~~
~~registered under the Act~~
 the Act shall be
 as legal marriages by all
 Courts of law and equity,
 though it is not subject to
 any serious consideration
 under the Act, and as the people concerned had
 till the passing of the enact-
 ment in question no customary
 law of marriage would
 appear to render the pro-
 visions of the Penal Code
 in regard to prosecutions
 for adultery &c inapplicable
 to them. It is therefore
 that the following may
 be inserted in the Act as
 section 3A.

Sambandham re-
 gistered under this Act
 shall, subject to the
 provisions of section 15
 be recognized as legal
 marriages by all Courts
 of law.
 II Section 1 lays

I do not see what
 need there is for this -
 marriage is defined in the
 Act and seems to cover down
 when only a marriage shall
 be null and void: but in all
 cases there is legal - what more is
 wanted? 20

How may we remove above

Section 3A of the Act

domiciled in sec I appears
 to mean nothing more than
 "residing"

shall be applicable to all
 Hindus domiciled in the
 Presidency of Madras follow-
 ing the Marumakkathayam
 or the Aliyasanana Law of
 inheritance. The term "domiciled"
 however, is not defined
 anywhere in the Act, nor
 is a definition of it found
 in any Indian Enactment
 other than the Indian Suc-
 cession Act the provisions
 of which are not applicable
 to Hindus. It seems there-
 fore desirable to indicate,
 in the present Act itself,
 the procedure that should
 be adopted by persons re-
 sident of being domiciled
 and this it is suggested might
 be done by adding a sub-
 section to section 1 to the
 effect that for the purposes
 of domicile under this
 Act the provisions of the
 Indian Succession Act shall apply.

11
 of clause 3 of section 8 which refers to
 the notice of objection in
 section 7. From a perusal
 of section 7 it will be seen
 that no notice of objection
 of any notice of objection
 clause 1 of section 8 enables
 certain persons to object
 to the registration of a
 sambandam and
 clause 2 of the same
 section lays down the
 procedure for the pre-
 sentation of such objection.
 In clause 3, therefore
 for the word "section" and
 figure "7" the words
 "the foregoing clauses"
 may be substituted.
 IV. Section 19 enables
 a husband and wife or
 either of them to present
 a petition for dissolution
 of the marriage in the
 Court of the District
 Munsiff within the local
 limits of whose jurisdiction
 the husband or

of the words in brackets
 in this instrument -
 the Hindu Succession Act in
 which a word "domestic" is defined
 are not apply to Hindus. But we
 can I think use the definition till
 the same. I will be not counselled
 as well in similar manner
 Act there. Reading accordingly.
 R.

There has been distinctly a mistake
 made in the Act and it will
 have to be amended. I think
 that which is suggested will
 do.

wife or in cases in which
 of them alone is petitioner, the
 respondent, has a permanent
 dwelling or actually and
 voluntarily resides at the
 time when the petition is
 presented. There arises the
 question in what Court
 should a person who has a perma-
 nent dwelling etc. at
 Madras should present
 the petition. An addition
 may therefore be made to
 this Section to the effect
 that in Madras the
 City Civil Court shall
 take the place of the District
 Munsiff Court.

City Civil Court Act put up.
 I think this objection is
 by the Act. There is no
 District Munsiff Court
 within the City of Madras.
 12

V. There is no provision
 in the Act binding the
 parties to marriage to
 furnish any information
 regarding the date of a
 sambandam even though
 registered as a marriage.
 Such a binding

12
especially for deciding
questions of legitimacy
of children born of parents
who have registered their
Sambandham. According
to section 2 children means
sons and daughters of
parents whose Sambandham
has been registered as a

Marriage under the Act
whether born before or
after such registration.
~~It is not possible for a
woman to have children
born to a man in a
former sambandham
before she effects another
Sambandham which has
been registered as a marriage.~~

Now the children
born to the parent
whose sambandham
has been registered are
legitimate children,
whereas the children

of the same woman
in the previous
sambandham

It may happen that a
Sambandham between a
man and a woman, having issue,
may be broken off, the man or
the woman or both forming a
connection elsewhere: if they
should again come together, &
form a Sambandham and register
it, the children of his former
Sambandham need be his
and entitled to maintenance
the father.

The Act apparently contemplates
the legitimacy of all
offspring to whose sambandham
has once been registered.
marriage, whether the child
were born in that particular
Sambandham or one previous
to it. But perhaps the point
better be cleared up.

There is I think force in the remarks
made in the office note. The point
in question is one which has not been
settled.

never made the point of
the Act, who would
drawings it up no doubt
though only of providing
for an unborn Sambandham
I am inclined to think that
in the case put in the Act.
in his marginal note the
children of such the original
Sambandham would not
be legitimate as it is the
second one alone which
has been registered and
there was another in between.
I admit however that the
point is open to argument
and very doubtful. It seems

therefore desirable in view
to prevent litigation that
the date from which the
Sambandham began should
be stated. I do not see
any necessity for requiring
the names and ages of the
children to be included
in the issue of the
connection as if at any
time the question of legitimacy
should arise it can easily
be settled by referring to
the date of the beginning
of the Sambandham

12

13

are not. The legitimate
children of a man or a
woman dying with testate
are entitled to succeed
to a certain share of his
or her property. In the
absence therefore of any
record as to the date of
the Sambandham subse-
quently registered as a mar-
riage it may be difficult
to settle the legitimacy
or otherwise of the several
children born to the same
person in different sam-
bandhams one of which
has been registered. To
obviate the difficulty it
is submitted that an
addition may be made
to the form of declaration
B at page 8 of the Act
whereby the parties shall
be required to declare the
date of the Sambandham
proposed to be registered and
if this is done

of the last column of notice form ^{the}
 A may be added the word ^{for}
 and the date thereof ^{with}
 It is also submitted that ⁱⁿ
 a new clause ^{may}
 may be inserted regarding ^{the}
 the parties to declare the ^{names}
 names and ages of all ^{children}
 children that were born ^{during}
 during a Sambar that ^{which}
 which is supposed to be ^{registered}
 registered so that the ^{possibilities}
 possibilities of litigation ^{may}
 may be reduced to a mini-
 mum.

Should the notice form A
 be altered in any way, ^{an}
 opportunity may also
 be taken to amplify the
 headings of columns 2 and
 3 by providing for the
 addresses of the persons
 therein referred to being
 furnished. This additional
 information is necessary
 for the registrar for
 the purpose of sending
 copies of the notice to
 the persons concerned.

This has already been referred
 to supra. It is the suggestion of
 the Registrar of Medical
 Law

Note

There has been some
 delay in the disposal of this file
 due partly to the current being
 printed and partly to press
 work of a more urgent
 nature
 6/7/97

8

Finally, it is submitted
 that this note, with the
 current in proof, may, if
 not considered objectionable,
 be sent with a D.O. to
 the Hon C. Sankaran
 Nair for remarks

6/7/97 CW 6/7/97

The above note is by a Mr. A. S. Nair
 Clerk in the Secretariat.
 The points which he raises are,
 it is submitted, worthy of
 consideration, and his suggestion
 that the Hon. C. Sankaran Nair
 should be consulted again seems
 a good one.

The clerical work may prove
 to be somewhat, but for further amend-
 ment of the Act I should say we
 had better wait until we get more
 experience of its working.

30/7/97

I agree. The Act intended
 would be the better for
 amendment. In one
 case - there where a
 wrong section has been
 quoted amendment is distinctly
 necessary.
 I have delayed the copies in the
 to having the Registrar in the
 and section
 and the law was the result
 in the same

which was not subsequently detected.
 Mr. Davidson noticed the error in
 the report of the Select Committee which
 was corrected in the Bill passed.
 when

20
 2977/97



Papers read today not com-
 plete. Madras official as
 asked - Reminded
 V. S. M. 20/7/97
 14/7/97

Papers read 13-17-97

Please see note on separate
 paper

V. S. M.
 18/7/97

NOTE FOR THE Chief Secretary

With reference to the CS's
 note of the 10th instant regarding
 the misquotation of a section
 in section 8 of the Malabar
 Marriage Act, attention is
 solicited to the papers separately
 tied up with a red tape.

Flag B shows that in the
 original Bill as introduced into
 the Legislative Council section
 7 enabled certain persons to
 object to the registration of
 sambandhams. In the Bill
 as amended by the Select Com-
 mittee clauses (1) & (2) of section
 8 took the place of clause (1)
 and the last ^{para of clause (1)} of section 7.
 But the select committee did
 not notice this change when
 they passed clause (3) of section
 8. Even in their report the Com-
 mittee at first mentioned section
 7 and 10 as having reference to
 objection to registration. The error
 appears to have been pointed
 out by Mr Davidson and

finally subd to the Council
It is thus clear that the mis-
take was committed by the
Select Committee and that
it was not noticed at the time
the Bill was passed, understood

The delay in resubmitting the
file is due to the Madras office
having not furnished complete
information in the first instance

28/7/97

28/7/97

[G.]
73
300-20-7-66

with the proposal to
amend the Bill

NOTE FOR THE Chief Secretary

The Hon. Mr. W. M. M.
note practically agrees
with the former portion of
the Hon. Mr. W. M. M.
but not the latter portion

Apparently what
the Hon. Mr. W. M. M.
means is that the amendment
proposed in the present
note should go to the
-ra Nair. Seemingly
"be" has been omitted
before "communicated"
As the note stands it
might mean that
the amendments in the
note at L which
have been communica-
ted to the Nair
should be mentioned.
But this has sub-
mitted is a different
matter & can hardly
be what is meant

Submitted that
the file should be
to the Hon. Mr. W. M. M.

28/8/97

21 Public

62-75
1,100-15-11-10

NOTE FOR THE CS.

Malabar marriage

AK

Order having been passed upon this Refers, letter hereon, it is submitted, no objection is sending ~~the~~ Sankaran Nair anything but a copy of the O.O. - or should a copy of the order for order still go? There is really nothing on which to stick his opinion. The order of the Hon. he from Ali, it is submitted be held, by general ordering Sankaran Nair name on the list of persons without a copy of the order will go.

I think that the copy of the order for order should be sent to Sankaran Nair with a C.O. - which is information. His event to the to have a copy of the order - a copy of the order would be sent to the smaller.

12/15/57

AK.

14/5/57

15/11/57
4/11/57
11/11/57

Public Dep

O. O. C. M. M.
6th Sept 1897

by

My dear Sir

I am directed
to send you the
accompanying
note on the working
of the Malabar
Marriage Act
and to ask you
to kindly favour
me with your
opinion on the
suggestions made
herein.

SECRETARIAT.

D. O.

1897

② The report referred to in the
note has been sent to you
with No. 1083 dated 18.9.97.

Madras Office
to check

To The Honble Chankaran Nair
(with note)

Yours faithfully
J. S. S. S.

[21.]
1,000-14-6-07.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., No.	dated	189	.
Again G.O., No.	dated	189	.
Current No. 2121	of 1897, dated	5/6	, from the Register for
" "	" 189	"	" of Banks, dated
" "	" 189	"	" hereafter

ORDER.

W. 10832 18 Aug 97

From the reports read above it appears it appears that, in the course of the operation of Act IV of 1876, no time was lost in taking advantage of its provisions. The reports relate to the fact that people like the State police in the collection of the undistributed stock of the of the people the population of the State.

Recorded

2 In the regard to the purposes of the Register General of British India & Revenue in paragraphs 10 & 11 of his letter the State under which will further experience is gained in the no amount of the collection is advisable.

that the in his section the
~~Amendment~~ early enactment.
 is required. In clause 3
 of section 8 it even has
 except in. That clause ^{alludes} refers
 to "a section of the Act" under
 sec 7, that section 7 contains
 no reference to any such provision.
 It is proposed to amend
 the section by substituting for
 the word "section" the phrase
 "the words 'the foregoing
 clauses'". Again in section
 19 it is provided that
 a petition for dissolution of
 a marriage should be presented
 in the court of the District
 Judge having jurisdiction.
 There being no District Judge's
 Court in the city of Madras
 it is ^{is} necessary to state
 that the City Civil Court shall
~~take its place~~. specify some
 other court, & it is therefore
 proposed that such petitions
 should be presented in the
 City Civil Court. A Bill containing
 these amendments will be introduced
 in the Leg Council ^{during} the coming
 session. Atk. 1448752. (for order), 18/8/97

The Registrar Genl. B. B. L. L.
 - Hon. C. S. S. S. S. S.
 - Registrar Genl.
 - Secy. of the
 - Secy. of the

first copy sent to Press.
 returned for signature.
 attached in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES
 REQUIRED. { Order complete.
 Letter only.
 Order complete with Letter.

AD AGAIN G.O., No.
 159

CURRENT No.

APPROPRIATE TO J. No.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DUTY.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP. BEING MEANT FOR DESTRUCTION
 IN ORIGINAL

N.B.

Not to be used
 for any purpose
 other than the
 purpose for which
 it was issued
 18/8/97