M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1578 Press ~~Mis.~~

183

Dated 12-7- 1862.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 183. *PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.*

Dated 12th July 1862, *No.* 1,518.

Read the Petition from Karany Subramonia Mudali of Sydapet in the District of Madras :—

1. The Petitioner, Subramonia Mudali, filed a suit in the Mufty Sudder Amín's Court at Chingleput against the Collector of Chingleput, M. Sawmi Naidoo, the late Tahsíldár of Sydapet, and another person for the recovery of damages for the demolition of certain portions of his premises occupied by shops at Sydapet.

2. The Plaintiff in the prosecution of this suit informs the Court that in a certain letter the Collector states that the Tahsíldár should be held responsible for the loss occasioned by the demolition of the shops alluded to, and procuring an order from the Mufty Sudder Amín directing in vague and general terms the production of an Extract from that paper requests the Government to order a copy of it to be furnished to him.

3. No letter containing such a statement can be found, and Petitioner will be so informed. But it seems to the Government desirable to ascertain from their Pleader how far it is incumbent on them to comply with such applications as the preceding. Under such a system their records are practically open to the inspection of every person who chooses to assert that they contain some particular assertion or information and can procure an order from any of the Courts for their production. Apart from the labor of search involved, the communications of Collectors to the Government are more or less of a confidential character, and the Government are desirous of knowing under what circumstances they can refuse to allow their production in Court.

4. Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on petition 1,006 of 1862 :—

"The Petitioner is informed that there is no information such as he requires on record."

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

Petition 1006 of 1862 2

Prayer of the Petition.

Petitioner is the Septemania
Municipality, whose case
~~Petition No. 1006~~
is referred to in
29 Jan 1861. No. 219 and 27 Dec 1861. No. 53.
19 Dec 1861. No. 219. Municipality vested
with certain powers
& duties conferred by Ordinance
No. 1006 of 1862 in regard to the dis-
posal & alienation of certain temporary sheds
in the public road leading
to St Thomas' Church.
Pet. 11 Jan 1863. Petitioner filed a duly
signed Tax Collector's Return

and others laying damages at
1050 Rupees.

In the prosecution of this
suit, the Munsiff Sadr Amin has,
at the request of Petitioner,
issued Proceedings directing
the production of an ex-
tract of the Collector's letter
to the Board in reply to their
(Board's) Proceedings of the
4 January 1861, the purport
of the Collector's letter being
that the Talukdar should
be held responsible for the
loss occasioned by the demo-
lition of the shops.

The Collector's letter reply-
ing to Board's Proceedings of

3
4 January 1861 is dated 8th idem
and is recorded in G.O. 29 Jan
1861. No. 269. It does not ap-
pear however to correspond
with that referred to in the
Munsiff's Proceedings — the Collec-
tor does not state therein that
the Talukdar should be held
responsible.

Would Petitioner be in-
formed whether no information
such as he requires is on
record?

I would ask also whether
it is always necessary to comply
with these requisitions? Are the
records of Government to be open
to the inspection of every person
who can get a proceeding from
a Sudr Amin or District Com-

the practice
should be dis-
continued that
applications
should be
complied with

Yes

infant

siff? I would beg a reference to the extreme vagueness of some of these Court Proceedings. This same Petitioner in Petition 319 of 1862 asked for a copy of a Govt. order and produced Proceedings in support of his prayer. This was worded very generally — no specific order was mentioned. A transcript of G.O. 8 March /60 No. 363 was however forwarded in reply. In his further Petition No 478 of 1862 he complained that that was not the order which he wanted, and applied for copy of another referred to in a further Proceedings of the Munsiff. He was told in reply to produce Proceedings shewing:

Clearly that document is not received — Cgls 3/11/62

No 1518 Revenue Deptt.

Proceedings of the Madras Government Under date the 12th June 1862.

Read the following Petition from Karany Subramonia Moodali of Sydapet in the District of Madras.

Here enter 9th April 1862 No /

The Petitioner Subramonia Mudali filed a suit in the Mofussil Sudr Ameen's Court at Chingleput against the Collr of Chingleput, Mr Sawmi Naydu, the late Tahsildar of Sydapet and another person for the recovery of damages for the demolition of certain portions of his premises occupied by shops at Sydapet.

W.M.

2 The Plaintiff in the prosecution of this suit informs

informs the Court that in a certain letter the Collector states that the Talookdar should be held responsible for the loss occasioned by the demolition of the shops alluded to, and procuring an Order from the Mufli Sudr Ameen directing in vague and general terms the production of an Extract from that paper Requests the Government to order a copy of it to be furnished to him.

3. No letter containing such a statement can be found and Petitioner will be so informed. But it seems to the Government desirable to ascertain from their Pleader how far it is incumbent on them to comply with such applications as the preceding. Under such a system their records are practically open to the inspection of every person who chooses to assert that they contain some particular assertion or information and can procure an order from any of the Courts for their production. Apart from the labor of search involved, the communications of Collectors to the Government are more or less of a confidential character and the Government are desirous of knowing under what circumstances they can refuse to allow their production in Court.

4. Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on Petition 1006 of 1862.

"The Petitioner is informed that

that there is no information
such as he requires on record."

J. D. S

3 Copies Lotte Gov^t Pleader Decbr 14^th

Endorsement to the Petitioner
thought the Petition Desirable J. D.

9-11/20

c/ 7 July 20

Revenue 1862 Deptt.
Pro: of Govt. for July.

No. 1518.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dt 12 July 1862.

Government Pro:
-ceedings informing
Karany Lubramania
Mudali of Sydapet
that there is no informa-
-tion such as the re-
-quires on record.

From Govt Pleader S. A
Dt 29 July 1862 C No. 2158
13 Aug — 1710

Copy of Mr. P. J.
Rev. & Judr. Dedatch
13 Aug 62 - No. 1710
No. 183.