

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 278

Press
~~Mis.~~

203. 204

Dated

10 - 2 - 1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th February 1865.*

No. 203. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th September 1864, No. 5,780.

Read the following letter from C. DALE, Esq., Government Pleader, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 30th August 1864, No. 194:—

1. I do myself the honor of acknowledging the receipt of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under the date and number noted in the margin, and of advising that an application be made to the Civil Judge of Chittoor for a review of his Judgment in Appeal Suit, No. 108 of 1861, on the file of the Civil Court of Salem.

25th August 1864, No. 2,510.

2. It is very evident that Mr. Roberts was desirous of passing a correct Judgment on the merits of the case, it is equally evident he has misunderstood the facts, and it is extremely probable that on the facts being correctly developed before him he may see reason to arrive at a different conclusion from that at which he has at present arrived, but even should he retain his present opinion, it will be highly desirable that he should amend the Statements made in the thirteenth and fourteenth paragraphs of his Judgment, and thus to have the facts correctly before the High Court should it be thought desirable to prefer a Special Appeal to that Court.

3. I have no means of ascertaining whether evidence was adduced before the Sub-Court to shew on what days the kist fell due, or whether from any of the documents before the Court such fact was shewn. If not, the Appellate Court has the power to allow additional evidence to be adduced.

4. I submit that action should be taken on the remarks of the Civil Judge regarding the conduct of the Government Vakeel at Chittoor. If they are passed over without notice it will be likely to deter Civil Judges from commenting on similar misconduct.

5. On principle, a man who so misconducts himself as to endanger the result of a Suit should be dismissed, unless he can afford a very good explanation for his conduct.

6. But whether practically, owing to the small pay given to the Government Vakeels, such a step would prove beneficial to the interests of Government, by getting a better man, I am unable to judge. I fear there is not sufficient inducement in Zillahs where the amount of litigation in which Government is concerned is small both in number of suits, and the value of the matter in dispute, for the best men to accept the appointment.

7. I return all the papers which accompanied the Proceedings noted above.

1. Communicated to the Collector of Salem, with reference to his letter, dated 13th August 1864, No. 148. He will take the necessary steps for obtaining a review of Judgment by the Chittoor Court.

2. The remarks of the Civil Judge and Government Solicitor on the Government Vakeel's conduct of the case will be brought to the notice of Government for such orders as they may see fit to pass.

No. 204. ORDER THEREON, 10th February 1865, No. 278.

Miscellaneous.

The Government resolve to call on the Collector of North Arcot, through the Board of Revenue, to direct the attention of the Government Vakeel in the Chittoor Court to the depreciating remarks made by the Civil Judge, and with reference thereto, to submit such explanation as the Government Vakeel may be able to offer.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 25th August 1864.

Read the following letter from the Honorable D. AkBUTHNOTT, Collector of Salem, dated 13th August 1864, No. 148:—

1. With reference to the Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated the 3rd March 1857, No. 224, conveyed with the Board's Proceedings, dated the 5th idem, No. 690, I have the honor to enclose copy of a Decree passed by the Civil Judge of Chittoor in Appeal Suit No. 108 of 1861, on the file of the Civil Court of Salem.

2. The Appeal Suit was filed in the Salem Civil Court, but owing to Mr. Cherry, the Civil Judge of Salem, having been, as then Acting Collector of the District, a party to the cause, the High Court directed the transfer of the appeal to the Civil Court of Chittoor.

3. The correspondence relating to the Original and Appeal Suits is specified below:—

Collector's letter to the Board, dated 10th July 1854.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th September 1854.

Collector's letter to the Board, dated 11th October 1854, No. 83.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th November 1854.

Board's letter to the Collector, dated the 18th July 1855, No. 1,811.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th April 1858, No. 1,503.

Collector's letter dated the 7th January 1857, No. 6, forwarding translation of original plaint and answer.

✓ Board's Proceedings to Government, dated 19th February 1857, No. 547.

✓ Government Extract from Minutes of Consultation, dated 3rd March 1857, No. 224.

✓ Collector's letter, dated the 21st February 1851, forwarding a copy of the Decree of Sub-Court.

Papers now sent.

Copy of Supplemental Answer filed in the Sub-Court.

Translation of Appeal Memorandum filed in the Civil Court at Salem by the Plaintiff.

4. I request that the Board will, if they consider that a special appeal from the decision of the Civil Court of Chittoor should be made, be good enough to take the necessary steps for the same. I am myself of opinion that a special appeal should be preferred, and that there is sufficient ground for it.

5. The only ground upon which the Chittoor Court has upset the decision of the Salem Sub-Court is stated in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Judgment, from which it is evident that the Court misunderstood the real state of things.

6. The Court says that the amount of arrears for which the Agraharum was attached having been paid up on the 23rd February 1853, the Agraharum should have been released, and that for the subsequent arrears it should have been re-attached, and an year's grace allowed from the date of such re-attachment.

7. The monthly kists in this District were fixed in accordance with the months of the Hindu year, and not the months of the Calendar year. It has been an invariable rule according to the usual practice of the District, in the case of Agraharums, to reckon the arrear as according (i.e. accruing) from the first of the native month. Indeed this practice was observed on all the many previous occasions on which this very same Nakarapatti Agraharum was attached for arrears. This being the principle, the January or the Margaly kist of Fasli 1262 on the Nakarapatti Agraharum fell due on the 1st of Thye, or the 12th of January 1853. On the 14th of January 1853, the Tahsildar sent a notice to the Agraharumdars stating that the Agraharum would be placed under attachment if the arrears due were not paid up within five days from the date of notice. The arrears not having been paid up, the Agraharum was placed under attachment. It is true that the Zufty Amin collected and remitted to the Taluk Treasury, on the 23rd February 1853, Rupees

120. Of this sum Rupees 116-3-8 was credited to the January or Margaly kist, and the remaining Rupees 3-12-4 were credited to the February or Thyee kist, which fell due on the 1st of Masy, corresponding with the 10th of February 1853. The February kist being then already due was an arrear in the legal sense of the word, and there was therefore no occasion for the release and re-attachment of the Agraharum. It would have been of course released if the whole arrears due up to date had been paid. It is therefore obvious that the Chittoor Civil Court has misunderstood the matter. The Government Vakil at Chittoor, who has shown much indifference in this case, as the Judge himself observes in his Decree, has not, I am inclined to think, laid this clearly before the Court. The Board may, perhaps, deem it necessary to obtain the Government Pleader's advice as to whether the Chittoor Civil Court may be moved for a review of the case.

8. I beg to enclose a copy of an endorsement passed by Mr. Brett on a Petition presented to the Board by Mr. Fischer, on behalf of the Agraharumdars. This and the correspondence named in paragraph 3 of this letter gives a full history of the case.

9. The Chittoor Civil Court's decision was passed on the 7th of July last, but the copy of the decision only reached me yesterday. A summary Petition will have to be put in at once in the High Court, if the Board consider that a special appeal should be preferred.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Decree.

In the Civil Court at Chittoor.

Present.

C. A. ROBERTS, Esq., Civil Judge.

Before the late Subordinate Court of Salem.

Original Suit No. 31 of 1856.

Before the Civil Court at Salem.

Appeal Suit No. 108 of 1861.

Under Act VIII of 1859.

In the Court of First Instance.

Yellayya, a shareholder at Nakarapatti Agraharum, and a resident of Irode in the Taluk of Rasipuram, in the Zillah of Salem, } Plaintiff.

H. A. Brett, Esq., late Collector of Salem, Defendant.

In the Appellate Court.

Appellant by his Vakil Narayanayyengar.

Respondent by Government Vakeel Maniratnamayya.

The above Plaintiff, Appellant, appeals to the Civil Court of Salem against the Decree of the late Subordinate Court of Salem, dated 29th September 1860, on the grounds to the purport and effect following, that is to say

1. Because the question raised by the Plaintiff was, the right of Defendant to demand a rate of assessment in excess of the permanent quit-rent originally settled, in answer to which quite another issue had been raised by the Defendant, viz., that in Jodigy Agraharums one shareholder was jointly responsible for the arrears of another.

2. Because the Plaintiff not only fully proved the issues settled by the Sub-Judge, viz., the amount of his original kist, the amount paid, and the excess collected, but also that the Defendant acted unjustly in sequestering the village at all.

3. Because the Defendant did not attempt to prove the third point given to him, viz., his authority to collect an excess of rent which is the real question at issue; that neither did he (Defendant) prove the first point, viz., that the village was not held in severally but jointly, and that he (Defendant) failed to establish his second point that Plaintiff was jointly responsible with the several holders.

4. Because the two Decrees upon which he (Defendant) relied did not apply to this case, and the correspondence between the Military Collector of the day, and his Military subordinates was not evidence, it being moreover doubtful if it bear the construction put upon it by the Sub-Judge.

5. Because the Sub-Judge had decided the cause upon the spurious issue raised by the Defendant, and that contrary to the evidence, accusing the Plaintiff of not proving what he was not called upon to prove, viz., whether payment upon an individual Puttab has ever exempted the entire Agraharum from attachment and resumption upon the failure of the dues of other shareholders.

6. Because no illegal practice on the part of Government with the view of facilitating the collection of revenue can justify an illegal or unjust act on their part.

7. Because the Sub-Judge has wrongly alleged that one year's notice had been given of the attachment in question, as stated by the Defendant without noticing the refutation argued by the Plaintiff, and proved by his documentary evidence.

8. Because the Sub-Judge has stated that the course adopted by the Defendant is sanctioned by established practice, while it was urged by the Plaintiff that it was notorious that the Agraharum in question originally consisted of fifty-two shares, of which seven had been assumed by Government for various causes at different times without making the other shareholders jointly responsible, and that remissions had at times been granted to different shareholders on failure of their dues from adverse causes.

9. Because, supposing the Government had a right to sequester all the shares in the village for the default of one shareholder, yet they had no right to raise the rent which had long since been permanently assessed.

This Court resolves to set aside the Decree of the Court below, and to declare for the Plaintiff with costs, so far as regards the excess of rent sued for up to the date of this Decree. The injunction sued for cannot be granted, the Court having decided that the Collector is entitled on lawfully resuming the Plaintiff's land to increase the rent thereon.

Costs in the Civil Court.

Appellant's costs.

1 Roll for Appeal Petition...	...	...	...	...	32	0	0
2 Do. for Vakalutnamahs...	...	...	...	...	1	0	0
12 Do. for copy of Decree...	...	...	...	...	12	0	0
Fees of Vakil....	...	...	...	...	16	12	0
						61	12 0

Respondent's Costs.

Fees of Vakil...	...	...	...	...	16	12	0
------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	----	---

Total Rupees... 78 8 0

It is hereby notified that no process of execution shall be issued to enforce this Decree unless some proceeding shall have been taken to keep the same in force within three years next preceding the application for such execution.

The date of Appeal, 12th April 1861.

Do. of Hearing, 6th May do.

Do. of Decree, 7th July 1864.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this 7th day of July, A. D. 1864.

(Signed) C. A. ROBERTS,
Civil Judge.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) T. CORNELIUS,
Deputy Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Judgment.

In the Civil Court of Chittoor.

Appeal Suit No. 168 of 1861.

On the file of the Civil Court of Salem.

Present.

C. A. ROBERTS, Esq., Civil Judge.

1. This suit was brought to recover Rupees 335-9-2 stated to be excess of rent levied by the Defendant, and to restrain him from hereafter collecting more than was due under Plaintiff's original Puttah.

2. The plaint set out that Plaintiff and his forefathers had long enjoyed four shares in the Nakarapatti Agraharum upon which a permanent rent had been assessed, under a Puttah dated 1795, agreeably to which a yearly Jodigy of Rupees 67-13-2 was due by Plaintiff, and had been paid in full up to the January kist of Fasli 1263 (1854) when, owing to the non-payment of their dues by other members of the Agraharum, the whole village was unjustly sequestered, including the Plaintiff's four shares and the assessment raised, and that Plaintiff had in vain appealed to the Collector (Defendant) for redress.

3. The Defendant in his answer raised a preliminary objection against the jurisdiction of the Court, as Plaintiff's claim referred to Inam property. This plea was rejected by the Sub-Judge, admitted on appeal by the Civil Judge, and eventually overruled by the Sudder Udalt in their Proceedings of the 27th October 1859. The Defendant finally pleaded that the Agraharum in question was not held in severally but jointly, and that consequently the shareholders were jointly as well as severally liable for the quit-rent due on it.

4. The Plaintiff rejoined that when a fixed rent was originally assessed on the Agraharum, separate Puttahs were issued for the portion held by each villager; that the Government dues were paid separately; that the Government (the Board of Revenue) in their letter to Defendant of the 18th July 1855, admitted that it was unjust to make the property of one shareholder responsible and to appropriate it for the default of another; that he (Plaintiff) could prove there was no balance due either by himself separately or by the village conjointly for Fasli 1263; and that the Defendant had annexed the village irregularly and contrary to the terms of paragraphs 31 and 32 of the Hukumnama of the District.

5. Mr. Hodgson, the Sub-Judge of Salem, dismissed the Plaintiff's claim with costs.

6. The Plaintiff appealed to the Civil Court of Salem upon the following grounds:—

1st.—Because the question raised by the Plaintiff was the right of Defendant to demand a rate of assessment in excess of the permanent quit-rent originally settled, in answer to which quite another issue had been raised by the Defendant, viz., that in Jodigy Agraharums one shareholder was jointly responsible for the arrears of another.

2nd.—Because the Plaintiff not only fully proved the issues settled by the Sub-Judge, viz., the amount of his original kist, the amount paid and the excess collected, but also that the Defendant acted unjustly in sequestering the village at all.

3rd.—Because the Defendant did not attempt to prove the third point given to him, viz., his authority to collect excess of rent which is the real question at issue; that neither did he (Defendant) failed to establish his second point, that Plaintiff was jointly responsible with the several holders.

4th.—Because the two Decrees upon which he (Defendant) relied did not apply to this case, and the correspondence between the Military Collector of the day and his Military subordinate was not evidence, it being moreover doubtful if it bears the construction put upon it by the Sub-Judge.

5th.—Because the Sub-Judge had decided the cause upon the spurious issue raised by the Defendant, and that contrary to the evidence, accusing the Plaintiff of not proving what he was not called upon to prove, viz., whether payment upon an individual Puttah has ever exempted the entire Agraharum from attachment and resumption upon the failure of the dues of other shareholders.

6th.—Because no illegal practice on the part of Government, with the view of facilitating the collection of revenue, can justify an illegal or unjust act on their part.

7th.—Because the Sub-Judge has wrongly alleged that one year's notice had been given of the attachment in question, as stated by the Defendant, without noticing the refutation argued by the Plaintiff, and proved by his documentary evidence.

8th.—Because the Sub-Judge has stated that the course adopted by the Defendant is sanctioned by established practice, while it was urged by the Plaintiff that it was notorious that the Agraharum in question originally consisted of fifty-two shares, of which seven had been assumed by Government for various causes at different times, without making the other shareholders jointly responsible, and that remissions had at times been granted to different shareholders on failure of their dues from adverse causes.

9th.—Because supposing the Government had a right to sequester all the shares in the village for the defaulter of one shareholder, yet they had no right to raise the rent which had long since been permanently assessed.

7. Owing to Mr. Cherry, the Civil Judge of Salem having been, as then Acting Collector of the District, a party to this cause, the High Court, in their Proceedings of the 20th October 1862, directed the transfer of the appeal in question to the Civil Court of Chittoor.

8. The appeal came on for hearing on the 24th February 1864, Vakil Narayangar appearing for the Appellant (Plaintiff), and the Government Vakil for Respondent (Defendant); but owing to the absence from the record of some of the documents referred to in the pleadings, and for want of other papers requisite to enable the Court to pronounce a satisfactory judgment, the Collector of Salem was (agreeably to Section 138 of Act VII of 1859) called upon to furnish the documents in question; these were not received in time to permit of the appeal being disposed of before the adjournment of the Court on the 7th May.

9. The questions for determination are,

(i.) Whether or not the Defendant had authority to sequester the Agraharum of Nakarapatti.

(ii.) Whether if so authorized the Defendant was justified in raising Plaintiff's rent.

(iii.) Whether the sequestration was legally carried out agreeably to the terms of the Hukumnama of the District.

10. Upon a perusal of the material papers referred to, it is clear that the right of the Defendant to resume the Agraharum upon the failure of any portion of the Jodigy is established by the repeated orders of the Government and the Board of Revenue in similar cases (Government 31st January 1843 and 13th September 1851, Board of Revenue 18th September 1851, and 18th July 1855); that other Agraharum villages in the Salem District have been similarly resumed; that the village of Nakarapatti now in issue, has been frequently attached under the general powers thus conferred on the Collector; that copy of Collector's Proclamation of October 1851 detailing such authority was at the time transmitted to the Monigar of this village in which the example of two resumed Agraharums was specified and held out as a warning, so that there could be no ignorance on the part of Plaintiff, nor doubt of the measures that would be taken towards the villagers of Nakarapatti in the event of undue arrears on the part of any member of their community. For the above reasons the Court concurs with the decision arrived at by Mr. Hodgson upon this point.

11. As to the second question which Appellant raises that supposing the Defendant authorized to sequester the village, it does not follow that he is justified in collecting an increased rent upon it; were this position tenable, it does not appear what object could be gained by the resuming a village on the part of Government. The result of sequestration in the other instances referred to was and of necessity the amalgamation of lands so resumed with other lands bearing the usual Tirwah of the District, and as already stated both precedents and due notification to the Monigar of Nakarapatti could leave no doubt upon this point. The procedure of Defendant is, moreover, fully supported by Section 6, Regulation XXXI of 1802.

12. With regard to the third point, Mr. Hodgson merely states that one year's grace was allowed before resumption. To the pleadings of Appellant's Vakil with regard to the irregularities alleged to have taken place in the attachment and resumption of the village, Defendant's Vakil replied that these were pleaded for the first time; this statement is contradicted by the terms of the Plaintiff's rejoinder, and by the documents he filed, and it may here be remarked that the carelessness of the Government Vakil in getting up his case, and the superficial knowledge displayed by him of its merits, is mainly the cause of the delay in disposing of this appeal, and has, moreover, thrown much extra labour on the Court.

13. From the documents examined it appears that the order for the attachment of Nakarapatti was despatched by the Tahsildar of the Taluk on the 14th January 1853, and reached the village on the 18th idem; that the amount due was Rupees 113-1-6; and that on the 23rd February 1853, a sum of Rupees 120 was paid, leaving a balance of Rupees 3-12-4 to the credit of the kist for February. The attachment should therefore have at once been removed, and in point of fact became null and void from that date.

14. The kist for February and subsequent months fell into arrears, and on the 1st February 1854, the Defendant issued a Notification resuming the village for a balance of Rupees 263-9-5 due for Fasli 1262 and 1263 (i. e., up to the 31st December 1853), calculating that one year had elapsed from the date of the aforesaid attachment to the date of resumption. This attachment have become void by the payment of the balance originally due on the 23rd February 1853, it was legally requisite, agreeably to paragraph 23 of the District Hukumnama quoted by Defendant in his Notification of resumption, and to Section 4, Regulation XXVII of 1802, that a fresh notice and a fresh order of attachment should have been issued for the subsequent arrears from the date of which attachment a fresh period of one year should have run to justify the Defendant in proceeding to resume the village. No such steps having been taken, it is evident that the Defendant's proceedings have been vitiated by a radical defect, the benefit of which the plaintiff must in equity receive.

15. Such being the case, the Court resolves to set aside the original decree, and to declare for the Plaintiff with the cost, so far as regards the excess of rent sued for up to the date of this decree. The injunction sued for cannot for the reasons above stated be granted, the Court having decided that the Collector is entitled, on lawfully resuming the Plaintiff's land, to increase the rent thereon.

Pronounced in open Court this 7th July 1864.

(Signed) C. A. ROBERTS,
Civil Judge.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. ARBUTHNOTT,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

ABSTRACT.—Translation of an Appeal Memorandum filed by Soobramaniah Vakil on behalf of Ellier, Plaintiff, against the Decree of the Sub-Court in Original Suit No. 31 of 1856.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of a Supplemental Answer filed in the Subordinate Court of Salem in Original Suit No. 31 of 1856 by the then Acting Collector of the District.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of an Endorsement passed by Mr. Brett on a Petition presented by G. F. Fischer, Esq., on behalf of certain inhabitants of the village of Nakarapatti in the Taluk of Razapur.

1. The Board observe that the Agraharum was originally attached on 19th January 1853, for the Kist due for the month of Margaly (Fasli 1262), which terminated on 11th January 1853.

2. The Kist for the following month Thye became an arrear on the 1st Masy, corresponding with 10th February 1853, while the village was still under attachment.

3. The collections to date paid in by the Zufty Amin on 23rd February 1853, amounting to Rupees 120, were only sufficient to liquidate the debt for the month of Margaly, and Rupees 3-12-4 of the arrear due for the month Thye.

4. The Court have assumed that the Kist for this last native month, which really became an arrear on 10th February, was the Kist for the Calendar month February, and did not become an arrear till 1st March, and that therefore in consideration of the payment to credit of the Agraharum made by the Zufty Amin on 23rd February, the estate was not in arrears on that date, and should have been released from attachment. The Court therefore decreed in favor of the original Plaintiff so far as regards the excess collections beyond the amount of the favorable Jody or quit-rent made subsequent to the date of attachment.

5. The Board resolve to forward the papers to the Government Pleader for his opinion whether the Civil Court can be moved to re-consider the decision with reference to the wrong assumption of facts above pointed out.

6. Otherwise the Board consider that it will be necessary to institute a special appeal to the High Court.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To C. Dale, Esq., Government Pleader,
with three enclosures and copies of correspondence alluded to in
paragraph 3 of Collector's letter.

Copy to Honorable D. Arbuthnott, Collector of Salem.

Edw. J. Wright.

Revenue Dept.

Memorandum

1 In paragraph 12
of a despatch passed on
the 7th July last in an
appeal suit brought by
a shareholder in the
Kottarapatti Ugra
harum against the col-
lector of Salem the
Civil Judge of Chittoor
remarked upon the un-
lessence of the Govern-
ment in getting
up the case. This and
the superficial know-
ledge of its merits which
he displayed were among
the causes of the delay
in disposing of this
case.

Enrolled in the Court of the
Civil Judge of Salem
on the 10th of August
1864.

1864. Department.

No. 2396/64.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 25th August 1864.

Despatched

Received

E. 302 WND

No. 5,510.

Forwarding to the Government Pleader for
opinion certain papers connected with Appeal
Suit No. 108 of 1861 on the file of the Civil
Court of Salem.

"assess" and ~~more~~ more;
over ~~there~~ "much extra
"labor on the Coast."

2. The Government
should to whom the
Board referred for
advice upon matters
connected with the suit,
in replying to their
Proceedings of the 25th
August 1864 adverted
to the point which is
noticed in the preceding
paragraph, in the fol-
lowing terms -

"I submit that ac-
tion should be taken
on the remarks of the
"Civil Judge regarding the
conduct of the Govt Vessel
at Chilloo. If they are
passed over without notice
it will be likely to
deter

deter ~~the~~ Judge from
commenting on similar
misconduct.

"On principle, a man
"who so misconducts him-
self as to endanger the
"result of a suit should
"be dismissed, unless he
"can afford a very good
"explanation for his con-
"duct.

"But whether pro-
"bably, owing to the
"small pay given to the
"Government Vessel,
"such a step would prove
"beneficial to the inter-
ests of Government by
getting a better man;
"I am unable to judge.
"I fear there is not
sufficient inducement
in salaries where the

* The right way befiled. I speak of things as they are, not as they should be; and we shall have long to wait before we see God's Father's glory as Man's King, and then man's salary, because such a course as Coltrane teaches Man's independence. Thank be well then for I consider, & call on the Gov. of N. York: to direct the attention of Gov. in the Cotton Com. to the separating & separating made of the C. Code, & will return them to to submit such explanation as the Gov. & Father's way be able to offer. When then or before the Gov. it may be determined whether errors will or will be then or then in - 2. 2. 55. 70. 1804

From the Salem Journal for 23rd Nov. 1841.
at Shelton: "Dear Clergy, Personal &
Commune." Addressing the Salem Collector &
the Post-Office at Shelton. Referring
every thing to the done, at present top of
time, by writing. Practically to I am
advised that few of any of our Post-
Offices are allowed to conduct a anti-
agel-Gods in the way of to them away
from each. It is the same kind of
the Collector who takes the letter, same
of the Post-Office the clerk, the Post-
Office being, in fact, a mere medium
of communication with the Court where it

9/11

For he had been with me

h^o. 278.

Fort St. George
10th. July 165

14 The 13th of Nov. with 3 incl. Dec. 18 Feb

Under Sea

No. 5,780.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th September 1864.

Read the following letter from C. DALE, Esq., Government Pleader, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 30th August 1864, No. 191:—

1. I do myself the honor of acknowledging the receipt of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under the date and number noted in the margin, and of advising that an application be made to the Civil Judge of Chittoor for a review of his Judgment in Appeal Suit, No. 103 of 1861, on the file of the Civil Court of Salem.

25th August 1864, No. 2,510.

2. It is very evident that Mr. Roberts was desirous of passing a correct Judgment on the merits of the case, it is equally evident he has misunderstood the facts, and it is extremely probable that on the facts being correctly developed before him he may see reason to arrive at a different conclusion from that at which he has at present arrived, but even should he retain his present opinion, it will be highly desirable that he should amend the Statements made in the thirteenth and fourteenth paragraphs of his Judgment, and thus to have the facts correctly before the High Court should it be thought desirable to prefer a Special Appeal to that Court.

3. I have no means of ascertaining whether evidence was adduced before the Sub-Court to show on what days the kist fell due, or whether from any of the documents before the Court such fact was shown. If not, the Appellate Court has the power to allow additional evidence to be adduced.

4. I submit that action should be taken on the remarks of the Civil Judge regarding the conduct of the Government Vakeel at Chittoor. If they are passed over without notice it will be likely to deter Civil Judges from commenting on similar misconduct.

5. On principle, a man who so misconducts himself as to endanger the result of a Suit should be dismissed, unless he can afford a very good explanation for his conduct.

6. But whether practically, owing to the small pay given to the Government Vakeels, such a step would prove beneficial to the interests of Government, by getting a better man, I am unable to judge. I fear there is not sufficient inducement in Zillahs where the amount of litigation in which Government is concerned is small both in number of Suits, and the value of the matter in dispute, for the best men to accept the appointment.

7. I return all the papers which accompanied the Proceedings noted above.

1. Communicated to the Collector of Salem with reference to his letter, dated 13th August 1864, No. 143. He will take the necessary steps for obtaining a review of Judgment by the Chittoor Court.

2. The remarks of the Civil Judge and Government Solicitor on the Government Vakeel's conduct of the case will be brought to the notice of Government for such orders as they may see fit to pass.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Secretary.

To Honorable D. Arbuthnott, Collector of Salem.

„ J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.,

with copy of Board's Proceedings,

dated 25th August 1864, No. 5,510.

Copy to C. Dale, Esq., Government Pleader.

Erd. J. Wright.

With an Order

25 July 1865

No. 3. Month/37 - 188-89

Rev. 1861. Department
of Govt. for Selby

No. 2396.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 24th September 1864.

24th 9th 1864
Private Solicitor's Office

No. 6780.

24th 9th 1864

Communicating to the Collector of Salem letter from the Government Pleader and requesting the former to take the necessary steps for obtaining a review of the judgment passed by the Civil Judge of Chittoor in Appeal Suit No. 108 of 1861, also bringing to the notice of Government the remarks of the Civil Judge and Government Solicitor on the Government Va-keel's conduct of the case.

With an Order

With an Order

22nd July/85 Rs.

203203x204.

22nd July/85 Rs.