28 S 80
95-18/RH/80

M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2487 Press ~~Mis.~~

373-374

Dated 17-9- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2 MS

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th September 1866.

No. 373. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Judicial Department:—

Passing orders on papers relating to the office of Government Vakeels in Mofussil Courts. } (Here enter 1st September 1866, No. 1,369.)

No. 374. ORDER THEREON, 17th September 1866, No. 2,487.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, with Proceedings Judicial Department, No. 1,369.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department, 1st September 1866.

Read the following papers :—

No. 9. From the Honorable C. COLLETT, Madras Civil Service, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George ; dated Madras, 10th March 1866.

In reply to the Proceedings of Government, dated the 27th January, No. 195, (which I understand to have been addressed to me personally, rather than as Judge of Vizagapatam), I have the honor to offer my opinion that it will probably be found best to abolish the office of Government Vakeel.

2. I am not sure whether the salary is the sole remuneration, or whether it is only a retaining fee, and in addition the usual fee is given in each case ; perhaps there is not the same practice in all places. The salary is, I think, more than sufficient as a mere retaining fee, but not so as the sole remuneration.

3. The selection for the office is often defective. Choice is made too often of a person on the ground of his having been long a Vakeel, and being a man of some respectability ; he is then kept on in the office, though younger and abler men may have subsequently joined the local bar.

4. I do not know what is the precise amount of Civil litigation in which the Government is engaged during the course of the year in the various Courts of the Presidency ; but I believe that the Government would be better served, if, instead of the present system, they employed and paid Vakeels in the usual way, just as business arose. It is true that there are in the Procedure Code some provisions for service of process on the Government Vakeel, but it is only the first summons that is so served. But all difficulty on this matter might be got rid of, if the Government, when made a party to a suit, will accept a service on the Collector of the District as a sufficient service, which practically it really is. When, not the Government collectively, but, some Officer of Government is made a party, service on him direct would be a good service.

5. During two and a half years the Government was a party in only one suit in the Vizagapatam Court. The Collector accepted service and employed a Vakeel. The Decree gave the Government their costs, and the Vakeel probably was satisfied with the fee taxed by the Court.

6. But if it should be thought desirable in any or all Courts to retain a Government Vakeel, I would suggest that the office should cease to be permanent. The Collector might each year retain some Vakeel on behalf of Government, paying him down some small retaining fee, and agreeing as to the fees to be allowed on any business that might arise. The fees that the Court would allow on taxing the costs of an opposite party would probably secure the services of the best Vakeels at the local bar. The selection should be left entirely to the Collector ; and at the end of any year, the plan of retaining a Vakeel might cease, if thought advisable.

7. In Criminal cases, it is competent to the Magistrate of the District to appoint any one he likes to prosecute before the Court of Session, and I entertain a strong opinion, from what I have seen both at Chittoor and Vizagapatam, that Session cases should always be prosecuted by some Officer from the Magistrate's office, and not by the Government Vakeel. A Government Vakeel is seldom experienced in criminal business, and when he is, his fee for defending a prisoner would be at least from 5 to 20 times what the Government allows for prosecuting a case. Then he is not a subordinate of the Magistrate, and it is not very material to him whether

he gives satisfaction or not to the Magistrate; and if he has much Civil practice, he has no time to look into the the Session cases thoroughly when this business pays him so badly.

8. Both Mr. Fraser, at Chittoor, and Mr. Carmichael, at Vizagapatam, sent to my Courts, as public prosecutors, officers on their own establishments, whose fixed salaries varied from 70 to 100 Rupees a month, and I believe every Magistrate could easily do the same. By such an Officer the fees allowed by Government are appreciated as an addition to his regular pay, and, besides, such an Officer is thoroughly a subordinate of the Magistrate; he has much to lose if he fails in his duty; and his future promotion greatly depends on his success. Further, being in the Magistrate's Office, he has every opportunity of consulting the Magistrate on any case, and on the spur of the moment. It is within my experience that defects have thus been supplied before trial; and also improper prosecutions stopped at once, by the Magistrate ordering his Officer to produce no evidence and submit to a verdict of acquittal. It is, no doubt, a fact that Subordinate Magistrates sometimes, from ignorance or corruption, make the most groundless commitments of respectable persons; the disgrace of a public trial, if not a conviction, being what is sometimes desired.

9. I know of no other measure so likely to induce Magistrates of Districts to exercise thorough supervision over their Subordinate Magistrates, and to appreciate their own responsibility for the prosecution of every case before the Courts of Session. I venture to doubt if in all Districts the Magistrates do now rightly appreciate this responsibility. Under the Code, it is expressly the duty of the Magistrate to appoint the prosecutor; and Session Judges now rightly decline to conduct the prosecution, or to do the work of the Superior Magistrates in supervising the Subordidate Magistrates in details. This change is not yet, I think, fully appreciated by the Superior Magistrates; and until it is, the supervision will be defective. As about 90 per cent. of the committed cases are sent up by Subordinate Magistrates, it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this duty of supervision.

10. Occasionally, an Officer of the Police, as, for instance, a Court Inspector, might be substituted for an Officer from the Magistrate's office, but, as a general rule, Police Officers ought not, in my humble opinion, to be public prosecutors. The Court Inspector is of great service to the officer of the Magistrate both before and at the trial, but that is his proper duty; and it is rather too much to expect that, as a public prosecutor, he will always forget his position as a Police Officer.

11. I need scarcely say that prosecutions in serious cases must not be left to inferior Officers. Of course, the plan will fail if a low Goomastah or Jawabnivis, or a petty Police Officer, is sent to prosecute Session cases.

12. I would beg to add the suggestion that young Assistants should be required to attend the Sessions, and report to the Magistrate all remarks made by the Court on the getting up of the cases, or any defects which, during the trial, may strike themselves. Mr. Carmichael's Assistant constantly attended my Court.

No. 10. From E. W. BIRD, Esq., Civil and Session Judge of Tanjore, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Tanjore, 6th February 1866, No. 89.

I reply to the Proceedings of Government, No. 109, of the 27th January 1866, calling for my opinion in respect to the emoluments of the Government Vakeels in

Mofussil Courts, and requesting suggestions for making better provision that the interests of Government should be efficiently represented in these Courts, I have the honor to submit the following for the consideration of Government.

2. There can be no doubt that the Government Vakeel, in all Mofussil Courts, is a greatly under-paid Officer. Being retained for Government in all Civil Suits, to which Government is a party, he is, of course, restricted, in such cases, to the bare fee allowed by law, and no more. As Government Vakeel, further, he is bound to prosecute at the Sessions all such cases (the majority here) as the Magistracy may, under the Code of Criminal Procedure, direct him to conduct. His time is taken up, therefore, entirely during the Sessions in this work, and he is, of necessity, obliged to devote several days before the Sessions commence, in view to master all the facts of the cases for the prosecution and defence, to enable him, if possible, to secure convictions. The fee allowed (Rupees 8 per Session Case) certainly does not cover the loss of private practice which the Government Vakeel incurs, as compared with the income which the other Vakeels of the Court, whose time is their own, secure during the month. The consequence is that, in this Zillah at least, the best qualified Vakeels, who make, on an average, I suppose, clear Rupees 400 a month by private practice, cannot be induced to accept the Government Pleadership, the salary of which, Rupees 21, is supplemented by about 65 Rupees a month, average Session fees and 2nd rate private practice, which, from the necessity of the case, I am told rarely exceeds Rupees 70 per mensem.

3. The remedy for this state of things, of course, is to increase the pay of the Government Vakeel, and to make it better worth the while of a really superior man to seek the place. With this view, I should recommend that the Government Vakeel's salary proper should be raised to Rupees 70 a month, his fees for conducting Session cases being 8 Rupees per trial, as at present. This increase, though it will not, in this District, equalize the income with that obtained by private practice by the best Vakeels, will render the disproportion less, and in other Zillahs of this Presidency may probably command the highest talent available.

4. These remarks should not, however, be taken to convey that I am dissatisfied myself with the Government Vakeel now employed in the Civil Court here. He is, I consider, well suited for the work he has to perform for the Government and public, especially on the Criminal side of the Court, and on the whole I do not think we could have a better man. When I selected him for the post he was the best man then available, and I am sure that, if the pay be increased now to Rupees 70, the one or two whose educational attainments are superior could not be induced, even if I desired it (which I do not), to accept the appointment.

No. 11. From J. R. KINDERSLEY, Esq., Civil and Session Judge of Bellary, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Bellary, 5th February 1866, No. 9.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Proceedings of Government of the 27th January, desiring the opinion of myself, among others, as to whether it is the fact that the best of the Pleaders in the Mofussil Courts are, as a general rule, not disposed to accept the office of Government Pleader, on account of the smallness of the salary, and of the office shutting them out from lucurative practice.

2. I understand the Office of Government Pleader to have reference only to practice on the Civil side of the District Courts; but the same person is so generally employed as public prosecutor at the Criminal Sessions, that it seems proper to consider his remuneration in either office.

3. I am of opinion that the usual salary of a Government Vakeel is generally sufficient for the Civil work which he is called upon to perform. In exceptional cases, in which the Government have large interests at stake, it might be advisable to stimulate their pleader with a fee, which would have more effect than an increase of salary. I believe that the salary is the same in every District, whereas the work to be done is not the same. In Bellary, there has not been a suit against Government for years, and the office of Government Pleader is almost a sinecure. I have never heard of the office being declined by a Vakeel; and I have always believed that it was coveted as a distinction. On the Civil side of the Court, I believe that it would increase the practice of almost any Vakeel. I am quite aware that the Government Pleader in a Mofussil Court has not generally been the ablest of the Vakeels, but I do not think that that is attributable to the insufficiency of the salary. The ablest Vakeel may not bear a good moral character, or his manner may not conciliate the favor of the Judge and of the Collector. It would be endless to enumerate the causes which often exclude the most able men, not only from the office of Government Vakeel, but from other offices also. I have never heard any complaint of the insufficiency of the salary for Civil work.

4. But the remuneration for Criminal prosecutions in the Courts of Session is notoriously insufficient, and the payment is not always prompt. I believe that the usual fee for defending a prisoner in the Court of Session is Rupees 25, but it is often very much more, and if the Government do not sufficiently fee their Vakeel, the opposite party is generally quite ready to do so. Of course, the rich will spend money in their own defence; but also large sums are subscribed when the honor of a particular caste or profession is involved in the issue of a trial.

5. I think that when the accused is defended by a Vakeel, the Vakeel for the prosecution ought to receive not less than Rupees 10 or 15. The Collector has generally the means of knowing when it would be expedient to give more.

No. 12. From C. R. PELLY, Esq., Civil Judge of Nellore, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Nellore, 3rd February 1866, No. 4.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the Proceedings of Government, Judicial Department, together with the Order thereon, dated 27th January 1866, No. 109, and, in reply, to state that I do not think it is the fact that the best of the Pleaders in the Mofussil Courts are, as a general rule, not disposed to accept the office of Government Pleader on account of the smallness of the salary and of the office shutting out the holders from lucrative practice; any instance in which it may have been declined on the above grounds (and none such has fallen within my experience) I take to be exceptional. In the Courts in which I have had the honor to preside, the Government Pleadership (writing from memory) has twice become vacant. In each case I offered the appointment (as far as the matter rested with me) to the Pleader I deemed most efficient, and the offer was accepted without hesitation; the nominee evidently considered that a benefit had been conferred on him. I

have always found the office sought after, notwithstanding the small salary attached to it; and I question that the appointment does in reality entail loss of practice. I believe, on the whole, in this respect the incumbent is a gainer, and that the official position has a tendency to increase rather than diminish his practice. In the instances I have referred to above, the Pleaders, as far as I could form an opinion, had about the largest practice of any in their respective Courts, and if they had found that the appointment entailed loss on them, I cannot doubt that their resignations would have quickly followed on the discovery.

2. The appointment is at present pretty nearly a sinecure. I refer, of course, to work on the Civil side, and that portion of it for which the fixed monthly salary is assigned; the Government Pleader, as such, having ceased to conduct prosecutions before the Court of Session, and receiving separate remuneration for suits to which the Collector may be a party. The interests of Government are only nominally represented, and though the salary is inadequate remuneration for the duties if efficiently discharged, I cannot say it is so for the work now performed, which consists simply of acting in conformity with specific written orders received from the Collector, relative to miscellaneous matters; beyond this they do nothing. I do not, however, think that a mere increase of salary will of itself effect an improvement. My view of the matter is that, if the Government interests are to be as efficiently represented as the present state of the Mofussil bar will fairly admit of, the appointment must be left entirely in the hands of the Collector of the District, *with power to dispense with the incumbent's services when he deems this course advisable.* Much, no doubt, may be urged against this suggestion, but, in practice, it would, I think, be found to work well. If with this check over the Pleader, the Collector finds he cannot get the duties efficiently discharged at the present rate, then the monthly salary will have to be raised to the requisite point which he will soon be in a position to determine, but to do this, and leave other matters as they now stand, would be to benefit the individual, without improving the position of the Government. Increase of salary might possibly here and there give rise to a little temporary zeal; but, before long, we should have the Pleader again running in his old groove. I attribute the inefficient manner in which the Government interests are looked after to the independent position of its Court representatives; and so long as they hold office on their present footing which practically renders removal impossible, they will, as a rule, adhere to, the do-nothing course. If Government invests its District representative, viz., the Collector, with that power over the Pleader that every private individual has over his, it will have its interests as efficiently represented as theirs are. I remember being struck, when in another District, at the manner in which the interests of certain Zemindars were looked after by their salaried Pleaders, who were not perhaps the best in the Court to which I refer, and certainly not, as far as I could form an opinion, in the largest practice. Nothing cropped up there likely to affect their employers directly or indirectly, without their taking immediate action in the matter (and this has been more or less observable in all Courts in which I have held office). The case, however, was invariably very different when the interests of Government were concerned; but if the Zemindars' Pleaders had held their situations on the same

tenure that the Government Pleader held his—practically almost beyond possibility of removal, free from check or control, and at liberty to do as little as they pleased—I have little doubt that their interests would have been no better looked after than those of Government, if so well.

No. 13. ORDER THEREON, 1st September 1866, No. 1369.

In November last, the Government Pleader, Mr. Dale, brought to the notice of Government the very inefficient way in which their Vakeel in the Civil Court of Guntoor had conducted a very important suit in which they were interested, and urged the expediency of endeavouring to procure the services of properly qualified persons for the office of Vakeel in the Provincial Courts.

G. O., Revenue Department, 8th December 1865, No. 299 5

2. The Government referred the subject to the four Judges marginally named, requesting them to state whether the best qualified Vakeels of the Courts were unwilling to accept the office of Government Pleader, owing to the inadequacy of the remuneration assigned to it, and to its precluding them from accepting private practice of a more lucrative character, and also to submit any suggestions that might occur to them for making better provision for the interests of Government being more efficiently represented in the Mofussil Courts.

G. O., Judicial Department, 27th January 1866, No. 105.

Mr. E. W. Bird, Judge of Tanjore.
,, C. Collett, ,, of Vizagapatam.
,, J. R. Kindersley ,, of Bellary.
,, C. R. Pelly. ,, of Nellore.

3. The letters above recorded are the replies of the gentlemen consulted.

4. The law (Section 37, Regulation XIV of 1816) at present imposes on the Civil Judge the duty of selecting one of the enrolled Pleaders of his Court for the office of Government Vakeel; but, under a standing order of the late Sudder Court, he must consult and obtain the concurrence of the Collector before submitting his nomination to Government, who, if they approve, then issue a Sunnud appointing the person during good conduct; and on occasions of misconduct on the part of the Vakeel thus appointed, it has been necessary that both Judge and Collector should agree in advising his dismissal, should such a course be thought to be required.

8th June 1832, No. 52 A.

5. A Government Vakeel is attached to each of the Civil Courts; the lower Courts have no such Vakeel.

6. The Government Vakeels are remunerated by a fixed salary of Rupees 21 per mensem, and the same fees as other Vakeels when costs are awarded by the Court, in suits to which the Government is a party.

See Clause 5, Section 37, Regulation XIV of 1816.

7. The following is the scale of fees prescribed by law:—

Section 25, Regulation XIV of 1816.
Section 7, Act I of 1846.

	Maximum fees.
	RS.
If the value of the claim does not exceed 5000 Rupees, 5 per cent....	250
From 5000 to 20,000, 5 per cent. on 5000 and on remainder 2 per cent.....	550
From 20,000 to 50,000, 2 per cent. on 20,000 and on the remainder 1 per cent.	700
From 50,000 to 80,000, 1 per cent. on 50,000 and on remainder ½ per cent.	650
Above 80,000, 1000 Rs.	1000

which last sum is, in all cases, the maximum. Parties, however, are at liberty to make their own terms with their pleaders.

8. Mr. Collett considers the salary more than sufficient as a mere retaining fee, but not enough as sole remuneration. Mr. Bird states that the Government Vakeel is "a greatly underpaid Officer", and consequently the best qualified Vakeels of his Court cannot be induced to accept the office. Mr. Kindersley deems the present salary generally sufficient for the civil work (in Bellary very trifling) which devolves on the Government Vakeel, and believes the office to be coveted as a distinction. Mr. Pelly has "always found the office sought after."

9. Thus the majority of the Officers consulted do not support the idea that the salary of the Government Vakeel is inadequate for the work to be performed on the Civil Side. Whether the holder of the office is a loser by being precluded from private practice is at least questionable, he is sure of all the suits in which Government is concerned; and if, in any of these, he receives a smaller fee from Government than their opponents would give, his official position, if the selection be so made as to command respect, should, as Messrs. Pelly and Kindersley remark, increase, rather than diminish, his practice.

10. Mr. Bird suggests, in order to procure a better class of men, that the salary should be raised to 70 Rupees per mensem. Mr. Collett would abolish the office, or, if it be retained, would leave the Collector each year to retain some Vakeel on behalf of Government, paying him down some small retaining fee, and agreeing as to the fees to be allowed on any business that may arise. The selection, he considers, should be left entirely to the Collector, and, at the end of any year, the plan of retaining a Vakeel might cease, if its cessation be thought desirable. Mr. Pelly is also of opinion that the appointment should be "left entirely in the hands of the "Collector of the District, *with power to dispense with the incumbent's services when he "deems this course advisable.*" He attributes the inefficient manner in which the interests of Government are looked after to the independent position of its representatives in the Courts—"practically almost beyond possibility of removal, free "from check or control, and at liberty to do as little as they please."

11. After a careful consideration of the question, the Governor in Council thinks there can be little doubt that the course advocated by Messrs. Collett and

Pelly furnishes the remedy required. He does not see how Government, as the Law now stands, can altogether dispense with a Vakeel in the Chief Court of each District, but it is anomalous that the Judge, whose duty is merely to decide matters brought before him, should have any, much less such a potential, voice, as he has, in selecting the Government representative, and that the latter should, when appointed, occupy so independent a position as he does. The Government do not see the necessity of any law on such a subject; the Government Pleader must, of course, be one of the enrolled pleaders of the Court, but in all other respects, the Government should be free to do as they think best for the interests of the State. A legal enactment for the appointment of a Vakeel, and none for that of an Advocate General, is at least anomalous.

12. It will be necessary, however, to have a law to repeal the existing law on the subject, and the Assistant Secretary in the Legislative Department will be instructed to frame a Bill for the purpose.

13. As to whether the nomination and removal of Vakeels should be left entirely to the Collector, and whether the tenure should be annual, are matters of opinion. The Government prefer nomination by the Collector, and appointment by Government during pleasure. The Government would, of course, readily attend to a Collector's well-founded representations against his Vakeel, and the latter would, therefore, be sufficiently dependent on the former. On the other hand, reasonable security in the tenure of office is one of the strongest inducements to able men to enter the service of Government; and the Sunnud of Government would doubtless be deemed an honorable distinction.

14. The above remarks apply only to the Civil functions of the Government Vakeels. All the gentlemen consulted remark strongly on the inadequacy of the fee usually allowed for conducting criminal prosecutions. The maximum fee payable, without the previous sanction of Government, is only 10 Rupees. This, experience shows, is too little; and the Government are of opinion that the limit may be advantageously raised. They are accordingly pleased to empower Magistrates to disburse fees to the extent of 25 Rupees, applying for special sanction only where a higher sum is considered necessary.

G. O., 2nd February 1863, No. 157, para. 5.

15. The question of whether the Government Pleader should, as a part of his duty, conduct all prosecutions, was recently considered by Government, in communication with the High Court; and it was decided, mainly in consequence of doubts of the fitness of these Officers, that it should be left to the Magistrate's discretion to employ a separate Prosecutor or the Government Vakeel, on each occasion. The latter is at times considerably a loser by the arrangement. Mr. Collett states that when he was Judge at Chittoor and Vizagapatam, the Magistrate employed, as public Prosecutors, officers from their own establishments in receipt of salaries from 70 to 100 Rupees, and he dwells strongly on the advantages of the plan. The Government in Council cannot, however, order this arrangement to be generally carried out. He doubts whether, with the great increase of criminal prosecutions of late years, the Magistracy could thus

G. O., 2nd February 1863, No. 157.

depute Officers of standing, ability and experience, to act as Prosecutors, without prejudice to their ordinary duties. Besides, the Government do not see the advantage of the plan. The Government Officer can do no more than the Vakeel could, either in or out of Court, and the permission to employ other than Government Vakeels has, the Governor in Council thinks, had the effect of connecting the Police more than is altogether desirable with prosecutions. The Government would rather employ the Vakeel as the rule, giving him, however, proper remuneration, which the Magistrates will be able to do, now that they have been authorized to pay fees to the extent of 25 Rupees without the previous sanction of Government. The Magistrate should of course personally communicate with the Vakeel before hand, or make one of his Assistants do so. At the same time, it is not intended to preclude the Magistrates altogether from exercising their discretion, if, on special occasions, they should deem it advisable to employ any other than the Government Vakeel to prosecute a particular case. On such occasions, they will be at liberty to employ any Officer on their own or their Assistants' establishments, but not a volunteer.

16. The prosecution of Criminal cases being thus generally left to the Government Vakeel, the Governor in Council considers it necessary that that Officer should not be free to defend prisoners. The effect of the Government Vakeel, paid by Government, and holding their Sunnud, and employed generally in conducting prosecutions, defending criminals would certainly be injurious; nor is it unreasonable thus to prohibit the Government Vakeel from undertaking the defence of criminals when the prosecution of Criminal cases is generally entrusted to him.

17. It remains to consider the question of the remuneration of Government Vakeels for the performance of Civil business in which the Government is concerned. It appears to the Governor in Council that the present pay is enough in all Civil Courts in which such business is light, but not enough in Courts where it is generally heavy and Government are often parties. The Civil Courts at Chingleput, Guntoor, Madura, Mangalore and Nellore appear to come under the latter category, and the Governor in Council resolves to request the presiding Judges of those Courts to state what, in their opinion, would be proper remuneration to Government Vakeels for the Civil work they are called upon to perform in their respective Districts. The present salary of 21 Rupees will continue undisturbed in the remaining Districts.

18. In conclusion, Mr. Collett's remarks on the degree in which, it is to be apprehended, the Subordinate Magistracy are left practically uncontrolled in the exercise of their powers, merit serious consideration. Ninety per cent. of the commitments, he says, are made by these Officers, and Government have no means of knowing how many cases are maliciously taken up, but dropped after the disgrace of trial has been inflicted. The Governor in Council resolves to request the opinion of the Honorable the Judges of the High Court on this subject, and their suggestions as to the best mode of exercising an effective control over the proceedings of the Subordinate Magistracy.

19. As the question of making the Collectors' Assistants attend the Courts, which is mooted in the last paragraph of Mr. Collett's letter, is being taken up in the Revenue Department, it needs no notice here.

(True Extract).

Secretary to Government.

To the Honorable the Judges of the High Court.
" Civil and Session Judge of
" Magistrate of
" Revenue Department.
" Legislative do.
" Accountant General.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

No. 2487.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

17th Sept. 1866.

5 Copies to the Bd of Revt with Govt. Jl No. 1369 Despd 17th

R 8 Dec. 1865 No. 33-34
Ind. 2 Feby 1863 " 157
" 27th Jany 1866
No. 195-196

Revenue 1866. Dept.
Pro. of Govt for September
No. 2999.

Proceedings of the
Madras Govt. in
the Ind. Dept.

Rorted 1st. Septr
Received 7th " 1866.
No. 1369.

Passing orders on
papers relating to the of-
fice of Govt. Vakeels in
Mofussil Courts.—

A. 373 & 374
373—374

No. 2487. 17 Septr
With order

E... Bu...