

Read the following papers :—

No. 360. From H. G. PRICHARD, Esq., Government Solicitor, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 2nd February 1871, No. 29 :—

With reference to the Order of Government, dated 7th December 1870, No. 1,962, Revenue Department, requesting me to instruct the Government Pleader to investigate the title to the West Hill Barracks at Calicut on the Malabar Coast, and also to settle the Draft Deeds in connection with the purchase of the property from the East India Iron Company, I have the honour to state that I submitted the necessary papers to the Government Pleader, and have had several interviews with him thereon; and I now forward, herewith, a copy of his opinion and observations on the title to the West Hill Barracks at Calicut, together with the Draft Deeds as settled by him.

2. The delay in returning the papers to Government was occasioned by my having had to make a reference to the Collector of Malabar, to examine the plan of the property furnished by the Company's Agents, and also to ascertain the correctness of the description of the property given in the Deed of Conveyance.

3 I have submitted the Draft Deeds, as settled by the Government Pleader, to Messrs. Dymes & Co., the Agents of the Company in this country, for their perusal, and yesterday the Drafts were returned by them to me approved.

4. As the Government Pleader has, in consequence of the Order of Government, dated 7th December 1870, No. 1,962, above referred to, had to give his opinion on the title and settle the Deeds in the stead of the Advocate-General, I have the honour to inform you that I marked on his Brief the usual fee of 140 Rs., and request the sanction of Government for its disbursement out of the funds in my hands.

OPINION.

MESSRS. Dymes & Co., the Agents in this country of the East India Iron Company, in reply to an application by the Government Solicitor for the Title Deeds of the Company's property at Calicut, state that no such Deeds can be found either in England or at any of the Company's stations or agencies in this country. The title, therefore, which I have to advise upon is a merely possessory one, and its validity depends entirely on the Limitation Act.

2. Independently of the question as to whether the Company has acquired a title by possession, which can be safely relied on, there is one danger to a purchaser arising from the fact of non-production of Title Deeds which may practically be of little importance, but which I must nevertheless point out, and that is, the liability to mortgages or other incumbrances created by the Company. According to the principles of equity, a purchaser who takes a Conveyance without getting the Title Deeds is, by the very absence of the Deeds, supposed to be put upon inquiry, and will be postponed to a prior incumbrancer who has the Title Deeds, even though he has not the legal estate, if the existence of such an incumbrance could have been discovered by ordinary diligence. If, therefore, the Company should have raised money by deposit of the Title Deeds, or any of them, it might be a question

whether the persons in possession of the Deeds had not a claim upon the property as against Government. Practically, no doubt the character of the leading members of the Company is a sufficient guarantee against the existence of any such incumbrances at any rate of recent date, and against any created more than twelve years ago the Limitation Act is complete protection.

3. It is stated by Mr. Maylor, the Company's Agent at Calicut, that the whole of the landed property of the Company at Calicut, about 37 cawnies in extent, originally belonged to a Mr. Sheffield, and was acquired by the Company in fee by purchase prior to the year 1810. All, but about 13 cawnies out of the 37, have certainly been in possession of lessees of the Company for at least twenty-five years. The lands marked A. and A. in the plan, about 8 cawnies, were leased by the Company to the late Mr. Conolly for ninety-nine years in 1813, were in his possession from that time until his death, and since have been in the possession of Government, by whom his interest was purchased. The lands marked B. and B. were also leased to the same person by the Company at the same date for twenty years, and were in his possession, or that of Government, until the expiration of the lease, since when they have been occupied by Government as monthly tenants of the Company. The land marked D., known as the Rock Hall property, also appears to have been in the possession of lessees of the Company since 1815, when it was leased by the Company to Mr. Strange. As to the possession of the remaining 13 odd cawnies, there is no information in the papers before me, but it is believed that they have been in the possession of the Company for about the same time as the other lands.

4. Assuming then, as seems almost certain, that the Company have been in possession of all the lands for at least twenty-five years past, either by themselves or by their tenants, they have now an indefeasible possessory title by virtue of the Limitation Act, unless the property was originally the subject of a trust or mortgage. The former contingency is so improbable that I think it may be passed over, but the latter requires consideration; for it is stated in the notes on the tracing of the plan among the papers before me, which, I presume, contain authentic information, that some of the lands were originally acquired by Mr. Sheffield on *kanem* or mortgage from Native owners, and even in the absence of any such statement, from the prevalence of mortgage tenures in Malabar, it would be very probable that such was the case.

5. Now, if any of these lands were originally acquired by the Company by way of mortgage, by Clause 15, Section 1, of the Limitation Act, sixty years' possession from the date of the mortgage would be necessary to give a title, and even that time might be extended by acknowledgments in writing. But it is stated by the Company's Agent, Mr. Maylor, that the whole of the lands were sold by Mr. Sheffield to Mr. Hudleston, and by the latter to the Company, and as before noticed, he dates the purchase by the Company prior to 1810; assuming this statement to be correct, and that the purchase by the Company was *bona fide*, and for valuable consideration, it is unnecessary to inquire whether the lands or any part

of them were originally acquired by way of mortgage or not; for by Section 5 of the Limitation Act, the cause of action against a *bona fide* purchaser for valuable consideration from a Mortgagee, etc., dates from the purchase, and it has been held by the High Court in a recent case that by the combined effect of this Section, and Clause 12 of Section 1, the period of limitation is twelve years from the date of the purchase.

6. Taking into consideration all the foregoing circumstances, I think that the title of the Company, as a merely possessory one to these lands, is as great as a title of that nature can be expected to be; but I am decidedly of opinion that the Company should be called upon to give absolute covenants for title, and I have altered the covenants in the Draft Conveyance accordingly. These covenants will be, in effect, an indemnity by the Company against any claims or incumbrances upon the property.

7. I have added to the Draft Conveyance, as settled by Counsel in England, a description of the property by boundaries, and have made a few other alterations in that part of the Draft. The plan and description of the property as altered have been referred to the Collector of Malabar for verification, and are stated by him to be correct. The Conveyance, as it now stands, comprises the whole of the Company's property at Calicut, including the piece of land (marked C. in the plan) purchased by Government in 1861, but of which no Conveyance was ever executed.

8. It appears that the original Lease of Iron Ore, etc., to the Company is not forthcoming, consequently it is impossible to carry out the Surrender in the form settled by Counsel in England by endorsement on the Lease. I have, therefore, settled the Draft Surrender to be made by a separate Deed. I have no copy of the Lease among the papers before me, but it is fully recited in the Draft Release, and I have assumed this recital to be correct. If a copy of the Lease is among the Government records, the Draft should be compared with it. A copy appears to have accompanied the letter from this Government to the Secretary of State for India, dated 21st September 1861, No. 55.

9. As all the Deeds relate to property in British India, they will require to be stamped in accordance with the provisions of the Indian General Stamp Act (Act XVIII. of 1869), though executed in England. In the case of the Conveyance by Section 6, Clause 4 of the Stamp Act, the expense of stamp would have to be borne by Government; therefore, no Stamp-duty is payable by Section 15, Clause 15. This latter does not, however, exempt either the Deed of Surrender or the Release from liability to Stamp-duty. It only exempts instruments executed by or on behalf of Government, in cases where the Government would, but for the exemption, be liable to pay for the stamp. The Deed of Surrender comes under Schedule I. of the Act, and therefore by Section 6, Clause 1, the expense of stamp would have to be borne by the Company, and the exemption does not apply. The proper Stamp-duty by Schedule I., Clause 20 (b) is Rs. 16. Section 6 does not provide by whom the Stamp-duty on a Release is to be paid, and there is no particular custom applying to the case of a mutual Release, such as the present one. It has, I think, been ruled by the Board of Revenue in a similar case that the exemption does not apply, and the document must bear a stamp. The proper stamp is Rs. 8 (Schedule II., Clause 30).

10. Both the Conveyance and the Surrender, since they relate to immovable property situate in districts in which the Indian Registration Act is in operation, must be registered under that Act. The Release does not require registration, being a mere Release of money-claims, all interest in the lands having been previously extinguished. With regard to the Surrender, a difficulty arises how to comply with the requirements of Section 21 of the Registration Act, as to the description of the property to which it relates. The Ore Lease, the rights under which are to be surrendered, extends to all the Government waste lands within the districts of Salem, Malabar, Canara, Coimbatore, and South Arcot. Section 21 provides that no instrument relating to immovable property shall be accepted for registration, unless it shall contain a description sufficient for identification, and among the necessary part of such description, it mentions the superficial contents, roads, and other properties, in which the property abut, and their occupancies, none of which particulars is it possible to give in the present case. However, the document may be presented for registration, but, in all probability, it will be rejected. Under the present Act the effect of non-registration of a Deed of this nature is to render it inoperative; for Section 49 provides that no instrument, required by Section 17 to be registered, shall be received in evidence in any Civil proceeding in any Court, or shall affect any property comprised therein, unless it shall have been registered under the Act. If, therefore, registration of the Deed of Surrender should be refused, the Deed will be useless, and the Government will have to rely upon the security afforded by the Deed of Release, which, in fact, is ample.

11. As it is intended that the Deeds should be executed in England, care must be taken that they are sent out here again in time to admit of registration within the four months prescribed by the Act. The Deeds, when returned here, must be accompanied by Powers of Attorney, executed in the manner prescribed by Clause C., Section 35 of the Registration Act.

12. The Indian Stamp-duty on the Deeds can be paid at any time within three months after their arrival in this country (Section 24, Clause C., Act XVIII. of 1869).

27th January 1871.

(Signed) J. W. HANDLEY,
Government Pleader.

No. 361. Official Memorandum from the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, to the Government Solicitor, Madras, dated 18th February 1871, No. 29.

With reference to paragraph 8 of the Government Pleader's opinion on the Deeds relating to the Iron Company's surrender, received from the Secretary of State, and herewith returned to the Government Solicitor, the duplicate of the Lease of 17th November 1857, signed by Messrs. George Norton and James Walker on behalf of the Company, is herewith forwarded to the Government Solicitor for comparison with the Draft Release. It is desired to know whether, if desirable, the Surrender might not be endorsed on this duplicate, if the other copy, which was probably made over in England to the Iron Company, cannot be traced.

2. In paragraph 7 of the Government Pleader's opinion, it is stated that the Conveyance comprises the whole of the Company's property at Calicut. It is desired

to know whether the Company are not owners of the "freehold land attached to the house and ground known as Rock Hall," which is specified in the list of boundaries of the property conveyed, as the Rock Hall property is apparently intended to be conveyed in its entirety.

No. 362. From the Government Solicitor, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 22nd February 1871, No. 53.

With reference to your official memorandum, dated the 18th instant, No. 29, Revenue Department, and its enclosures, I have the honour to inform you that I have conferred with the Government Pleader thereon; and I now forward herewith a copy of his further opinion, from which it will be observed that he does not consider it advisable that the Surrender should be endorsed on the duplicate Lease of the 17th November 1857, executed by Messrs. George Norton and James Walker on behalf of the East India Iron Company.

2. With regard to the freehold land attached to the house and ground known as "Rock Hall," referred to in the 2nd paragraph of your memorandum under reference, I have the honour to state that I some time since had the Title Deeds relating to the Rock Hall property before me on the occasion of its being assigned to the present lessee Major Law, and that, to the best of my recollection, I found that the freehold land had been purchased, or acquired by a former lessee from Native owners, and not from the East India Iron Company. But from whomsoever such freehold land was originally purchased or acquired, it is now, I know, vested in Major Law under the Deed by which he acquired "Rock Hall;" and under these circumstances upon the falling in of the Lease of the Rock Hall property, the freehold land will still remain the property of the person who may be the lessee of the Rock Hall at the time of the expiration of the Lease, unless, indeed, such freehold land may have been previously sold by the lessee for the time being.

3. I return herewith the enclosures which accompanied your official memorandum under reference.

OPINION.

With reference to paragraph 8 of the above opinion, I have since had the duplicate of the Ore Lease laid before me by the Government Solicitor. I have compared it with the recitals in the Draft Surrender, and find them correct. I think it would not be desirable to endorse the Surrender upon this Deed. The original Lease is the one on which the Government are liable, and on which, therefore, the endorsement should be made, if at all.

21st February 1871.

(Signed) J. W. HANDLEY,
Government Pleader.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd March 1871.

No. 363.

ORDER THEREON, 23rd March 1871, No. 533.

Miscellaneous.

THE Draft Deeds, as modified by
the Government Pleader, are approved,
and will be returned to the Secretary of
State, with reference to the Public Despatch of His Grace, dated 16th June 1870.

1. The above recorded, with Mr. Handley's signature, and
ings of Government marginally noted,
will also be forwarded with the Deeds.

8th August 1870, No. 99.

7th December, Nos. 149, 150.

2. Adverting to paragraph 4 of the Government Solicitor's letter of 2nd
February, the Government sanction payment of a fee of Rs. 140 to Mr. Handley.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary to Government.

To the Government Solicitor.
,, the Board of Revenue.
,, the Military Department.
,, the Accountant-General.

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

I think the proper course to carry out
the arrangement, come to by the correspondence
above referred to is for the Company to execute
a Conveyance of all the property which the Secretary
of State in Council has contracted to purchase,
and to make a formal surrender to the
Secretary of State in Council of the lease
of the 17th November 1857 and for the Company
then to release the Secretary of State in Council
from all claims in respect of the matters referred
to in the documents, and correspondence. I have
accordingly settled the drafts of 3 Deeds to effect
the above purposes. With regard to the Conveyance
of the fee simple lands it will of course be
necessary to define with sufficient accuracy
the property which is intended to be conveyed
to the Secretary of State in Council, and it
may be necessary to obtain further information
from India with regard to the parcels. The
Map supplied includes only part of the
property purchased: There are too
inconsistencies in the papers before me
with regard to the parcels and as to which
are comprised in the different leases and
I have been unable to do more than refer
to a plan and to a district which it is
intended should comprise all the property

now purchased. I think the Deeds should
be all executed and the considerations paid
at the same time. The part of the land
of the Company will have to be paid up to
the time of completion. It does not appear
in what state the Co now is, or for what
purpose they are selling, or whether there are
any encumbrances affecting the purchased
property. The deeds will require to be registered
under the Indian Registration Act.

(Sd) C. Griffith Smith
Lincoln Ave
1st May 1870

57 In Sept 18/70.

No 23 & 11/11
In No. 16302

No. 590/71
22nd March 1871

5

In $\frac{23}{6}$ p.

Read the following papers — 1-67
No. 29

Madras 2nd February 1871.
From, H. C. Richard, Esq.
Govt. Solicitor, Madras.

To, W. H. Buddleston Esq.
Secy to Govt. Revenue Dept. Fort St George
Sir

With reference to the Order of Government dated 7th November 1870 No. 1962 Revenue Department requesting me to instruct the Government Pleader to investigate the title to the West Hill Barracks at Calicut on the Malabar Coast and also to settle the draft deeds in connection with the purchase of the property from the East India Free Company, I have the honor to state that I submitted the necessary papers to the Government Pleader and have had several interviews with him thereon, and now forward herewith a copy of his opinion and observations on the title to the West Hill Barracks at Calicut together with the draft deeds as settled by him.

2. The delay in returning the papers to

to Government was occasioned by my having
had to make a reference to the Collector of
Malabar to examine the plan of the
property furnished by the Company's Agents
and also to determine the correctness of
the description of the property given in
the deed of Conveyance.

3. I have submitted the draft deeds
as settled by the Government Pleader
to Messrs. Holmes and Company the
Agents of the Company, in this Country
for their perusal and yesterday the drafts
were returned by them to me approved.

4. As the Government Pleader has in
consequence of the Order of Government dated
7th December 1870 at 1962 above referred to
had to give his opinion on the title and
settle the deeds in the stead of the Advocate
General, I have the honor to inform you
that I marked on his Brief the usual
fee of 140 Rupees and request the sanction
of Government for its disbursement out
of the funds in my hands.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obed. Servant

A. G. Richard
Government Solicitor.

No 53
Madras 22nd February 1871
From, A. G. Richard
Govt. Solicitor Madras.

No 149-150

Rev. 1871. Oct

From, H. 346

The Govt. Solicitor

To, The Secy to Govt.

Revenue Dept.

Dated 22nd February

Recd 22

No 29

Enclosed 6

Forwarding Copy of

the Govt. Pleader's opinion

on the title to the west

Hill Barracks at Calicut

together with the draft

deeds as settled by him

sent 508-23 March

the original

to the

and

now

Rock Hall, referred to in the 2nd
para of your Memo under reference, I
have the honor to state that I some time
since had the title deeds relating to
the

to Government was occasioned by my having
had to make reference to the Collector of
Malabar to examine the plan of the
property furnished by the Company's Agents
and all

the de
the de
3.
as set
to sell
Agents
for the
were

4.
Conse
7th
had
settle
leaves
that
fee of
of the

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obed. Servant
A. G. Richardson
Government Solicitor.



1053.
Madras 22nd February 1857
From, Mr. G. Richardson
To, Mr. Govt. Solicitor, Madras.

Mr. H. Bullock Esq.
Secretary to Govt. Receipts. Fort St. George.
Sir,

With reference to your Official Memo-
randum dated the 18th instant & 129,
Revenue Department, and its enclosures,
I have the honor to inform you that I have
conferred with the Government Pleader thereon
and I now forward herewith a copy of his
further opinion from which it will be
observed that he does not consider it advisable
that the Surrender should be endorsed on
the duplicate Lease of the 17th November
1857, executed by Messrs George Norton
and James Walker on behalf of the East
Indian Iron Company.

With regard to the freehold Land
attached to the house and ground known
as "Rock Hall", referred to in the 2nd
paragraph of your Memo under reference, I
have the honor to state that I some time
since had the title deeds relating to the

the Rock Hall property before me on the occasion of its being assigned to the present Lessee Major Law, and that to the best of my recollection I found that the freehold Land had been purchased or acquired by a former Lessee from Native Owners and not from the East India Company. But from whomsoever such freehold land was originally purchased or acquired, it is now, known, vested in Major Law under the blessing which he acquired Rock Hall and under these circumstances upon the falling in of the term of the Rock Hall property, the freehold Land will still remain the property of the person who may be the Lessee of the Rock Hall at the time of the expiration of the term, unless indeed each freehold land may have been previously sold by the Lessee for the time being.

I return herewith the enclosed which accompanied your Official letter under reference.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant,
J. G. Anderson
Government Solicitor

Opinion.
Messrs. Lysons & Co. the Agents in this Country of the East India Company in reply to an application by the Government

Per 1871. Oct 590
From the Govt. Solicitor
The Revenue Secy to Govt.
Dated 22nd February 1873
Enclosures 8.
Forwarding Copy of the Govt. Pleader's further opinion as to the title to the West Hill Barracks at Calcutta.
10362
C. 27 Feb 71

who takes a Conveyance without getting the title deeds is, by the very absence of the deeds, supposed to be put upon inquiry

the Rock Hall property before me on the
occasion of its being assigned to the present
Lessee Major Law, and that to the best
of my recollection I found that the freehold
Land had been purchased or acquired by

a former
not for
But for
was not
and I
the, the
said not
falling
proper
remains
away
at the
times
have
for the
3.

accom
referen

Most Obedt Servant
J. S. Lushington
Government Solicitor



Opinion.

Messrs. Hynes & Co. the Agents in this
Country of the East India Trading Company
in reply to an application by the Government
Solicitor for the title deeds of the Company's
property at Calicut state that no such
deeds can be found either in England
or at any of the Company's stations or
agencies in this Country. The title therefore
which I have to advise upon is a merely
possessory one and its validity depends
entirely on the Limitation Act.

2. Independently of the question as to
whether the Company has acquired a title
by possession which can be safely relied on
there is one danger to a purchaser arising
from the fact of nonproduction of title
deeds, which may practically be of little
importance but which must nevertheless
point out and that is the liability
to mortgages or other incumbrances
created by the Company. According to
the principles of Equity a purchaser
who takes a conveyance without getting
the title deeds is, by the very absence
of the deeds, supposed to be put upon
inquiry

Handwritten notes or signatures in the left margin of the right page.

inquiry, and will be postponed to a prior
incumbrancer who has the title deeds,
even though he has not the legal estate,
if the existence of such an incumbrance
could have been discovered by ordinary
diligence. If therefore the Company
should have raised money by deposit
of the title deeds or any of them, it might
be a question whether the persons in
possession of the deeds had not a claim
upon the property as against Government.
Practically no doubt the character of the
leading members of the Company is a
sufficient guarantee against the existence
of any such incumbrances at any rate
of recent date, and against any created
more than 12 years ago. The Limitation
Act 20th gives complete protection.
3rd Article stated by Mr. May for the Company's
Agents at Calcutta that the whole of the
landed property of the Company at Calcutta
about 37 Canons in extent originally belonged
to Mr. Sheffield and was acquired by
the Company as free by purchase prior to
the year 1840. All but about 13 Canons
out of the 37 have certainly been in possession
of

See Col
letter, 11th
embodied
Proceedings
of the
22nd Dec
1863

117
of lessees of the Company for at least 25
years. The Canons marked A and A' in
the plan, about 8 Canons, were leased
by the Company to the late Mr. Conolly
for 99 years in 1843, were in his possession
from that time until his death and since
have been in the possession of Government
by whom his interest was purchased. The
lands marked B and B' were also leased
to the same person by the Company at the
same date for 20 years and were in his
possession or that of Government until the
expiration of the lease, since when they
have been occupied by Government as monthly
tenants of the Company. The land marked
D known as the Rockhall property, also
appears to have been in the possession of
lessees of the Company since 1845, when
it was leased by the Company to Mr. Strange.
As to the possession of the remaining 13 odd
Canons there is no information in the
papers before me, but it is believed that
they have been in the possession of the
Company for about the same time as the
other lands.
4th Assuming then, as seems almost certain
that the Company have been in possession
of

of all the lands for at least 25 years past
either by themselves or by their tenants they
have now an indefeasible possessory title by
virtue of the Limitation Act unless the
property was originally the subject of a trust
or mortgage. The former contingency is so
improbable that I think it may be passed
over, but the latter requires consideration
for it is stated in the notes on the tracing
of the plan among the papers before me
which I presume contain authentic infor-
mation that some of the lands were originally
acquired by Mr Sheffield on Kancu
or mortgage from native owners, and
even in the absence of any such statement
from the prevalence of mortgage tenure in
Malabar it would be very probable
that such was the case.
Now if any of these lands were
originally acquired by the Company by
way of mortgage by clause 15 section 1 of
the Limitations Act 60 years possession
from the date of the mortgage would
be necessary to give a title and even that
time might be extended by acknowledgments
in writing. But it is stated by the Company's
Agent Mr Maylor that the whole of the
lands



lands were sold by Mr Sheffield to Mr
Boddleston and by the latter to the
Company, and as before noticed the date
the purchase by the Company prior to 1840.
Assuming this statement to be correct
and that the purchase by the Company
was bona fide and for valuable consid-
eration it is unnecessary to inquire
whether the lands or any part of them
were originally acquired by way of mortgage
or not, for by section 5 of the Limitation
Act the cause of action against a bona
fide purchaser for valuable consideration
from a mortgagee dates from the
purchase and it has been held by the High
Court in a recent case that by the
combined effect of this section and clause
12 of section 1 the period of Limitation
is 12 years from the date of the purchase.
6. Taking into consideration all the
foregoing circumstances I think that the
title of the Company is a merely
possessory one, to these lands is as great
as a title of that nature can be expected
to be, but I am decidedly of opinion
that the Company should be called upon
to give absolute covenants for title and

I have altered the Covenants in the Draft
Conveyance accordingly. These Covenants
will be in effect an indemnity by the
Company against any claims or incumbrances
upon the property.
I have added to the Draft Conveyance
as settled by Council in England, a description
of the property by boundaries and have made
a few other alterations in several parts of the
Draft. The plan and description of the
property as altered, have been referred to
the Collector of Malabar for verification,
and are stated by him to be correct.
The Conveyance as it now stands comprises
the whole of the Company's property at
Calicut, including the piece of land
(marked C in the plan) purchased by
Government in 1861 but of which no
Conveyance was ever executed.
It appears that the Original Lease of
the land to the Company is not for the
coming; consequently it is impossible to
carry out the Surrender in the form
settled by Council in England by
endorsements on the Lease. I have therefore
settled the Draft Surrender to be made by
a separate deed. I have no copy of the
Lease.

137
Lease among the Papers before me, but it
is fully recited in the Draft Release and
I have assumed this recital to be correct.
If a Copy of the Lease is among the Govern-
ment records, the Draft should be compared
with it. A Copy appears to have accompanied
the letter from this Government to the
Secretary of State for India dated 21st
September 1867 No 33.
As all the deeds relate to property in
British India they will require to be
stamped in accordance with the provisions
of the Indian General Stamp Act (Act
of 1869), though executed in England. In
the case of the Conveyance by section 6
of the Stamp Act, the expense
of Stamp would have to be borne by
Government, therefore no Stamp duty
is payable by section 15. Clause 15.
This latter does not however exempt
either the deed of Surrender or the Release
from liability to Stamp duty. It only
exempts instruments executed by or on
behalf of Government in cases where the
Government would, but for the exemption
be liable to pay for the Stamp. The
deed of Surrender comes under Schedule 2

of the Act and therefore by Section 6 Clause 1 the expense of Stamp would have to be borne by the Company and the exemption does not apply. The proper Stamp duty by Schedule I Clause 20 (6) is Rs. 16. Section 6 does not provide by whom the stamp duty on a Release is to be paid and there is no particular custom applying to the case of a mutual Release such as the present one. It has I think been ruled by the Board of Revenue in a similar case that the exemption does not apply and the document must bear a Stamp. The proper Stamp is Rs. 8 (Schedule II. clause 30).

10. Both the Conveyance and the Surrender since they relate to immovable property situate in Districts in which the Indian Registration Act is in operation must be registered under that Act. The Release does not require Registration being a mere release of money claims all interests in the lands having been previously extinguished. With regard to the Surrender a difficulty arises how to comply with the requirements of Section 21 of the Registration Act as to the description

description of the property to which it relates. The Release the rights under which are to be surrendered extends to all the Government waste lands within the Districts of Salem, Malabar, Canara, Coimbatore and South Arcot. Section 21 provides that no instrument relating to immovable property shall be accepted for registration unless it shall contain a description sufficient for identification and among the necessary part of such description it mentions the superficial contents roads and other properties in which the property abut and their occupancies none of which particulars is it possible to give in the present case. However the document may be presented for registration but is all probability it will be rejected. Under the present Act the effect of non-registration of a deed of this nature is to render it inoperative, for Section 49 provides that no instrument required by Section 17 to be registered shall be received in evidence in any civil proceeding in any Court unless it shall have been registered under the Act. If therefore registration

the deed of Surrender should be refused, the deed will be useless and the Government will have to rely upon the security afforded by the deed of Release, which in fact is ample.

11. As it is intended that the deeds should be executed in England care must be taken that they are sent out here again in time to admit of registration within the 4 months prescribed by the Act. The deeds when returned here must be accompanied by Powers of Attorney executed in the manner prescribed by clause (C) section 35 of the Registration Act. 1869.

12. The Indian Stamp duty on the deeds can be paid at any time within 3 months after their arrival in this Country (see 24 clause C, Act XVIII of 1869.)

27th January 1871
J. W. Gaudley
Govt Pleader.

(True Copy)
J. W. Gaudley
Govt Pleader.

With reference to para 8 of the above opinion I have since had the duplicate of the deed laid before me by the Government Solicitor.

I have compared it with the recitals in the draft Surrender and find them correct. Still it would not be desirable to endorse the Surrender upon this deed. The original deed is the one on which the Government are liable and on which therefore the endorsement should be made, if at all.

21st Decy 1871
J. W. Gaudley

(True Copy)
J. W. Gaudley
Govt Pleader.

herewith returned to the Govt Solicitor, the duplicate of the deed of 17th November 1867, signed by Mr George Norton and James Walker on behalf of the Company is herewith forwarded to the Govt Solicitor for comparison with the draft release. It is desired to know whether it is desirable to surrender with reference to the Public Ser.

patch of His Grace
dated

29)
29

187
53)

Deeds,
Govern
showed
to the

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

187

1-29. 167 Recd of

C. 1

Offl Memo

With reference to para 8 of the
 Govt Pleader's opinion on the Deed re:
 relating to the Iron Company's surrender
 received from the Secretary of State and
 herewith returned to the Govt. Solicitor,
 the duplicate of the Deed of 17 November
 1857, signed by Messrs George Norton and
 James Walker on behalf of the
 Company is herewith forwarded to
 the Govt. Solicitor for comparison with
 the draft release. It is desired to
 know whether if desirable, the
 surrender

Secretary of State with
 reference to the Public Ser.
 patch of His Grace
 dated

187

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

187

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

the letter from the Govt
 Solicitor to Govt of 27
 January 1871

Enclosure

Mr. Pleader

1871 Dec 29

Recd 3267/1
 Rec. 590/71

can be paid at any time within 3 months
 after their arrival in this Country (Sec. 24
 clause C, Act XVIII of 1869.)

27 January 1871
 Govt. Pleader

(True Copy)

M. S. Srinivasan

Govt. Solicitor

With reference to para 8 of the above opinion
 I have since had the duplicate of the release
 laid before me by the Government Solicitor.

See letter from the Govt
Solicitor to Govt of 27th
January 1871 No 19.

Deeds might not be entered
in this duplicate of the title copy
which was probably made out in
England to the Iron Company and
= not be traced.

In para 4 of the Govt
Solicitor's opinion it is stated that the
conveyance comprises the whole of the
Company's property at Gadium. It is
desired to know whether the Company
are not owners of the "freehold land
attached to the house and ground known
as Rock-Hall" which is specified
in the list of boundaries of the property
conveyed, as the Rock-Hall pro-
= perty is apparently intended

With reference to para 8 of the above opinion
I have since had the duplicate of the original
laid before me by the Government Solicitor.

Revenue Department.

No. 538

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

1871

to be conveyed in its entirety.

18/2/71 147 W. H. De Silva

L. Govt Solicitor
Madras

1871

1871 Dec 29

1871 Dec 29

1871

1871 Dec 29

Deeds,
Govern

known

to the

with

reference to the various des-
patches of His Grace
dated

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 23rd March 1871.

Read the following

From the Govt. Solicitor
Forwarding copy of the
Govt. Pleader's opinion on the
title to the West Hill Barracks
at Calicut together with the draft
Deed as settled by him.
Off. Memo. to Govt. Solicitor
From the Govt. Solicitor
Forwarding copy of the
Govt. Pleader's further opinion
as to the title to the West Hill
Barracks at Calicut.

(H.C. 2nd February 1871 No. 29)

- u - 18 February 1871 No. 29

(- a - 22nd Dec. - 1870 - 53)

The Draft Deeds,
as modified by the Govern-
ment Pleader, are approved
and will be returned to the
Secretary of State with
reference to the Public Ser-
vice of His Grace
dated

J. P. S.

A. A.

Official Memo
No. 281
To the Govt. Solicitor
Madras
2/18 February 1871 No. 29

Recd. 538. 23rd March/71

No. 361

the letter from the Govt.
Solicitor to Govt. of 27th
January 1871 No. 29.

can be,
after the
clause,
Madras
27th Jan

Govt. Solicitor
With reference to para 8 of the above opinion
I have since had the duplicate of the order
laid before me by the Government Solicitor.

dated 16th June 1870, L^d 18.
 The papers above recorded
 with Mr. Handley's opinion
 and the Proceedings of

Govt marginally noted will
 also be forwarded to the
 Secy. with the Recd.

8th August 1870 L^d 99
 7th Dec^r - " - 119-150.

2. Adverting to para
 1 of the Government Soli-
 citor's letter of 2nd Fe-
 bruary, the Govt sanction
 the payment of a fee of
 Rs. 140 to Mr. Handley.

LB

- 1. To the Govt. Solicitor General
- 2. To the Secy. of the Govt.
- 3. To the Military Secy.
- 4. To the Secy. of the Govt.

10th March
 By Mr. Handley

10th March

197

197
 Mr. Hill Bn
 not sufficient

19

197090909

19

19

19

C. 27th Feb^r / 1911 No March