Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd November 1871.

No. 237. From the Under-Secretary to the Government of India, (Home Department—Judicial,) to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 18th November 1871, No. 1,860.

In reply to your letter No. 1,618, dated 16th September, I am directed to call your attention to the inquiries contained in the letter from the Department of Agriculture, Revenue, and Commerce, No. 186, dated the 17th August last, (1) whether the Madras Government consented to Mr. Norton's defending the case of the Ramnad Zemindar before the Privy Council, and (2) what opinion is held by that Government of Mr. Norton's conduct in the matter. I am further to inquire whether Mr. Norton did, in his capacity of Advocate-General, advise the appeal to the Privy Council, or was he in any, and, if so, in what, way consulted in relation to it; and whether the Madras Government knew that Mr. Norton intended to appear against it and defend the appeal, supposing that he did not obtain permission to do so.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
22nd November 1871.

No. 1,993.

No. 238.
To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

HOME DEPARTMENT.

Miscellaneous.

SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your Under-Secretary's letter No. 1,860 of 1st November 1871, which, in reply to my letter of 16th September, draws attention again to the inquiries contained in the letter of 17th August, from the Department of Agriculture, Revenue, and Commerce, regarding Mr. Advocate-General J. B. Norton's connection with the Ramnad Suit.

2. In reply, I am directed to point out that there would appear to be some error in the statement of facts made in paragraph 2 of the last-mentioned letter, which statement purports to be derived from paragraph 2 of the letter from this department of 13th June. On reference to the last-mentioned document it will be seen that it contains no such statement, nor are the facts of the case as represented in Mr. Secretary Hume's letter of 17th August. In regard to the inquiries contained in paragraph 3 of Mr. Secretary Hume's letter, I am to state that this Government conceive that Mr. Advocate-General Norton had no alternative but to continue his advocacy of the cause of his client, whose retainer he had accepted after he had ceased to be Government Pleader in 1856, and before he became Advocate-General in 1864. The original Suit, in which the Government were concerned relating to the Ramnad estate, was brought in February 1860.

3. In the matter of the Ramnad Appeal to the Privy Council this Government were advised by Mr. Dale, the Government Pleader, in whose province, and not in that of the Advocate-General, the case, as a Mofussil one, properly fell.

4. From the enclosed copy of a demi-official Note on the subject lately addressed to me by Mr. Norton on the eve of his departure from India, after resigning his appointment of Advocate-General, it will be seen that Mr. Norton did not appear and plead on the Ramnad Zemindar's behalf before the Privy Council, and was, in fact, not in England when the hearing took place.

5. This Government believe Mr. Norton's course to have been strictly consistent with the practice of the profession, and they see no reason to call in question the sanction which was given to it by their predecessors.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Revenue Department.

22nd June 1871

No. 1993

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

Home Dept.

Sir

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter No 1861 of 1st Nov 1871 which in reply to my letter of 16th Sept draws attention again to the enquiries contained in the letter of 17th August from the Dept of Agri. Rev & Com^ce regarding the Advocate Genl's J. B. Norton's connection with the Nawanagar suit.

In reply I am directed

directed to point out
that the statement
of facts made in
para 2 of the last-
mentioned letter in which statements
were said to be derived
from para 2 of the
letter from the Deputy
of 13th June [illegible] the last statement
[illegible] contained
in the enclosed statement
was taken as represented
in Mr. Hunne's
letter of 17 August

in regard to the en-
quiries contained in
para 3. of Mr. Secretary
Hunne's letter I am
to state that the
Govt. conceive that
Mr. Advocate Genl.
Norton had no alter-
native but to con-
tinue his advocacy
of the cause of his

Original
The [illegible] in Mr. Hope's
[illegible] concerning Tobacco
the Revenue Act
brought in Feby 1865.

client whose retainer
he had accepted
before
the Act ceased
to be Govt. in 1856 and
the became Advocate
Genl. in 1864.

In the matter
of the Railroad ap-
peal to the Privy
Council the Govt.
were advised by the
Dale, the Govt. Plead
for whose province
and not in that of
the Adv. Gen. The
case - a la Moguai
die - properly fell.
Upon this enclose
copy of a demi-offi
cial note on the
subject lately add
dressed to me by
Mr. Norton on t

ence of his departure
from Ireland after
resigning his ap-
pointment of Advo-
cate General
will be ~~given~~ ~~—~~
that Mr. Norton
did not appear
and plead on the
Command Sermon-
dar's behalf before
the Privy Council
and was in fact
not in England when
the hearing took
place:—

This Gr.d believe Mr.
Hortons conduct has been
strictly consistent
with the practice of the
Jurisdiction and by the
Ordinance he called in
question to sanction &
has given light by their
Proceedings.

This Gr.d believe Mr.
Norton conduct to have been
strictly in accordance
with the rules