No. 70. Read the following Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 1st November 1873, No. 2,235 :—

Read the following letter from E. BARCLAY, Esq., Acting Government Solicitor, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated Madras, 24th October 1873, No. 587 :—

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge receipt of copy of Proceedings of the Court of Wards, No. 1,969, of 29th September 1873.

2. As far as I can ascertain, the mode of reviving an appeal to the Privy Council is by petition, stating the grounds on which the revival of the appeal is asked for.

3. In the present case, information should be given as to the date of the late Zemindar's death, the family he left with the names and ages, if possible, of his children, so as to show that the present minor Zemindar is the heir, and properly certified copies of the Orders and Proceedings of the Court Wards, regarding the taking charge of the Zemindari during the present Zemindar's minority, should be sent Home, so that the application to revive the appeal may be made on behalf of the Court of Wards, as representing the minor Zemindar.

4. I do not think any affidavit such as that suggested by S. Parthasarady Ayyangar is necessary, or would be of any use if sent; and it will be observed that in Mr. Blaxland's letter to Messrs. Gregory Rowcliffe & Co., he suggests that the latter firm's correspondents in India should furnish the firm "with the necessary information and instructions" to revive the appeal.

5. It would have saved a good deal of time and trouble had Mr. Gregory himself stated what it was he required in this case, as he is much more likely to know the requirements of the Privy Council in cases like the present than any one in this country.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G. O., 11th October 1873, No. 1,094.

2. The Government Solicitor is of opinion that no affidavit such as that suggested by Parthasarady Ayyangar is necessary. With reference to paragraph 3 of his letter it would probably suffice at the present stage to send properly authenticated copies of the Orders of Government which recognize the minor as the heir, and direct the Court of Wards to take charge. But as proceedings were to be taken early in November, it is doubtful whether even these will be in time.

No. 71. ORDER THEREON, 15th November 1873, No. 1,264.

Miscellaneous.

ORDERED accordingly that certified copies of the papers referred to by the Board of Revenue be forwarded to His Grace the Secretary of State in continuation of the despatch, dated 16th September 1873, No. 26.

3x

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Court of Wards
dated 1st. November 1873

Read the following

No. 587.

From,

Ernest Barclay.
Ag. Government Solicitor,
Madras.

To,

J. Grose Esqre.
Secretary Court of Wards,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge
receipt of copy of Proceedings of
the Court of Wards No. 1969 of
29th September 1873.

2. As far as I can ascertain,
the mode of reviving an appeal
to the Privy Council is by Petition
stating the grounds on which
the revival of the appeal is
asked for.

3. In the present case informa-
tion should be given as to the
date of the late Zemindar's death
the

the family he left with the names and ages, if possible, of his children so as to show that the present minor Zemindar is the heir, and properly certified copies of the orders and proceedings of the Court of Wards regarding the taking charge of the Zemindary during the present Zemindar's minority, should be sent home so that the application to revive the appeal may be made on behalf of the Court of Wards, as representing the minor Zemindar.

4. I do not think any affidavit such as that suggested by S Parthasarathy Iyengar is necessary or would be of any use, if sent, and it will be observed that in Mr. Playlands' letter to Messrs Gregory Rowcliffe & Co he suggests that the latter firms' correspondents in India should furnish the firm "with the necessary information and instructions" to revive the appeal.

It

5. It would have saved a good deal of time and trouble had Mr. Gregory himself stated what it was he required in this case, as he is much more likely to know the requirements of the Privy Council in cases like the present than any one in this country. —

Madras
24th October 1873

Shave & Co
pp Ernest Barclay
Actg Govt Solicitor

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order No. 1264 - 15 Nov 1873 - Ld 4 Nov 12 & 12 C 8 - 12 C 15

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order No. 1094.

2. The Government Solicitor is of opinion that no affidavit such as that suggested by Parthasarathy Aiyengar is necessary. With reference to para 3 of his letter it would probably suffice at the present stage to send properly authenticated copies of the orders of Government which recognize the minor as the heir and

direct

direct the Court of Wards to take charge. But as proceedings were to be taken early in November, it is doubtful whether even then will be in time.

/ True Copy & Extract

H Stokes
Offg. Sub Secretary

For the Offg. Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

No. 1264

To Court of Wards dtd. 15 Nov
Govt. Circular " "

Directed accordingly that certified copies of the papers referred to by the Board of Revenue be forwarded to enable the Secretary of State in continuation of No. Despatch dated 16 Sept 1873 No 226.

When referring to this appeal in his letter dated 20 Oct 1873 No 428 ® the Govt Solicitor should have informed the Court of Wards that it was likely these papers would be required for the revival of the appeal. 15 Nov 73

® G.O. 3 Sept 1873 No 965.

Rev. 1873. Nov
No 3526

Proceedings of the
Court of Wards

Dated 18th November 1873
Read 1 —
Sent 3 —

Valuation Officer to Govt
Collector of Madura forwarding
Petition of Kadiah Nachiar
praying for reversing the order
of the Revenue Board
Enquiry Commissioner
Superintendent of Police
Tahsildar of Periakulam
Claudius Bowers
Lewis & Bowers
Messrs Madura & Co

Writs orders

No 1264 - 15 Nov 73 -

C.F. Mem. R. & Rec's - 12/5