

(1) Number of Pages..... 30
(2) Date of repair..... 1-8-67
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... 8/2.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	101	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated 18-1-1875		196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read again G. O., 11th October 1874, No. 1,303.

No. 207. Read also the following letter from H. G. PRICHARD, Esq., Government Solicitor, Madras, to C. G. MASTER, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 19th November 1874, No. 595:—

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the order of Government, dated 10th October 1874, No. 1,303, Revenue Department, requesting the Advocate-General's opinion relative to the question as to whether in the case of lands sold for arrears of revenue under Madras Act II. of 1864 possession must be given to the purchaser immediately on payment of the deposit, or after the payment of the full amount of the purchase-money, and whether an appeal to the Collector against such sales shall be allowed.

2. I submitted the matter for the consideration of the Advocate-General; and I now forward herewith a copy of his opinion and the proposed Bill therein referred to.

—
OPINION.

I AM of opinion that the proper construction of Sections 36 to 40 of Act II. of 1864 (Madras) is that possession of land purchased at an auction sale for arrears of revenue is not to be given to the purchaser till the balance of the purchase-money has been paid, and that accordingly a condition to that effect in conditions of sale, mentioned in Section 36, is not only "permissible" but necessary if the intention of the Act is to be duly carried into effect. The certificate of sale provided in Section 38, which is to be conclusive evidence of the purchase, the formalities of publication prescribed in Section 39, and the application under Section 40 for delivery of possession founded on the certificate, seem to me clearly to imply that the sale is to be finally completed by payment of the whole purchase-money before grant of the certificate or delivery of possession.

2. It is inconceivable that the Legislature can have intended that registration, such as to give conclusive evidence of ownership, a public formal declaration of the rights of the purchaser, and legal delivery of the property to him, if necessary, should take place in the case of a man who has merely paid 15 per cent. of the purchase-money, and who, at the expiration of thirty days, is liable, if the balance be not paid, not only to cancelment of the sale but to forfeiture of the deposit.

3. It is not clear from the Language of Section 36 whether the conditions of sale to which allusion is made refer to the various conditions subsequently specified in the Act, or to other conditions to be imposed by the vendor. I can see nothing in the terms of the Act to preclude the Board or Collector from imposing any conditions of sale not absolutely repugnant to the Act, and the condition that delivery of possession is not to be given till payment of the balance is, in my opinion, a correct exposition of the meaning of the Act and clearly legal.

4. With regard to the appeal to the Collector, the first question is whether the condition making the sale subject to the confirmation of the Collector is illegal. This rule appears to have survived by an inadvertence, but its usefulness is strongly insisted on by Mr. Grose, in his letter of 4th June 1874, and in the

Order of the Board, 6th July 1874, on the letter of the Collector of Chingleput. It is to be observed that the condition strictly carries out the intention of the Legislature on the subject. The auction is directed by the Act to be conducted by the Collector or "other officer empowered by the Collector in this behalf," and this officer is elsewhere referred to as the officer empowered under Act VII. of 1839. That Act invested Tahsildars with power of selling property for arrears of land-revenue, but provided that, in respect of the exercise of those powers, the Tahsildars should be subject to the control and superintendence of the Collector. This control and superintendence would certainly seem to be very properly exercised in making the sale in each case subject to his approval and confirmation. In fact, if it is not so, his control and superintendence come to nothing. Moreover, any purchaser who had bought with the conditions of sale before him would be precluded from contesting a condition to which he has voluntarily chosen to submit. I do not, therefore, feel any doubt as to the legality of the condition, nor apprehend any risk of inconvenience from maintaining it. If, however, it is thought undesirable to leave the matter open to question, it would certainly place the Collector's right of interference on a more unequivocal footing if the Act were amended so as to authorise him to cancel sales on the ground of irregularity within a specified period. I append an amendment of Section 59 by which this would be effected, supposing the Government resolves on adopting the Board's view of the appeal to the Collector being desirable.

His Excellency may remember my having brought this matter to his notice on a former occasion, and having urged the views which are now entered by the Board. The severity of the law has been somewhat mitigated by the imposition of the stamp on complaints in such cases; but the Stamp-duty is only one of the numerous heavy expenses attendant on a suit, and, as it is admitted that irregularities do not unfrequently occur, it seems only a reasonable precaution to arm some superior authority with powers of correcting such mistakes with as little expense and delay as possible. Such facilities are afforded by the Revenue Laws of Lower Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab; in the latter province there is an appeal from the Collector to the Commissioner, an appeal from the Commissioner to the Financial Commission, with the further right of contesting a sale in the Civil Courts on certain specified grounds. The refusal of any redress to a defaulter aggrieved by an irregular or unjustifiable sale, except by means of a process, which, by the facts of the case, it is out of his power to afford, is an administrative severity which certainly seems to require very cogent reasons to justify it, and which is very little in harmony with the sedulous tenderness with which, in other parts of the country, the Government regards the interests of the owners of the soil. So far as the policy of the Government of India can be inferred from recent legislation, the Punjab Land-revenue Act, 1871, indicates that a sale of this description should be set about with every sort of precaution, and be liable to be contested in every possible manner. The same policy is indicated in the North-West Provinces Land-revenue Act, 1873. By Section 178 the sale has to be reported to the Commissioner; by Section 179 the Commissioner can, within thirty days, set aside the sale on the ground of material irregularity. A similar provision, I venture to think, might, with great advan-

tage to the interests of the ryots, be introduced into the Revenue Law of the Presidency.

(Signed) H. S. CUNNINGHAM,
Advocate-General.

17th November 1874.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

A Bill to amend Act II. of 1864.

Statement of Objects and Reasons.

THE object of this Bill is to confer on the Board of Revenue power to cancel sales of property made under Act II. of 1864 (Madras), on account of arrears of land-revenue if there has been in the publication or conduct of such sales material irregularity producing substantial injury either to Government or the parties interested. Section 59 of Act II. of 1864 enables the parties aggrieved to seek a remedy in the Civil Court; but it would appear to be convenient that, in addition to the remedy in the Civil Court, the Board should be empowered to set aside such sales on due cause being shown in a manner analogous to that provided for the Civil Courts by Section 256 of the Civil-Procedure Code.

Bill of 187

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend Act II. of 1864 (Madras), it is hereby enacted as follows:—

Section 1.—In Act II. of 1864, at the beginning of Section 59, read:

Any person aggrieved by any material irregularity in publishing or conducting a sale under this Act may, within three months from the date of such sale, apply by petition to the Board of Revenue to set aside the same: and if the Board of Revenue considers that there has been a material irregularity in such publication or sale and that substantial injury has been occasioned either to the Government or to the petitioner thereby, it may cancel such sale and direct fresh notice of sale to be given, and the proprietors of the land or other property sold to be put in possession of it, and the purchase-money, if it has been paid, to be returned to the purchaser at the sale so cancelled. And thereupon proceedings shall be had as though no such sale had taken place. In order to ascertain whether any such irregularity has occurred the Board may, on receipt of any such petition, either take evidence itself, or empower such officer, subordinate to it, as it thinks fit, to take evidence as to such irregularity, and transmit it with his finding to the Board. The officer so empowered shall have all the powers to summon and examine witnesses, call for and examine documents, which are conferred on a Commissioner under Section 180 of the Civil Procedure Code. The order of the Board of Revenue cancelling any such sale shall be final, and no Court of Civil Judicature shall take into consideration or decide any question as to the propriety of such cancellation. But except as hereinbefore provided.

Then continue Section 59.

No. 207A.

MINUTE BY THE HON. J. D. SIM, C.S.I.

On the first question the Advocate-General takes the same view as I did.

2. On the second his opinion is adverse to mine, which nevertheless I see no reason to change. To save time I will not repeat the arguments used in my Minute of the 8th September 1874.

25th November 1874.

(Signed) J. D. SIM.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
18th January 1875.*

No. 207B.

MINUTE BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

I SHOULD be quite prepared to alter the law; but the Advocate-General considers this unnecessary, and that the "clause" in question, which gives an appeal to the Collector, and which the Board consider should be retained, is perfectly legal. I consider, therefore, that the Board should be informed that the clause is to be retained. Otherwise, while, on the one hand, our land-sales are far more frequent than in any other part of India; on the other, we should be withholding from the ryot a protection to which he is not only entitled, but which he possesses in other parts of India, and which the Legislature intended to give him. This is a matter of the highest importance as affecting the welfare of the people.

29th November 1874.

(Signed) HOBART.

No. 207C.

MINUTE BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

As will be seen from my former remarks on this subject, I altogether dissent from this order. In the first place, the reason which it gives for not altering the law, as suggested by the Advocate-General, is that "the intention of the Legislature was clearly against such an appeal." But the intention of the Legislature (supposing this was its intention) may possibly have been wrong; and the question here is, whether it was wrong or not. It is no reason for not doing an act of justice, or any other act, by altering a law that the framers of the law did not intend it to be done.

2. In the next place the Government refuses in this order to rectify, either by altering the law or by leaving Clause 9 as it stood (which latter, in the Advocate-General's opinion, might legally be done) a grievous injustice to our ryots, whose land is sold to an extent altogether unknown in the rest of India partly because they have not that which the cultivators in all other parts of India possess,—a right of appeal against the sale of their holdings from the subordinate Revenue official to the Collector. On the supposition that our ryots had this appeal to the Collector, it was proposed some short time ago (in order to place them on an equality with cultivators in the rest of India) that they should have a further appeal to the Board of Revenue. This was negatived; but to go a step further and deprive them of an appeal which in the commonest equity ought to be theirs, which has been considered necessary in all other provinces, and which the Board of Revenue itself recommends, is, in my opinion, unjustifiable and inexpedient in the highest degree.

25th December 1874.

(Signed) HOBART.

No. 208.

ORDER THEREON, 18th January 1875, No. 101.

Land Revenue, No. 10.

THE two questions put to the Advocate-General in G. O., 10th October last, No. 1,303, were:—

(1.) Whether, in the case of lands sold for arrears of revenue, possession must be given to the purchaser immediately on payment by him of the prescribed deposit of 15 per cent. of the purchase-money, or can be deferred until the full amount of purchase-money shall have been paid, by making this a "condition of sale" under Section 36 of the Act (II. of 1864, Madras).

(2.) Whether an appeal to the Collector against such sales shall be allowed.

2. On the first, Mr. Cunningham says: "The condition that delivery of possession is not to be given till payment of the balance is, in my opinion, a correct exposition of the meaning of the Act, and clearly legal."

3. The Board will act on this view.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
18th January 1875.*

4. As to the second inquiry, the Advocate-General does not "feel any doubt as to the legality of the condition, nor apprehend any risk of inconvenience from maintaining it;" but to "place the Collector's right of interference on a more unequivocal footing," he proposes an amendment of Section 59 of Act II. of 1864 (Madras), should the Government resolve on adopting the Board's view of the appeal to the Collector being desirable.

5. The Governor in Council considers that as the law requires an amendment to make the matter certain, and as the intention of the Legislature at the time was clearly against such an appeal being allowed, it is not desirable to pass the Act suggested. He is of opinion that Clause 9 in Form 7, Board's Standing Order No. 275, should be cancelled.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

N^o 595.

10/4

Madras, 19th November 1874.

From

H. G. Prichard

Government Solicitor

Madras,

To

C. G. Master Esq^{re}

Acting Secretary to Government

Fort St. George,

Sir,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Order of Government dated 10th October 1874, N^o 1303, Revenue Department, requesting the Advocate General's opinion relative to the question as to whether in the case of lands sold for arrears of Revenue under Madras Act II of 1864, possession must be given to the purchaser immediately on payment of the deposit or after the payment of the full amount of the purchase money and whether an appeal to the Collector against such sales shall be allowed.

2. I submitted the matter for the consideration of the Advocate General and I now forward herewith a copy of his opinion and the proposed Bill therein referred to.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

H. G. Prichard

Government Solicitor.

Copy of 11875: Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Co. Co. &c.

Dated January 1874.

Read

Encl.

G. O. 1384, January 1875, No. 101.

JANUARY.

No. 207-208.

Lands sold for Arrears of Revenue.—Directing the Board of Revenue to act on the Advocate-General's view in regard to the delivery of possession to purchasers of —; and with reference to the opinion on the question of appeal to the Collector against such sales, observing that Clause 9 of the 7 of the Board's Standing Order, No. 275 should be cancelled.

Opinion

101
6

I am of opinion that the proper construction of Sections 36 to 40 of Act 2 of 1864 (Madras) is that possession of land purchased at an auction sale for arrears of revenue is not to be given to the purchaser till the balance of the purchase money has been paid, and that, accordingly, a condition to that effect in the conditions of sale, mentioned in Section 36, is not only "permissible" but necessary if the intention of the Act is to be duly carried into effect. The Certificate of Sale provided in Section 38, which is to be conclusive evidence of the purchase, the formalities of publication prescribed in Section 39, and the application under Section 40 for delivery of possession, founded on the Certificate, seem to me clearly to imply that the sale is to be finally completed by payment of the whole purchase money before grant of the Certificate or delivery of possession.

It is inconceivable that the Legislature can have intended that registration such as to give conclusive evidence of ownership, a public formal declaration of the rights of the purchaser, and legal delivery of the property to him if necessary, should take place in the case of a man who has merely paid 15 per cent of the purchase money and who at the expiration of 30 days is liable, if the balance be not paid, not only to cancellation of the sale but to forfeiture of the deposit.

It is not clear from the language of Section 36 whether the conditions of sale, to which allusion is made, refer to the various conditions subsequently specified in the Act, or to other conditions to be imposed by the Vendor. I can see nothing in the

terms

Revenue

18th Decr

1874. No. 2050

From

The Government & Secretary,

Madras.

For the Secretary to Govt.

For the Secretary

Dated 19th Decr

Decr 20th 1874

Revenue 11-

No. 2050

Land sold for arrears of Revenue under Madras Act II of 1864.

Forward a copy of the Act of 1864 to the Secretary, and the proposed Bill thereon referred to.

Decr 10 1874 January 1875

For order

Decr 10 1874. Decr 11 1874. Decr 12 1874. Decr 13 1874. Decr 14 1874. Decr 15 1874. Decr 16 1874. Decr 17 1874. Decr 18 1874. Decr 19 1874. Decr 20 1874. Decr 21 1874. Decr 22 1874. Decr 23 1874. Decr 24 1874. Decr 25 1874. Decr 26 1874. Decr 27 1874. Decr 28 1874. Decr 29 1874. Decr 30 1874.

of the Act to preclude the Board or Collector from imposing any condition of sale not absolutely repugnant to the Act, and the condition that delivery of possession is not to be given till payment of the balance is, in my opinion, a correct exposition of the meaning of the Act and clearly legal.

With regard to the appeal to the Collector, the first question is whether the condition making the sale subject to the confirmation of the Collector is illegal. This rule appears to have survived by an inadvertence, but its usefulness is strongly insisted on by Mr. Grose in his letter of 4th June 1874, and in the Order of the Board, 6th July 1874, on the letter of the Collector of Chingleput. It is to be observed that the condition strictly carries out the intention of the Legislature on the subject. The auction is directed by the Act to be conducted by the Collector or "other officer empowered by the Collector in this behalf," and this officer is elsewhere referred to as the officer empowered under Act VII of 1839. That Act invested Tasildars with power of selling property for arrears of land revenue, but provided that in respect of the exercise of those powers, the Tasildars should be subject to the control and superintendence of the Collector. This control and superintendence would certainly seem to be very properly exercised in making the sale in each case subject to his approval and confirmation. In fact, if it is not so, his control and superintendence come to nothing. Moreover any purchaser who had bought with the conditions of sale before him would be precluded from contesting a condition to which he had voluntarily chosen to submit. I do not, therefore, feel any doubt as to the legality of the condition or apprehend any risk of inconvenience from maintaining it. If, however, it is thought undesirable to leave the matter open to question, it would certainly place the

the Collector's right of interference on a more unequivocal footing, if the Act were amended so as to authorize him to cancel sales on the ground of irregularity, within a specified period. I append an amendment of Section 59 by which this would be effected, supposing the Government resolves on adopting the Board's view of the appeal to the Collector being desirable.

9. His Excellency may remember my having brought this matter to his notice on a former occasion and having urged the views which are now entertained by the Board. The severity of the law has been somewhat mitigated by the abolition of the Stamp on plaints in such cases; but the Stamp Duty is only one of the numerous heavy expenses attendant on a suit, and, as it is admitted that irregularities do not infrequently occur, it seems only a reasonable precaution to arm some superior authority with powers of correcting such mistakes with as little expense and delay as possible. Such facilities are afforded by the Revenue Laws of Lower Bengal, the North West Provinces, and the Punjab; in the latter province there is an appeal from the Collector to the Commissioner, an appeal from the Commissioner to the Financial Commission with the further right of contesting a sale in the Civil Courts on certain specified grounds. The refusal of any redress to a defaulter aggrieved by an irregular or unjustifiable sale except by means of a process, which, by the facts of the case, it is out of his power to afford, is an administrative severity which certainly seems to require very cogent reasons to justify it, and which is very little in harmony with the sedulous tenderness with which in other parts of the Country the Government regards the interests of the owners of the soil. So far as the policy of the Government of India can be inferred from recent legislation, the Punjab Land Revenue Act 1871 indicates

indicates, that a sale of this description should be set about with every
out of precaution and be liable to be contested in every possible manner.
The same policy is indicated in the North West Provinces Land Re-
venue Act 1873. By Section 178, the sale has to be reported to the
Commissioner, by Section 179 the Commissioner can, within 30 days,
set aside the sale on the ground of material irregularity. A similar
provision, I venture to think, might, with great advantage to the
interests of the ryots, be introduced into the Revenue Law of this
Presidency.

(Signed) J. L. Cunningham.

Adm. Genl.

1st - 11 - 74.

(True Copy)

H. L. Richard

Government Solicitor.

101
A Bill to amend Act 2 of 1864.

Statement of Objects and Reasons.

The object of this Bill is to confer on the Board of Revenue
power to cancel sales of property made under Act 2 of 1864
(Madras) on account of arrears of Land Revenue, if there has
been in the publication or conduct of such sales material irregu-
larity producing substantial injury either to Government or the
parties interested. Section 59 of Act 2 of 1864 enables the parties
aggrieved to seek a remedy in the Civil Court, but it would appear
to be convenient that, in addition to the remedy in the Civil Court,
the Board should be empowered to set aside such sales on due
cause being shown in a manner analogous to that provided for the
Civil Courts by Section 256 of the Civil Procedure Code.

Bill of 187

Whereas it is expedient to amend Act 2 of 1864 (Madras),
it is hereby enacted as follows.

Sec. 1. In Act 2 of 1864, at the beginning of Section 59, read
Any person aggrieved by any material irregularity in
publishing or conducting a sale under this Act may within
three months from the date of such sale apply by Petition, to
the Board of Revenue to set aside the same: and if the Board
of Revenue considers that there has been a material irregularity
in such publication or sale and that substantial injury has
been occasioned either to the Government or to the petitioner,
thereby, it may cancel such sale and direct fresh notice of sale
to be given and the proprietors of the land or other property sold
to be put in possession of it, and the purchase money, if it has
been paid, to be returned to the purchaser at the sale so
cancelled.

101/9
cancelled. And thereupon proceedings shall be had as though no such sale had taken place. In order to ascertain whether any such irregularity has occurred the Board may, on receipt of any such petition, either take evidence itself, or empower such Officer, subordinate to it, as it thinks fit, to take evidence as to such irregularity and transmit it with his finding to the Board. The Officer so empowered shall have all the powers to summon and examine witnesses, call for and examine documents, which are conferred on a Commissioner under Section 180 of Civil Procedure Code. The Order of the Board of Revenue annulling any such sale shall be final, and no Court of Civil Judicature shall take into consideration or decide any question as to the propriety of such cancellation. But, except as hereinbefore provided.

then continue Section 59.

Rev: 4050/74.

Enclosure in letter from the
Government solicitor, Madras,
to the Secy. regarding the
Government, Fort St. George,
dated 19th November 1874.
No. 595.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 4050

From Govt. Solicitor

Dated 19th November 1874.

FOR ORDERS.

On the first question the Ad.
-vocates sent to the same
view as I did.

On the second question the opinion
is adverse to mine, which leaves
the hope of some modification of
charge. To some time I
will not repeat the arguments.

used in my minute of
8 Dec 74.

J. B. S.

25-11.

The alteration of the law is much
unadvisable. Jm
28/11

I should be quite prepared to alter
the law: but the Advocate
just considers this unnecessary.

and that the clause in question
which gives an appeal to the
Court, and which the
Board consider should be retained,
is perfectly legal. I
considered therefore that the
Board should be informed
that the clause is to be
retained. Moreover, which
at the one hand our land-survey
are far more perfect than

FOR ORDERS.

in any other part of Madras - on
the other, we should be well satisfied
from the Ryot a protection to
which he is not well entitled,
but which he possesses in other
parts of Madras, and which the
legislation intended to give
him. I do not think that
this is a matter
of great importance as affecting
the welfare of the people. 29/11

C 20/11/12 R 11/12/12

Revenue Dept

No 101

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 18th Decr 1874

Read again G.O. 10th

Oct, 1874 No 1303.

Read also the following
letter from the Govt. Solicitor

Having a copy of the Govt. Genl.
Opinion, in the matter of lands sold for
means of Revenue under Madras Act II
of 1864, and the proposed Bill therein
referred to

H. 2. 19: No: 1874 No 535

The two questions
put to the Advocate General
in G.O. 10: Oct: last No 1303
were:-

(1). Whether, in the case
of lands sold for means of
Revenue, possession must
be given to the purchaser
immediately on payment

J. D. S.

M. 12/12

Revenue to the Govt.

by

by him of the prescribed deposit
of 15 per cent of the purchase
money, or can be deferred until
the full amount of purchase money
shall have been paid, by making
this a condition of sale "under Sec.
36 of the Act (II of 1864 Madras).

(2) Whether an appeal to the
Col. against such sales shall be
allowed.

2. On the first, Mr. Cunningham
says "the condition that delivery of
possession is not to be given till
payment of the balance is, in
my opinion, a correct exposition
of the meaning of the Act, and clearly
legal."

3. The Board will act
on this view.

4. As to the second
enquiry, the Advocate General
does not "feel any
doubt as to the legality

*Mr. Cunningham has the
impression that the
condition is a correct
exposition of the meaning
of the Act, and clearly
legal.*

*Expenditure ought to be
less - and what
has been considered
unhappy in all other
Provinces has been
the fact of R. itself
in many cases
is to be feared
in the future
in the future
in the future*

+ *conspicuous that
the Board's report
has been official
to the Collector, it
was proposed that
such a case (in
order to place
them on an equal
with cultivation in
the rest of India) that
they should have a
public appeal to
the Bd. of Revenue.
This was rejected;
but to go a step
further, and deprive
them of an appeal
which in the ~~consequence~~
commenced*

of the condition or appor-
tioned any risk of incon-
venience from maintaining
it," but to "place the Col-
lector's right of interference
on a more unequivocal
footing" he proposes an
amendment of section 59
of Act II of 1864 (Madras)
should the Govt. resolve
on adopting the Board's
view of the appeal to the
Collector being desirable.

5. The Governor in
Council considers that
as the Law requires amend-
ment to make the matter
certain and as the in-
tervention of the Legislature
at

at the time was clearly
against such an appeal
being allowed it is not
desirable to pass the Act
suggested. He is of opinion
that clause 9 in Form 7
Bd's Standing Order No. 275
should be cancelled.

gll

Passed in Council
12/1/75

14. To the Board of Directors
14. The Procurement Solicitor

gll

N.S. My note on the
paper which was
referred to the
Bd's Sec. is not
with the paper.
I write to cancel
it with a Minute,
and that it does
be printed with the
Minute to accompany
the paper.

25/12

Minute

Minute was passed
on 12/1/75, I am
in the first place,
the reason which I give
for not altering the
law, as suggested
by the Board
several, is that
the intention of
the Board was
"to amend"
"such an appeal"
But the intention

that was its induction
may ~~have~~ perfectly have been
wrong: and the

I
 remember there is water
 it was ^{wrong} or not.

It is no reason for not

doing ~~not~~ an act of
in any other, etc.

modern ~~rest~~ by gallery

a case, sent for further
12 net

Après la lecture des
de 17 à la suite.

~~Kakabatu~~

In the worst place

~~The 100th Anniversary~~
of the 100th Anniversary

В. Тар! репринт,
и др. бр.

not attend the

... to the Living Class.

9 as it stood

Letter to the Specials

Decision accepted - 1844

... in appercento

and Rpts, which have

is not a great

along their common
side

in the road of

... that Miss

the cultivators
in all other

Leaves of *Andria* / *Andria*

... of official ap...

the scale from the Island

Review Special to

the Collector. On the