

28-6-11 ✓

11-8-24 ✓

CONFIDENTIAL.

Revenue (1898) Department.

Miscellaneous Series

G.O., No.	¹²¹⁵ 1020
Confidential No.	¹⁰²⁰ 1215
DATED 10 th March 1898	

[Despatch Abstract.]

Forwarding to the Legal Adviser and Solicitor
General the (Madras) Council's opinion in the
Pittapur appeal case and pointing out an error
in the form of the Procs of the Court of Wards

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

0
18 4,000-19-7-07.

Revenue (1898) Department.

Do. CURRENT No. 17.

From

Sir Philip Antehins K.C.S.

Order

No.

Dated 13 January 1898

Received 1 February 1898

Registered -

Enclosures One

Spare copies.

SUBJECT,

Regarding the Pittapora appeal

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



CHIEF SECRETARY
31. JAN. 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

India Office,

London. 13th January 1898. Hly

Dear Sir,

To save time I address you demi-officially instead of preparing a formal despatch for the Secretary of State. The matter is a very simple one but urgent as it concerns the details of the record which is to be sent home in the Pittapur Appeal now before the Privy Council.

I send you a note by our Legal Adviser, Sir Arthur Wilson, together with the correspondence to which he refers. The point to which your attention is particularly directed is that care must be taken that

Exhibits

To the Chief Secretary to the Government
of Madras.

2

D.O. № 17/98

Exhibits CCLXXIX and the D Q series are included in the
record which is sent home.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

Philip Smith

Secy

The facts are briefly these.

The late Rajah of Pittapur died in July 1890. His estate was then registered in the name of his minor (natural) son and taken charge of by the Court of wards. In April 1891 the late Rajah's adopted son filed a suit in the District Court of Godavari against the Court of wards & the minor natural son for the recovery of all the properties left by the late Raja.

The District Court decided in favor of the Plaintiff (the adopted son) but on appeal the High Court decided against him on a point of law chiefly & in favor of the minor son. The estate has accordingly been taken charge of by the Court again.

The adopted son has now obtained leave to appeal to the Privy Council.

against the decision of
the High Court. In the usual
manner the High Court ordered
that the entire record con-
nected with the case should
be printed. Against this order
the appellant appealed to
the Privy Council and obtained
an ex parte order to the effect
that only so much of the
record should be sent to
England for the purposes
of the appeal as was material
for the decisions of the questions
of law decided by the High
Court. The counsel for the
Court of Wards & the minor
represented that it was
necessary to get the entire
record printed and urged
that application be made
to the Privy Council for a
review of the ex parte order
passed by that ~~court~~
tribunal in the matter.

This Govt. accordingly
addressed the Secy of
State on the subject in
September last & requested
to give the necessary

Please see C.O. 5076d, 28-9-97
(Some of the connected papers
are put up with the current
about the Court of Wards legislation
now in C.O.)

Please see para 3 of
the judgment flagged R.

Please see pages 70 & 71
of the appeal filed in the
H.C. - flagged M+N.

instructions to the Solicitor
India office.

From the papers now
forwarded, it appears that
the counsel engaged in
England on behalf of the
Court of Wards & the minor
(Mr Cohen & Mr Woodroffe)
are of opinion that the
ex parte order of the Privy
Council was in substance
right and that it is not
advisable to make an
application for a ~~review~~
view of that order. They
have, however, obtained
from the appellant certain
admissions which they
consider to be sufficient,
except as regards one point.
That point is the statement
in the High Court's judgment
that certain exhibits there
referred to show alienation
of portions of the Zaminda
the exhibits ~~are~~ being there
referred to in the High Court
judgment as "Exhibits
CCLXXIX & D of Series".

The Solicitor India Office

Sir Arthur Wilson, the legal
a adviser, India office,
the wrote to the appellants soli-
citors (in England) suggesting,
with a view to save an appli-
cation to the Privy Council,
that they ~~might~~ ^{might} (as regards this one point)
the ~~communicate~~ ^{communicate} with their clients
the here and get the exhibits
a referred to printed as a part
the of the record & the solicitors
agreed.

Sir Arthur Wilson
& Sir Philip Hutchins
now suggest that care
~~must~~ be taken that the
particular exhibits are
printed & sent as part
of the record.

If the papers are for-
warded to the Court of wards
it will instruct the attorney-
at-law (P. Subramania
Aiyar) engaged for the
purpose to take the
necessary action.

A D.O. to the Court of
wards Secy is submitted.

12th 98.

1/11/98
JH

Secy
2/2/98

Keep records
the 20/8/98

(original the
returned)

Issue
3/2/98

Secy
3/2/98
1 Feb 98

2/1/98

Dear Sir
With reference
to the correspondence
ending with the Proceedings
of the Court of wards No 174
of 12.11.97 on the subject
of the Pittapur appeal,
I am to forward copy of
a D.O. of the 13th ultimo
received from Sir Philip
Hutchins, ^{together with the enclosing} and request
that the necessary action
may be taken without
delay.

Confidential

Revenue (189⁸) Department.

CURRENT No. 1819

Confidential No 20

From

Court of Wards

Order

No. 232 *Ins*
Conf. No 4

Dated 4th March 1898

Received 5th do

Registered 5th do

Enclosures 10

Spare copies —

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government
with remarks letter from Mr P. Subra-
=moneya Iyer, Solicitor, Madras, im-
=bodying the remarks of the Hon: V.
Bhashyam Iyengar on certain
papers relating to the Pittapur
Privy Council Appeal.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

NOTE BY THE LEGAL ADVISER INDIA OFFICE
DATED 12th JANUARY 1898.

I am now in a position to report on this case up to the present stage on certain points.

It will be seen from the papers that the person represented by the Court of Wards is alleged to be entitled to the Pittapur estate on two grounds, first as the actual son and only heir of the late proprietor; and secondly by virtue of the Will of the latter. The High Court decided in his favour on the ground of the Will, giving no decision as to his being or not being the son of the late proprietor - A question as to which the evidence taken was very voluminous. A petition of appeal to the Privy Council having been presented, that tribunal in July last, on the application of the appellant, made an ex parte order to the effect that only so much of the record should be sent to this Country for the purposes of the appeal as was material for the decision of the questions of law decided by the High Court.

The Madras Government in two letters of the 15th and 28th September 1897 took exception to this order, and said that they thought it desirable that the whole record should be transmitted at once, and suggested that an application should be made to the Privy Council to review the Order in this sense.

I formed a decided opinion that the order of the Privy Council was in substance right, though its language was too stringent, and that an application such as that suggested ought not to be made; but out of deference to the views of the Madras Government, I laid the matter before Counsel.

And

And in order to meet the wishes of that Government, as far as possible I selected Mr. Woodroffe as our junior Counsel. I annex copies of two opinions of Mr. Cohen and Mr. Woodroffe, and of a correspondence which has passed between me and the Appellants Solicitors. It will be seen that Counsel advised against such an application as that suggested, and recommended that the undoubted defect in the order should be met, if possible, without an application to the Privy Council. This advice has been acted upon, and the appellant has admitted all that we ask except upon one point. That point is the statement in the High Court's judgment that certain exhibits there referred to show alienations of portions of the Zemindari in question. Care must be taken that these are sent as part of the record.

I suggest that copies of these opinions and of the correspondence, be sent to Madras by the earliest possible mail, and that the Government be asked to give the necessary instructions to secure that the exhibits referred to on page 181 of the reported judgment of the High Court, as "Exhibits CCLXXIX and D.Q. Series", be included in the record sent home to the Privy Council.

I should like to have the papers again when they are done with.

(Sd) A. Wilson.

(Copy)

Joint Opinion

of Mr Arthur Cohen Esq. & Mr Woodroffe

We have perused and carefully considered the Instructions and answers thereto and are of opinion that the Judicial Committee will abide by their Order so far as it relates to the evidence with regard to the Respondent being the son of the late Rajah of Pithapur. That evidence is quite unnecessary for the purposes of the present appeal and would only be relevant if the decision under Appeal were reversed. Should that decision be reversed the Judicial Committee would remit the case to the High Court to obtain their judgment upon this point and would not take upon itself the burden of examining the entire evidence and deciding whether the Court of first instance had or had not rightly decided that the Respondent was not the adopted or naturally begotten son of the deceased by his first wife.

It seems to us however that the order of the Privy Council is objectionable in that it directs "only so much of the original record as properly bears upon and may be material for the decision of the questions of law which were

decided by the High Court and which form the subject matter of the present appeal" to be transmitted - Some of the questions which were decided by the High Court were questions of fact notably that involved in the 1st Issue with respect to which the High Court after stating the reasons for their conclusion observes "For these reasons we have come to the conclusion that the District Judge was wrong in his finding of fact upon the issue" Other questions or decided were mixed questions of law and fact for instance that involved in the 4th Issue. It seems to us that the Judicial Committee fell into the mistake of supposing that only questions of law were dealt with by the High Court owing to the erroneous statement contained in para 4 of Annexure G. That order was made ex parte and ought we think to be varied to the following effect.

On the appellant admitting -

- (1) That the Zamindari of Pittapur with all increments thereto and also the estates forming the subject matter of the suit were impartible
- 2 That such Zamindari and estates were not

alienable either by family custom or by reason of tenure.

(3) That there was no implied agreement which precluded the testator from devising such Zamindari and estates and

(4) That if the Respondent be not the aurasa son of the late Rajah of Pittapur the Testator though always treating him as such son knew that he was not so.

It is ordered that no evidence relating to this matter be transmitted to England and that unless these matters and facts be admitted all the evidence relating thereto be transmitted to England.

The appellant should be asked to make these admissions and inform that unless he does so application will be made to vary or discharge the Privy Council Order. The application to the Privy Council should be supported by a short Affidavit showing that the order made was obtained ex parte and upon an erroneous statement of facts. It should further state that the case is fully reported in J. L. Rep 20 1124 series, and set forth the para of the Judgment above referred to as also the recapitulation of the grounds of decision as set forth on p 100 of the above report.

25 Nov 1894

2 Arthur Chen

2 J L Woodroffe

India Office, S. H.
Legal Advisers Dept.
26 Nov. 1897.

Dear Sirs,
Pittapur Appeal Case.

I believe you appeared for the Appellant in this case on the application to the Privy Council in July last for an Order that so much only of the Record as related to the matters of law decided by the High Court should be printed and sent home. -

The order was made upon that application was made ex parte, upon an affidavit which I am advised contains an erroneous statement in para. 4 to the effect ~~that~~ that the High Court had reversed the Decree of the District Court and dismissed the suit on points of law only. - And the order made was that only so much of the record should be transmitted as may be material for the decision of the questions of law decided by the High Court. -

An examination of the judgment of the High Court shows that while some of the points decided by that Court were matters of law others were matters of pure fact or of mixed fact and law. And I am advised that it will be necessary to apply to the Privy Council as soon as possible for an Order that in addition to the documents included in their order

Pittapur Appeal
Case

Copy Joint Opinion
of Mr. Cohen & Mr. Woodroffe
dated 25 Nov. 1897

1897
S. H.
India Office

of July the papers relating to the questions of fact decided by the ^{High Court} ~~Lower Court~~ should also be printed & form part of the Record to be used at the hearing. -

It is possible however that you may be in a position to make such admission of fact as may render an application to the Privy Council unnecessary. -

The facts which I ask you to admit are. -

1. - That the Zamindari of Pittapur with all increments thereto & other the estates formerly the subject matter of the Suit were impartible. -
2. That such Zamindari & estates were not alienable either by family custom or by reason of tenure.
3. That there was no implied agreement which precluded the testator from devising such Zamindari and estates, and -
4. That if the Respondent be not the ~~successor~~ son of the late Rajah of Pittapur the testator though always treating him as such son knew that he was not so. -

I shall be glad to receive your reply by Wednesday next - as I am anxious to make application to the Privy Council promptly if it has to be made.

Yours faithfully
(S^d) A. Wilson

Mess^{rs} Frank Richardson & Sadler.

28 Golden Square
London. W.
30th Nov. 1897.

Dear Sir,

Pittapur Appeal Case.

We have laid your letter of the 26th inst. before Mr. Mayne the Appellants' Counsel & he advises that we can make the following admissions which we hereby do on behalf of the Appellant. -

1. The Appellant accepts the findings of the District Judge & of the High Court upon the 6th issue, that the property in Schedules 1 & 2 is impartible.

He also accepts the findings of the District Judge upon the 7th issue, that the property in Schedules 3 & 4 was the self acquisition of the late Rajah. -

2. He admits that the property in Schedules 1 & 2 was not alienable by virtue of any special family custom or tenure attaching to the zemindari. He will contend that a current of decisions in the Madras Presidency has established a usage having the force of law, that no impartible estates are alienable beyond the life of the alienor, except for purposes of necessity or family benefit. -

3. He admits that there was no agreement that precluded the Testator from devising such zemindari & estates, except such as the law would

infer from the fact of adoption & from
the terms of the document of 1st Oct. 1873.

4. He admits that if the Respondent
be not the Aurasa Son of the late Rajah
of Pittapur the Testator, though
treating him in public as such Son
knew that he was not in fact his
son. -

We trust the above will be sufficient
to render any application to the Privy
Council unnecessary & that you will
at once inform your correspondents
in India that the only documents that
are required to be printed & forwarded
to the Privy Council for the purposes
of the Appeal are the Pleadings & Issues,
the Deed of 1873, the Wills and the 2
Judgments. -

Yours faithfully
(Sd.) Frank Richardson & Sadler

A. Wilson Esq.
Legal Adviser's Department.
India Office
D. W.

(Copy)

Further Joint Opinion
of Mr Arthur Cohen & Mr Woodroffe
Joint Opinion.

Having read and considered
the correspondence dated 26th & 30th
Nov: last in the light of our former
opinion together with the observations
of Counsel dated 3rd Dec: thereon we
are of opinion that -

- (1) The first admission of the
Appellants Solicitors rightly
distinguished the properties in
Schedules 1 & 2 and is sufficient
for the Respondents requirements.
- (2) In view of the suggested
contention on behalf of the
Appellant set forth in his Solicitors
second admission the Respondent
is entitled to require the further
admission that there have been
numerous grants in perpetuity
of portions of the immoveable
property in suit from time to time
as well prior as subsequent to the
permanent settlement thereof
(see reported Judgment p. 181
where reference is made to
Exhibits C C L X X I X & D Q series).
- (3) The fourth admission does
quite cover the ground taken by

408-

R_h

the 4th requisition and that the Respondent is entitled to have such admission supplemented so as to make it clear that the testator was at no time under any misapprehension as to the status of his alleged aurasa son. If the Appellant will word his admission thus: "He admits that if the minor Respondent be not the aurasa son of the late Rajah of Pithapur the testator though treating ^{him} as such son always knew that he was ~~not~~ his aurasa son." -

We have underlined the words which in our opinion ought to be added to his admission to obviate the necessity of transmitting the evidence in support of the High Court's finding in the issue as to the minor Respondent being entitled under the testator will to persona designata irrespective of his claim as aurasa son (see p. 188 second paragraph where

the Madras Court summarized
its finding on this point).

(2.) Arthur Cohen

(1.) J. J. Woodroffe

20th Dec. 1894.

India Office. S.W.
21st Dec: 1894.

Dear Sirs,

Pittapur Appeal Case.

I am obliged by your letter of the 30th instant, containing certain admissions in this case on behalf of the Appellant. -

In view however of your suggested contention, as set forth in the second admission, I am advised that the Respondent must ask for the further admission as follows. -

(5) That there have been numerous grants in perpetuity of portions of the imposable property in suit from time to time as well before as subsequent to the permanent settlement thereof [see Judgment (at page 181) 22 Indian Law Reports (Madras) where reference is made to Exhibits CC LXXIX. - and DQ series I. -

I would further point out that the 4th admission does not quite cover the ground taken by my 4th requisition and I am advised that the Respondent must ask to have the admission supplemented so as to make it clear that the testator was at no time

EXHIBIT No. 6
DUPONT No. 1819

under any misapprehension as to the
status of the alleged aurasa son - I
shall therefore be glad if you will
make admission 4 in the following
form.

(4) He admits that if the Minor
Respondent be not the aurasa
son of the late Rajah of Pithapur
the testator though treating him
as such son always knew that he
was not his aurasa son. -

Will you kindly let me hear from
you as soon as possible as I am anxious
to communicate to India the result
of this correspondence.

Yours faithfully
G. A. Wilson

Messrs Frank Richardson & Sadler.

Copy

28 Golden Square
London, W.
23^d Dec. 1897.

Dear Sir,

Pittapur Appeal Case.

We have laid your letter of the 21st inst. before Mr. Mayne who points out that the 4th admission exactly followed the words of the admission asked for by you except for the insertion of the words "in public". He however advises that the word "always" may be added so as to read as follows: -

"He admits that if the Respondent be not the anarasa son of the late Rajah of Pittapur the Testator though treating him in public as such Son always knew that he was not in fact his Son." -

With regard to the 5th admission asked for in your letter Mr. Mayne advises that it is impossible to make any general admission as to the effect of documents. If the Respondent thinks that anything in the documents referred to will help him in meeting the argument of which notice is given in Admission 2 they must be printed in full. -

Yours faithfully
(S^d) Frank Richardson & Sadler.

A. Wilson Esq.
Legal Adviser's Department
India Office.
S. W.



7
1819

India Office. S.W.
3rd January 1898

Dear Sirs,

Pittapur Appeal Case.

I am obliged by your letter of the 23rd ulto. and thank you for the admissions, which, with the exception of the proposed fifth admission, seem to cover the ground of my previous letters. As to the latter admission I propose, in sending out a copy of this correspondence to India, to suggest that the exhibits in question, referred to in the Judgment, should be printed as part of the Record. I presume you will not object to this, as it will save an application to the Privy Council. If you agree perhaps you will be so good as to communicate with your clients on the subject. -

Yours faithfully
(S^r) A. Wilson

Messrs. Frank Richardson & Sadler.

[Copy]

28 Golden Square
London W
11th January 1890

Dear Sir,

Pittapur Appeal Case.

We have now seen Mr Mayne
with reference to your letter of the 3rd
instant and assuming that the Respondents
intend to rely on the Exhibits therein
referred to he agrees with your suggestion
that they should be printed as part
of the record and he will so inform
our clients by next mail.

Yours faithfully
(S) Frank Richardson Sadler

Wm Arthur Wilson

P. SUBRAMANIA IYER,
SOLICITOR.

CWT 9366 of 1898
Confidential No. 74198

PARRY'S BUILDINGS, ESPLANADE,
MADRAS.

25th Feb 1898



Re Pittapur Privy Council
Appeal

Dear Sir

The enclosures that accompanied
the Confidential Pro^{Repeal on} No 235 of 98 have been
carefully considered by the Honble Mr. J. B. S. S. S.
Lyngan. It appears to him that the 2nd of
the admissions made by the appellants
is not clear. The 2nd Admissions runs as follows:-

"He admits that the property in Schedules
I & II was not inalienable by virtue of any special
Custom or tenure attaching to the Zamindari.
He will contend that a current of decisions
in the Madras Presidency has established a
usage having the force of law that no private
estates are inalienable beyond the life of the
alienor except for purposes of necessity or family
benefit."

It is by no means clear
that

Vote

word in

is

the

attached.

What is the exact purport of the contention now sought to be raised on behalf of the adopted son. Whether the Appellants' Counsel really means that the Course of the decisions referred to created a territorial usage or custom having the force of law or judicially recognised an already existing usage having the force of law - is left in doubt. He could hardly mean seriously to contend that the decisions themselves must be taken as originating the Custom. If he means that the decisions recognised an existing usage & are based thereon, in one view the judgments can be relied on only as evidence of such an usage. But if on the other hand, as is probable the Appellants' Counsel means to rely upon those decisions as a recognition of a general usage in the Presidency of Madras having the

13/

the force of law, he will be relying on the current of ~~decisions~~ simply as laying down the common law of the land, bearing on the question in this Presidency.

Viewing the question in this light the decision of the Privy Council reported in 10 Allahabad ^(p. 272) is as applicable to this Presidency as it is to the ~~North West~~ North West Provinces, for it will be seen from the report of the Case, in which the Allahabad Court's judgment is quoted, that in the North West Provinces as in Madras there was a current of decisions running the other way. As observed by Mr. Mayne in his "Hindu Law" (para 313) the so called current of decisions was not based upon any usage or custom which was established or upon any usage or custom having the force of law which having become part of the common law

Note
Vide pages 277 &
278 of X Alla.

of the Privy Council letter have been received and assigned in this Presidency.

In view of the foregoing, Counsel thinks it desirable to invite the attention of the Solicitor to the "India Office" to the contents of the Appellant's Counsel embodied in the ~~the~~ second of his admissions - so that he may take such further action as he may consider necessary. Any further information or instructions with reference to this custom now set up, which he may deem necessary to obtain from India, will be furnished to him on his informing me of the same.

Exhibits CC LXIX and the D & Q series referred to in Sir Philip Hutchins letter have already been included in the documents already ready & they have all been translated & printed to form part of the record to be

4

of the ~~land~~ was Judicially recognised without special proof of the existence of such custom or usage, but upon certain definite propositions of Law deduced ~~the~~ *Mitakshara*.

The decision in 10. Allahabad has been followed in this Presidency by the Madras Court in the Case reported in 13 Madrasp. and in other subsequent cases reported and unreported. In the Case reported in 13 Madras series while the Judges referred to the prior course of decisions, do not suggest that they establish any usage or custom having the force of Law in this Presidency & that therefore the decision of the Privy Council in 10 Allahabad which is based on definite proposition of Law does not apply. During the last 10 years the said decision of the Privy Council has been followed in this Presidency & ~~other~~ *on the faith of the decision*

x Note
This is not now
available in the
Library

7

P. SUBRAMANIA IYER,
SOLICITOR.

PARRY'S BUILDINGS, ESPLANADE,

Madras, 189

to be submitted to the Report of the Chief
Council.

I return the enclosure, that
accompanies the Proceedings of the Court
of Ward, under consideration.

Yours truly

P. Subramoneya Iyer

To the Secretary to the Court of Ward,



Proceedings of the Court of Wards,

Dated 4th March 1898.

No. 232 Mm

Ensl. No. 4

Read the following:-

(1) Demi-Official from G. S. Forbes Esq.,
Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
dated 3rd February 1898

(2) Reference, dated 4th February 1898, No. 8.

A copy of the letter from the Revenue
Secretary to Government and the enclosures in
original will be forwarded to Mr P. Subra-
maniyar Iyer, who will be requested to take
the necessary action forthwith, in consultation
with the Hon. Mr. V. Bhasiyam Aiyangar.

2. It will be observed that care
must be taken that Exhibit C.C. 7XXIX and
the D. Q series are included in the record
sent to the Privy Council.

(3) Letter from Mr P. Subramoneya Iyer,
Solicitor, Madras, dated 25th February 1898.

Resolution

The letter of the 25th ultimo containing
Counsel's

Counsel's views will be submitted to Government
with the request that steps may be taken to
bring the Hon: V. Phashtyam Aiyangar's remarks
to the notice of Counsel at home.

2. Mr. P. Subramoneya Iyer's attention
will be called to the misquotation at page 10 of
his letter, the word "inalienable" having been used
instead of "alienable" in referring to Admission 2.

[True Copy & Extract]

Recd
Secretary

To The Secretary to Government, Per: Dept.
Hon: V. Phashtyam Aiyangar with Enclosures returned
Mr. P. Subramoneya Iyer.

CONFIDENTIAL

1896.
Court of Wards,
MADRAS.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF

Proceedings, dated _____ 1896.
No. _____
Conf. No. _____

Abstract.

Read Pro. of the Court of Wards
N^o 232 mis d, 4.3.98.
(Civ. 1819/98)

Secy

Please see the Court's
Proceedings and the
accompanying draft
of a G.O. letter to the Legal
Adviser & Solicitor, India
office.

This being merely
"incidental correspondence"
in the course of a ^{litigious} ~~litigious~~
it is ~~a~~ unnecessary
address of State of India-wide
para 7 of the Secy of States
Despatch at page 2 of
G.O. N^o 250 Judicial d, 7.2.96
& para 1 of the Despatch
d, 14.7.87 on page 4 of the
same G.O.

The ~~communication~~ Des-
patch last quoted says
that ~~it~~ in matters of the
nature the communica-
tions should be addressed
to "the solicitor, India office"
but in page 3 of the Ind

case here and to
that the counsel
marks therein contained
may be brought to the
notice of the counsel at
home.

C.P.
May 98.

8/3/8

Copy sent to Press.
for Signature.
Despatched.

MAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

Spare Copies.

Struck ..	..	..	..
Issued ..	..	..	..

Total ..

In hand ..

CHIEF No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

Order of Government

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

SENT WITH DITTO

NOT TO BE PUT UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.