3,000—5-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2564

DATED 17th June

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating to the Board Circular from the Govt of India re: the Compounding of forest offences in Burma and requesting the B Govt to report on the necessity for introducing into this Presidency further precautionary rules besides those already in force in order to safeguard the exercise of the power of compounding forest offences.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	Circ 3058 / 99						

Revenue 1898 Department.

Current No. 3/14

File No. 108 of 1898.
Serial No. 1.

1898.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND AGRICULTURE.

FORESTS.

To LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIONS.

Circ 3058/99

Circular No. 4—108-1-F.

Ent.

Dated Simla, the 9th May 1898.

Red 22 "
Regd 23 "

SECT. GOVT. OF INDIA
29 MAY 98
REV. DEPT.

SUBJECT.

Compounding of Forest offences in Burma.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 119 R & A. D.—11-5 98.—370.

2 J P

Extract from the Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Burma, in the Forest Department—No. IM.-12, dated the 5th April 1897.

READ again—

Resolution No. 2R.—5, dated the 22nd January 1897, on the Forest Administration Reports of Burma for the year 1895-96.

Read also—

Letter No. 1099-14F., dated the 6th March 1896, from the Commissioner of the Southern Division, with enclosures.

IN paragraph 10 of the Resolution above cited attention was drawn to the necessity for the careful supervision of proposals of forest subordinates for compounding forest offences. It was then pointed out that—

"Unless careful supervision is exercised, the compounding provisions of the forest law may undoubtedly afford opportunities of extortion to unscrupulous subordinates; the publicity and formalities of a trial before a Magistrate are a safeguard against such malpractices. It is the duty of superior forest officers to examine carefully proposals of their subordinates for compounding cases. Unusual activity in this direction on the part of any such officer should always be viewed with suspicion. So long as superior officers discharge their duties properly in these matters, the Chief Commissioner believes that the advantages of the compounding system, namely, the saving of time and trouble to villagers, outweigh its disadvantages, namely, the opportunities of extortion which it affords."

2. The attention of the Chief Commissioner has now again been drawn to the subject and the following extract from a letter which has been recently submitted illustrates the abuses which are liable to occur in the working of the compounding sections of the Forest Act and Regulation :—

"Cases are for the most part of a petty nature and it is quite impossible for the Deputy Conservator of Forests to enquire into even a very small portion of them personally. The result is that *tawgaungs* and *tawöks* extort money, and my enquiries have shown that the Forest Department are in the end the losers to a great extent. I give an instance of the way villagers are bullied; the evidence in this case was recorded on oath and was brought to my notice by the Subdivisional Officer. Four men were reported by the *tawgaung* for destroying teak trees in their *yas*. The Deputy Conservator of Forests issued orders showing what sum he would accept as compensation. The *tawgaung* instead of telling them anything about compensation, said they had been fined. They refused to pay and were ordered by the *tawgaung* to attend on him first at one place and then another. In one case they were ordered to go some 50 miles, as the *tawök* wanted to examine them. Another order was issued to a *séeaing gaung* that he was personally to bring them to the *tawgaung's* house. The orders filed in the enquiry very clearly show that the *tawgaung* made it appear that they had no option but to pay the *fine* (as it was called). Eventually the case came up for trial, some three months after. The witnesses, who were apparently followers of the *tawgaung* and not *lugyis*, were not to be found. This is one of the many similar cases I have heard of. The result is that villagers, rather than be worried by being ordered about all over the place, subscribe village by village to subsidize *tawgaungs* to leave them alone. They say it is a very heavy tax. It is necessary that *tawgaungs* should make some show, so they report that a man has destroyed certain trees; he is fined; and the fine is paid by the *tawgaung* out of his own pocket. This he can well afford to do out of the money he has levied on the village. Another case came before me in which a ranger reported to the Magistrate that he had discovered damage to certain cutch trees on the 5th October *1895*. His application for summons was dated the 5th October *1896*, exactly a year afterwards."

From the remarks which have been made from time to time by district officials in annual reports and from cases which have come under his notice, the

Chief Commissioner fears that the cases reported above are not isolated instances of oppression. If malpractices of the kind are common, it is obvious that the compounding sections are being abused and that some remedy must be applied.

3. Wherever such malpractices exist, it will probably be found that they are due mainly to the Deputy Conservator acting on the report of a subordinate without further enquiry. Under the existing law * no officer may be empowered to, accept compensation unless he is a Forest Officer of rank not inferior to a ranger and unless he is in receipt of a salary of not less than Rs. 100, and hitherto, in practice no officer of lower rank than an Assistant or Extra-Assistant Conservator of Forests in charge of a subdivision, who has passed in Burmese by the higher standard and in Land Revenue and Law, has been so empowered. † If, however, an officer who has been so empowered, on receiving from a subordinate a report of a forest offence, makes it his usual practice to put the compounding sections in force through that subordinate, without further enquiry, it is evident that the subordinate is the real authority and the limitation above referred to is practically a dead-letter. The Chief Commissioner therefore desires Conservators of Forests to report, in the first place, what is the actual practice in their divisions, in other words, what is the procedure ordinarily adopted by officers empowered to compound forest offences when they receive from a subordinate a report of a forest offence. It should be stated in particular whether it is the custom for such officers to accept the subordinate's report as an accurate statement of facts, or whether any further enquiry is ordinarily made for the purpose of verifying the report.

4. The Chief Commissioner desires, further, to receive the opinions of Commissioners, Deputy Commissioners and Forest Officers as to whether it is expedient to lay down rules regulating the procedure to be adopted in putting the compounding sections in force. Officers who consider the issue of such orders necessary should give reasons for their opinions, and if any cases of abuse of the sections have come to their notice they should mention them.

5. Finally, the Chief Commissioner desires that officers will advise what rules, if any, should be issued to regulate proceedings under the compounding sections in future. The following are among the suggestions which have been made for the issue of rules:—

(*a*) That no action should be taken under the compounding sections in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed more than three months previous to the report of the offence.

(*b*) That a forest subordinate should be bound to submit his report regarding an offence within one week from the date of the discovery of the offence; that Divisional Officers should be prohibited from taking action on cases reported after a longer interval; and that subordinates should be required, when forwarding reports of offences, to forward also the statements of the accused and the witnesses. The object of these suggestions is to prevent subordinates from delaying reports of offences in order to extort blackmail.

* Section $\frac{66}{62}$ of the $\frac{\text{Forest Act.}}{\text{Forest Regulation.}}$

† Revenue Department Notifications No. 305, dated the 1st October 1895, and No. 386, dated the 5th December 1895.

(*c*) That when a report has been submitted to the Deputy Conservator of Forests or other officer empowered, he should be required, if he decides to invite the alleged offender to pay compensation, to send his order to the Township Officer. The Township Officer would then inform the accused person that he can elect either to pay the compensation demanded by the Deputy Conservator of Forests or to stand his trial. If he elected to pay compensation, he would pay it into the Myoôk's Court. The object of this suggestion is not to deprive Divisional Officers of the powers of control which properly belong to them, but to secure that persons whose alleged offences it is proposed to compound are given an opportunity of deciding whether they will pay compensation or will stand their trial. From facts brought to the Chief Commissioner's notice it is clear that villagers are often under the impression that an offer to accept compensation is a fine which they are bound to pay. The proposed rule would also provide some security against blackmailing. The fact that all cases must come under cognizance of a Magistrate would probably act as a powerful check on dishonest subordinates. Under this proposal the Deputy Conservator's power of assessing compensation is not touched. The Magistrate is merely the agency through which the compensation is paid, but the power of demanding money as compensation is taken entirely out of the hands of forest subordinates. It may be argued that if compensation is not paid through subordinates, they will be less ready to report forest offences. The answer to this is that Rule $\frac{44}{77}$ of the $\frac{\text{Burma Forest Act}}{\text{Upper Burma Forest Regulation}}$ affords a means of stimulating the zeal of subordinates.

(*d*) That rangers and officers of lower grades should be prohibited from issuing orders requiring persons to attend them for the purpose of enquiries into alleged offences or in order to pay compensation. Such officers have no power to issue legally binding orders of this kind, but as they are said often to issue such orders, and as ignorant cultivators imagine that the orders are legally binding, it may be desirable to specifically prohibit the issue of such orders.

(*e*) That an officer empowered to accept compensation should not offer to accept it except in cases which he has enquired into himself, or which have been enquired into under his orders by an officer of not lower grade than a ranger on Rs. 100 a month. Such a rule will perhaps be unnecessary if suggestion (*c*) is adopted; but if suggestion (*c*) is not adopted, it seems necessary to make a rule rendering it imperative that an alleged forest offence shall be examined by an officer of some standing before compensation is asked for.

6. The Chief Commissioner wishes for opinions from District and Forest Officers on the above suggestions, and he will be glad to receive any other suggestions which may be offered for dealing with the matter. The question is one

of great importance and Sir Frederic Fryer hopes that it may be possible to devise rules which will protect ignorant cultivators from oppression without hampering the work of the Forest Department or preventing harmonious relations between District and Forest Officers.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma, in the Forest Department—No. 1 M.-12, dated the 2nd November 1897.

READ—

Resolution No. 1 M.-12, dated the 5th April 1897.

The replies thereto.

RESOLUTION.—In the Resolution cited in the preamble the question of the administration of the compounding* sections of the Lower Burma Forest Act and the Upper Burma Regulation was discussed. Reports were called for as to the manner in which the compounding sections of the Act and Regulation were put in force, officers were asked to specify the particulars of any cases which had come to their notice in which oppression had been practised, proposals were made for checking the abuses rendered possible by the present practice, and officers were invited to criticise and add to these proposals.

* Section 66 of the Act. Section 62 of the Regulation.

2. From the replies received it appears that the existing practice varies considerably. In the Eastern Circle cases are generally investigated by an officer of or above the rank of Extra-Assistant Conservator. Cases compounded on the report of subordinates are usually trivial cases or cases in which a quick decision is in the interest of the accused. In the Western Circle the practice of putting the compounding section in force on the bare report of a subordinate is more common than in the Eastern Circle. There has been a considerable change in the practice of the Circle since 1893, when the Conservator reported that the ordinary practice was for Divisional Officers to inquire into cases at or near the villages of the accused. In the Pegu Circle cases are inquired into by Divisional Officers personally when possible. In cases not so inquired into, action is taken on the report of a Ranger. In the Tenasserim Circle the practice is similar, except that in two divisions the compounding section is put in force on the report of officers below the grade of Ranger. The general conclusion to be drawn from the reports is that the practice depends mainly on circumstances. An officer empowered to compound usually inquires into an alleged offence himself, if he can arrange to have the parties brought before him or if he can go to the scene of the case. In other cases he acts on the report of a subordinate, preferring the report of a Ranger as a general rule, but not declining on principle to act on the report of a subordinate of lower grade. The amount of investigation insisted on in such cases depends mainly on the character of the superior officer.

Letter No. 2043-77 O., dated 6th March 1893.

3. The second point dealt with in the Resolution of April was the frequency of the occurrence of cases of oppression and black-mail in connection with inquiries under the compounding section. On this point the Lieutenant-Governor has pleasure in recording that the particular cases of oppression reported are not

numerous. Only four specific cases are reported, while several Deputy Commissioners state explicitly that they are unable to mention any cases. These facts are creditable to the Forest Department. Black-mailing no doubt occurs in the Forest as in other Departments, but facts have not been adduced to prove the assertion which is sometimes made that corruption and black-mailing are commoner among Forest subordinates than among subordinates in other Government Departments. It is, however, certain that the compounding section is a powerful weapon in the hands of an unscrupulous official, and the facts reported and views expressed in the correspondence before him confirm the Lieutenant-Governor in the opinion that it is expedient to issue general instructions for the guidance of Forest Officers in putting the section in force.

4. It remains to consider what rules should be issued. On this point officers consulted generally approve wholly or in part of the suggestions made in paragraph 5 of the Resolution of 5th April. The Lieutenant-Governor now proceeds to specify the rules which he has decided to lay down and the reasons for them.

5. *Suggestion* (*a*).—This is generally approved, but several officers object on the ground that the limitation will often secure impunity to offenders who deserve punishment. The object of the proposed rule is to prevent subordinates from black-mailing by reporting or threatening to report imaginary offences alleged to have occurred long before. The Lieutenant-Governor considers that this object will be sufficiently attained by the following rule:—

RULE I.

No offence alleged to have been committed three months before the date of the first report regarding it may be compounded, except after a personal investigation by an officer empowered by law to compound.

The effect of this rule will be that in old cases, which are *primâ facie* suspicious cases, either a regular prosecution must be instituted, or an investigation must be held by a responsible officer. In either case the object of the rule, namely, a *bonâ fide* investigation in which the accused has an opportunity of defence, is secured.

6. *Suggestion* (*b*).—This suggestion contains three separate parts:—

(i) that subordinates should be required to submit reports of offences within a week of the date on which they come to their notice;

(ii) that action should not be taken on cases reported after a longer interval;

(iii) that subordinates making reports should be required to forward statements of witnesses.

Several Forest Officers object to (i) as impracticable. It would be impracticable if by "report" were meant "final report." It is not impracticable if it is understood to mean "preliminary report." The Lieutenant-Governor accordingly lays down the following rule:—

RULE II.

A Forest subordinate reporting an offence is bound to submit a preliminary report within one week of the date on which the facts come to his notice, and if further information is afterwards elicited, a subsequent report as soon as he has ascertained all the facts of the case.

7. The second part of suggestion (*b*) is also objected to as impracticable. After considering the objections raised, the Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion

that it will be sufficient if cases in which there is delay in submitting a report are inquired into by an officer empowered to compound or are sent to trial. He accordingly lays down the following rule:—

RULE III.

Cases in which a considerable time elapses between a first and a final report of an offence by a subordinate are prima facie *suspicious. Officers empowered to compound offences should investigate such cases themselves or send them for trial. It is not possible to lay down absolutely the length of time between a priliminary and a final report which should be held to bring a case within the scope of this instruction. The point depends on the locality in which the case occurs. A delay which would be suspicious in Tharrawaddy might be in the ordinary course of things in the Upper Chindwin. Divisional Officers must deal with cases on a consideration of the facts of each case.*

8. The Lieutenant-Governor is inclined to think that the third clause of suggestion (*b*), that subordinates should be required to furnish statements of accused, etc., is unnecessary. Compounding officers would naturally insist on evidence being furnished. The suggestion is also open to the objection that by requiring subordinates to submit statements of accused and witnesses it gives them an excuse for harrying the people. For these reasons the Lieutenant-Governor decides not to take action on this clause.

9. *Suggestion* (*c*).—This is objected to by a number of officers, both Civil and Forest. The objections are—

(1) that it will increase the work of Township Officers;

(2) that it will lead to greater harassment of the people than the present system.

The first objection, though not without weight, is not of great importance. The second objection has great weight and is urged by officers to whose opinions on such a subject the Lieutenant-Governor attaches much value. They point out that extortion is not unknown among the hangers-on of Township Officers; that the intervention of the Township Officer may mean that the accused is more harassed than under the present system; and that, consequently, the introduction of the proposed rule may do more harm than good. The Lieutenant-Governor admits the force of these objections and has decided to take no action on suggestion (*c*).

10. *Suggestion* (*d*).—Nearly all Civil Officers and a number of Forest Officers approve this suggestion, and the Lieutenant-Govenor considers that there are good grounds for adopting it. He accordingly prescribes the following rule:—

RULE IV.

No officer of a lower grade than Ranger on Rs. 100 a month may issue notices inviting persons to attend for the purpose of inquiries into alleged offences or in order to pay compensation.

In explanation of this rule it is to be observed that no Forest Officer as such has power to summon persons to appear before him. It is, of course, often necessary for superior Forest Officers to summon persons before them in connection with forest offences, and the Lieutenant-Governor has no wish to prohibit them from doing so. In the case of inferior officers, however, the same necessity does not exist. If such an officer is ordered by his superior to take any action in connection with the compounding of an offence, it is his duty to go to the parties concerned and not to summon them to him.

11. *Suggestion* (*e*).—In the opinions recorded on this suggestion the discussion turns on the question whether it is practicable. Most officers think that it is and approve it. On the other hand, the Conservator of Forests, Western Circle, thinks that its adoption would "lead to the inquiry being a dead letter." The Deputy Commissioner of Thayetmyo says that it "would mean that 95 out of 100 cases would have to be sent for trial" in his district. The Commissioner of Tenasserim considers that it is "impracticable owing to the paucity of officers of the grade referred to." In spite of these objections the Lieutenant-Governor doubts whether the proposed rule is generally impracticable. Two Conservators and several other Forest Officers cordially approve it. In the Lieutenant-Governor's opinion it is as efficient a security against abuse as can be devised, because it ensures that offences shall not be compounded till they have been inquired into by an officer who will, with very few exceptions, be competent to hold a proper inquiry. In view of these considerations the Lieutenant-Governor lays down the following rule:—

RULE V.

An officer empowered to accept compensation shall not offer to accept it except in cases which he has inquired into himself, or which have been inquired into under his orders by an officer of not lower grade than a Ranger on a salary of Rs. 100 a month.

While prescribing this rule for general adoption, the Lieutenant-Governor is prepared to consider proposals for suspending its operation in special cases. It is open to Conservators to submit proposals for relaxing it in particular divisions in which it is considered unsuitable, and for suggesting in its place some other procedure which, while enabling superior Forest Officers to compound on reports of officers below the grade of Ranger on Rs. 100, will secure that cases are properly inquired into.

12. Some special suggestions are made in the correspondence which call for notice.

13. The Financial Commissioner suggests the adoption, in the case of forest offences, of a rule corresponding with section 57 of the Excise Act. The Lieutenant-Governor doubts whether this is practicable. Serious offences, such as unlicensed felling of teak, might go on for some time by the connivance of dishonest subordinates, as happened in Toungoo early in the seventies, and the punishment of the offenders might ultimately be prevented by such a clause.

14. The Conservator of Forests, Eastern Circle, suggests that the guard-book form of receipt for compensation ($\frac{\text{Forest}}{6—\text{Miscellaneous}}$) should be revised by the entry of words stating that the payment of compensation is not compulsory. The Lieutenant-Governor approves this suggestion and requests the Conservator to draft a revised form in the terms which he considers suitable.

15. The Commissioner, Mandalay Division, proposes that the compounding of forest offences in Kachin areas without the Deputy Commissioner's permission should be prohibited. He points out that, under section 30 of the Kachin Hill Tribes Regulation, prosecutions may not be instituted against members of hill tribes without the consent of the Deputy Commissioner. The section makes no mention of compounding offences, but, as the Commissioner points out the spirit of the law requires that the Deputy Commissioner's sanction should be obtained to proceeding in this manner as well as to proceeding by prosecution. The Lieutenant-Governor accordingly directs that in areas to which the Kachin Hill Tribes Regulation extends no action shall be taken to compound a forest offence alleged to have been committed by a member of a hill tribe without the previous consent in writing of the Deputy Commissioner.

1308
FOREST DEPARTMENT.
Number 1
Date 3/11/98

1 P

Circular No. 4—108-1-F.

FROM

E. MACONOCHIE, ESQ., I.C.S.,

Under-Secretary to the Government of India,

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras, Revenue Department.

Dept. of Rev. & Agri.
Forests.

Simla, the 9th May 1898.

SIR,

I AM directed to forward, for information, a copy of two Resolutions* which have been issued by the Government of Burma on the subject of the compounding of Forest offences.

* (i) No. 1-M.-12, dated 5th April 1897.
(ii) No. 1-M.-12, dated 2nd November 1897.

I have the honour to be,

SIR

Your most obedient Servant,

E Maconochie

Under-Secretary to the Government of India.

W.

Govt. of India Cir.No.4-103-1F d/

9th May 1898.(C.No. 3717.)

Secy.

With the above paper the Govt. of India forwards Copies of Resolutions of the Govt. of Burma which describe the steps taken in that Province to counteract the mal-practices of Forest subordinates in the matter of compounding offences. It would appear that the compounding provisions of the Forest law afforded opportunities of extortion to unscrupulous subordinates in Burma and the Lieut: Governor after enquiries invited ~~him~~ opinions upon a draft set of rules devised to regulate the procedure in allowing composition. Opinions of local officers having been obtained and considered, the Lieut: Governor has issued a final set of rules for this purpose. These rules are as follow:-

Rule I. No offence alleged to have

been committed three months before the date of the first report regarding it may be compounded, except after a personal investigation by an officer empowered by law to compound."

"Rule II. A Forest subordinate reporting an offence is bound to submit a preliminary report within one week of the date on which the facts come to his notice, and if further information is afterwards elicited, a subsequent report as soon as he has ascertained all the facts of the case."

"Rule III. Cases in which a considerable time elapses between a first and a final report of an offence by a subordinate are prima facie suspicious. Officers empowered to compound offences should investigate such cases themselves or send them for trial. It is not possible to lay down absolutely the length of time between a preliminary and a final report which should be held to bring a case within the scope of this instruction. The point depends upon the locality in which the case occurs. A delay which would be suspicious in Tharrawaddy might be in the ordinary course of things in the Upper Chindwin. Divisional Officers must deal with cases on a consideration of the facts of each case."

"Rule IV. No officer of a lower grade than Ranger on Rs. 100 a month may issue notices inviting persons to attend for the purpose of inquiries into alleged offences or in order to pay compensation."

"Rule V. An officer empowered to accept compensation shall not offer to accept it except in cases which he has enquired into himself, or which have been inquired into under his orders by an officer of not lower grade than a Ranger on a salary of Rs. 100 a month."

2. The necessity for guarding against ~~the~~ abuse in this matter has been frequently recognised by this Govt. In reviewing the report of the Forest Dept. for the year 1891-92, the Govt. remarked

ed:-

"There has been a marked increase during the year particularly in the districts of Salem, North Arcot, Trichinopoly and North Malabar in the number of cases compounded and the amount realised in compensation fees has almost doubled as compared with 1890-91. The Board is unable to account for this large increase owing to the want of satisfactory explanations from the Collectors concerned. It would be instructive to know whether the power of compounding has been properly exercised and the Board should obtain and submit further information on the point. It should be borne in mind that the power of compounding should not be used in cases where the evidence is not sufficiently strong to secure convictions, but is intended to meet those cases where the offence is clear, but there are circumstances, such as the petty nature of the offence, ignorance of law on the part of the offender, or distance of the

Flag K in vol put up
G.O. 1277 Rev dt 20-12-92

Flag A

Flag H
G.O. No 31 Rev dt 22-1-95

place of offence from a Magistrate's Court which render it inadvisable to institute a prosecution."

3. In commenting upon the report of 1892-93, the Govt. of India gave a caution in the matter, vide para 9 of Mr. Ibbetson's letter in G.O. 696 Rev: dated 26th Septr. 1894. This is referred to by the Govt. in reviewing the report of 1893-94. An extract from the review is given below:-

"The large increase in the percentage of cases compounded and in the amount of compensation levied is, nevertheless, a matter of serious import. The dangers attaching to the system of compounding offences were indicated by the Government of India in reviewing the report for 1892-93. His Excellency the Governor in Council now resolves to reiterate the principles which should govern the exercise of this power. Cases in which the evidence does not appear to be strong enough to ensure conviction

should be withdrawn altogether, and the power of compounding should be utilized only when the offence has clearly been committed by the individual in question, but prosecution is deemed to be inadvisable owing to the existence of special circumstances, such as the petty nature of the offence itself, ignorance of the law on the part of the offender, or distance of the scene of the offence from a Magistrate's Court. These principles were enunciated in the annual review for 1891-92, but the Govt. has reason to fear that they have not in all cases been carefully followed; and the attention of all officers concerned will again be drawn to the matter. It must further be borne in mind that delay in disposal is in itself very harassing to the parties concerned, and petty cases in which there has been long delay either in the institution of prosecutions or in the bringing of the offenders to trial should be withdrawn."

4. The above instructions were repeated in the omnibus order on Forest matters issued last July. (Vide para. 14 of G.O. 569 Rev: d/ 13th July 1897.) The Govt. again noticed the matter in the last Forest review. (Vide para 14 of G.O. 273 d/ 16th May 1898.)

Flag S.

Flag N

Put up.

5. The powers of Forest officers to inquire into and compound offences are given on page 33 of the Forest Manual. It will be seen that only District Forest officers and subordinates of District Forest officers having the rank of Deputy Assistant, Extra Asst., or Sub-Asst. Conservator have the power to compound~~ing~~ offences or to accept compensation under section 55 of the Act.

6. Beyond the figures in the annual reports which have been commented on as noted above, there is nothing before the Govt. which shows that much or any oppression is caused by the exercise of the power of compounding offences. The papers may it is submitted, be forwarded to the Board for information.

It is a power the exercise of which may be much abused & has been in many cases in my experience

10.VI.98

Yes: & for report as to whether they think any further precautionary rules ought to be introduced into this Pdy to safeguard the exercise of the power of compounding

SH 16/6/98

Please see draft-order submitted for approval on separate sheet below. Secy

Mk 14/6/98 Ms 15.VI.98

Issue draft

SH 16/6

PD 16/6/98

6 P

Read C/o 3717 of 1898.
Letter from the Govt of India
No 4-108-1-F
dd 19.5.98.

A

G.O. misc No. 2564 dd 17th June 98.

~~The resolutions of the Govt of Burma received with the letter from the Govt Govt of India~~ The papers read above will be communicated to the Board of Revenue for information and for report as to whether any further precautionary rules besides those already laid down ~~should be introduced into this Presidency~~ in order to safeguard the exercise of the power of Compounding forest offences.

Ms 15.VI.98

SH 16/6/98

To the Board (R.P.).

Draft issued 21.6.98

Mk 14/6/98.

in margin

Vide G.Os 1277 dd 20.11.92
696 dd 26.5.94, 31 dd 22.1.95
569 dd 13.7.97, 273 dd 16.5.98

*When given for copying*_____
*When copied*_____ } 189 .
*When examined*_____
*When signed*_____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.