

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4937

DATED 14th Decr 1898.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt. sees no reason to reconsider the orders already passed on the appeal of E. Krishna Sastri, late Nagadi Gumnastah Arest Taluk, against his reduction to the post of attender.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
S. 946 Rev 23-298							

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cus	1871-99.		
f. 409	R. 018-599.		

REFERENCE

Judicial (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8095

Read nos. 8035, [8044] and ⁸³⁶⁰~~8360~~ of 1898.

Order mis no 493791415 Dec 1898

From



The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue,
Madras.

No. 1325 *Refce.*

The Govt. sees no reason
to reconsider the orders already
passed on the petitioner's
case.

the
9/12/50

Dated 22nd November 1898.

Received }
Registered } 23/11-

Enclosures 3

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

To the Board of Rev. J. R., with encls.
 Dec-16-12-98.
 Pl. 1 enc. 14 2 to 16 80354 2 to 16
 9-12-18.
 To J. R. Dec-16-12-98.
 Su
 H. B. B.

Submitting to Govt. memorial from
E. Krishna Sastri, ~~Assistant, Stationary~~
^{late}
~~Sub-Registrar,~~ Negadi gum-stah, ~~North~~
Arcoi Taluk, North Arcoi District pa
praying for a review of its Order
dismissing his petition appealing
against his reduction to the post
of attender.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Go.	946	Rev	23-2-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE),

Madras, 22nd November 1898 189

READ— Endorsement of J.K. Batten Esquire, Ag. Collector of North Arcot, Dis. No. 2683 /var of '98, dated 14th November 1898, submitting the review petition of E. Krishna Sastri, attender, Stationary Sub-Magistrate's office, Chittoor, in the matter of his reduction.

Reference No. 1325 dated 22nd November 1898.

The memorial of E. Krishna Sastri, late Nagadi gumestah, Arcot Taluk, North Arcot District, praying for a review of Government Order, No. 946 Misc., dated 23rd February 1898, dismissing the memorialist's petition appealing against his reduction to the post of attender, is submitted for the orders of Government. The Board has no recommendation to make on behalf of the memorialist.

Lonel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To


The Secretary to Govt. Revenue Department, with petition & enclosures.

Md. R. H.

MD

Petr. No. 1955 Rev. of 1384

7/10/10.80



To His Excellency the Governor
in Council
Madras.

The humble petition of Krishna Sashy Kali Nagadi
Gumastah Chief Taluk now Attender Stationery Sub-
magistrates office Chittoor North Madras.

May it please your Excellency in Council that I, the
petitioner, was dismissed from Nagadi Gumastah's place
on Rs 20/- for four charges as per margin.

- (1) Substitution of a fabricated thandal
in an impugned case
- (2) Forgery of a Taluk Shrestha's initials
- (3) Impugned of Rs 12-12-0
- (4) Incompetency.

On my appeal to the
Collector, I was acquitted
of all the serious charges and
the order of dismissal was
practically cancelled.

II. As however, my inimical Talukdars reported that I
was incompetent, the Collector did not give me back
my appointment but posted me as attender on Rs 7-0-0
- a degradation from a superior to inferior service,
from the position of an official on Rs 20-0-0 to that of a
menial servant on Rs 7-0-0, all after 17 years' service.

III. I then procured copies of some papers and pointed out how
a charge of incompetency has not been made out at all.
In due course, I appealed to Government and I got an
endorsement by G.O. dated 22-2-98 and from the

the Collector I received copy of the Government Order Board proceedings No 603 dated 1-3-98.

IV. The Government order runs as follows:-

- The Government will not interfere;
- The Local officers are in the best position to judge whether a man is fit or unfit for clerical duties.

It adds - all Government can do in such a case is -
to see they have come to that decision
after due investigation.

V. Now my contention is exactly that the local officers
i.e. the sub-collector and the collector did not hold
any personal inquiry as to any one of the allegations

of the Tahsildars against me. I have shown and it has been in some way admitted that the Tahsildars that held me to be incompetent were biased and had extra official reasons today so.

They of course laid at my door the faults of
their accountants and others and I have pointed
out these things in my contentions.

Now there is this allegation of the interested
biased Tahsildars saying I am incompetent, and
in justification there is my explanation in
refutation of the Tahsildars' allegation. It is not
fair that the sub-collector or the collector should have
held a personal inquiry with reference to the truth or
otherwise of each item of allegation and with

reference to each item of refutation.

As no such investigation has been held and much
less "due investigation", I earnestly pray for the
interference of Government merely to order such an
investigation.

Christnasamy

late 2nd Gurnastah

Arkot Taluq

now attends stationery & to
magistrate's office Chittoor

7-10-98

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8044

From

Krishna Sastri
Late Nagadi Sumastak, Arcot Tk,
now attender, Stationary Sub-Magistrate's
Office - Chittoor.

No.

Dated 20th Nov: 1898

Received 23rd ..

Registered 24th ..

Enclosures -

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Requesting that due investi-
gation may be ordered to be made
into the matter of his ^{reduction} ~~dismissal~~ from
his post and that final order may
be passed in his case to an attender
Ship

24-11-98
P2

Order

2p 41-7

898

3

8035

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Duplicate

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 NOV. 1936
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

His Excellency the Governor
Through the Collector of
Masra

PETITION

REVENUE DEPT
of Krishna Sastri
Sub-Registrar's office

will say it please your Excellency in council
that I in continuation of my petition dated
7th October 98 beg most respectfully to
submit the following few lines to illustrate
what I mean by saying that no investigation
was held and much less a "disinterested" investigation
by the local officers and that your Excellency
in council will therefore be kindly please
to order such an investigation as per G.O.
no 946 dated 2-22-28

2 Point 1. From the late collector's proceedings & 1
(dated) 22-10-95 dismissing me it will be
seen that seven reports (argis) from the
Talukdars had been read and the dismissal
order based on them. But my explanation

was taken only with reference to one of these seven viz in re no 687 dated 12-9-93 and as regards the other six which dealt with mis-points my explanation was not taken at all

It has been held repeatedly that the fundamental principle of justice adopted by the British Government is that no man may be punished for any thing without being heard. The benign rules of the Government of India contained in the G.O. no 2290 dated 3-12-83 laid down as a very strict rule (never to be departed from) that the accused should be given the charges and evidence in support thereof and his explanation rendered to writing. This very alphabet of the rules of Departmental investigation has not been observed in my case.

3 Point 2: One of the allegations against me was that I had forged the initials of the Head Accountants. It is stated that the forgery took place on the 18-9-93 and the Head Accountants statement (enclosure 2) dated 14-11-93 was taken about two months after I was behind my back and I was not given an opportunity to cross examine him. The rules of Departmental

Argy no 920 of 15-11-93
- - - 1047 - 16-12-93
Walya J. J. Argi no 83 - 30-7-94
Arrest J. J. Argi no 3984 - 24-7-94
- - - 4254 - 9-8-94
- - - 4307 - 18-8-94

inquiry require that such evidence should be recorded in the presence of the accused and subject to his cross examination.

It is also enjoined that all these should be done before the officer comes to any decision on the subject.

This is the second instance of want of due investigation.

4 Point 3: In connection with the same allegation of forging the Head Accountants initials I had requested that a clerk in the Collector's office be examined. My words are -

" If Mr. R. Raj Samba Sunda Mudaliar and Mr. R. Raj Vajravelu Mudaliar and
" Now a clerk in your honor's office
" (doing duty in August 1893 in the Treasury
" by Collector's office) be closely questioned
" by your honor whether they were same
" whether (statement of Rs 1-10-0) as former
" the subject of the Treasury by Collector's
" memo no 5412 dated 14-9-93 has not
" been presented to notice on the 28th August
" 1893 by the latter to the notice of the
" former and by him to my notice
" if they are asked to answer this simple
" question with a warning that it is in
" my power to confront them with their

14
19
19
19
"writing and controvert them successfully
I am sure they cannot venture to tell
a lie."

5 Point 4. In connection with the allegation
that a certain ~~...~~

This request has not been made to and
the clerk was not examined. Hence

it is that no investigation was made

5 Point 4. In connection with the allegation

that a certain Tandal (of Lumanjali village)
has been tampered with the most important
point was the custody of the Tandal and
on that point I requested that one

Batcha Musali ^{aguntah} and Mr. R. R. Rajagopal
Musali and Tahildar be examined

My word are —

"The Tahildar Mr. R. R. Rajagopal and Musali and

"held an inquiry into the case of embezzlement

"and found that it was not made out

"and accordingly reported to the Sub Collector

"for dismissal. When Mr. R. R. Venkata

"Saharayalu Reddy and others

"Mr. R. R. Rajagopal Musali and (the

"of findings to them whom had become much

"straightened to reopen the case and prove

"that the latter Tahildar's report was

"false etc x x"

"4th Period. From the date it reached

"the Tahildar it must have been

"presumably (for the most important personages

"the Tahildar and his named clerk Batcha

"Musali do not seem to have been examined

"about its custody at this period) in the

"custody of the criminal clerk Batcha Musali

"till the year 1893 when an eye was sent

"to the Sub Collector. x x x"

"6th Period. From the date of the receipt thereof

"from the Sub Collector by the Tahildar towards

"the close or beginning of April 1893 it must

"have remained in the Tahildar's hands or

"in that of his clerk Batcha Musali for him.

"There it remained till the 15th May and

"even after. It was on the 15th May that the

"its spurious x x x"

This has not been done and they were not examined

6 Point 5. In connection with an allegation of

misappropriation of Rs 12-12-0 being the remittance

from a certain village (Teliga Nal) the case was

closed without any cross examination which has

been reserved. This is pointed out as one of the many

points of defects of investigation and perhaps the

greater may not be of importance now that the

Collector himself has fully acquainted with this

7 Point 6. One of the items of evidence or perhaps

the chief item of evidence against me to show

my incompetency (the only charge on which the Collector

order degrading me to an attendership mainly

dependers) is that I ^{was} have find a number of things

(1) One none of these occasions was any explanation taken or recorded before the fine was inflicted on me.

(2) All these were fines imposed by the Talukdars & the Talukdars collecting materials for my ruin.

(3) The orders of the Government of India rules enjoining warnings against using evidence of past conduct are most relevant.

(4) After my dismissal I asked for copies of the fine statement and other papers to show the circumstances of these fines and I was refused. Vide enclosure

Consideration dated 7.11.95 submitted to the Collector appeal against the order of the sub Collector the extract for the argu is sent here with.

(4) Subcollector's order in appeal dated 5.8.96

8. Point 7. There are few items of inequity alleged against me ^{vide} and in regard to none of which did the sub collector or collector take any explanation. The same biased Talukdars took my explanation. This is not due investigation in a case in which the point is that the Talukdars themselves are biased and took deliberately to procure the ruin of a

subordinate - a circumstance proved by all the records and almost admitted on all sides
9. Point 8. With reference to the point of work distribution and deliberate overloading me with work not legitimately mine there has been an alteration inside none of the old work distribution lists between the date of my Board's appeal and the Collector's ^{report} appeal thereon. This which I am constrained to have to submit with greatest ^{deference} and reluctance savors of the nature of tampering of records has not been investigated into at all. An investigation of this matter in my presence will show that there has been an overloading first and that there has been an alteration since

10. There are only a few most material points on which there has not been any investigation or on which there has been most material defect of investigation. The highest relevancy of these points will be seen from the context.

11. I therefore earnestly pray that a due investigation be kindly ordered and my case be judged by the result and final orders passed thereon.

Records submitted 8
Statements of the Major 3
S. S. Curran - 4
S. S. Talukdar 5
S. S. Little Norton 6
S. S. M. M. 7
S. S. Panna 8

Endorsement 5 & 96
Extract for the appeal
petition for copies -

1. Subcollector's order 1-1-95
2. 30-6-96
3. 27-9-96
4. 2-12-96
5. 26-8-96

Christy
Colliery
S. S. M. M.
attending station
Sub Collector of Panna

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8360.

From

The Board of Revenue, Land
Revenue, Madras.

Order

REF No. 209 (Petition)

Dated 5th December 1898.

Received $\times$ 5

Registered 8

Enclosures 16

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submg. to Govt. memorial from M. Krishna-
na Sastri, late Nagadi gumastah, com-
plaining that the matters which ---
led to his reduction ^{have been} not duly
investigated & praying that a ---
fresh investigation ^{may} be order-
ed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Office of the Board of Revenue,
(Land Revenue),

Madras, dated 5th December 1898.

Read endorsement of ~~Mr~~ J.K. Batten Esq., Ag.--

Collector of North Arcot, Dis. No. 2852-Var. of '98, dated 26th November 1898, submitting the supplemental review petn of E. Krishna Sastri, late Nagadi gumastah of Arcot 2k in the matter of his reduction to an Attendant post.

Read also Official Memorandum from the Ag. Under Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, No. 292, dated 29th November 1898.

Reference No. 209 (Patn) dated 5th December 1898.

The memorial of E. Krishna Sastri, late Nagadi gumastah, Arcot Taluk, North Arcot District, complaining that the matters which led to his reduction have not been duly investigated and --- praying that a fresh investigation may be ordered is submitted for the orders of Government in continuation of Reference No. 1325, dated 22nd November 1898. The Board is unable to support the continuation of the memorialist and can find no reasons to warrant a re-opening of his case.

Leonel D. D. D.
Ag. Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with memorial & enclosures.

C.B.

J. J. J.

PETITION

0728

Petr. No. 2148 Rev of 1892

7.2.11.98

It is Excellency the Governor
in Council
(Through the collector of Madras
North Arcot)

The humble supplement petition of
Krishna Sastri late Nagari Guvnastal
Arad Taluk now attending stationery and
Magistrate's office to hitoor.

In continuation of my petition dated
7th October 98 I beg most respectfully to
submit the following few lines to illustrate
what I mean by saying that no investigation
was held and much less a "due investigation"
by the local officers and that your Excellency
in Council will therefore be kindly pleased to
order such an investigation as per G.O. no 946
dated 22-2-98

2. Point 1. From the sub collector's proceedings
dated 22-10-95 dismissing me it will be seen
that seven reports (argies) from the Talukdars
had been read and the dismissal based on
them. But my explanation was taken
only with reference to one of these seven
viz in re no 687 dated 12-9-93 and as
the other six were not taken into consideration

Arad Talukdars' argies no 9889
4214
4307

It has been held repeatedly that the fundamental principle of justice adopted by the British Government is that no man may be punished for any thing without being heard. The benign rule of the Government of India contained in the G.O. No 2290 dated 3-12-93 laid down as a very strict rule (never to be departed from) that the accused should be given the charges and evidence in support thereof and his explanation reduced to writing. This very alphabet of the rules of departmental investigation has not been observed in any case.

3. Point 2. One of the allegations against me was that they have forged the initials of the Head Accountant. It is stated that the forgery took place on 18-9-93 and the Head Accountant's statement (in enclosure 2) dated 14-11-93 was taken about two months

afterwards to show my back, and I was not given an opportunity to cross examine him. The rules of Departmental inquiry require that such evidence should be recorded in the presence of the accused and subject to his cross examination. It is also enjoined that all these should be done before the officer comes to any decision on the subject. This is the second instance of want of due investigation.

4. Point 3. In connection with the same allegation of forging the Head Accountant's initials I had requested that a clerk in the Collector's office be examined. My words are

"now a clerk in your honor's office (doing duty in August 1893 in the Treasury Dy Collector's office) he closely questioned by your honor this very same matter (Item of Rs 1-10-0) as for me the subject of the Treasury Dy Collector's memo No 541 dated 14-9-93 has not been pressed to notice. On the 28th August 93 by the letter to the notice of the former and by him to my notice - if they are asked to answer the simple question with a warning that it is their power to confront them with their writing and contradict them successfully I am sure they cannot venture to tell a lie." This request

This request has not been acceded to and the case was not examined since it is that no due investigation was made.

5. Point 4. In connection with the allegation that in certain cases (of Jannagali village) land has been fixed with the most important point was the custody of the Savel and on that point I requested that Mr. Batek mudahar & Jannagali and Mr. R. Raja Gopal Mudahar, sub Tahsildar be examined. My words are

"The Tahsildar Mr. R. Raja Gopal Mudahar held an inquiry into the case of embargement and found that it was not made out and he accordingly reported to the Sub collector for dismissal of the case."

" between whom has become much straightened
 " to reopen the case and prove that the latter
 " Tahsildar's report was false. x x x
 " 4th Period. From the date it reached the
 " Tahsildar it must have been presumably
 " (for the most important personages the Tahsildar
 " and his revenue clerk Batela illadhar do not
 " seem to have been examined about its
 " custody at this period) in the custody of the
 " circuit clerk Batela illadhar till 10th March
 " 1893 when an arji was sent up to the collector.
 " collector. x x x
 " 6th Period. From the date of the receipt
 " thereof from the sub collector by the Tahsildar
 " towards the close or beginning of April it
 " must have been remained in the Tahsildar's
 " hands for so or in that of his clerk Batela
 " illadhar for him. There it remained
 " till the 15th May and even after it was
 " on the 15th May that the Tahsildar called it
 " spurious x x x
 " This has not been done and they were not
 " examined.

b. Point 5. In connection with an allegation
 of misappropriation of Rs 12-12-0 being the
 remittance from a certain village (Dahi Nalor)
 the case was closed without any cross examination
 which had been reserved. This is point 5
 as one of the many points of defects of investi-
 gation is to let the matter pass.

7 Point 6. One of the items of evidence or perhaps
 the chief items of evidence against me to show
 my incompetency (the only charge on which the collector
 order degrading me to an attendantship mainly
 depends) is that I was fined a number of times
 (1) On none of these occasions was any
 explanation taken or records before
 the fine was inflicted on me
 (2) All these were fines imposed by the Tahsildar
 because I failed to collect materials for
 my ruin
 (3) The words of the Government of India
 rules enjoining warnings against using
 evidence of past conduct are most
 relevant
 (4) After my dismissal I asked for my
 copies of the fine statement and other papers
 to show the circumstances of these fines and
 I was refused and enclosure
 (1) Endorsement dated 7-11-95 submitted
 to the collector appealing against the order
 of the sub collector the extract of the arji
 is here with a certificate dated 1-12-95
 (2) Sub collector's endorsement dated 5-8-98
 8. Point 7. There are few items of incompetency
 alleged against me and
 in the first place the

biased & falsified took my explanation
 this is not due investigation. In a case in which
 the point is that the falsified themselves are
 biased and work deliberately to procure the
 ruin of a subordinate - a circumstance
 proved by all the records and almost admitted
 on all sides.

9. Point 8. With reference to the point of work
 distribution and deliberate overloading me
 with work not legitimately mine there has been
 an alteration in side in one of the old work distribution
 list between the dates of my Board appeal
 and the collector's report thereon. This which
 I am constrained to have to submit with
 greatest ^{difference} and reluctance shows of the
 nature of tampering of records has not been
 investigated at all. An investigation
 of this matter in my presence will show that
 there had been an overloading first and that
 there has been an alteration since.

10. There are 8 most material points
 on which there has not been any investigation
 or on which there has been most material defect
 of investigation. The highest relevancy of these
 points will be seen from the context.

11. I therefore earnestly hope for

And my case be judged from the result
 and final orders passed thereon.

Records submitted 64
 Statements of the origin 3
 do do do do do 4
 do do do do do 5
 do do do do do 6
 do do do do do 7
 do do do do do 8
 Work distribution of 1-1-98
 do do do do do 30.6.98
 do do do do do 4.7.94
 do do do do do 2-12-
 Endorsement - 368.79.6
 Endorsement - 5.8.96
 Extract for the appeal
 Petition for copies - 31

Christnasasthy
 Late Dy. Commissioner
 By, now attending
 Stationary Subm. Office
 Chittoor
 20.11.98

Handwritten notes at the top of the left page, mostly illegible.

Handwritten notes in the bottom left corner of the left page.

Handwritten notes in the top right corner of the right page.

O.M. No. 292.

Reference - B.P. (Land R)
No: 1325 Refce. date
22.11.98. (Cw. 8035/98)

The Board of Revenue
is requested to expedite
the transmission of ~~the~~
Supplemental petition
dated 20th November 1898
^{which} ~~forwarded by~~ the memo-
^{appearing} ~~rialist~~ ^{has submitted} through the
Collector of North Arcot,
a duplicate copy
of which has been sub-
mitted direct to
Government.

Handwritten signature/initials.

For: Genl.
29th November 1898

To the Board of Rev., L. R.

Pl. 28/11/98. Inc. No. 1-12-98

Cus. 8035 and 8044/98

To the Under Secy.

In continuation of his review petition d. 7.10.98 now submitted by the Board (Cus. 8035 of 1898), the petitioner has sent direct to Govt. a duplicate copy of his supplemental petition d. 20.11.98 (Cus. 8044) forwarded through the proper channel. Orders are requested as to whether the currents referred to above may lie over pending the receipt of the original of the Supplemental petition.

P.E.
24.11.98

Jeske
26.11.98

Adv the govt to expedite its
transmission

Please see the draft on submitter

- (1) Read again G.O. No. 946 d 23.2.98
- (2) " B.P. (L.R.) No. 1325 Ref. d. 29.10.98 of
- (3) " Petition (duplicate) from E. Krishna Sastri, d. 20.11.98
- (4) " B.P. (L.R.) No. 209 Petn. Ref. d. 5.12.98 Cus. 8369/

To Under Secretary.

The petitioner, E. Krishna Sastri, late a gumastah in the Arcot District Office, was ^{reduced} by ~~Proceedings of the~~ Collector of North Arcot on 21.4.96 ~~and~~ to an attender's post, on charge of general inefficiency. On appeal the Govt. was satisfied that the charge of incompetency was made out and passed the following order:- "The Govt. will not interfere. The local officers are in the best position to judge whether a man is fit or unfit for clerical duties. All Govt. can do in such case is to see that they have come to that decision after due investigation".

G.O. No. 946 d 23.2.98 (A)

In the two petitions
which the Board now forwards
the order of Govt., the
petitioner contends that
his case
~~is not a case which led to his~~
deduction has not been
by investigated, and
says ~~that~~ ^{for} a fresh investi-
gation ~~may be ordered~~. The
Board ~~states that~~ it is unable
support the appeal
~~the petitioner~~ and to
induce no reason to ~~warrant~~
re-opening of the case.

The greater part of ~~what~~
~~the petitioner says in the two~~
review petitions ~~is~~ ^{is} before
~~and~~ is irrelevant, referring
to it does to ^{the} charges involving
and which the Sub-Collector
found against him, but which
the Collector on appeal held
unproven. As regards the
charge of general inefficiency
which the Collector's order of
deduction was based, it is sub-
mitted that the petitioner
now adduces no facts which
had

Cus 8035 & 8360/98.

Please see B.P. No. 209 Pet. Refere. d
5.12.98. (Cus 8360).
(B)

(D)
Please see paras 2 & 3 of the B.P.
under Gov. No. 946 d 23.2.98 (A)

A

had not already been
placed before Govt. in his
appeal petition disposed of
in Gov. No. 946 d 23.2.98. It
is accordingly submitted
that there appears no reason
for a reconsideration of the
Govt. order quoted above.

A draft order is submit-
ted for approval on the docket
of Cus. 8035 of 1898.

Pl.
9/12/98.

Seen by
9/12/98
H. M. Karason to refer
R. H. M. S.

I agree
MS
12-12-98

In the two b

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH AUTO.

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.