C.P. Old No. 73, New No. 24—563 834—20-10-59

DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer.

Press / Miscellaneous / Routine No. ______________, dated ______________ 195 .

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

7

$\frac{6}{9}$. 3,000—17-12-96.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 867-868.

DATED 28th February. 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

accepting the revised demarcation, effected by Mr. Martin, of the boundaries of the villages of Sasirihalli and ~~[illegible]~~ Hagarigundihalli villages of the Harpanahalli taluk, Bellary Dt. and informing the Resident in Mysore accordingly.

Letter

Informing the Resident in Mysore that certain incorrect demarcation of the village boundaries of Sasirihalli and Hagarigudihalli of the Harpanahalli taluk, Bellary Dt. has now been rectified.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cuo.	2447/99	571 24-4-9					
Go.	675 d/ 17.5-99 2309 d/ 27.6.99						
Cuo	6120/99						

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 985

Order

From The Superintendent Madras Survey

No. [illegible]

Dated 6 February

Received 8/2

Registered 8/2

Enclosures 3

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Incorrect demarcation on the boundary between Sasivihalli and Kanimadihalli village of the Harpanahalli Taluk and the Mysore Province — Reporting that the — has been rectified.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(C. O. Form No. 13-A 1.)

SURVEY OFFICE, MADRAS,
6 February 1899.

No. 20/G

From

H. O'C. Cardozo, Esq., C.I.E.,
Superintendent, Madras Survey,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

REFERENCE. G. O. No. 3507, Mis, dated 27 August 1898 referring to the Superintendent, Madras Survey, letter from the Resident in Mysore bringing to notice that certain boundary stones in Sasivihalli and Kanimadihalli Villages of the Harpanahalli Taluk, have been wrongly fixed on the side of the Mysore Province.

Sir,

In continuation of Mr. Greene's letter No. 125/G dated 18 October 1898, I have the honour to report that Mr. Martin, Deputy Superintendent in charge of No. II Survey Division, Bellary, has inspected the ground and revised the demarcation so as to agree with the village maps of the Mysore Survey. Four field stones defining the correct boundary have now been fixed and two theodolite stations which do not define the boundary have been sunk flush with the ground.

Copy of Mr. Martin's report on the boundary dispute is submitted for information.

2. The enclosure to the G. O. under reply is returned.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Superintendent
Madras Survey

Sent 4/2/99

Code Class. INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. Monthly Number.

To (Office) Telephone | From (Office) Message

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
	22	11	51	

To (Person) 2nd Asst R. D. | From (Person) 1st Asst Sett

There is a hamlet named Kunimadihalli attached to the village of Hagarigundihalli, Harpanahalli Taluq. There is no village or hamlet of the name Kudumadihalli in the whole Taluq.

Transformed into Kudumadihalli in the transmission by telephone
RS.

64 Word Form. F. C. 2.

Recd. from I.N. At Hrs. Mts by | Sent to I.N. At Hrs. Mts. by | Telegraph Master.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

TELEPHONIC MESSAGE.

To	From
the 1st asst Board of Revenue (Settlement)	The Second Assistant, Rev. Secretariat, Fort St. George.

Please refer to the Settlement Diglott Register of the village of ~~[illegible]~~ Hagarigudihalli of the Harpanahalli taluk, and let me know if Kunimadihalli is a hamlet of that village. If not whether there is any village named Kunimadihalli

13.4.2

Date.

RS
22-2-99

D/1 1,000-7-9-98.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C No. 985/99

From the Superintendent, Madras Survey

No. 20/G Dated 6. 2. 1899.

FOR ORDERS.

in f.o. 3507/27-8-98 A

x No. 605/R.249 of 22.7.98 B

to the Under Secretary.

With his letter No. 3768/3.8.98, the Resident ~~in~~ Mysore forwarded for consideration a communication from the Mysore Durbar bringing to notice

(i) that the boundary stones of Survey Nos 100 and 443 of Sasavehalli and Kunimadihalli villages respectively of the ~~Bellary~~ Harpanahalli taluk, Bellary Dt, had been wrongly fixed by the Madras Survey Dept so as to include 8 acres and 16 guntas of unoccupied land belonging to the Basavankote village in the Mysore territory; and

(ii) that the ryot holding a portion of Survey No. 443 of the Kunima[illegible]lli village (British) had further encroached upon 1 acre and 12 guntas of land out of Survey No. 200 of the Basavankote village (Mysore) and been in the enjoyment of the same for the past four years, but that the said ryot admitted that the ~~excess~~ encroachment was due to a mistake on his part regarding the limits of his land and was willing to give up the encroached portion and to pay its Kandayam⊗ for the four years.

⊗ Land-tax (Wilson).

The Durbar accordingly requested that steps might be taken for the removal of the boundary stones ~~wrongly placed~~ in question ~~being removed~~ to their proper places and for the relinquishment of the land encroached upon by the British ryot, ~~being relinquished~~ with payment of proportionate Kandayam for 4 years as agreed to by him.

2. The communication was referred to the Supdt: Madras Survey, for report in communication with the Collector of Bellary. The Supdt. Madras Survey, in his letter No. $\frac{20}{C}$ d/ 6.2.99 read above, reports that the incorrect demarcation referred to by the Durbar has been rectified and forwards a copy

G.O. $\frac{3507}{27-8-98}$ Mis A

vide telephonic message from the Board of Rev. C

of a report submitted by Dy Supt. Mr Martin in the matter. Mr. Martin's report and sketch refer to Sasivehalli and Hagarigudihalli as the villages in which the demarcation was found to be incorrect, ~~but~~ and it appears that Kunimadihalli mentioned in the Residents' letter is a hamlet of Hagarigudihalli. The Resident may now be informed that the incorrect demarcation referred to by the Darbar has been rectified.

3. As regards the other question referred to in the Darbar's letter, viz. the taking of measures for the relinquishment of a portion of a field belonging to the Mysore village of Basavankote said to have been encroached upon by a British ryot and for the payment of the Kandayam for a period of 4 years during which he enjoyed the land, it is a question whether any special instructions should be issued to the Collector; the point is not referred to in Mr. Martin's ~~let~~ report and the opini of the Collector, in communication with whom the Supdt of Survey wa

out of Survey No. 200 of the Basavankote village (Mysore) and been in the enjoyment of the same for the past four years, but that the said ryot admitted that the ~~excess~~ encroachment was due to a mistake on his part regarding the limits of his land and was willing to give up the encroached portion and to pay its Kandayam⊗ for the four years.

The Durbar accordingly requested that steps might be taken for the removal of the ~~wrongly placed~~ boundary stones in question ~~being removed~~ to their proper places and for the relinquishment of the land encroached upon by the British ryot, ~~being relinquished~~ with payment of proportionate Kandayam for 4 years as agreed to by him.

2. The communication was referred to the Supdt: Madras Survey, for report in communication with the Collector of Bellary. The Supdt. Madras Survey, in his letter No. $\frac{20}{C}$ of 6.2.99 read above, reports that the incorrect demarcation referred to by the Darbar has been rectified and forwards a copy

⊗ Land-tax (Wilson).

L.O. $\frac{3507}{27\text{-}8\text{-}98}$ Mis A

vide telephonic message from the Board of Rev. C

of a report submitted by Dy Supt. Mr Martin in the matter. Mr. Martin's report and sketch refer to Sasivehalli and Hagarigudihalli as the villages in which the demarcation was found to be incorrect, ~~but~~ and it appears that Kunimadihalli mentioned in the Residents' letter is a hamlet of Hagarigudihalli. The Resident may now be informed that the incorrect demarcation referred to by the Darbar has been rectified.

3. As regards the other question referred to in the Darbar's letter, viz. the taking of measures for the relinquishment of a portion of a field belonging to the Mysore village of Basavankote said to have been encroached upon by a British ryot and for the payment of the Kandayam for a period of 4 years during which he enjoyed the land, it is a question whether any special instructions should be issued to the Collector; the point is not referred to in Mr. Martin's ~~let~~ report and the opinion of the Collector, in communication with whom the Supdt. of Survey wa

4

asked to report is not known. The ryot is, as already stated, reported to be willing to give up the land and to pay the amount of Kandayam due. Perhaps the Collector may be instructed to render the Mysore authorities any assistance that may be needed in the matter; but it is to be noted the Collector can apparently do nothing if the British ryot should refuse to pay the Kandayam; as regards the encroachment, the Darbar can of course eject him if he refuses to relinquish.

The annexed draft order and letter are submitted for approval.

RS
23-2-99

Secy

The report was to have been submitted in communication with the Collr but this does not seem to have been done.

However, it is submitted that Mr Martin's demarcation may be accepted. No further action as regards the encroachment seems necessary. Please see drafts

---

Vi

Su
Pa

Pr

The land
Village is
Survey N
Basavant
1 Acre-40
Village N

O

The My
boundary
Basavank
said to be
repair tha
their theod
approxim
The My
according to
recorded
the Tahsil
and the N

98 B

R24

Bu
C
of the
edly Fan
Mysore, they
can deal with him

Revenue Department

A D

A Read again G.O.s $\frac{3507}{27.8.98}$ & $\frac{1546}{3.11.98}$

A Read also letter from the Supdt, Madras Survey, No 2.0/G of 6.2.99 (Curo 985)

Order Mis No 867 / 28th Feb 1899.

The Govt presume that ~~[illegible]~~ the Supdt's report has been submitted ~~[illegible]~~ in commn with the Collector of Bellary ~~[illegible]~~ as directed in G.O. 3507 d 27-8-98. ~~[illegible]~~ The revised demarcation now effected ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ by Mr Martin which ~~so as to~~ agrees with the village maps of the Mysore Survey, is accepted, & the Resident in Mysore will be infd accordingly. In regard to the portion of S. No 200 of Basavankote village (Mysore) said to have been encroached upon by a ~~British~~ ryot of Kunimadihalli, hamlet of Hagarigudihalli village of the Harpanahalli taluk, it is understood from the Darbar's communication that ~~of the Darbar forwarded by the Resident that the ryot is willing to relinquish the land and to pay the Kandayam for the period of 4 years. The Collector~~ No ~~[illegible]~~ action ~~[illegible]~~ ~~of Bellary should be instructed therefor to be necessary to assist the Darbar any~~ is now required

27/2/99

28/2/99

revised by that officer. ~~so as to~~ This Govt accepts the revised demarcation which agrees with the village maps of the Mysore Survey.

2. In regard to the portion of S. No 200 of Basavankote said to have been encroached upon by a British ryot, it is understood from the communication of the Darbar referred to above that the ryot in question is willing to relinquish the land and to pay the Kandayam thereon for a period of 4 years. ~~[illegible] of Bellary~~ No action by this Govt therefore seems to be necessary. ~~[illegible] to afford the Darbar any [illegible] assistance in the matter.~~

3. The sketch received with your letter under reply is returned as requested.

28
-2-99

27/2/99

Form No. 78/S.
Survey Manu

No.

Name

Nar

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with reference to G.O. No. 867 mis / 28.2.99

of Revenue
Revenue
3-99

SPUTE.

PUTE

ame Sasivihalli
Hagarigudiha

k The Reddies an
of Sasivihalli and
Vill

Name Basavankot

nk Revenue Inspe

		In possession of Village		Possession doubtful.		
	No.	Area.	Rev.	Area.	Rev.	Area.
						Acre
Dry Cultivation Survey No 443 of Hagarigudihalli Village	1					1
Waste Survey No 100 of Sasivihalli Village ..	6					6
Total ..	7					7

N.B. This land was at the time of enquiry in the wrongful possession of the Bellary Villages as explained at pages 2 and 4 of this Report.

44267

N.B.—Decimals of an acre and annas and pies to be omitted.

revised by that officer. ~~so as to~~ His Govt accept the revised demarcation which agrees with the village maps of the Mysore Survey.

2. In regard to the portion of S. No. 200 of Basavankote said to have been encroached upon by a British ryot, it is unders from the communication of the Darbar referred to above that the ryot in question is willi to relinquish the land and to pa the Kandayam thereon for a peri of 4 years. ~~[illegible]~~ No action by Govt therefore seems to ~~[illegible]~~ necessary. ~~[illegible]~~ ~~in the matter.~~

3. The sketch receive your letter under reply is r as requested.

RS
23-2-99

27/2/99

Form No. $\frac{78}{S.}$
Survey Manual, Section 38.

REPORT ON BOUNDARY DISPUTE.

No. ~~TALUK~~

PARTIES TO THE DISPUTE

Bellary. { Village No. 22 Name Sasivihalli
21 Hagarigudiha

Represented by

Name Rank The Reddies an of Sasivihalli and H Vill

VERSUS

Mysore. Village No. Name Basavankot

Represented by

Name Rayappa Rank Revenue Inspe

II. Particulars of Land in dispute.	In possession of Village Nos 22 and 21.		In possession of Village No.		Possession doubtful.		
	AREA. Acres	REV.	AREA.	REV.	AREA.	REV.	AREA. Acre
Wet Cultivation							
Dry Cultivation Survey No. 443 of Hagarigudihalli Village	1						1.
		N.B. This land was at the time of enquiry in the wrongful possession of the Bellary Villages as explained at pages 2 and 4 of this Report.					
aste Survey No. 100. of Sasivihalli Village ..	6						6
Total ..	7						7

4467

N.B.—Decimals of an acre and annas and pies to be omitted.

revised by the
revised dem
agrees with the
ysore survey
2. In
S. No 200
to have be
y a Britis
om the
refer
arbar
relinqu
Kand
4 ye
~~Eo1~~
nece
the

Bellary

ge Nos 21 and 22
Name Hagarigudihalli
vey
ash Nos. Sasivihalli
443
100

esent Possession

in dispute in Sasivihalli
Government waste-
Nos 199 and 200 of
ota Village, 27 cents and
cents in possession of
21 Hagarigudihalli

ther evidence

3. ore Survey marks on the
between Sasivihalli and
ta Villages, at the place
in dispute, were in such bad
the Madras Surveyors fixed
lite boundary stones
ately-
ore marks were repaired
the measurements taken and
by the Mysore Survey before
ar of Harpanahalli Taluk
mildar of Jagalur Taluk-

If this page is not sufficient, a central sheet or sheets can be added,

---

EVIDENCE. Mysore.

Village No.

Name Basavankota

~~Paimash~~ Survey Nos 244, 199 and 200

Present Possession

The land in dispute is Governme
waste-

Other evidence

The village boundary having been demarcated by the Mysore Survey about 23 years before that of the British Village by the Madras Survey, the British Village boundary should have followed the marks set up by the Mysore Survey

---

SKETCH MAP.

Scale. 8 Inches = 1 Mile

Red line.	Boundary claimed by British Vill
Green line.	Do. Mysore Vill
Yellow wash.	Area in dispute
Thick black line.	Boundary settled



Measurements in Links are entered in red ink

Paimash Field Boundaries should not be plotted

The d
have foll
Owing to
repair
Sasiviha
included
Mysore
B and C
as laid
marked
mark b
Survey,

Hagarig
been alt
coincid
The
plante
Su

Report of the Deputy Superintendent

~~SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE AND DECISION.~~

marcation of the boundary of Sasivihalli Village sh
ved the boundary laid down by the Mysore Survey in 1867-
the marks set up by the Mysore Survey being in bad
st the time the Madras Surveyors demarcated the
li Village in 1890, the demarcation was wrong and
in Sasivihalli village a portion of land belonging to
Territory - Stones have been fixed at the points A
marked in the Sketch to coincide with the boundary
down by the Mysore Survey. The Theodolite station
D in the Sketch, which does not denote any boundary
t which has been fixed only for convenience of
as been planted flush with the ground -
For the same reason, the demarcation of No. 21
lihalli Village at the point in dispute is wrong and has
ed by fixing a stone at A shewn in the Sketch to
with the boundary as laid down by the Mysore Survey-
eodolite station marked B in the Sketch has been
flush with the ground -

y Office, Camp Kurnool
29 January 1899 }
(signed) C. W. Martin
Deputy Superintendent
Madras Survey

(True copy)

Survey Office
Madras
6 February 1899 }
2/99
985
Superintendent
Madras Survey

RECEIVED IN THE SURVEY OFFICE
ON
3 - SEP. 98
MADRAS

Letter No. 605/R.249, dated 22nd July 1898, from the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments, to the First Assistant to the Resident in Mysore.

I am directed to state that the Deputy Commissioner of the Chitaldroog District, has brought to the notice of the Durbar that the boundary stones of Survey Nos. 100 and 443, of Sasavehalli and Kunimadihalli villages respectively, of the Harpanahalli Taluk, Bellary District, have been wrongly fixed by the Madras Survey Department, so as to include in them 8 acres and 16 guntas of Government unoccupied land belonging to the Basavan-Kote village, Jagalur Taluk, as specified below:-

From Survey No.	To Survey No.	Extent wrongly included.
244 of Basavankote	100 of Sasavahalli	A. G 6-29

Cft 467/99

				A. G.
199 of	— Do —	443 of Kunimadahalli	—	0-11
200 of	— Do —	Do — Do	—	1-16
			Total	8-16

2. It is also reported that the ryot holding a portion of Survey No. 443 of Kunimadihalli, has further encroached upon 1 acre – 8 guntas of land out of Survey No. 200 of the Basavankote village, and been in the enjoyment of the same for the past 4 years, though he pleads that the encroachment was due to a mistake on his part in not being able to identify the boundary marks of his land which had disappeared, and he is now ready to give up the encroached portion and pay its Kandayam for 4 years.

3. The Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldroog had issued general orders that all boundary marks shewn in village maps should be kept in thorough repair. ~~Insurance~~ In pursuance of these orders, the ryots of Basavankote executed necessary repairs to their boundary marks and in doing so, they fixed new marks in places of those that had disappeared on land erroneously included by the Madras Survey Department. This at first appeared to be an encroachment by the Basavankote ryots and the villagers of Sasvehalli in the Harpanhalli Taluk, Complained to the Tahsildar, whereupon, the Collector of Bellary brought the matter to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District The Amildar of the Jagalur Taluk was ordered to the spot and on inspection by him it was found that land belonging to the Basavan-Kote village in Mysore had been included within the limits of the two British villages as shewn above.

4. The accompanying sketch map clearly shows the position of the boundary stones fixed by the Madras Survey Department, and the correct line of boundary in each case, which is marked as MNOP., between Sasvehalli and

Basavankote and as ABCD., between Kunimadihalli and Basavankote. The portion marked F is the encroachment referred to in para. 2.

5. This state of things appears to be due for the most part to the boundary marks of the Survey nos. in Mysore being in a worn out condition. The Survey of the British villages took place in 1889, while that of the Mysore village was made so long ago as 1867. No reference is forthcoming to show that the Basavankote village map was caused to be produced and consulted when the above named villages of Harpanhalli Taluk were surveyed.

6. Under the above circumstances, I am to request the favor of your moving the Resident to address the Madras Government in the matter, in view to the boundary stones of Survey nos. 100 and 443 of Sasvehalli and Kunimadihalli villages respectively, being removed to their proper places and the land encroached upon by the British ryot in Survey no. 200 of the Mysore village of Basavankote being relinquished with payment of proportionate Kandayam for 4 years as agreed to by him.

"Copy"

Henry Clarke
Registrar
Residents' Office, Bangalo

Col No. 1
Pol Cr No 1036

189 8
[illegible] DEPARTMENT
[illegible] No. 2
Current No. 2550

2
985

---

en given for copying______ }
en copied______ } 189 .
examined______ }
n signed______ }

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

MENT No.

DS TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

ER OF GOVERNMENT

EMENT WITH DITTO.

ERS 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.

$\frac{O}{9}$. 3,000—17-12-98.

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 869

DATED 28th February.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Ordering the publication of an erratum to the boundary descrip
of the Guligy reserve, Coimbatore Dt.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1251

SEC[illegible] [illegible] REV. DEP.

From
The Secretary to the Commissioners of L. Revenue
Board of Revenue
Madras.

No. 100 (Forest)

Dated 16th February 1899.
Received 18th " "
Registered 20th " "
Enclosures 2
Spare copies —

Sent 3-3-99

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government for approval and publication in the Fort St George Gazette of the draft erratum in respect of the Eastern boundary description of the Gulipy block in the Coimbatore District.

DF
28.2.99 Reasons for this coming at [illegible]
[illegible]
1.3.99

Order mi No 869 d/ 28th Feb 1899.

The draft erratum will be published in the Fort St George and Coimbatore district gazettes.

[illegible]
24/2/99

To the B.S: L.R with w.o.p.
" Supdt: Govt Press with notification.

Examiner to carry out the correction in all spare copies of G.O 279 d/ 16.5.98.

SM
22.2.99

Recd. 9/3/99

Spare copies of G.O. ~~279~~ 16.5.98 corrected.

[illegible] 10/3/99

BACK PAPERS

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	279		16.5.98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2,000
28-1-07.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 16th February 1899.

No. 100 Miscellaneous.

READ the following letter from C. H. Mounsey Esq., Ag. Collector of Coimbatore, Current no. $\frac{293}{\text{Forests}}$ of 98-99 dt. 11th January 1899, with the endorsement thereon of the Conservator of Forests S.C. no 1883 of 98-99 dt. 24th January 1899:—

I have the honour to inform you that in verifying the Sketch of Gulligy block of the Kollegal Taluk with its boundary description the following error has been noticed.

I therefore enclose for reference and return a true copy of the above Sketch and request that you will kindly order the publication of the erratum in the Fort St. George Gazette.

Fort St. George Gazette dated 27th May 1898. Page 479 no 250 Part I.

Line 24 of North and East boundary.

For	Read
Forty five and a half Chains to Cairn no 15	Thirty seven and a Quarter chains to Cairn no 15

Resolution

Resolution

Submitted to Government with the request that the annexed draft erratum in respect of the East boundary description of the Guligy Reserved Forest in the Coimbatore District may be approved and ordered to be published in the Fort St. George Gazette.

(True Extract)

Lionel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government R. D.

with notification & map (to be returned.)

Draft erratum

In notification No 250, published at page 479, Part I of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated, 27th May 1898, declaring the Guligy block in the Coimbatore District as a Reserved Forest, for the words "forty five and a half" occurring in the last line of the 'North and East' boundary description read "thirty seven and a quarter."

Lionel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

Gazette

G. O. No 809
26.12.98

hen given for copying
hen copied
Then examined
Then signed
} 189 .

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

URRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

RDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

ETTER OF GOVERNMENT

TATEMENT WITH DITTO.

APERS 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.

G.O. No 869
28-2-99

99
DEP
2
1251