

For Your Printing
SAIVA PRAKASA PRESS

THE Hindu Organ

FOR YOUR BOOKS
CONTACT
Saiva Prakasa Book Depot

Estd. Sept. 11, 1889,]

[The Only Newspaper in Ceylon for the Hindus]
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

PHONE No. 888

[Price 15 CENTS

VOL LXXXII

JAFFNA, FRIDAY MAY 8, 1970

NO. 5

The Law and the Common Man

BY

Hon. Dr. C. G. Weeramantry, L. D. (Lond.)
Puisne Justice

(Continued from our last issue)

Now again let us take something very fundamental. Take our very law of prescription. Ten years' adverse possession, was by Roman standards, or, by the standards of seventy five years ago, a long expanse of time, in the life of the individual. In times when the average life expectancy was in the region of thirty years (it was even less in Roman times) it comprised practically the entire life span after adulthood of the average citizen. But the pace of life has changed, and life expectancy has more than doubled. Ten years represents today, only a fraction of the span of life after adulthood, of the average citizen. Moreover the citizen of today lives under greater pressure, and has far more claims upon his time than the citizen of any other age. Ten years' inattention to property, may not deserve today, to attract the same drastic consequences, as it did, in an earlier age, particularly when one considers that prescription, all too often, gives legal validity to acts of usurpation. So do we think the ten year rule is adequate today, or, does it not at least need reconsideration?

To come now to more down to earth matters, what do we think of the operation of the Food and Drugs Act? Lunching out in cafes and eating houses, the working citizen must surely have observed violations of these rules, which could be obviated by appropriate improvements in the rules themselves. It is after all, his own health and the health of the community that these rules seek to protect, and if there are loopholes, and opportunities for evasion, gaps in the law which can be stopped, self interest and duty, both demand that the benefit of his experiences and his suggestions should be available to the authorities, and that more effective legislation should result from the pressure of his views. So also with our system of Motor Car Registration. I am sure many a car owner can offer suggestions with regard to ways and means in which the system of registration can be improved, particularly, having regard to the rules relating to the currency of insurance policies, and so on.

One final illustration to drive home this point may be drawn from the terrible boating tragedy that recently turned the North into a land of mourning. There have been many such tragedies in the past though on a smaller scale; but a complacent public, numbering among them so many who from their bitter personal experience could no doubt have offered suggestions for the improvement and the better implementation of existing regulations relating to boating, remained silent and inactive. The memory of each succeeding tragedy faded in due course and golden opportunities for improvement slipped away unused. Instead of this negative attitude a hundred suggestions may well have been made and much pressure of opinion built up for an amendment of the relevant laws and regulations so as to avert similar and other possible tragedies in the future.

One can go on unendingly and pile illustration upon illustration to demonstrate how the

citizen can by expressing his views build up, as I said, a body of opinion which would eventually result in moulding or remoulding the law. The citizen must not of course be disappointed if after he has made his views known, his views are not accepted, because it is clear that a final decision in regard to these matters can only be taken upon a consideration of a great number of views and a variety of other factors; but he will at least have the satisfaction that his views have not gone by default — and that is a very great thing. After all in the last analysis the law which the public gets is nothing other than the law which the public moulds.

I would like now to pass on to another aspect of the inadequacy of the citizen's contact with the law. The citizen all too often tends to view the legal process as being confined to the occasional criminal trial of a flashy and sensational nature which tends to hit the headlines. Little does he realise that the real work of the judiciary and of the profession is the settlement of humdrum day to day disputes, and that it is by this process that orderly life in society is maintained and remains possible. That is the backbone of the work of the profession, and the judiciary and the profession daily devote their best energy to that aspect of the law. But their best work attracts the least attention, and passes completely unnoticed by the citizen.

You may perhaps have heard the saying that broken contracts are more prolific of litigation than broken heads. The average citizen, however, tends to identify justice with the administration of criminal justice and to consider poison, the club and the dagger as the main sources of grist to the legal mill. It is a very lopsided view of the law that results. In consequence of this he tends to confuse and lose sight of even the very elementary differences in the civil and criminal standards of proof. That is a most fundamental matter which I think every citizen should know. Whereas the criminal charge has to be established beyond reasonable doubt, the judge in civil litigation only concerns himself with the question in whose favour the scales of justice tip. Should the scale tip ever so lightly in favour of one party, judgment would go to that party in a civil case, but in a criminal trial the mere fact that the scales tip in favour of the prosecution is an altogether insufficient basis on which to rest a conviction. The difference is not realised and very often citizens want to know why in a particular case with a fair amount of evidence which they consider is evidence indicative of guilt, there has been no conviction' quite oblivious of the very high standard of proof required in regard to a criminal case. But should it happen that a man has been convicted and has later been proved to have been convicted wrongly, that very same citizen would be the first to be scandalised at the miscarriage of justice thereby revealed. I think therefore that a keener awareness should be produced in the minds of the citizen that in regard to a criminal case it is only proof beyond reasonable doubt that is sufficient, because once a conviction has been entered, that is a process that cannot be reversed. It is better therefore that ten guilty men go unpunished rather than that in our anxiety to avenge a wrong, we should punish one innocent person by relaxing the rule requiring proof of criminal guilt beyond reasonable doubt. By contrast, in a civil case, one need only find out which of the contending parties has presented the stronger case, be the difference ever so slight. The difference between this latter standard — proof by a balance of probabilities and the former

(Continued on page 2)

SIVAN TEMPLE CONSECRATED IN CANADA

Things which one never expects to happen occur with the help of Providence and it is looked upon with great wonder. What is being referred to here is the building of a Sivan Temple in the city of Quebec in Canada, some years ago. No body ever dreamt that a temple dedicated to Lord Shiva in this materialistic age would be erected in a non-Hindu country.

During the years 1964 and 1965 Mr. James George was officiating in Ceylon as the Commissioner for Canada and he happened to meet Sri Yogar Swamy the noble sage of Colombergam whose spiritual attainments had blessed hundreds of individuals both indigenous and foreign. Mr. James George was richly benefited by his wisdom and was initiated into the mysticism of Shiva worship.

சிவசிவ என்கிலர் தீவினை
யுள்ளார்
கிவசிவ என்றிடத்தில்கினை
மாளுய்
சிவசிவ என்றிடத்தேவரு
மஹர்
கிவசிவ என்றிடச் சுவகதி
தானே,

He realised the benefit of worshipping Lord Shi-

(Continued on page 2)

TIME IS PRECIOUS
FOR INSTANT WASH
Use Milk White
Washing powder



COLLECT THE WRAPPERS
and
WIN PRIZES
MILK WHITE
SOAP WORKS
JAFFNA

THOUGHTS TO BE TREASURED

The wise will do no wrong actuated by envy as they realise that evil is bound to result from such wrong doing — Kural



தமிழகம் நமசிவாயவே ஐராளயுகம் தலைபும் தமசிவாயவே நாளறி விக்கலும் தமசிவாயவே நாளறித் தெத்துமே தமசிவாயவே தன்னறி கட்டுமே தமசிவாயவே.

Hindu Organ

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 1970

TASTE OF THINGS TO COME?

It is common ground that the full-throated shouting from political platforms especially during the time of a General Election constitutes empty threats or wishful thinking. However, when accredited leaders of responsible political parties declare from these platforms how they and their parties will seek revenge on those who fail to follow them and utter revolutionary threats, such statements must be understood in the sense that they are intimidatory and therefore tend to violate laws governing elections.

The announcement that People's Committees will be established by the Coalitionists once they get returned to power and that these committees will be the same as the Election Committees that do the canvassing at the May 1970 General Election for the S. L. F. P. the L. S. S. P. and the C. P. must be analytically studied for the veiled intimidation to be seen. Here is a promise to the agents and canvassers working for the Coalitionists that they who constitute Election Committees will, ipso facto, become members of the proposed People's Committees and enjoy authority to rule whatever the constitutional set up may be.

Mr. R. Premadasa, has pointedly referred to this announcement in a matter of fact manner and posed the question. "So, what are the local bodies for?" But deeper than that the mind of the common man who is devoted to the discipline of constitutional

rule sees in such irresponsible statements a challenge to law and order.

The mounting wave of methodical violence and the disclosure of the diabolical plans of a determined group of rabid revolutionaries who are reported to be carrying out their brutish activities at the behest of those who derive inducement from the death-dealing disruptors of foreign lands must certainly make leaders of recognized political parties of this country restrain themselves in speech and writing.

The common man cannot but become alarmed and frightened at the terrifying turn that may overtake the people. Hence the paramount duty of all national leaders to do their utmost to prevent a major catastrophe that is likely to be caused by the subversive tendencies of mischief mongers.

Sivan Temple.....

(Continued from page 1)

va uttering His name and meditating on Him in his heart.

When he was in Jaffna he became acquainted with Miss. Parvathy Sittambalam daughter of the late Pandit A. Sittambalam B. A. of Neeraviady. She was also a devotee of Sri Yogar Swamy and was following a course of higher studies at the University of Columbia U. S. A. Miss Parvathy is a humble, pious, modest person who leads a spiritual life and she loves to follow in the foot-steps of the Indian Saints. One Mrs. Olga Mago of South America was a pious disciple of Shivananda of Rishi Kesh. She received her initiation from Swamy Shivananda who gave her the name of Shanthi Devi according to Hindu tradition. He presented her a Saiva Linga for her worship. After some years she handed over the Shiva Linga to Miss. Parvathy who preserved it with great veneration and worshipped at her residence in U. S. A.

Mr. James George who happened to meet Miss. Parvathy at the Columbia University suggested his desire to build a temple for Lord Shiva in his own country of Canada. Miss. Parvathy welcomed his suggestion. They resolved to build a temple

and instal therein the Shiva Lingam presented to Shanthi Thevi by Swamy Shivananda.

In 1968 foundation for a temple was laid in the city of Quebec and the building was completed within one year. The consecration ceremony (Kumbabishekam) was performed by a North Indian Brahmin in the presence of a distinguished gathering. Regular poojas are now performed paying attention to purity which is essential for preserving the sanctity of a temple.

Thus we see how a young maiden who is engaged in the persecution of higher studies had contributed her service towards the building of a Sivan Temple in Canada.

The seed for the temple was sown by Sri Yogar Swamy in the heart of Mr. James George and when it was planted in the soil of Quebec. Swamy Shivananda had supplied the water needed for the sprouting of the seed and its growth into a tree

The blessings of two spiritual leaders had helped the building of this temple.

Funds for the temple were contributed by several well wishers, the chief among them being the Indian High Commissioner in U. S. A.

PARTITION NOTICE

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

No P/1317

- 1 Kanaganayagam Jabaratham and wife
2 Chandrawathana, both of 61 Arasady Road, Jaffna
Vs. Plaintiffs
Minor 1 Thambirajah Manoharan
.. 2 Thambirajah Lalitharani
.. 3 Thambirajah Manoharan
Appearing by their Guardian-ad-Litem the 4th Defendant
4 Vyramuthu Thambirajah, all of No. 61 Arasady Road, Jaffna Defendants

It is hereby notified that action No. P 1317 has been instituted in the District Court of Jaffna under the Partition Act No. 16 of 1951 for the partition/sale of the land/lands called 'Kusavankulam Karaiyaval Thalimadai and other parcels' in extent 9 kachchams V. O. and 3 kulies and situated at Vannarponnai North East. The defendants in the aforesaid action are summoned to appear in Court on the 17th day of May 1970, at 10 O'clock of the forenoon.

By Order of Court

T. Sivabalingham Secretary/Chief Clerk This 17th day of April 1970

All Ceylon Saiva Conference

MAY 11, 12 & 13, 1970

Three-Day Program For Scholars From South India

நாள்: சாதாரண ஞாயிறு சித்திரை மீ 28, 29, 30-ஆம் உ. திங்கள், செவ்வாய், புதன் (11, 12, 13-5-1970)

இடம்: சபை நாவலர் ஆச்சிரம மண்டபம்

மகாநாட்டுத் தலைவர்:

தருமையாதினத் தமிழ்ப் புலவர், சித்தாந்தக் கலைமணி, மகா வித்துவான், முதுபெரும் புலவர்

திரு சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள் (தருமபுரம் - தமிழ்நாடு)

சைவாபிமானிகள் அனைவரையும் அன்புடன் அழைக்கின்றோம்.

வே. நாகலிங்கம் தலைவர் மு. மயில்வாகனம் சமயப்பிரச்சார அமைச்சர் ஆ தனபாலசீங்கம் அரசியலறி யாழ்ப்பாணம். 4-5-70

சித்திரை 28 உ (11-5-70) திங்கள் உட்கிழமை

பிற்பகல்:

தலைவர்:

தருமையாதினப் புலவர், சித்தாந்தக் கலைமணி மகாவித்துவான், முதுபெரும் புலவர்

திரு. சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள்

- 4-00-- 4-30 ஆராதனை வண்ணார்பண்ணை வைத்தீஸ்வரன்கோயில்
4-30-- 5-30 ஊர்வலம் கோயிலில் இருந்து காங்கேசன்துறைவிதி வழியாக விழா மண்டபத்தை அடைதல் (பஜனைக்கொஷ்டிகள், நா தஸ்வரக்கொஷ்டிகள் பங்குபற்றும்)
5-30 -- 5-45 பூசை சாந்தி மங்கள பாடம் பிரம்மஸ்ரீ கி. தி. சீதாராமசாஸ்திரி அவர்கள்
5-45-- 6-00 தமிழ்மறை ஒதல் பன்னிசைப் புலவர் P. A. S. இராஜசேகரன் அவர்கள்
6-00-- 6-15 வரவேற்புரை சைவ பரிபாலனை சபைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்
6-15-- 6-30 வரவேற்புப் பா பாண்டித்தர் க. நமசிவாயம் அவர்கள்
6-30-- 8-00 தலைமைப்பேருரை
8-00-- 8-15 பூசை தேவாரபாராயணம்.

சித்திரை 29 உ (12-5-70) செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை

முற்பகல்:

தலைவர்:

தருமையாதினப் புலவர் சித்தாந்தக் கலைமணி திரு. சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள்

- 9-30-- 9-40 பூசை தேவார பாராயணம்
9-40--10-30 தலைவர் முன்னுரை
10-00--10-50 முருக இலக்கியம் பாண்டித்தர் திரு. பெரன். கிருஷ்ணபிள்ளை அவர்கள்
11-00--12-00 இலக்கியமும் சமய வாயுக்களையும் திரு. அ. பாலசுப்பிரமணியன் M. A. அவர்கள் பாடிநீராசிமயர், அ. வ. அ. கல்லூரி நாயுடுமே

ORDER NISI DECLARING WILL PROVED

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

Testamentary Jurisdiction No. 2575

In the matter of the Last Will and Testament of the late Sinniah Perampalam of Myliddy, Coasts

Deceased
Vallipuram Ramasamy of Myliddy Coast, Myliddy

Vs. Petitioner
1 Sivakany widow of Sinniah Perampalam
2 Vadivelu Selliah and wife
3 Nagapillai
4 Sellam widow of Thevarajah all of Myliddy Coast, Myliddy

Respondents
This matter coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail Esquire District Judge, Jaffna on the 20th day of March 1970 in the presence of Mr. A. Kumaraguru Proctor on the part of the Petitioner and the affidavit of the Petitioner dated 28th day of February 1970, and the affidavit of the Notary and Witnesses dated 1st day of March 1970

having been read, It is ordered that the Last Will and Testament of Sinniah Perampalam of Myliddy Coast deceased, dated 21st day of December 1968 attested by T. Gunaratnam, Notary Public under No 11900, the Original of which has been produced and is now deposited in Court be and the same is hereby declared proved, Unless the respondents or any other person or persons interested shall, on or before the 16th day of May 1970 show sufficient cause to the satisfaction of this Court to the contrary

It is further declared that the said petitioner is the Executor named in the said Last Will and Testament and that he is entitled to have probate of the same issued to him accordingly with a copy of the Will annexed unless the respondents or any others interested shall on or before the 16th day of May 1970 show sufficient cause to the satisfaction of this Court to the contrary

This 20th day of March 1970
R. Paramaguru
District Judge, Jaffna
20 8 & 15

The Law and the Common Man

(Continued from page 1)

standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt constitutes a necessary part of the citizen's elementary education if he is to take an intelligent interest in the working of the courts, an interest which it is his right as well as his duty, as a citizen, to take.

I pass now to an even more fundamental matter on which I think every citizen should have sounder knowledge than is now generally possessed. I refer to the important question of the rule of law. A knowledge of its fundamental principles is important for his protection, and is the surest guarantee against inroads upon his liberties. The rule, though it may not be stated in absolute terms, is easy to explain and has been broadly formulated in these terms by Lord Hewart, a former Lord Chief Justice of England, who did much to bring home to the public the importance of this concept: firstly, that no one can be lawfully restrained or punished except for a violation of the law established in proceedings regularly instituted in one of the ordinary courts of justice; secondly that everyone, whether he is a Minister of State or a high official or a humble soldier or policeman, is governed by the ordinary law of the land and is personally liable for anything done contrary to the law and that he is subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of the land and thirdly that no one charged with violation of the law can plead the consent of a superior or even of the sovereign himself by way of excuse that the maxim that the King can do no wrong is the equivalent of saying that the King cannot authorise a wrongful act in such a manner as to justify the wrong doer. To quote Dicey, "Every official from the Prime Minister down to a constable or a collector of taxes is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen." It is also important for the citizen to understand the numerous facets of this rule of law and the numerous rights it gives him his freedom of movement his right to a fair trial, his right of recourse to a court, his freedom from arrest and confinement, his right to know what the charges against him are if he is charged with a criminal offence, his right to counsel of his choice, his freedom of political activity, his freedom of conscience, the inviolability of his home and the importance of observing the principle of natural justice. All these and others too numerous to enumerate are facets of this broad general principle of which it is important that the citizen should be intensely aware. He should realise the full dignity of his position as a citizen enjoying the rule of law, a dignity which means, in the words of Kipling: "Leave to live by no means leave underneath the law." A grasp of this principle is essential to his appreciation of his full dignity as a citizen of our land.

Such an appreciation will make him more watchful also of legislation which seeks to place bureaucratic decisions beyond the reach of the ordinary courts of law. He must realise that all law making power is vested in Parliament alone and that those to whom this power is delegated by the supreme law making authority are strictly confined within the four corners of the powers given to them and may not even by so much as a hair's breadth travel beyond the scope of those powers. He must know that no Minister, no bureaucrat however highly placed, no corporation and no local body has a jot or tittle of law making power other than what Parliament has expressly conferred on them and he must be sufficiently aware of this principle to resist both in his own interests and for the general good, the slightest tendency towards a usurpation of law-making power.

In the same way the right to trial in the ordinary courts of the land is an inalienable right of the citizen of which again he should be so conscious that he will view with caution and scrutinise with care any measure which seeks to make encroachments upon the judicial powers of the courts.

To be Continued

ORDER NISI

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

Testamentary Jurisdiction No. T/4581

In the matter of the Last Will and Testament of the late Nathaniel Samuel Sabaratnasingham of Dispensary, Lane, Karainagar

Deceased
Ambelavanar Murugesu of Allen Lane, Karainagar

Vs. Petitioner

1 Mrs Elizabeth Ponnammah widow of Sabaratnasingham
G.A.L. 2 Sabaratnasingham Manoharan
3 Sabaratnasingham Mahendran
4 Miss Indirani Sabaratnasingham
5 Miss Chandrarany Sabaratnasingham
Minor 6 Sabaratnasingham Mathitharan, all of Dispensary Lane, Karainagar

Respondents

This matter coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail Esquire, District Judge Jaffna on the 31st day of March 1970 in the presence of Mr. C. Mahesan, Proctor on the part of the petitioner and the petition dated 18-3-1970 and affidavit of the petitioner dated 8-3-1970 and the affidavit of the witnesses dated 8-5-1970 the Last Will dated the 2nd day of November 1969 having been read.

It is ordered that the 2nd respondent be and he is hereby appointed as Guardian-ad-rem over the minor the other respondent abovenamed for the purpose of watching his interest in these proceedings.

It is further ordered that the Last Will of the deceased dated the 2nd day of November 1969 and now deposited in this court be and the same is hereby declared proved that the petitioner abovenamed as the Executor named in the said Will be and he is hereby declared entitled to obtain Probate thereof and that Probate be issued to him accordingly unless the respondents or any other person or persons interested in the subject matter of this application shall on or before the 2nd day of June 1970 at 10 a. m. show sufficient cause to the contrary.

It is further ordered that the 2nd respondent do produce the said minor the 6th respondent on the 2nd day of June 1970.

This 31st day of March 1970
Sgd. I. M. Ismail
District Judge, Jaffna

Drawn by
Sgd. C. Mahesan
Proctor for Petitioner

23 8 & 15

12-00—12-30 தலைவர் குறிப்புரை தேவாரம்
பிற்பகல்:
3-00—3-20 தமிழ்மறையோதல்
3-20—3-30 தலைவர் முன்னுரை
3-30—4-20 தேவார இன்பம் பண்டிதர் செ. சிவப்பிரகாசம் அவர்கள்
4-30—5-20 தமிழ் ஞானசம்பந்தர் பண்டிதை. சைவப்புலவர் தங்கம்மா அப்பாக்குட்டி அவர்கள்
5-20—6-30 ஞானம் ஈசன்பால் அன்பே சித்தாந்தக் கலைமணி சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள்
6-30—9-00 திருமுறை இசை விருந்து தேவாரமணி திரு. P. A. S. இராஜசேகரன் மாணவிகள் கடவுளாராதனை, தேவாரம்

சித்திரை 30 உ (13-5-70) புதன்கிழமை தலைவர் சைவப் புலவர்மணி திரு. த. குமாரசுவாமிப்பிள்ளை அவர்கள்
முற்பகல்:
9-30—9-40 பூசை, தேவார பாராயணம். தலைவர் முன்னுரை
9-40—10-00 சிவம் பெருக்கும் பிள்ளையார் தருமையாதினப் புலவர் திரு. சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள்
10-00—11-00 சேக்கிழார் தெய்வத் தமிழ் திரு. அ. பாலசுவாமிநாதன் M. A. அவர்கள் பயிற்றுசிரியர் அ. வ. அ. கல்லூரி மாபூரம்
11-10—12-10 தலைவர் குறிப்புரை தேவாரம்.
தலைவர்:
சித்தாந்த வித்தகர் திரு. வே. நாகலிங்கம் J. P.; U. M. அவர்கள் (தலைவர், சைவ பரிபாலனசபை, யாழ்ப்பாணம்)
3-00—3-20 தேவார பாராயணம்
3-20—3-35 தலைவர் முன்னுரை
3-35—4-30 சைவ நூற்பாடம் பண்டிதர் மு. கந்தையா, B. A.
4-30—4-45 தீர்மானங்கள்
4-45—5-00 சைவப்புலவர் முதலிய தேர்வுகளில் சித்தியடைந்த வர்களுக்கு தராதரம் பத்திரம் வழங்குதல்.
5-00—6-00 வன்முறைபடுது வன்மையும் மென்மையும் தருமையாதினப் புலவர் திரு. சி. அருணைவடிவேல் முதலியார் அவர்கள்
6-00—6-15 நன்றிப்புரை சித்தாந்த சிரோமணி திரு. மு. மயில்வாகனம் அவர்கள்
6-30—9-00 திருமுறைப் பண்ணிசைக் கச்சேரி காஞ்சிபுரம் மெய்கண்டாராதினப் பண்ணிசைப் புலவர் தேவார இன்னிசைச் செல்வன், தேவார மணி, தமிழ் இசைமணி P. A. S. இராஜசேகரன் அவர்கள் பூசை, தேவார பாராயணம்:

12-ஆம், 13-ஆம் தேதிகளில் மத்தியான பேரணம் அளிக்கப்படும்.

NOTICE

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF POINT PEDRO

No. 10715

1 Naganathar Chittiravelu
2 wife Sinnappillai of Alvai South

Vs. Plaintiff

1 Sinnathamby Sinnadurai
2 wife Eledehumippillai of Puloly West
3 Mutter Subramaniyam
4 Mutter Ponnambalam
5 Mutter Kandavavam all of Alvai South
6 Mutter Maniccam of Policandy
7 Mutter Muruguppillai Mailvaganam
8 Nagappan Chinniah
9 wife Sivahamippillai
10 A. Thamer Sinnadurai all of Alvai South
11 Chellappan Subramaniyam of Alvai North
12 Mutter Muruguppillai of Alvai South

Defendants

It is hereby notified that action No. 10715 has been instituted in the District Court of Point Pedro under the partition act No. 16 of 1951 for the partition/sale of the land called Muvveddiyanchima in extent 14, 1/4 Lms. v. c. and situated at Alvai Imayanankuruchchi, in Kaddaively Parish Vadamaratchchi Division Jaffna Dist. N P.

The defendants in the aforesaid action are summoned to appear in Court on the 31st day of May 1970 at 10 O'clock of the forenoon.

By order of Court Rajah for Secretary / Chief Clerk

Drawn by Ratnasingham & Subramaniam Proctors for Plaintiff This 16th day of March 1970

Order Absolute in the First Instance

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

Testamentary Jurisdiction No. 2579

In the matter of the Last Will and Testament of the late Thambiah Kulasegaram of Colombogam Road, Chundikuli, Jaffna.

Deceased

Seethiradevi widow of Thambiah Kulasegaram of Colombogam, Chundikuli, Jaffna. Vs. Petitioner

This matter coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail,

Esquire, District Judge, Jaffna on the 1st day of April 1970 in the presence of Mr K. Gnanachandran Proctor on the part of the Petitioner and the affidavit of the Petitioner dated 11th day of March 1970 and the affidavit of the attesting Notary Public, and the witnesses to the Last Will and Testament dated the 11th day of March 1970 having been read.

It is ordered that the Last Will and Testament No 3347 made by the deceased abovenamed jointly with the Petitioner abovenamed on the 13th day of October 1968 and attested by Kanagasabai Gnanachandran of Chavakachcheri Notary Public, the original of which has been produced and is now deposited in court be and the same is hereby declared proved and it is further ordered that the petitioner abovenamed is the Executrix and sole heir named in the said Will and that she is hereby declared entitled to have Probate thereof issued to her accordingly on her taking the usual Oath and tendering security.

This 1st day of April 1970.

Sgd. I. M. Ismail District Judge.

Drawn by Sgd. K. Gnanachandran Proctor for Petitioner

14 1 & 8

ORDER NISI

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

Testy No. T. 2634

In the matter of the intestate estate of the late Sinnathamby Muttiah of Chankanal East

Deceased

Kanagammah widow of S Muttiah of Chankanal East

Vs. Petitioner

1 Muttiah Mathipoo-shanam

Minor 2 Muttiah Thirulogar aged at 20 years both of Chankanal East

Respondents

This matter coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail Esquire District Judge of Jaffna on the 23rd day of October 1969 in the presence of Messrs. M. K. Subramaniam and V. Paramanandan Proctors on the part of the petitioner and the affidavit of the petitioner dated 12th October 1969 having been read,

It is ordered that the 1st respondent be appointed guardian-ad-litem over the 1st respondent minor, that the petitioner abovenamed be and she is hereby declared entitled to as lawful widow of the abovenamed deceased to have Letters of Administration to the estate of the abovenamed deceased and the same be issued to her accordingly unless the respondents or any other person or persons interested shall show sufficient cause to the satisfaction of this Court to the

Order 'Nisi' Declaring Will Proved &c

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

No. Testy/2555

In the matter of the Last Will and Testament of the late Ramalingam Sivasubramaniam of Kokuvil East, East, Jaffna

Deceased

Ganesharatnam Kanagasabapathy of Kokuvil East, Jaffna

Vs. Petitioner

1 Neeladevi Neelakandar
2 Koneswari Senageratnam
3 Indumathy Kanagasabapathy
4 Padmavathy Rajah
5 Arunassalam Manickavasagar
6 Annapooranam widow of Kandappasegaram
7 Manomany widow of Neelakandar all of Kokuvil East, Kokuvil
8 Seethalechumy and her husband
9 Sampantnar Senakarotnam of Neervely

Respondents

This matter coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail, Esquire, District Judge, Jaffna, on the 10th day of December, 1969, in the presence of Mr. T. Sangarapillai, Proctor on the part of the Petitioner and the affidavit of the Petitioner dated the 19th day of November 1969 and the Affidavit of the Notary and the witnesses dated the 19th day of December having been read.

It is ordered that the Will of Ramalingam Sivasubramaniam, deceased dated 20th August 1968 and attested by M. Sittampalam, Notary Public, and numbered 115 and produced in this case be and the same is hereby declared proved and that the Petitioner abovenamed is the executor named in the said Will and that he is entitled to have Letters of Administration with the Will annexed and the same issued to him accordingly, unless the respondents or others interested shall on or before 13th day of March 1970 show sufficient cause to the satisfaction of court to the contrary

This 10th day of December 1970

Sgd I M Ismail District Judge, Jaffna.

Drawn by Sgd. T. Sangarapillai Proctor for Petitioner 13-3-1970

Time to show cause is extended to 16-5-1970

Sgd. I. M. Ismail District Judge.

22 8 & 15

contrary on or before the 26th day of January 1969.

This 23rd day of October 1969

Sgd. I. M. Ismail District Judge

The date for showing cause is extended to 5th March 1970

Sgd I. M. Ismail District Judge.

23-10

The date for showing cause is extended to 16th May 1970

Sgd. K. E. Kathirgamellogam Aotg. District Judge 5-3-70

16 1 & 8

ORDER NISI

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF POINT PEDRO

Testamentary Jurisdiction No. 965

In the matter of the Intestate estate of the late Kandasamy Ratnasingham of Puloly East.

Deceased

Packiam widow of Ratnasingham of Puloly East.

Vs. Petitioner

1 Ratnasingham Rajanayagam
2 Ratnasingham Sri-tharan
3 Kalawathy daughter of Ratnasingham all of Puloly East.

Respondents

This matter coming on before C. M. Tharmalingam Esquire, District Judge, Point Pedro on the 14th day of August 1969, in the presence of Mr. M. Eswarapadaam Proctor for the petitioner and the petition and affidavit of the Petitioner having been read.

It is ordered that the 1st Respondent be appointed Guardian-Ad-Litem of the minor the 3rd Respondent that the Petitioner as widow of the abovenamed deceased be declared entitled to obtain Letters of Administration to his estate and that Letters of Administration be issued to the petitioner unless the Respondents or any other person interested appears before the 28th day of September 1969 and show cause to the satisfaction of this court to the contrary.

This 19th day of August 1969.

Sgd C. M. Tharmalingam District Judge

Time to show cause extended to 15-5-1970

Intld. C. M. T. D J.

018 1 & 8)

ORDER NISI

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

Testamentary Jurisdiction No. 2577

In the matter of the intestate Estate of the late Ramalingam Ponnambalam of Ponnavaalai, Karainagar

Deceased

Theivanaippillai widow of R. Ponnambalam of Ponnavaalai, Karainagar Vs. Petitioner

Ramalingam Nedarajah of Ponnavaalai, Karainagar Respondent

This matter of the Petition of the abovenamed Petitioner coming on for disposal before I. M. Ismail

செய்துள்ள இரண்டு மாதங்களுக்கு முன்பு கையாண்டுள்ள பத்திரிகை மூலம் பண்பாளர் குடும்பத்தின் மூலம் மூலக்கிரையாக உட்கார்ந்திருக்கின்ற இரண்டு மாதங்களுக்கு முன்பு கையாண்டுள்ள பத்திரிகை மூலம் பண்பாளர் குடும்பத்தின் மூலம் மூலக்கிரையாக உட்கார்ந்திருக்கின்ற.

Printed and published by Mr. M. Myivaganam residing at No. 7, Second Lane Brown Road Jaffna, for and on behalf of the Proprietors, the Saiva Paripalana Sabha, Jaffna, at their Press, the Saiva-Prakasam Press, 450 K. K. S. Road Vannarponnai, Jaffna, on Friday May 8, 1970

Editor: R. N. SIVAPRakasam

PARTITION NOTICE

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF JAFFNA

No. P/1256

1 Visuvanathar Manickam and
2 wife Sinnammah both of Vannarponnai West.

Vs. Plaintiff

1 Kanthasamy Kugathasan and
2 wife Parwathy both of Nainativu. Defendants

It is hereby noticed that action No P/1256 has been instituted in the District Court of Jaffna under the partition act No 16 of 1951 for the partition/sale of the land/lands called 'Iyankanchodam add Karuppankurai' in extent Sixteen Lachams Varagu Culture (16 Lms V. C.) and situated at Nainativu in the Parish of Nainativu, Islands Division, Jaffna District Northern Province.

The defendants in the aforesaid action are summoned to appear in Court on the 17th day of May 1970 at 10 O'clock of the forenoon.

By order of Court Sgd. S. T. Sivabalasingam Secretary/Chief Clerk This 4th day of May 1970 (21 8 5)

mail, Esquire, District Judge, Jaffna on the 20th day of March 1970 in the presence of Mr K. Arumugam, Proctor on the part of the Petitioner and and the affidavit of the abovenamed Petitioner dated the 3rd day of March 1970 having been read.

It is ordered that the abovenamed Petitioner be declared entitled as widow of the abovenamed deceased to have Letters of Administration to the above estate issued to her accordingly unless the Respondent or any other person or persons interested shall appear before this court on the 16th day of May 1970 and show sufficient cause to the contrary.

This 20th day of March 1970

Sgd I. M. Ismail District Judge

10 4 & 11