

Paddy Processing Research Centre,  
Vijayapuram,  
Tiruvavur,  
TamilNadu,  
13--4--74.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
No.53, Thirteenth Cross,  
Malleswaram,  
BANGALORE-3.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

Your letter of 5/4, together with the enclosure, was received here during my absence from station. I was in Madras on the 9th, in Mysore on the 10th and back again in Madras on the 11th before returning to this place on the 12th morning. Prior to my visiting Mysore, I had written to Dr. Swaminathan and also had a meeting with him on the evening of the 10th. I had however no time to meet my lawyer or any one else in regard to the matter.

I had sent in advance to Dr. Swaminathan a letter dt. 30/3/74 which I received from the DGSIR. He, in turn, conveyed to me the gist of what Shri Krishnamurthi had conveyed in his letter dt. 28/3/74. I enclose herewith a copy of the letter which I had received from the D.G.

Reading between the contents of the two letters, it is my impression that, having already circulated a proposal for arbitration, the CSIR will not take any further initiative in proposing any compromise formula. It may not however oppose any proposal for compromise if the initiative is taken by you and it conforms to the requirements stipulated in Shri Krishnamurthi's letter.

I do not know as to what proposals you have made and what the seven people in Mysore have agreed to. I may mention however that the compromise formula outlined in your letter of 25/3 is not the same as what I had proposed and to which you had also agreed. I had proposed that all payments to be made after the Minister's order of 30/4/69 should be according to the E.O's recommendation of 1963. You had agreed to it. If I remember right, the CSIR did not make any payment during 1969.

The CSIR had made payments upto a certain period. The money payable after that period is now with the CSIR. According to the terms that you had agreed to, the money now available with the CSIR and any to be received later will be divisible according to the 1963 decision.

I have given the above as an interpretation so as to avoid any misunderstanding. I have no personal interest in the

amount involved as I have already proposed to give it away for certain causes.

I have already conveyed my agreement to the proposal for arbitration on the terms proposed by the CSIR. I am equally agreeable to a compromise as reached between the beneficiaries provided the details are clear and unequivocal and will not lead to any further complain or even litigation. The best course will be to first have the wordings drafted by the lawyers as suggested in Shri Krishnamurthi's letter dt. 28/3/74. If it conforms in principle to what we had agreed upon, the lawyers will then be only concerned with the wording.

After having got the proposal suitably worded, the lawyers may themselves be requested to draft the letter to be addressed to all the participants. That should give related background without going into the merits or demerits of arbitration. They can state however that one of the participants is hesitant about accepting arbitration as the means of settlement. Relevant extract from Shri Krishnamurthi's letter of 28/3 will be sufficient. You may then circulate the letter with the proposals to all concerned with the request that they would convey their concurrence before a certain date. If the lawyers themselves can circulate such a letter, it may be better in certain ways.

I cannot help feeling that such an approach will be necessary because the people who are now abroad will not otherwise have a clear picture of what it is all about. As far as I am aware all of them have already agreed to arbitration. They will begin <sup>to</sup> wonder why a new proposal has now come up. They are not likely to worry about the money, but they may be more concerned with the need for a change in the commitment - from arbitration by an eminent Jurist to a compromise formula as agreed between some of the participants. They must know that the CSIR has no objection to accepting a compromise formula as reached between individuals as an alternative to arbitration.


I am sending a copy of this letter to my lawyer. If I remember right, he also represents the CSIR and Dr. Bhatia. If he and your lawyer can get together, a workable procedure can be evolved. They should have before them the formula which we had agreed upon, so that it will then be only a matter of wording the proposal. They should also convey your written concurrence for the withdrawal of the case from the Court. The others concerned should also convey that they will not start any litigation after the compromise formula is agreed upon.

All of us are agreed that the court case has already dragged on for ~~the~~ too long a period. Apart from what we wish to do with whatever we may receive, there are the interests of the lower ~~paid~~ paid staff who have been counting on getting this money as some thing for their future.

If the compromise formula is to succeed it should be made sufficiently convincing to all concerned. If there is even a single dissentient, it will not go through. It is very important therefore that a proper case should be made out when circulating the papers.

With my greetings and best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

  
(V. SUBRAHMANYAM)

15-4-74.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
No.53, Thirteenth Cross,  
Malleswaram,  
BANGALORE-3.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

Considering the trends in the recent correspondence, I have now begun to feel that even the drafting of the 'form of consent' by the two advocates may become a long-drawn process unless we can both meet with them and provide them with the necessary guide lines. There is a fair chance that if the two advocates would kindly agree to take the initiative and provide the background information, all concerned may agree.

I have been suggesting to Dr. Swaminathan that he may meet with you; but, even that, may not be very effective unless we can provide some thing tangible for the lawyers to act on.

I have suggested to my lawyer - who also represents the CSIR and Dr. Bhatia - that you and I may have a meeting with him and your lawyer, along with Dr. Swaminathan, some time towards the end of this month or even early next month. We should have ample margin of time for finding a free date and also to make travel arrangements. We may all meet at some place selected by the two advocates in Mysore

The meeting may not take much time as we have already cleared most of the ground. We have only to decide on the wording of the form of consent in such a manner as to make it acceptable to all the others concerned.

When drafting the form of consent, the lawyers should make it clear that, though it had been proposed earlier to have an arbitrator, the CSIR has no objection to an alternative form of settlement as mutually agreed upon between the different participants; that we have no further interest in the part issues; that we recognize and accept as final all distributions as so far made; that the payments to be made in the future, including the money now withheld by the CSIR, will be on the basis of the E.C's recommendation of 1963.

Instead of meeting as litigants, we may meet as friends interested in finding a quick and mutually acceptable solution. When we meet face to face in a spirit of good-will, all doubts and diffidence will disappear. The lawyers will also forget that they are representing different sides and do their best to help us.

You may have already noted that in my offer to surrender my share for the benefit of certain institutions, I have left .. 2

all the residuary benefit to the CPTRI. It is not material to me whether I get more or less; but it is the CPTRI - and particularly the lower paid staff - who will benefit to a greater or less extent.

Please do consult with your lawyer, who may also contact my lawyer, for fixing a convenient date or even a range of dates and informing us in advance. I will come to Mysore for the meeting. You may also kindly arrange it accordingly.

Thanking you for kind, early advice and with my best regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

P.S.

You are no doubt aware that the Kaira Coop. Milk Producers Union is paying royalty on less than a third of its total production. The argument used is that the royalty is payable only on the roller dried product. They seem to have forgotten that the first product made at Anand was the spray-dried product and that it was this which was used for all evaluations. At that time, they had not perfected gas-packing and we felt that the product would have better shelf life if they start with roller drying. This will not mean that we had not thought of or omitted to try spray drying.

The NRDC did raise this issue some years ago when I was Adviser to the Govt. of India. I explained the position I do not know whether a similar reference had been made to the CPTRI. Whatever be the reason, the NRDC did not pursue the matter.

Though I had initiated all the talks, starting with Seth Kasturbhai Lalbhai (who was then Chairman of the NRDC), the NRDC did not show me the terms of agreement with the Kaira Union. I have suggested to the CSIR that the terms may now be studied to see whether there is any specific reference to the exclusive use of roller drying. On the basis of it, the NRDC may make a fresh approach to the Kaira Union - if there is a case. The Union may at least make a contribution towards the welfare of the staff of CPTRI.

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

53, XIII Cross Road, Malleswaram,  
Bangalore 560003

Dated 25 March 1974.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyan,

As possibly you know, I hesitated to sign the agreement regarding the arbitration. My reasons were; after having spent considerable money and effort ~~in~~for getting a court decision, there was no purpose ~~for~~ going for arbitration (2) arbitration is final and there is no appeal against it (3) arbitration proceedings will be held in Delhi and not in Mysore. When I went to Delhi recently, I met the DG and put forward my earlier suggestion of compromise. Since you had also agreed to this earlier, I suggested to the DG that the CSIR should get the consent of all the parties for compromise and close the issue as early as possible. The compromise I have suggested is as follows; (a) the royalties will be distributed according to the formula in practice till the end of 1969 (b) from 1970 January, the formula will be changed to that prescribed in the EC meeting of 1963. (c) all other matters arising out of this will be considered closed by all the parties concerned. If you also feel that we can bring the matter to a close as suggested above, I would request you to write to the DG conveying your consent.

Trusting that this finds you in the best of health and with kind regards,

I am yours faithfully,

M. R. Chandrasekhara

Dr. V. Subrahmanyan,  
Project Head,  
Paddy Processing Research Centre  
Modern Rice Mill  
Vijayapuram, (P.O.)  
Tiruvarur 610108  
Tamil Nadu.

1-4-74.

Shri N.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Malleswaram,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekharaj

I am sorry for the delay in acknowledging your letter of 25/3/74.

It is quite some time since I forwarded the proposal for a compromise along the lines which I had proposed and to which you had also agreed. The Director-General, whom I met later in Delhi, pointed out that any such compromise, as reached between two individuals, may not be acceptable to others and may even lead to further litigation.

He then reiterated his earlier proposal for arbitration by an eminent Jurist and to which some of us, including yourself, had agreed at an earlier date (1972).

Following this, we had all received the communication from the Secretary CSIR asking us to state whether we are agreeable to the arbitration on certain terms. I have already conveyed my concurrence.

We are all anxious to have the matter settled as quickly as possible. The D.G. is certain to choose an eminent jurist who will approach the subject with an open mind. The latter will like to have a free hand in respect of the manner in which he will set about his function.

I have personally no experience of any arbitration. I do not know whether there will be any thing like arbitration proceedings or whether it will be in Delhi or Bangalore.

In spite of his preoccupations, the D.G. had taken interest in helping us to get the matter settled quickly out of court. He is now suggesting a procedure to which we had previously agreed.

With the above as the background, I do not see much point in approaching him again with the compromise proposal which he does not consider to be legally proper. If we had agreed to the arbitration in 1972, it will be equally binding on us to accept it in 1974. We have to repose confidence in him and leave it to him to do what he considers to be proper.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

1-4-74.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Malleswaran,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekharay

I am sorry for the delay in acknowledging your letter of 25/3/74.

It is quite some time since I forwarded the proposal for a compromise along the lines which I had proposed and to which you had also agreed. The Director-General, whom I met later in Delhi, pointed out that any such compromise, as reached between two individuals, may not be acceptable to others and may even lead to further litigation.

He then reiterated his earlier proposal for arbitration by an eminent Jurist and to which some of us, including yourself, had agreed at an earlier date (1972).

Following this, we had all received the communication from the Secretary CEIR asking us to state whether we are agreeable to the arbitration on certain terms. I have already conveyed my concurrence.

We are all anxious to have the matter settled as quickly as possible. The D.G. is certain to choose an eminent jurist who will approach the subject with an open mind. The latter will like to have a free hand in respect of the manner in which he will set about his function.

I have personally no experience of any arbitration. I do not know whether there will be any thing like arbitration proceedings or whether it will be in Delhi or Bangalore.

In spite of his preoccupations, the D.G. had taken interest in helping us to get the matter settled quickly out of court. He is now suggesting a procedure to which we had previously agreed.

With the above as the background, I do not see much point in approaching him again with the compromise proposal which he does not consider to be legally proper. If we had agreed to the arbitration in 1972, it will be equally binding on us to accept it in 1974. We have to repose confidence in him and leave it to him to do what he considers to be proper.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

No. 53, XIII Cross,  
Malleswaram,  
Bangalore-3.

April 5, 1974.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyam,

Thank you for your letter of 1.4.74. I hope the marriage of your son went off in a very pleasant way. I have already sent my felicitation to the bride and the groom.

My letter of 25.3.74 to you was only after a talk with the D.G., Sri Krishnamurthy and the Law Officer. The D.G. was kind enough to spare a few minutes of his precious time and discuss with me all the possibilities. It was only after I received his assurance that I met Shri Krishnamurthy and the Law Officer. My letter to you was consequent on the assurance received from these to the effect that if all of us agree, the matter could be settled out of court. Subsequently I had a talk with the other colleagues at Mysore including Dr. Swaminathan. They have all agreed to the proposal put forward by me. I am endorsing the copy of the letter of Shri Krishnamurthy to me to substantiate what I have mentioned above.

Unless the proposal is pushed through now, I am afraid we will again end up with a stalemate. As I have already written to you I am not happy about arbitration. Also if the arbitration is held ~~up~~ at Delhi, it is possible that it may be prejudiced because the case may not be presented in the proper perspective. Under the circumstances, if you also feel that we should bring an end to the litigation, you may kindly consider the alternative proposal of compromise and write to D.G. indicating your consent to the same. I hope this finds you in the best of health.

With kind regards,

Dr. V. Subrahmanyam,  
Head, Paddy Processing Research Centre,  
Modern Rice Mills, TIRUVARUR.

I am, Yours sincerely,  
*M. R. Chandrasekhara*  
(M.R. Chandrasekhara)

P.S. Just today I received the agreement signed by seven people in Mysore. I am sending them to CSIR.

Dated 22 April 1974.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyan,

Thank you for your two letters of 13.4.74 and 15.4.74.

The DG.SIR and the Chief(Admn) have both agreed to consider the proposals of compromise, I have put forward. The proposals have already been sent to you in my letter dated 25.3.74. I had written to you in my letter of 25.9.73 that the condition for compromise could be only on the basis that there can be no modification of the existing pattern of payment up to 1969. and any change could only be prospective to that date., i.e. from 1970. I have not changed this stand.

I have suggested this as a compromise because several of the other participants have also expressed their concern over the long drawn out litigation. I am also not anxious to have litigation against CSIR, I would never have taken recourse to legal action against CSIR, if they had not been so unjust as to issue a mandate against me without any other consideration except to be vindictive.

I have no doubt that in the research work on Amul Baby Food, the major portion of the work was done by Dr. Swaminathan and me. It is only on this consideration that the Executive Council awarded a higher share to me. At no time did I plead before the Executive Council or any individual, that I should be given such and such a share. I am prepared to forego a part of my share of the royalties from 1970. I expect that the others also will show a similar consideration. I am sorry I cannot change my stand now. I am not anxious to attend any meeting to resolve this now. I have already consulted most of my colleagues at Mysore who have shown a remarkable degree of compromise. If the compromise cannot come through on the basis suggested now, I am afraid I have no other go except to request my lawyer to continue the proceedings. I will be very sorry for this, not only from my point of view, but also for the sake of others, who are in greater need of the money. I am still hoping that you will agree to this, so that we can finish it early.

The question of royalty on the spraydried baby food was discussed in detail some time back. I gave my opinion then that the CSIR should not take any legal action on the KDCMPU, because of the good relations we have always had with them. I am still of the same opinion.

With kind regards,

I am yours Sincerely

M. R. Choudhary

11-5-74.

Shri W.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Halleswaram,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I delayed replying to your letter of April 22 because I was anxious to find a method of approach that will minimise the need for any controversy or difference of opinion or interpretation over the issue.

I enclose herewith a copy of my letter dated 4/5/74 as addressed to my lawyer.

Having explained the position, I have now left it to the two lawyers to draft the form of consent in any manner which they consider to be proper. I have stated my preparedness to accept any wording which they may both agree upon.

I have also suggested that the two lawyers may jointly take the initiative in circulating the form of consent. There should also be some preamble to explain why the earlier proposal of the CSIR in respect of arbitration is not being pursued. If however the lawyers are of the opinion that you should take the initiative in circulating the form of consent as drafted by them, I would be quite agreeable to it.

With the present difficulties and delays in mail transit, I do not know as to when this letter will reach you. I am hoping however that my letter dt.4/5/74 has already reached my lawyer. I am also sending him a copy of this letter. I trust that the suggestions which I have made will be found to be constructive and will be acted upon. The lawyers may, in all probability, like to refer to the Law Officer of the CSIR before finding their wording and evolving a procedure for circulating the form of consent.

Before concluding, I wish to repeat that I wish to end all controversy over the subject and that I am agreeable to accepting any wording and procedure which the two lawyers may agree upon, with the prior concurrence of the Law Officer of the CSIR. I also trust that, on the basis of what the legal experts agree upon and suggest, further action will soon follow.

With my kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

11-5-74.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Haleswaram,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I delayed replying to your letter of April 22 because I was anxious to find a method of approach that will minimise the need for any controversy or difference of opinion or interpretation over the issue.

I enclose herewith a copy of my letter dated 4/5/74 as addressed to my lawyer.

Having explained the position, I have now left it to the two lawyers to draft the form of consent in any manner which they consider to be proper. I have stated my preparedness to accept any wording which they may both agree upon.

I have also suggested that the two lawyers may jointly take the initiative in circulating the form of consent. There should also be some preamble to explain why the earlier proposal of the CSIR in respect of arbitration is not being pursued. If however the lawyers are of the opinion that you should take the initiative in circulating the form of consent as drafted by them, I would be quite agreeable to it.

With the present difficulties and delays in mail transit, I do not know as to when this letter will reach you. I am hoping however that my letter dt.4/5/74 has already reached my lawyer. I am also sending him a copy of this letter. I trust that the suggestions which I have made will be found to be constructive and will be acted upon. The lawyers may, in all probability, like to refer to the Law Officer of the CSIR before finding their wording and evolving a procedure for circulating the form of consent.

Before concluding, I wish to repeat that I wish to end all controversy over the subject and that I am agreeable to accepting any wording and procedure which the two lawyers may agree upon, with the prior concurrence of the Law Officer of the CSIR. I also trust that, on the basis of what the legal experts agree upon and suggest, further action will soon follow.

With my kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAM)

PADDY PROCESSING RESEARCH CENTRE,  
MODERN RICE MILL,  
VIJAYAPURAM 610108 (TAMIL NADU.)  
11-5-74.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Malleswara,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I delayed replying to your letter of April 22 because I was anxious to find a method of approach that will minimise the need for any controversy or difference of opinion or interpretation over the issue.

I enclose herewith a copy of my letter dated 4/5/74 as addressed to my lawyer.

Having explained the position, I have now left it to the two lawyers to draft the form of consent in any manner which they consider to be proper. I have stated my preparedness to accept any wording which they may both agree upon.

I have also suggested that the two lawyers may jointly take the initiative in circulating the form of consent. There should also be some preamble to explain why the earlier proposal of the CSIR in respect of arbitration is not being pursued. If however the lawyers are of the opinion that you should take the initiative in circulating the form of consent as drafted by them, I would be quite agreeable to it.

With the present difficulties and delays in mail transit, I do not know as to when this letter will reach you. I am hoping however that my letter dt.4/5/74 has already reached my lawyer. I am also sending him a copy of this letter. I trust that the suggestions which I have made will be found to be constructive and will be acted upon. The lawyers may, in all probability, like to refer to the Law Officer of the CSIR before finding their wording and evolving a procedure for circulating the form of consent.

Before concluding, I wish to repeat that I wish to end all controversy over the subject and that I am agreeable to accepting any wording and procedure which the two lawyers may agree upon, with the prior concurrence of the Law Officer of the CSIR. I also trust that, on the basis of what the legal experts agree upon and suggest, further action will soon follow.

With my kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAM)

PADDY PROCESSING RESEARCH CENTRE,  
MODERN RICE MILL,  
VIJAYAPURAM 610108 (TAMILNADU.)

24-6-74.

Dr. V. SUBRAHMANYAN,  
Project Head.

Shri M.K. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Wallaswaram,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I am thankful to you for your letter of 20th inst. and the enclosed copy of the agreement for settlement as approved by the two lawyers.

I have already agreed to accept any agreement as reached jointly by the two lawyers. I am accordingly signing the paper and sending it to the Chief of Administration (Shri K.C. Krishnamurthi) of the CSIR.

I trust that, on the basis of the above and other similar paper signed by the other defendants, the lawyers can report about the settlement to the Court at its sitting on 12/7/74.

At least three of the defendants are now outside the country. I hope that you have already contacted them. Their concurrence will also be needed. There is a fair chance that they may agree if you could explain the background to them and also convey that all of us in India have agreed to accept the proposal as a basis for settlement.

With many thanks for your kind interest and efforts and with my best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

P. C. Bhatt, B.A.,  
LAWYER

PHONES { RESIDENCE : 23069  
OFFICE : 21214

M. R. Narayanaswamy,  
B.A., LL.B.,  
ADVOCATE, SUPREME COURT  
RESIDENCE : "DEEPAKMALA"  
1077, NARASARAJA ROAD, MYSORE-4

SAYYAJI RAO ROAD  
MYSORE-I

Ref. No.

672

12-6-1974.

To

Sri. V. Subrahmanyam,  
Tamilnadu.

Sir,


Re: O.S.No.74 of 1969 -  
M.R.Chandrasekhara.

---

The case stands posted for settlement  
of evidence to 12-7-1974.

I understand that the other defendants  
have been on the move to get the settlement  
papers signed. As intimated to you earlier,  
the draft settlement has been made by me in  
consultation with the plaintiff's advocate,  
copy whereof is sent to you already.

Yours faithfully,



Very many  
thanks for your  
kind response  
and for the  
copy of the  
settlement  
papers.  
M.R.

M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

53 XIII CROSS RD? Malleswaram  
Bangalore, 560003  
Dated 20 June 1974.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyam,

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the agreement as approved by the two lawyers, i.e., Sri. Krishnarao and Sri.M.R.Narayanaswamy. I will be much obliged if you can kindly sign this and send it to Sri.Krishnsmurthi of CSIR. The court has adjourned the case to 12th July when either the settlement has to be reported or the trial has to be started. Hence I request that you may kindly send this to CSIR early.

Trusting that this finds you in the best of health and with kind regards,

I am yours\* sincerely,

*M. R. Chandrasekhara*  
(M.R.Chandrasekhara).

I hereby agree that so far as the distribution of Royalties is concerned all the parties interested therein shall be governed by the order dated 23/26.7.65 up till the end of the year 1969, and by the order dated 1.9.1963 coupled with the order dated 30.4.69 from the year 1970 onwards.

PADDY PROCESSING RESEARCH CENTRE,  
MODERN RICE MILL,  
VIJAYAPURAM 610108 (TAMILNADU.)

Dr. V. SUBRAHMANYAN,  
Project Head.

24-6-74.

Shri M.K. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Walleswaram,  
BANGALORE-560003.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I am thankful to you for your letter of 20th inst. and the enclosed copy of the agreement for settlement as approved by the two lawyers.

I have already agreed to accept any agreement as reached jointly by the two lawyers. I am accordingly signing the paper and sending it to the Chief of Administration (Sri K.G. Krishnamurthi) of the CSIR.

I trust that, on the basis of the above and other similar paper signed by the other defendants, the lawyers can report about the settlement to the Court at its sitting on 12/7/74.

At least three of the defendants are now outside the country. I hope that you have already contacted them. Their concurrence will also be needed. There is a fair chance that they may agree if you could explain the background to them and also convey that all of us in India have agreed to accept the proposal as a basis for settlement.

With many thanks for your kind interest and efforts and with my best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

  
(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

53 XIII Cross Road, Malleswaram  
Bangalore, 560003.

Dated 12 July 1974.

Dear Sri.Krishnsmurthi,

Along with my letter dated 20th June, I sent you the agreements signed by eight of my colleagues. Dr.V.Subrahmanyan wrote to me later that he had also sent his agreement to you. On the same day that I wrote to Dr.Subrahmanyan, I wrote to Drs.Parpua, Bhatia and Narayanarao also, requesting them to send their agreements also to you. I hope they have done so. However I will be much obliged to you if you can kindly expedite the matter now.

Thanking you and with kind regards,

I am yours sincerely,

(M.R.Chandrasekhara)

Copy to Dr.V.Subrahmanyan for kind information.

*M.R. Chandrasekhara*  
(M.R.Chandrasekhara).

P. C. Bhatt, B.A.,  
LAWYER

M. R. Narayanaswamy,  
B.A., LL.B.,  
ADVOCATE, SUPREME COURT  
RESIDENCE : "DEEPAKMALA"  
1077, NARASARAJA ROAD, MYSORE-4

PHONES { RESIDENCE : 23069  
OFFICE : 21214

SAYYAJI RAO ROAD  
MYSORE-1

Ref. No. 845

13-7-1974.

To

Dr. V. Subramanyam,  
TIRUWAWUR (Tamil Nadu).

Dear Sir,

Re: O.S.No.74/1969 3-  
M.R.Chandrasekhara.

This case is finally adjourned to 12-8-1974  
for reporting settlement or evidence. Please see  
that the case is finalised within ~~at~~ that date.

Yours sincerely,



M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

53, XIII Cross Road, Malleswaram,  
Bangalore, Dated 25 August 1974.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyam,

Thank you for your two letters and the telegram. I met Dr. Parpia when he came to Bangalore. We had a detailed discussion regarding the statements to be given. Finally he agreed in principle to the statement as proposed now. But he felt that the actual wording as proposed now has to be changed. I requested him to discuss this with the Dg and let me have the final format. He has sent that now to me. I am enclosing a copy of the same to Sri. Krishnamurthi of CSIR, to find out whether we can get this again signed by all. I am enclosing herewith a copy of the same, so that you can also expedite the reply from CSIR. I can only hope that my other friends will not blame me for requesting them to sign statements one after the other.

Trusting that this finds you in the best of health and with kind regards,

I am yours sincerely,

*M. R. Chandrasekhara*

(M. R. Chandrasekhara).

Draft Copy of Statement

I, \_\_\_\_\_ hereby agree that so far <sup>as</sup> distribution of royalties is concerned, all the parties therein shall agree to the distribution as follows:-

Name of the person	For the period 1960-1969 (Percentage of r yalt available for distri- bution)	For the Perio II 1970- 1974.
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

This statement will override all the orders issued in respect of the above royalties.

Place:

Sd/-

Date :

28th August, 1974.

Ref.No.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Malleswaram,  
BANGALORE-3.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I am thankful to you for your letter of 25/8/74 and the enclosed draft.

It is my impression that the two lawyers prepared the very b/rief statement so as to avoid any fresh technical or legal issue. The calculations of the proportions and payments to be made can be easily done by the CPTRI office and checked up by the CSIR office before making the payments. The people concerned will also see that they get the correct payments. If there is any under payment, one can always raise the issue with the disbursing officer.

The last statement about 'over-riding' all the previous orders will lead to a justifiable query whether we, who are regarded as litigant over an issue, are competent to sign a statement over-riding the decisions of Ministers and others. As far as I can see, all concerned, including the CSIR wish to treat all past issues as closed. This will also automatically include all the past orders. By making a pointed reference to them; we are virtually inviting people think of the implications introducing such a sentence. In the interests of all concerned, the best course will be to omit that sentence.

So far as I am concerned, I am no longer interested in any of the past issues. The only order which refers to matters other than the issue of the royalty is the one of 30/4/69 and I wish to assure you that I have no desire to raise them. The others will be still less interested.

In view of the above, I would thank you to kindly move Dr. Parpia to sign the draft as prepared by the two lawyers. I had agreed to accept the draft prepared jointly by them and I had done so without going into further details. Any fresh draft, as now prepared, will again have to be scrutinised by the Law Officer and the two lawyers. All this, and also the consequential delays, doubts<sup>ts</sup> and queries, can be eliminated by accepting the draft already prepared by the two lawyers.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

28th August, 1974.

Ref.No.

Shri M.R. Chandrasekhara,  
53, Thirteenth Cross Road,  
Wallewaram,  
BANGALORE-3.

Dear Shri Chandrasekhara,

I am thankful to you for your letter of 25/8/74 and the enclosed draft.

It is my impression that the two lawyers prepared the very brief statement so as to avoid any fresh technical or legal issue. The calculations of the proportions and payments to be made can be easily done by the CPTRI office and checked up by the CSIR office before making the payments. The people concerned will also see that they get the correct payments. If there is any under payment, one can always raise the issue with the disbursing officer.

The last statement about 'over-riding' all the previous orders will lead to a justifiable query whether we, who are regarded as litigant over an issue, are competent to sign a statement over-riding the decisions of Ministers and others. As far as I can see, all concerned, including the CSIR wish to treat all past issues as closed. This will also automatically include all the past orders. By making a pointed reference to them; we are virtually inviting people think of the implications introducing such a sentence. In the interests of all concerned, the best course will be to omit that sentence.

So far as I am concerned, I am no longer interested in any of the past issues. The only order which refers to matters other than the issue of the royalty is the one of 30/4/69 and I wish to assure you that I have no desire to raise them. The others will be still less interested.

In view of the above, I would thank you to kindly move Dr. Parpia to sign the draft as prepared by the two lawyers. I had agreed to accept the draft prepared jointly by them and I had done so without going into further details. Any fresh draft, as now prepared, will again have to be scrutinised by the Law Officer and the two lawyers. All this, and also the consequential delays, doubts<sup>ts</sup> and queries, can be eliminated by accepting the draft already prepared by the two lawyers.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)



D.O.No.8/16/69-vig.

वैज्ञानिक एवं औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद्  
COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC & INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

नई दिल्ली-१

NEW DELHI-1...23...10.....1974

Chief (Admn.) &  
Jt.Secy. to the  
Govt. of India,  
(Ex-Officio):

Dear Dr. Subrahmanyan,

Kindly refer to your letter dated  
5.10.1974 regarding action on the basis of  
settlement reached between the parties in  
respect of 'Baby Rood Royalty'.

I have been advised to inform you  
that a copy of the court decree in the afore-  
said matter is still awaited from our Advocate  
at Mysore. Further action in the matter will  
be taken on receipt of the same.

With my best regards,

Yours sincerely,

*K.G. Krishnamurthi*

( K.G. Krishnamurthi )

Dr. V. Subrahmanyan,  
Project Head,  
Paddy Processing Research Centre,  
Modern Rice Mills,  
Vijayapuram (P.O.),  
Tiruvarur-610108.  
Tamil Nadu (India).

5--10--74.

REF: No.

Shri K.G. Krishnamurthi,  
Chief of Administration,  
Council of Scientific & Industrial Research,  
Rafi Marg,  
NEW DELHI-1.

Dear Shri Krishnamurthi,

Sub :- O.S.No.74 of 1969 in the Court of the Civil  
Judge at Mysore - Action on the basis of settle-  
ment reached between the parties in respect  
of the royalties.

I have been advised by my lawyer, who also represents the  
CSIR, that the Court has issued a decree accepting the terms of the  
settlement.

As I wish to utilise the money for some charitable causes,  
I would thank you and the Law Officer to kindly advise and help me.

- 1) The amounts payable to different individuals may please be  
calculated in accordance with the terms of the decree
- 2) I may be advised about the amount which would be payable to me  
and also whether it would be paid by your office or through the  
office of the CFTRI as in the past.
- 3) If tax exemption is possible, I may be advised about the steps  
to be taken. If that is not possible, the tax as in the case of  
company dividends may be deducted at the source and the balance  
paid to me. I will then distribute the money on a revised basis.
- 4) I have already decided to utilise a fair part of the money for the  
benefit of the lower paid staff of the CFTRI. I do not know as to  
what the amount will be. *Whether* it is, I am writing to enquire  
whether the CSIR will also help by making a contribution.

I would feel thankful for your kind early advice in respect  
of the above and any other related issue which I may not have antici-  
pated.

With my appreciation of your courtesy and assistance,

Yours sincerely,

(V. SUBRAHMANYAN)

M. R. CHANDRASEKHARA

No.53, XIII Cross Road,  
Malleswaram,  
Bangalore-3.


January 6, 1975.

Dear Dr. Subrahmanian,

I was very sorry to learn that you had to undergo an operation and were ill for some time. I had told Mr. N. Subramanian to meet you when you came to Mysore and tell you that the Royalty case has now been settled and you could arrange for drawing the money after consultation with the Director, C.F.T.R.I. I have also written to him suggesting that he should disburse the dues as early as possible. I hope you are taking the necessary steps in this connection.

Trusting that you have now returned to your normal health and with kind regards,

I am, Yours sincerely,

  
(M.R. Chandrasekhara)

Dr. V. Subrahmanian,  
Project Head,  
Paddy Processing Research Centre,  
Modern Rice Mills, Vijayapuram, P.O.,  
~~Post Office~~ Tiruvarur - 610108  
TAMIL NADU.