Despite the recent considerable increase in our knowledge concerning the post-Palaeozoic ostracodes, no satisfactory classification has yet been put forth which could be acceptable to the majority of ostracodologists. Presently, we have Pokorny's classification (1958) based on muscle scar patterns, hinge structure, characters of the duplicature and dimorphic features; Scott's classification (in Moore, 1961) based on various morphological features of hard parts; Morkhoven's classification (1963) based on the soft parts and structure of the carapace; and Hartmann's classification (1964) based on the soft parts. To these can be added Deroo's (1966) revised classification of the superfamily Cytheracea and Hazel's (1967) revised classification of the Recent Hemicytheridae and Trachyleberididae. A discussion on the merits and demerits of these classifications would not be very pertinent for a work of the present type. Different sets of criteria have been used in different classifications and there is no consensus of opinion as regards the true significance, either individually or
collectively, of the various morphological features like the muscle scars, hingement, duplicature, and surface ornament. Nevertheless, the classification given by Scott (in Moore, 1961) has been followed here with slight modifications, mainly because of the fact that it is a comprehensive classification and also because it includes more taxa in comparison to other works. Insofar as the terminology pertaining to hinge, morphology, etc. is concerned, the one used by Howe and Laurencich (1958), Scott (in Moore, 1961), Morkhoven (1963) and Ramsay (1968) has been followed.

**TAXONOMIC COMMENTS ON CERTAIN OSTRACODE GENERA**

**Genus ACROCYTHERE Neale, 1960**

The genus *Acrocythere* was described by Neale (1960) as a subgenus of *Orthonotacythere* Alexander from the type Berriasian of France and was placed in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Loxoconchinae. Malz (1961) raised it to the generic level. Neale in 1962 transferred this genus to the subfamily Pleurocytherinae, and in 1967 to Progonocytherinae. Hazel and Paulson (1964), however, assign this genus to the family Cytheruridae. In the present work, Hazel and Paulson's views on the family placement have been followed.
Genus **ACUTICYTHERETTA** Deroo, 1966

The genus *Acuticytheretta* was described by Deroo (1966) from the Maestrichtian of Holland. He placed this genus in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Cytherettinae. Hazel (1967), however, considers Cytherettinae to be a subfamily of the family Trachyleberididae. In the present work, however, Deroo's view has been followed.

Genus **AMPHICYTHERURA** Butler and Jones, 1957

The genus *Amphicytherura* was described by Butler and Jones in 1957 from the Upper Cretaceous of U.S.A. Butler and Jones and Hartmann (1964) assigned this genus to the family Cytheridae, subfamily Cytherinae. Howe (in Moore, 1961) placed *Amphicytherura* in the family Schizocytheridae. Deroo (1966) is of the view that this genus should be assigned to the subfamily Schizocytherinae. In the present work Howe's placement has been adopted.

Genus **BAIRDIA** McCoy, 1844

Kornicker (1961) in an excellent summary has reviewed the status of the genus *Bairdia*. Maddocks (1969a) emphasized the need to have a more useful and reasonable classification for the Mesozoic and Recent Bairdiidae like the one given earlier by Sohn (1960) for the Palaeozoic ones. She, on
the basis of muscle scars and appendage anatomy, erected two new genera - Neonesidea and Paranesidea - to include recent species of the form genus Bairdia, which according to her are "..........equally appropriate for any Post-Paleozoic Bairdiidae". She (Maddocks, 1969a, p. 19) further considers Neosidea Costa to be nomina dubia because of the fact that the genus was erected on a single species N. hirta of which "........the type is unknown and the original illustrations faulty."

The author has, however, adopted the form genus "Bairdia" to describe the South Indian and Bagh specimens which with a single exception ("Bairdia" pseudoseptentrionalis (Mertens) ) (p. 100 ) do not show details of muscle scars. Maddocks (personal communication) in reply to a query from the author suggested that "If the interiors, especially muscle-scar patterns, are not visible, then it is not much use to try to identify them this precisely".

It may not be out of place to mention here the occurrence of "Bairdia" sp. D (p. 107 ) in the South Indian Cretaceous which closely resembles Cryptobairdia Sohn, a Palaeozoic genus. In view of the paucity of material a more precise identification could not be made.

Coryell, Sample and Jennings (1935) erected the genus
Bairdoppilata to include forms of "Bairdia" having denticles at either end of the hinge line in the right valve. Reyment and Reyment (1959) observed that in view of the fact that the denticles vary within one species and that similar denticles are also known to occur in Bairdia coronata Brady, formerly assigned to Triebelina, the genus Bairdoppilata be considered as a junior synonym of "Bairdia". This view is also held among others by Morkhoven (1958, 1963) and Kaye (1965). Maddocks (1969a, p.68), however, observed that the Recent species of Bairdoppilata ".........show significant and consistent differences in soft-part anatomy, shape and opaque pattern that are congruent with and perhaps even more consistently expressed than the hinge dentition". The present writer has, however, followed the views of Reyment and Reyment and others because of the fact that there are very subtle differences in carapace morphology of the two genera which may not be easily distinguished in fossil forms.

Genus **Brachycythere** Alexander, 1933

The genus Brachycythere was placed by Alexander (1933) in the family Cytheridae; in Cytheridae-Brachycytherinae by Puri (1953); in Cytheridae-Cytherinae by Pokorny (1958); in Brachocytheridae by Howe (in Moore, 1961); in Cytheridae-Brachocytherinae by Hartmann (1964); in Cytheridae-Trachyleberidinae by Morkhoven (1963); in Cytheridae-
Brachycytherinae by Deroo (1966) and in Trachyleberididae—Brachytherinae by Hazel (1967). In the present work, Howe's classification has been followed.

Genus **Bythoceratina** Hornibrook, 1952

The genus *Bythoceratina* was described by Hornibrook (1952) from the Recent of New Zealand and was placed by him in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Bythocytherinac. This placement has also been followed by Morkhoven (1963), Hartmann (1964) and Deroo (1966). Sylvester-Bradley and Kesling (in Moore, 1961), however, raised the subfamily Bythocytherinac to the status of a family. Szczechura (1964) assigned the genus *Bythoceratina* to a new subfamily Monoceratininae. In the present work, the classification proposed by Sylvester-Bradley and Kesling (in Moore, 1961) has been followed.

Genus **Bythocypris** Brady, 1880

The genus *Bythocypris* was placed by Brady (1880) in the family Cypridae; in Bairdiidae by Jones (1901); in Nesideidae by Mueller (1912); in Cypridae-Bairdiinae by Hessland (1949); in Bairdiidae by Shaver (in Moore, 1961); and in Bairdiidae-Bythocypridinae by Maddocks (1969a). In the present work, Shaver's classification has been followed.
Genus **Cursina** Deroo, 1966

The genus *Cursina* was established by Deroo (1966) and placed in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Trachyleberidinae. In the present work, however, family Trachyleberididae has been considered to be an independent family. The specimens from the Indian sub-continent (though similar in shape and ornament) differ from the forms described by Deroo in having smooth hinge elements. Deroo (personal communication) who examined these specimens agreed with the generic placement.

Genus **Cythereis** Jones, 1849

The genus *Cythereis* was first described by Jones (1849) as a subgenus of *Cythera*. This genus has been subjected to a detailed study among others, by Triebel (1940), Sylvester-Bradley (1948) and Pokorny (1963a). In recent years, *Cythereis* s.l. has been split into a number of genera like *Cerithilla* Pokorny, *Cursina* Deroo, *Limburgina* Deroo and *Phacorhabdotus* Howe and Laurencich. The hinge of *Cythereis* s.s. according to Sylvester-Bradley (1948) is characterized by the presence of crenulate teeth and sockets. The specimens from Bagh beds, however, show smooth hinge elements. These specimens were examined by Professors P.C. Sylvester-Bradley, W.A. van den Bold and Dr. J.E. Hazel who are unanimous in their view (personal communications) that they
are not *Cythereis* s.s. and may even represent a new genus. However, because of lack of other internal details, these are for the time being described as "*Cythereis*".

Genus **CYTHERELOIDEA** Alexander, 1929

The genus *Cythereloidea* was established by Alexander (1929) for those species of the genus *Cytherella* which show surface ornamentation. Bettenstaedt (1958) found that *Cythereloidea ovoidea* Weber shows both smooth as well as ornamented carapaces. Reyment (1960) and Reyment (in Moore, 1961) regarded *Cythereloidea* as a subgenus of *Cytherella*. Kaye (1963, p. 111), however, is of the opinion that "Though there is considerable similarity particularly in the internal details, the present author prefers to regard the two as separate genera. The strong ornament, the absence of overlap anteriorly and the subparallel dorsal and ventral margins make *Cythereloidea*, in the author's opinion, distinct. Though forms intermediate between the two may occur and also the degree and the prominence of the ornament vary within a population, the author is sure that such a separation is sound and useful". The present writer is also of the opinion that *Cythereloidea* should be considered as a separate genus.

Recently, Ramsay (1968, p. 348) in a very interesting publication has suggested that "The various ribbing patterns
in many species of the genus are shown to be based on one simple spiral pattern. Minor variations in this basic pattern allow differentiation between various species." It is interesting to note that a large number of species of Cytherelloidea in the present material also show this basic spiral ornament. In these cases, the ornamentation has been described following Ramsay's terminology.

Genus **Cytheropteron** Sars, 1866

The genus *Cytheropteron* Sars, first described from the Recent of North Atlantic, has been subdivided into a number of subgenera like *Bocytheropteron* Alexander and *Aversovalva* Hornibrook. Of these, *Aversovalva* was established by Hornibrook (1952, p. 57) to accommodate forms which differed from *Cytheropteron* in having "...........comparatively simple hinge and reversal of the usual valve proportions". Reyment (1960) and Reyment (in Moore, 1961) considered *Aversovalva* to be a junior synonym of *Cytheropteron*. Crane (1965), however, raised *Aversovalva* to the generic rank. In view of these divergent views the present writer has described *Cytheropteron* s.s. and *Aversovalva* under "*Cytheropteron*". Of the four taxa described in the present work, in "*Cytheropteron*" nealei n.sp. the left valve is larger than right valve, however, dorsally the right valve overlaps left valve, in "*Cytheropteron*" sp. B and "*Cytheropteron*" sp. C
the left valve is larger than right valve and has a pronounced dorsal overlap; in "Cytheropteron" sp. A no carapaces were found, hence the nature of the overlap could not be ascertained.

Genus **CYTHERURA** Sars, 1866

The genus *Cytherura* was established by Sars in 1866 and has since been reported from sediments as old as Cretaceous. Wagner (1957) opined that it is very difficult to make correct generic identification on the basis of external characters alone. In view of the fact that the only specimen in the South Indian Cretaceous is a carapace, it has been assigned to "*Cytherura*".

Genus **DUMONTINA** Deroo, 1966

The genus *Dumontina* was erected by Deroo in 1966 and assigned to the family Cytheridae, subfamily Trachyleberidinae. The present writer has, however, followed the views of Sylvester-Bradley (in Moore, 1961) in considering Trachyleberididae as a separate family.

Genus **ECHINOCYTHEREIS** Puri, 1954

The genus *Echinocythereis* has been placed in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Trachyleberidinae by Puri (1953), Hartmann (1964), and Deroo (1966); in Trachyleberididae by
Sylvester-Bradley (in Moore, 1961); in Cytheridae-Hemicytherinae by Morkhoven (1963); and in Trachyleberididae-Echinocytherinae by Hazel (1967). In the present work, however, Sylvester-Bradley's view has been followed.

Genus **EOCYTHEROPTERON** Alexander, 1933

The genus *Eocytheropteron* was first established by Alexander (1933) as a subgenus of *Cytheropteron* on the basis of hinge and shape of the carapace. Reyment (in Moore, 1961) and Morkhoven (1963) considered it to be a separate genus. Kaye (1964), following Alexander (1933) considered *Eocytheropteron* to be a subgenus of *Cytheropteron*, on the ground that hinge should not be considered as a criterion for generic diagnosis. The present writer, however, feels that the differences in shape, hinge and the marginal zone are sufficient to assign it a separate generic rank.

Genus **KIKLIOCYTHERE** Howe and Laurencich, 1953

The genus *Kikliocythere* was placed in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Brachycytherinae by Howe and Laurencich (1958) and Hartmann (1964). Howe (in Moore, 1961) transferred this genus to the family Brachycytheridae. Deroo (1966), on the other hand, placed *Kikliocythere* in Cytheridae-Mauritssininae while Hazel (1967) placed this genus in Trachyleberididae-Mauritssininae. In the present work, however, Howe's view has been followed.
Genus **KINGMAINA** Keij, 1957

The genus *Kingmaina* was placed in the family Brachycytheridae by Howe (in Moore, 1961); in Cytheridae-Trachyleberidinae by Morkhoven (1963), Hartmann (1964) and Deroo (1966); in Trachyleberididae-Pterygocytheridinae by Hazel (1967). The present writer has, however, followed the classification as proposed by Howe.

Genus **KRITHE** Brady, Crosskey and Robertson, 1874

The genus *Krithe* is characterized among other features, by the presence of posterior indentation, a simple hinge and a few marginal pore canals which are either straight or branching. The genera *Parakrithe* Bold and *Parakrithella* Hanai though similar in outline to *Krithe* differ in the absence of posterior indentation and in the details of marginal areas and hinge. The specimens from the South Indian and Bagh materials though lacking posterior indentation have been described under *Krithe* as the details of hinge and marginal areas are not clearly visible. Since the posterior indentation is absent in the type species (*fide* Howe, in Moore, 1961) the present author feels that the presence or absence of this particular feature alone should not be considered of generic importance.
Genus **Leguminocythereis** Howe, 1936

The genus *Leguminocythereis* was placed in the family Cytheridae by Howe (in Howe and Laurencich, 1936); in Trachyleberididae by Oertli (1956); in Trachyleberididae-Trachyleberidinae by Mertens (1958); in Leguminocythereididae by Howe (in Moore, 1961) and Deroo (1966); in Cytheridae-Hemicytherinae by Morkhoven (1963); in Cytheridae-Trachyleberidinae by Hartmann (1964); and in Hemicytheridae-Campylocytherinae by Hazel (1967). In view of the divergent opinions on the family placement of the genus *Leguminocythereis*, the present writer has followed Howe's classification.

Genus **Lenicythere** Howe, 1951

The genus *Lenicythere* was established by Howe in 1951, who placed it in the family Cytheridae, subfamily Cytherininae. Sylvester-Bradley (in Moore, 1961) placed this genus in the family Trachyleberididae. Hartmann (1964) in Cytheridae-Trachyleberidinae; and Hazel (1967) in Hemicytheridae-Campylocytherinae. In the present work, however, Sylvester-Bradley's classification has been adopted.

Genus **Limburgina** Deroo, 1966

The genus *Limburgina* was described by Deroo (1966) from the Maestrichtian of Holland and placed by him in the family
Cytheridae, subfamily Trachyleberidinae. Hazel (1967) placed Limburgina in Trachyleberididae-Trachyleberidinae. The genus Limburgina is characterized by the presence of a lobed posterior tooth. The specimens from South India, though similar in shape and nature of ornament, differ from Limburgina in having all hinge elements smooth. These specimens were examined by Drs. W.A. van den Bold, J.E. Hazel, G. Deroo, H.S. Puri and H. Grekoff who agree (personal communications) with the generic placement and also with the writer's opinion that the absence of lobes may be due to poor preservation.

Genus MACROCYPRIS Brady, 1868

The genus Macrocypris was placed in the family Cyprididae by Brady (1868); in Bairdiidae by Brady and Norman (1889); in Cyprididae-Macrocyprinae by Mueller (1912); in Macrocyprididae by Sylvester-Bradley (in Moore, 1961) and in Cyprididae-Macrocypridae by Morkhoven (1963) and Hartmann (1964). In view of the conflicting opinions, the present writer has followed the classification as given by Sylvester-Bradley.

Genus MONOCERATINA Roth, 1928

The genus Monoceratina was first described from the Pennsylvanian of Oklahoma, U.S.A. by Roth (1928) and has since been reported from sediments of all ages including Recent. There has been some difference of opinion as to its
systematic position, and whether the post-Palaeozoic forms are congeneric with the Palaeozoic ones. An excellent account of different views can be found in Szczechura (1964). Sylvester-Broadley and Kesling (in Moore, 1961) and Szczechura (1964) consider the genus Monoceratina to be a long ranging one. McKenzie, Swan and Robinson (in McKenzie, 1969) on the other hand do not agree with the above contention and opine that Monoceratina s.l. be used for all post-Palaeozoic forms. The present author agrees with this view. As regards family placement, the genus "Monoceratina" was assigned to the family Primitidae by Roth (1928); to Beyrichiidae by Harlton (1933); to Cytheridae by Alexander (1934); to Cytheridae-Bythocytherinae by Bold (1946); to Bythocytheridae by Sylvester-Broadley and Kesling (in Moore, 1961); to Cytheridae-Bythocytherinae by Morkhoven (1963) and Hartmann (1964); and to Cytheridae-Monoceratininae by Szczechura (1964). In view of the widely divergent views, Sylvester-Broadley and Kesling's assignment of the genus "Monoceratina" to the family Bythocytheridae has been followed in the present work.

Genus PARACYTHERIDES Mueller, 1894

The genus Paracytherides was assigned to the family Cytheridae by Mueller (1894); to Cytheridae-Cytherideinae by Bold (1946) and Pokorny (1958); to Cytheridae-
Parcytherideinae by Puri (1957); to Cytherurinae by Morkhoven (1963); to Cytheridae-Parcytherideinae by Hartmann (1964); and to Cytheridae-Painjenborchellinae by Deroo (1966). In view of the widely divergent opinions on the family placement, the classification given by Howe is followed.

Genus **Phacorhabdotus** Howe and Laurencich, 1958

The genus *Phacorhabdotus* was established by Howe and Laurencich in 1958 and was considered to differ from *Cythereis* in shape, absence of surface reticulation, marginal rim, and crenulations of the terminal teeth and by the presence of a much wider marginal area. The genus was later emended by Pokorny (1963b) who stated that it includes forms both with or without crenulate terminal teeth as well as marginal rim. According to him, the reduction in surface ornament and the increase in the width of the marginal area (e.g. in *P. semiplicatus* (Reuss) and *P. texanus* Howe and Laurencich) represent phylomorphogenic trends. Hazel and Paulson (1964) suggested that there are two groups of species belonging to *Phacorhabdotus* which appear to be phylogenetically distinct. The first group, comprising *P. pokornyi* Hazel and Paulson, *P. semiplicatus* (Reuss), *P. filicosta* (Marsson) and *P. texanus* (Howe and
Laurencich), is characterized by the presence of a strong ornament (a character considered by them to be primitive), of three lateral ribs and a muscle node. The marginal rim may be absent. The other group, comprising such species as P. tridentus (Israelsky) and P. formosa (Alexander), is characterized by the absence of the marginal rim and a more broadly rounded anterior.

The specimens from South India which have been assigned to the genus Phacorhabdotus have a well developed marginal rim and are also ornamented and would therefore fall in the first group of species as suggested by Hazel & Paulson (1964) and probably represent the oldest (Aptian-Albian) known representatives of the genus.

Genus **PONTOCYPRELLA** Mandelstam, 1955, in Lyubimova

There appears to be considerable difference of opinion as regards the authorship of the genus Pontocyprella. Different workers have variously attributed it to Lyubimova, 1955 (Malz, 1959); to Mandelstam, 1955 (Oertli, 1959, Esker, 1968); to Mandelstam, 1955, in Lyubimova (Neale, 1962); to Lyubimova, 1955 (Swain in Moore, 1961); to Mandelstam, 1956 (Howe and Laurencich, 1958, Mandelstam and Schneider in Tschernysheva, 1960 and Kaye, 1965). Neale (1962, p.431) commenting on this unsatisfactory situation stated that "An official ruling by the ICZN would seem desirable, and
pending such clarification this genus is referred to Mandelstam, 1955, in Lyubimova. As the present author is unaware of any ruling by the ICZN in this matter, Nesle's suggestion has been followed in the present work.

Genus **PROPONTOCYPRIS** Sylvester-Bradley, 1947

The genus *Propontocypris* was erected by Sylvester-Bradley in 1947. Recently Haddocks (1969b) has subdivided the genus into three subgenera on the basis of muscle-scar patterns and carapace curvature. These are *Propontocypris* Sylvester-Bradley, *Ekpontocypris* Maddocks and *Schedopontocypris* Maddocks. In the present work, however, *Propontocypris* is described as defined by Sylvester-Bradley because of the fact that the muscle-scar patterns are not visible in the specimens from South India.

Genus **SCHULERIDEA** Swartz and Swain, 1946

Subgenus **AEQUACYTHELIDEA** Mandelstam, 1947

The genus *Aequacytheridea* was erected by Mandelstam in 1947. Howe and Laurencich (1958), Howe (in Moore, 1961) and Neale (1962) consider it as a junior synonym of *Schuleridea*. Kollmann (1960) and Deroo (1966) on the other hand consider *Aequacytheridea* as a subgenus of *Schuleridea*. In the present work, the latter view has been followed.
REVISION OF SOME PREVIOUSLY DESCRIBED TAXA

In the present work the various taxa described earlier by the present writer (Jain, 1961, 1963a, 1969a) have been restudied and their identifications brought up-to-date. Wherever possible, taxonomic comments on other previously described taxa (auctorum) are also included. Since in most cases, the holotypes and/or the paratypes were not available for comparison, these comments are based entirely on the published illustrations and description.

Identification by previous workers

JAIN (1961)                              Revised identification (Present work)

Paracypris schnii Jain                  Paracypris jonesi Bonnema
P. monmouthensis Schmidt                Paracypris sp. C
Bairdia obliqua Alexander                "Bairdia" sp. I
Bythocypris chiplonkeri Jain            Sphaeroleberis ? chiplonkeri (Jain)
B. goodlandensis Alexander              Bythocypris sp. C
Macrocypris ? baghensis Jain            Acuticytheretta baghensis (Jain)
? M. graysonensis Alexander             Pontocyprella sp. B
Cythereis sp. aff. C. krumensis Alexander "Cythereis" regi n.sp.
Cytherura thuatiensis Jain              Protojonesia sp. cf. P. bolliaformis (Veen)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haplocytheridea punctata Schmidt</th>
<th>Brachocythere batei n.sp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monoceratina sp.</td>
<td>&quot;Monoceratina&quot; sp. aff. M. bugensis Szczechura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytherelloidea indica Jain</td>
<td>Cytherelloidea thautiensis nom. nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachocythere bhatiai Jain</td>
<td>Brachocythere angulate Grekoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JAIN (1963a)**

| Bythocypris goodlandensis Alexander | Bythocypris sp. C |
| B. kritheformis Bonnema | Krithe kritheformis (Veen) |
| ? Canclona sp. ? mantelli Jones | Pontocyprilla recurva Esker |
| Cytherelloidea multilamella Bosquet | Dumontina hazeli n.sp. |
| Cytherella auroidea Alexander | Cytherella sp. A |
| C. subreniformis Jones and Hinde | Bythocypris acularensis n.sp. |
| Cytherelloidea granulosa (Jones) | Cytherelloidea sp. B |
| Paracypris sp. | Paracypris sp. A |
| Monoceratina transileana Bonnema | Bythoceratina sp. B |
| Bairdia trigona Bosquet | "Bairdia" ex gr. B. limburgensis Veen |
| Bairdia sp. 1 | "B." ex gr. B. cretacea Veen |
| Bairdia sp. 2 | "B." ex gr. B. pentagonalis Veen |
GOWDA (1966)

*Bairdia* ? ex gr. *binkhorstii* Veen

Definitely not *Bairdia*, probably *Limburgina*

*Echinocythereis* ? sp.

*Echinocythereis* *apostolescui* n. sp.

*Brachocythere* ex gr. *carinata* Veen

*Kikliocythere* *szczechurae* n. sp.

JAIN (1969a)

*Acrocythere* n. sp.

*Acrocythere* sp.

*Amphicytherura* n. sp.

*Amphicytherura* *subbaramenti* n. sp.

*Bythocypris* n. sp.

*Bythocypris* sp. A

*Cythereis* n. sp.

*Phacorhabdotus* *dalmiapuramensis* n. sp.

GOVINDAN (1969)

*Brachocythere* *ledaforma* Israeli sky

*Kikliocythere* *szczechurae* n. sp.

*Cythereis* *bicornei* Israeli sky

*Surfina* *Reginae-astrid* (Veens)

BANERJIT (1970)

*Kritha* *trichinopolitensis* Banerji

*Kritha* *krithiformis* (Veens)

The specimens of following taxa reported earlier by Jain (1961, 1963a) have since been lost and are, therefore, not included in the present work:
Paracypris gracilis (Bosquet), Bairdia misrai Jain, ? Paracyprides aovata Swain, Cyltherella scotti Alexander, Paracypris acuta (Cornuel), P. tenuicula Alexander.

DISTRIBUTION OF OSTRACODE TAXA

As stated earlier, one hundred and twenty ostracode taxa from South Indian Cretaceous have been described in Part II, and thirty-two from Bagh beds of Narmada valley in Part III. Only six ostracode taxa namely, Bythocypris sp. C, Brachycythere angulata Grekoff, Curfsina thuatiensis n.sp., Paracypris jonesi Bonnema, Neocytherideis reynenti n.sp. and Sphaeroleberis ? howei n.sp. are common to both these regions. The distribution of ostracode taxa in the South Indian Cretaceous and Bagh beds is given in tables 1 and 2 respectively.