

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 686

Press
Mis.

Dated ¹⁶ 16 December 1859.

B. no 21-23

17/17

Not to be folded or roughly handled

P. 21-23

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
for the month of December 1859.*

No. 21. Read the following letter from T. CLARKE, Esq., Collector of Madura; to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 19th November 1859, No. 1292.

With reference to paragraph 3 of the Order* issued on a letter, dated 24th September 1859, No. 152, from the Acting Sub-Treasurer of Fort Saint George, I have the honor to report that the deposed Zemindar of Ramnad Moottooramalinga Sathoopathy, who died in Madras in January 1809, left a daughter Sevagami Nauchiar, aged about 12 years. She married 2 husbands, 1, Vada-baveety Ramasawmy Taver and 2, Vijiagopaula Sathoopathy, and on the 13th February 1849, died childless, but is stated to have adopted a son named Kaungiasawmy Taver, who performed her funeral rites and succeeded to all the personal property of his adoptive mother. Kaungiasawmy Taver died in March 1850, leaving 2 sons.

2. In addition to this daughter, Moottooramalinga Sathoopathy left 2 widows and several concubines and natural children, some of whom are now surviving and receiving allowances from Government. Some of these women, in 1827, applied, through the Collector of Madura, for the property now referred to. The Government, in a letter, dated 12th June 1827, rejected their claims.

3. The Zemindary was, after its escheat, in consequence of rebellion, placed in possession of Mungalaiswary Nauchiar the only surviving sister of the deposed Zemindar. She was a widow at the time of accession and, before her death, adopted a son Annasawmy Sathoopathy. Sevagami Nauchiar the daughter of the deposed Zemindar claimed the Zemindary on the death of her aunt; but her claim was rejected and the adopted son declared the heir. Annasawmy Sathoopathy died childless and was succeeded by Ramasawmy Sathoopathy, adopted by Annasawmy Sathoopathy's widow, the sister of the adopted son. Ramasawmy Sathoopathy died in 1830, leaving two daughters, minors, who each succeeded to the estate, but died during minority. The estate then reverted to their mother who now holds it.

4. It will thus be seen that no legitimate blood relations of the deposed Zemindar are living. The Zemindary itself is held by the widow of an adopted son of the adopted son of the sister of Moottooramalinga Sathoopathy, while the personal property of his own daughter has descended to an adopted son or rather son of affection.

5. It will be seen, from the letter of Mr. Parish, dated the 14th February 1810, that the Ranee of Ramnad, claimed the property of her deceased brother and attached great importance to the possession of it, because it consisted of articles, which, according to the custom of Southern countries, descended immediately to the person succeeding to the Zemindary. The Collector supported the claim of the Ranee, on the ground that, at the period of the Poligar's deposition, the Government in their public orders acknowledged the Ranee to be the sole heir to his real and personal property and recommended that the Town Major of Fort Saint George, under whose charge the property was, be instructed to deliver it over to persons appointed by the Ranee to receive the same. I cannot find any thing on the record to justify the statement of the Collector that the Government in their public orders acknowledged the Ranee to be the sole heir to the personal property of her deceased brother. *Vide* letter to Government by special Commissioner, 10th February 1803, paragraph 3rd "to transfer the lands." Reply of Government 15th February 1803, "to transfer the lands of Ramnad." Mr. Parish's letter 12th March 1803, paragraph 1st "in full possession of the Ramnad Zemindary," and these are the terms used by Mr. Lushington in his report and instructions to Mr. Parish.

6. In a letter, dated 10th March 1810, the Collector reported that the Ranee had appointed Ramakistna Naick and Rackapen to receive the property of her deceased brother.

7. In a communication, dated 23rd March 1810, the Town Major, in reference to these and the letter from the Collector, requesting an early settlement of the Ranee's demand, transmitted to Mr. Parish copies of a correspondence which had already taken place regarding these effects.

on 7

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
for the month of December 1859.*

8. Among this correspondence was copy of a letter from the Company's Solicitor, dated 1st March 1809. In this communication Mr. Orme reported that he was desired to state that the Advocate General did not see how creditors could claim to take charge of the deceased's property. The son if any, if not, the widow or other next of heir of the deceased are the proper claimants of the property, and, if they are not inhabitants of Madras, it appears to the Advocate General that the creditor cannot even take the property by legal process, and the Advocate General recommended the Town Major to keep the property locked up till taken by some legal authority.

9. The widows were at the time alive, but, I cannot find from my records that either they or the daughter of the 2nd after them laid any claim to the property in question.

10. Nor have I any thing on the record to shew that the property constituted any portion of the public property of the Estate of Ramnad.

11. After the death of Sevagami Nauchiar, Mr. Parker on 1st April 1851, reported on the validity of the claims of several parties to her real property.

12. These claimants, excepting certain Brahmins who claimed on other grounds than those of heirship, to the deceased, were 1, Saithookarasoo Nauchiar, 2, Pereasawmy Taver the son of Kaungiasawmy Taver, 3, Puttabiramasawmy Taver, the son of the deposed Zemindar by a concubine and 4th, the Zemindar of Ramnad.

13. A copy of Mr. Parker's letter is appended; it deals so fully and so completely with the rights of these several parties that I deem it unnecessary to add to his arguments.

14. The 1st claimant, he shews, was the daughter, by a former wife of Vijiagopala Saithoopathy, the second husband of Sevagami Nauchiar, the first husband being alive and having been divorced by his wife.

15. Mr. Parker remarks that the legal right of Saithookarasoo Nauchiar to be considered a step daughter of Sevagami Nauchiar, was very questionable under the Hindoo Law and that even were she able to establish this relationship, her right as the daughter of a rival wife to inherit her step-mother's property was extremely doubtful.

16. He then proceeds to shew the legal exception to be taken to the alleged adoption of Kaungiasawmy Taver, that he was said to have been adopted after he was married and the father of two children and therefore that he had exceeded the age prescribed by Hindoo Law for the adoption of Sudras and that, if the marriage of Vijiagopala Saithoopathy with Sevagami Nauchiar was, as he supposed, illegal, any adoption made by them would necessarily be null and void.

17. The third claimant being an illegitimate son had no right whatever.

18. In regard to the claim of the Zemindar "who stands in the relation of the widow of a grandson by adoption" (he might have said by two successive adoptions) "of the father's sister" to the deceased Sevagami Nauchiar, he remarks that it is very doubtful whether the descendants of a father's sister can, according to the Hindoo Law, inherit the property of a deceased female independently of the circumstance, in the present case, of the said female having died a childless widow, who can have no heir.

19. Had the Zemindar Mungalaiswary Nauchiar been able to shew that the property left by the deceased Poligar formed part of the Regalia of the Estate, it is hardly conceivable, she would have failed to do so, especially after the death of the widow Rajarajaswary Nauchiar on the 8th June 1815, when Sevagami Nauchiar of about 18 years of age was under her care and protection.

20. Failing to do so, the jewels must, I conceive, be looked on as the private personal property of the deceased deposed Poligar, of which at the time of his decease, his widow was entitled to be placed in possession, and after her the daughter.

21. The title of the Zemindar to this property most questionable at the first, cannot, I conceive, at this distance of time be recognized at all.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
for the month of December 1859.*

22. The sons of Kaungiasawmy Taver, the alleged adopted son of Sevagami Nauchiar, if they could shew that the adoption of their father was real and legal, appear to me to have the best title to the property; but in absence of such proof, I cannot recommend its being delivered over to them.

No. 22.

ORDER THEREON, 16th December 1859, No. 686.

In the above letter the Collector of Madura replies to the reference made to him in the Order of Government, dated the 8th of October last, No. 569, paragraph 3, to ascertain whether the deposed Rájá of Ramnad, Múttú Ramalinga Satúpati, had any representative to whom the property* now in deposit in the General Treasury might be given.

* Lists of jewels, &c., deposited in the Treasury in 1811.

2. Upon a consideration of all the circumstances represented by the Collector in regard to the claims formerly advanced to the property in question, and adverting also to the opinion expressed in the concluding paragraphs of his report, the Governor in Council directs that the property be sold by public auction and the proceeds carried to account, subject to any claim that may hereafter be established. The Sub Treasurer will take the necessary steps for the disposal of the jewels, &c., enumerated in the lists submitted with his letter, dated 24th September 1859, No. 152.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,

Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

Sir,
Para. 1 In Para. 3 of the Minutes of Consultation under date the 17th May 1850, having reference to 1/4th Village enjoyed by the late Swagamy Acheen of Ramnad, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council directed me to report whether any claims have been preferred to the 1/4th share of Chatoorvada Mangalam, with my opinion thereon, & at the same time, afford explanation in regard to the title to this share possessed by the Bramins, who sold it to Swagamy, Nachyan.

2. I beg to advert to the last question first. The Cutcherry Records give no information regarding the title of the Bramins, the earliest being a Register in the name of Rajakrishnaswamy Nachyan, the Mother of Swagamy Nachyan. The Bramins themselves ascribe their right to the gift of one Arjoon Permal Pillay, a Merchant, who purchased 3/4th of the Village for the purpose, in 1780 of the former cycle from the former Possessors, of whose title, it is not possible to give any information.

3. The present claimants are the Bramins, Lakshokaraswamy Nachyan, Paradaswamy Nachyan, Son of Haugia Nachyan, Pittabheramaswamy Nachyan Son of Mooddoo Ramalinga Satopathy, Zemindar of Ramnad by a Concubine, & the Zemindar of Ramnad.

4 The Bramins found their claim

on the insufficient price obtained by them -
This ground, being obviously untenable
after a lapse of 50 years, I do not think it
necessary to discuss.

5. Sato Karadosh Rachean, whose
Petition by Vakeel is herewith forwarded,
is the Daughter of Veja Gopal Satoopathi,
husband of Sevagamy Rachean, by another
wife Poornasandra Rachean. In support
of her claim, which extends not to the 1/4 Village
only, but to the 4 1/4 Villages she asserts

- 1st That the Villages were Stridhanam
to Sevagamy Rachean, & as such,
must go to female heirs.
- 2nd That she is step daughter of Sevagamy
Rachean which is equivalent to being
her daughter.
- 3rd That as such, she is heir to Sevagamy
Rachean, the alleged adoption of
Kangiasawmy Laven, & will
in his favour never having taken place,
& being invalid & inefficient to bar
her right of succession, even if
they could be established.

6. The Villages descended to Sevagamy
Rachean from her Mother Rajah Rajaswamy
Rachean, & were therefore, not Stridhanam,
to the former, according to the Law laid down,
in Page. 36. Vol. 1 of Mr. Macanaghten's
work, as follows. "Stridhanam which has
once devolved according to the law of
Succession, which governs the descent of this
peculiar species of property, ceases to be
ranked as such & is ever afterwards governed
by the Ordinary Rules of inheritance.

The

7. The legal right of Sato Karadosh Rachean
to be considered a step daughter of Sevagamy
Rachean is very questionable. Sevagamy
Rachean was first married to Purnasawmy
Laven & after cohabitation divorced
& married Veja Gopal Satoopathi. This kind
of marriage may be tolerated among the
Maraners but is not included in the recognized
Forms & consequently will not, I think,
stand in the Hindoo Law as a ground of right to
Property. If not, it follows that Sato Karadosh
Rachean is not legal step daughter to
Sevagamy Rachean, and it becomes un-
necessary to enter into the question whether,
if in that character, she would have been
entitled to succeed to the Villages under the
ordinary Rules of succession, by which,
it has been shown, the inheritance must
be governed. It may, however, be observed
that the right of the daughters of a rival wife
to inherit her step Mother's property is, I believe,
extremely doubtful.

8. The son of Kangiasawmy Laven
claims the 1/4 Village together with the four,
on the pretext of the adoption of his father
by Veja Gopal Satoopathi & Sevagamy
Rachean & will made by them in his
favour. The Will is dated 26th May 1830.
& there is a Mooktearnam mentioning
the fact of adoption, dated 14th March 1830, but
the date of the adoption itself is not mentioned.
nor was it stated by Kangiasawmy Laven
during an enquiry before the Salt Amildar.
Sato Karadosh Rachean, it will be observed,
makes sundry objections to the adoption,

one

one of which, the fact of Kanguia Laven being a married man with 2 Children in 1830 would, if proved & the date be 1830, invalidate the adoption, supposing it to have taken place, because it would tend to the conclusion that he was then above 16, which is the limit of the period of adoption among Laveas, but it does not seem to me necessary to go into the question, inasmuch as, if the marriage of Peja Gopal Latoopaty was, as I suppose, illegal, any adoption made by them would necessarily be null & void. The order of the Magistrate in Kanguia Laven's favor as regards some property is of no avail to prove the present claim. Kanguia Laven's Laven had been represented by Luvaga my Pachan to be her adopted son, and, having managed her property & lived with her, had possession with such a colorable right as rendered it proper to refer the opposing claimants to the Civil Courts, but the Magistrate did not, & could not decide the question of rights.

9 Another individual, who pretends a claim is Pullabai Ramaswami, Laven styling himself the son of the Zamindar of Alloodoo Ramalinga Latoopaty. The mother of this man was only a concubine, & he argues that as an illegitimate son of a Zamindar of Shevengurah has received a Sub Division the same consideration should be shown to him. It is sufficient to state that the Sub Division in question was

made

made during the father's life time - and that the applicant appears to me to have no right whatever.

10 The last claimant to be adverted to is the present Zamindar of Pannad, who, like the others, includes in her pretensions the whole 4th Village. She claims not simply as Zamindar but as heir to the deceased, to whom she stands in the relation of the widow of a grandson by adoption of her father's sister. I very much doubt whether the descendants of a father's sister can, according to the Hindoo Law, inherit the property of a female deceased, independently of the circumstances in the present case of the said female having died a childless widow, who I believe cannot have no heir.

11 Under all the circumstances, it appears to me that it is competent to the Govt to retain the 1st Village as a lapsed Pannam, or, if it be not viewed in that light, to sequester it until one or other of the parties shall have established his or her claim in the Civil Courts.

12. Board Petⁿs Nos 1952-2488 and 2457 of 1850 are herewith returned and I beg also to forward Copy of a Petition to my address from Lathoo Karasoo Pachan & translations of Petitions from the Zamindar of Pannad & the son of Kanguia Laven & of the Deed of sale of the 1st Village.

13. With reference to the latter part of Para 2. of the Minutes of Consultation of Govt. I beg to state that, with exception of

of the $\frac{1}{2}$ Village of Copalagoody (which
is waste) the remainder are situated near
each other at the undermentioned distances
from Pannur, & that they can therefore
be managed without difficulty by the
Salt Amildar of Pannur

Pannuraindul . . . 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles

Littaindul . . . 13 "

Peria raindul . . . 14 "

Chattamadamungalam . . 10 "

Coppalagoody . . . 18 (in another direction)

Madura
1st April 1851

I have &c.
(signed) R. D. Parker
Collector
(True Copy)

Wm. K.
Collector

Contents of Sundry Deposits ... No 5
A List of Sundry jewels belonging to the late Sathupetty
Rajah of Ramnad deceased and valued by his Valuer
Chedamparapilly

3 Pairs of Gold Bangles set with small Rubies and Emeralds called Adarkoy Vallib	100 "
1 Pair of Gold Bangles set with small Diamonds Emeralds and Rubies	60 "
1 Pair of Gold Angli-joy called Tanday	28 22 40
1 Gold Neck jewel of 3 strings called Palagemonny	25 " "
1 Gold Waist jewel called Aramooday Annul	26 " "
1 Gold Arm jewel, called Payookund Cochoo	18 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel, called Hiramonny	15 " "
1 Gold Arm jewel, called Yudasoonny	3 " "
1 Pair of Gold Ear rings, called Chulladali Coppoo set with small Rubies	10 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel, with 6 Corals called Millecoymony	20 " "
10 Gold Finger rings	12 " "
1 do do set with Ceylon Stones	4 " "
1 do do set with a yellow false Stone	2 " "
1 Pair of Gold Finger rings set with small Rubies and the other with a small Emerald	4 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel of six Pearl strings set with small Diamonds, Emerald, and Rubies	200 " "
1 Gold Arm jewel set with small Diamonds Emeralds, and Rubies and Pearls, called Payookund	30 " "
1 Gold Bangle set with small Rubies and an Emerald	15 " "
1 Pearl Bangle	15 " "
1 Gold Head jewel set with small Diamonds Rubies and Pearl called Chandrapay	40 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel, called Saradoo Alagoozoolsum	23 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel set with Rubies Emeralds, and six strings of Pearls	30 " "
1 Gold Neck jewel, called Cochoo, with Corals and Pearls a pair only	10 " "
1 Gold Tail	1 " "
1 Pair of Gold Ear rings, set with small Rubies and Emerald called Woonnapoo, without the Screws	3 " "
1 Gold Ear ring set with small Rubies, called Melloodoo	4 " "

1859. A.D. Deposits
The 1. Anderson in letter
from the collector
The Chief Secretary to
Government
Dorville George
Dated 19th Decr
Recd. Chedamparapilly
Proc. of Govt. 25 December 1859 No 21

Copy of the list
letter to Ramnad No. 35
dated 14th April 1857.

Aug 19th 87
B. No 581

1 Gold Bead	✓	33 "
2 Pieces of Gold	✓	22 "
1 Piece of Silver Chain	✓	4 "
1 Silver Stick	✓	4 "
1 Coral mounted with silver	✓	11 "
4 Small Glass Beads	✓	1 "
17 Small pearls	✓	2 "
2 Small Gold Beads	✓	4 "
1 Pair of Gold Bangles, called Cadgom	✓	40 "
1 do Ear rings set with small rubies, Emeralds and Pearls, called Challada Copper	✓	20 "
1 Gold Neck jewel set with small Diamonds Emeralds Rubies and Pearls called Naga Addega	✓	150 "
1 Gold Neck jewel, set with small Rubies and Pearls called Patchy Padacorn	✓	10 "
2 Gold Nose rings set with small Diamonds Emeralds Rubies and Pearls	✓	15 "
1 String of Emerald Necklace containing 37 Emeralds	✓	150 "
3 Gold Finger rings	✓	4 22 "
1 Gold Ear ring set with small Diamonds Rubies and Pearls called Nagavudom	✓	5 "
1 Gold Ear ring set with small Rubies and Diamonds called Mookromany	✓	3 "
1 Pearl Neck jewel with 24 pieces of Glass Beads	✓	10 "
23 Green Glass Beads	✓	1 "
1 Silver finger ring	✓	11 "
1 Piece of Silver Chain	✓	3 "
8 Small pearls	✓	2 "
1 Gold Neck jewel called Addega set with small Rubies Diamonds and Pearls	✓	20 "

Total Star Pagodas 11296 40

1 Bag containing 1 Rupee
1 Ring 2 Gold Ornaments and 2 Coral Beads
The above in a Canvas Bag
Wm. B. Barclay
J. M.

+ Not in the original list

List of Jewels and Articles of Plate belonging to the late Sado-pulley
Rajah included in the General List already before Government

1 Large Silk Cap	1 Small Ivory Image
1 Small D	1 Looking Glass
1 P of Silver leg Bangles	14 Bottles supposed to contain Oil of Bases
1 do do	" A few small pearls tied on a String
1 do do	1 Silver pencil case and Pen
2 do do	1 Ivory Club tipped with Silver
2 do Waist Ornaments	14 Porto. 1000. Pagodas
1 Gold Neck Ornament	A 18 Pagodas in Quarters
1 P of Gold Bracelets	2 Half Pagodas
3 do do tied together	83 Neck Rings
1 Gold Watch Chain and fine Scale	3 Silver Hoops
1 Gold Watch	2 Pocket Telescopes
1 Gold Churnam Box complete	1 Large Silver Sugar Carrier
1 Silver do do	2 do Water Pots
1 Gold Petal leaf Box complete	1 do Kettle for Churnam
1 Large Silver Seal	1 Small Silver fumble
2 P of Gold Ear rings	1 Silver Chattri and Plate
1 Small Gold Pot	1 do
1 String of Gold beads	1 Silver Petal Box
1 Gold head Ornament set with Stones	1 Silver Euyek
2 P of Gold Toe rings	1 Small Silver fumble
1 Coral and Gold Neck lace	1 do Plates
1 Set of Gold Ornaments apparently	1 Silver ladle
intended for a Poth for a cloth	1 do Strainer and Cup
1 Europe made ring, silver set in Gold	2 do Box Water pots, with tops rather
3 P of Silver Toe Ornaments	damaged
11 Rings Stone set in Gold on a string	2 Old Silver Box Water pots with tops rather
6 do ring Gold on a string	damaged
33 Small plain Gold rings on a string	1 Metal Arm Case
1 P of Emerald and Diamonds Earrings	1 Silver fumble
2 Silver Seal rings	2 Silver Boxes and 1 Stand
2 Gold Ear rings tied together	1 do Box Ornaments and Stand
1 P of Nose Ornaments	1 Silver Cup and Wine Goblet
1 Blue Smelling Bottle	1 Large Silver Box for perfumes
1 Gold Neck lace	1 Small Gold french Watch damaged
10 Gold Arm Ornaments tied together	1 Red China made Box containing one jar
1 P of Silver Ornaments for a Dista	and painted Tin Cups
1 Silver Arm Ornaments	1 Silk mounted Portrait of the Rajah
6 Gold Buttons and Ruby tied in a cloth	1 Small China filgree Petal Box
1 Carnelian Box set in Gold	
" some few bits of Silver and Gold	
enclosed in a horn box	
2 Silver balls	
1 Plated pocket Compo	
1 Silk Medal	
2 Smelling Bottles	
1 Gold pencil Case	
	List of Jewels and Articles of Plate which
	were omitted to be inserted in the report
	of the Committee
	B 106 Pieces of Gold, supposed to have been
	a Neck Ornament

For 1858
At the 5th
Jan. 1858

proposed

23

8

1

- 3 P^{rs} of leg Ornaments Silver
 C 6 P^{rs} of Silver Ornaments
 D 1 Silver Toy Rings
 9 do Finger Rings
 E 4 Gold Ear rings set with Rubies
 2 do set with Rubies & Pearls
 2 do set with Rubies Emeralds
 and Diamonds
 1 Gold Nose ring set with Emeralds
 and Pearls
 2 Gold Ear rings set with Rubies
 Emeralds and Glaze
 14 Gold Beads part of a broken
 Necklace
 1 Silver Skool
 1 Old Candlestick
 2 Bells
- 4 Gold rings for the Ears
 1 Silver Baccata
 1 G Hair pin
 1 Gold Nose ring set with Ruby and Pearl
 1 Silver Fork
 14 Gold Beads
 3 Gold Ear pins set with Rubies
 2 Coral and 1 Gold Bead, upon a Gold pin
 36 Coral Beads
 2 Ivory Boxes with a few small pearls
 in one of them
 A few small Coral Beads
- F Star Pagodas four hundred and fifty
 two, Rupees Twenty three Cash
 twenty / 452. 23. 20

- A. 71 Quarter Pagodas and 1 (Dollar)
 Standard Rupee.
 B. New 110 pieces
 C. If these are bangles, two pairs
 seem to be missing.
 D. I suppose 300 Rings
 E. I cannot find these, unless they
 are the same with the two
 pairs detailed immediately
 below.
 F 450 Pagodas are in old East Bank
 Notes

I find not accounted for in this List
 A pair of plain Gold ear rings
 A Gold tooth pick
 Three Bottles of Star
 A pair of ivory rings, and
 A little powder.

W. H. F. F. F.
 A. Dub Treasurer

For 1/2 year
 and Treasury
 2/2

Memorandum.

From the Collector of Madura. (Dated 19th November 1859, No. 1292.)

In their order of 8th October last No. 569, the Government referred to the Collector of Madura to ascertain whether the deposed Raja of Ramnad, Mootoo Samalinga Sathasputty, had any representatives to whom the property now in deposit at the General Treasury might be given. If not, it was to be sold and the proceeds carried to the public account. The above letter from Mr. Clarke is in reply to that reference.

The property should, I think, be sold and the proceeds carried to account subject to any claim that may hereafter be established.

Wm. Clarke

Wm. Clarke

On Mootoo Samalinga Sathasputty being deposed for rebellion, his daughter

Should have been referred to the Resident Wm.

759. B.
in the 1475
11-11/581. From 16 Oct 59
Gm 628

daughter Sevagami Nutchiar was passed over, and the permanent settlement formed with his sister Mungalaishwary Nutchiar.

3. Mungalaishwary Nutchiar died in 1811 — without issue, and the Zemin-dary passed to her adopted son. He also died childless, and the estate then went to his widow's adopted son, her ^{own} brother. He dying the estate then devolved successively on his two daughters. On the last of these dying, it went to their mother who now holds it.

4. — Thus the present Zemin-dar of Ramnad is widow of the Grandson, by a double adoption, of the Istimar Zemin-dar sister of the deposed Poligar.

5. — The Poligar died in confinement at Madras in 1809. He left only one legitimate

legitimate child — a daughter Sevagami Nutchiar who long, but unsuccessfully, contested the title to the Zemin-dary. She died without issue 13th February 1849.

6. — Sevagami Nutchiar was twice married — having divorced her first husband.

7. — On her death, claims were preferred to certain Zamins enjoyed by her, including a quarter share of a village, which she had acquired by purchase. The pretensions of her several claimants are fully explained by Mr. Parker, in his letter of 1st April 1851. They were: —

1st. A step daughter of Sevagami Nutchiar, the daughter of her second husband.

2nd. Her alleged adopted son. The adoption is objected to on two grounds.

First

+ Annaswamy Taver

+ Ramaswamy Taver

+ Mungaleswar
hatchian
Dorrajah hatchian

+ Puva K. hatchian

She adopted a son in 1847 — who has since been put forward as entitled to succeed to the Zemin-dary.

+ enclosure in Mr
Clarke's letter 19
Nov 1859

(and after him his son)

— First that it must have taken place when the party was beyond the proper age.—

— Secondly— that the marriage of Sevagami Nutchiar with a second husband, although tolerated among the Marawars, is not recognised by the Hindoo Law, and any adoption made by Sevagami Nutchiar and her second (so called) husband would be null and void.—

3rd. A natural son of the deposed Zemindar Moothoo Ramalinga & a Nthooppetty.—

4th. The present Zemindar of Ramnad.—

8.— The Government disallowed the pretensions of all these claimants, and the villages, including the 1/4 share bought by Sevagami Nutchiar from the Bramins, were incorporated with the Government lands.

Note— It is stated by the Board of Revenue, letter 25th March 1850, Para. 9— to have been her nephew— ~~and suppose her eldest son~~ The Collector's letter of 31 July 1846. P. 6. shows him to have been her nephew by marriage— i.e. her husband's nephew— brother's son—

13
9. The alleged adopted son seems to have succeeded to Sevagami Nutchiar's private property, landed and personal— but then he had been living with her and managing her affairs, and had therefore a colorable title. It does not appear that his right to these effects was ^{ever} legally established, or indeed that any one cared to interfere with him about them.

10.— Mr. Clarke thinks that the sons of this individual, if they could show that the adoption of their father was real and legal, appear ~~to me~~ to have the best title to the property; but in absence of such proof, I cannot recommend its being delivered over to them.

11. It may be proper to observe that on the death of the Zemindar of Ramnad the succession to the Zemindari will probably be contested.

Ex. Minis. Cons. 17th May 1850.
3rd June 1851.
30th January 1855.

W.H.

by the then other persons
you named besides
themselves - nor one of them
I conceive can make
out a valid title - but
if it is thought fit
to give the property now
in the Treasury to any
one of the three, it might
be stated that it was
done as a pure act of
grace & bounty, & that
Govt did not thereby
recognize any right
in the party to the pro-
perty - still less any
greater right -

JF

2 Decr.

List

* ~~The~~ Lists of Jewels &c. de-
posited in the Treasury in
1811.

14
Financial Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following
letter from the Collector
of Madras.

(Dated 19 Nov, 1859 - No. 1292)

Order thereon - 16 December 1859. No. 606.

In the above letter the
Collector of Madras re-
plies to the reference
made to him in the Order
of Govt dated the 8th of Octo-
ber last No. 569. para. 3. to
ascertain whether the de-
posed Raja of Ramnad,
Sattu Ramalinga Sata-
pati, had any represen-
tative to whom the pro-
perty now in deposit in
the General Treasury
might be given.

2. Upon a conside-
ration of all the circum-
stances represented by
the Collector in regard to
the claims formerly ad-
vanced to the property
in

Proc of Feb 20 Dec in
Financial 1859 ad

10686

Proceedings of in Court
at Oct 16th Dec 39.

7. No 199 of do.

Upon a consideration of
all the circumstances so
represented by the Petition-
ers of Madras in regard to
the claims formerly
advanced to the Property
after the above Report of
James and Swatlow, & that
the Property be sold by
Public Auction and the
proceeds applied to any
debt due and to any
claim

I am that many
 have after be established
 that I mean to take
 the necessary steps for
 the disposal of the
 funds &c

C. A. Deane
Feb 12th 11