M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 26

(2) Date of repair 26.7.39

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 794 Press / Mis.

35-37

Dated 7-12- 18 63.

14/15

- 35-37

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department, 7th December 1863.

Read the following papers :—

No. 35. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd November 1863.

Read letters from the Collector of Madura, dated 6th and 24th October 1863, Nos. 219 and 235.

From V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Madura, 6th October 1863, No. 219.

I have the honor to submit herewith translation of the Plaint preferred in the Civil Court of Madura in *forma pauperis* against Government by Setukarasu Nacheyar, calling herself the heiress of the late deposed Poligar of Ramnad, Mutturamalinga Setupati, for the recovery of jewels and clothes to the value of Rupees 59,763 left by him in Fort Saint George where he died in January 1809 while in confinement.

2. The Plaintiff claims the property through Sevagamy Nacheyar, the daughter of Mutturamalinga Setupati. This Sevagamy Nacheyar married Ramasawmy Tevar, she separated from him and married Vijayagopala Setupati, who married a second wife Poorema Soondara Nacheyar the Plaintiff's mother. As step-daughter of Sevagamy Nacheyar Plaintiff claims; how this relationship would stand in Hindu Law I am not aware, but such re-marriages and breaking off from the first husband is common and recognized amongst the Marawars to whom the above named parties belong.

3. My predecessors, Messrs. Parker and Clarke, have so fully and completely dealt with the rights of the several claimants, of whom the Plaintiff was one, to the property left by Sevagamy Nacheyar, that I cannot do better than beg the Board's permission to refer them to marginal correspondence.

Paragraphs 5 and 7 of Mr. Parker's letter to the Board, dated 1st April 1851, No. 35.
Paragraph 8 of do. do., 27th September 1855, No. 177.
Government Proceedings, 8th October 1859, No. 569.
Mr. Clarke's letter to Government, 19th November 1859, No. 1292.
Government Order, 16th December 1859, No. 686.

4. It will also be seen that from the papers noted in the margin, the Plaintiff claimed the jewels, &c., now forming the subject matter of the suit, and that the Government negatived her title to them.

Board's Endorsement on Petitions, Nos. 102 and 103 of 1860.
Letter to Board, 21st May 1860, No. 101.
Board's Proceedings, 12th June 1860, No. 2766.
Government Proceedings, 20th June 1860.
Government Order, 21st July 1862, No. 533.
Do. 4th February 1863, No. 79.

5. In conclusion I beg to observe that the case under notice appears to involve a point of law whether the Plaintiff legally can be recognized as the heiress and representative of Sevagamy Nacheyar, and request the Board will be pleased to favor me with their explicit instructions for my guidance in the matter.

6. The suit will come on for hearing on the 25th November next, when the written statement on behalf of the Government should be put in.

7. I further beg to enclose a translation of the marginal papers* alluded to in paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Plaint respectively.

* Extract from Register of Petitions on the Collector's file for November 1816.
Do. do. for June 1843.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government with the Board's recommendation; that Mr. Dale be furnished with instructions as to the course Government desire to be adopted in the matter and requested to draft an answer to the suit accordingly.

2. In the Order of Government, dated 4th February 1863, No. 79, Financial Department, the Government expressed their wish that the present Zemindarni of Ramnad and the party who claims as the grand-son by adoption of Sivagami Nachiar, the daughter of the deposed Poligar, should bring Suits against Government who would then move the Court to order them to interplead, the present Plaintiff's claim having been deemed inferior to either of the others.

3. The Board observe that the legality of the alleged adoption by Sivagami Nachiar has been repeatedly questioned, and from the papers submitted by Mr. Levinge, the Board are disposed to think that the claim of the present Plaintiff is at least as good as that of either of the above parties.

4. Sivagami Nachiar was her father's legal heir, she divorced her first husband and married Vijiagopala Setupati, and whatever may be the legal force of such a marriage in ordinary Hindu law there seems no reason whatever to doubt that by the custom of the Maravers from time immemorial, such marriages are legal, and in all probability have been repeatedly and would now be recognised by the Court.

5. Sivagami Nachiar's second marriage being childless, it appears, that on 4th December 1816, she addressed a petition to the Collector stating her desire that her husband should marry, as his second wife, Poorna Savoondra Nachiar the grand-daughter of her (Sivagami's) aunt, and then raise up an heir to the Estate by one of the family. No objection was raised to this second marriage and the present Plaintiff was born of it. Mr. Clarke appears to have been in error in styling her the daughter of Vijiagopala Setupati by a "*former*" wife. Mr. Parker whom he quotes, speaks of her in his letter to the Board, dated 1st April 1851 as the daughter by *another* wife, but says nothing to induce the belief that her mother's marriage preceded that of Sivagami Nachiar.

6. Under these circumstances it appears to the Board that the Plaintiff's claim to inherit the personalty of Ramalinga Setupati the deposed Poligar, as the only child of the Poligar's only child's husband is deserving of much consideration, the Government claim to the property as escheat being, as the Board understand, waived.

7. The Board are not aware that either of the other parties have yet instituted suits as desired by Government.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copies of correspondence.

Proceedings, 16th December 1859, Nos. 21 and 22.
" 4th May 1860, " 13 and 14.
" 21st July 1862, " 69 — 71.
" 24th January 1863, " 69 and 70.
" 30th " " " 88 — 91.
" 4th February " " 16 and 17.
" 28th April " " 84 and 85.
" 15th July " " 40 and 41.

Forwarded, with copies of the previous correspondence noted in the margin, for the opinion of the Advocate General.

2. It may be well that Mr. Norton should confer with the Government Pleader on the subject, the claim referred to in the Board's Proceedings being more or less connected with matters in which Mr. Dale has been engaged on behalf of Government.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
16*th November* 1863.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 36. From JOHN ROBERT BOYSON, Esq., Government Solicitor, Madras; to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 26th November 1863, No. 830.

Dated 16th November 1863, Financial Department.

I have the honor to acknowledge the Order of Government noted in the margin, with the papers therein referred to, in connection with the claims to proceeds realised by the sale of certain jewels which belonged to the late deposed Zemindar of Ramnad.

2. I submitted them for the consideration of the Advocate General, and have also conferred with him on the subject in communication with the Government Pleader, and I now forward a copy of the opinion which the Advocate General has written.

3. I likewise return the order and papers above noted.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
7th December 1863.

COPY—OPINION.

1. I have perused the papers submitted herewith and conferred with the Government Pleader upon them as suggested by the order of reference.

2. If this were *res integra*, and I were called upon to advize the Government as to the party morally entitled to the amount in deposit, I think I should not have had much difficulty in coming to a conclusion in favor of the petitioner Pratapasima, though I should have required certain further information as to documents pointed out in his petitions, such as the Futwahs of 12th May 1809 and 24th February 1810, the Advocate General's opinion of 1st May 1809, the Decree in O. S., 13 of 1844, the Decree of the Provincial Court, 13th December 1813, and some evidence as to the alleged custom of the Marawars for wives to divorce their husbands.

3. It is very true, as remarked by the Advocate General Mr. Smyth, in his opinion of 31st January 1863, that the petitioner's claim is merely exparte: but it appears to me to be supported by the probabilities of the case, and to be capable of substantial and satisfactory confirmation by the evidence to which I have alluded.

4. I think it would turn out that the Government might very safely have paid the petitioner without the necessity of litigation, a recourse which should, in my opinion, be always avoided, if possible. Had the Government, on such evidence, paid the petitioner, I do not think it ever need have apprehended any liability to any other claimant.

5. I am quite clear that it need fear no such liability now; for the Statute of Limitations has run against *all* the applicants; and hence I speak of Pratapasima's as a *moral*, not a *legal* claim.

6. But the Government has invited litigation by its orders, and the question is no longer that to which I have above referred, but what conduct Government is to pursue in respect to the particular suit instituted.

7. I take it that the desire of Government is not to resist payment on the plea of limitation, but only to take care that it pays the party morally entitled.

8. It would I think have been very desirable in this case that the suit or suits should have been instituted in the High Court instead of the Court at Madura.

9. Though Act VIII of 1841, has not been absolutely repealed, it applied only to the late Supreme Courts which no longer exist, and it is therefore scarcely accurate to talk of interpleading. But the same end might certainly have been attained under Section 73 of the Procedure Code which provides for making all persons claiming an interest, parties to a suit. There is no provision for *interpleading*, which I think a defect in the Act, nor was there ever such a procedure in the Provinces.

10. Section 73 is not imperative on the Court. It only says that the Court *may* make, &c., and therefore in dealing with the suit before the Madura Court, care must be taken to provide against the contingency of the Court declining to add any parties.

11. I am clearly of opinion that the present claimant has no title, and therefore care must be taken to provide against her obtaining this money to the detriment of those who have a well founded claim.

12. It appears to me that, unless the Government waives the objection, the Court at Madura has no jurisdiction in the case under Civil Procedure Code, Section 5. The Government and the Collector are both made Defendants. As regards the latter, no act of his in respect of the property is alleged. And I think he ought to be struck off the record at once, if the Civil Procedure Code enables the Judge to take such a step. I cannot, however, find that it does, wherein again I consider the Act defective.

13. As respects the Government, the cause of action certainly did not arise within the jurisdiction of the Madura Court. The jewels were received in Madras, the sale was in Madras, the proceeds are in Madras: and the Government cannot be said to dwell or work in Madura. The seat of Government is the proper jurisdiction for trial of this case. And if the Government is liable to be sued in any Mofussil Court for causes of action arising in Madras, precisely the same class of inconveniences will follow as those pointed out in the recent case in the High Court against the Government and Mr. Cunliffe, when we successfully resisted the attempt to make the

Government liable in the High Court for acts and causes of action not arising within the jurisdiction of the High Court.

14. Public Officers of Government and public documents may have to be sent from the seat of Government to the local Courts, it may be hundreds of miles away and for considerable periods of time, to the great detriment of public business.

15. It is true enough that submitting to the jurisdiction in one case will not give the Court jurisdiction in another in which it may be raised; but the question is one of much importance, and it may be desirable to have it authoritatively settled.

16. The Government Pleader is not aware whether or no the Plaintiff is the Pauper she represents herself, and thinks that time should be obtained for ascertaining the point.

17. Subject to that I think, and the Government Pleader agrees with me, that the Government and the Collector should join in their answer, and that both should object to the jurisdiction on the grounds I have above explained; that the Collector should pray to be dismissed the suit forthwith: that the Government should plead the Statute of Limitations; but should state that various claimants have appeared from time to time, naming them, and requesting the Court to make them parties to the suit, in which case the Government should profess its willingness to waive the objection to the jurisdiction and its plea of limitation; and disclaiming all interest in the subject matter of the suit, declare its readiness to pay such party as the Court may declare entitled to the money.

18. The Government Pleader had not been instructed to prepare the answer, but as the time for settlement of issues is very short, has at once put himself in communication with Mr. Hudleston.

MADRAS, 21*st November* 1863.

(Signed) JOHN BRUCE NORTON,
Advocate General.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. R. BOYSON,
Government Solicitor.

No. 37. ORDER THEREON, 7th December 1863, No. 794.

A copy of the Acting Advocate General's opinion will be furnished to the Board of Revenue and to the Collector of Madura, who will adopt the course suggested in paragraph 17 of Mr. Norton's opinion.

2. The Government Pleader will be requested to prepare a draft answer, and the Collector will be instructed by telegraph to apply to the Court under the provisions of Section 67, Act VIII of 1859, for five days additional time for putting in the answer.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

Revenue Department.

No.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 3d November 1863.

Read the following letters from the
Collector of Madura dated 6th and 24th October 1863
Nos 219 & 235.

(Encs 12th and 30th Octr/63 No 6612 & 7117/No 4790)

Ordered that the above papers be sub-
mitted to Government with the Board's recom-
mendation that Mr Dale be furnished with
instructions as to the course Government desire
to be adopted in the matter and requested to
draft an answer to the suit accordingly.

2. In the order of Government dated 1st
February 1863 No 79. Financial Dept the Government
expressed their wish that the present Zemindarnee
of Ramnad and the party who claims as the
Grandson by adoption of Sivagami Nachiar,
the daughter of the deposed Poligar, should
bring Suits against Government who would
then move the Court to order them to interplead
the present Plaintiffs' claim having been
deemed inferior to either of the others.

3. The Board observe that the legality
of the alleged adoption by Sivagami Nachiar
has been repeatedly questioned, and from the
papers submitted by Mr Levinge the
Board

Board are disposed to think that the claim of the present Plaintiff is at least as good as that of either of the above parties.

4. Sivagami Nachiar was her father's legal heir. She divorced her first husband and married Vijiagopala Setupati, and whatever may be the legal force of such a marriage in ordinary Hindu law there seems no reason whatever to doubt that by the custom of the Maravers from time immemorial, such marriages are legal, and in all probability have been repeatedly and would now be recognized by the Court.

5. Sivagami Nachiar's second marriage being Childless, it appears, that on 4th December 1816. She addressed a petition to the Collector stating her desire that her husband should marry as his second wife, Poorna Savoondra Nachiar the granddaughter of her (Sivagami's) Aunt, and thus raise up an heir to the Estate by one of the family. No objection was raised to this second marriage, and the present Plaintiff was born of it. Mr Clarke appears to have been in error in styling her the daughter of Vijiagopala Setupati by a "former" wife. Mr Parker whom he quotes, speaks

1 Inclo 2

speaks of her in his letter to the Board dated 1st April 1851. as the daughter by another wife but says nothing to induce the belief that her mother's marriage preceded that of Sivagami Nachiar.

6. Under these circumstances it appears to the Board that the Plaintiff's claim to inherit the personalty of Ramalinga Setupaty the deposed Poligar as the only child of the Poligar's only Child's husband is deserving of much consideration. the Government claim to the property as escheat being, as the Board understand, waived.

7. The Board are not aware that either of the other parties have yet instituted Suits as desired by Government.

(A true Esctract.)

Secretary.

To,

J. D. Sim Esqre

Secretary to Government

Revenue Department.

with Copies of Correspondence

Madura, 9th
6th October 1863.

No. 219.

From, V. H. Levinge Esqre
Collector of Madura,

To, W. Huddleston Esqre
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras,

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith translation of the Plaint preferred in the Civil Court of Madura in forma pauperis against Government by Setukarasu Nacheyar calling herself the heiress of the late deposed Poligar of Ramnad Mutturamalinga Setupati for the recovery of jewels and clothes to the value of Rs. 59,763 left by him in Fort St. George where he died in January 1809 while in confinement-

2- The Plaintiff claims the property through Sevagamy Nacheyar the daughter of Mutturamalinga Setupati- This Sevagamy Nacheyar married Ramaswamy Tevar, she separated from him and married Vijayagopala Setupati, who married a second wife Poorna Soondara Nacheyar the Plaintiff's mother- As Step daughter of Sevagamy Nacheyar Plaintiff claims; how this relationship would stand in

Pd 15th July 63- 4-8-4

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 3rd Nov 1863.
Dept. 4 Sour 1
Pro. 5th
2. Forwarded with 8 cos from Mdy
No. 1794

No. 2420 Pa

Fort St George
the 4th Nov 1863

Forwarded, with copies of the correspondence noted in the margin, for the opinion of the Advocate General.-

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

Advocate General's Office
the 5th November 1863

Returned with the opinion of the Advocate General.-

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

Read the Letter from the Collector of Madura No 219 dated 6th October 1863 and the Plaint therein enclosed.

Read also the following papers noted in the margin.

Resolved that the Collector of Madura be informed that the Board are of opinion that the Plaint should be returned to the Plaintiff for presentation to the Court of Wards.

Ordered accordingly.

1. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 6th Oct 1863 No 219 and Plaint.
2. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 9th Oct 1863 No 220 and Plaint.
3. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 15th July 1863 No 1794 and Plaint.
4. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 3rd Nov 1863 No 2420 and Plaint.
5. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 4th Nov 1863 No 2442 and Plaint.
6. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 5th Nov 1863 No 2466 and Plaint.
7. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 6th Nov 1863 No 2490 and Plaint.
8. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 7th Nov 1863 No 2514 and Plaint.

Fort St George
the 10th Nov 1863

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

Forwarded to the Collector of Madura for information and guidance.

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

Read the following papers noted in the margin.

Resolved that the Collector of Madura be informed that the Board are of opinion that the Plaint should be returned to the Plaintiff for presentation to the Court of Wards.

Ordered accordingly.

1. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 6th Oct 1863 No 219 and Plaint.
2. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 9th Oct 1863 No 220 and Plaint.
3. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 15th July 1863 No 1794 and Plaint.
4. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 3rd Nov 1863 No 2420 and Plaint.
5. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 4th Nov 1863 No 2442 and Plaint.
6. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 5th Nov 1863 No 2466 and Plaint.
7. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 6th Nov 1863 No 2490 and Plaint.
8. Letter from Collr of Madura dated 7th Nov 1863 No 2514 and Plaint.

Fort St George
the 10th Nov 1863

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

Forwarded to the Collector of Madura for information and guidance.

H. D. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary

in Hindu law I am not aware, but such re-
marriages and breaking off from the first
husband is common and recognized amongst
the Maravars to whom the above re-
named parties belong.

3. My predecessors re- Paras 5 & 7 of Mr. Parker's
Messrs. Parker & Clarke letter to the Board —
have so fully & completely dated 1st April 1851
dealt with the rights of the No. 35.
several claimants of re- Para 8 of Do. Do. 27. Sept.
whom the Plaintiff was 1855. No. 177.
one to the property left by Govt. Pros. 8. Oct. 1859 No. 569.
Sevagamy Nacheyar that Mr Clarke's letter to Govt.
I cannot do better than beg the Board's permis- 19. Nov. 1859 No. 1292.
-sion to refer them to marginal correspondence. Govt. order 16. Dec. 1859.
No. 686.

4. It will be also be Board's Endt. on Petitions
seen that from the papers No. 102 & 103 of 1860.
noted in the margin the Letter to Bd. 21st May 1860.
Plaintiff claimed the re- No. 101.
jewels &c. now forming Bd. Pro: 12. June 1860 No. 2768
the subject matter of the Govt. Pro: 20. June 1860.
Suit and that the Govern- Govt. Order 21st July 1862
-ment negatived her title No. 533.
to them. Do. 4. February 1863.
No. 79.

5. In conclusion I beg to observe that
the case under notice appears to involve a
point of law whether the Plaintiff legally
can

can be recognized as the heiress and repre-
-sentative of Sevagamy Nacheyar and re-
-quest the Board will be pleased to favor me
with their explicit instructions for my guidance
in the matter.

6. The Suit will come on for hearing
on the 25th November next when the written re-
Statement on behalf of the Government should
be put in.

† Extt. from Regr. of Petitions on the Coll[re] file for November 1816. Do. Do. for June 1843.

7. I further beg to enclose a transla-
-tion of the marginal papers† alluded to in re-
Paras 3 and 5 of the Plaint respectively.

I have &c.

(Signed) V. H. Levinge
Collector.

(True Copy)

Sub Secretary.

Copy Opinion.

1. I have perused the papers submitted herewith and conferred with the Govt. Pleader upon them as suggested by the Order of reference.

2. If this were res integra, and I were called upon to advize the Government as to the party morally entitled to the amount in deposit, I think I should not have had much difficulty in coming to a conclusion in favour of the Petitioner Pratapasima though I should have required certain further information as to documents pointed out in his petitions, such as the Entwahs of 12th May 1809 and 24th Feb. 1810 the Adv: General's opinion of 1st May 1809 the Decree in O.S. 13 of 1844 the Decree of the Provincial Court 13th Dec. 1813 and some evidence as to the alleged custom of the Marawars for wives to divorce their husbands.

3. It is very true, as remarked by the Adv: Gen. Mr. Smyth in his opinion of 31st Jany. 63 that the Petitioner's claim is merely exparte: but it appears to me to be supported by the probabilities of the case, and to be capable of substantial and satisfactory confirmation by the evidence to which I have alluded.

4. I think it would turn out that the Govt. might very safely have paid the Petitioner without the necessity of litigation a recourse which should in my opinion be always avoided, if possible. Had the Govt. on such evidence paid the Petitioner, I do not think it ever need have apprehended any liability to any other claimant.

5. I am quite clear that it need fear no such liability now,

for

for the Statute of Limitations has run against all the applicants; and hence I speak of Purtapasimas as a moral, not a legal claim.

6. But the Govt. has invited litigation by its Orders, and the question is no longer that to which I have above referred, but what conduct Govt. is to pursue in respect to the particular Suit instituted.

7. I take it that the desire of Government is not to resist payment on the plea of Limitation, but only to take care that it pays the party morally entitled.

8. It would I think have been very desirable in this case that the Suit or Suits should have been instituted in the High Court instead of the Court at Madura.

9. Though Act VIII of 1841 has not been absolutely repealed it applied only to the late Supreme Courts which no longer exist, — and it is therefore scarcely accurate to talk of interpleading. But the same end might certainly have been attained under Sec: 73 of the Procedure Code which provides for making all persons claiming an interest, parties to a Suit. There is no provision for interpleading, which I think a defect in the Act - nor was there ever such a procedure in the provinces.

10. Sec: 73 is not imperative on the Court. It only — says that the Court may make Order, and therefore in dealing with the Suit before the Madura Court, care must be taken to provide against the contingency of the Court declining to add any parties.

11. I am clearly of opinion that the present claimant has no title, and therefore care must be taken to provide against her — obtaining this money to the detriment of those who have a well — founded claim.

12. It appears to me that, unless the Govt. waives the objection, the Court at Madura has no jurisdiction in the case under Civil — Pro: Code Section 5. The Government and the Collector are both made

made Defendants. As regards the latter, no act of his in respect of the property is alleged. And I think he ought to be struck off the record at once, if the Civil Procedure Code enables the judge to take such a step. I cannot however find that it does — wherein again I consider the Act defective.

13. As respects the Govt., the cause of action certainly did not arise within the jurisdiction of the Madura Court. The jewels were received in Madras, the Sale was in Madras, the proceeds are in Madras - and the Govt cannot be said to dwell or work in Madura. The Seat of Government is the proper jurisdiction for trial of this case. And if the Government is liable to be sued in any Mofussil Court for causes of action arising in Madras, — precisely the same class of inconveniences will follow as those pointed out in the recent case in the High Court against the Government and Mr. Cunliffe, when we successfully resisted the attempt to make the Govt liable in the High Court for acts and causes of action not arising within the jurisdiction of the High Court.

14. Public Officers of Government and public documents — may have to be sent from the Seat of Government to the local Courts, it may be hundreds of miles away and for considerable periods of time, to the great detriment of public business.

15. It is true enough that submitting to the jurisdiction in one case will not give the Court jurisdiction in another in which it may be raised; but the question is one of much importance, and it — may be desirable to have it authoritatively settled.

16. The Govt Pleader is not aware whether or no the — Plaintiff is the Pauper she represents herself, and thinks that time should be obtained for ascertaining the point.

Subject

17. Subject to that I think, and the Govt. Pleader agrees with me, that the Government and the Collector should join in their answer, and that both should object to the jurisdiction on the grounds I have above explained: that the Collector should pray to be dismissed the Suit forthwith: that the Govt. should plead the Statute of Limitations; but should state that various claimants have appeared from time to time, naming them, and requesting the Court to make them parties to the Suit, in which case the Govt. should profess its willingness to waive the objection to the jurisdiction and its plea of Limitation; and disclaiming all interest in the subject matter of the Suit, declare its readiness to pay such party as the Court may declare entitled to the money.-

18. The Govt. Pleader had not been instructed to prepare the answer, but as the time for Settlement of Issues is very short, has at once put himself in communication with Mr. Hudleston.-

(Sgd.) John Bruce Norton
Adv. Genl.

Madras:
21st Nov. 63.

True Copy
L. R. Boyton
Govt. Solr.

19 no

No. 830.

Madras November 26th 1863.

From

John Robert Boyson
Government Solicitor - Madras.

To

The Honorable A. J. Arbuthnot
Chief Secretary to Government
Madras.

Sir.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the Order of Government noted in the margin, with the papers therein referred to, in connection with the claims to proceeds realised by the sale of certain Jewels which belonged to the late deposed Zemindar of Ramnad.

Dated 16th November 1863
Financial Depart.

2. I submitted them for the consideration of the Advocate General and have also conferred with him on the subject in communication with the Government Pleader; and I now forward a copy of the opinion which the Advocate General has written.

3. I likewise return the Order and papers above noted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir.
Your most obedient Servant

J R Boyson

Govt. Solr.

Re
the claims to proceeds realized
by the sale of certain Jewels belonging
to the late deposed Zemindar
of Ramnad. -

(Copy)
Advocate Generals opinion.

Encl. to
Encl. No 823
In letter from Govt. Solr. to Chief Secy.
to Govt. dated 26th Novr. 1863. No 830.

Financial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under date the 3d November 1863 with their letter No. 970 dated 26th November 1863 forwarding a Petition from Ramasawmy Chetty praying that he may be allowed to purchase certain Lands in Vellore Fort, which were sold by the Collector of that District for Arrears of Revenue due by the Petitioner's late father Ramasawmy Chetty.

Read also a letter from the Board of Revenue under date the 26th November 1863 forwarding a Petition from Ramasawmy Chetty praying that he may be allowed to purchase certain Lands in Vellore Fort, which were sold by the Collector of that District for Arrears of Revenue due by the Petitioner's late father Ramasawmy Chetty.

Financial 1863.
From the Govt. Sec. Madras
To the Chief Secy. to Govt.
Dated 26th November
Read 28th —
No. 829
& Inclosures
No. 827

Forwards Copy Advocate General's opinion in connection with Petition Ramasawmy Chetty praying that he may be allowed to purchase certain Lands in Vellore Fort, which were sold by the Collector of that District for Arrears of Revenue due by the late father of Petitioner.

Ordered to the Table.

Forwarded to the Govt. of India.

copy of the Advocate
General's opinion as
to the course to be adopted
with reference to the
claim referred to in
the foregoing proceedings
of the Board of Revenue.

(Here enter
Order thereon: 7th December 1853 No. 794.
letter
b. copy of the Advocate
General's opinion will
be furnished to the
Board of Revenue and
to the Collector of Customs
who will adopt the course
suggested in para 17
of the Law Officer's opinion.

The Secretary Chamber
will be specially to prepare
a short answer and the
Collector will be instructed
by telegraph to apply to the

of Section 67 Act
VIII of 1859 for five
days additional time
for putting in the answer

G/G.

Board of Revenue desptd 7th
12 Original enclosures re-
turned with G.O No 797
Collector
Govt Solicitor desptd 8th
Govt Chamber desptd 7th
Records

Foreign 1863. Department.

No. 794

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT,

Dated 9th Dec 1863

Home letter regarding
a suit filed by Abdulla
Sheyar claiming 30/ parcels
the sale of certain Jewels
his late deposed Dewan
Ramiah —

9678

FA 832 - 322 - 447 - 448

35037