Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

[F/26]
1,000—25-7-96

Financial (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 66067

DATED 10.1.99

INDEXED. 17/17

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording the correspondence in connection with the claim of one Mr. M. Ry Ragavali Naicker to the Payment of Rs 3000 on account of an old Bank Note of the late First Bank Madras, & forwarding copy of the same to the Govt of India (Fin & Commerce).

T 10.1.99.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Exo 434/99	= 177						
~~Ex~~	3.2.99.						
cw 925/99							

Financial

~~Public~~ (1898) Department.

3525

CURRENT No. ~~3707~~

Endt:- No: 2720, dy 5-12-98.

Referred to the Commissioner of Paper Currency for remarks

G Stokes
Chief Secretary

Exo
2. XII. 98

Order

From Messrs. Grauts & ~~Greatorex~~ Greatorex
4, North Beach Road
Madras

No.

Dated 19 — 11 — 98

Received 23 — 11 — 98
in Fin. 1-12-98

Registered 24 Do. — 11 — 98.

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Requesting payment, on behalf of their Client, Y. Rashavalu Naicker, for a sum of Rs 3000/ due to him on account of a Bank note found in the property of his deceased father, and also giving notice that legal steps will be instituted for the recovery of the above sum if not paid, within two months.

PAPER CURRENCY DEPARTMENT. 7 DEC. 1898 MADRAS.

Journal Office

R. This appears the proper

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

35-25

CHIEF SECRETARY'S GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 23 NOV 1893

No 44 North Beach Road
Madras 19th November 1893.

To

The Right Honorable
The Secretary of State for India in Council

To and

The Secretary of the Government of Madras
on his behalf.

Your Lordship

It is represented to us by Y Raghavulu Nayakar of No 47 Narasaiyar Street Jandrapett near Old Washermanpett, Madras that some time in the month of October 1896 our client who is the son of V. Emberumall Nayakar who died in the month of November 1895 while searching for some documents among certain old records belonging to his late father discovered a Government Bank Note No 641 dated 18th September 1834 for Rs 3000/- in a rather torn condition.

It is further represented to us that on or about the 16th of October 1896 our client enclosed the said Government Bank note in a letter which he addressed to the Secretary & Treasurer Bank of Madras and requested

PAPER CURRENCY DEPARTMENT 7 DEC. 1893 MADRAS

requested payment of the value of same but that on the same date the said Secretary & Treasurer of the Bank of Madras returned the said Government Bank note to our client and referred him to the Accountant General of Madras in regard to the same.

It is further represented to us that on or about the 19th of October 1896 our client addressed himself to the Account General of Madras enclosing the original letter of the Secretary & Treasurer of the Bank of Madras of the 16th idem and the said Government Bank note for Rs3000/- and requested payment of the value of the said Government Bank note at an early date and not having received any reply to that letter our client wrote a reminder to him on the 28th December 1896.

It is further represented to us that on the 11th January 1897 our client received a letter from the Accountant General of Madras with reference to his letter of the 19th of October 1896 wherein he requested our client to let him know when his father died and why the claim had not been preferred for so many years by our client or by his father.

It is further represented to us that on the 18th of January 1897 our client in reply to the letter of the

PAPER CURRENCY DEPARTMENT
7 DEC. 1893
MADRAS.

the Accountant General of Madras of the 11th idem, afforded him the information he required and again requested payment of the value of the said Government Bank note and that on or about the 2nd of April 1897 the Accountant General returned the said Government Bank note and the original letter of the Secretary and Treasurer Bank of Madras dated the 16th of October 1896 to him stating that he the Accountant General was unable to pay the note as the Registers of the Bank show that the note was cancelled on the 7th of January 1839 but giving no explanation as to how the cancellation was effected.

It is further represented to us by our client that on or about the 5th May 1897 our client through us addressed a letter to the Accountant General of Madras asking him how he made out that the Government Bank note had been cancelled notwithstanding the fact that the note was still in our clients possession and requesting payment of the sum of Rs 3000/- the amount represented by the said Government Bank note but that after a personal interview with a member of our firm and of our client the Accountant General through the Government

PAPER CURRENCY DEPARTMENT
7 DEC. 1893
MADRAS

Government Solicitor has refused to comply with our client's request.

We most respectfully beg to bring the above facts to Your Lordship's notice and to claim payment on behalf of our client of the said sum of Rs 3000/-.

We also beg respectfully to give Your Lordship notice that in the event of the said sum of Rs 3000/- not being paid to our client or to us on his behalf within two months from this date our client will be reluctantly compelled to institute a suit for the recovery of the same.

We are,

Your Lordships Obedient Servants

Grant & Prentice

PAPER CURRENCY DEPARTMENT
7 DEC. 1893
MADRAS

Biennial

~~Public~~ (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 3777

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
17 DEC 1898
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

From The Accountant General
Madras

Order

No. 1 B 4 / 242.

Dated 16 th December 1898.

Received
Registered 17th Dec. 98

Enclosures (Four Cartons 35-25 returns)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding certain papers connected with the claim of one Mr. A. Raghavalu Naicker to a payment of Rs 3000 on account of an old bank note

R.O. for papers.

A.S. 17/12/98

Rect 19/12/98 Rect. 21/12/98

BACK PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
R1280	20-9-97		
R1037	2-8-97		
R838	29-6-97		
77	7-2-45		
Sml C	26-9-8874		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Letter from the Accountant-General, Madras,

No $\frac{I.B.C.}{27}$, dated 23rd February 1897, to the Comptroller-General,

Calcutta.

—

I have the honour to state that a note of the old Government Bank at Madras for Rs 3000/ bearing No 8[illegible], dated 18th September 1834 has been presented for payment by one G. Raghavulu Nayakar of Madras. On a reference ma he explains that he was only 13 years old when his late father died in 1859 and that his elder brother was away on business in the South Arcot district and that he suddenly discovered the note when he was making a search for a document among his father's old papers. The note presented appears to be moth eaten and the part containing the signature of the authority who issued the note has entirely disappeared.

2. A register of notes issued by the old Government Ba from 1833 to 1842 has been traced out in this office wh shows that the note in question was cancelled on 7th January 1839. The cancellation seems to have been conse upon the payment of the note, but there is no direct pr

of the payment, as the accounts of the Government Bank from 1834 to 1844 have been destroyed.

3. A sum of Rs 69491 was written off on the 31st March 1867 as the unclaimed balance under the head "Government Bank notes in circulation" under Government of India letter No 2769 dated 15th October 1866 to your address and the value of this particular note could not have been included in the balance. But I am unable to prove this because no account particulars of the balance is forthcoming

4. I have also made a reference to the Bank of Madras which was established on the abolition of the Government Bank under Government of India Act IX of 1843 and was under Sections VII and VIII required to pay the value of notes then outstanding and to recover the same subsequently from Government. The Bank is however unable to throw any light on the subject as it reports that it does not possess any records relating to the Government Bank.

5. I have the honour therefore to request that you will be good enough to state whether a list of notes outstanding at the end of March 1867 exists in your office and whether the value of the above note was included in it and if not what reply is to be made to the presenter of the note.

Letter from the Offg: Head Commissioner of Paper Currency, Calcutta, to the Accountant-General, Madras, No 623, dated 28th March 1897.

With reference to your letter No $\frac{\text{I.G.B.}}{27}$, dated 23rd February 1897, I have the honour to return the note of the old Government Bank at Madras, for Rs 3000/- forwarded therewith, and to state that you should refuse to pay the note on the ground that it was cancelled on 7th January 1839.

2. There is no list in this office of the outstandings of these notes at any time.

Letter from the Accountant-General, Madras, to the Government Solicitor, Madras, No $\frac{\text{I.B.G.}}{84}$ dated 20th May 1897.

I have the honour to state that a note

of the old Government Bank at Madras for Rs 8000/-
bearing No B. 641 dated 18th September 1834 was
recently presented for payment by one G. Raghavulu
Nayakar of Madras stated that he was only 13
years old when his father died in 1839 and that
his elder brother was away on business in the
South Arcot district and that he suddenly discovered
the note when he was making a search for a
document among his father's old records. The note
presented appears to be moth-eaten and the part
containing the signature of the authority who issued
the note has entirely disappeared.

2. A register of notes issued by the old Government
Bank from 1833 to 1842 has been traced out in this
office which shows that the note in question was cancelled
on the 7th January 1839. The cancellation seems to have been
consequent upon the payment of the note, but there is
no direct proof of the payment as both the Register of
notes paid and the accounts of the Government Bank
from 1834 to 1844 have been destroyed.

3. As however a sum of Rs 69491 was transferred
to Government on the 31st March 1867 as the unclaimed

balance

balance of Government Bank notes in circulation
under the Government of India instructions to the
Comptroller-General, I acted the latter officer what
reply to make to the present claim. He instructed
me to refuse payment of the note on the ground that
it was cancelled on the 7 January 1839 and I did so;
I have now received a letter dated 5th Instant from Messrs
Gant and Greatorex Solicitors Madras applying on
behalf of the above mentioned Raghavulu Nayakar for
payment of the note and asking how it is made out
that the Government Bank note in question was cancelled,
notwithstanding the fact that the note is still in their
client's possession. It is possible that the payment was
made at the time either on a duplicate note or on
an indemnity bond on the allegation that the note
was lost or mislaid. But nothing can now be stated
definitely as the cancellation was made so long ago
as January 1839 and the Bank itself was abolished
in June 1843 on the establishment of the present
Madras Bank under act IX of 1843.

4. The payment of a note on an Indemnity bond
was not unusual. I find that in letter No 653

dated

of dated 12- February 1839, the Superintendent and Treasurer
bearin Government Bank applied to the solicitor to the East
rece India Company to prepare an Indemnity bond to
No guard the Bank against loss by payment of a half
yea Bank note.
h 5. I shall therefore be obliged by your advising
S me generally on the claim in question. I enclose for
th the purpose Messrs Grant and Greatorex letter under
da reference and this office letter to which it is a
p reply together with the former correspondence on
c the subject.

Letter from William Morgan,
Acting Government Solicitor, Madras, to the Accountant
General to the Government of Madras, No 393, dated
19th July 1897.

With reference to your letter No 84 dated the
20th of May 1897 relating to a claim of Y. Ragavaloo
Naidu to payment of a currency Note of the old
Government Bank of Madras for Rs3000/- dated 18th
September 1834, I write to inform you that
I saw the claimant and his solicitors on Saturday
last and have also seen the note in question.

From the statement I have taken from the
claimant it would appear that his father died some
35 years ago leaving himself and two brothers both of
whom are now dead; That his father was a House
contractor and supplier of building materials and
died worth from nine to ten thousand Rupees: That
he was in the habit of keeping his accounts on cadjan
which accounts are in the claimants possession but that
there is nothing in them shewing the receipt of a sum
of Rs3000/-: That he and his two brothers divided about
25 years ago but continued to live in the family
house: That in October last he found the note
whilst searching for the certificate of his house.
That no one was present whilst he found it but
that he at once told his Nephew and also a friend
of his of its having been found, and sent it in to
the Bank of Madras ten days afterwards.

The note is very moth-eaten in parts, but it
appeared to me on examination that the lower
portion of it where the signature should be, had

of a been cut off, in contradistinction to having worn away
beards or been eaten away, and looking to this fact and
rec. to the improbability of so large a proportion of the
N. claimants fathers possessions being in the shape of
ye a Currency Note, and to there being no mention of
t. the receipt of such sum in his Accounts, and also
c. looking to the fact that according to your register
th the note in question appears to have been cancelled
a on the 7th of January 1839 I cannot advise Govern-
ment to admit the claim. It is possible that
if a suit is filed, the claimant may be able to
establish his right, and I saw no reason myself
to doubt the truth of his story, but in any
event I am of opinion that he should be put
to the proof of his claim.

It might be as well if possible to ascertain
if any of the claimants relatives have ever
been employed in the Accountant-General's office;
2. I asked the question of the claimant but
he denied it.

Letter from the Accountant-General
Madras, to the read Commissioner of Paper Currency,
Calcutta, No. I.O.G./142, dated 28th July 1897.

With reference to your letter No. 623, dated
the 26th of March 1897 instructing me to refuse
payment of an old bank note for Rs 3000/- on the
ground that it has been cancelled, I have the
honour to inform you that I have received a
letter dated 5th May 1897 from Messrs Grant and
Greatorex Solicitors, Madras, in behalf of their client,
Y. Rajhavulu Naidu the claimant of the value
of the note. They enquire how I contend that the
note was cancelled notwithstanding the fact that
it is still in their clients possession and intimate
that if their clients claim is not settled without
further delay, they have been instructed to take
legal action. I therefore thought it desirable
to consult the Government solicitor and sent him
the correspondence in the case. He states in his
letter No. 393, dated 19th Instant that it is possible
that if a suit is filed the claimant may be able

of
bear to establish his right, but still he should be put to the
rec proof of his claim. I therefore beg to forward Messrs
N Grant and Greatorex's and the Government Solicitor's
ye letters mentioned above and request that you will
h be so good as to favour me at an early date with
c your further instructions in the matter.

tl With regard to the Government Solicitor's remark
a that it might be as well ~~as~~ to ascertain if any
of the ~~relatives~~ relatives of the Claimant was ever employed
in this office, I cannot find that any body here
knows any thing about him.

I am still trying to get from the Government
office here a copy of the rules, if any, regulating the
payment of these notes or any record which may
throw further light on the payment of the note
under reference.

R.W. 1280 7-9-98
20-9-98 G

Letter from the Offg: Head
Commissioner of Paper Currency, Calcutta, to
the Accountant-General to the Government
of Madras, No 149, dated 11th August 1897.

In returning the annexures to your letter
No. $\frac{I.S.B.}{142}$ dated 28th July 1897, having reference to a
claim to a note for Rs 300/- of the old Government
Bank at Madras, I have the honour to state
that under the circumstances I am of opinion
that you should reject the claim and allow the
claimant to take legal action in regard to it.

2. I presume that in the event of any notice
of a suit being sent to you, you will communi-
cate with the Local Government regarding its
defence.

(True Copies)

Fort St. George
Accountant-General's office
16th December 1898.

J. D. B. Bowes
Chief Superintendent.

M.D. 16/12.

CURRENT No. 3777

Treasury account DEPARTMENT.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
Accountant-General's Office,
16th December 1898.

No. 1B.G
242 Rec.

From

J. Hesketh Biggs Esquire,
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

SIR,

H With reference to your endorsement No 2720 dated the 5 of December 1898 on letter from Messrs Grant and Greatorex, solicitors, requesting payment on behalf of their client Y. Raghavalu Naicker of a sum of Rs 3000, on account of an old Bank Note, I have the honour to state that the case is that in connection with which certain records were called for by this office from Government - Vide correspondence ending with Govern-
G -ment order R No 1280 Financial dated 20 September 1897.

The claim in question was rejected after taking the

the advice of the Comptroller General and Head Commissioner of Paper Currency, and the Government Solicitor Madras on the matter.

I enclose for the information of Government copies of the marginally noted correspondence with those officers which contain all particulars of the case.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

your most obedt: servt:,

Accountant General.

From Accountant General to Comptroller General No 185-A/27 dated 23-2-97.
Head Commissioner Paper Currency to Accountant General No 623 dated 26-3-97.
Accountant General to Government Solicitor " 185-A/32 " 20-5-97.
Govt: Solicitor to Accountant General " 393 " 19-7-97.
Accountant General to Hd Commissioner Paper Currency " 185-A/142 " 23-7-97.
Head Commissioner Paper Currency to Accountant General " 149 " 11-8-97.

[G. / 75]
1 060—11-8 98.

C. No. 3525-3777

C No. 3525 B

NOTE FOR THE Chief Asst.

In their letter dated the 19th November 1898 Messrs Grant and Greatorex give notice that, unless the amount of Rs 3000 due to their client Raghavelu Naicker on account of a Govt Bank Note in his possession be paid within two months from the date of this letter, a suit will be instituted against the Secy of State for the recovery of the amount.

The facts connected with this notice are the following:

Y. Raghavelu Naicker, son of Embermmal Naicker, found a Govt Bank Note of Rs 3000 in a torn condition while searching for some documents among the records of his late father & presented it to the Secretary & Treasurer, Bank of Madras, for payment. The Secy returned the Bank Note with the to Raghavelu and referred him to the Acct Genl. Raghavelu thereupon presented the Bank

with the Secy's letter to the Acct Genl demanded payment of the amount. After obtaining some further particulars from Raghavelu the Acct Genl referred the matter to the Comptroller Genl, and reported that the Bank note presented was moth-eaten, that the part containing the signature of the authority, who issued the note had entirely disappeared; that the fact had been traced in this office that the Bank note in question was cancelled on the 7th January 1839 and that the cancellation must have been consequent on the payment of the note but that there was no direct proof as to the date on which the amount was paid as the accounts of the Govt Bank from 1834 to 1844 had all been destroyed. The Comptroller Genl in reply reported that the claim should be refused on the ground that the note in question was cancelled in January 1839.

Raghavelu was informed accordingly by the Acct Genl

The Govt Solicitor, to whom the matter was referred, was of opinion that the lower portion of the note where the signature should be appears to be cut off in contradistinction to having worn away or motheaten away. For ~~[illegible]~~ other reasons also he could not advise the Govt to admit the claim. He further added that even though Raghavelu might be able to establish his claim by filing a suit he should be put to the proof of it.

The Commissioner of Paper Currency is also of opinion that the Claim should be rejected.

Under the circumstances the Govt has nothing to do in the matter

P. T. O

Cs. It is doubtful whether the

It is submitted that the
with papers may kindly be
Accl

of Recorded.

Some suit if filed, should not be
Ra filed against the Accl. Genl
the as Comm^r. of Paper Currency.
Gen ~~Gen~~ ~~Gen Ker Mitchell Smith~~
& Ker Mitchell. The Comptroller
Ge & Comm^r. of Paper Currency
Co has asked presumes that on the
ar event of any notice of a suit being
h sent to the Ch^y. he (the Ch^y.)
will communicate with the
Local Govt regarding the defence
Ul para 2 of his letter No. 149 dy
o 11. August 1899). It would suffice,
th if it is thought, to record the papers
t send copies to the Govt of Ind:
Commerce Dept.

Draft order is submitted
below

Cwb
5. 1. 99

No notice of a suit having been filed has been received with

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.
154]
0—11-10-98.

Soon
5/1/99
365 days

No. 3525 From the Govt of Madras, No. , dated 19. 11 1898.
" 3777 " " Acct Genl " " 242 " 16. 12 1898.
" " " " " 1898.
" " " " " 1898.

Order. It is to be recorded
this The correspondence will
be recorded and a copy will be
forwarded to the Govt. of India
Fin: & Commerce Dept.

Ch. (3525 = 98
3777 = 98

All = a

Cwb.
5. 1. 99

No. 67 dated 1. 99
Copy to the Govt of Ind: Fin: &
Commerce Dept.

Cwl
5. 1. 99.

When given for copying 9/1
When copied } 10/1 } 1899
When examined
When signed

HEAD AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.							
" OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only