M.R.O. 1—88,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

1053

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1053 Press
~~Mis.~~

-146-

Dated 20 P. 1860 19 .

13/14

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2093

செப்பஞ்சுபவர் பெயர்
கே. மகேஷ்
செப்பஞ்சுவதற்காக எடுத்துக்
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 7/9/98
செப்பஞ்சு முடித்த நாள் 8/98
சரிபார்க்கும்
மு. பா. ஏ.
கையொப்பம்
ஆராய்ச்சி
உதவியாளர்
கையொப்பம்

1053

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department, 20th August 1860.

No. 145. Read the following letter from V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Magistrate of Madura, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 5th August 1860.

As directed in the Government Order of the 22nd June 1860, No. 7,719, on a letter from the inhabitants of Arpucotta, I have the honor to report that after making enquiries on all sides and after making a visit to the neighbourhood of Arpucotta, I have failed to discover that there is the least feeling of alarm or anxiety for the safety of the Hindu Religion in the mind of any Hindu in any part of the District; because Mr. Clarke the late Magistrate permitted the Shanars of Arpucotta to perform a marriage after the fashion of the Hindus and Mahomedans residing in that village, that is by allowing them during the ceremony to take the Bride and Bridegroom in procession through the streets, and every Hindu will admit that such an act has nothing whatever to do with the Hindu Religion and in fact beyond the limits of Arpucotta the existence of the feud is scarcely known.

2. Hitherto such a custom has not been allowed to the Shanars as the Hindus claimed the privilege of pronouncing them a vile race who should not be permitted the use of the streets and they were generally upheld in their oppression.

3. The Shanars now claim to use the streets in the same way as the other castes do—they are the wealthiest and most numerous of the castes living in Arpucotta and the assertion of their right to use the streets is as much opposed by the Mahomedans as by the Hindus, shewing clearly that it is not a question affecting in any way the safety of the Hindu Religion, but merely an attempt of certain castes to oppress those they pleased to pronounce their inferiors.

4. The Shanars are spoken of in the petition contemptuously as Toddy drawers, &c. There are many men of independent means amongst them, worth lacs of Rupees, skilful, honest, traders, landlords and shopkeepers; many are cultivators, jaggery manufacturers, toddy drawers, &c. Having fewers prejudices and being an active pushing race they are emancipating and raising themselves which causes the bitter hatred of their slow but old oppressors who take their revenge by trying to heap insult and abuse on them.

5. As to directing each caste to abide by its own custom such is impossible; daily the castes are modifying their customs, and while each caste tries to alter its own customs, or to imitate or to surpass the one above it—it as steadily tries to keep down the caste it pronounces inferior; to endeavour to compel stagnation is impossible, it would lead to intolerable confusion and interference, it is not necessary to enforce right of way to any procession which has purposely for its object a triumph or insult, but it would be most unjust to deny to any caste a use of the streets allowed to its fellow towns-people.

6. Besides the people, if the Magistrate and Police are firm, are fully prepared though they may murmur a little at first, to admit the justness of and to obey the Orders of Government that all castes have a free right to the use of all public streets and roads. In this case the Magistrate was firm, the opponents gave way, and the procession passed off peaceably, in revenge false charges were got up against the Shanars, but were dismissed on preliminary enquiry by the Deputy Magistrate, and his proceedings were upheld by the Session Court.

7. The good effect of firmly carrying out the Orders of Government was recently exhibited in Dindigal; in consequence of a fight between the left and right hand castes at a marriage procession in that town. 30 years ago, processions had been forbidden by the Magistrate; in June last, a Carpenter of the left hand caste wished to have a procession, the opposite caste objected, the Joint Magistrate explained the law, and insisted it should not be violated; accordingly the procession passed off without the slightest breach of the peace, the right next had their procession, and now both go without attempting to disturb each other.

8. The Petition* signed a Hindu is not the production of a Native of Madura, it is not known here, nor are the statements contained in it entertained in the least by the people of the district. I am certain that no one out of Arpucotta cares in the least how the Shanars of Arpucotta perform their marriages, that is looked on as a question to be settled between the Shanars and the Villagers of Arpucotta.

* *Herewith returned.*

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
20th August 1860.

9. The Petitions Nos. 1,777 and 1,705 and 1,706 of 1860 are herewith returned with their enclosures.

No. 146. ORDER THEREON, 20th August 1860, No. 1,053.

Under the explanation submitted in the above letter, resolved that Petitioners in Petitions Nos. 1,704, 1,705 be informed that the Government having consulted the Magistrate of the District, see no occasion to interfere in the matter of their complaints.

2. Resolved also that Petitioners in Petition No. 1,777 be referred to the Magistrate, who will afford them such protection as they may at any time require.

3. Resolved likewise that Petition No. 998 of 1860 be lodged.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

[illegible]

No. 1704 of 1840

Forwarded to the Magistrate of Madura with reference to the order of Government dated 22nd June [illegible] Judicial Department.

By Order

[illegible] Fort St. George
June 1840.

[illegible] Secretary

1853/3 (3)

To
The Honorable the Governor
in Council
Fort St. George
Madras
The humble petition of the undersigned Hindu and Mahomedan inhabitants of [illegible] Ramnad Zemindari, Madura

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That in presuming to submit the subject of their grievance to your Honor in Council — a grievance serious and important to Petitioners as well as the great majority of the Hindus in its present consequences and ultimate result — they humbly beg to premise that the ground on which they object to the Shanars going in procession in palanquins, flags and other insignia on marriage occasions, is that it is contrary to ancient immemorial usage.

That in the [illegible] of the Hindus and of the Mahomedans as well as from the period of the assumption of the Country by the British Government, in fact from the first establishment of Hinduism in consequence of the division of the people into castes, until very recently the Shanars of this part of Southern India never went beyond their prescribed rights and privileges, nor did they ever attempt any innovation of such a nature as the one they now seek to introduce. And the fact [illegible] proved from the very circumstance of their first [illegible] permission of the Magistrate to use the prohibited [illegible] prohibited by ancient customs and usages in their marriage processions and then of their obtaining [illegible] permission with the [illegible] and other [illegible] of respectable character [illegible] force the opposition [illegible] they would [illegible] themselves, [illegible] admit that neither they, their fathers [illegible] forefathers before them ever went in public procession in palanquins attended with flags [illegible] in marriage [illegible] it being against the rules of caste.

In urging usage as the ground of objection [illegible] of the [illegible] immemorial [illegible]

all to have the Effect expected it was in accordance therefore
that a former Magistrate of Indiana when on the Subject
of creating the Shakers a Corporate Body Said that
Ancient customs in the same manner Statutes now done
away with by the Court of Kings Bench dated 30th October 1838 and
3d November 1840, prohibiting them from infringing on
certain rules established by way of pain of a fine of
£10 each and if fined certain of their number Two Three
orders were strictly enforced and observed until Lately
when under the influence of the late Magistrate Mr Clarke
they again ventured to introduce a new practice Why the
Magistrate in the Guardians of the public peace should
thus forward to violation of which he knowing the Result
would be a Breach of the peace that it would distribute to
the great Majority of the Local Community and cause
Confusion among them amounted the orders of his
Office for in contravention of the orders of God
of the 2d March 1847 as well as of the terms of Her most
Gracious Majesty the Queens Proclamation mentioned
Commissioners Clauses Act

Is the orders of God above referred to
Such Laws as your Petitioners are forced to obey
follow that they are to be permitted to observe the Articles
mentioned with Prayer and the Laying on of Hands
or are they to be likely to incur Penalties under the
Magistrates or the Guardians of the public peace Should
certainly prohibit them again in future Speaking
generally from the public streets for the ordinary avocation
of life and Trade as Christians and the comfort and convenience
of the Inhabitants as to Carriages in the Streets
Crowds assembling to be dispersed by the Police
any and what Regulations or Instructions
there to prevent the Shakers Meeting for Worship
Singing or Preaching in their own Chapel or Dwelling Houses
comfort and convenience of the Public are in no
way interested and if such Prevention and
Instructions would be likely to create a Breach
and Contempt of the Peace they must be perfectly
Lawful to and the contrary therefore follows the
Maintenance of

Such being Elements of God Petitioners
humbly enquire by what right and Authority did
the Magistrate grant the Shakers permission to introduce
their customs and practices? Has he not fully known that
Attempt would be attended with Public Danger and a
Breach of the Peace if not Indictable as the Proclamation
and Statute Law if not Indictable as the Proclamation
and Statute Law if not Indictable as the Proclamation
and Statute Law if not Indictable as the Proclamation

authority by countenancing the Shakers in their present
proceedings?

In the Proclamation Petitioners Counsel
is pleased to declare that "the Lord Lord Provost
that none be in any wise favored or countenanced
by reason of their religious faith and practice" Your
Petitioners would respectfully ask was the Magistrate
justified in favoring the Shakers? for favor they did
when he upheld them in their professed practices
ignore & thereto rights and privileges of Petitioners
enforced & thereby common constant and unwarranted
Did not the Magistrate thereby act contrary to the
letter and Clause? Petitioners are thankful for
supporting the Shakers in practices grievous & common
that Petitioners would be insulted and disquieted?

In act of going in procession as taken place
attended with Public Danger is no mere
is not a practice of public right to be performed
and in the present case should be performed above
another. The Petitioners and the Magistrate
only upon the Shakers and not upon the
Petitioners may give rise to Public Danger
Petitioners to have an opportunity to
By the Shakers practising their Religious
but by going in procession in the manner
they offend against the Public Peace
the Magistrate to prevent the
Petitioners would respectfully ask
justified in favoring the Shakers
when he upheld them in their
ignore & thereto rights and
enforced & thereby common
Did not the Magistrate
and Clause? Petitioners
supporting the Shakers
that Petitioners would
In act of going
attended with
is not a practice
and in the present
another. The
only upon the
may give rise
Petitioners to
By the Shakers
but by going
they offend
the Magistrate
Petitioners

1083
6

(5)

No. 1705 of 1880.

Forwarded to the Magistrate of Madura with reference to the order of Government dated 22d June 1880 No. 1[illegible] Judicial Department.

28th June 1880

[illegible]

Dy. Secy. to Govt

Judicial Letter Recd d/21st Decr
No 30 of 1866

No 1705 of 1866

From Tiruvambalam
Sayyagar, Thungasamy
and 4 others &c
Muhammadan Inhabitants
of Arithapatti
in Pattamadam Taluk
Madura

Petn of Tiruvambalam
Sayyagar &c praying
for the Alteration
of the Decree passed
in Original Suit
No 1 of 1865 on the
file of the Court
of the District Munsif
of Pattamadam

The original Petition
returned to the Petrs
vide Cover dated 29th Augt

jealous eye any innovation which may be sought to be introduced. The privileges and practices of each caste, and of every division and subdivision of it, are clearly defined and universally known and acknowledged, and the slightest encroachment on the rights of one class by another is instantly opposed and repelled.

I have been induced to submit these remarks to your Honor in Council from the state of ferment into which the whole of the Madura District has been thrown consequent on the innovation attempted to be introduced by the Shanars, who, by the way, form but a small part of the population. From time immemorial, according to the practices of their caste, they have been accustomed to perform their marriage ceremonies and processions in a certain prescribed manner. They possess neither the right nor the privilege of parading the streets where higher caste people reside, or of using palanquins, elephants and the like insignia in their processions. Some of the Shanars of the Madura District, thinking to set aside ancient customs and usages, went in public procession and used the prohibited articles on a recent marriage occasion. Before presuming to do this, however, they applied to the magistrate Mr. Clarke for permission, and that authority, taking a contracted view of the order of Government of the 20th March 1859, complied with their request. The Shanars, in order to make a thorough demonstration, collected a large number of gang-robbers and other disreputable characters and committed serious assaults on the inhabitants of the streets through which they passed. This occurred in November last at Arpucotá, a large, populous, mercantile Town in the Madura District. The great majority of the inhabitants, consisting of the higher classes of Hindus, had no alternative but to submit passively for the time being to the insult and disgrace, constantly trusting that your Honor in Council, on a full representation of the matter, would uphold and protect them in the enjoyment of their hereditary caste rights and privileges and restrict the Shanars to the exercise of theirs, as prescribed by long custom and usage. It is to be observed that the Shanars would not have dared to act in the manner they did, were it not that they were confirmed in their misconceptions of their supposed newly acquired rights, by the Magistrate so decisively acting with the decision of one of his predecessors, dated 30th October 1858 and 3rd November 1858, by both of which said orders, they were peremptorily prohibited, under pain of

fine of Rs. 50, from overstepping the bounds of ancient usages in their marriage processions; and, accordingly some of their number were fined on two occasions for attempting to do it.

I have said that the Magistrate took a contracted view of the order of Government above alluded to, and this will be apparent from a comparison of his order permitting the Shanars, (at the imminent risk of a breach of the peace), to conduct their processions in whatever manner they pleased, with the orders passed by Mr. Hathaway, Collector of Salem, in April last year, and by Mr. Silver, Collector of Tinnevelly, on the 3rd January of the current year—prohibiting with reference to the same order of Government all public processions &c. which were likely to create disturbances and discontent. Having put a misconstruction on the words in question, Mr. Clarke perceived, much to the disturbance of the whole of the District, in carrying out his views and backing the Shanars in their presumptuous follies.

It will be perceived by your Honor in Council, that the question at issue is not that of the rights of any class of people as subjects of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, but as the professed adherents of a religion, the distinctive characteristics of which they are bound to maintain at any costs; in other words the question is not as regards civil rights but caste privileges and observances. These are clearly defined and acknowledged by all classes of Hindus,—by the caste, as well as by those who are generally designated the no caste people. The Chuckler will no more allow the Pariah to interfere with his privileges than the Parian will permit the Chuckler to infringe on his, and the Shanars, who are so ready to defy those above them in caste, will be the first to resent any attempt of the Chuckler or Pariah to pass the line of demarcation.

From this feeling respecting caste rights and privileges being deeply rooted in the Hindu mind and in a manner inherent, it may be easily conceived that the recent attempt of the Shanars to break in upon ancient established usages, supported as they are by the highest authority in the District, viz, in the estimation of the great majority of the population, in their sole controlling, irresponsible ruler, has caused no little ill feeling, which, for obvious reasons, should be quickly allayed

by the adoption of proper measures. There are many reasons why the feeling of exclusiveness exists towards the low caste people, but to mention the main ones—they are, 1st That the Pariahs and Chucklers are guilty of a "Panchamahá Pathkam" or one of the five great sins by killing and devouring the sacred Cow, and 2nd that the Shanars draw Toddy, an intoxicating beverage, the use of which the Hindu religion strictly forbids. For these reasons the Chuckler, Pariah and Shanar, are prohibited from coming in contact with the persons of the higher classes, or entering the precincts of the Temples. The presumption of any one of these classes to pass the threshold of a Temple would be fearfully chastised.

1 Killing the Sacred Cow
2 Theft
3 Drunkenness
4 Adultery
5 Lying

My countrymen duly appreciate the principle of non-interference set forth in the Royal Proclamation, and are willing that it should be extended to—that practical effect should be given to it in all disputes relating to caste rights and privileges—as well as to all matters connected with Hindu law, the obvious duty of the civil authority is to prohibit, but not to permit, any innovation. In the particular instance above alluded to, however, the Magistrate Mr. Clarke, was unwarrantably interfered in a matter beyond his jurisdiction and interposed his influence and power in encouraging and upholding the Shanars in their unwarrantable proceedings.

From a representation which has already been submitted to your Honor in Council it will be perceived that the tenor of the requests therein preferred is, that each and every class of the Hindu community may be maintained in their rights as conferred on them by immemorial custom, that the higher classes of the Madura District never had and never will have any inclination to interfere with even the humblest of Her Majesty's subjects in the enjoyment of his rights and privileges. Agreeably to these sentiments, it was stated that there were no objections to the Shanars or any other low caste people traversing the public streets in any manner they pleased on the ordinary avocations of life. But it was and is urged, and that fairly and justly, that the Shanars should not be permitted to parade the streets in marriage processions, using pelunquins, flags and other insignia appertaining to the practice which heretofore obtained among them. The

Magistrate knew full well that by granting the Shanars permission to traverse the public streets in procession, in the manner they did a disturbance would be created, notwithstanding which, in defiance of his known duty as a Protector of the peace, and of the direct order of Government, he coolly gave the sanction and caused disquietude and discontent throughout a certain District. Strange as it may seem, the late Magistrate of Madura is the only Government official who has misconstrued the order of the 26th March, and overstepped the limits of his legitimate authority. According to his process of reasoning, there can be no objection to the Shanars having free access to the Hindu Temples from their being places of public resort, and if his successor should hold the same views, no doubt he could effect an entrance at the point of the bayonet. Grant innovation to be made in caste rights and privileges by the sword of the Magistrate and the same weapon will effect, sooner or later, free ingress and egress to and from the sacred precincts of Hindu Temples, to all classes without distinction. What such a course of procedure will result in, does not require the spirit of a seer to divine.

In cases of the above nature, Government, in the self same Order so sadly misconstrued by the Magistrate, state, in para 5, "that it does not follow that he is to be permitted to traverse the streets in procession with flags and the like insignia, and if such a proceeding would be likely to excite disturbance the Magistrate, as the guardian of the public peace, should certainly prohibit it." Again, in para 6, speaking generally, to use the public streets for the ordinary avocations of life, and to such an extent as the comfort and convenience of the individual may require, or to do any acts of a like character is one thing, to do beyond this as, for example, to carry out processions or get up demonstrations hitherto unusual, thereby needlessly offering provocation and raising excitement is another. In the latter case the comfort and convenience of the public are in no way interested, and if such processions and demonstrations would be likely to create a tumult and lead to a breach of the peace, they must be peremptorily interdicted and the custom there to fore followed be rigidly maintained." Here the line of duty to be pursued by the Magistrate is clearly marked out, and it is strictly in accordance with the tenor of Her Majesty's Proclamation wherein it is declared that it is Our

Royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favored, none
hissed or disquieted by reason of their religious faith and observances
In the face of the express order of Government and in contravention
of the "Royal will and pleasure" the Magistrate, bound as he was
prevent any demonstrations likely to create a tumult, and knowing
that the procession sanctioned by him was unusual and contrary to
memorial custom, and that its prohibition would not in any way cu
either the comfort or convenience of the public, passed an order fo
ing a particular class and ignoring the rights of all others. Happy
India that such Magistrates are scarce and "few and far between."

In the course of his late Excellency's tour, he visited Madu
and he was pleased to state with regard to the inhabitants th
"during my whole stay at Madura there were demonstrations of loya
and good will." Loyalty is indeed the characteristic of the people
Madura.—They are satisfied with the "mild and equitable charac
of the British rule" and they earnestly desire its continuance and pr
perity. They have uniformly proved themselves worthy of the cul
His Excellency has passed on them, and it rests with their lo
rulers to cherish and strengthen their feelings of loyalty and good
to the British Government. What feeling of loyalty can exist if inste
of striving to cultivate a good understanding between himself and
people, their immediate ruler should take every opportunity to humil
them and offend their prejudices? Would it not be a mishap, serio
to be lamented over, if, through the injudicious proceedings of a misguid
Magistrate, a mild and docile people like those of Madura, should
thrown into a state of excitement and discontent, from an unwarran
interference with their caste rights and privileges, and be driven
acts of violence? Yet if due enquiry were made, it will be fo
that the whole of the District of Madura is in a state of ferment a
disquietude, having been excited and irritated by the arbitrary, u
and unlawful orders of the late Magistrate, sanctioning the propo
ons attempts of the Shanars at innovations. Being loyal subjects, ho
ever, and opposed to causing disturbance, the higher classes here w
the insult offered them and appealed against the order of the Magistrate
the Session and Koondan Unaid Ovaru, but their appeal was rejected wi
reference to C. O. 6th July 1854, of the Pounlart Udalut. Even
to this Circular, the Magistrate has only the power of prohibiting and

of sanctioning the observance of any practice contrary to ancient usage,
and being responsible for the peace of the District, he should prevent and
not countenance, as Mr. Clarke did, a breach of it. The duty of the Ma-
gistrate was clear—he should have ascertained if he did not know it,
what the prevailing usage was and whether such usage accorded with
ancient custom, and acted accordingly thereon. The people of Madura
urge, as the ground of objection to the innovations sought to be in-
troduced by the Shanars, that they are against ancient usages and
customs, which, in the absence of any written law, is as binding as
any acknowledged rule and "being a branch of Hindu law, supersedes its
general maxims wherever it obtains. Ancient usage, as determined by
the Caste on creditable evidence is the general rule" (Summary of Law
and customs of Hindu Castes By Bombay Government.) In lack of
cording to Hindu (Ch. 1, para. 3) "Traditional custom is trans-
scendent Law, and "nothing could be more obviously just than
amidst private contests according to those laws which the parties
themselves had ever considered as the rule of their conduct and
agreements in civil life" (E. W. Hay's Sudder Court's Rulings
March 1788.)

That the Shanars have had the right or the privilege of putting the
streets in procession, using palanquins, music, &c. &c. on the occa-
sions in dispute question, and can in no way prove from the dispute that
they have enjoyed the exercise of the aforesaid rights from time
[illegible] which may form an immemorial usage to the Hindu
of the Hindu [illegible] to ground their present claims
[illegible] under the Hindu Code. They might perhaps
give their [illegible] report.

[illegible] question is more [illegible] and should
[illegible] is necessary [illegible] to be remembered that
[illegible] by the Hindu [illegible] of Hindu
[illegible] by the Hindu [illegible] of
[illegible] Thus [illegible] and [illegible] as
[illegible] as [illegible] which, to
[illegible] Perhaps the

ause of the contest is about his right to wear pant
ther he may parade in a palanquin or on horseback,
his marriage. Sometimes it is the privilege of having
uen; sometimes that of having a trumpet sounding bef
distinction of being accompanied by the country music
monies. Perhaps it is the ambition of having flags
or with the resemblances of certain deities displayed abo
on such great occasions. These are some of the import
amongst many others not less so, in asserting which, the
scruple occasionally to shed each others blood."

The Shanars elated with the easy victory obtai
and in view to annoy their opponents, have, with *malici*
ferred several unfounded charges against there which
However, both parties will not remain satisfied here—
riage occasion, the Shanars will attempt the display of
acquired rights and the higher classes will oppose the
feuds will be perpetuated, calling for the interference o
forces which are proposed to be dispensed with, while, were
state of things, a small Police force would be sufficien
the peace of the District. But a more serious effect
trate's order is that it has caused the people of Madura
future policy of Government and tended to confirm the
them in the suspicion under which they have all along
it was intended to destroy all caste distinctions by the
the more especially so, since the innovations complained
introduced and sanctioned subsequent to the Royal Pro
during the administration of the present Government under wh
expected justice and impartiality, peace and prosperity. The
the present Government was hailed by all classes of pe
course your Honor in Council has hitherto pursued ha
render it to be respected and loved by all. This is not
sycophancy. I only give utterance to the feelings know
versally entertained by my countrymen, which daily pas
Supreme Being is that the Government as now composed
spared to rule over them. They trust in the impartiality
your views, in the correctness of your judgement, in the
your administration. The people of Madura look up to yo

1023/3

(10)

Council at the present juncture, and trust that they will be maintained and upheld in the caste rights and privileges enjoyed by them and their ancestors from time immemorial. All that they ask and seek for is that *Ancient Usage* may not be interfered with by the Magistrate nor allowed to be infringed upon by the Shanars. What the prevailing custom has been can be easily determined, and let every class be instructed to abide by it. The adoption of this course will put down ill-feeling, prevent tumults and contentions, and remove the fears entertained as regards the sinister motives attributed to Government. Nor will it interfere with the civil right of any class of people, nor their right to pass the streets in any manner they please on the *ordinary avocations of life*, nor will the Shanars be deprived of any right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by them nor put them to the least inconvenience;—it will simply restrict and confirm each caste in its respective rights and privileges as held and enjoyed by long established usage.

I beg to remain,

Honorable Sir,

Your most obedient

and humble Servant,

A HINDU.

1253/2

Magistrate

Magistrates Office

Madura

5th August 1860

Ordered thereon 20 August 1862. No. 1053

Under the application submitted

in the above letter, resolved that

Petitioner in Petition Nos 1704,

1705 be informed that he for having

committed Impositions of the Dist

145 & 146

Wickramarata

AP

Recd 22nd June 1860 No 1458 Judicial

Judicial Letter to Engd 21st Dec.
No 36 of 1860.
Rept to etg of 1861

20-4-11 BZ

Judicial
1860
20-8-60-1053

Dept (12)

From
The Magistrate
of Madura
To The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort Saint George

Dated 5th
Recd } 8 August 1860

No 1292. Enclosures 2
& Petitions with Translations
to each Letter

Offering his remarks
in reference to the order
of Govt 22nd June 1860
No 7719 on the Petitions
of Nopukottai Paraiahs
soliciting the interference of Govt to prevent the Shanars
passing in procession.—

W. Thackeray
Esq

C.H. Dept
R17.

1458 1446

Leave to withdraw in the
matter of the complaint—

Resolved also that Petitioners
Petition No 1777 be referred to the
Magistrate who may consider the
best protection to be given to
any Caste required.—

Resolved to receive that Petition
No 990 of 1860 be lodged—

GO

Abstract of proceedings Dept 2nd
Endorsement given on Petition dept

(19)