M.R.O. 1—[illegible]—14-12-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1677	Press Mis.
200-23	
Dated 24 11 19 86	

10/1

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 200. Read the following papers :—

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort Saint George.

The humble Memorial of NAIDAL TIYAGASUMMUNTHA MOODELLIAR, an inhabitant of Nagore, in the District of Tanjore,

SHEWETH,

That your Memorialist most respectfully begs leave to bring to the kind notice of your Excellency in Council the treatment he has experienced at the hands of C. G. Plumer, Esquire, the Acting Joint Magistrate of the abovenamed District, as your Memorialist cannot permit himself to doubt but that reparation will be made with alacrity, as soon as your Excellency in Council is made acquainted with the true circumstances of the most deplorable case of your Memorialist.

2. That before your Memorialist proceeds to lay before your Excellency in Council the grave injustice he has met with from the said Acting Joint Magistrate, your Memorialist would wish to call the attention of your Excellency in Council to the events which caused the Acting Joint Magistrate to vent himself in what may justly be designated gross insults to your Memorialist, to his mother, and to other female members of his family.

3. That the Telegraph Line, in the village of Nagore, having caused great inconvenience to religious processions carried on during the time of Hindoo Festivals in the said Town, the Acting Joint Magistrate, at the request of your Memorialist and others, got the Line removed to another place, as would appear in his letter to your Memorialist quoted in the margin.

DEAR SIR,
I am coming to-morrow morning to look at the Telegraph Posts. Will you be good enough to give the bearer the Rupees 35 you said you would bring.
Your's truly,
NEGAPATAM, 16-5-64. C. G. PLUMER.
M. R. R.
TIYAGASAMUNDA MOODELLIAR,
Nagore.

4. That the removal of the Telegraphic Line, as above stated, from one side of the street to the other, for the convenience of Hindoo processions, gave annoyance to the Mussulman portion of the inhabitants, who, finding that their objections to the alteration were not successful, rose in open hostility to the Hindoos, and set fire to the sacred Car on the day of the Car festival. Not being contented with this, they tried their best to persuade the Pattana caste people to refuse to render their services as usual in the Hindoo temple, and seeing that they could not succeed, they prevented these people from selling fish, as they had usually done on the spot of ground attached to the Mussulmans' mosque, and forced them to remove and build a new fish bazaar on the ground appurtenant to the Hindoo temple, of which your Memorialist and two others are trustees.

5. That your Memorialist further begs to inform your Excellency in Council that afterwards, when the said Pattana caste people were once engaged in a Hindoo religious procession, the Mussulmans came in crowds with weapons and attacked them and other Hindoos and severely wounded several of them, which breach of the peace called forth the interference of the Acting Joint Magistrate, who accord-

ingly apprehended some of these fanatic Mussulman leaders, tried and punished them with rigorous imprisonment, and issued warrants for the apprehension of some other leaders who had absconded; and the Magistrate's above order was confirmed by the Sessions Judge in appeal.

6. That this increased the hatred of the Mussulman people against the Hindoos, especially against your Memorialist, who, being descended from an old and respectable family, is looked upon as the Head of the Hindoos of the said locality; so that the Mussulmans, in collusion with some of the Mofussil Police Officers, plotted to invent some means to bring your Memorialist into difficulty and disgrace, and take thereby revenge through him on the Hindoos, and they were not long wanting for such an opportunity; for your Memorialist was soon afterwards accused, but falsely as will hereinafter appear, with having abetted certain parties who were said to have stolen a box containing 270 Rupees from the Police Station at Nagore, and with having received the same, and this case was pending before the Acting Joint Magistrate for nearly a month before your Memorialist was accused with the aforesaid charge.

7. Your Memorialist would here draw the attention of your Excellency in Council to another fact which took place about the same time, and which will throw light on the true origin of the gross insult cast upon your Memorialist.

Whilst the fishermen held their bazaar on the Mussulmans' ground, they paid 40 Rupees a month to the Mosque; but when they were driven to the Hindoo side, this sum was paid to the Pagoda. The Mussulmans soon discovered the mistake they had made, and petitioned Mr. Plumer to have the bazaar put back to its old place, stating that if this were done, the facts of the aforesaid robbery would soon be found out.

Mr. Plumer sent for the fishermen and ordered them to remove their bazaar back to the Mussulman quarter, which they refused to do, saying that they could incur the cost of another removal, and that they were afraid of being murdered if they went back again.

Mr. Plumer then sent word to your Memorialist by one Calleyana Ramiyen, a Sub-Magistrate, to get the bazaars so removed, threatening your Memorialist at the same time that if he failed to do so, he would be called up to the Cutcherry and publicly disgraced.

That your petitioner, in the presence of the Sub-Magistrate, sent for the fishermen and informed them of the wishes of the Joint Magistrate, and also told them that if they refused to remove the bazaar your Memorialist would get into great trouble; but they all refused.

The Acting Joint Magistrate then issued a notice directing the removal of the said bazaars at once to their former locality, and that they should be opened nowhere else in Nagore, except in the said place attached to the Mosque. The fishermen then removed their bazaar from Nagore altogether, and opened it on the Sea beach near their own houses to the great inconvenience of the inhabitants of Nagore. But as the Acting Joint Magistrate chose to think that all this opposition to his wishes was occasioned by the influence of your Memorialist, he thence began to direct his tyrannical and unnecessary indignity upon your Memorialist, and a good opportunity was at hand which he took advantage of. Then the above

said charge was brought on your Memorialist, and a warrant was issued for his apprehension on the 29th October 1864, though the said robbery was alleged to have taken place on the 2nd of that month.

8. That Mussulmans and some of the Police Officers suborned some witnesses against your Memorialist from Vellypolyem and Vempannacherry, respectively situate at a distance of four and twenty miles from Nagore, as none could be suborned in the last mentioned place. Your Memorialist having been absent at the time of the issue of the warrant against him, his house was entered into on the order of the Magistrate and a regular disturbance caused, and then the Acting Joint Magistrate issued a proclamation on the 14th November 1864, allowing 30 days' time for the apprehension of your Memorialist, and on the same day attached not only the most part of his property, real and personal, but also whatever separately belonged personally to the ladies of his family, and this seizure was accompanied by a most cruel insult and outrage on the said ladies, who are women of rank, by forcing them to give up their jewels and all their cloths except one, and then turning them by force out of the house into the street, and locking the house door against them. These dastardly acts were committed between the hours of 6 and 11 o'clock P. M.

9. That the principal parties charged with having stolen the box as aforesaid were committed to the Sessions Judge who investigated the case, and who acquitted the prisoners on the 15th December 1864.

10. That your Memorialist under apprehension that the Acting Joint Magistrate would publicly disgrace him as he threatened to do as aforesaid, was obliged to stay in Pondicherry, whence he informed your Excellency in Council, through the French Governor thereof, the whole circumstances of the case, and prayed your Excellency in Council for redress, and he has also himself submitted several petitions to your Excellency in Council on the subject.

11. That your Memorialist petitioned the District Magistrate under Section 36 of the Criminal Procedure Code to withdraw the case from the Acting Joint Magistrate and try it himself, or to refer it for trial to any other Magistrate, as your Memorialist was assured that he could not obtain justice from the hands of the Acting Joint Magistrate, who has been already biased against him; but the District Magistrate refused to comply with the request on the plea of want of jurisdiction.

12. That your Memorialist then presented a petition through his Vakeel to the Acting Joint Magistrate himself, requesting him to have the warrant cancelled, under the principles respectively laid down at page 20 of Mayne's Criminal Law, and at page 9 of Archbald's Criminal Law of Evidence, stating that as principal parties were acquitted by a competent judicial tribunal, the charge against your Memorialist for abetting falls down, but the petition was rejected on the 5th January 1865, on the ground that no sufficient cause was shown to grant your Memorialist's prayer.

13. That your Memorialist then submitted an appeal to the Sessions Judge of the District, under Section 434 of the Criminal Procedure Code, praying to call for and examine the record of the case, and the Sessions Judge declined, on the 23rd January 1865, to interfere in the matter for want of jurisdiction. Your Memorialist's petition to the High Court met with the same success.

14. That the Acting Joint Magistrate sent the warrant to Pondicherry, through the Collector of South Arcot, for immediate apprehension of your Memorialist; but the French authorities of Pondicherry had informed the Collector of South Arcot, on the 9th December 1864, that your Memorialist was ready to appear before the Acting Joint Magistrate if bail be taken for him, and to let them know the nature of the evidence in the case. The Acting Joint Magistrate again, on the 13th March, despatched the warrant and the record of the case to the Collector of South Arcot, requesting to apprehend and send to him your Memorialist; but the Collector of South Arcot after perusing the whole record wrote to the Acting Joint Magistrate, on the 18th March 1865, that there is no evidence in the case to warrant the issue of the writ against your Memorialist, and that it could not be executed against him, as the principal parties were already acquitted and released by the Sessions Judge.

15. That the said Acting Joint Magistrate, without cancelling the warrant and releasing the property of your Memorialist first attached, went beyond the scope of his authority and sold some of the attached property, viz., seven head of valuable cattle, contrary to the provisions of Section 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He also in the month of May 1865, five months after the case against the principal parties had been dismissed by the Sessions Judge, and seven months after the issue of the warrant against your Memorialist, issued another attachment against the lands belonging to your Memorialist, contrary to the provisions of the Section* noted above.

*. If the absent person shall not appear within the time specified in the proclamation, the property under attachment shall be declared to be at the disposal of Government.

16. That the Acting Joint Magistrate having laid waste the said villages under attachment in proper time applied to Government when it was too late to supply him with money for cultivation expenses, and the Government being unaware of the circumstances of the case, passed an order to collect the assessment on the lands of the said villages from the representatives of your Memorialist, but the Acting Joint Magistrate informed the Collector that he could find none from whom he could collect the assessment, although there were at that time in Nagore several of your Memorialist's Agents, who would have paid the same if called on.

17. That on the report to the Government by the Acting Joint Magistrate of the robbery of the sum of Rupees 270, the Government ordered him to give full particulars of the case, on the perusal of which, the Government suggested to the Acting Joint Magistrate to cancel the warrant and release the whole property attached, but the Acting Joint Magistrate would not, as he of course wants to disgrace your Memorialist, and thereby satisfy his revenge on him.

That your Memorialist, in conclusion, therefore prays your Excellency in Council to issue an order that his case may be referred for trial to any other Magistrate but the said Acting Joint Magistrate, that your Memorialist may prove that he did not abscond or conceal himself to evade the warrant and to defeat the ends of justice.

Your Memorialist, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

PONDICHERRY, *28th October* 1865. (Signed) N. TIYAGASUMMUNTHA MOODELLIAR.

No. 201. To THE HONORABLE H. D. PHILLIPS,
Member of the Madras Government, &c.

The humble Petition of THIRUNAKAVULLEE UMMAL, daughter of IYAKUNNOO MOODELLIAR, of Marakanum, South Arcot, and Widow of MUTTUVAITALINGA MOODELIAR, who was the son of TINGARAJA MOODELIAR, who was Head Sheristadar of Tanjore,

HONORED SIR,

That your petitioner is the mother of Naidal Tiyagasummuntha Moodeliar of Nagore, who has lately been so cruelly oppressed by Mr. Plumer, the Magistrate of Negapatam, the details of which oppression are set forth in the accompanying English petition from my son.

2. That your petitioner earnestly entreats that you will grant a sorrowing mother's request, and permit her son to surrender himself before Mr. Morris, the Collector of Tanjore, or any other Magistrate except Mr. Plumer, and thus enable him to save his property from being sold, *as it is threatened to be on or after the 11th of this month.*

3. That your petitioner earnestly requests that you will kindly pardon her for presuming to make this humble request personally before you, which she does in the firm belief in your well known justice and humanity.

9th November 1865. × The mark of THIRUNAKAVULLE UMMAL.

No. 202. From the Magistrate of Tanjore; to the Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Tanjore, 28th October 1865, No. 236.

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, Judicial Department, dated 14th October 1865, No. 1461, I have the honor to forward a letter, with enclosures, from the Acting Joint Magistrate, which contains full information on the several points alluded to.

2. From paragraph 1 of this letter, the Government will perceive that Mr. Plumer has, in accordance with Section 181 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, directed bail to be taken from Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, if he is willing to appear before him. There is now, therefore, not the slightest excuse for Thiagasammantha Moodelliar not making his appearance, for his alleged reason hitherto for not doing so has been, that he was afraid of being ill-treated and ironed by the Police Constables.

3. With reference to paragraph 8, I beg to solicit the permission of Government for Mr. Plumer to be allowed to defend, at the public cost, the suit he mentions as having been filed by Thiagasammantha Moodelliar's mother against the Moodelliar and himself. I quite concur with the Acting Joint Magistrate in thinking that the claim is a collusive one, and am apprehensive that if the suit be allowed to go *ex parte* all the rest of the Moodelliar's property will be taken possession of by similar under-hand means.

From the Acting Joint Magistrate of Tanjore; to the Magistrate of Tanjore, dated Negapatam. 24th October 1865, No. 113.

In reply to your endorsement on the Proceedings of Government under date the 14th instant, No. 1461, I have the honor to inform you, that since the receipt of the Proceedings therein referred to I endorsed the warrant for the arrest of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, under Section 181 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, authorizing the Constable executing the warrant to take bail for Thiagasammantha Moodelliar's appearance, himself in Rupees 2000, and two securities in Rupees 1000 each. Thiagasammantha Moodelliar has not yet surrendered; he is, I believe, in Pondicherry.

2. I enclose a list of the property attached. The Bungalow No. 1 at Kadampady was, at the time of attachment, rented by Mr. Roberts. It was vacated in the beginning of February, and was rented to Mr. Cross from the end of March to the end of August, when he left it, the bungalow having, on examination by Mr. Bateman, been condemned as unsafe. This bungalow is now empty. Mr. Cross, however, pays a monthly rent of Rupees 10 for the use of the godowns. If repairs are not executed speedily, I fear that the roof of the bungalow will fall. The repairs necessary to rent the bungalow in thorough order would require an outlay of some Rupees 2000, which, I presume, the Government would not be willing to sanction. I should add, that the garden attached to the bungalow is rented by one Kuppa Thevan at an yearly rent of Rupees 42.

3. The Bungalow No. 2, at Kadampady, was not completed at the time of attachment. It has been occupied by Mr. Ricketts since the 1st January last at a monthly rent of Rupees 40. The whole of the rent has been *spent* in completing the bungalow.

4. The houses at Nagore and Kullapuram are empty.

5. All the land under attachment, with the exception of that situated in the villages of Kullapuram, Nadukandangudi, Thennalagudi, and Nagamungalum in the Nannilam Taluq is uncultivated this year, as the Government refused to sanction any advance to meet the necessary expenses of cultivation. A portion of the land in the villages of Kivalur, Vairavanirappu, Periatumbur, Thennelapady, Pretaparamapuram and Annaikudi in Negapatam Taluq is about to be sold under Act II of 1864 to meet arrears of revenue due on the said land for the last Fasli. The land in the four villages of Nannilam Taluq above-named was, previous to its attachment, rented out to certain Mirassidars for a term of years, which has not expired. They continue to cultivate the land on the same terms as hitherto.

6. The bullocks and cows attached were sold by auction in the month of February, as they suffered considerably from confinement and want of proper attention, and I considered that their sale was for the benefit of the owner.

7. I enclose an account showing the receipts and disbursements on account of the property under attachment up to the end of September.

8. I would take this opportunity of bringing to your notice that a suit has been filed in the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court by the mother of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, in which Thiagasammantha Moodelliar and I are the defendants. The suit is for the recovery of the Bungalow No. 1 at Kadampady, and the House No. 3 at Nagore, and for the rent of the former amounting to Rupees 393-12-0. The plaintiff's claim is grounded on an agreement on unstamped cadjan, said to have been executed in 1859, in which Thiagasammantha Moodelliar makes over to the plaintiff the above property for maintenance. I have no doubt whatever that the claim is a collusive one, and the agreement a forgery. The rent for the Bungalow No. 1 at Kadampady was, up to the time of its attachment, always paid to Thiagasammantha Moodelliar himself, and he alone was consulted on all matters of repairs, &c., connected therewith; he himself paid the quit-rent for the same, and he received the rent for the garden attached. Further, in 1856, he mortgaged the said bungalow and garden to Mahomed Ghouse Mercoir, and, in 1863, being sued by the said Mahomed Ghouse Mercoir for the recovery of the principal and interest due, Thiagasammantha Moodelliar executed a Rajinamah or deed of compromise. In all these documents the bungalow and garden are referred to as the absolute property of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, and no mention is made of the plaintiff's claim thereto. As regards the house at Nagore, I would observe that the plaintiff always lived with Thiagasammantha Moodelliar in that very house, and there was, therefore, no necessity for his formally making it over to her. Again, the Government accounts for the house tax paid for the same up to Fasli 1270 are all in the name of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar. These facts are all capable of the most positive proof, and as still stronger evidence of the collusive nature of the present claim, there is the fact that no such claim was preferred until more than five months after the attachment of the property, and until it was popularly supposed that the same was about to be sold. The hearing of this suit is fixed for the 21th of November, and I would request the sanction of Government to defend the same at their expense.

9. Several claims have been preferred for other portions of the property under attachment. List of these claims is annexed. It will be seen that the claims for the land are, for the most part, founded on mortgage bonds. These are, I believe, *bona fide*, and will, no doubt, in due time be adjudicated on by the Civil Court.

List of property of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar of Nagore under attachment under Section 184 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, Tanjore District.

Number.	Description of property.	Where situated.	Estimated value. Rs.	A.	P.	Claims.	Remarks.
1	A bungalow with out-houses and garden.	Kadampady	...	...	...	Tirunagavalli Ammal, mother of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, claims this property, alleging that under an agreement executed by Thiagasammantha Moodelliar the rent of the house is allotted for her maintenance.	
2	A bungalow with out-houses.	Do.	...	...	...		
3	A house with backyard.	Nagore... ...	1,925	0	0	Do.	
4	A house with backyard.	Do.	1,114	0	0	The same individual claims these properties as being her dowry, and requests their release from attachment, as they have been given already by her to Thiagarajaswamy of Trivalore, and since become the property of that Pagoda—Vide decision in case No. 5 of 1814 of the Civil Court, Combaconum, but this decision has not been filed.	
5	A piece of ground... ...	Do.	37	0	0		
6	A piece of ground... ..	Do.	20	0	0		
7	A piece of ground with a front building.	Do.	142	8	0		
8	A piece of ground with a brick wall.	Do.	170	0	0		
9	A house with backyard.	Do.	240	0	0		
10	A house with garden...	Do.	315	0	0		
11	A piece of ground... ...	Do.	13	0	0		
12	A house with backyard.	Do.	528	0	0		
13	A roof without ground.	Do.	10	0	0		
14	A small building... ...	Do.	10	8	0		
15	A godown with back-yard.	Do.	1,120	0	0	Claimed by Andapillai Chettiar, as it has been mortgaged to him.	
16	A piece of ground... ...	Do.	53	0	0		
17	A piece of ground... ...	Do.	23	0	0		
18	A piece of ground... ...	Do.	42	8	0		
19	A house with backyard.	Kullapuram	...	...	...	Piranesweri Ammal, 1st wife of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, claims these properties as a present to her by Thiagasammantha Moodelliar at the time of his second marriage.	
20	A Cow-shed...	Do.	...	...	...		
		Total...	5,767	8	0	One Arumuga Moodelly of Kullapuram also claims these properties as being a dowry of his wife Parvathiammal (how related to Thiagasammantha Moodelliar is not stated.) Two houses and one Manaikat, and one house and one Manaikat are claimed by one Subbaroya Moo-	

List of property of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar of Nagore, &c.—*(Continued.)*

Number.	Description of property.	Where situated.	Estimated value. Rs.	A.	P.	Claims.	Remarks.
						delly of Moodelliar Pettai, and Gnanambal, sister of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar respectively, the former under a Deed of sale, alleged to have been executed by Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, and the latter as dowry by Thiagasammantha Moodelliar. Neither of these parties has stated as to where they are situated.	
	Cattle.						
	A pair of big bullocks	...	120	0	0		These were sold by public auction in Feb. 1863 for Rs. 307. Died.
	A pair of small bullocks	...	35	0	0		
	1 Buffaloe	...	10	0	0		
	3 Cows, with 3 Calves	..	32	0	0		
	1 Old bullock	...	5	0	0		
		Total...	202	0	0		
	Vehicles.						
	1 Box bandy	...	100	0	0		
	3 Carts	...	45	0	0		
	1 Small bandy	...	10	0	0		
		Total...	155	0	0		
	Jewels.						
	1 Saradaddigai	...	60	0	0	Pirancsweri Ammal, 1st wife, and Annammal, 2nd wife of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar, claim some of these jewels as their dowry.	
	1 Do.	...	25	0	0		
	2 Pairs of Keppu	...	33	0	0		
	1 Pilak	...	33	0	0		
	1 Mukuthi	...	8	0	0		
	1 Pair of Karnaipu	...	10	0	0		
	Other jewels of minor value.	...	40	8	0		
		Total...	222	8	0		
	Brass Vessels.						
	2 Chatties	...	80	0	0		
	2 Kergalams	...	25	0	0		
	2 Joduthavalays	...	20	0	0		
	9 Lamps	...	20	0	0		
	2 Chatties	...	12	0	0		
	1 Thavalai	...	10	0	0		
	1 Big lamp	...	10	0	0		
	3 Thambalams	...	9	0	0		
	1 Joduthavalai	...	5	0	0		
	Other vessels of minor value.	...	110	8	0		
		Total...	301	8	0		

List of property of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar of Nagore, &c.—*(Concluded.)*

Number.	Description of property.	Where situated.	Estimated value. Rs.	A.	P.	Claims.	Remarks.
	Furnitures.						
	21 Chairs	...	30	0	0		
	3 Cots	...	20	0	0		
	1 Cot	...	7	0	0		
	1 Bereau	...	5	0	0		
	5 Chairs	...	4	0	0		
	1 Table	...	1	0	0		
	1 Paper box	...	3	0	0		
	1 Small do.	...	1	0	0		
	1 Big do.	...	1	4	0		
	2 Boxes	...	1	8	0		
	2 Do.	...	1	8	0		
	1 Big wooden box	...	2	2	0		
	1 Do.	...	3	8	0		
	1 Box	...	1	1	0		
	Other furnitures	...	193	14	6		
		Total...	275	10	6		
	Cloths.						
	4 Laced cloths	...	80	0	0		
	2 Female cloths	...	50	0	0		
	10 Jackets	...	80	0	0		
	1 Benares Thuppatta	...	10	0	0		
	1 Shawl	...	7	0	0		
	Other cloths of small value	...	132	14	0		
	Total...	...	359	14	0		
	Other sundry articles...	...	378	8	5		
	Grand Total...	...	7,662	3	11		

(Signed) C. G. PLUMER,
Acting Joint Magistrate.

NEGAPATAM, *24th October* 1865.

(True Copy).

(Signed) G. L. MORRIS,
Magistrate.

Statement of the landed property of Thiagasammantha Moodelliar of Nagore under attachment, under Section 184 of C. C. P., Tanjore District.

Taluqs.	Villages.	Extent including Dry, Wet, &c.			Assessment.			Claims.	Remarks.
1	2	3			4			5	6
		Veli.	M.	G.	Rs.	A.	P.		
Negapatam Taluq.	Kivalur	5	7	93½	227	15	9	2 V. 13 M. 8$\frac{15}{16}$ G. of this land, which was mortgaged to the Moodelliar, is stated to have been since recovered by Suba Moodelly and others. 2½ Pangus in the village are claimed by Annammaul, 2nd wife of the Moodelliar, as dowry by her husband. ½ Pangu is claimed by Panchanadi Moodelly as mortgaged to him.	
	Vairavanirupu	10	4	28½	360	10	11	2 V. 10 M., are claimed by Annammaul, 2nd wife of Moodelliar, as dowry by her husband. 5 V. 40 G., of Nanjah and Punjah, connected with the lands in the village, is claimed by Andapilli Chettiar of Nagore as mortgaged to him.	
	Anaikudi	24	1	62½	1,087	1	7	21 V. 11 M. 81 G., claimed by Saminada Moodelliar, as purchased in public auction by Civil Court.	
	Pretaparamapuram	16	15	38½	107	10	9	The whole claimed by Annammaul, 2nd wife of Moodelliar, as dowry by her husband.	
	Periatumbur	0	13	27	20	13	1	None.	
	Thennelapady	0	2	3½	2	3	6	None.	
	Papanacheri	0	1	15½	2	11	5	None.	
	Total	57	5	68½	1,809	3	2		
Nannilam.	Kullapuram	21	16	81½	655	2	2	Muttusawmi Pillai of Tranquebar, Narrayanasamien of Pillur, and Suba Moodelly of Pondicherry, claim the whole under mortgage, Pianesvari Ammal, 1st wife of the Moodelliar, claims as dowry by her husband.	
	Nadukandangudy	16	15	85½	471	1	1		
	Thennalagudi	27	17	23½	773	14	8		
	Nagamangalum	17	2	30½	519	12	0		
	Total	83	12	20½	2,419	13	11		
	Grand Total	140	17	89½	4,229	1	1		

(Signed) C. G. PLUMER,
Acting Joint Magistrate.

NEGAPATAM, 24th *October* 1865.

(True Copy).

(Signed) G. L. MORRIS,
Magistrate.

No. 203. ORDER THEREON, 24th November 1865, No. 1679.

The Governor in Council directs that the following endorsement be passed upon the petition of Tiyagasummuntha Moodelly :—

The petitioner is informed that he must appear before the Joint Magistrate under Section 185 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, or take the consequences. The Joint Magistrate it appears has directed that bail shall be taken from the petitioner.

2. The Governor in Council authorizes the Joint Magistrate to defend the suit referred to, at the public expense in the first instance, subject to such further orders as the Government may deem it proper to pass after the decision of the suit, as to whether the Joint Magistrate shall be eventually required to pay any costs that may be awarded against him.

3. Adverting to the statement made in the petition presented by Thirunakavalloo Unnaal, that it is proposed to sell the land which has been attached, the Governor in Council presumes that, with reference to the provisions of Section 184 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, no sale will take place without the previous sanction of Government.

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

Ed. J. Tulloch.

Judicial

N: 2263.

From The Magistrate of Tanjore
D/ 28th Oct 1865

For Pondicherry.

I yaggatayen Pandy has made ap-
-plication upon the Joint Magistrate
under Sec 185 of the Criminal
Procedure Code to take the
conveyance of his wife Ponnu
Ammal that she may come on bail.
She is still at Pondicherry
this might be done through the
Special Agent
to the Tamil, which is all

Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Read the following papers

From A Sangaramanna dated Received 28 October 1805
Dubashcarrying the Annual
The Magistrate of Tanjore do No 236

Order thereon 2d November 1805 No 1079

The Governor in Council
directs that the following
endorsement be passed on
the Petition of Sangaramanna
dated &c.

The Petitioner is informed
that he must appear before
the Joint Magistrate under
Section 183 of the Code of
Criminal Procedure, or take
the consequences. The Joint
Magistrate at Tanjore is
directed that bail be taken
to be taken from the Petitioner
2 The Governor in Council
authorizes the Joint Magis-
trate to defend the suit
referred to at the public
Expense

Judicial 1865. Department.

No. 1679.

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

Fct. 2601.
1757/56
Dated 24 November 1865

20-203.