

Go 1736 11-8-82
Smy 12/2/82

CONFID Go

Sept. I (i) L-10,006-7-10-70.

- (1) Number of pages_____
- (2) Date of repair_____
- (3) Initials of the Referencer_____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

JUDL DEPARTMENT

CONFID Go

G.O. No.	1936	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	11-9-1888	187 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

869

1936
London

Sept 4 1888



My dear Price -

I send you Extract
from a Confidential report just received from
Immervell regarding the loss
while passing through the Port
of property valued at Rs 65,000
from an insured parcel -
Both the Superint. and Asst.
Superint. are on the spot requiring
into the case - Any further
information obtained will be
communicated - Thus is all

I have at present —

Saucy a Sub. Mag.

Very able to send away
jewels valued at Rs 65,000.

Yr Smt
M. S. Fortnum

1933
2

1933

Confidential 3

H.M.

sep.
5 Sep. 4

5 edw

Confidential

55 SEP 1888

" A parcel which was sent from Strullaputar
" to Sripurampudur near Madras on the
" 15th inst. was refused by the addressee
" and was consequently returned to the
" sender - but the Sub Post-Master of
" Strullaputar noticing that one of the
" seals was damaged and looked as
" if it had been tampered with, became
" suspicious and caused the parcel to be
" opened in the presence of the Magistrate
" of the District who is the Sub Magistrate of
" Hatttrapp - The parcel originally is said
" to have contained diamonds and rubies
" to the value of Rs 65,000 - and it was
" insured by Government at that figure -
" On being opened, it was found to contain
" copper coins - substituted for the
" jewels - The weight of the parcel
" coinciding exactly with that which
" was originally reported by the Post
" Office department -

True Extract

M. S. Fortman
Ag. Insp. Genl. Madras

August 30, 88

Handwritten marks and scribbles in the top left corner.

Do 328

From

Colonel Portman.

No.

Dated 4

Received 5

} Sept. 1888

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Loss of property in
Timor. 11 Sept/88 1936.
Recorded

8 Sept. 11 Sept.

been.
The whole thing may have
been a mistake, to get
out of the P.O.

Yes - Why was it refused by
address?

579 R 269

*ppit
6 Sept*

No. 112A
17/1888

[7]

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Imm</i> DEPARTMENT. G. O. DATED 11 Sept 1888 No. 1936

Confidential

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Immsvelly Pol Officer Case

5 Shirts

Page no 164

1937 11-8-88

Sony 12/14/88

Not to be folded or roughly handled