

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Judicial</i> DEPARTMENT. G.O., DATED 7-8-91 No. 1572

INDEXED.

When given for copying 15/

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing C. N. Lutchmans
 Bunder's late letter of this
 North West that the Postcard
 referred to by him cannot
 be returned to him, nor is
 the Post prepared to grant a
 copy of the letter with which
 they were forwarded to Colonel
 Portman.

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18, No. MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

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

CURRENT No.

Indicial.

DEPARTMENT.

From

C. N. Lutchimiana Indialy
Late Inspector of Police
North West- District

No.

Dated 21st } July 1891
Received 22nd }
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Requesting that the postcards
not returned to him with
the other enclosures of his
memorial & which were
sent by Col. Porteous, may
be returned to him.

Co. order 7th Aug. 91 No. 1572

The post-cards cannot be
returned as requested, as they
were prepared to print a copy
of the letter with which they
were forwarded to Col. Porteous.

(Firm order)

WATCHED
To post 2 AUG 91
Am. 4 Aug.

For orders

Are the post-cards to be returned
to Lutchimiana Indialy? The
only objection seems to be that the
from the main evidence on which
Lord 14 July 1890 & 1895 had been
furnished.

By "the letter covering the post-cards"
the post? probably refers to the
letter addressed to Col. Porteous by
the person who sent the post-cards
to him on the 17th June 1890; this will
be found at the place marked with
a tape in P.O. 10 Oct. 1890 & 1891
1899 Ind. together with a translation
the original it is presumed cannot
be given to the post? but may a
copy be furnished to him?

29 July.

It is submitted the post? request should
be refused as this case has been finally
decided and he has been furnished
documents he continues in being

30 July

I think both requests should
be refused.

2 Aug.

R3/8



R. 22

ootacamand.

18th April 1891.

My dear Mr. Price,

I have been trying to remember any circumstance regarding the receipt of Latchmana Mudaliyar's Letter in April or May last which would throw light on the questions drawn up by Col. Weldon, forwarded to me with your ^{confidential} Letter of the 13th inst. & now returned, but I am sorry to say that I am unable to recall any thing ^{at all} connected with the receipt of the Letter. I may have received it while on leave and sent it to Mr. Hunt in a white cartridge cover, but even as to this I cannot be certain, & I have no recollection of what became of the

Circulated

May a DO to Col. Weldon now be drafted or should the statement of the persons mentioned by Mr. Schmidt be taken.

15 Sept

Put away in
80.1572 Jnd
7. 8. 1891

cover. It was probably destroyed.
I am very sorry that I cannot be of
any help in the matter, but I do not
remember receiving this particular
letter at all, while I could not say that
I did not receive it.

Yours sincerely
A. G. Cardew.

The Honble Mr. Price.



OOTACAMUND,

15 April 1891.

My dear Corden,

You no doubt remember
the case of Lutchmana Mudaligar
and his ~~unreturned~~ enclosures which
occurred shortly after the order on
his case was passed in January
1890. Shortly before you went on
leave a reference went to L. M.
directing him to return the copy
of the G.O. and the enclosures

which according to him accompanied
it. ~~Harvard~~ In not complying with
this reference he returned the papers,
as far as the office remembers, to your
address and you sent them into the
office addressed Wm. Stuart in a
small white cardboard cover. Weldon
who is enquiring into the business
has asked me to get the accompanying
question answered & as ~~certainty~~
you may be able to throw some light
on question that I have thought I would
ask you before sending back the ^{reply} ~~papers~~

Weldon is wrong in supposing that
returned the original cover (i.e. the
cover in which the L.O. of Tany went
Wm.) at the time in question.
This he only did some time after in
a further memorial. The only
papers received with his reply
& reference in No. 803 were
the copy of the L.O. of Tany
and the six enclosures
alleged to have been read
written by him. You may
however be able to throw
some light on the state
of the papers when read.

two Weldon a cue
Quarter 3 can be
answered in the office &
as to quarter 4 I submit if
it is as stated above, you destroy
the cover as you would say the

The papers are all with
Weldon or I should send you the
reference but I hope these
above will explain things to
you sufficiently (8017/80)

Alfred J. C.

2. 4. 91

SECRETARY

PL 91

My dear Sir

Could you kindly ask Mr
Schmidt or some knowledgeable
person to answer the enclosed
questions and return them
to yours self

Alfredson

Office Order.

The following rule in regard to the despatch of papers from the office should be strictly adhered to in the future:-

The Despatcher is to close and stamp all covers himself or to personally superintend this being done.

The number of enclosures, accompanying a G.O., that leave the office should be distinctly entered in words both in the original of the G.O., the signed copy, and in the Post. Book.

15 Sept
Aq. Asst. Secretary

*CM given
to the Clerk*

19. ^{Cl.} Copy of Mutchmana Mudali's letter to Post Master of 11. 9. 90, reply from Post Master of 13. 9. 90, letter from L. M. to Postmaster of 14. 9. 90, Reply from Postmaster of 21. 9. 90. } all on one sheet of paper
20. Copy of Mutchmana Mudaliyar's letter of 24. Sept 1890 & Post M. Punganur's reply dated 30 Sept 90.

Certified that the above Twenty Enclosures have been strongly stitched to me with the signed copy of G.O. 1395 Jut of 14. 7. 91 going to Mutchmana Mudaliyar Late Inspector of Police, Big Nallam Chinglesput, that entry "with Twenty enclosures ^{signed} returned" has been made below the address in the G.O., that I have myself put the signed copy of the G.O. ^{and enclosures} in the cover addressed to Mutchmana Mudaliyar & sealed it with the office seal, that the cover with its contents weighs accordingly to the office scales ^{a little less than 11} tolas, that it has been stamped with stamps to the amount of 5 annas, and sent to the Post Office by a trustworthy servant - Rajagopal Murchi.

Ch. Schmidt
Chief Secretary

Atacamund
15th July 1891

Certified that we have examined the enclosures going to Mutchmana Mudaliyar with the ^{Cl.} ~~copy~~ G.O. 1395 Jut, that they are as given in the above list, that we have seen them placed in the cover addressed, ~~and~~ ^{Cl.} seen the cover sealed & handed to C. Rajagopal Murchi for registry & posting. Certified also that the cover & contents according to the office Scales weighed ^{a little less than 11} tolas & that the cover has been stamped with 5 annas stamps.

R. S. S.
Henry E. Hoyle

Atacamund
15th July 1891

List of Enclosures returned to C. M. Lutchmanan Mudaliyar
with G.O. No. 1395 of 14.7.91

1. Order of dismissal by the J. G. of Police of 4.4.84 - marked Tust. $\frac{1}{2484}/90$
2. Order of Supdt. of Police (W. Storeman) of 15.11.83 - marked Tust. $\frac{2}{2484}/90$
3. Copy of G.O. No. 1855 Tust. of 15.7.86 signed by Mr. Carden - marked Tust. $\frac{4}{2484}/90$
4. Copy of G.O. No. 989 Tust. of 10.6.90 signed by Mr. Pice - marked Tust. $\frac{5}{2484}/90$
5. Copy of Reference on Tust. 883/1890 signed by Mr. Carden - marked Tust. $\frac{7}{2484}/90$
6. Copy of G.O. 229 Tust. of 21.2.90 signed by Mr. Carden - marked Tust. $\frac{9}{2484}/90$
7. Cover that contained G.O. 23.1.90. No. 90 Tust. sent to Mr. M. - marked Tust. $\frac{11}{2484}/90$
8. Cover of letter addressed to Lutchmanan Mudaliyar bearing Chulian Post Mark of 22nd February 1884 - marked Tust. $\frac{12}{2484}/90$
9. Tamil Letter - marked ~~2098~~ Tust. $\frac{13}{2484}/90$
10. Letter dated 30.12.88 addressed to Lutchmanan Mudaliyar - bears enclosure mark of Judicial 68/89 - Palace des 1. Anna - marked Tust. $\frac{14}{2484}/90$
11. Extract from Dr. Order of Supdt. of Police N. Arcot District No. 800 of 21.12.83 marked T $\frac{3875}{17}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{2098}{9}$ of 88 [Remainder patched] Tust. $\frac{15}{2484}/90$ - patched at back of Cop.
12. Tamil Letter of 1888 marked "Exhibit 16" in red ink - marked Tust. $\frac{2098}{4}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{12}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{16}{2484}$ of 90 - patched on the inside
13. Copy of order by Mr. Storeman. Supdt. of Police - of 24.2.84 - marked [padding] Tust. $\frac{2098}{3}$ of 88 - Tust. $\frac{5295}{4}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{13}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{17}{2484}$ of 90, [patch] 964/86, In Tust. 79 of 86 - pasted at back
14. Copy of Mr. Storeman's Affidavit of 30.1.84 - Enclosure mark of 1888 almost obliterated stands $\frac{875}{1}$ of 88 - marked also Tust. $\frac{2098}{2}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{264}{5}$ of 86 Tust. $\frac{18}{2484}$ of 90 - In Tust. 679/86 - patched down the middle of back & three cross patches.
15. Copy of order by the J. G. of Police of 30 April 1888 - marked Tust. $\frac{2098}{1}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{15}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{19}{2484}$ of 90.
16. Half. Anna starryford Envelope - marked D in purple ink - addressed to Lutchmanan Mudaliyar - marked Tust. $\frac{20}{2484}$ of 90.
17. Tamil Letter - marked T $\frac{3875}{4}$ of 88 & Tust. $\frac{21}{2484}$ of 90.
18. Copy of G.O. of 23.1.90. No 90 Tust. signed by Mr. Carden and addressed to Lutchmanan Mudaliyar - torn in the middle - marked Tust. $\frac{22}{2484}$ of 90

Description of Enclosures to
L. M. Petition to the Viceroy of 23. June 1890
C. M. 2484/1890.

- | No of Enclosure | Description | Remarks |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| X 1 | Order of dismissal by J. G. of Police of 4.4.84 - | |
| X 2 | Order of Supdt. of Police Tumbally of 15. Nov 1883 - | |
| 3 | Copy of Lutchmanan Mudaliyar's Meml. to the Viceroy. of 13.2.86. | |
| X 4 | Sup. Copy of G.O. 1855 Tust. of 15.7.86 signed by Mr. Carden and addressed to Petitioner | |
| X 5 | Copy of G.O. 989 Tust. of 10.6.90. Signed by Mr. Pice and addressed to Petitioner | |
| 6 | Copy of L. M. Petition of 10. April 90 addressed to Mr. Carden | |
| X 7 | Copy of Reference on No. 883/1890 Tust. signed by Mr. Carden and addressed to Petitioner | |
| 8 | Copy of L. M. Petition of 23rd Feb 90 | |
| X 9 | Super Copy of G.O. 229 of 21.2.90 signed by Mr. Carden and addressed to Petitioner | |
| 10 | Copy of L. M. Petition of 25 January 1890 | |
| X 11 | Copy of G.O. 23.1.90 signed by Mr. Carden and addressed to Petitioner | |
| X 12 | Cover that contained G.O. 23.1.90 No. 90 despatched to Mr. M. | |
| X 13 | Tamil Letter - | |
| X 14 | Letter of 30.12.88. addressed to Lutchmanan Mudaliyar - bears enclosure mark of Judicial 68/89 - Palace des 1. Anna. | |
| X 15 | Extract from Dr. Order by Supdt. of Police N. Arcot. No. 800 of 21.12.83. (Marked T $\frac{3875}{17}$ of 88, Tust. $\frac{2098}{9}$ of 88 (not patched) & $\frac{15}{2484}$ of 90). patched at back of Cop. | |
| X 16 | Tamil Letter of 88 marked "Exhibit 16" in red ink. Tust. $\frac{2098}{4}$ of 88 T. $\frac{3875}{12}$ of 88. Tust. $\frac{16}{2484}$ of 90 - patched on the inside | |
| X 17 | Copy of Supdt. of Police Tumbally's order of 24.2.84 patched at back - marked - Tust. $\frac{2098}{3}$ of 88 - Tust. $\frac{5295}{4}$ of 88 T. $\frac{3875}{13}$ of 88 - Tust. $\frac{17}{2484}$ of 90 (patch) 964/86. In Tust. 79 of 86. | |

X 18 - Aff Copy of Mr. Storrer's Affidavit of 30. 1. 86 - patched
near the middle and 3 cross patches. Enclosure mark of 88.

almost obliterated stamp $\frac{576}{2484}$ of 88 - mark also $\frac{2098}{2}$ of 88

$\frac{18}{2484}$ of 90. Int. $\frac{264}{5}$ of 86. In Int 679/86.

X 19 - Copy of Ombudsman's of 30. April 1888 - marked Int $\frac{2098}{2}$ of 88.

J $\frac{3875}{18}$ of 88 Int $\frac{19}{2484}$ of 90.

X 20 Half Anna stamped envelope marked D in purple ink addressed
W. M.

X 21 Tamil letter marked J $\frac{3875}{4}$ of 88 & Int 21 of 84.

X 22 - Copy of fo. 22. 70 No 90. Supplied W. from and received
to Pottanar (letter in the middle).

23. Copy of L. Sri Pichu of 1st May 88.

24. Resolution of the Secy of State of 23. June 1890.

Enclosures to L. Sri Pichu of 23. 3. 90

X 1. Copy of letter from L. Sri. of 11. 9. 90 to Mr. Pichu
Reply for Pichu. of 13. 9. 90.
Letter from L. Sri. of 14. 9. 90
Reply for above of 21. 9. 90 } all on one sheet

2. Copy of letter from L. Sri. to Pichu. reply
from Pichu. Pungam. 7th. & 30. Sept 90

16. Half Anna stamped in relief - marked D in
purple ink - addressed 17/8 - marked Jul $\frac{20}{2484}$ / 90

17. Tamil letter - marked T $\frac{3875}{4}$ 488 + Jul 21/84,
Jul $\frac{21}{2484}$ / 90

18. Copy of 480 of 23.1.90 No. 90 Jul. signed by M. G. V. and addressed
to Petitioner - written in this middle - marked Jul. $\frac{22}{2484}$ / 90

19. Copies of Lutchmana Mudalayar's letter to Post Master
of 11.9.90, reply from Post Master of 13.9.90, letter from
L.M. to 20 of 14.9.90, Reply from P.M. of 21.9.90 } all on one thin
sheet of paper

20. Copy of Lutchmana Mudalayar's letter + reply from
Post Master Punganur dated 24 + 30 Sept 90

List of enclosures returned to L. N. Luthmanen
Mudalayar with S.A. No. 7.

1. Order of dismissal by the J. G. of Police of 4.4.84 marked $\frac{2484}{1}/90$
2. Order of Supdt. of Police Tinnervelly dated 18th November 1883. marked $\frac{2484}{2}/90$
3. Copy of S.O. 1855 T.J. of 15.7.86 signed by Mr. Corder. marked $\frac{2484}{4}/90$
4. Copy of S.O. 989 " of 10.6.90 signed by Mr. Price - marked $\frac{2484}{5}/90$
5. Copy of Reference on T.J. 883/1890 signed by Mr. Corder - marked $\frac{2484}{7}/90$
6. Copy of S.O. 229^a dated 21.2.90 signed by Mr. Corder - marked $\frac{2484}{9}/90$
7. Cover that contained S.O. $\frac{23.1.90}{N. 90}$ T.J. sent to M. - marked $\frac{2484}{11}/90$
8. Cover of letter addressed to Mr. bearing Chittoor Post Mark of 22nd February 1884 addressed to L. N. - marked $\frac{2484}{12}/90$
9. Tamil letter. marked $\frac{2484}{13}/90$
10. Letter dated 30.12.88. addressed to L. N. - bears enclosure mark of T.J. 68/89 - Postage due 1 anna - marked $\frac{2484}{14}/90$
11. Extract from Dt. Order of Supdt. of Police N. Arcot No 800 of 21.12.83. (marked) $\frac{3875}{17}$ of 88, T.J. $\frac{2098}{9}$ of 8 [remainder patched] + $\frac{15}{2484}$ of 90 patched at back of copy.
12. Tamil letter of '88 marked 'Exhibit 16' in red ink - marked T.J. $\frac{2098}{4}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{12}$ of 88, T.J. $\frac{16}{2484}$ of 90 - patched on the inside.
13. Copy of Order by Supdt. of Police, Tinnervelly, of 24.2.84. pasted at back - marked [Quoting] Dt. $\frac{2098}{9}$ of 88 - T.J. $\frac{5295}{4}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{13}$ of 88 - T.J. $\frac{17}{2484}$ of 90, [patch] $\frac{264}{86}$, In T.J. 79 of 86.
14. Copy of Mr. Stremmon's Affidavit of 30.1.84 - patched at back down the middle and 3 anna patches - Enclosure marked of 1888 almost reiterated stand $\frac{875}{1}/90$ - marked also T.J. $\frac{2098}{2}$ of 88. T.J. $\frac{18}{2484}$ of 90 - In T.J. 679/86.
15. Copy of Order by the J. G. of Police of 30. April 1888 - marked T.J. $\frac{2098}{1}$ of 88, T. $\frac{3875}{15}$ of 88, T.J. $\frac{19}{2484}$ of 90.

NOTE FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY.

Am 15/7 The draft order mentions only the memorial of 23^d June 1890 as withheld but there is another Memorial to the Secretary of State of 3 October 1890 which forms No. 15 of the enclosure to Mr. Ouldorn's report on which is written placed at the bottom of the current in the file. This point was not noticed till the E.D. had been copied and the date of petitions were been checked. The date of the 2^d Memorial might be added to the E.D. Part brief.

Orders are solicited as regards the enclosures to be returned to L. M.

It is not known whether the four torn Post Cards are to be returned to him. It is submitted that they should not be.

As regards the other enclosures it is presumed all should be returned to L. M. except such as are mere copies of previous petitions and orders of Govt. This will reduce the number to be returned.

It is proposed to draw up a detailed list of the enclosures that are returned to and to get this attested by two senior clerks in the office. *in addition to myself* before despatch. Lyons & Mr. Hogg - and to send the order to the under register Corer. This will give the some security against any

The person ~~was~~ who need. The Corer - who was I am certain Mr. Carden. - It was probably destroyed as all covers are.

Might not Mr. Carden be asked by D.O. about the receipt of the Corer last April please? He may remember something which ^{may} throw light on the matter and give Mr. Weldon a clue.

C.
7-11

Yes.
8/4

L. M.'s reply to Reference
on No. 883 of 14. 3. 90 was recd.
by W. Conder, if I remember
right, when he was on leave
here last April and sent into
the office ^{by him} in a small white
cartidge cover addressed to W.
Hunt.

In regard to Col. M's 2nd
Question, he is mistaken in
supposing that L. M. recd. the
original cover with his reply
to the above reference. This cover
was first received when L. M.
sent in his Memorial to the
Secretary of State. The only
papers received with his
reply to Reference on 883
were the copy of the 8th of
Jan'y (that with the curious
"6" entry) and the six enclos.
which L. M. said he had only
need. The cover did not come
with these. Had it done so
the Post Office Mark of ^{over}
weight would have aroused
suspicion at once as to
it when the cover did come
to hand subsequently.

Question 3. can be
answered but Question
4 can only be replied to by