

1884
Justice (193—) Department.

Miss SERIES.

G.O. No. 3357

DATED 28 - 12 - 1884

[Despatch Abstract.]

BACK PAPERS.

[illegible]

FURTHER PAPERS.

[illegible]

28TH DECEMBER. 1884, No. 3351, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

Read—the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godávári district, dated 1st November 1884:—

I heard Board ordered Collector to take my estate under management. I intend to apply Government to reconsider their order. Therefore I respectfully beg to telegraph Collector not to take estate from my possession *forcibly* until disposal of my review petition by Government. Reply prepaid two rupees.

Resolution—dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Submitted to Government with reference to G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884, Judicial: *orders as requested in this petition, that the*

1884, Judicial.

2. It is unnecessary to issue orders, as requested in this petition, that the Collector should not forcibly take the estate from petitioner, for, of course, he has no power to take any such action. Petitioner is admittedly in possession. When she adopted a son in 1876 she gave notice that she intended to continue the magagement. This being so, all that the Collector can do is to nominate a guardian for the minor and let the guardian file a suit against the petitioner to obtain possession of the minor's property. A similar course is being followed in a case in South Canara by the Collector, with the approval of Government, and, as Regulation V of 1804 contains no procedure enabling a manager to acquire possession, it appears to be the only course. As this estate is within the Scheduled districts it is presumed that such a suit would be filed before the Agent, and, as he is an interested party, the suit will probably be transferred by the High Court. The Collector, doubtless, has the list of villages of the estate which was under the Court in 1857 and so will be able to prove, when the suit comes on for trial, what portions of the present estate are ancestral. Any portions of the present estate which have been acquired by the widow do not, of course, pass under the Court of Wards.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.

„ Collector of Godávári.

Mis. No. 4936.

Transferred to the Judicial department.

FORT-ST. GEORGE,
8th November 1884.

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godavari district, dated 19th November 1884:—

Special Assistant, Collector, Magistrate went yesterday to Polaveram to seize my estate. I beg Board to telegraph Collector not to take estate forcibly till Government pass final orders to my telegram submitted by Board to Government.

Resolution—dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 10411, dated 6th November 1884.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.
Copy to petitioner through the Collector of Godavari.

Mis. No. 5211.

Transferred to the Judicial department in continuation of the previous papers.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
22nd November 1884.

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.

Order—dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

The papers will be laid before the Advocate-General who is requested to state his opinion whether the Government can direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor in the manner in which this estate has devolved, i.e., not by direct inheritance, but by virtue of an adoption by a widow proprietrix many years after the death of the proprietor; the Advocate-General will also advise on the procedure to be adopted when under clause 2, section 2, Regulation X of 1831, the Court of Wards assume charge of an estate at any time during the minority of the proprietor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Government Solicitor, with Current No. 4663,
and copy of G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Government Solicitor, Madras, dated 8th December 1884, No. 625.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Hon. P. O'Sullivan, Advocate-General, dated 8th December 1884:—

OPINION.

With reference to the order of Government, in the Judicial department, dated the 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, I think the Government may direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor by adoption as well as by survivorship or inheritance. I assume that in this case there was a valid adoption.

2. The Agent of the Court of Wards cannot forcibly dispossess a person in possession. He can only enter by due course of law, that is, in execution of a decree passed in a suit to eject the person wrongfully in possession.

3. In this case the circumstances relating to the adoption are not fully stated, but it is stated that the widow, in reporting the adoption, notified that she would continue to manage the estate. If the widow, before or at the time of the adoption, made an agreement with the guardian of the boy to be adopted that the estate of the widow should, notwithstanding the adoption, continue for her life or until the adopted son attained his majority, such agreement, though in restriction of the ordinary rights of an adopted son, may be valid. This is a question upon which the law has not yet, I believe, been declared with sufficient clearness.

4. The effect of the agreement may be that the estate has not as yet devolved upon the adopted son by inheritance or otherwise, and in that case the Court of Wards would not have jurisdiction to interfere.

5. The Bombay High Court has ruled that such an agreement is good, but the Privy Council has said that it is at all events not wholly void and was capable of ratification by the adopted son after majority.

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort St. George, Madras.

The humble petition of SRI RAJAH
KOCHARLACOTA KAMAYAMMA
GARU, Proprietrix of the Polaveram
estate, Godavari district.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—With a view to enable herself to carry out such improvements in her estate as might be considered desirable by the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent, petitioner applied to the Board of Revenue by telegram,*

dated 21st October 1884, that the services of Cherukurada Sridanna Row Garu, an able and first-class revenue inspector of the modern school now serving in the Rajah-mundry taluk, may be lent to her for two years, on a salary of Rs. 60 per mensem, with necessary pensionary contributions. With his assistance, petitioner hoped to be able to give complete satisfaction to the local as well as *higher* authorities. He is well known to the former. But petitioner greatly regrets to learn that this important proposal was not before the Honorable Government when they passed their orders directing her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management, and that the Board had withheld it because the orders of Government about this estate did not admit of their transmitting it for favorable consideration—a fact which, if necessary, can be verified by a reference to the Board of Revenue.

In this and the other circumstances briefly set forth below, petitioner respectfully solicits a reconsideration of the orders directing her estate to be taken over by the Court of Wards—

- I. That the petitioner has managed the estate for upwards of twenty-seven years, with credit to herself and satisfaction to her tenants and the local officers.
- II. That she has always taken a keen and deep interest in the welfare of her ryots, a fact easily borne out by the records of the Revenue and Civil Courts in the district, wherein there was not a single suit between herself and her ryots.
- III. That her present troubles are of a recent date, solely due to certain private quarrels between her late manager Chamurti Venkatachellam and the village munsif of Polaveram, who has misinformed the Special Assistant Mr. Atkinson about the affairs of the estate.
- IV. That the late Acting Collector Mr. Happell, who knows the district and its people more than any other officer, expressed himself very unwilling to disturb the petitioner's management, but that the permanent Collector Mr. Foster, who had just returned from leave, reluctantly supported his Special Assistant Agent in recommending her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management.

- V. That she has solicited obedience to the Special Assistant Agent's suggestions in the matter of remitting her tenants arrears of more than three years' standing—a course not adopted in other zemindaries—and in making other concessions to the ryots as he suggested. The Special Assistant Agent herself, she trusts, will do her justice of admitting the same.
- VI. That it is not true that petitioner is under the influence of her late Manager Chamurthi Vekatachellam. He was dismissed three years ago, and left the estate good ten months ago. Petitioner is prepared to prove this if necessary.
- VII. That the inevitable result of the Court's interference will be to saddle the estate with heavy expenses, while its net income is only Rs. 5,000, and probably also to sow seeds of dissension in a family hitherto living in peace and harmony.
- VIII. That prior to adoption it was distinctly agreed upon that petitioner should not be ousted of her management of the estate (*vide* Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 30th June 1876, No. 5467, and the Government order thereon).
- IX. That the Court of Wards have no power to take forcible possession of the estate, when petitioner does not voluntarily surrender the same. Petitioner begs to state, however, that it is far from her wish to appeal to or solely rely on her legal rights, so long as a fair treatment is accorded to her by local authorities.

All the advantages which the estate and the minor (who is petitioner's sister's son and whom she has brought up from the date of his birth, his mother having died on the fifth day of delivery) would derive under the Court's management, have already been only thought of by the petitioner and amply provided for. For the minor was sent to the Rajahmundry college some months ago, having been previously trained in a private school specially opened for his benefit at Polaveram, and a new suitable manager has since been proposed to look after the affairs of the estate. If petitioner's request about the personation of this manager be kindly complied with, all that could be desired by the Honorable Government to be done under the Court's management, would have been completely achieved. It will of course be petitioner's constant study to ascertain the views of the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent and carry them out to the best of her powers. If even with these precautionary measures, petitioner does not succeed in giving satisfaction to the local authorities within the two years specified, there is nothing to prevent the Honorable Government then to take such steps as may be deemed necessary for the future improvement of the estate.

In these circumstances, petitioner humbly hopes that the honorable members of Government will be pleased to see the reasonableness of her prayer and to grant her request, viz., to hand over the service of the aforesaid Srirama Rau Garu and to try her management of the estate for the ensuing two years. This measure would save the petitioner from unnecessary humiliation and disgrace, which the benign Government could hardly have contemplated to inflict on her. For this act of justice, petitioner will ever pray.

MADRAS,
29th November 1884.

(Signed) C. SITARAMAYYA,
First-grade Pleader,
Vakil for Petitioner.

ORDER—dated 23th December 1884, No. 3351, Judicial.

It appears from the petition now before Government from the ex-Proprietrix of the Polaveram estate that she is willing to appoint a competent Government official as her manager. The Government are of opinion that, if the Agent can arrange matters so that Chamurthi Vekatachellam shall not exercise any further influence whatever over the affairs of the estate, and can select a competent Government official as manager, the intervention of the Court of Wards would not appear to be necessary.

2. The Government Agent will report after enquiry whether an arrangement of this kind cannot be arrived at.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Government Agent, Godavari.
„ Revenue department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of (1884) Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 28th December 1884, No. 3351.

DECEMBER.

Polaveram Estate, Godavari
District.

Informing the Agent that if Chamurti Venkatachellam be deprived of all influence on the affairs of the — and a competent Government officer be appointed manager, the intervention of the Court of Wards is unnecessary, and that a report should be submitted on these points.

28TH DECEMBER 1884, No. 3351, JUDICIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

Read—the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godavari district, dated 1st November 1884:—

I heard Board ordered Collector to take my estate under management. I intend to apply Government to reconsider their order. Therefore I respectfully beg to telegraph Collector not to take estate from my possession *forcibly* until disposal of my review petition by Government. Reply prepaid two rupees.

Resolution—dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Submitted to Government with reference to G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884, Judicial.

2. It is unnecessary to issue orders, as requested in this petition, that the Collector should not forcibly take the estate from petitioner, for, of course, he has no power to take any such action. Petitioner is admittedly in possession. When she adopted a son in 1876 she gave notice that she intended to continue the management. This being so, all that the Collector can do is to nominate a guardian for the minor and let the guardian file a suit against the petitioner to obtain possession of the minor's property. A similar course is being followed in a case in South Canara by the Collector, with the approval of Government, and, as Regulation V of 1804 contains no procedure enabling a manager to acquire possession, it appears to be the only course. As this estate is within the Scheduled districts it is presumed that such a suit would be filed before the Agent, and, as he is an interested party, the suit will probably be transferred by the High Court. The Collector, doubtless, has the list of villages of the estate which was under the Court in 1857 and so will be able to prove, when the suit comes on for trial, what portions of the present estate are ancestral. Any portions of the present estate which have been acquired by the widow do not, of course, pass under the Court of Wards.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.
Collector of Godavari.

Mis. No. 4936.

Transferred to the Judicial department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
8th November 1884.

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godáviri district, dated 19th November 1884:—

Special Assistant, Collector, Magistrate went yesterday to Polaveram to seize my estate. I beg Board to telegraph Collector not to take estate forcibly till Government pass final orders to my telegram submitted by Board to Government.

Resolution—dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 10411, dated 6th November 1884.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.
Copy to petitioner through the Collector of Godáviri.

Mis. No. 5211.

Transferred to the Judicial department in continuation of the previous papers.

FORT ST. GEORGE, (Signed) H. E. STOKES,
22nd November 1884. *Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.*

Order—dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

The papers will be laid before the Advocate-General who is requested to state his opinion whether the Government can direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor in the manner in which this estate has devolved, i.e., not by direct inheritance, but by virtue of an adoption by a widow proprietrix many years after the death of the proprietor; the Advocate-General will also advise on the procedure to be adopted when under clause 2, section 2, Regulation X of 1831, the Court of Wards assume charge of an estate at any time during the minority of the proprietor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Government Solicitor, with Current No. 4663,
and copy of G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Government Solicitor, Madras, dated 8th December 1884, No. 625.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Hon. P. O'Sullivan, Advocate-General, dated 8th December 1884:—

OPINION.

With reference to the order of Government, in the Judicial department, dated the 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, I think the Government may direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor by adoption as well as by survivorship or inheritance. I assume that in this case there was a valid adoption.

2. The Agent of the Court of Wards cannot forcibly dispossess a person in possession. He can only enter by due course of law, that is, in execution of a decree passed in a suit to eject the person wrongfully in possession.

3. In this case the circumstances relating to the adoption are not fully stated, but it is stated that the widow, in reporting the adoption, notified that she would continue to manage the estate. If the widow, before or at the time of the adoption, made an agreement with the guardian of the boy to be adopted that the estate of the widow should, notwithstanding the adoption, continue for her life or until the adopted son attained his majority, such agreement, though in restriction of the ordinary rights of an adopted son, may be valid. This is a question upon which the law has not yet, I believe, been declared with sufficient clearness.

4. The effect of the agreement may be that the estate has not as yet devolved upon the adopted son by inheritance or otherwise, and in that case the Court of Wards would not have jurisdiction to interfere.

5. The Bombay High Court has ruled that such an agreement is good, but the Privy Council has said that it is at all events not wholly void and was capable of ratification by the adopted son after majority.

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort St. George, Madras.

The humble petition of SRI RAJAH
KOCHARLACOTA KAMAYAMMA
GARU, Proprietrix of the Polaveram
estate, Godáviri district.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—With a view to enable herself to carry out such improvements in her estate as might be considered desirable by the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent, petitioner applied to the Board of Revenue by telegram,*

* Copy enclosed.
dated 21st October 1884, that the services of Cherukurada Sridanna Row Garu, an able and first-class revenue inspector of the modern school now serving in the Rajah-mundry taluk, may be lent to her for two years, on a salary of Rs. 60 per mensem, with necessary pensionary contributions. With his assistance, petitioner hoped to be able to give complete satisfaction to the local as well as *higher* authorities. He is well known to the former. But petitioner greatly regrets to learn that this important proposal was not before the Honorable Government when they passed their orders directing her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management, and that the Board had withheld it because the orders of Government about this estate did not admit of their transmitting it for favorable consideration—a fact which, if necessary, can be verified by a reference to the Board of Revenue.

In this and the other circumstances briefly set forth below, petitioner respectfully solicits a reconsideration of the orders directing her estate to be taken over by the Court of Wards—

- I. That the petitioner has managed the estate for upwards of twenty-seven years, with credit to herself and satisfaction to her tenants and the local officers.
- II. That she has always taken a keen and deep interest in the welfare of her ryots, a fact easily borne out by the records of the Revenue and Civil Courts in the district, wherein there was not a single suit between herself and her ryots.
- III. That her present troubles are of a recent date, solely due to certain private quarrels between her late manager Chamurti Venkatachellam and the village munsif of Polaveram, who has misinformed the Special Assistant Mr. Atkinson about the affairs of the estate.
- IV. That the late Acting Collector Mr. Happell, who knows the district and its people more than any other officer, expressed himself very unwilling to disturb the petitioner's management, but that the permanent Collector Mr. Foster, who had just returned from leave, reluctantly supported his Special Assistant Agent in recommending her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management.

- V. That she has shown implicit obedience to the Special Assistant Agent's suggestions in the matter of remitting her tenants arrears of more than three years' standing—a course not adopted in other zemindaries—and in making certain other concessions to the ryots as he suggested. The Special Assistant himself, she trusts, will do her justice of admitting the same.
- VI. That it is not true that petitioner is under the influence of her late Manager Chamurti Venkatachellam. He was dismissed three years ago, and left the estate for good ten months ago. Petitioner is prepared to prove this if necessary.
- VII. That the inevitable effect of the Court's interference will be to saddle the estate with heavy expenses, while its net income is only Rs. 5,000, and probably also to sow seeds of dissension in a family hitherto living in peace and harmony.
- VIII. That prior to adoption, it was distinctly agreed upon that petitioner should not be divested of her management of the estate (*vide* Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 30th June 1876, No. 5467, and the Government order thereon).
- IX. That the Court of Wards have no power to take forcible possession of the estate, when petitioner does not voluntarily surrender the same. Petitioner begs to state, however, that it is far from her wish to appeal to or solely rely on her legal rights, so long as a fair treatment is accorded to her by the local authorities.

All the advantages which the estate and the minor (who is petitioner's sister's son and whom she has brought up from the date of his birth, his mother having died on the fifth day of delivery) would derive under the Court's management, have already been only thought of by the petitioner and amply provided for. For the minor was sent to the Rajahmundry college some months ago, having been previously trained in a private school specially opened for his benefit at Polaveram, and a new suitable manager has since been proposed to look after the affairs of the estate. If petitioner's request about the personate of this manager be kindly complied with, all that could be desired by the Honorable Government to be done under the Court's management, would have been completely achieved. It will of course be petitioner's constant study to ascertain the views of the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent and carry them out to the best of her powers. If even with these precautionary measures, petitioner does not succeed in giving satisfaction to the local authorities within the two years specified, there is nothing to prevent the Honorable Government then to take such steps as may be deemed necessary for the future improvement of the estate.

In these circumstances, petitioner humbly hopes that the honorable members of Government will be pleased to see the reasonableness of her prayer and to grant her request, viz., to hand her the services of the aforesaid Srirama Rau Garu and to try her management of the estate for the ensuing two years. This measure would save the petitioner from unnecessary humiliation and disgrace, which the benign Government could hardly have contemplated to inflict on her. For this act of justice, petitioner will ever pray.

MADRAS,
29th November 1884.

(Signed) C. SITARAMAYYA,
First-grade Pleader,
Vakil for Petitioner.

ORDER—dated 28th December 1884, No. 3351, Judicial.

It appears from the petition now before Government from the ex-Proprietrix of the Polaveram estate that she is willing to appoint a competent Government official as her manager. The Government are of opinion that, if the Agent can arrange matters so that Chamurti Venkatachellam shall not exercise any further influence whatever over the affairs of the estate, and can select a competent Government official as manager, the intervention of the Court of Wards would not appear to be necessary.

2. The Government Agent will report after enquiry whether an arrangement of this kind cannot be arrived at.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Government Agent, Godáviri.
" Revenue department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of 1884 Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 28th December 1884, No. 3351.

DECEMBER.

Polaveram Estate, Godavari
District.

Informing the Agent that if Chamurthi Venkata-
chellam be deprived of all influence on the affairs
of the — and a competent Government officer be
appointed manager, the intervention of the Court
of Wards is unnecessary, and that a report should
be submitted on these points.

3351/8 28 Dec 84



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Dated 6th November 1884.

No. 10411

Read the following telegram from the Proprietor of
Reddi Plainsam, Godavari District dated
1st Nov 1884: —

I have Board ordered Collector to take
my estate under management & intend to
apply Government to reconsider their order
therefore I respectfully beg to telegraph
Collector not to take estate from my possession
forcibly until disposal of my revenue
by Government. Reply prepaid two rupees

Resolution 86 of 84, No. 10411.

Submitted to Government with reference
G.O. No. 249 dated 1st October 1884, Judic

2. It is unnecessary to issue order as
requested in this petition, that the Collector
should not forcibly take the estate from
for, of course, he has no power to take a

ch action. Petition is admittedly in possession.
Then she adopted a son in 1876 she gave
order that she intended to continue the
management. This being so, all that the
Collector can do, is to nominate a guardian
for the Minor and let the guardian file a
suit against the petitioner to obtain possession
of the Minor's property. A similar course is
being followed in a case in South Canara by
the Collector, with the approval of Government.
Under the Regulation T of 1884 contains no
procedure enabling a Manager to acquire
possession, it appears to be the only course.
As this estate is within the Scheduled District
it is presumed that such a suit would be
brought before the Agent and, as he is an
interested party, the suit will probably be
referred by the High Court. The Collector,
however, has the list of villages of the estate
which was under the Court in 1857 and so
will be able to prove, when the suit comes on
trial, what portions of the present estate
are what. Any portions of the present
estate which have been acquired by the
law do not, of course, pass under the
Court

28
Court of Wards.

(True copy and Extract)

From MacKinnon
Sg. Sub-Collector

To The Secretary to Government R. D.

Collector of Godavari

with 2 Rs. telegraph stamps
as per R. D.

1884
1/2/84

Sub P.O. 14-6-86: 2935m.
1-10-86: 2490.
7/11

CORRESPONDENCE No. 4481
REVENUE (1884) DEPARTMENT.

No. 7011

Mis. No. 4936

From
Pres. of the Board of Revenue.

Transferred to the
Judicial Department.

W. H. Jones
Secy to Govt.
H. H. George,
November 1884.

Dated 6th November/84.
Recd. 7th

Mis. No. 10411.

2 Rs Telegraphic Stamp.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt. with
accompanying telegram from the Pres-
ident of Reddi Palavaram,
Godavari District praying for
orders to the Coll^r not to take
possession of the Estate from
her forcibly finding disposal
of her review petition to Govt.

Record with reference
to the case. 1884. 4481.
The course proposed by the B^d of
Revenue is approved.
proposed course, with land
a costly law office. The
which is doubtful. Even if
in the estate, will have been
improvised & a deal of hard
expended in the family. I
think the best course is to go back
to Oct/84 N^o 2490 & agree in the
expressed by the Board in their
proceedings read in that order.
Fid.
1884/85



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.
Dated 20th November 1884.
No. 10900 mis

2nd READ the following telegram from the Pres^{nt}
of Reddi Palavaram, Godavari, dated
19th November 1884.

Special Assistant Collector Magish
went yesterday to Palavaram to
seize my estate. I beg Board to
telegraph collector not to take
forcibly till Government pass
orders to my telegram submitted by
Board to Government

Resolution:— 20 Nov 84. Mis. No. 10900
Submitted to Government in
continuation of Board's Proceed^{ings}
No. 10411 mis, dated 6th November 84.
(True Copy and Extract)
From MacRae
By Secretary.

To, The Secretary to Govt. G.O. with
Copy to Petitioner through the collector of
Godavari.

REVENUE (1884) DEPARTMENT.

No. 7968.

From

The Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Dated 20th November 1884.

Recd. 21st Enc. { 2 Pro. tele
graph St.
No. 10900 mis.

SUBJECT.

Submitting telegram from
the proprietress of Reddi Polavara
Godavari district praying for
orders to Collector not to take
her estate by force until Govt.
pass final orders on her pre-
vious telegram submitted to
Government by Board.

Mis. No. 5211.

Transferred to the Judicial
Department in continuation
of the previous papers.

W. Nicholas
Secy. to Govt.

St. George
Nov. 1884

orders

W

1/12

former papers in case

Transferred

To

The Right Honorable
The Governor in Council.
Fort St. George.
Madras.

The humble petition of Sri Rajah Kochharlaola
Kamayamma Sani, Proprietress of the Polavara
Estate, Godavari District.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
CHIEF SECRETARY
1 DEC 94

With a view to enable herself to carry on

Copy enclosed.

such improvements in her Estate as might be considered desirable
by the Collector and his special Assistant Agent, petitioner applied
to the Board of Revenue by telegram dated 21st October 1884,
that the services of Chennurada Sridainad Rao, an
able & first class Revenue Inspector of the Mosan School now
serving in the Rajahmundry Taluk, may be lent to her for
2 years, on a salary of Rs 60 per mensem with necessary pen-
sionary contributions. With his assistance, petitioner hoped
to be able to give complete satisfaction to the local as well as
higher authorities. He is well known to the former. But
petitioner ^{greatly} regrets to learn that this important proposal was
not before the Honorable Government when they passed
their orders directing her Estate to be taken under the Court
of Wards management, and that the Board had withheld
it because the orders of Government about this Estate
did not admit of their transmitting it for favourable
consideration - a fact, which if necessary, can be verified
by a reference to the Board of Revenue.

In this & the other circumstances briefly
set forth below, petitioner respectfully solicits a

reconsideration of the orders directing her estate to be taken over by the Court of Wars.

I. That the Petitioner has managed the Estate for upwards of 27 years, with credit to herself & satisfaction to her tenants and the local officers.

II. That she has always taken a keen & deep interest in the welfare of her ryots, a fact easily borne out by the records of the Revenue & Civil Courts in the District, wherein there was not a single suit between herself and her ryots.

III. That her present troubles are of a recent date, solely due to certain private quarrels between her late Manager Chennurthy Venkatachalam and the Village Munciff of Polavaram, who has misinformed the Special Assistant Mr. Atkinson about the affairs of the Estate.

IV. That the late acting Collector Mr. Happpell who knows the District & its people more than any other officer, expressed himself very unwilling to disturb the petitioner's management, but that the permanent Collector Mr. Foster, who had just returned from leave, reluctantly supported his Special Assistant Agent in recommending her Estate to be taken under the Court of Wars Management.

V. That she has shown implicit obedience to the Special Assistant Agent's suggestions in the matter of remitting her tenants arrears of more than 3 years standing - a course not adopted in other Zemindaries - and in making certain other concessions to the Ryots as he suggested.

The

108
The Special Assistant himself, she trusts, will do her justice of admitting the same.

VI. That it is not true that petitioner is under the influence of her late Manager Chennurthy Venkatachalam. He was dismissed 3 years ago, and left the Estate for good ten months ago. Petitioner is prepared to prove this if necessary.

VII. That the inevitable effect of the Court's interference will be to saddle the Estate with heavy expenses, while its net income is only Rs 5000, and probably also to sow seeds of dissension in a family hitherto living in peace and harmony.

VIII. That prior to adoption, it was distinctly agreed upon that Petitioner should not be divested of her management of the Estate. (Vide Proc. of the Court of Wars, dated 30th June 1876 no 5467 and the Government order thereon.)

IX. That the Court of Wars have no power to take forcible possession of the Estate, when petitioner does not voluntarily surrender the same. Petitioner begs to state however that it is far from her wish to appeal to or solely rely on her legal rights, so long as a fair treatment is accorded to her by the local authorities.

All the advantages which the Estate & the Minor (who is petitioner's sister's son & whom she has brought up from the date of his birth, his ^{mother} having died on the 5th day of delivery) would derive under the Court's management, have already been only thought of by the Petitioner and amply provided for. For the Minor was sent to the Rajahmundry College some months ago, having been previously

102
trained in a private school, ^{specially} opened for his benefit at
Polavaram, and a new suitable Manager has since been
proposed to look after the affairs of the Estate. If Petitioner's
request about the personate of this Manager be kindly
complied with, all that could be desired by The Honorable
Government to be done under the Court's Management, ~~and~~
would have been completely achieved. It will of course be
Petitioner's constant study to ascertain the views of The Collector
and his Special Assistant Agent and carry them out
to the best of her powers. If even with these precautions
measures, Petitioner does not succeed in giving satisfaction
to the local authorities within the 2 years specified, there is
nothing to prevent the Honorable Government then to
take such steps as may be deemed necessary for the future
improvement of the Estate.

In these circumstances, Petitioner
humbly hopes that the Honorable Members of Government
will be pleased to see the reasonableness of her prayer
to grant her request, viz, to lend her the services of
the aforesaid Sriramarangam & to try her Manage-
ment of the Estate for the ensuing two years. This
measure would save the Petitioner from unnecessary
humiliation and disgrace, which the benevolent Government
could hardly have contemplated to inflict on her. For
this act of Justice, Petitioner will ever pray.

Your Most Obedient Humble
Servant.

C. Sridamaya
per Grace Pleader
Vakil
for Petitioner.

19
Dated 29th November
1884.
Triplicane, Madras.

Ind. Ep. 2-12-84: 3158/1

Judicial 4763

From Sri Rajah Kocharlast
Namayannafaru
Proprietor
Ploveram Estate

No.

Dated 29/10/84
Received 12 Dec 84
Enclosures Two.

SUBJECT.

Reconsideration order
directing her estate being
taken over by Ch. of Wards.

Reference to order of 12-12-83
3171

For

Opinion

With reference to the Order of Government, in the
Judicial Department, dated the 4th December 1884,
N^o 3171, His, I think the Government may direct the
Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving
upon a minor by adoption as well, as by survivorship
or inheritance. I assume that in this case there was
a valid adoption.

The Agent of the Court of Wards cannot forcibly
dispossess a person in possession. He can only enter
due course of law, that is, in execution of a decree passed
in a suit to eject the person wrongfully in possession.

In this case, the circumstances relating to the adop-
tion are not fully stated, but it is stated that the widow, in re-
solving the adoption, notified that she would continue
manage the estate. If the widow, before or at the time
of the adoption, made an agreement with the guardian
of the boy to be adopted, that the estate of the widow should
notwithstanding the adoption, continue for her life, or until
the adopted son attained his majority, such agreement
though in restriction of the ordinary rights of an ad-
opted son, may be valid. This is a question upon which the
law has not yet, I believe, been declared with suf-
ficient clearness.

The effect of the agreement may be, that it
has not as yet devolved upon the adopted son
inheritance or otherwise, and in that case
Wards would not have jurisdiction.

The Bombay High Court has
agreed that the agreement is good, but the point
that it is at all events not wholly

ratification by the adopted par after majority

Signed: D. O'Sullivan
Attorney General

10th December 1884

[A True Copy]
Trust Hartley

Government Solicitor

a suitable manager
under his collection
approval. Is this not
a satisfactory conclusion
of the whole matter?
The estate is in almost
as much impoverished
by his acts of law suit
as by his peculations
his agent F.W.

Quite so - a lawsuit
should in every account
be avoided.

Let the draft be cir-
culated & with it the
order to the Adm-
istrator General now ref-
& the note alluded to
by the Under Secy
Cary

12/12
14/12
Must see Venkata
being got rid of
M

No. 3071 of 4-12-84 M.
 318 of 2-12-84 M.
 2935 of 14-11-84 M.
 2490 of 1-10-84 M.

Judicial (1884) Department
 4830

From
 Ernest Barclay
 Government Collector
 Madras
 To
 The Chief Secretary to Government
 Fort George

orders
 Acting on the orders of the Hon. Member
 this letter upon the former paper, in
 substance to Com. Shaird now be
 told to try & make some
 satisfactory arrangements for the
 management of the Estate by a
 permanent servant & to report
 on the matter. It was offered
 to file a suit before
 can be taken under
 suit, besides the point
 which he raised -
 21/12
 Collector must be
 satisfied with
 his letter

No 625.
 Dated 8th December 1884
 Received
 C No 4481 Peta
 General, 10 Dec 84:-
 Enclosures 2.
 Forwarded with Enclosures with refer-
 ence to the Order of Government dated
 4 December 1884 No 371. Judicial
 Department.

Ernest Barclay
 Government Collector

Most Respected Sir,
 I beg to send herewith
 the accompanying cover regarding
 the Polavaram Estate. I regret I was
 not able to submit it earlier, as I
 had to communicate with my client
 about one or two points of detail.
 The telegraph line on the East Coast
 having been recently broken, there
 was some delay in the transmission of
 messages. I trust that your honor
 will excuse the delay & save the poor
 lady from her present perplexing
 position. I may add that in accordance
 with the Court's proceedings now under
 disposal before Government, the
 Collector has stayed action pending
 final orders.

Hearing 1/1

but your honor to
inconvenience by a personal visit,
I have
ventured to send this by a
messenger.

I beg to remain
Your most obedient humble
servant.

C. Sitaramayya
Triplicane.

29th November 1884 }
Muziris.

Class.				INDIAN TELEGRAPH.				Local No. 81	
To (Station)				From (Station)					
Triplicane - Madras				Madras - Triplicane					
Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	OFFICIAL INSTRUCTIONS.					
34	1	11	30	Urgent					
To (Person)				From (Person)					
The Collector of Madras District				The Collector of Madras District					
S. P. No. 4000 - G. I. Press - No. 209 - 93-6-31 - 2460000.									
1. Hypothetical holding payments									
2. owing to Special									
3. assistants reports to									
4. procure more efficient									
5. management of									
6. willing to entertain									
7. competent government servant									
8. as manager on									
9. Sixty rupees with									
10. per diem contributions please									
11. and for two									
12. years services of									
13. Chaturwada Srinivasan Iyer									
14. RECD. FROM L. N.									
15. AT Hrs. Mts. By SENT TO L. N.									
Date AT Hrs. Mts. By									

TRIPLICANE
MADRAS
21 OCT. 84
Telegraph Master.

18

18

[illegible]

Just 4768-84
2

* cont from overleaf Judicial C. No 4481/84

If the widow will
make *placitum bellum*
pointless for her she
might be allowed to
continue in the ma-
nagement of the estate
with a good just officer
to assist her.

HV

* Pro 16 August
1884 No 2853

The difficulty
which the Court of Wards
now raise was never
alluded to before
nor did the Court con-
template the contin-
gency of the ex-propi-
etrix declining to
surrender possession
then in 1876 they per-
mitted her to contin-
ue to manage the
estate until her
son comes of age.
When representing
several legal points
in connection with
the proposal & as-
sume the manage-
ment it never
occurred to the
Court to allude to
this - very important

aspect of the case
for they distinctly
say 'Government
can authorize
the exercise of
the powers of the
Court only if
the estate has
devolved by inheri-
tance on the adopted
son.

We should I think
have the Law Offi-
cers' opinion on the
general question
& on the procedure
to be adopted when
under clause 2 section
2 Reg I of 1831 the
Court of Wards
assume charge

yes 10/11

* d/19 Nov 1854

of an estate, ^{as} any
time during the
minority of the
proprietor.

It is certainly
desirable to avoid
litigation. It is
also desirable to
avoid cancelling
orders already
issued after due
consideration.
If any other course
is open.

The ex-proprietor
is willing, it would
seem (vide enclosed
petition from her
vakil) to appoint
some competent
Govt official as
her manager and

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

Read—the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godavari district, dated 1st November 1884:—

I heard Board ordered Collector to take my estate under management. I intend to apply Government to reconsider their order. Therefore I respectfully beg to telegraph Collector not to take estate from my possession *forcibly* until disposal of my review petition by Government. Reply prepaid two rupees.

Resolution—dated 6th November 1884, Mis. No. 10411.

Submitted to Government with reference to G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884, Judicial.

2. It is unnecessary to issue orders, as requested in this petition, that the Collector should not forcibly take the estate from petitioner, for, of course, he has no power to take any such action. Petitioner is admittedly in possession. When she adopted a son in 1876 she gave notice that she intended to continue the management. This being so, all that the Collector can do is to nominate a guardian for the minor and let the guardian file a suit against the petitioner to obtain possession of the minor's property. A similar course is being followed in a case in South Canara by the Collector, with the approval of Government, and, as Regulation V of 1804 contains no procedure enabling a manager to acquire possession, it appears to be the only course. As this estate is within the Scheduled districts it is presumed that such a suit would be filed before the Agent, and, as he is an interested party, the suit will probably be transferred by the High Court. The Collector, doubtless, has the list of villages of the estate which was under the Court in 1857 and so will be able to prove, when the suit comes on for trial, what portions of the present estate are ancestral. Any portions of the present estate which have been acquired by the widow do not, of course, pass under the Court of Wards.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.
Collector of Godavari.

Mis. No. 4936.

Transferred to the Judicial department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
8th November 1884.(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.

2
This might be the
best disposal of
it is found on 28
to the Advocate
General that
possessor can
not be taken a personal interview
without litigation.
W. Foster should insist on
a personal interview
with the lady & further
insist on her publishing
a proclamation depriving
power and Mr. Foster

En. J. S. 3351 8, 28. 12. 84
hp in 1879 and
frightened him a bit
but he has evidently
got over this & is at his
old tricks again. I think

There would be no
trouble at all if Chennu
Venkatachallam could
be dropped into the fodder
with a heavy stone attached
to him. The ~~proposition~~
is capable enough & is
personally very popular
with her tenants but
her agent is simply de-
tested. I think him
might scare it may
be necessary in the future
of the public peace to
deport him. I never
by decided action
is not taken in regard
to them men as many
have a small future
in those parts
H. E. S. O.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Read—the following telegram from the Proprietrix of Reddi Polaveram, Godáviri district, dated 19th November 1884:—

Special Assistant, Collector, Magistrate went yesterday to Polaveram to seize my estate. I beg Board to telegraph Collector not to take estate forcibly till Government pass final orders to my telegram submitted by Board to Government.

Resolution—dated 20th November 1884, Mis. No. 10900.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 10411, dated 6th November 1884.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) G. MACKENZIE,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department,
with 2 rupees telegraph stamps.
Copy to petitioner through the Collector of Godáviri.

Mis. No. 5211.

Transferred to the Judicial department in continuation of the previous papers.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
22nd November 1884.

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secy. to Govt., Rev. Dept.

Order—dated 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, Judicial.

The papers will be laid before the Advocate-General who is requested to state his opinion whether the Government can direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor in the manner in which this estate has devolved, i.e., not by direct inheritance, but by virtue of an adoption by a widow proprietrix many years after the death of the proprietor; the Advocate-General will also advise on the procedure to be adopted when under clause 2, section 2, Regulation X of 1831, the Court of Wards assume charge of an estate at any time during the minority of the proprietor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Government Solicitor, with Current No. 4663,
and copy of G.O., No. 2490, dated 1st October 1884.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Government Solicitor, Madras, dated 8th December 1884, No. 625.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Hon. P. O'Sullivan, Advocate-General, dated 8th December 1884:—

OPINION.

With reference to the order of Government, in the Judicial department, dated the 4th December 1884, Mis. No. 3171, I think the Government may direct the Court of Wards to take charge of an estate devolving upon a minor by adoption as well as by survivorship or inheritance. I assume that in this case there was a valid adoption.

2. The Agent of the Court of Wards cannot forcibly dispossess a person in possession. He can only enter by due course of law, that is, in execution of a decree passed in a suit to eject the person wrongfully in possession.

3. In this case the circumstances relating to the adoption are not fully stated, but it is stated that the widow, in reporting the adoption, notified that she would continue to manage the estate. If the widow, before or at the time of the adoption, made an agreement with the guardian of the boy to be adopted that the estate of the widow should, notwithstanding the adoption, continue for her life or until the adopted son attained his majority, such agreement, though in restriction of the ordinary rights of an adopted son, may be valid. This is a question upon which the law has not yet, I believe, been declared with sufficient clearness.

4. The effect of the agreement may be that the estate has not as yet devolved upon the adopted son by inheritance or otherwise, and in that case the Court of Wards would not have jurisdiction to interfere.

5. The Bombay High Court has ruled that such an agreement is good, but the Privy Council has said that it is at all events not wholly void and was capable of ratification by the adopted son after majority.

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
Fort St. George, Madras.

The humble petition of SRI RAJAH
KOCHARLACOTA KAMAYAMMA
GARU, Proprietrix of the Polaveram
estate, Godáviri district.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,—With a view to enable herself to carry out such improvements in her estate as might be considered desirable by the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent, petitioner applied to the Board of Revenue by telegram,*

* Copy enclosed.
dated 21st October 1884, that the services of Cherukurada Sridanna Row Garu, an able and first-class revenue inspector of the modern school now serving in the Rajah-mundry taluk, may be lent to her for two years, on a salary of Rs. 60 per mensem, with necessary pensionary contributions. With his assistance, petitioner hoped to be able to give complete satisfaction to the local as well as higher authorities. He is well known to the former. But petitioner greatly regrets to learn that this important proposal was not before the Honorable Government when they passed their orders directing her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management, and that the Board had withheld it because the orders of Government about this estate did not admit of their transmitting it for favorable consideration—a fact which, if necessary, can be verified by a reference to the Board of Revenue.

In this and the other circumstances briefly set forth below, petitioner respectfully solicits a reconsideration of the orders directing her estate to be taken over by the Court of Wards—

- I. That the petitioner has managed the estate for upwards of twenty-seven years, with credit to herself and satisfaction to her tenants and the local officers.
- II. That she has always taken a keen and deep interest in the welfare of her ryots, a fact easily borne out by the records of the Revenue and Civil Courts in the district, wherein there was not a single suit between herself and her ryots.
- III. That her present troubles are of a recent date, solely due to certain private quarrels between her late manager Chamurti Venkatachellam and the village munsif of Polaveram, who has misinformed the Special Assistant Mr. Atkinson about the affairs of the estate.
- IV. That the late Acting Collector Mr. Happell, who knows the district and its people more than any other officer, expressed himself very unwilling to disturb the petitioner's management, but that the permanent Collector Mr. Foster, who had just returned from leave, reluctantly supported his Special Assistant Agent in recommending her estate to be taken under the Court of Wards' management.

- V. That she has shown implicit obedience to the Special Assistant Agent's suggestions in the matter of remitting her tenants arrears of more than three years' standing—a course not adopted in other zemindaries—and in making certain other concessions to the ryots as he suggested. The Special Assistant himself, she trusts, will do her justice of admitting the same.
- VI. That it is not true that petitioner is under the influence of her late Manager Chamurti Venkatachellam. He was dismissed three years ago, and left the estate for good ten months ago. Petitioner is prepared to prove this if necessary.
- VII. That the inevitable effect of the Court's interference will be to saddle the estate with heavy expenses, while its net income is only Rs. 5,000, and probably also to sow seeds of dissension in a family hitherto living in peace and harmony.
- VIII. That prior to adoption, it was distinctly agreed upon that petitioner should not be divested of her management of the estate (*vide* Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 30th June 1876, No. 5467, and the Government order thereon).
- IX. That the Court of Wards have no power to take forcible possession of the estate, when petitioner does not voluntarily surrender the same. Petitioner begs to state, however, that it is far from her wish to appeal to or solely rely on her legal rights, so long as a fair treatment is accorded to her by the local authorities.

All the advantages which the estate and the minor (who is petitioner's sister's son and whom she has brought up from the date of his birth, his mother having died on the fifth day of delivery) would derive under the Court's management, have already been only thought of by the petitioner and amply provided for. For the minor was sent to the Rajahmundry college some months ago, having been previously trained in a private school specially opened for his benefit at Polaveram, and a new suitable manager has since been proposed to look after the affairs of the estate. If petitioner's request about the personate of this manager be kindly complied with, all that could be desired by the Honorable Government to be done under the Court's management, would have been completely achieved. It will of course be petitioner's constant study to ascertain the views of the Collector and his Special Assistant Agent and carry them out to the best of her powers. If even with these precautionary measures, petitioner does not succeed in giving satisfaction to the local authorities within the two years specified, there is nothing to prevent the Honorable Government then to take such steps as may be deemed necessary for the future improvement of the estate.

In these circumstances, petitioner humbly hopes that the honorable members of Government will be pleased to see the reasonableness of her prayer and to grant her request, viz., to hand her the services of the aforesaid Srirama Rau Garu and to try her management of the estate for the ensuing two years. This measure would save the petitioner from unnecessary humiliation and disgrace, which the benign Government could hardly have contemplated to inflict on her. For this act of justice, petitioner will ever pray.

MADRAS,
29th November 1884.

(Signed) C. SITARAMAYYA,
First-grade Pleader,
Vakil for Petitioner.

ORDER—dated 28th December 1884, No. 3351, Judicial.

It appears from the petition now before Government from the ex-Proprietrix of the Polaveram estate that she is willing to appoint a competent Government official as her manager. The Government are of opinion that, if the Agent can arrange matters so that Chamurti Vekatachellam shall not exercise any further influence whatever over the affairs of the estate, and can select a competent Government official as manager, the intervention of the Court of Wards would not appear to be necessary.

2. The Government Agent will report after enquiry whether an arrangement of this kind cannot be arrived at.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Government Agent, Godáviri.
„ Revenue department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of (1884) Madras.

JUDICIAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 28th December 1884, No. 3351.

DECEMBER.

Polaveram Estate, Godavari
District.

Informing the Agent that if Chamurti Venkata-
chellam be deprived of all influence on the affairs
of the — and a competent Government officer be
appointed manager, the intervention of the Court
of Wards is unnecessary, and that a report should
be submitted on these points.

110
Judicial Dept.

R^o

From Board of Rev. d. 6th Nov 84
C 4663

Sri. Rajah Kotarladu
Phaveram

d. 29th Nov 84

Advocate General
d. 8th Dec 84
No 625

Order d. 28th Dec. 1884 No 3351.

It appears from the petition
before Government from the
Ex-Proprietor of the Polaveram
Estate that she is willing

to appoint a competent Govt
Official as her manager. The

Government are of opinion
if the agent can arrange
provided precaution is taken
in other so that
by the agent, in order to free

Chamurti Venkatach
should not exercise
having any further

What is the nature of
that
and

all
20/12

Lect

the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~, the intervention of
the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~ - the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~
the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~ for immediate ~~of the estate~~
the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~ placing ~~of the estate~~
the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~ with a view to attach ~~of the estate~~
the ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} ~~of the estate~~ be necessary

Under the act of wards may sell
the estate will be absorbed -

The government Agent will
report after Enquiry whether
Satisfactory
An arrangement cannot

arrived at 7 1/2 which I shall
 leave for the good reason that

~~the affairs of his estate, without~~
estate
being the same under the

of the C^t of wards—

Mr

16/veij/04

For: Agent; Zöclawon 6/1/1905
Rue Depe - 6 2/1/1905

For copy in print

1. Letter to the Editor
 2. Letter to the Editor
 3. Letter to the Editor
 4. Letter to the Editor
 5. Letter to the Editor
 6. Letter to the Editor
 7. Letter to the Editor
 8. Letter to the Editor
 9. Letter to the Editor
 10. Letter to the Editor
 11. Letter to the Editor
 12. Letter to the Editor
 13. Letter to the Editor
 14. Letter to the Editor
 15. Letter to the Editor
 16. Letter to the Editor
 17. Letter to the Editor
 18. Letter to the Editor
 19. Letter to the Editor
 20. Letter to the Editor
 21. Letter to the Editor
 22. Letter to the Editor
 23. Letter to the Editor
 24. Letter to the Editor
 25. Letter to the Editor
 26. Letter to the Editor
 27. Letter to the Editor
 28. Letter to the Editor
 29. Letter to the Editor
 30. Letter to the Editor
 31. Letter to the Editor
 32. Letter to the Editor
 33. Letter to the Editor
 34. Letter to the Editor
 35. Letter to the Editor
 36. Letter to the Editor
 37. Letter to the Editor
 38. Letter to the Editor
 39. Letter to the Editor
 40. Letter to the Editor
 41. Letter to the Editor
 42. Letter to the Editor
 43. Letter to the Editor
 44. Letter to the Editor
 45. Letter to the Editor
 46. Letter to the Editor
 47. Letter to the Editor
 48. Letter to the Editor
 49. Letter to the Editor
 50. Letter to the Editor
 51. Letter to the Editor
 52. Letter to the Editor
 53. Letter to the Editor
 54. Letter to the Editor
 55. Letter to the Editor
 56. Letter to the Editor
 57. Letter to the Editor
 58. Letter to the Editor
 59. Letter to the Editor
 60. Letter to the Editor
 61. Letter to the Editor
 62. Letter to the Editor
 63. Letter to the Editor
 64. Letter to the Editor
 65. Letter to the Editor
 66. Letter to the Editor
 67. Letter to the Editor
 68. Letter to the Editor
 69. Letter to the Editor
 70. Letter to the Editor
 71. Letter to the Editor
 72. Letter to the Editor
 73. Letter to the Editor
 74. Letter to the Editor
 75. Letter to the Editor
 76. Letter to the Editor
 77. Letter to the Editor
 78. Letter to the Editor
 79. Letter to the Editor
 80. Letter to the Editor
 81. Letter to the Editor
 82. Letter to the Editor
 83. Letter to the Editor
 84. Letter to the Editor
 85. Letter to the Editor
 86. Letter to the Editor
 87. Letter to the Editor
 88. Letter to the Editor
 89. Letter to the Editor
 90. Letter to the Editor
 91. Letter to the Editor
 92. Letter to the Editor
 93. Letter to the Editor
 94. Letter to the Editor
 95. Letter to the Editor
 96. Letter to the Editor
 97. Letter to the Editor
 98. Letter to the Editor
 99. Letter to the Editor
 100. Letter to the Editor

80. no. 3351 just.
28/12/84

Plavina

2. 10. 1985