

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	237	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	20-3-	1918

Not to be folded or roughly handled

N^o 122

Panama

Commissioner's Office,

3rd March 1857

From

A. D. Phillips Esquire

Commissioner of Panama,

To

J. Pycroft Esquire,

Chief Secretary to Government,

Fort St. George

Sir

N^o 160

1. I have had the honor to receive an Extra

from the Minutes of Consultation dated the 23rd 11th

and, communicating the instructions conveyed to the

Government Pleader, relative to the preparation by

him, of an answer in the suit instituted by Rama-

-krishna Eyer against the late Acting Collector of

this District, Mr. Cherry.

2

In regard to these instructions, I beg
with deference to observe, that there would seem

to have been some misconception by the Govern-

ment of the real facts of the case; and in that

relation

believe, I take the liberty to add to the particulars
submitted in my letter to you of the 5th ultimo.

N^o 108

3 The Surva Manniam village in which
lies the small spot of ground where the subject
matter of this action has arisen, is not a Manni-
am brought under temporary attachment by
the order of the late Acting Collector, by reason of
its forming part of the Enams, or Survamanni-
ams held by the late Rajah. It is altogether
distinct from those lands.

4 It was temporarily resumed ~~solely~~
because it belonged to one Vaitobanawamy,
the recently deceased proprietor of extensive tracts
of rent free, and otherwise favorably assessed
lands. His present representatives, or those who
now hold under him, or through him, were called
for the production of such Sumudis, or other
title deeds, as would support their occupation
of their Enams, and, as has been stated to the
Government, they for some time failed to con-
form to the Commissioner Mr. Forbes' requisition

to

to the above effect. issued through the late Acting
Collector on the 30th October last.

5 But, the attachment issued by the
late Collector consequent on the requisition from
the late Commissioner above mentioned, in res-
pect of the lands of Vaitobanawamy, is, I sub-
mit, in no wise affected by the injunction of
the Supreme Court prohibiting any further in-
termeddling or interference with the real and
personal property of the late Rajah of Tanjore;
and, treating it in that light, I have continued
the attachment, and proceeded with the enqui-
ries arising out of it, so far as lay in my power.

6 These enquiries were necessarily im-
peded by the disinclination of parties con-
cerned, to submit their title deeds to official
inspection; but in the particular instance of
the village where Panakistia Iyer's action
arises, I was enabled a few days ago, to
remove the temporary attachment and relin-
quish my hold on the lands, being satisfied

from

from the documents latterly laid before me, that, as had previously appeared, the Mannim was originally alienated by Rajah Soorajee in 1770, to Saitobharamany, who, in 1784, divided it into seven shares, of which, reserving one for his own enjoyment, he bestowed six on the Bramins of the village. It is in one of the latter portions that the land lies on which Ramakistna Iyer's claim is founded.

7 Independently of the long and uninterrupted enjoyment of the village as Sannamiam, by parties holding from Saitobharamany, the tenure of it appeared to me to be incontestable on the simple ground that, by Section II, Act XXXI of 1802, grants of date prior to 1792 in Tanjore, are declared to be valid.

8 In thus treating the claim for relief of the main body of the proprietors of the village, who were in attendance, at my Cutcherry, I exempted from the operation of my order, the small
of the

There is nothing
new in this - I told

Dr. Dace when he

came to his office

10 days ago. But the

fact had been

in the paper since

the 1st of June

and he received the

mail on the 1st

of June. He presents

the fact that

not made for a

little

Helena Rose

Great undecision

as the land was

not held by the R.

by but by some

party holding and

a summer of

by the Rajah

for

spot of ground to which Ramakistna Iyer's
suit has reference. My reason for so doing
was simply that it was for matter of action.
A different course might have been claimed
by the Plaintiff as a concession, and might
have proved embarrassing, if the Government
have determined to use Ramakistna Iyer's
action as the means of judicially establish-
ing the correctness of the arguments alluded
to in paragraph 2 of the Minutes of Con-
sultation under reply. I have, however, reason
to suppose that Ramakistna Iyer will
withdraw the suit when he hears that his
coproprietors have been treated as now
reported, but my belief does not rest on
any official information.

~~I have the honor to be~~

Tanjore
3 March 1857

Sir

Your most obedient servant

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government

T. D. Alcock
Commissioner

Compd
Ramesh Chandra Roy
Fort St. George

21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

1830

32-33

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

1830

The Commission
Lancaster

To the Secretary
of the Commission

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830

Order to the effect of the 11th of 1830
of 1830 21/3/1830