M.R.O. 1—30/XII—16-10-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 9-40 Press Mis.

Dated 11— 1— 1887

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Replies to notes by the Advocate General
in the Margin of the draft Answer to the
bill filed by Ramatchee Chuyee Versus
East India Company.

Para 1
Note -

In general, Tanjore includ
the Fort and the Villages immedi
:ately surrounding, and the whole
Considered to form one Town - pro
:perly speaking the Fort alone i
Tanjore, and the Suburbs are con
:tained in seperate Villages - a
all Revenue Accounts the Village
are entered in their proper names
the Fort is itself very thickly popu
:lated -

Para 3

The late Rajah Serwajee
died on the 29th of October, not on
November, 1855 -

Para 5.
Note.

To describe the Villages
given

iven in endowment of Pagodas and
Chattrums it seems necessary only
to specify that they have been so
given -

Query - Some of the Villages were
given, as said above, to support
Chattrums, which are Charitable
institutions, affording food to all
comers - no lands were granted
for State purposes.

Query 2. It can not be said
that the Rajah derived benefit from
the surplus rents of the Pagodas
& Chattrum Lands, as a Regular
source of income - when endow-
ments of religious or Charitable
institutions have been at any time
made, it was no doubt the intention

of the person making the grant that
the whole proceeds should be spent
on the institution endowed - Never
theless the late Rajah Serfojee
at different times took money belong
ing to the Pagodas & Chattrums to
the amount of upwards of 530,000
rupees, which he means repaid.

Para 7. This note requires proof
Note. that certain State jewels, arms &
other Chattels, were heirlooms, or otherwise
appertaining to the Royal equipage
of the Rajah.

It will be extremely diffi-
cult, if not impossible, to prove
that any identical jewel was an
heirloom - because there are no
details lists of the jewels pre-
sent in 1799 - it can be said
generally

generally that they belonged to the Rajas Equipage.—

The complaint attributed in the note to Seevajee could not have been made by him, as Ameer Singh dies thirty years befor Seevajee came to the Musnud.— It is said to be very true that Ameer Singh, when he left Jeypore, took with him the greater part of the Crown jewels, and that he returned very few when called upon.— The story is not got up for the occasion, for I have often heard it in the Rajahs' life time, and on one occasion, with permission of the family of Pertaup Singh, the son of Ameer Singh, I made search for these jewels in a room in

in the Palace at Madiarjeenun which was by tradition said to contain these treasures, and not to have been opened for half a century.— Some jewels were found, but none that at all bore out the story that has always been told regarding Ameer Singh.—

Para 13. All the property which
Note. I assumed I considered to fall within the description of the State property of the Rajah.— but still, a great part of it can not be retained if the orders of the Government of India be acted on literally.— All the Cloths probably were purchased since 1799.— and I do not at present believe that proof can be adduced

that

that any of the jewels were possessed by the Rajah prior to that date.

The gold and silver Howdahs, Coaches and Ambaries were also made since the Treaty - but these I consider will be properly classed in Schedule **D2**, as pal-pably of a public nature.

The only other items on which doubt may be felt under the present orders are thirteen brace of pistols, and fifty rifles and guns, of which I took possession. they were not in the Arsenal, and I shall request instructions whether I am to include them with the State arms, or to release them as private property.

Schedule

Para 17. Schedule **C** seems to have been erroneously included in this paragraph with Schedules **D** and **D1**. —

Para 25. The real names of the deceased Bhoyee Sahibs were

1. Soyerumba bhoyee and
2. Tootumba bhoyee

— the names of the Bhoyee Sahibs now living are

Soyemba bhoyee 1
Comumba bhoyee 2
Iyentumba bhoyee 3
Jessayeeumba bhoyee 4
Deepumba bhoyee 5
Ranna Tumarumba bhoyee - 6
Sirgoorumba bhoyee ..... 7.
Ashtaroopaeumba bhoyee 8
Yeshwarumba bhoyee ..... 9.

Anarumba bhoyee ..... 10.
Govrumba bhoyee ..... 11.
Aroomumba bhoyee ..... 12.
Sootroomarumba bhoyee .. 13.
Geesumba bhoyee ..... 14.
Chemumba bhoyee ..... 15.

Para 26. and the names of the late Rajahs elder daughter was Soobagiawathy Cherunjeeva Raja: sabhoyee Ammany Rajah Sahib, and that of the younger daughter is Cherunjeeva Vijia Mohana Mootta bhoyee Ammany Rajah Sahib -

Para 27. The name of the husband of the Rajahs' elder daughter is Luchmeram Sahib --

Para 38. I have already informed the Government that I have assumed no property whatever, excepting

3/.

5

excepting lands, jewels, gold and Silver Equipages & trappings, arms and Cloths -

There is no doubt very much other property, including the large Palaces in the great & little Fort at Tanjore, all the elephants & Camels, horses, ponies, carts, cattle of all Kinds, carriages, & Conveyances, wild beasts, English and Vernacular libraries, brass and Copper utensils, & pictures and furniture of all description - with none of these, as the Government is already aware, have I in any way interfered - The Honorable Company's Solicitor will instruct me if I am to make out lists of this property in

in a separate Schedule, and in what detail it is to be given - whether for instance, the animals may be grouped as so many Elephants and so many Cows, and whether the books may be referred to as so many volumes, - the detail of the pictures & furniture I can not procure, as, besides that all are in the interior of the Palace, where the ladies reside, the Court injunction prevents my having access.

The draft answer takes no note of Specie - to which particular reference has been made in my reports to Government, and I shall need instructions as to what amount, if any, I am to include in any of the Schedules.

As regards the Libraries, it must be noted that the Vernacular books were also collected prior to 1799. and the English books subsequent to that date. - The Honorable Company's Solicitor will inform me if I may include the former in Schedule C, notwithstanding that I have not hitherto assumed possession. -

Para 45. I shall be instructed if it be intended that Schedule E. shall be filled up by me, as I do not gather from this paragraph what it is to contain. -

H Elwes

Commissioner

England 20 Lot No 4
1865 Cases 1 & 5.

List of the pistols and guns belonging to His Highness the late Rajah of Tanjore.

No.	Pistols.
1.	A pair of double barrelled duelling pistols, Stocks and barrels beautifully inlaid with gold, flint locks - in Mahogany Case, with apparatus complete, including Spare locks, and gilt powder flask. By Joseph Manton.
2.	A pair of double barrelled duelling pistols, inlaid with gold, percussion locks, in Mahogany Case, with apparatus complete, including Spare locks, and silver powder flask. By Charles Lancaster.
3.	A pair of single barrelled duelling pistols, Stocks and barrels beautifully inlaid with gold, flint locks, in Mahogany Case with Apparatus complete. R. & B. Sutherland London.
4.	A pair of single rifle barrelled pocket pistols, Silver mounted, in Rosewood Case lined with Velvet, with apparatus complete. R. S. Clarke London.

Pol 1857 Dep.
Lot 314

5. A pair of double barrelled holster pistols, with swivel ramrods & flint locks - in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

Thomas Mortimer

London.

6. A pair of double barrelled holster pistols, with swivel ramrods & flint locks, in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

Thomas Manton.

7. A pair of single barrelled holster pistols, with percussion locks, in Mahogany case, with apparatus complete.

Thomas Manton.

8. A pair of double barrelled Holster pistols, with flint locks, in Mahogany case, with apparatus complete.

Thomas Mortimer.

9. Two pairs of holster pistols, with swivel ramrods & flint locks, in case with apparatus.

E. Bond

London.

10 Two pairs of dueling pistols, with flint locks, in case, broken, with apparatus.

Wogdon & Barton.

London.

11. A pair of large brass barrelled pocket pistols, with spring bayonets, and flint locks - in Mahogany case with cleaning rod.

Huntley

12 A pair of single barrelled dueling pistols, with gilt barrels, and flint locks, in Mahogany case.

Tatham & Egg.

13. A pair of brass barrelled pistols, broken.

No name.

Guns.

14 A double barrelled rifle, stock & barrel beautifully inlaid with gold, flint locks, in Mahogany case with share locks, gilt powder flask and apparatus complete

Joseph Manton.

15. Sister piece to the above.

Joseph Manton.

16. Sister piece to the above, the gold ornamental work being more elaborate, and the powder flask very richly chased.

Joseph Manton.

17. A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, barrels gilt, with diamond sights, and set with rubies. in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

Thomas Mortimer.

18. A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, stock inlaid with silver, barrel with gold, in Walnut case with apparatus complete.

Bonnet.

Versailles.

19. A single barrelled blunderbuss, barrel cased in silver, stock inlaid with silver military trophies, lock inlaid with gold, in Mahogany Case, with apparatus complete.

A. W. Mortimer.

20. A single barrelled rifle, stock inlaid with silver military & sporting trophies, barrel inlaid with gold. Mahogany Case, with apparatus complete.

Charles Lancaster.

21. A single barrelled gun, with percussion lock. bore three quarter of an inch diameter. in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

John Manton.

22. A double barrelled rifle, with flint locks, in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

W. Parker

London.

23. A four barrelled gun, two barrels rifled, in Mahogany Case with powder flask and bullet mould.

Brookes.

24. D°.....D°.....D°, in Mahogany Case with powder flask, bullet mould, punch and shot bells.

William Wood & Sons

St James's Street

London.

25. Sister piece to the above.

26. A double barrelled gun with beautiful stock. in Walnut Case with apparatus complete.

Le Faucheux

Paris.

27. A double barrelled gun with flint locks, in Mahogany case with powder flask &c.

Mortimer.

28. A double barrelled gun with percussion lock in Mahogany case, with apparatus complete.

William Wood & Son
St James Street
London

29. A double barrelled gun with percussion locks, in oak case, with vice & turnscrew.

Charles Lancaster.

30. A double barrelled gun with percussion lock in Mahogany case, with powder flask, turnscrew, nipple screw & punch

J. Reid
London.

31. A double barrelled gun with percussion locks for tubes, in Mahogany case, with apparatus.

Joseph Manton.

31½ Case with spare stocks & flint locks for the above.

32. A double barrelled gun with percussion locks, in Mahogany case with apparatus complete except cleaning rod.

William Wood & Co
St James Street
London

33. A double barrelled rifle with percussion locks, in Mahogany case with apparatus complete.

Kerney
Plymouth.

34. A double barrelled gun with percussion locks, in Mahogany case, with apparatus complete.

Rabone Brothers.

35. A double barrelled carbine with spring bayonet, in Mahogany case, with apparatus complete.

H. W. Mortimer.

36. A double barrelled gun with percussion locks, in case with powder flask, bullet mould, punch & turnscrew.

Swallow.
London.

37. A single barrelled gun with percussion lock in case with Apparatus Complete.

Pegler

Southton.

38. A single barrelled rifle, with percussion lock, with revolving breech, so that seven shots may be fired without reloading, in case with Apparatus Complete, excepting cleaning rod.

Wilkinson & Son

Pall Mall.

39. A double barrelled gun, with percussion lock in Mahogany Case with Apparatus.

John Manton.

40. A single barrelled gun, with flint lock, in case with powder flask & cleaning rod.

Joseph Manton.

41. A double barrelled rifle, with flint locks, in Mahogany Case, with Apparatus complete excepting patch punch.

Joseph Manton.

42. A double barrelled gun with flint locks, in Mahogany Case, with powder flask.

Manton.

London.

43. A heavy double barrelled gun, with large bore, in Mahogany Case, with Apparatus, wanting bullet mould and cleaning rod.

W. Horton

Shrewsbury.

44. A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, in Mahogany Case, with Apparatus complete.

Joseph Manton.

45. Sister piece to the above.

Joseph Manton.

46. A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in Mahogany Case, with spare locks and Apparatus Complete.

Charles Lancaster.

47. A double barrelled gun, one barrel rifled, with flint locks, in Mahogany Case, with Apparatus Complete.

Thomas Mortimer.

48 A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in Case with powder flask, bullet mould and vice.

Nock.

49 A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, one lock lost - in Case with apparatus.

W. Smith.
Leicester Square
London.

50 A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in case with apparatus.

No name.

51 A double barrelled gun, with flint lock, in Case.

Harcourt.

52 A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in Case with powder flask, punch and vice.

Nock.

53 A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in case with powder flask.

Fleron & Co.
Paris.

54 A single barrelled rifle, loading at the breech, with percussion locks, in oak case, with Apparatus.

Needham & Co
Piccadilly
London.

55 A double barrelled duck gun, with flint locks, in Case with Apparatus.

Locks marked Wilson
Barrels - Damon - Order.

56 A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, Country made Stock, in Case with powder flask.

A. Nock.

57 A single barrelled gun, with flint lock, in case with powder flask.

Richards.

58. A single barrelled gun, with flint lock, in case with powder flask.

A. Wilson

London.

59. A double barrelled rifle, with flint locks in Case with powder flask.

T. Mortimer

Sur gate Hill.

60 A double barrelled gun, with flint locks, in Ca with apparatus.

Joseph Monton.

61. A double barrelled gun, with percussion locks, in case with powder flask.

No name.

62. Light gun, with percussion lock.

Lacy

London.

63 Do. .....

Days patent.

Jersey
Commissioners office.
6th January 1857.

Le Hardy
Commissioner

Ld England 20 Feb 58
4 of 1857 Paras 1 @ 15.

No 2 17

Ld 1857 Dep't.
Ln 42-34

N.97.

Tanjore
Commissioners Office
6th January 1857.

From

H. Forbes Esq
Commissioner of Tanjore

To

T. Pycroft Esq
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St George.

Sir,

Para 1 I have the honor to submit replies to remarks on the notes and queries in the margin of the draft answer prepared by the Advocate General in Bengal to the bill filed against the East India Company by Ramatchee Chuyee, and I request that the Honorable Company's Solicitor, to whom a Copy of this letter and its enclosure will be sent,

may

may be requested to instruct me on the points on which I have expressed a doubt.

2. I enclose for the information of Government a list of the guns and pistols referred to in my remark on paragraph 13 of the draft answer, and I beg that I may be informed if these articles can be appropriately entered with the arms & Armour, or whether they should be given up. They were all procured by either Subajee or Seevajee, and therefore are all possessions bearing date subsequent to 1799. On the other hand they are, to a certain extent, munitions of war, and has occasion called the Rajah to the field, no doubt he would have been armed with

gun

gun & pistols, equally as with sword and dagger. The arms are of no use to the Bhajee Sahibs, and some of the pieces are so beautiful that it is a pity to let them go to decay.

3. I have made every enquiry with a view to discover if a distinction can be plainly drawn between the jewels possessed by the Rajahs prior to 1799, and those subsequently obtained, and I regret to say that my impression as expressed in my letter of the 3. instant, is confirmed. No complete list of the jewels then present can be found. Some loose papers have been produced, but they are of no practical use

because

because they specify the jewels by name only, as "one necklace" or "one ring", and, giving no account of their value, it may with equal probability of truth be assumed at ten, or ten thousand rupees.-

4. There was no list of the late Rajah's jewels during His Highness' life time, and the one which has been prepared since his death was made by my order, when the Chief jewellers of Tanjore were assembled and each jewel was valued.

5. Under these circumstances a literal fulfilment of the orders of the Government of India will lead to a sacrifice of the

the whole of the Rajah's jewels, and the Government will determine whether that course shall be followed, or whether some other plan should be devised which shall not include a renunciation of all property not proved to have been possessed by the Rajah prior to 1799.

6. According to the list which was prepared last year, the jewels usually worn by men were valued at Rs. 399237, those worn by women at Rs. 194998, gold idols, silver plate, and gold & silver utensils of various descriptions, at Rs. 304491. besides loose stones & gold to the value of about 20,000 rupees, and the gold

gold howdahs, ambarier & Coach,
and gold & silver State trappings
for Elephants & horses, valued at
a further sum of Rs. 156675.—

7. Whether, in consideration of
the absence of any
lists of property by which may be
ascertained the value of that in
possession of the Rajah prior
to 1799, it may be possible to
substitute for the rule laid
down by the Government of India,
one under which all the mens jew:
:els shall remain with Govern:
:ment, and the womens jewels
be given up, the remaining pro:
:perty, excepting the State Convey:
:ances & trappings, which will
I apprehend come under Schedule D2,
being

being decided; it will be for the Government to determine, but whatever course may be determined upon should be laid down definitively, as there is no doubt that every opportunity of evil will be taken full advantage of by the Plaintiffs Agent here.—

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

Tanjore.
6th January 1857.

H Forbes
Commissioner

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

Ld Ingland 20 Feb
No 4 of 1837 Paras 1 & 5

Encl 04 to Cons 13th Jany
Political 1857 Dept

From the Commissioner
of Tanjore.
Recd

Dated 6th Jany 1857.
Recd

Read
2 Feb 57.
No 34

41

Submits replies to certain queries in the Notes and queries in the margin of the Draft Decision prepared by the Advocate General in Bengal to the Bill filed against the East India Company by Nawab Ameer Singa Saheb, with a list of the Pistols and guns belonging to H.H. the late Rajah of Tanjore.

No 4.

Tanjore
Commissioner's Office
3d January 1857.

From H. Forbes Esq
Commissioner of Tanjore

To J. Pycroft Esq
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St George

Sir,

Para 1 I have the honor to enclose a Memorandum in reply to such parts of the affidavit of the Plaintiff in the Suit of Ramatchee Charee versus the East India Company as it has appeared to me required notice.

2. I request that the attention of the Government may be directed to that part of the Memorandum which

which treats of the Plaintiff's assertion that her husband was a member of a divided Hindoo family. It appears to me to be a point of considerable importance, both as regards the soundness of Plaintiff's suit, and also as regards the liability of the East India Company to be sued by other parties, if admitting Plaintiff's assertion that her husband was of a divided family, they should give over to her any part of the property now in their possession. The Government will remember that I denied Plaintiff's assertion in replying to her bill — letter No 44 p: 23.

3. If the professional advisers of

of Government should be of opinion that weight attaches to the observations I have made, and that there is a reasonable prospect of non suiting the Plaintiff on the ground I have assumed, the Government will no doubt consider the expediency of at once obtaining from Yetrojee, who appears to be the real heir to the private estate of Seevajee, a transfer of his claim. He is a young man of about twenty five years of age, of very ordinary capacity, and is entirely in the hands of those by whom he is surrounded. He succeeded to about 60,000 rupees on his adoptive Father

Father's death, and on the interests
of this he lives.

4. I have considered it my
duty fully to lay befor the Govern-
-ment what has occurred to me
on this point, but I do it with
some diffidence, because I am
in a position which prevents me
from discussing the question, and
from testing my own views by
comparing them with the views of
others - Until the Government shall
have had an opportunity of con-
-sidering the matter, it cannot
be mentioned even here - it would
speedily be communicated to the
Plaintiff's Agent, and he would

at

at once take his own measures
with yet Injee -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt servant

Tanjore -
31st January 1857.

R Morris
Commissioner

To
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George

3/

Memorandum on the Affidavit filed by Ramatchee bhoyee Sahib in her Suit against the East India Company.

Para 3. Plaintiff was duly and law-fully married to Sevajee as she here represents - but she was not his first wife, for Sydemba bhoyee the Mother of his now sole surviving Child, was married to him before the Plaintiff -

Para 4. This short paragraph in the Affidavit is of perhaps greater importance than all the others, for on its truth or error must turn all the Plaintiff's claim - She main-tains that Sevajee was a Mem-ber of a divided Hindoo family, but it is very clear to me that his family

family was undivided - As the
widow of a divided family -
Plaintiff could claim his property,
but the widow of a member of
an undivided family can claim
only food and clothing, and hence
arises Plaintiff's assertion that
Seevajee was divided, and the
necessity for thoroughly investigat-
-ing the point.

As a general rule I would
maintain that a reigning Prince
can not be divided from his family,
- he neither can, nor will, divide
his Sovereignty, either as regards
power or possessions, and he
has nothing else to divide - I
would in no way limit the views

of

of Eastern potentates to make their
Brothers independent of themselves,
and that all, both great & small,
should look to them alone for
their support from day to day, -
flatters their vanity, while it
strengthens their despotic power.

Plaintiff should be called
upon for proof that her husband
was a member of a divided
family, and proof to the contrary
should be adduced on the part
of the Defendants - independant
of the general ground that a
Rajah can not divide his inheri-
-tance, I would, in the present
case, suggest the following as
facts to show that in the family

of

of Plaintiff's husband there has been no division.

The founder of the Tanjore family and dynasty was Yekojee, who came from the Southern Mahratta Country in the middle of the Seventeenth Century - it will perhaps be contended that in coming to Tanjore he divided from the original stock - but I submit that we are not to be sent two Centuries back for proof of a division, when going back half a Century will show us that the family lived undivided, and at all events, even if Yekojee was divided from the parent stock, his own branch of the family

family has never been divided - The Tanjore family dates from 1676, and it is subsequent, and not prior, to that date, that we must look for proof of its condition -

If we find the family living as an undivided family at a certain date, and that no division has been subsequently made, it will be sufficient for our purpose, and we need not go beyond a date at which we have full proof that they were undivided -

The state of affairs at the death of Tolajee in 1786 is well known - he left a half brother Ameer Singh, and an adopted son Serfojee, and two widows,

and

and had the brothers been divided the adopted son and the widower would have been independent of Ameer Singh, but they were not so, for Ameer Singh having succeeded to the throne, throughout his reign made an annual allowance of 11,000 Star Pagodas for Serfojees support, and of 3,000 Pagodas for the support of each of the widows. 1793. When Ameer Singh was deposed, and Serfojee succeeded, in the treaty by which he ceded the Country, a clause was entered guaranteeing to Ameer Singh 25,000 pagodas a year, to be deducted from the gross revenue before Serfojees one fifth was calculated, thus

on

See 10th article of the Treaty

in his turn implicating Serfojee in the support of his adoptive fathers brother.

Nanah Sahib.

There is another instance still which shows that the family was undivided, and as it dates from the time of the son of Yekojee the first Tanjore Rajah, it proves decisively that the family not only it not now, but never was considered divided.

Yekojee had three sons, and Tookojee the youngest had, by a second marriage, a son named Nanah Sahib. Nanah Sahib had a son named Appah Sahib, and Appah Sahib, by a second marriage, a son named

Nanah

Nanak Sahib, who adopted Tookojee, whose daughter is now alive. The family has always been supported by an allowance from the Rajah, sometimes more and sometimes less, according to the Caprice of the Sovereign, and Tookojee's daughter, who is now alive, continues to receive from the Rajah's Circar an allowance of Rs. 300 a month, to which, had the Tanjore family been divided, she would of course have had no claim.

Further, on Nanak Sahib's being involved in difficulties Serfojee paid his debts, Tookojee's marriage was performed by the Rajah, and the Ceremonies of

of the funerals of both Tookojee and Nanak Sahib were similarly paid for by the Rajah - had the family been divided, none of these duties would have fallen on its head.

If on the above, and on other grounds that may occur to the professional Advisers of Government, Plaintiffs assertion that her husband was of a divided family can be successfully refuted, it must be considered what results may follow.

Serfojee had no sons, and was himself the only son of Sefojee, neither had any Brother, nor had Tolajee, who adopted

Serfojee

Serfojee, any son by marriage, so
that we must revert to Ameer
Singh the undivided brother of
Tolajee — he had a son Pertaup
Singh, who, dying in 1849, left
an adopted son Yeshojee now alive
at Madirajenum, and altho' the
adoption was never recognized by
Government as giving him a claim
to any part of the allowance paid
to Pertaup Singh, there is no doubt
whatever that it was a legal & fair
adoption according to Hindoo law,
and it appears to me as long as
Yeshojee, or his descendants, live
Plaintiff can claim nothing but
food & raiment.

It may be said that

under

under this view we are but shifting
the suit from one Plaintiff to
another, and that it signifies
little to Government whether
they are sued by Ramatchee
bhayee or by Yeshojee, but we
do not admit Yeshojee's claim
to be a good one by asserting
only that it is better than
Ramatchee bhayee's. Our present
business is to answer her claim
and there is time to make
an arrangement with Yeshojee
if it should be thought, a
view which I do not hold myself,
that his claim would be
successfully made. Further
it must be remembered that

any

any concessions which may be made to Ramatchee bhayee Sahib will not bar a suit against the Govern: ment by Yetrojee, and that it will be no answer to his claim to say that we have admitted that of Ramatchee bhayee.

The late Rajah had a fancy for changing the names of his relations, and each of his wives have three different names, those entered in this paragraph are not the real names of the Bhayee Sahibs and the following is a correct list.

Para 5

Soyemba bhayee 1

Oomamba bhayee ..... 2.

Syentumba bhayee ..... 3.

Jeeayee umba bhayee ..... 4.

Deepumba bhayee ..... 5.

Rama Rumaramba bhayee ... 6

Sugunumba bhayee ..... 7.

Apparosparumba bhayee ... 8.

Yeshwarumba bhayee ..... 9.

Amasumba bhayee ..... 10.

Gowrumba bhayee ..... 11.

Aroomumba bhayee ..... 12.

Sootroomarumba bhayee ..... 13.

Ceerumba bhoyee ..... 14.

Chenumba bhoyee ..... 15.

Para 6. The proper names of the late Rajah's daughters are Soobagiavathy Chrunjeeva Rajasa bhayee Ammany Rajah Sahib, and Chrunjeeva Vijea Mohana Mookta bhayee Ammany Rajah Sahib, the former lady died

at

at Tanjore on the 26th of December 1856.

The name of the late Rajahs' mother is Ahalea bhoyee, the affix of Matoory being given honoris causâ. Avvo Sahib is not a name at all, and signifies only Dowager, without designating any individual. Para 9

This paragraph contains the real claim at issue and I imagine that it is the Plaintiffs part to prove to be private, any property she may claim from that now in Defendants' possession. Para 10

She claims, first, houses, & Houses and if it be admitted that a Rajah has any private property, a distinction may be fairly admitted between his Palaces and other private residences - but this distinction is one, which if acted on, will tell greatly against the Plaintiff - Windsor Castle & St. James's are no doubt royal palaces, Balmoral and Osborne are no doubt private property, and if by the same rule the Government take possession of the late Rajahs palaces at Tanjore, Trivisar, & Combaconum, and refer Plaintiff and the other Ranees to his bungalows at Calimere, Shetobaval and Combaconum, they will certainly find Cause most bitterly to regret the suit - The Government has not now the

smallest

smallest intention of disturbing them in the quiet occupation of the very extensive Palace at Tanjore, but if the question of Right is to be tried, it will be remembered that Government, in whom the Raj has lapsed, have rights as well as Ramatchee Bhayee.

In my letter of the 25th Sands. November last, No. 44, I gave a brief account of the state of the Rajahs' claims — that letter was written in reply to a claim made to them on behalf of Ahalea Bhayee, commonly called the Avvo Sahib — Plaintiff does not specify her claims as distinct from Ahalea Bhayee's, and until I

I am informed of the particular lands she demands, I can offer no particular reply. As a general reply I take leave to refer to my letter already quoted. —

Jewels. I shall refer to the particular jewels claimed by Plaintiff, in remarking on paragraph 13. but as regards the general question, perhaps some help to a reply may be found in the Correspondence which passed regarding the Rival Claims of Serfojee & Ameer Singh, an Abstract of which I lately submitted to Government. It would seem very clear that Plaintiff can not now claim as private, that which Serfojee, thro'

Vide Commissioners letter dated 24th Dec. 1856 No. 80.

thro' whom the claims, claimed
and received only because it
was public.

Further it must be remembered
that Plaintiff has her own jewels
in her own possession, and that
unless some may have been
accidentally in the Rajah Mahal
for repair at the time of the
Rajahs death, to no other jewels
but her own had she ever the
means of access - His Highness
decked out his ladies, both wives
and Concubines, for his own
gratification on feasts & Ceremonies, but the jewels which
them adorned them, were given
out to the Managers of their
departments on regular receipt,
and

and were again restored whenever
the object of their loan was passed.
Jewels so kept and so treated
must be looked upon as the
property of the Raj, and not as
that of an individual.

When Sertojee died he
left behind him valuable jewels
and similar property of equal
value may be fairly looked
for from his successor. The
identity of the jewels cannot
now be traced in many instances,
because it was the habit of the
late Rajah to be for ever changing
their shape & fashion - and he
kept constantly at work a set
of men whose duty it was to
make up new sets of jewels
from

from the materials of old sets.

Finally it must be remembered that in assuming possession of the property under the orders of Government, the Commissioner particularly informed the Sirkle, and begged him to inform the family, that it was public pro= =perty only that would be retained, while all private property would be restored - and if, on examin= =ing the jewels, any may be found to which Plaintiff, or any other member of the family, may be able to substantiate a claim, it has never been otherwise than intended at once to restore them to their possession - that this is not now done is the

Consequence

8/

Cash.

consequence Plaintiff's act in ob= =taining the Court's injunction, for the examination of the jewels having been delayed owing to the time occu= =pied in arranging and translating their Catalogue, the work was about to commence just as the injunction issued.

Plaintiff's claims to the Cash left by her husband can not of course be extended over any period subsequent to his decease. but limited to the sum actually in the treasury on the day of the Rajah's death - it is questi= =onable if the Government, as Successors to the Raj, have not a lien upon it.

When

31

When Serfojee died he left in his ordinary treasury about Rs. 8000 — but besides this he left a royal treasure of three & a half lacs in gold Coins, placed in an iron Chest, under two Keys, one of which he entrusted to his Sirkele Bavak Punt, and the other to the Residents Shrestadar Ventut row, with injunctions, which were also pasted on the Chest, that the treasure was on no account to be spent except for the purpose of warding off some great dis= =aster that might at any time threaten the Raj — the Rajah dismissed Bavak Punt, the Resident dismissed Ventut row, the Keys were obtained by force, the Chest was opened, and in a few weeks not a single Coin remained - Now the question arises whether Plaintiff can claim the Cash left by her hus= =band as an item of private property, before she has, from his Estate, accounted to his successor in the Raj, for the royal treasure inherited from his Father? -

Silver plate and gold utensils. To these items apply the remark I have already made about the jewels -

Copper & Brass utensils. Have not been af= =sumed -

Clothes - The Jamdha Khanah or wardrobe department of the Palace

Palace was under the management
of the Sirkele and other principal
officers, and without an order
passed by them, even the Rajah
himself could not obtain a cloth
from it. It must be remembered
that nothing has been taken that
could be designated as Clothes,
or cloth made up, altho' the gar-
=ment had been never worn, and
any cloth however apparently
new, which the experienced eye
of the weaver asserted to have
been only once used, was left
untouched.

Untouched. — Furniture.

The libraries, En- Books.
=glish & Native, formed part
of the property on which I was
directed

directed to report, and which
I was to place in safe keeping.
I have made Catalogues of both,
but I have never assumed
possession, the doors have
never been locked, nor have
guards ever been placed.

The Government are there-
=fore wholly unfettered by any
act of mine, and are at liberty
to claim the libraries as public,
or to let them fall as private
property, as to them may appear
expedient. The Native library
is old, but no one can give any
account of it, nor was a Cata-
=logue ever made until I gave
direction. The English books
were also collected by Serfojee.

Arms. I apprehend that there
can

can exist no dispute about the
arms - if troops be not the re-
-tainers of the Sovereign as such,
even the Crown itself must cease
to be considered the Ostensible
of Royalty - the very nature of
the arms, now long out of date,
show that they have been descend-
-ed through a long line of Rajahs -
and the modern introduction of
the Sabre and the Musket
have been left untouched -

Such Equipages only Equipages.
have been taken as were clearly
the property of the Raj - such
as were used by the Rajah as
Rajah, on occasion of State
Ceremonies, and such as His

Highness

Highness would have tolerated
the use of in no other person -
the late Pertaub Singh, son of
Ameer Singh, made a silver
Coach in imitation of the Royal
Equipages at Tanjore, but the
Rajah protested against his
being allowed to use it, and
it remains to this day unused
in the Palace at Madiarjenum -

Carriages, Elephants, horses, ponies, Cattle Carts, Wild Animals birds & other Sundries. None of these items have been touched - As regards the question of public & private however, it may be well to see in the Abstract of correspondence lately sent, what was Sestopjee's notion of the proper allowance of horses and Cattle to be main-

to

to Ameen Singh as private property,
and the proportion to be retained
as public property by himself.

In concluding the remarks
on this paragraph it remains only
to say that no acts of the Defend-
-ants have prevented Plaintiff
from obtaining the particulars
of her husbands property and
its value - She lived with
Seevajee for 24 years, and
for 12 months after his death
no measure connected with the
property was adopted by
Defendants -

Para 11. The claim here advanced
depends upon whether Lee-
-vajee was [illegible] divided
or undivided family, and
if

Para 12. if, as I maintain, he was of the latter,
the claim at once falls.

The horses, Camels, Elephants
and Carriages referred to in this paragraph
as having been sold by the Defendants'
Officers, were not sold in connection
with the extinction of the Raj, or
with the assumption of the State
property of the late Rajah - The
Rajah died in October 1855, and
the Resident, whose duty it had
for some years been, to enforce a
settlement of the claims against
H is Highness, and under whose
management seven lacs of rupees
had been fixed, recommended to
the Sirkele such a curtailment of
the expenditure as would leave
a larger surplus to be applied to

the

the extinction of the debt - such ele=
=phants, horses, Camels, and Carriages,
as were of no use to the family, were
sold by auction at Madras, and
the proceeds were not appropriated to
the use of Defendants, as the Plain=
=tiff has sworn, but were paid
into the Rajah's treasury to be avail
=able for the payment of his debts.

I think it more than ques= Powder & Shot.
=tionable if powder & Shot can
be considered part of the "private
estate" of the Rajah - the powder
referred to was either in barrels
to be used for Cannon, or made up
into Musket Cartridges - and the
Shot were musket bullets - these
are munitions of war, and must
be considered the property of the
Rajah

Rajah, and not of the individual.
But it was not because they were
State property that they were seized,
but because they were considered
dangerous to the lives of the inhabi=
=tants of the Fort, and events soon
showed that the precaution of
destroying them was wise - they
were destroyed on the 21st of October,
and on a Storm that occured
on the 8th of December, part of the
Wall of the Magazine that con=
=tained them fell down, and had
the powder remained in wood
have been without protection - The
value of the powder must be
much overrated at 900 rupees as the
barrels were also marked 1818 -

3 Copper barrels. The three Copper barrels said to
have

have been sold much below their value for 400 rupees, not only were never sold, but never had any existence - the barrels which contained the powder were made of wood, having, as all powder barrels have, Copper hoops - they were offered for sale, but as no purchaser appeared, they were not sold and are now forthcoming - Lastly, it is falsely sworn that these barrels were "purchased by Seevajee" - they were marked 1818, and Seevajee did not ascend the Musnud till 1832.

It is sworn in this para- graph that the Defendants have by their officers taken possession of "all the private personal estate

Para 13.

"estate and effects of Seevajee found "in his dwelling house" and this is not true. the house is full of furniture of all kinds, clothes, pictures, books, Conveyances of every description, and the numberless utensils made use of in Hindoo families - As regards the jewels specified by Plaintiff I have been unable to look for them in the Rajah-Mahal, because the Courts' injunction prevents my having access to it, but I have enquired of the Rajahs' servants, and have caused search to be made in the list of jewels given in by the Solicitor, and I can neither find trace nor hear of any "Maharaccantah" valued

at

at 70,000 rupees, nor indeed of any
jewel of even half that value.
There is among the jewels a Khuntah,
supposed to be worth about 11,000 Rs.
but no one can speak to its purchase
by Serfojee and its having been
given to Seevajee. There is a set of
Chand Sirpeech, which belonged
to Sydumba bhoyee, but the value
is calculated at 1,000 and not
7,000 rupees, and there is a Kuntee,
which was received from Rajah
Coomara bhoyee Ammany Rajah,
but its value is Rs. 1,400 and
not Rs. 4000.—

H Sinclair
Commissioner

Lt Rutland 20 Sept
No 4 of 1834 Paras 10/15

In Dft to Cons 13th Jany
Political 1837 Dept.

From The Commissioner
of Tanjore
dated 4th Novr 94
Recd
Dated 3d
Recd Govt Sept 1837
No 29.

40

Submits Memorandum
of reasons of replies to such parts
of the Affidavit of the Plaintiff
in the suit transmitted
Bhoyee Sahiba to the S. C.
as it appears to him to be
proper to be filed with certain
observations.

Memo.

I beg to circulate the draft in reference to the minute recorded by the Hon'ble Sir H C Montgomery.

I would say by way of that the only way to bring Sir Henry's views fully before the Govt of India ~~only~~ without complicating the subject is to send a copy of that minute to the Secretary of State and ask for particular attention to Lord Ripon's and I have done by an additional para to that letter.

I should add that there is no time to lose. If the non receipt of the Telegraph be caused by the stoppage of the Bombay Steamers &

no mishap has happened to P20
boat the may be here to day.

11.1.57
6.30 AM

Inner.

The Commissioner of Income tax sends a Memorandum in Reply to the Affidavit sworn by Kanaiyalal Bhagwandas and desires him to Register the

2 Some of the points to which he attaches importance in the assessment of this Company are

- that the Company has been declared an Agent of the Enemy Government of the United States of America.
- The most important of the grounds made by the Income Tax Officer is that which calls in question the title of Kanaiyalal Bhagwandas to be registered as the Owner of the Vessel Ruby.
The Income Tax Officer's contention is that

half brother

Sahajee - Rajah — Rama Swamy
died 1786 alias Kenajee
adopted - Sing -
| his | son
Sahajee - Pertaub Sing
died 1832 died - 1814
succeeded by his son adopted son
| of
Serfojee - Yekojee.
Last Rajah.

4. It has been a dispute between Sahajee & Rama Sing - & between his descendants the eldest issue of Serfojee is his heir - if not, his heir is his undivided second cousin Yekojee -

5. There is only the doubt that there has been a division & Krom of province that Krom has been on record in the party also make his assertion - & the Pitt & Rent

41

It is time that put doubt in question - Existence & the legitimacy of Amar Sing - In the Minute of the Govt of Madras Lord Hobart 24 Jan 1797 it was said "there would appear evidence to be brought by many deficient Sebastian - dizee Sein" / Amar Sing / - but the question was not fully pursued - because it was deficient for the then purpose intended. - Since the validity of Serfojee's adoption - The dethronement of Amar Sing - The Proclamation & other papers of the day made out on that point & Lord in a letter from Bengal 18 June 1798 it was expressly stated that the status illegitimacy of Amar Sing "founded upon the ground on which the title of the Rajah to succeed has been adjudged in point" —

7 It will scarcely be possible to procure evidence now - the whole

to grant app. but I suppose objection may must be pursued until it contrary be established ——.

8 If Yeksir & H Rajah hui H Commissioners suggest that an arrangement might be made with him, "if" "it should be thought a view of Ds" "interest myself, that his claim will" "be successfully made".

I do not understand this. If his claim be better than that of Ramachundra Boya, it must be successfully made — unless on H supposition that there is a third party whose claim is superior to either —

Q. Whether the Rajah would consider his claim unless that of giving him pecuniary assistance to establish his claim to the Musnud —

- 2 -

On the other hand it is of importance to know with certainty who is Seevajee's heir if he has one — that we may be sure that we are giving all the certain property to the rightful claimant, and that we run no risk of being called on to pay it all over again to another person.

11 Again if the Rajah dies & has no children or failure of male heirs — the Court's Desk (para 47 of 1856 — to a male heir is found for the purpose, may he not claim the Rajahship? Can it be said that the treaty of 1799 was made with Seevajee and confirmed to his branch of the family, a branch which the Court of Directors seem to favor.

Copies of these papers shd be sent to Calcutta & the Govt as soon as the property title Guru up asked.

No arrangement could be made with the person known as a hospital Assn.

I suppose the next step will be the earliest communication

I know nothing of the Rebecca case, but I doubt that Khazin was legally and properly detained by Pulakdis. The child was released on the coroner's Blackbook Retainer and asserted to have been admitted into hospital before death.

I think the difficulties of carrying out the orders of the Admiralty Govt should be clearly pointed out & the embarrassments by which the whole matter is surrounded shown and I would refer to the Govt of India the advisability of standing on the broad ground that all that has been ordered by Govt is that the Govt with the clearest knowledge of the facts — If precedent is of any value this claim would stand with the examples of improper detention of Americans proved here & some other

legal advice under Mr. Bazoons and I think as soon as the Govt of India after seeing these written notes should decide on the course to be pursued the Gentle=:men of the Calcutta Bar who is to conduct the case should be sent here — he should not I imagine be later than the 2d. Steamer of this month —

8/1/57 [illegible]

Political Departmt.

No. 34.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Dated 11th January 1857.

Read the following letters

From Commr. of Tanjore	(Here enter 3d Jany. 57 No. 94)
From - - Do. - - - Do. - - -	(Here enter 6th - - - - - 97)
~~Min. by the Hon. Sir H. C. Montgomery Bt.~~	~~(- - - - - - - - - 98)~~
~~Do. - by the R.H. the President~~	~~(- - - - - - - - - 99)~~

Resolved that a copy of the above letter of the 3d instant be forwarded to the Govt. of India and their at-tention be called to the remarks of the Commr. on the claim that may be advanced on behalf of Yekojee — It appears however to Government that the question whether Sevajee was of a divided or undivided Hindoo family has been already considered by the Advocate General of Bengal who

I pass the draft on the understanding that if the ad-:ditions to it is not thought ad-:visable the minute which I now send will either accompany the letter to Govt of India or the views I have mentioned in it

W.G.M.

who in para 23 of his draft Answer has admitted that Serajee and his predecessors on the Gunzaud were as Sovereigns divided from all other Members of their family - That Admission the Govt. conceive should stand - and no further notice be taken of Serajee's supposed claim prior the receipt of any order that the Supreme Government may see fit to give -

2 Resolved also that so much of Mr. Forbes' letter of 6th Instant para 3 to 7 as relates to the Jewels be communicated to the Government of India and their Orders solicited on the proposal to reserve to Government the Jewels usually worn by them - Pending the receipt of such instructions the Commr. will take from Serajee

from Serajee his list of property to be surrendered so as to include all Jewels which cannot be proved to have been in the possession of Serajee prior to the Treaty of 1799 - The state Conveyances and transfers may the Govt. think fairly be retained and included in List D 2 -

Ordered that the following letter be dispatched.

To G. F. Edmonstone Esqre Secy. to the Govt. of India Foreign Dept.

Secy. to the Govt. of India Foreign Dept. Fort William 11th Jany. 1819

Copy to Commissioners of Poona } Dispt. 12th
Copy to H.C. Solicitor Dispt. 13th

Ld Ireland 20th Sept 1854
of 1853 Paras 1 & 15

In Dft to Cons 11th Jan 1854

Political 1857 Dft:

No 39

Extract from the
Mins. of Cons:

Dated 11th Jany 1854

Proposing to forward to the Govt of India the two petitions referred to by the Council of Jeypore, viz whether the claim of Jeypore to the private estate of the late Rajah is not prefera-ble to that of the widows or children of the deceased Prince, & whether the Jewels worn by the Rajah may not be reserved to the Government -

40 & 42

Mem.

Since this draft was circulated yesterday I have consulted Mr Ritchie's answer and have modified para 8 to accord with his view that the Rajah's right of succession & sovereignty could not be separated & divided from the rest of his title -

I have likewise also taken Mr Forbes' letter of 1st 6th and modified N. Letter part of N which appears with it - This official letter differs from the private one given me - From this it seems that the Jeypore Rajah's death has made one of the Jewels - The Commissioners also think the proposal postponed & suggest that N. Jewels should be worn by one of

Disp. 11th Feb. 1874 per the Steamer

47

Political Dept.

No 41.

To

G. F. Edmonstone, Esqre
Secy to the Govt of India
Foreign Department.

Sir,

With reference to my letter under date 22nd Ultimo No. 525 I am directed by the Right Hon. the Governor in Council to forward, for submission to the Govt of India the accompanying copy of a letter from the Commissioner of Sangor offering remarks on such parts of the Affidavit sworn by Ramchandra Boyee Sahib as seemed to him to require notice.

2. Mr Forbes, it will be seen, requests particular attention to that part of his Memorandum which treats of the Plaintiff's assertion that her husband was

v. note on Bom Govt Minute
Feby 5

a

h assumed to Govt. I have submitted this for the orders of the Supreme Govt although I feel convinced that they will not accede to it - nor depart from the line of policy which they have laid down advisedly and after full consideration many months ago a few days worth of Sunds.

In Forbes says nothing about the difficulty of preparing his defence consequent upon the injunction & Bombay whom he has prosecuted despite of his communication stating that he will be difficulty in his drawing out his defence fully & correctly for the purpose.

He also mentions of Shridhar that Mr Lawrie from Calcutta reached Poona on the 2d Instant of this month.

was Rajah of Tanjore from the year 1786 to 1798, when he was deposed in favor of Serfojee adopted son of his half brother Tulpajee. In the discussions from 1796–98 which preceded the deposition of Ameer Sing and installation of Serfojee great suspicion was cast on the legitimacy of the former. The question does not seem to have been however ~~was not~~ pressed to any definite conclusion – it being sufficient for the purpose of the enquiry then proceeded that the adoption of Serfojee was clearly shown to be valid – and his title to succeed to his adoptive father Tulpajee in place of Ameer Sing fully established. In the letter from the Supreme Govt to that of Fort St George 18th June 1798 it was said that "the stated illegitimacy of Ameer Sing formed no part of the grounds on which the title of the Rajah to Ameer Sing to the throne had been decided to be invalid."

"There would appear evidence which might be brought by many sufficient to bastardize him" (Ameer Sing)
Lord Hobart's Minute
24 January 1797

Letter 25 Nov 56
No 44 - para 23 –

a member of a divided Hindoo family. He had previously denied this averment in his reply to her bill and his denial was noticed on the margin of para 23 of the answer prepared by the Advocate General –

3. The annexed genealogical table will serve to illustrate the Commissioner's views. If a division of property did take place between the Rajah Tulpajee and his half brother Ameer Sing or between their Children, in that case the pretended Boys Sahebs may, as the claims, ~~&~~ the heirs of the last Rajah Serfojee. If, on the other hand, as ~~the Hon Forbes~~ he contends there has been no division, the heir to the Rajah would, in his judgment, be first cousin Gopojee –

Mr Forbes shows, he

4 Gopojee is, it will be perceived, the grandson by adoption of Ameer Sing who

5 It was made a question of the Treaty of 1779 that an allowance of 25000 Pagodas or Rs 87500 per annum should be made to Ameer Sing this was continued and diminished to his son Pertaub Sing —

6 Pertaub Sing died on the 1819 leaving adopted Yekoje a few hours before his death. The Govt however refused to continue any part of his allowance to his adopted Son Yekoje, and the refusal was fully approved by the Court of Directors. No allusion appears to have been made to Yekoje after the death of the late Rajah in Oct 1850 when the succession to the Raj was under consideration. It is however to be remarked that of his right to the property of the late Rajah he resigned as his nearest male heir he may on the same grounds be held to assert his title to the Raj also —

To Court of Dir 7 Feb 50
From do 11 Sept 50

+ as having the smallest title to succeed

7 Supposing Ameer Sings legitimacy and Yekojees adoption to be unquestionable, that the family was not divided, and that the matter is to be settled strictly according to Hindoo law the undivided second Coparcenary of Savajee would inherit his private estate, in preference to his widow. In such case also the delivery to the widow of the property now in charge of the Government might subject them to a second demand on the part of the Crown.

8 It would however appear that this point as to the alleged division or non division of the family

families of Serjojee and Ameer Sing has already been considered by the Advocate General. In para 25 of the draft answer it is admitted that as alleged in the Bill Seerojee was a member of a divided Hindoo Family. "The "said Rajah Sabajee "being Rajah and also "Sole Sovereign was more "joined in estate with "his only brother Ameer "Sing, or undivided from "him, but was always "as mere his successors "separate and divided "from him; and therefore "these Defendants admit "that the said Seerajee "under the circumstances "aforesaid was not a "member of any undi- "vided Hindoo family."

It

See also note on P. 2

From Commrs. 5th Jany 1857 No. 64
& Heard

g. It does not appear to the Governor in Council that supposing Gerojee to be the real heir the becoming the dignity of Government could effect Govt to endeavour to bring compromise with him, nor obtain from him a transfer of his claim.-

10 Under these circumstances the Govt do not think that that part of the answer which admits Seerajee being of a divided Hindoo family should be separated from, nor any notice be taken of Gerojee's supposed claim and they propose to pursue this course unless otherwise instructed by the Government of India. They have thought it right to bring the Commissioners view to notice

for

of the orders of the Court of India will lead to a sacrifice of the whole of the Rajah's jewels, and the Government will determine whether that course shall be followed, or whether some other plan should be devised which will not include a renunciation of all property not proved to have been professed by the Rajah prior to 1799."

"According to the list which was prepared last year, the jewels usually worn by men were rated at Rupees 3,99,237, those worn by women at Rs. 194,998, gold idols, silver plate, and gold and silver utensils of various description at Rupees 304,491 - besides loose stones and gold to the value of about 20000 rupees, and the gold howdahs, ambaries and Cash, and gold and silver State

State trappings for Elephants and horses, valued at a further sum of Rs. 1,56,675."

"Whether in consideration of the absence of any list of property by which may be ascertained the value of that in possession of the Rajah prior to 1799 it may be possible to substitute for the rule laid down by the Court of India, one under which all the immoveable jewels shall remain with Government, and the women jewels be given up, the remaining property, excepting the State Conveyances and trappings, which never comprehend coined money to be Double D2, being divided, it rests for the Court to determine, but whatever course may be determined upon should be

be

be laid down definitively as there is no doubt that every opportunity & Claimt will be taken full advantage of by the Plaintiffs' Agent here".-

12 The Governor in Council solicits the orders of the Govt of India on the suggestion here made by Mr. Forbes as to the retention of the Mens Jewels which it is requested may be communicated by Electric Telegraph if thought necessary- but unless instructed to the contrary this Govt purpose causing the title of the property to be investigated, to be framed strictly on the principle laid down by the Govt of India, viz so as to include all Jewels that cannot be proved to have been in possession of Deposee prior to the Treaty of 1799- The State Conveyances and Trappings

may th
be reserv
-ment and entered in
Sch Nos D 2.-

13. I am desired finally to request early attention to the suggestion recorded by ~~Lieut~~ Henry M. Montgomery

as expression of opinion that the claim of the Plaintiff should be limited to 8 years concession made. Whether the Supreme Govt on consideration of his education will be pleased to adopt this course which they have adopted & have intended I have

Cancelled
Council 13-1-57

× to alter to Jewels
Ecclesiastical
& Personal.

27-11-12

of the Sailor may be given on the Electric Telegraph - & of posting a Signal on the Steeple of the Station of the 27th Steamship Co. - less otherwise ordered - with the answer will be posted as if from Port of Ceram, Stands 11th Jan. 1857

43

Passed during Class Meeting
1
Vice Pres
Presided during
part 1849
1
adopted Constitution
Mexico.

Mexican Regiment
dated 1858
adopted
1
Mexican Regiment
dated 1858
Mexico.

Ans: Dec 6th

Dft to Cons 13th Jan
Inst 1857 y Dept

No 40

From the Secretary to the
Govt of India
in
Foreign Dept

40

Dated
Dept
11th January 1857.

Answered 26th Jan
1857 No 116.

Submitting for the consideration of the Govt of India,
the Petition brought to notice
by Mr Taylor requesting the
Pension of Rupees Fifteen
a Year granted to the late
Captain Kirkpatrick on
Retiring from the Service
[illegible] from the Treasury