

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

74

Press

~~Mis.~~

Dated

21/1

1887

Not to be folded or roughly handled

From

Amabhadra Bhosale

To

J. J. Croft Esq.
Chief Secretary to Govt.

Sir,

With reference to my former
Petitions I have the honor to request
you to lay the accompanying further
Petition before the Right Honorable
the Governor in Council for his con-
sideration.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Tanjore
January
1857

Most Obedient Servant

Amabhadra Bhosale

A
L. N. 328 of 1884
From

Moolhoorasaba of Rajasthan
Maharaja
Plaintiff
Gnanamba bayee
Defendant
Rajnababasa
Notice to the Defendant

We fined you one Rupee
on account of not signing the notice
sent by us in the suit preferred by the
Plaintiff against you to cancel the
Mortgage bond executed by you for
Rupees 50. and should you not only
pay the said fine within the 8th
January 87. but also you should
give Petition Wth within that time
If you fail to do

High Court 26
27th Dec 1887
Page 24

On 27th Dec 87
Official 1887/88

Sanad
Pahar of
Gudra
Sanad

Dated 11th
Dec 13th 1887

1887

1
which have in the
all court by his lordship
with proper facts
accord with the law

with reference to his
first petition to Government
concerning of the disposal
tion of his property land
-ing the determination
of the suit instituted
against
H. M. M. M.

Copy to His Honor
with copy of the memorial
& original evidence
to be returned

Present to the
President of the High Court
at the Bar of
the High Court
at the Bar of
the High Court
at the Bar of
the High Court

to you by Post Office 4 Notes amounting
to Company Rupees 2900 on the 8th Novem-
ber last and 1 Note for Company
Rupees 51200 on the 11th of the same
Month, we herewith, forward Copies
of letters returning your Notes.

Fort Saint George } We have &c.
6th January 1857 } Signed J. L. Pendergash
Accountant General
Signed J. D. Birch
Sub Treasurer

D.

Agency Dept. N^o 1241.
To, Ry. Ramabhadra Bosalay
Sanyal.

In compliance with the
request contained in your letter dated
the 30th ultimo we have the honor to
return herewith the Promissory Notes
particularized below, the receipt of which

we will thank you to acknowledge, and
to request you will return the Receipt in
Duplicate which we granted for the same
N^o 29350 of 1842/43 for C. Rupees 200-

20210 of " " for " 200-
50/- 8905 of 1854/55 for " 1500-

10665 of " " for " 1000-

Fort Saint George } We have &c.
8th November 1856 } Signed J. L. Pendergash
Accountant General
Signed J. L. Lushington
Ag. Sub Treasurer

/True copy/
Signed W. L. Alexander
3rd Asst. Secy. Genl.

Agency Dept. E
N^o 1259.
To, Ry. Ramabhadra Bosalay
Sanyal.
Sir, In compliance with the
request

and your request has been approached,

request contained in your letter dated
the 30th Ultimo we have the honour
to return herewith the Promissory Note
particularized below, the receipt of
which we will thank you to acknow-
ledge, and to request you will return
the receipt in Duplicate which we
have granted for the same.

N^o 3048 of 45/55 of 1851/55 for C. Rs. 512.00.

Fort St. George. We have &c.

11th November 1856. Signed J. L. Pendergast

Account General

Signed J. L. Lushington

Ag. Sub. Treasurer

True Copy

Signed H. S. Alexander

3^d Asst. Asst. Genl.

Receipt

F

Receipt granted, on the 26th November
1856, to Shungannoollooppilly Jotter peon
of Tanjore Post Office, by Venkata Row
Manager, or Agent, of Ramabadra
Phosalay, appointed by His Highness
Maharajah.

I have received two letters
as usual after paying the Postage,
namely one of 12 annas dated 12th
and another of 6 annas 13th November
1856. addressed to Rajastree Ramaba-
dra Phosala by the Accountant
General of Madras for which I give
you this as receipt.

Signed Chinnu Annah alias

Venkata Row

(True Copy or
Translation)

Signed Ramabadra Phosalay

Compd
A. K. S. Bra

Received
28th Dec 1837
Pena 21

Dec 1837
to H. H.

To
The Right Honorable
George Lord Harris
Governor in Council of
Port Saint George
The humble Petition of
Rama Chundra Rosalay
Inhabitant of Tanjore.
Respectfully Sheweth.

That with reference to your
Petitioner's former petitions and
to elucidate the conduct of the "Court
of his late Highness" at Tanjore, your
Petitioner craves to lay these further
facts before your Lordship.

2. That in the suit here before
brought to your Lordship's notice
your Petitioner received the notice &
of which the accompanying paper
is a true translated copy.

3. That although he denies the
legality of the said Court; yet as the
day for his appearance approached,

no intimation of the opinion of your
Lordship in Council having arrived,
he was compelled for his own security
to comply with the exigency of the
order; lest otherwise, in event of your
Lordship declining to interpose, the
said Suit should go against him in
parte, and he should be altogether
precluded hereafter from questioning
the decision of a Court which it may be
held has jurisdiction and legal existence.

That accordingly he on the day
named in the notice retained a Vakeel
of the Court, and sent him to the Court
with the fine, orders to file his Vaka-
lutnamah and apply for three weeks
time to answer.

That the judge having first of
all received the rupees declined to allow
your Petitioner's Vakeel to file his
Vakalutnamah or to give him a copy
of the Plaint, or in any way to acknow-
ledge him, adding gross abuse of
your Petitioner whom he described

That by this most monstrous
proceeding your Petitioner is altogether
cut off from making any defence:
notwithstanding he had complied
with the exigency of the orders, and
his fine was received and accepted.

That this suit, as it turns out,
though brought by your Petitioner's
wife was not for the 25,000 Rupees
upon the agreement, but respecting
a sum of 50 Rupees.

That for this trumpery
sum, the "injunction" has issued
depriving your Petitioner of the
whole of his property.

That within an hour after your
Petitioner had been informed of the
refusal of the Court to admit him
to plead in accordance with their
own order A, he nevertheless received
notice (of which the accompanying B
is a true translation) of another suit
brought against him by his wife seeking

to transfer the whole of his Company's paper 5,100 Rupees into her name and to draw the interest.

That the said Chinna Annab who has the Keys of all your Petitioners boxes proceeded to his house on the 7th, opened his money box, and took out 400 Rupees with which your Petitioner's wife purchased the stamped paper on which to bring the last named Suit.

That she has now ascertained the said Chinna Annab has obtained possession of the whole of your Petitioner's Company's paper for as appears by the accompanying letters marked respectively C D & (which he prays may be returned) the whole of the said paper was dispatched to your Petitioner's address in the two letters which the said Chinna Annab received as appears by the document F. Copy of the receipt given to the Deputy

Chinna Annab.

The above facts speak for themselves and your Petitioner prays that your Lordship in Council will take them into consideration when disposing of the matters brought to notice in his former Petitions.

And your Petitioner shall ever pray

Mysore
10th January
1857

Ramakrishna Dasabai

No 11

9C

Seyon Residents Office

10th January 1857

From

H. Forbes Esq^{re}

Resident of Seyon

To

S. Pycroft Esq^{re}

Chief Secretary to Government

Fort St George

Sir,

Para 1

I have had the honor to receive

an Extract from the Minutes of Com-

Pol^l Dept^t

sultation No 24 dated the 8th Instant,

referring for report a petition from

Pamabhadra Bhonslay.

2

This petition is evidently

written by Mr. Sarton, and the hand

writing is the writing of Mr. Sarton's

writer.

Pamabhadra

Sept Indus 26
24th Sept 1857
Para 24

1857
26 Sept
24

3 Ramabhadra Bhonslay was a foundling picked up at the Mookumbapoorn Chuttrum in 1834 and from motives of Charity brought up by Sydumboyee Sahib, the late Rajah's deceased wife, and the mother of his two daughters.

4 Sydumboyee Sahib married the boy to a respectable Marattah girl, an alliance to which he, being a chetty, could otherwise never have aspired.

5 On Sydumboyee's death, she committed the charge of the boy to her husband the Rajah, and he remained with his wife an inmate of the Palace for about four years, dependant on the Rajah's bounty.

6 In 1851 the conduct of Ramabhadra Bhonslay being displeasing to the Rajah, he removed him from the Palace, gave him a house within the Fort, applied officially to the President to invest in Ramabhadra Bhonslay's name 50,000 Rupees out of the balance due on the Pungim heva for the year, assigned him an establishment of servants, gave his wife some jewels, and nominated Venkat Rao Govinda Rao, commonly called Chinnamma, as his manager.

7 Ramabhadra Bhonslay's conduct

conduct continued to be displeasing to the Rajah up to His Highness's death, and after that event he contracted vicious habits, and the attention of the Serke and other servants of the Rajah, to whom his wife complained, was attracted to his conduct. They then brought about an arrangement by which both parties agreed that if they could not live amicably together they should divide their property, and separate, but that neither followed vicious courses, and neglected the other, that other was to retain all the property given by the Rajah to both.

112
8 This agreement was formally drawn out on stamp paper, signed by both parties, and lodged with the family manager.

9 Matters remained in this state until a few weeks ago, when Shri traja Kasava Rao, the adviser and assistant of Mr. Norton, experiencing great difficulty in raising all the money demanded from his clients by that gentleman, prevailed upon Ramabhadra Bhowlay, by promises of large presents, when the Raj should be reestablished in the person of Namatche Boyce, and he himself Shri traja Kasava Rao, Serke,

to agree to advance, from the funds given
by the Rajah, 25000 Rupees to aid in
supplying Mr. Norton's demands.

10 Ramabhadra Bhonslay's
wife, who is a clever and high spi-
rited young woman, herself able
to read and write in three languages,
immediately objected to this, and
claimed that, under the agreements
actually entered into by her and her
husband, their joint property should
remain as it then was.

11 Ramabhadra Bhonslay
was persuaded to leave his own
house, he took a lodging near to
Mr. Norton, associated himself
with some vicious women, and
commenced

commenced a career which enabled
his wife to file a suit in Court for
the fulfilment of the engagements
he had entered into with her.

12 In the mean time the
securities hitherto left with the
Accountant General, were, on
the cessation of the public agency,
returned by that Officer to Ra-
mabhadra Bhonslay, and the
letter containing them was deli-
vered to his Manager Vankutram
Govindarao, as he had hitherto been
the Customs with all letters co-
ming to his address through the
post. Ramabhadra Bhonslay
claimed

claimed that these securities should be given up to him, and refused the further services of his Manager. but the Manager, appointed by the Rajah, refused to resign his trust until he received Orders from an authority equal to that from which he had received it.

13 The suit is now in progress, and the wife, understanding that some interest on the securities had been sent by the Collector to the Deputy Taxildar for payment to her husband, applied to the Court to arrest the payment, she having a claim to the money; on this the Court issued the notice of which the Petitioner complains.

14 I am not able to combat the arguments of Ramabhadra Bho-

slay's

slay's adviser against the stop of the Court, but it appears to me quite out of place to limit the action of the Rajah's Courts by the rules which prevail in Westminster Hall, and also, setting legal technicalities aside, it would appear that the Courts' Order is, after all, nothing but substantial justice. a woman sues her husband for certain property which is in the hands of a third party, and fearing that if it gets into her husband's possession he will dissipate it, she applies to the Court to obstruct its delivery pending the decision of

of her suit. I am myself at a loss to discover the injustice done in the Courts according to her request.

15 From the above explanation the Government will see that there are others who have their own ends and objects to consummate, besides the parties charged by Ramabhadra Bhonslay, and will perceive who it is that will chiefly profit by the abolition of the Rajah's Courts, which this petition so urgently demands.

16 The Larkle has in my opinion acted very properly if he has respected Ramabhadra Bhonslay's wife in the steps she has taken

to restrain her husband from advancing for Mr. Norton's benefit, money given for the support of both parties by Her Highness, not a fraction of which, once given, would be ever seen again, and I commend the spirit with which the woman has applied at once for the protection of a Court of justice against the threatened plunder of her property.

17 The petition which I received, returned.

I have the honor to be

Bangalore
January 1857

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

Chief Secretary
to Government

B. L. L. L.

President.

From the President of Jamaica
 Read the following letters:
 a Memorial of the
 of the year 1857
 a do do do 1857

It Resolved that the following
 endorsement be passed on
 the Petition, 5th Jan^y 1857
 presented by Ramabhadra
 Bostany

Petition is captioned
 that the Govt having seen
 a full report upon this, and
 - sent from the President at
 Jamaica see no cause

Copy of the same by the
 of the Govt of Jamaica
 1857

From the President
 of the
 1857

Called 1857
 1857

14.1.57

The copy is
 the reference made to the
 submit a detailed copy
 of the original and make
 the difference in the
 capital copy, and in the
 copy of the original
 1857

for their further perusal in the
 matter

For the Governor,
 1857

in view of the
 of the R. B. Bostany

1857

1857

MAD