M.R.O.—L—89,000—16-10-89.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 86 Press
Misc.
Konerkha 22-23
Dated 26-1-1987

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Alterations in the Answer of
Kumatchee Bhoya Sahiba
Versus
East India Company.

8th February 1837.

At the end of paragraph 9 add these words.

9A. The said Rajah also left certain Jewels and personal property, part of which were acquired before, and part of which were acquired after, the said Treaty of 1799, but all of which were held, used and applied in the manner in the 9th paragraph mentioned, and which were by the said Rajah, and are now so mixed up as to prevent the Defendants from being able now to distinguish between the same, or to ascertain which were acquired before and which after the said Treaty.

Paragraph 10. In paragraph 10 after the words "in the 9th paragraph mentioned" and before the words "so far as such particulars" add these words.

(1) "And of the personal effects, partly acquired

acquired before and partly acquired after the date of the said treaty, used as in that paragraph mentioned, but as to which the Defendants have not been able to ascertain which were acquired before, and which after the said Treaty, the same having been mixed up and blended by the said Rajah so as to be at present undistinguishable."-

After "D4" add and "D8".-

(2). I think a Schedule D8 containing a list of the jewels and property mentioned in Mr. Forbes's letter of January 1857, which are so regarded as not to admit of the distinction being made between those acquired before, and those acquired after 1799, should be added.-
(Sd) W. Ritchie.

(3) And at the end of the paragraph (3) and the said Rajah also left considerable debts and claims due from him both to individuals & to and in respect of Customs, public Institutions of that character, and unpaid at the time of his death, all of which were incurred by him while such Rajah and Sovereign Prince as aforesaid".-

Jas

Paragraph 13. (1) In Paragraph 13 after D(2) add "and D8".

Near the end of paragraph 13, after the words "hereunto annexed", and before the words "but of no other property or effects of the said late Rajah", insert these words:-

(2). 13/2. "They have also in like manner taken possession of certain Jewels and property specified in the Schedule D9 hereto annexed, in the belief that the same belonged in the same manner to the said Rajah as part of his State Property, the same having been found in his or Depository of State Jewels, at the time of his death, and having been for several years in possession. But the same have since been claimed by divers persons as being their own property wrongfully taken by, and in the possession of the said Rajah, and particularly by one Venkat Rao on behalf of, and as representing his deceased wife Boyumah Chuyeera, on the ground that the same were her exclusive property, of which the said Rajah had wrongfully possessed himself. The Defendants have been hitherto unable to ascertain, and do not know whether the same was really the property of the said Rajah or not, but they have always intended since the said

(Add a Schedule, D9, of property situated like that described in Mr. Forbes's letter of 15th January 1857, para: 4. viz. property possessed by him or the Collector as State property of the late Rajah, but now claimed by third persons, such as Venkat Rao, in right of Boyumah Chuyeera, and as to which the real right of property is uncertain.)
(Sd) W. Ritchie.

said claim was first preferred, and still intend to hold the same for the rightful owner, when they shall have ascertained who he is".- Continues- "But the Defendants have possessed themselves of no other"- or to End of paragraph.-

In paragraph 17 after the words "Treaty of 1799," and before the words "shall be dealt with," add these words:- "and that so much of the property and effects in the Schedule D8, as shall be ascertained to have been acquired by the said Rajah since the date of the said Treaty, and as much of the property and effects in the Schedule D9 as really belonged to the said Rajah Serwajee, and not to third persons who claim the same:"- (1) Paragraph 17.

And after the words "as a private individual," and before the words "and that the officers", add these words: "regard being had to the just debts of, said claims upon the said Rajah Serwajee, which debts these Defendants are desirous should be paid from the said Estate, they being willing for that purpose, and for the purposes hereinmentioned, to relinquish their own claims as aforesaid" and to allow the whole Estate and property of the said (2)

excepted to be administered and distributed in a due course of administration in the first instance in the payment of such debts as aforesaid, and being also willing that the said property and estates acquired since the said Treaty, except as aforesaid should be delivered over subject to the debts of and claims upon the said late Rajah to the person or persons who would have been the legal representative or representatives of the said Rajah had he been a private individual upon such representative or representatives giving adequate security for the proper administration of the said property, by the payment of debts and otherwise, (3) [and] for obtaining such Certificates or Letters of administration as would have been sufficient to enable

(3) [and] also to those words in brackets, I do not advise their insertion unless at the Chamber summons to allow the Plaintiff to apply without appearing for Letters of administration or a Certificate to

enable such representative or representatives to recover debts due by the deceased Rajah, if he had been a private individual dying intestate within the dominions under the Government of the East India Company).

And strike out the sentence beginning: "And that the officers and servants of the Defendants"; or, in the end of the Paragraph 17 and add: 17 (4) "And the defendants have in like manner resolved and are willing to allow all the property and effects described in the Schedule D(8) to be applied in and towards the payment of such debts due by the said Rajah, and such claims on his estate as shall clearly be established (to the satisfaction of the Defendants) to be just and equitable demands."[xo]

in order to clothe them with the legal right of realizing & claiming the title subject to the duty of administering it under such Collector's Certificate in payment of debts.

[xo] Ins. to the words in Brackets in ¶ 14.

Para: 27. In Paragraph 27. after the words: "to one Sree Baram Sahib" and before the words: but these Defendants submit &c. add these words: "and that she has died since the death of the said Seerajee".

Para: 28. At the end of Paragraph 28 add these words: "And that applications have been made to the defendants by Roy Sacharam Sahib, Roy Keelakunt Row, Annund Row & Roy Madhajee Jovind Row calling themselves her guardians and managers to protect her alleged rights in respect of the property claimed in this suit against the Plaintiff.

And that defendants have in like manner been applied to by four of the widows of the said late Rajah Seerajee namely S. B. S., G. B. S. G. B. S. and G. B. and also by divers persons claiming to be creditors of

of the said late Rajah, particularly by Raj Sacharam Saheb, Devant Row and the said R Sacharam Saheb, R. st. N.J., and R. st. B. not to deliver over any of the said property to the Plaintiff, without full security that she will apply the same in payment of the debts of the late Rajah or without seeing, that full provision is made for such payments."

In Paragraph 30 after the word D(4) and before the words: "and which Schedules" add these words: "D.5, D.6, D.7 and D.8 and that he also was possessed of the property and articles specified in Schedule D.9, but

Para: 30. (1) (i.e. if there be so many Schedules. Ld. J. W. Withdrew)

whether he was entitled to such landed property and articles or not, these Defendants for the reasons aforesaid are ignorant and cannot answer."

(2) and at the end of the Paragraph "but that it is subject to the payment of many debts and claims due by the late Rajah which he left unpaid, and in respect of which claims have been made upon the Defendants as the successors of the late Rajah which claims are still pending."

Para: 35. At the end of Paragraph 35 add these words: "and so much of the property

in D.8 as was acquired before the Treaty of 1799 or as can be distinguished from the portion acquired after that date."

In Paragraph 37 after the words D.2, and before the words: hereto annexed: add D.7 and D.8; and so much of the property and effects specified in Schedule D.9 as "belonged to the said Rajah as aforesaid".

38 In Paragraph 38: after the words D.2: and before the words: hereto annexed" add "D6. D7. & D8, and in D9 so far as the property therein specified really did belong to the said Rajah."

39. In Paragraph 39: after the words D3: and before respectively, as & add "D3, D6 or D9 so far as the property therein belonged to the said Rajah or so much of the property described in Schedule D8 as was acquired since 1799 and as can be distinguished from the other property in the said Schedule mentioned acquired since that date".

41. In Paragraph 41: after the words D2: and before the words: and the property described: add "D3. D6. D6. D9 and so much of the property described in Schedule D8 as has been acquired since 1799, and can be distinguished as aforesaid

41 and

and also in Schedule D 9 so far as it was really the property of the said Rajah".

and after the words D 1, and before the words; the latter of which you add- "D 4 and so much of the property in D 8 as cannot be shewn to have been acquired since 1799." (2)

And after the words, Rajah Serujee and before the words: without this the Defendants add: "subject to the payment of the debts and claims upon him as aforesaid in such manner and upon such security being given as hereinbefore and particularly in the 17th Paragraph mentioned." (3)

The words ("to the legal representative or representatives of the person" may be omitted here: & after the words "since as" before "as if he formed" the words "as aforesaid" may be substituted.)

J.P.R.

9th January 1857.

The following new list of the Schedules and of the Paragraphs of the Answer in which they are referred to may be found useful - Possibly several of these under the head D may not be required - but this can only be determined in Madras - In that case the numbers should be altered - This will require care - and it should be borne in mind that in all remarks made in Calcutta on the Schedules, they are spoken of as if the full number of possible Schedules were required - Thus for instance D 9 may by the omission either of D 4, D 5 or D 6 become D 8 or if all are omitted D 6.

Paragraphs	Schedules.	
10, 13, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41.	A 1. —	Real property acquired before 1799.
10, 13, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41.	B. —	Real property taken in exchange for property acquired before 1799.
10, 13, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41.	C. —	Personal Property acquired before 1799.
10, 13, 17, 30, 37, 38, 41, 43.	D. —	Real property acquired since 1799.
10, 13, 17, 30, 37, 38, 39, 41.	D 1. —	Personal Property acquired since 1799 except that in D 2 and subsequent Schedules.
10, 13, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41.	D 2. —	Personal Property acquired since 1799 but which of the very nature perishes such as the Powder and munitions of war.
10, 17, 30, 37, 39, 41.	D 3. —	Property of the late Rajah - of which Mr. Morland has not taken possession (not acquired before 1799 or evidentially State Property.) —

16, 30. D. 4. – Property of which Mr Forbes has not had possession if any (acquired before 1799 or essentially State property.)

31, 39, 41. D 5. – Property if any – strictly private acquired since 1799 not possessed by Mr. Forbes.

13, 17, 31, 37, 38, 39, 41. D 6. – Property of this description possessed by Mr Forbes if any.

10, 30, 37, 38, 41. D. 7. – Personal property sold by Mr Forbes except the Powder and Barrels (Paras 12.) if any. –

10, 17, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41. D 8. Personal property acquired partly before and partly after 1799. and which cannot be distinguished by reason of the two Firms having been mixed by the Rajah.

13½, 17, 30, 37, 38, 39, 41 D. 9. Property possessed by Mr Forbes and now claimed by 3rd persons and Firms.

E. Documents to be produced.

F. Documents not to be produced on the ground of professional privilege.

G. Documents not to be produced on grounds of public Policy.

(I have not had time to compare this list and Paras: referring to the several Schedules, and care should be taken in the final copying of the answers to address accordingly. – J.P.P.

9th February 1857.

(True Copy)

G. Edmonstone

Acting Under Secy of State.

Copy.

From

H. Ritchie Esquire

Advocate General

To

G. F. Edmonstone Esquire

Secretary to the Government of India

Foreign Department

Calcutta, 8th February 1857.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge your letter No. 525 of the 3d Instant, transmitting for my opinion a letter from the Secretary to the Government of Madras dated 26th January, requesting claims against the Estate of the late Rajah of Tanjore, & have the honor to enclose herewith the observations which I think it will be desirable to make in the answer of the Court of Directors to the suit of Tirumalrao Sirja Sahiba, in consequence of the enclosures being continued in that letter.

2. Mr. Forbes letter of the 15th January states a state of things of which I had no knowledge when I gave the opinion and which subsequently added observations in it, and which I think requires that

that some further alterations of importance should be introduced into it.- There will be no time I fear before the Mail leaves on Monday to obtain the sanction of the Right Hon'ble the Governor General in Council to these alterations, some of which peculiarly require such sanction before they can be adopted, as they involve some departure from the course resolved on by His Lordship in Council after mature deliberation. On the other hand, the alterations are of a nature which renders it almost impossible to transmit them accurately by Electric Telegraph; and if they be not transmitted either in Sanscrit, or by the Messenger of Monday, they will probably be too late to be inserted in the Decree, the further extended time for filing which will expire on the 15th Instant.-

3. I therefore think that the better course will be to transmit the alterations as suggested by me to Madras by the Steamer of Monday, without awaiting for the instruction to the Governor General in Council, and to apprise the Secretary to the Government of Madras that there has not been time to submit them to His Lordship in Council & that they must be instructed immediately

and that the approval or disapproval of each of the more important alterations will be conveyed to Madras by Electric Telegraph before the time for filing the answer expires.-

4. From Mr. Forbes' letter it appears that the Estate of the Late Rajah of Tanjore is merely, if at all, sufficient for the payment of his debts.- that some of these debts are due to individuals and some to Public Institutions such as the Chattrams referred to in the previous correspondence and the answer.- and that some at least of the Creditors, as well as the persons representing the interests of the infant daughter of the late Rajah, (who has under Hindoo Law an interest, though only a contingent reversionary interest, in the property, accruing on the death of the widow or widows) and four of the widows of the Rajah, deprecate the taking over of any of the Debts of the property to the Elder Widow, the Rani of Sivagunga, suggesting that if it be so determined, it will be rendered wholly unavailable for their claims, and pray the Government to see that their interests are not

sacrificed

sacrificed to those of the Plaintiffs.

5. These claims of the creditors raise a grave doubt as to the expediency of making any offer in the Answer (such as that improved upon as it now stands) of the delivering up by the Government to the person who would be the representative of the late Rajah if he had been a private individual of any part of the property of the Rajah - at least without some material qualification. For if the Rajah had been a private individual, there is no doubt that his widow paying aside the question previously discussed as to the relative claims of the eldest and of the other children) would be his present legal representative. - And being a Hindu, no Letters of Administration would be necessary to complete her representative character, - and inasmuch as she is not now seeking to recover any debts due to the deceased, she would not require a Certificate under Act 20 of 1841 to entitle her to receive the property of her late husband, if he had been a private individual. She would therefore answer the description given

given of the person to whom the Government by the answer express their willingness to deliver up the property and would be in a condition to claim it without giving security of any kind for the payment of the Debts. There would in that case be great reason to apprehend that the just claims of creditors would be defeated, - There would also be some reason to apprehend that the disappointed Creditors might try the experiment lately resorted to by a Creditor of the Nabob of the Carnatic in an action against the Government and Directors of the East India Company or its Officers as Executors de son tort, or who having in some manner rendered themselves liable for the payment of debts to the extent of assets received, and that the delivering over to the widow affords no discharge as against Creditors. - I do not think that this contention is legally tenable; but the Court might take a different view, - and it is at all events important not to make any Concession which could involve such a risk. -

6. I therefore propose to modify the answer by introducing the alterations sent herewith stating therein the facts reported by Mr. Forbes as to the debts of the Rajah, and the claims made on the Government through him by the several claimants. The most important of the alterations is perhaps that in para. 17, which contains the statement of the instructions of the Government with respect to the property acquired since 1799. I think that the instructions therein stated to have been given by the Government to its officers to deliver over the scheduled property to the person who would have been the legal representative of the Rajah if he had been a private individual should be qualified in the way now suggested in answer thereto.

See alterations numbered (2)(3) Para: 17.

7. Another important consideration arises as to the Jewels &c. referred to in the despatch sent by the Government of India to the Madras Government, on about the 26th or 27th January, and in the Minutes of the Right Hon'ble the Governor General in Council of the 25th January. It was then resolved that the

the Government should take upon itself the burden of proving that any of these Jewels &c. were not bought after 1799 but were State Property in that year and the answer as it now stands is framed in accordance with that Resolution; and all the Jewels, the origin of which is doubtful, are included in the Schedule D, of the property which the Government is willing to give up.

8. I would respectfully suggest a reconsideration of this Resolution with reference to the facts now disclosed as to the debts of the Rajah and the annihilating [illegible] of other Claimants on the Estate to submit to the exclusive claim of the elder widow. It is not of course question the propriety of devoting all Jewels and other property which cannot be shown to have been State Property before 1799 unincumbered by the payment of all just claims whether of Creditors or of the Rajah's widow or family. But as the Plaintiff appears to be putting an unconscientious advantage of her position as the eldest widow, in a able events to be respected, and a majority of having so, I do not think it desirable to make any concession to her, which the principle, upon

which

which the line was drawn between property acquired before, and property acquired after 1799, does not absolutely require.— For however much the considerations may be guarded by referring to the date and to the necessity for taking security from the Plaintiff for their payment, it is very probable that the Court will take the view that as she as the widow of a deceased Hindu would be entitled (apart from the question of Sovereignty) to enjoy all the property of her husband without giving any security or taking out administration, she is the person who can alone be held responsible for the debts on the assets being handed over to her, and that therefore all that the Government admit they do not claim to treat otherwise than as the property of a private person ought to be handed over to her, without conditions or Security.— In that case the creditors if their apprehensions as to their intentions are just, would be deprived of the benefit of property which if the Government had stood upon their right by putting her to the proof that the Jewels were acquired after 1799,

would have been applicable to the payment of their claims.- And although they could not, I think, have any legal ground to complain of this as against the East India Company, yet the intentions of the Government that the property should be devoted to the persons equitably entitled to share in it, would thereby be virtually frustrated.

9. I therefore propose to state the facts respecting these Jewels, describing them for that purpose in a separate Schedule D 8 instead of inserting them in D 1. To this I think no objection could exist even if the course determined on by His Lordship in Council on the 25th January be strictly adhered to. But I would further suggest that the last, I would further suggest that the admission in para: 9 as to the willingness to give up the property in the Schedule therein mentioned, should be limited (as to D 8) to so much of the property mentioned in that Schedule as should be ascertained to have been acquired by the Rajah since the date of the Treaty.— If the facts be as stated by Mr Forbes, and of the sets by which the State Jewels as they existed in 1799, were so mixed up with the Jewels acquired

See para: 9 (1)
" — 10 (2)
See para: 9 (1) Version

required after that date as to the apparently
and distinguishable from them, were the acts
of the Rajahs, the Law would I think cast
the burden of proof that any particular
Jewels were bought after that date upon
the Plaintiff claiming as the personal
representative of the last Rajah — And
for the reasons above given I think now
that it will be but equitable to have
this burden as the law casts it upon her
unless there is a reasonable affirmance
that if she be relieved from it, the property
thus given up to her will be properly applied.

10. If the Right Honble the Governor
General in Council shall think it right
there may be added a paragraph to the
effect that the East India Company
had in like manner resolved and is
willing to allow all the Jewels &c in
D (8) to be applied for the payment 17(4)
of such debts and claims as shall be
clearly established (to the satisfaction of
the Defendant) to be equitable demands
and of any be convenient in order to pre-
vent any contention that the Jewels &c
to be given should be made over
immediately to the Plaintiff, as the
personal Representative, to enable her
to pay such demands, to indent the words

in brackets (to the satisfaction of the Defendant)
in order to preserve to the Government
case of need the right of distinguishing
between legal debts which a Court of Equity
would establish according to the letter of the
Islamic and equitable debts, considerable
-cording to the principles laid down by the
Honble Court of Directors in their Regula
of 19th March 1825, regarding the Mussul
of the Carnatic debts.

To Private Rajah's 11. With respect to the claim of
Narrow boundary Rajah's daughter, it has been twice
Order dep. 91 decided by the Privy Council that on the
and Deed of Compromise dated 5 1858 Rajah's absence of male issue, a Hindoo widow
Privy Council Order has absolute, during her life, to hold the
dated 5 Feb 1862 estate property of her late husband, to the
father to the deceased exclusion of any person who may be
against the widow entitled to the succession. Under
in the Supreme Court at this rule the Rajah's widow would
Calcutta, on right appear to be entitled to the whole of
appeal. the property of her late husband, to the
exclusion of any person who may be entitled to the succession.

Paras 13 (2) (2), Paras 13, and the Proposed Decree
should be amended so as

to provide

Political Dept 15

Dispatch 26th to the Viceroy

Secretary of State for India in Council

I am to forward for submission to the Right Hon'ble the Governor General in Council the accompanying letter from the Commissioner of Jaipur, 15 Jan'y. bringing to notice various claims that have been or may be advanced against the estate of the late Rajah of Jaipur & that with reference to the event of the said estate being attached by Kadrat Khan Boje Sahoor against the 29 Comp.

Yours Inclosure 20 February 1867 Paras 1 to 5.

See too Para: 30 (1)

Schedule D &c.

13. It may be worthy of the consideration of the Right Hon'ble the Governor General in Council, whether if no legislative measure comparable with respect to the Rights of the Comptoirs should be adopted, a similar measure might not be introduced with respect to those of the Rajah of Jaipore, suffering the Estate to be, as it now is, mortgaged, encumbered. The two cases would in themselves be nearly parallel. The circumstance of a doubt on the present case whether any existing law is sufficient would confer death or succession upon different, and if any such be adopted, reference could be taken to proceedings to the Plaintiff's Legal rights, and to indemnify him against all costs of the present suit.

Enclosure in Despatch to Secretary of State for India in Council

Calcutta, the 3rd February 1867.

Home Office
H. Beecher
Asst. Secy

True copy
H. Harrowsone
Secretary to the Government

being decided in her favour - Mr Forbes Se-
-gowlie attended as
her Solicitor and that
the Government in
taking the Late Rajah's
property made them-
-selves responsible for
more than the property
was worth -

2. That the presumption
that Kamalachee Boye
in taking the proper-
-ty of her late Husband
will also take the lia-
-bility for all claims
that can be made
upon it; either by Judi-
-cial, or by practising
-ing an extortion
or

Pg

16

shown many cir-
-cumstances that if the
estate ~~property~~ the princi-
-pal & interest under the Award
and which consists
for the most part of
Lands & property
readily convertible, be
kept in her controul
charge for any princi-
shown by it, still
by much of it, diri-
-pated by the prejo-
-dice of the having
claims upon it, or
entitled to the pro-
it + and especially
by the detriment of
the immediate
members of the Family
the mother of the Late
Rajah his sister &
others, and having

+ or by provision for
it

but
The eldest daughter
died a few weeks
since.

Indian merchants
with how only one
living daughter —
3 — The Court of Justice
may perhaps think
proper to consult the
Law Officers on the
measures to be adopted
on the petitioning the
various parties above alluded
to — as well as for
punishing against
any responsibility
that might attach
to Govt, should they
surrender to Lazar a
property of Indian
property without taking
the legal precautions
which have been for securing
the rights of the parties
entitled to it —

4 — It appears by petition

in the Kings petition
that the Rajah's
Court are still
maintained in the
Fort of Tanjore as
during his lifetime
and that the Fort &
small surrounding
territory hitherto
exempt has not yet
been placed under
the Company's Courts
The Govt known pow-
-ers for making early
arrangements for
establishing a Hindu
Court either that of
a District Moonsiff
a Principal Sudr
Ameen in the Fort —
and bringing it
under the jurisdic
tion of

Criminal of the Civil
& Session Court of
Combaconum & the
Court which was
by first dictat
on the 2nd of the
Province of Tanjore
S. Jan. 1856 the
Civil Early on the
of the Judges of the
Court & any alterations
or additions that it
may be necessary
to make in, or to the
Rules - or any
proceedings that
it may be proper
to take in the Court
Court after the Rules

have been approved by
Govt Telegraphic Order
of the 21 inst - that
the Court have power
an extension of the
time for the Rules
to work from the
28 inst -

For the Govt
Dec Bonnaud 1857

128

Central Depot

No 86

Chief Bureau Cairo

Date 26 January 1857

Sir

I have the honor to inform you that in pursuance of your instructions I have this day delivered to the Attached Indents for Camels Equipments and Camp Equipage for the Regiment of Camel Corps

Regiment of Camel Corps — 576 Indents
do of Chasseurs — 140 do

716 Indents

Also 2 Indents for Camels Equipments from the Forts Rut, Zeytoon & Regina & Cheetham

Indents for Camels Equipments 4 of the 4th Class

Duplicate Indents of 17 Indents

Regiment of Camel Corps
Cairo 26th January 1857

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith Indents for Camels Equipments and Camp Equipage for the Regiment of Camel Corps

Also 2 Indents for Camels Equipments from the Forts Rut, Zeytoon & Regina & Cheetham

Indents for Camels Equipments 4 of the 4th Class

Duplicate Indents of 17 Indents

Chief Bureau Cairo
Cairo 26th January 1857

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith Indents for Camels Equipments and Camp Equipage for the Regiment of Camel Corps

Also 2 Indents for Camels Equipments from the Forts Rut, Zeytoon & Regina & Cheetham

Indents for Camels Equipments 4 of the 4th Class

Duplicate Indents of 17 Indents

Chief Bureau Cairo
Cairo 26th January 1857

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith Indents for Camels Equipments and Camp Equipage for the Regiment of Camel Corps

Also 2 Indents for Camels Equipments from the Forts Rut, Zeytoon & Regina & Cheetham

Indents for Camels Equipments 4 of the 4th Class

Duplicate Indents of 17 Indents

alienation of these
Lands has been abso-
-lute and unqualified
and that Persons and
Property in the
Colonies or Places
-Countries or Places
-pied by His Majesty's
Forces or Ships may be
protected from
Violence — As Foundation
-ation of the
Jurisdiction of the
Admiralty Court here
by His Majesty's
Royal Instructions
and Power extended
to the Determination
of Causes of Seizures
-ures being exclusively
vested in the Courts
of Admiralty and
Vice Admiralty
in the Plantations

2. His Majesty's
other Dominions
Extent of His
Commissions
Export of the 25th
Last or Evidence of the
Time may be known
under Attachments
Writs such as would
Issue in Case of
Schedule D or the
Schedules by Act
of 9 & 10 Geo. 4.
That the Commissioners
will not unfa-
-vourably con-
-sider Applications
-ing Mere Attach-
-ments in Cases
of Seizures

Rec'd 20 Feb.

No 4 of 1883 Canada

9-4-94

Extract from Treasury Letter

dated 26th January 1887

No 86

Ex. from the

Minute of Council

dated 26th January 1887

Under the observations

presented by the Hon.ble the Min.r

directing that the Deposits and

Securities enclosed may be

returned by the Collector of

Customs the Revenues having

realized and the purposes

disposed of under the Act

and the Proceeds applied for

the Services of the Year

in the manner as directed

by the Act 51st Geo. 3rd Cap. 15

23

reading and with regard

to the other Officers dealt

at the Commissioners

to express the suggestion con-

tained in para.2 of their

Letter of the 9th Inst. for giving

re-attention to the

Letter