M.R.O. 1—89,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political **DEPARTMENT.**

G O. No. 316 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 18 . 5 . ~~19~~ 1886

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Jail
15/4/21

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, for the month of May 1860.

Read the following letters.

From the Commissioner of Tanjore, dated 11th April 1860, No. 983.*

No. 24. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner of Tanjore, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated 12th April 1860, No. 987.

Paragraph 18. In my communication, dated 11th instant, No. 983, I have referred to 2,976 claims against the late Rajah's Estate, which arise out of arrears of salary and wages from periods prior and subsequent to the Rajah's death.

2. Of that number, 992 belong to the Dowlat Pámlók department, of which two were settled by the late Sirkele after a list of them had been prepared. There are 34 for sums above 50 Rupees and the remainder, or 956, are for amounts below that figure. Under the instructions* of Government, I have myself disposed of the latter class. My awards involve the disbursement of an aggregate sum of Rupees 6,995-1-10.

* *23rd March* 1860, 178.

3. Accompanying, I beg to forward, in separate memoranda,† a brief history of each of the 34 cases in which the Orders of Government are now wanted to enable me to pay the sums recommended, the aggregate of which is Rupees 1,314-8-6, as appears in the enclosed statement.‡

† *Enclosure No.* 1.
‡ *Enclosure No.* 2.

4. It is my duty to explain, that all the individuals who are interested in the disposal of the claims in question have not appeared before me personally to prefer them. A list of advances recoverable from the servants of each of the three minor departments and of the arrears of wages due to them, was prepared in the office of the late Sirkele under an arrangement, I ordered for adoption in June 1857.

5. It is my examination of this list for the Dowlat Pámlók department and its collation with the original accounts, that brings before Government the thirty-four claims on which I now have the honor to report.

6. Adverting to those which I have myself adjusted, it is obvious, on reference to their trifling amounts, which in many cases represent an arrear of a month's wages, that the late Sirkele might at once have disposed of them, by indenting for what was due on the abolition of the department. As, however, he did not do so, what were current arrears have assumed the form of claims.

Memoranda of 34 *claims in excess of Rupees* 50 *which belong to the Dowlat Pámlók Department.*

No. 6. CHIMNAJI KEROJI JADHO.—During the life time of the Raja, this person, on a salary of Rupees 70, held office as a Madhiast or superior Steward in the department of the Seraglio. After the Raja demised and the then Sirkele and the Darbár officers, with the approval of the Resident, reduced the salaries of many of the Palace servants, as a measure of general economy, this claimants allowances were fixed at only Rupees 20 per mensem. Further, as the servants of the Seraglio were said to have all placed themselves in opposition to the Sirkele and thwarted his desire to ascertain the expenditure of their department, their wages were stopped. Under the effect of that stoppage, there has accumulated the sum marginally shown above. The claimant has demised. The amount should be paid to his heir.

Rupees 95-5-4.

No. 8. RAMJI NIROJI ZAMBLE.—The circumstances of this claim are similar to those of the one last above, with the exception that the original salary was Rupees 30, which were reduced to Rupees 20. This claimant also has demised. The sum at his credit for salary not disbursed, should be paid to his heir.

Rupees 75-5-4.

No. 11. KONAIR NAIK PERMAL NAIK.—Was a Panká puller in the Huzúr department on 7 Rupees a month. He has died and has left no known heirs. Being anxious to buy a house he is said to have allowed his wages to remain accumulating in the Palace Treasury. The amount should be paid to any one coming forward and properly establishing a title to it.

Rupees 93-1-4.

---

*Entered in Proceedings, 10th May 1860.

No. 12. NIMBAJA MUDOJI ARSUL.—From 20 Rupees a month, drawn by him before the Raja died, this man was reduced, after the Prince's death, to Rupees 15. He *Rupees* 67-12-0. is indebted to the Palace in Rupees 50-11-4. Deducting that sum from the arrear of accumulated salary which was stopped, among other reasons, that the debt might be recovered, the remainder Rupees 17-0-8 should be paid to the claimant.

No. 13. AMRAT ROW LUCHMAN ROW PAMAR.—This man's salary was reduced after the Raja's death, from 20 to 15 Rupees a month. He was attached to the department *Rupees* 71-8-0. of the Bhai Sahibs and was one of the many servants who offered passive opposition to the wishes and orders of the Sirkele when Mr. Forbes came to Tanjore as Commissioner in 1856. His pay was accordingly stopped for a time and the sum due to him on that account is shown above. It should now be made over to him.

No. 15. KRISTNAJI BHAGOJI JADO.—The circumstances of this case resemble those of the one above. The claimant's pay in the Raja's time was Rupees 25. It was *Rupees* 71-8-0. lowered to 15. There is a counter claim recorded against him for Rupees 3-8-3 due under a decree by one of the Raja's own Courts for maintenance, but with that I have now no concern and recommend payment to him of the full accumulation sum, Rupees 71-8-0.

No. 17. RY RUDRAJI ANANDA ROW JADO *alias* BABE ROW APPA.—This claimant is the person whose pension has been cancelled by Government in their Order 29th *Rupees* 286-0-0. March 1860, No. 190. He was the Head Manager of the 15 Bhai Sahibs' establishment at the time of the Raja's death and so remained up to the period of Mr. Forbes' arrival at Tanjore in October 1856. The obstacles thrown in the way of the Sirkele in respect of procuring accounts of the Bhai Sahibs expenditure in order to form data on which to fix their future allowances, were created by him and by him alone. The subordinate servants of the establishment were under his immediate control and orders, and he, again, was bound, according to the long established practice of the Palace, to yield obedience to the Sirkele whom he set at defiance. Some hundreds of the subordinate servants have been punished by the stoppage of their allowances, solely in consequence of this man's acts. His conduct was wholly unjustifiable and as the payment of the arrears of the wages which accumulated under the Sirkele's determination to withhold payment of them until he could enforce obedience, is an act of grace on the part of the Government, I do not feel that I can conscientiously advise payment to this man, of what was not disbursed to him when indented for.

No. 18. RY BUJANGA LAKSHMA PANDIT.—This claimant was the principal Accountant of the Raja's Dufter department. The sum marginally noted is the amount *Rupees* 169-13-9. of stoppages made from his salary to meet a debt which he had incurred to the Palace of Rupees 395-5-5 for cloths. As that sum is still owing by him, the claim is rejected.

No. 22. NANAPPA NAIK KRISTNAPPA NAIK.—The disobedience of claimant No. 17, which brought so many minor servants into trouble, also caused the stoppage of this *Rupees* 95-5-4. man's salary of Rupees 20, to the extent shown marginally. As in the previous similar cases, I recommend that the sum be now made over to him.

Rupees 75-5-4. No. 25. RY HEROJI NARASOJI SHINDE.—This case is similar to the one last above. I make the same recommendation.

Rupees 426-8-10. No. 27. MALLARJI DATTAJI APPA.

No. 28. CUPPUSAMY DATTAJI APPA.—Each of these claimants, who are brothers, drew a salary of Rupees 15 a month. It was stopped for two reasons ; the one,

Rupees 426-8-10. that awards against them in the Raja's own Court's required liquidation ; the other, that their father had sold a village to the Raja for Rupees

„ 853-1- 4. 30,000, and received 10,000 Rupees in part payment thereof, but had subsequently found himself unable to give possession to the Raja, consequently on certain claims which it was the seller's duty to adjust.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, for the month of May 1860.

2. There would, thus, have been Rupees 853-1-4, in deposit available for credit to the Rupees 10,000 drawn from the Raja ; but I observe that so recently as the 5th November 1859, in No. 325 letter to the Sirkele, the Government Agent has called for and sent to the Combaconum Sub-Court, for a creditor there, a sum of Rupees 378-4-10 from the accumulated arrears of the salary of these claimants.

3. The Government Agent appears to have proceeded under the impression that the claimant's salaries had been stopped under orders of the Courts of the Raja only and the proceeds separately kept in deposit. The error has diminished *pro tanto* the resources from which the 10,000 Rupees might partially have been liquidated.

4. The village when purchased by the Raja, was intended as an investment for the inmates of his Seraglio. I have reported at length on this matter in my letter dated the 26th ultimo, No. 930.

5. The sum at present in hand is Rupees 471-12-6 which the claimants should not be allowed to receive. I reject the claim.

No. 31. GOPAL RAGOJI MOHITAY.—I recommend the payment to claimant of this sum. It is an accumulated arrear of salary stopped under the circumstance *Rupees* 57-3-2 stated in claim No. 22.

No. 32. CUPPUSAMY SACCARAM BHONSLE.—This case is similar to *Rupees* 57-3-2 the last one above, my recommendation is the same.

No. 37. RY ATMARAM DADAJI PANDIT.—This and the two preceding cases are similar. I recommend as I did then, the only difference being, that Rupees 2-8 *Rupees* 77-13-4 due by claimant to the Palace, must be deducted from the amount payable to him .

No. 39. LUTCHMEN VENCAJEE PUNDIT.—This claim rests on an appointment to the office of the Palace " Muzumdar" of which the claimant never for one *Rupees* 539-9-4. moment entered upon the duties.

**7th August* 1855. 2. It was, it appears, made* about three months before the Raja's demise, a vacancy having been specially created that claimant's nomination might take place.

3. On the strength of claimant's alleged filling of the Muzumdar's situation, which was one of the hereditary classes of Darbár offices, he has secured a pension of Rupees 20 a month on the Dowlat Pámlók's list, for the cancelment of which I shall separately address the Government. This claim is rejected.

No. 49. GOVINDA VENCUT SOOBBA.—This man was the official custodian of funds presented by the Raja for certain religious ceremonies. Claimant misappropriated *Rupees* 57-1-9. what he had received, instead of making the prescribed distribution. His pay of Rupees 4 monthly was accordingly stopped to realize a sum of money of which the total is not now traceable, but which was payable to 60 individuals. The amount available not being equal to what claimant should refund, this claim is rejected.

No. 316. KRISHNJEE JEEVAJEE.—The 5 Rupees monthly salary of this man were stopped about 18 months prior to the Raja's death by the Raja's own order. The *Rupees* 89-15-3. reason of the order is not known. It was issued in the " Girdam" department which no longer exists. As the claimant does not appear to have given any service during the period for which the accumulated amount of salary has been drawn for him, and as only the Raja was competent to annul an order which he had himself issued, I regard the claim as inadmissable and reject it.

No. 427. SUBNAVEES LUTCHMA BOOJUNG.—Claimant's pay of Rupees 14 was stopped after Mr. Forbe's arrival as Commissioner in order to impel him to complete *Rupees* 66-11-8. certain accounts he was ordered to prepare. He has since that demised. His heir is claimant, No. 18, against whom stands a balance due to the palace. This claim is consequently rejected.

No. 431. RUNGO NANAJEE.—This man was the original nominee in an Accountant's Office; but, for years past his work has been done by an Official substitute, named Ramajee Nagoji, to whom the salary of the situation was therefore payable. The latter having failed in the preparation of some accounts required before the death of the Raja, the pay of the Office was stopped for a time and the sum marginally noted is thus in deposit. Ramajee Nagoji considers himself entitled to it and I recommend that it be paid to him.

Rupees 54-1-5.

No. 482. KAMAKSHI BHAI, *Widow of Mallarji Appa.*—This person is the grand-mother of the claimants in Nos. 27 and 28. Under the circumstances relative to the loss susstained by the Raja which are therein stated, this claim should also be rejected.

Rupees 419-10-7.

No. 558. SHAIK ZAMAN MAHOMUD SHAIK BOODDUN, *Chitta Keeper.*—This man enjoyed a salary of 8 Rupees which, owing to his idleness, was ordered to be given to three persons appointed to his work. The arrangement continued until after the Raja's death, when a change in the number of substitutes occured. Whatever may be the rights of the substitutes, this claimant can have none. I reject the claim accordingly.

Rupees 55-11-8.

No. 559. SHAIK JAFFAR SHAIK BOODDAN, *Chitta Keeper.*—This claim is similar to the last, and is similar by rejected.

Rupees 54-8-8.

No. 574. DATTAJI MALLARJI APPAH.—This person who has demised was the seller to the Raja for Rupees 30,000, of the village of which possession has not yet been obtained. See cases Nos. 17, 18, and 482, claim rejected.

Rupees 57-0-0.

No. 576. VEDAMURTY PAUCHAPAKAIS BHATGOSAMY.—This claimant urged with much pertinacity his right to certain property to which he deemed himself entitled, under the family circumstances of the Sirkele of the Poodoocotta Raja.

Rupees 200-15-8.

2. The late Raja of Tanjore was annoyed at the litigation threatened as the result of his obstinacy, and appears, through the Saraswate and Girdham departments of his Darbár, to have ordered the stoppage of this man's allowance of 10 Rupees a month. The Raja was clearly competent to issue such an order and to any sums drawn for claimant whilst that order remained in force, claimant can have no right whatever, claim rejected.

No. 584. DEVARAJA ASHARRY.—An order from the Raja issued about 1843, stopped this man's monthly allowance of Rupees 6. The sum shown marginally is what would seem to have been payable to him up to the date of stoppage, and should now be made over to him.

Rupees 91-14-11.

No. 585. SOOBRAM SASTRY.—This man was dismissed six years before the death of the Raja under orders from the Resident. He was some how re-employed and again dismissed and with another, ordered to be turned out of the Fort. It is possible that the Raja may privately have kept his name on the pay list, but if so, his claim to arrears of salary cannot now officially be recognized. Rejected.

Rupees 115-5-8.

No. 618. ANNU ROW GANGAJI BHONSLE.—This man was a cook on 3 Rupees a month. He was dismissed and the sum shewn marginally is the accumulated amount of wages for a period of about 22 months during which he did no work. Rejected

upees 68-10-9.

No. 645. GHULAM HUSEIN ABDUL KADAR.—Was a Doctor on 10 Rupees a month, and has demised. The Raja's order stopped has allowances, but its reason cannot be traced. The sum marginally shown accumulated after the issue of the Raja's order and is not admissible as a claim.

pees 182-10-8.

No. 689. SUVARNAMBICA.

No. 690. KANAKAMBICA.—These two females were brought up in the family of Sydamba Bhai Sahib, first wife of the late Raja. As is usual in the Palace, monthly wages were assigned to them at the rate of 3 Rupees each, but as is also usual, it was kept on as an accumulating deposit to be made into ornaments

ees 192-2-7.

ees 192-2-7.

for them at a fitting occasion. On the death of their mistress they were transferred to the Huzúr department, and thence, an order was issued to attach them to a Pagoda, which course of life they both refused to adopt. The result of this was the temporary stoppage of their allowances. Later, however, an order was passed for the payment to them of the sum which had accumulated on their account, which the Sirkele should have carried into effect. He did not do so, and the sum marginally noted in each case is still a deposit at the credit of each of the women. It should, I think, be paid to them respectively.

Rupees 137-7-7. No. 870. VASANT SUBAYA RAMAKALAHASTIA.

No. 871. SHESHAMMA, *wife of do.*—These sums accumulated subsequent to the issue of an order by the Raja to stop the allowances of the two claimants. The reason of the order is not known, but it was one the Raja was competent to issue. Claims rejected.

Rupees 91-10-4.

Rupees 122-4-9. No. 969. AMMALU.—This case is similar to the last one. I reject the claim.

TANJORE,
12*th April* 1860.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

Statement of sums recommended for payment, subject to approval by Government on account of claims on the Dowlat Pamloké Establishment of the late Raj.

No. of the claim.	Name of the Claimant.	Amount of claim. R.	A.	P.	Amount awarded. R.	A.	P.	Remarks.
6	Chimnaji Kéroji Jadho...	95	5	4	95	5	4	
8	Ramji Niroji Zamble	75	5	4	75	5	4	
11	Konair Naick, Permal Naick	93	1	4	93	1	4	
12	Nimbaji Mudoji Arsul...	67	12	0	17	0	8	
13	Amratrow Latchman Row Pamár	71	8	0	71	8	0	
15	Kristnaji Bagóji Jado	71	8	0	71	8	0	
17	Ry Rudráji Anantarow Zadhow alias Babé Row Appá	286	0	0	...	...	...	Rejected.
18	Ry Bujanga Lakshma Pandit	169	13	9	...	...	...	Do.
22	Nánappa Naik Kistnappa Naik	95	5	4	95	5	4	
25	Ry Heroji Narasóji Sindé	75	5	4	75	5	4	
27	Mallarji Dattaji Appá	426	8	10	...	...	...	Do.
28	Kuppusami Dattaji Appá	426	8	10	...	...	...	Do.
31	Gopal Rakoji Mohité	57	3	2	57	3	2	
32	Kuppusami Sakkaram Bhonslé	57	3	2	57	3	2	
37	Ry Atmaram Dadaji Pandit...	77	13	4	75	5	4	
39	Latchman Venkaji Pandit	539	9	4	...	...	...	Do.
49	Govinda Vencut Soobba	57	1	9	...	...	...	Do.
316	Kistnaji Jeevaji	89	15	3	...	...	...	Do.
427	Subnavees Luchma Boojung	66	11	8	...	...	...	Do.
431	Rungo Nanaji	54	1	5	54	1	5	
482	Kamakshi Bhai, widow of Mallarji Appá..... ...	419	10	7	...	...	...	Do.
558	Shaik Zaman Mohamud Shaik Boodden, Chitta keeper...	55	11	8	...	...	...	Do.
559	Shaik Jaffar Shaik Boodden, Chitta keeper... ...	54	8	8	...	...	...	Do.
574	Dattaji Mallarji Appá	57	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
576	Védamarty Panchapakais Bhatgosamy	200	15	8	...	...	...	Do.
584	Devaraja Asharry	91	14	11	91	14	11	
585	Soobram Sastry	115	5	8	...	...	...	Do.
618	Annu Row Gungaji Bonslé...	68	10	9	...	...	..	Do.
645	Ghulam Hussain Abdal Kadar	182	10	8	...	...	...	Do.
689	Suvarnambica...	192	2	7	192	2	7	
690	Kamakambica...	192	2	7	192	2	7	
870	Vasant Subaya Ramakalahastiá	137	7	7	...	...	...	Do.
871	Sheshammá wife of do.	91	10	4	...	...	...	Do.
969	Ammalú	122	4	9	...	...	...	Do.
		4,936	1	7	1,314	8	6	

TANJORE,
12*th April* 1860.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

No. 25. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 19th April 1860, No. 1,020.

* *No.* 983. Adverting to the Order by Government 21st February last, No. 90, paragraph 1, and in continuation of my communication* dated the 11th instant, paragraph 16, submitting for orders a digest of 48 claims on the Tanjore Estate exceeding 50 Rupees in amount; I have herewith the honor to transmit in the form of separate Memoranda, a brief history of 61 claims of the same class.

2. The total amount represented by these claims is Rupees 12,227-13-6. I have deemed it proper to advise the rejection of twenty-five claims embracing a sum of Rupees 4,371-3-9 and recommend for admission thirty-six cases involving the disbursement of Rupees 7,499-3-2 out of Rupees 7,856-9-9 the total amount of the latter claims.

† 61 3. The claims† now brought to notice added to those‡ reported on by me on the
‡ 48 11th instant, together with those§ under 50 Rupees in amount which I have myself
§475 disposed of, and the 18 settled by the late Sirkele, form the total number of claims entered
18 in the lists which that Officer originally laid before Mr. Forbes, Commissioner, in
602 November 1856.

Statement of sums recommended for payment subject to approval by Government.

No.	No. of the claim.	Name of the claimant.	Amount of claim. R.	A.	P.	Amount awarded. R.	A.	P.	Remarks.
1	77	Rakhmaji Gantgay	527	0	0	411	7	2	
2	78	Govindasamy Mestri	188	14	0	188	14	0	
3	106	Subba Patta	50	8	2	50	8	2	
4	110	Rakhmaji Gantgay	139	6	3	6	6	3	
5	115	Malagamary Kannusami	74	0	1	17	13	10	
6	118	Trichitambala Chetty, a Cloth Merchant. ...	51	11	9	5	9	7	
7	120	Gopanadaraj Chetty	55	6	1	55	6	1	
8	121	Sadásiva Pattá, Brasier	52	4	2	...	...	...	Rejected.
9	129	Rakhmaji Gantgay	108	8	5	108	8	5	
10	142	Venkatachelam, Oil Merchant	66	3	3	66	3	3	
11	149	Vaithilingam, at Saraya Choultry	180	14	4	180	14	4	
12	150	Permàl Naik, Herdsman	155	15	7	155	15	7	
13	163	Múkayi, Curd Seller	80	7	0	...	...	...	Do.
14	169	Alamélu, do.	369	8	0	...	...	...	Do.
15	170	Kannamma do.	72	8	0	...	...	...	Do.
16	172	Virabhadra Vélan	180	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
17	173	Kartta Vélan	350	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
18	175	Vaiapuri	51	4	4	...	...	...	Do.
19	186	Kristna, Vegetable Seller...	80	0	0	44	11	0	
20	187	Ambasenker Zosi Guzar	505	11	10	80	0	0	
21	210	Avusahib Dinmut	74	9	4	...	...	...	Do.
22	224	On account of the sale of some articles of the stable ...	112	14	6	...	...	...	Do.
23	245	Ranga, Bricklayer	79	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
24	246	Modali Ausary, Carpenter	850	2	0	...	...	...	Do.
25	250	Sami Reddi	358	8	0	850	2	0	
26	253	Rudra Cótti	150	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
27	291	Pambaya Cótta, Bricklayer	103	1	2	150	0	0	
28	299	Dhairiam, Flower man	66	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
29	305	On account of Batta due to those who had been to Benares				...	...	...	Do.
30	442	Narrainasami Naik	715	7	3				
31	444	Annamalé, female servant	644	4	11	644	4	11	Do.
32	446	Kumárasami, Tailor	179	1	3	179	1	3	
33	449	Sitambara Ausari, Carpenter	639	5	6	639	5	6	
34	452	Zegannath Pondiá Guzar...	166	14	10	166	14	10	
35	453	Ramachendra Davi do.	169	1	7	169	1	7	
36	454	Ramakristna Zosi do.	173	6	0	173	6	0	
			349	9	7	349	9	7	

Statement of sums recommended for payment—(Continued.)

No.	No. of the claim.	Name of the claimant.	Amount of claim. R.	A.	P.	Amount awarded. R.	A.	P.	Remarks.
37	455	Amréswara Táker Guzar	285	0	0	285	0	0	
38	456	Toppe Venkatakristna Chetty	228	0	0	228	0	0	
39	457	Toppi Subba Chetty	322	0	9	322	0	9	
40	458	Anna Venkatasami	75	0	9	75	0	9	
41	462	Bhaji Vira Chetty	115	14	4	115	14	4	
42	463	Kumbi Alagiri Chetty	215	2	9	215	2	9	
43	464	Subba Naik	185	4	0	185	4	0	
44	465	Bhaji Venkatachela Naik...	118	12	0	118	12	0	
45	457	Dévanná Mannaru do.	144	6	4	144	6	4	
46	468	Muttusami Vándián, Flower Merchant ...	82	15	6	82	15	6	
47	473	Satwáji Seváji Navadkar	480	0	0	480	0	0	
48	475	Gangáthara Rakmáji	409	4	8	409	4	8	
49	479	Kámákshi, female servant	114	0	0	...	...	...	Rejected.
50	492	Pagoda of Chakrapániswàmi at Nellichary ...	215	3	5	...	...	...	Do.
51	494	Brámins on account of Pája in the name of C. Vijaiabhóganandáji	110	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
52	496	V. Bávu Kásirow Inglé	85	15	8	85	15	8	
53	497	Náráina Row Inglé	57	3	1	57	3	1	
54	532	Tangamma Veeramma, Nurse	106	15	11	...	...	...	Do.
55	554	Rájammá Bhái Ammani Raja Sahib	155	4	1	...	...	...	Do.
56	559	Durba grass provider	89	15	4	...	...	...	Do.
57	593	Viswanatha Bhut Dèvker	150	0	4	...	...	...	Do.
58	594	Arnachella Pillai	81	9	11	...	...	...	Do.
59	597	Pattabhi Ramasami Pagoda	89	8	6	...	...	...	Do,
60	598	Appuchariar for Hanumar...	71	11	0	...	...	...	Do.
61	602	Panchanathiswaraswami's Mantapapadi ...	67	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
		Total...	2,227	13	6	7,499	3	2	

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

TANJORE,
19th April 1860.

Memorandum of claims for sums above 50 *Rupees, standing against the estate of the late Raja of Tanjore.*

No. 77. RUCKMAJI GHANTIGE.—This claim which originated in the Jamdarkhana had not been recorded in the Raj accounts as the result of a purchase. The claimant, however, appears beyond a doubt to have brought to the Palace for sale prior to the Raja's demise two mirrors, some pictures, and several glass globes coated inside with quick silver, which were retained and never restored to him.

Rupees 527-0-0

2. They appear to have been presented by the Raja to Kamakshi Bhai Sahib and Saccaram Sahib. From the Goomashta of the first, an acknowledgment for the mirrors and globes is forthcoming and the servants of the Mahal declare that the pictures reached Saccaram Sahib.

3. After the Raja had demised, the late Sirkele convened a meeting of merchants to fix the value of the articles, which were sent for from the apartments of their possessors for that purpose, and they were estimated to be worth Rupees 527, the amount of the present claim.

4. Rackmaji Ghantige is dead and is represented by his widow and a son of about 14 years of age who keep a shop in the town of Tanjore. The debt should I think be admitted, but as a sum of Rupees 115-8-10 stands against claimant for advances made, the net sum payable to him will be Rupees 411-7-2.

No. 78. GOVINDASAMY MAISTRY AND THREE OTHERS.—These men were paid servants in the Palace. On the occasion of marriages in their families, they appear to have brought to the Raja, as presents, certain articles consisting of worked skull caps, portraits of himself and father and the god Kristnaswamy, and

Rupees 188-14-0

wafers for the middle of the forehead which the Raja accepted and ordered to be paid for, by the presentation to them of a sum equal to the value of the articles. There is a Parwange to this effect issued in 1850 which seems never to have been obeyed. Probably the sundries were intended to elicit from the Raja a handsome present. Failing that, the offerers may not have liked to draw the mere value of their gifts and therefore the sum has remained undisbursed. As they are now prepared to accept what formerly it was not agreeable to them to take, and as the amount is the value of property that actually reached the Raja, I would admit the debt and pay it.

No. 106. Soobba Patta.—This man was a brass-founder, and the sum at his credit seems to have been the balance due to him for purchases made. It was entered in the account of the Raja's liabilities prepared in October 1856, at the figure marginally shown, and seems fairly due.

Rupees 50-8-2

No. 110. Ruckmaji Ghantige.—Of this entry an item of Rupees 133-0-0 arises in the Zerat Khana department, but I find that it relates to the pictures adverted to in claim No. 77 and therefore reject that amount. The remainder Rupees 6-6-3 is for a supply of scissors and knives, and should, I think, be admitted.

Rupees 139-6-3.

2. The repetition of the entry in this claim would seem to have resulted from the non-cancelment of the memorandum drawn up when the pictures first reached the Zerat Khana, whence they were transferred to the Jamdar Khana.

No. 115. Malagomory Cannusamy.—This sum is due for certain copper chembús prepared according to a Benares model for the Avú Sahiba, but of which when brought and delivered in the Palace, the price was not adjusted. Accordingly, the usual memorandum of articles received was made and there the matter had rested until after the Raja's death, when the Sirkele caused the price of them to be fixed by mediators.

Rupees 74-0-1.

2. Claimant's father, however, is in debt to the Palace to the extent of Rupees 56-2-3. This being deducted, the net sum payable to claimant is Rupees 17-13-10.

No. 118. Trichitumbala Chetty, *a Cloth Merchant.*—This debt is composed of two items: Coarse cloths supplied worth Rupees 29-13-9 and cloths deposited in the Zerat Khana and never returned to him, though nothing appears to show how they were disposed of in the Palace.

Rupees 51-11-9.

2. This deficiency cannot justly affect claimant who being indebted to the Palace in Rupees 46-2-2, should get a net sum of Rupees 5-9-7.

No. 120. Gopanadaraja Chetty.—Among sundry articles supplied in 1851 on the occasion of the Princess and the Mungalavas children's "Barsa" festival, this man brought and delivered certain small vessels of bell metal for which he does not seem to have been paid according to the memorandum recorded at the time.

Rupees 55-6-1.

2. I would admit the debt.

No. 121. Sadasiva Pillay, *Brasier.*—This debt is for some brass vessels supplied, and certain articles furnished by him for the great Exhibition, but as claimant owes to the Palace more than the amount of claim, the latter is rejected.

Rupees 52-4-2.

No. 129. Ruckmaji Ghantigay.—This sum appears to be due for medicines supplied partly before and partly after the Raja's death, it having been impracticable to discharge the later debt, *viz.*, Rupees 42-10-3 owing to the arrival of the injunction of the Supreme Court. I recommend its being admitted and that Rupees 108-8-5 be now paid.

Rupees 108-8-5.

No. 142. Vencatachellam, *Oil Merchant.*—This claim arises on a supply of oil up to date of Raja's death. It should be admitted and paid.

Rupees 66-3-3.

No. 149. Vydelingam.—Sundry articles of all sorts were furnished by this man to the Choultry near the East Gate of the Fort. The balance struck for what was owing to him at the date of Raja's death is the claim. I see no objection to its payment.

Rupees 180-14-4.

No. 150. Permaul Naik.—This debt is of a character similar to the last, and should also be paid.

Rupees 155-15-7

No. 163. Mookkayee, *Curd seller.*—This woman would seem to have furnished the Hoozoor Department, where the Raja's own food was cooked, with curds of several kinds. The memorandum produced by her Agent is found to correspond with the Hoozoor people's reckoning; but neither the one nor the other shows more than that certain quantities of curds were received in the "Hoozoor" on certain dates. No mention of price is made and nothing is known of these supplies in the stores department where they ought to have been entered when received and where the price would ordinarily have been settled.

Rupees 80-7-0

I do not feel that I can conscientiously regard this, as a well established debt and would reject it.

No. 169. Alamailu.—This claim resembles the one above. I come to the same conclusion.

Rupees 369-8-0.

No. 170. Kannamma.—This, too, resembles No. 163. I dispose of it in the same manner.

Rupees 72-8-0.

No. 172. Virabadra Vailan.—This debt is said to have arisen on supplies of chatties to the Hoozoor of which the regular stores department had no information until after the Raja's death. All that is now known of it is from copies of entries made in the Hoozoor Dufters. The arrear is a large one for alleged accumulations in favor of a Chatty seller, to whom there is nothing to show that intermediate payments on account were made. I do not feel that it should be admitted.

Rupees 180-0-0

No. 173. Karatta Vailan.—The same remarks apply to this debt, which I also reject.

Rupees 350-0-0

No. 175. Vyapuri.—I find that this man is said to have supplied hog's lard for the Cattle of the Palace for use in the hot weather as medicine; but only Rupees 44-11-0 worth, found its way to the regular department and to that extent only I would admit the claim. The difference or Rupees 6-9-4 worth may have gone to the Hoozoor department, but that matter cannot now be traced.

Rupees 51-4-4

No. 186. Kristna, *Vegetable seller.*—Is said to have furnished vegetables to the Raja when he went on a pilgrimage to Trivady, but the accounts of his supply were destroyed by bandy-coots accidentally, and the entry of his debt was made roughly on his own conjectural estimate. He has died and his wife has disappeared. The man who wrote the account having been dismissed is not now to be found. I think the debt should be admitted under the circumstances, as the destruction of account was no fault of the claimant.

Rupees 80-0-0

No. 187. Gujar Ambasenker Jasey.—This debt is based on an arrangement made by the late Sirkele after the Raja's death which he was not competent to make. The claimant had contracted to supply grain to the Palace, but evaded his engagement on finding that the price of the article had suddenly risen. What was required was, however, bought in the open market and the surplus above the contract rate recovered from a balance at his credit in the Palace accounts. On an appeal to his kind consideration by the claimant, the Sirkele agreed to divide with claimant, the loss sustained by his non-fulfilment of the contract and accordingly credited him with the sum shown marginally above. I reject the claim.

Rupees 505-11-10

No. 210. Avusahiba Dimmat.—This is said to be a debt payable to the establishment designated the Avusahiba's Dimmat or Catcherri, for bamboos and leaves purchased from villages under management by it. The establishment has now no existence and the debt, even if a genuine one, is impossible of payment. Rejected.

Rupees 74-9-4

No. 224. On account of the sale of some Articles of the Stable.—This should be rejected. At a sale of carriages, &c., ordered by Mr. Forbes, Commissioner, in 1856, the Emarut *department* bought sundries of the value above shown; and, if all the departments not been abolished, it would now have had to pay to the Sirkele's Agent who sold the things, the sum appearing in the sale list. As the Emarut department ceased to exist on the 1st March 1860, I reject the claim.

Rupees 112-14-6.

No. 245. Ranga, *Bricklayer.*—This debt originates with a contract for building 20 Aukanams of stable shed in the cattle yard of Sakkaram Sahib's first wife, the late Princess. When the work was completed and was formally valued, it was found that the advances made exceeded the estimate of work done, but the Contractor was not forthcoming. Claim rejected.

Rupees 79-0-0.

No. 246. Modally Ausary, *Carpenter.*—A Contract was made with this person and four others in 1849, for the construction of six large chariots to be drawn on State occasions by elephants. Advances to the extent of Rupees 1,667-11-4½ were made, of which Rupees 1,459 and odd went to this claimant. The difference was paid in two small amounts to others who had taken part in the contract, but the chariots had not been completed when the Raja died, in 1855, though much had been done and a large quantity of materials had been collected and prepared to finish the job. These materials in the hands of the claimant cannot, of course, now be made available for other work of an ordinary character. Under these circumstances, some mediators were called together to estimate the value of the work actually executed, and of the wood and iron prepared but not used up, and the sum then settled to be due to him was as above shown. He has claimed Rupees 900 in an address recently presented to me, but I find no data on which I can make an award of that amount. I would pay him the Rupees 850-2-0 leaving him as the principal contractor, to meet the demand of the minor Contractors who have come to me for reimbursement of what they state is due to themselves.

Rupees 850-2-0.

No. 250. Sami Reddi—This item was not fit for inclusion in the list of claims. Sami Reddi has not come forward to demand any thing, and the sum set down against his name is the amount of an advance made to him for setting up a flag-staff in the Tanjore Fort. When he brought the materials required for the work, they were disapproved and rejected and discussion ensued. A statement was, it seems, taken from him as to the actual cost of what he had produced, but this and the other accounts relative to the transaction have been destroyed by rats. The claim is struck out of the list.

Rupees 358-8-0.

No. 253. Rudrakotti.—This man brought to the Palace two bullock carriages for sale, about three years before the Raja died. They were retained in the Palace without any arrangement as to their price being made. The proprietor failed to appear to adjust their value and in course of time they were considerably spoiled and are now worthless. An elephant, too, injured one of them. The department in which they were left estimated their worth after the Raja's demise, at the sum marginally shown which under the circumstances, may, I think, be fairly awarded to Rudrakotti. He, however, being dead, and no claim having been actually preferred, his representatives will be at liberty to come and make good their right to it.

Rupees 150-0-0.

No. 291. Pambayacotta.—This should not have appeared in the list. Nothing is known of the reputed claimant, in whose favor the amount marginally entered has been standing for the last twenty years. Further, advances made to him in several departments are still unadjusted, consequent on his failure to come forward. Rejected.

Rupees 103-1-2.

No. 299. Dhereyem, *Flowerman*—This case resembles the one last above. Rejected.

Rupees 66-0-0.

No. 305. Batta to persons who went to Benares.—This should not have appeared in the list. It represents numerous small sums due to individuals who were employed at different periods in conveying to Benares the bones and ashes of members of the Royal family of Tanjore. Such as they are, they mostly

Rupees 715-7-3.

fall within 50 Rupees in amount, and are therefore adjudicable by myself under the authority granted to me. But as only two individuals are as yet actual claimants before me for batta due, I need not in respect of this miscalled "claim" now trouble Government for any orders. Accordingly, it is rejected.

No. 442. Narraianasami Naik.—This man is a general dealer, but principally sold grain. About ten years before the late Raja died, he abolished a department called the Susrestásmu Sudma and blended it with the late Huzúr. At the time of abolition a list of the liabilities of the abolished establishment was prepared and these were regarded as transferred to the new or substituted department, but none of them would seem to have been paid. The list in question is forthcoming and a Gumasta who has all along belonged to the Huzur is aware that the debts noted in it still remain unadjusted. The sum noted marginally above is one of these less Rupees 54-13-0, which the creditor owes the Palace, and it seems that although application has frequently been made by the creditor, he did not get his money. The reason of the non-payment seems to have been the unwillingness of the Dárbár officers in the Hoozoor to recognize debts transferred from another department which tended to swell the list of Raja's liabilities which shortly after the transfer, was laid before the then Resident.

Rupees 644-4-11.

I think it should now be admitted and liquidated.

No. 444. Anamalay, *female servant.*—Of this amount, Rupees 38-0-6 were a transfer to the Hoozoor from the abolished department mentioned in the last case. The sum was due for cloths supplied, retained, used and never paid for. The difference Rupees 141-0-9 is the value of cloths furnished to the Palace through the Hoozoor, for which a credit was entered in Annamalay's favor, though nothing was ever paid to her. When the list of Hoozoor liabilities was prepared in 1856, this was put down as one of them. I see nothing suspicious in the matter and would pay it.

Rupees 179-1-3.

179-1-3	
38-0-6	
141-0-9	

No. 446. Kumarasami, *Tailor.*—This creditor appears to have supplied for the Raja, a State garment richly embroided and worked in gold lace now in store, of which the price was settled to be Rupees 655-15-6. Deducting, however, Rupees 16-10-0 as the value of the cloth originally given him to work upon, the sum due to him and entered as due in the list of amounts payable from the Hoozoor in 1856, is Rupees 639-5-6, which I recommend for liquidation.

Rupees 639-5-6.

No. 449. Sedambara Aucharry, *Carpenter.*—About eight years prior to the Raja's demise certain musical instruments were brought by this man to the Raja, who retained them as was his practice with anything of interest that was shown him. The Dárbár officers did not, however, pay their value and as the creditor was generally employed about the Palace in consequence of being skilful in ivory and other fine work, the discharge of the debt seems not to have been pressed for.

Rupees 166-14-10.

It should now be paid.

No. 452. Jagganada Ponda Guzar.—This creditor in common with certain other merchants, supplied cloths for transmission to the Deccan as presents to the relatives of the 17 young wives of the Raja. A list of what was bought was prepared at the time, but owing to the confusion then prevalent, no payments appear to have been made. The sum seems to be fairly due and should be discharged.

Rupees 169-1-7.

No. 453. Ramachendra Davi Guzar.—This debt has originated in the same manner as the one above and should be similarly discharged.

Rupees 173-6-0.

No. 454. Ramakristna Jassee Guzar.—This case, too, is of a similar kind and should be similarly settled.

Rupees 349-9-7.

Rupees 285-0 0. No. 455. Amareswara Taker.—

Rupees 228-0-0. No. 456. Toppe Venkatakishna Chetty.—

Rupees 322-0-9. No. 457. Toppe Subba Chetty.—
Rupees 75-0-9. No. 458. Anna Venkatasawmy.—
Rupees 115-14-4. No. 462. Bhaje Veera Chetty.—
Rupees 215-2-9. No. 463. Cumbi Alagiri Chetty.—
Rupees 185-4-0. No. 464. Subba Naik.—
Rupees 118-12-0. No. 465. Bhaji Venkatachela Chetty.—
Rupees 144-6-4. No. 467. Devanna Mannaru Chetty.—

The above nine claims arise under circumstances similar to those of **Nos. 452, 453, and 454.** The sums respectively due under them as shown marginally, should be liquidated.

No. 468. Muttusamy Vandian.—*Flower Merchant.*—This debt arises on a daily supply of "Tumba" flowers for devotional purposes. On one occasion of a festival the creditor furnished 40 Rupees worth, and an account has been kept of his daily supplies. The debt under these circumstances seems sufficiently supported. Accordingly, I recommend it for payment.

Rupees 82-15-6.

No. 473. Satvaji Sivaji Navadker.

Rupees 480-0-0

No. 475. Gangather Rakmaji.—In 1810 the Raja was so embarrassed by a deficiency of funds that, becoming clamorous for their arrears of pay, a body of his servants closed the avenues of the palace and prevented all communication with it. In this exigency the two sums noted marginally above, appear to have been advanced by these two Creditors, the first of whom got his contribution, it is understood, from an ex-head Accountant named Bhujanga Lakshmana. They seem to have abstained from demanding repayment and thus the two accounts were at their credit when in October 1856 the list of Raja's liabilities was prepared. They should be paid, I consider, and I recommend accordingly.

Rupees 409-4-8.

No. 479. Kamkashi, *female servant.*—This sum appears to be the accumulations of wages said to have been assigned by the Raja to a female, in temporary employ about the Palace; but, who she was or why the order to pay her the wages, Rupees 4 a month, was given, no one knows. Neither has she ever come forward to demand any current wages or arrears. As the sum was drawn and credited to the name above, the Sirkele seems to have deemed it requisite to regard it as a claim. I reject it.

Rupees 114-0-0.

No. 492. Pagoda of Sree Chakrapany Samy at Nallicherry.—Several Parwangis were issued by the Raja to give to this institution certain sums. They appear to have been partly ignored and partly obeyed, but however that may be, the sum noted marginally above is the balance of the several amounts of which the Parwangis would have justified the disbursement had they at once been acted upon at each issue. Under the practice observed in the Dárbár, a Parwangi lapsed when not immediately enforced and could not be revived without a special fresh order. I therefore reject this, which the Sirkele need not have included in the list of claims.

Rupees 215-3-5.

No. 494. Brahmins, on account of Puja in the name of C. Vijiabhagia Nandaji.—This of a class similar to the above, and is rejected.

Rupees 110-0-0.

No. 496. Vazarat Mob Bavu Kasee Row Inglay.—Nothing is known of this debt further than that it was due on account of arrears of pay by the grand-mother of the late Raja, Mohana Bhai Sahib, from whose accounts on her demise in 1838, it was transferred to those of Sydamba Bhai Sahib who succeeded to certain of her inheritances. During the time of the latter lady, it still remained unpaid, and appeared in the list of her liabilities prepared after her death. The original creditor is represented by his son. The retention of the item for a series of years in the accounts of the two ladies with faint hope of its liquidation, favor the justice of the claim. Its validity, too, has been practically admitted by its insertion in the Huzoor accounts. Were it a false claim, I think it would have disappeared from the Dufters when Mohana Bhai Sahib died. I would therefore admit and pay it.

Rupees 85-15-8.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, for the month of May 1860.

No. 497. Narraina Row Inglay.—This debt is similar in its origin and particulars to the one last above. I make the same recommendation.

Rupees 57-3-1.

No. 532. Tangamma Veeramma, *A Nurse.*—This female was the wet-nurse of a child born in the late Raja's Seraglio. When first employed as such, an order was issued to give her Rupees 3 *monthly*. After a period she was taken into permanent employment in the Seraglio. Although the order was in force for three years, she seems to have drawn no wages under it, and as no reason appears why an order so long in abeyance should be revived for the benefit of a person who has claimed nothing, I would reject the debt.

Rupees 106-15-11.

No. 554. S. Rajamma Bhai Ammani Raja Sahib.—This sum is stated to be due to this lady (a sister of the late Raja) who died twenty years ago, on account of "Fairdooshta" or sets of cloths which she was entitled to receive from the Wardrobe department and did not take. She died childless and was long survived by her husband. Nothing more is known of the origin of the supposed debt than that the sum appears in the *Huzúr* accounts. I would reject it.

Rupees 155-4-1.

No. 559. Durba Grass providers.—This amount is very likely payable to certain coolies who may have brought and supplied Durba Grass. Otherwise the sum would not have been set down in the Department accounts of Mohana Bhai Sahib who died in 1838. But the antiquity of the debt and the impossibility of now ascertaining to whom the money should be distributed are reasons for its rejection.

Rupees 89-15-4.

No. 593. Viswanath Bhut Davagher.—This sum is said to represent the accumulations which in the time of Sydamba Bhai Sahib, who died in 1849, were due to this claimant whose duty it was to worship the household idol in the palace. On each occasion of an offering being made by Sydamba Bhai to the idol it was understood that a fee was payable to claimaint and for the fees thus due, an account is put forward in which Rupees 150-0-4 are entered. If all this be true the fees were a "Danam" at the option of the giver. I reject the claim.

Rupees 150-0-4.

No. 594. Aroonachella *on account of the repairs of Saptastanam Palanquin*—This man repaired the Saptastanam Palanquin at Trivadi long before the demise of Sydamba Bhai Sahib in 1849, and it was ordered by that lady that a contribution on her account should be made in payment of the cost of the repairs.

Rupees 81-9-11.

I do not think a claim of this kind is valid against the estate of the late Raja, and reject it.

Rupees 89-8-6. No. 597. Pattapi Ramasawmi Pagoda.

Rupees 71-11-0. No. 598. Appuchariar for Hanumar.

Rupees 67-0-0. No. 602. Panchanathiswarasami Mantapapadi.—The sums specified in the three cases last above, represent sums which Mohana Bhai Sahib who died in 1836 is stated to have directed to be given to the three Pagodas in question.

Orders of the kind issued by the grand-mother of the late Raja 25 years ago, do not justify a claim against the estate of the late Prince. I therefore reject the three claims.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

Tanjore,
19*th April* 1860.

No. 26. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner, Tanjore, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 26th April 1860, No. 1,089.

* No. 987.
Enclosures 1 and 2.
38
18
56

In continuation of my letter* dated the 12th instant, I have the honor to submit separate memoranda relative to fifty-six claims against the Tanjore estate which have arisen in the Huzúr Pamlók and Dowlut Lushkar Pathuck departments.

Rupees	4,389	11	9¾
"	6,543	13	1
"	10,933	8	10¾
"	1,874	4	7½
"	2,084	7	1
"	3,958	11	8½

2. The aggregate amount of these claims is Rupees 10,933-8-10¾ of which, for reasons shown, I have recommended that a sum of Rupees 3,958-11-8½ be admitted and paid, as will be seen by reference to the accompanying statements.

Memorandum of 38 *claims above* 50 *Rupees which have arisen on the Huzúr Pámlók establishment.*

No. 36. KAKAJI ANNAJI.—This man had been employed for 40 years in the Raj Mahal on a salary of Rupees 10. It was desired to close the accounts of the Barsa festival of the Princess, the Raja's daughter, but delay occurred and stringent orders on the subject being still unobserved, his pay was stopped and remained under stoppage for about 10 months. Similar stoppages had been ordered on previous occasions. The sum due to him under these circumstances up to the abolition of the department in January 1857, is what is shown marginally. It should be admitted and paid.

Rupees 155-11-6.

No. 40. BAPUJI APPAJI.—This person was the Head Accountant of the Raj Treasury in which, after the Raja's death, a deficiency was discovered of Rupees 572. It has been a rule that for any deficiency of the kind whatever, in any department of the palace, a certain set of 16 Gollers should be jointly and severally responsible, and so it was arranged in this case; but their salaries did not cover the deficiency and the present claimant's pay was also impounded. No examination of the Raj Treasury had been made for many years prior to the discovery of the deficiency adverted to and there had been a succession of Head Accountants. The stoppage was the act of the Sirkele. Unless actual neglect or criminalty were established against a man who had to keep the accounts of the Treasury and no more, I apprehend this person is not justly responsible with the Gollers. I would therefore pay him the Rupees 57-10-8 entered above.

Rupees 57-10-8.

No. 44. BAVAJI ABAJI—Was Head Accountant of the Huzúr Pámlók department. The amount marginally shown is an arrear of pay due to him but stopped by the late Sirkele in order to impel him to expedite the preparation of certain lists of servants wanted by the Commissioner in October 1856. His neglect of duty seems to have led to his losing his right to pension. Not to punish him twice, the sum should now be made over to him, I think.

Rupees 52-11-8.

No. 64. GIVAJI SIVAJI.—Of this sum, composed of the arrears of the salary at Rupees 9 per mensem due to Givaji up to the abolition of the Huzúr Pámlok, Rupees 53-8-0 have been disbursed to him and on his account. The remainder Rupees 53-9-9 should now be made over to claimant.

Rupees 107-1-9.

No. 147. KRISTNA VENKETASUBBA TASOGERI.—This is an arrear of pay due and withheld on account of an embezzlement of funds, to the extent of Rupees 500 and odd, formed of offerings to the Priests of the Raj family, with the distribution of which claimant had been entrusted.

Rupees 89-7-10.

The money in hand as claimant's wages in arrear should be delivered to the Priests from whom I have an application for it.

No. 152. ZAJOJI GUNAJI TOSKAR.—Was security for certain individuals to whom paddy was distributed to be beaten and cleansed for palace purposes. They did not return the grain and a loss ensued, under estimate, of Rupees 69-2-0. Claim rejected.

Rupees 68-3-0.

Rupees 88-9-4. No. 210 DOWLAT RAU BALAVANT RAU.
Rupees 74-13-8. No. 211. DHONDABAR NANAJI.
} According to the accounts these sums are payable to these persons as salary in arrear for about twenty-four months. Nothing appears to show why the pay was withheld from payment except that the two men have long been absent from Tanjore. Claims rejected.

No. 238. PONAM APPU.—During the life time of the Raja a valuable gold idol was stolen from the Arsenal in which this man was a store-keeper. He and several others were in consequence subjected by the Raja's order to the stoppage of their pay. About twelve months subsequently, certain gold ingots were recovered and produced to the Darbár as the gold of which the idol was formed. claimant had meanwhile been serving at his post and as no actual participation in the theft appears to have been either charged or established against him, the arrear shown marginally should, I consider, be paid to him.

Rupess 50-8-4.

No. 254. MARUDE NARAINA.—This sum represents part of the claimant's share of the value of deficiency of stores in a department where he was employed as a store-keeper. Several others besides himself were held liable. At one time so many as 30,000 measures of gram were found to be wanting. The stoppage of his pay was ordered by the Raja and continued up to the date of abolition of the department in question, in January 1857. I cannot admit the claim.

Rupees 62-9-2½.

No. 257. LUKSHMI, *Mother of Marude Narayana.*—This case resembles, preceding one. I dispose of it similarly.

Rupees 78-11-3½.

No. 276. SUBBARAYPILLAI KALIVIRAYAPILLAI.—This arrear of pay is insufficient to meet an arrear of ground rent due to the Raj Claim rejected.

Rupees 87-8-2.

No. 277. MUTTUSAMI MARUDE.—Three years before the Raja's death, an order was received to stop this man's pay of Rupees 3 per mensem, and it was obeyed. He seems to have continued to serve on after the Raja's death and during the interval between the date of the stoppage order and the abolition of the department, certain payments were made to him, the balance being as marginally shown. The cause of the order which came from the Raja's Huzur is not known.

Rupees 88-13-8.

If the Raja had intended that the man should in no wise be remunerated for his services, he might have dismissed him. I would therefore admit and pay the debt.

No. 298. BALAKRISINA JETTI VASTAD.—The claimant here was the Raja's fencing master. His pay was 30 Rupees a month and the arrear is due to him for wages, but as he is indebted for money borrowed of the Dévastanam, I reject the claim.

Rupees 83-0-0.

369. MUTU KRISHTNAPPA NAIK.—This man is one of the 16 Gollers to whom reference is made in claim No. 40 and who, under the practice of the Raj, were responsible and bound to make good the defficiency in the funds severally under their custody. The claim is therefore rejected.

Rupees 101-2-6.

No. 370. SUBBA NAIK SASHAPPA NAIK.—This case resembles the one last above. Besides which an order from the Huzur directs the collection from him of Rupees 32-14-0 which it has been as yet impossible to enforce. Rejected.

Rupees 71-12-4.

No. 563. CHITAMBARAM ASARRY.—Materials have been supplied and money advances made to this man in the Emárat department which he has not come forward to adjust. This arrear of salary is a partial set off against what he owes. Rejected.

Rupees 90-11-3.

Rupees 141-4-5. No. 565. NARAYANA MESTRI.—
Rupees 152-5-4. No. 566. KARIAPPA MESTRI.— } The pay of both these men, who are brothers, appears to have been stopped in order to realize a balance alleged by the Darbár people to be due by the elder one, No. 566, for the balance of a quantity of gold bullion entrusted to him to make into a circular plate. No. 566 has quitted the country and No. 565 contends that it is unjust to render him and his pay liable for the act of his elder brother, with whom he lives dividedly.

His protest seems just. I would admit and pay his claim, Rupees 141-4-5.

No. 589. SUBRAMANI RAMALINGA.—A goldsmith employed in the Avésana department. He has not accounted for gold made over to him to be worked up and his pay has been withheld to make good the deficient amount. Rejected.

Rupees 214-6-3.

Rupees 186-3-6. No. 590. MUTUSAMI AKILANDAM.—This case is similar to the preceding one. Rejected.

No. 593. VENKATACHALAM KRISTNASARI.—This is an engraver, but the arrear is similarly due to the palace for gold supplied and not accounted for Rejected.

Rupees 160-3-8.

No. 938. BHUJANG VASUDEVA.—This person was a Gumasta in the department from which an idol of gold was stolen under the circumstances stated in claim No. 238. The reasons then given in respect of a storekeeper apply also to this claimant, to whom I would pay Rupees 96-4-1.

Rupees 96-4-1.

No. 957. SUBAJI VENKAJI—Has demised and is represented by his son. He was head wardrobe accountant in the Jamdar Khana and was subjected to stoppage of allowances in view to his expediting the closing of the accounts of the "Barsa" festival of the Raja's daughter and the children in the Seraglio. Cloths worth more than one lakh of Rupees were distributed on this occasion and every menial dependent appears to have received a cloth of some kind. The difficulty of keeping pace in the account department with distributions of masses of cloths under such circumstances must have been very great and much allowance was due to the accountants, as they were at their posts and at work. I would pay the wages at this man's credit.

Rupees 97-10-2.

No. 959. STRINIVAS NAGAJI NESHINDE.—Was Gómástá in the cow department where accidentally certain accounts were destroyed by fire. He was required to supply substitutes from any data he chose to procure and apply to that object, and was employed on the work when he died. His pay had been stopped until the completion of the job, which *was* completed by his Deputy, his own son, No. 962, claimant, whose pay was also stopped under similar reasons and circumstances. Nothing criminal in connection with the destruction of the accounts by fire, having been charged or established against him, I would admit and pay the claim.

Rupees 62-1-10.

Rupees 102-0-10. No. 962. DEVAJI SRINEVAS.—For the reasons above stated, this claim should also be admitted, and paid to the claimant.

No. 968. VENKAJI KONER.—This sum is an arrear of salary due to Venkáji who demised thirty years ago, in the reign of the late Raja's father. In the absence of heirs it has remained unpaid and should I think be now rejected.

Rupees 59-5-10.

No. 979. VIRAMMA WIFE OF VENKATASAMI.—The arrear due to this woman as now exhibited, has been reduced by the assignment of Rupees 36-5-4 to her substitute. It is further to be reduced by Rupees 11-5-0 for claimant's share of the value of deficiency in the stores, for which, in common with other store keepers, she is liable. The balance Rupees 36-6-6 should be paid to her.

Rupees 84-0-10¼

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, for the month of May 1860.

No. 981. LUKSHMI, *wife of Marude Colandvalu.*—This is an arrear of pay held back to make good claimant's share of the value of deficient stores. The claim is therefore rejected.

Rupees 69-10-0.

No. 1,204. DHANU KHODI *alias* RAMASAMI PILLAI.—
No. 1,517 VENKATACHLLA PILLAI. } The above two persons are father and son. They were hereditary servants in the palace and although entered in the pay lists as servants in the Menagerie department were elsewhere employed. The father died about a year before the Raja and was succeeded by a son named Narrainasami who was altogether dismised about four months after the Raja's demise, consequent on a general reduction of establishments. Venkatachella Pillai was also similarly dismissed, but owing to a discussion which had arisen many years previously in respect of the some trees which the Raja had caused to be cut down the pay of the father and son had both been held back from payment. The cause was, that the Raja's Darbar considered claimant No. 1,517 had instigated the proprietor of the trees and garden, when they were felled, to complain to the Resident in 1841. The service being hereditary the incumbents continued on doing their duty and hoping for better times. Both arrears should I think be paid.

Rupees 271-2-6½.

Rupees 303-3-10.

No. 1,206. GOVIND RAU GANOJI TAGATRAU.—This man who drew Rupees 3 a month, appears to have left Tanjore for the Deccan without leave of absence and in consequence was dismissed after he had been away from his duty for a long period. Deducting what was given to his substitute, the sum in the margin is due to the permanent incumbent up to date of dismssal. Nothing has been heard of him for years, but the balance being due should be paid if application be made within the time specified in a late Order by Government, viz., three months.

Rupees 54-9-9.

Rupees 160-1-5. No. 1,266. MANNARU KALAHASTI.
Rupees 161-12-3. No. 1,267. SHANMUGAM MUTTIA.
Rupees 234-12-9. No. 1,269. ARUMUGAM SUBBA PATTA.— } Under requisitions from five departments of the Raj, the wages of the above three claimants were withheld from payment in order to secure the realization of advances made to them through the medium of old metal vessels. No. 1,266 owes far more than the balance of arrear of pay. *His* claim is rejected. The case is the same with No. 1,267, and 1,269 whose claims are also rejected.

No. 1,424. VENCATACHELLA VEERAPPA.—Demised long ago. Owes money for land rent to the palace. His pay was stopped by order of the Huzúr in the Raja's life time. As no adjustment has been arrived at in respect of what he owes, the arrear of wages is cancelled and should not be paid.

Rupees 68-1-10.

No. 1,428. KRISTNA PANCHNADEE.—This man demised sometime ago. Three years before the Raja's death in 1855, his pay was ordered by the Huzúr to be stopped, no cause being assigned. After the Raja's death, his name was struck out of the Pay list. It is not known whether he had served after the issue of the stoppage order up to the date of his formal dismissal during which interval the arrear accrued. I would reject it.

Rupees 137-2-3.

No. 1,637. RAMASWMY PATTA.—This man, a goldsmith, was employed in the Avésana Mahal where jewels are made up. Before the Raja's death his pay was stopped without any reason being assigned, by an order from the Huzúr, but he continued to do his work up to the death of the Raja, shortly after which he was dismissed. The sum marginally noted is what had accumulated for wages up to that period. I would admit and pay the amount.

Rupees 160-15-3.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

Memorandum of 18 *claims above* 50 *Rupees which have arisen on the Dowlat Laskar Padak Establishment.*

No. 1. Ry Sakkaram Sahib.—This is Sakkaram Sahib's stipend payable for some odd days of January 1860, the month adopted in the Sirkele's office being the Mahomedan one according to the old practice of the Raj. Sakkaram Sahib's stipend as fixed by Government Order 5th December 1859, No. 705, commenced to have effect on the 1st February last and there seems a disinclination on the part of certain members of the family and others to send for and draw the balance of the stipend due under the old system. If, however, it be not drawn, much trouble will be created in the sequel by applications for old dues when the Sirkele's office has ceased to exist. It is well therefore to bring such sums into this list of liabilities so that they may appear in the local Gazette for the prescribed period of 3 months and be irrecoverable and forfeited, if, at its expiration, they have not been drawn. Accordingly it is to be paid.

Rupees 125-0 0.

Rupees 53-10-8. No. 2. Narayana Rau Hybat Rau,

Rupees 53-10-8. No. 4. Kanday Rau Shaw Rau.

Rupees 122-8-0. No. 117. Ramachendrarow Esavantrow Surve.

Rupees 122-8-0. No. 118. Manaji Mesji Mohite.

No. 119. Prataparudra Manarow Ingle.—These five cases are analegous to that above of Sakkaram Sahib and should be similarly treated.

Rupees 122-8-0.

No. 3. Abaji Ramachendra Rau.—Against this man there stands a debt, for advances, of Rupees 75-6-0 which being deducted from the sum due to him as marginally shown, the balance of Rupees 53-10-8 should be paid.

Rupees 129-0-8.

No. 10. Mankoji Ramachendra Rau Gadhay.—This person's father, Ramachendra Rau, about seven years ago sold a house to the late Raja stipulating that he would secure the consent to the sale of two cousins who had shares in the property. Accordingly, Rupees 2,231-12-0 were paid to Ramachendra Rau who at that time was in the receipt of Rupees 45 as a stipend from the palace. The two cousins, however, threw obstacles in the way of yielding possession of the house and the Raja failing to get it into his own hands or the recover the money paid to Ramachendra Rau, ordered the stoppage of the latter's salary. Under the effect of this step, there has accumulated the sum marginally shown above. But, as the total funds now available exceed the amount paid for the house, the difference or Rupees 237-13-2 should be disbursed to Mankoji Gadhay, to whom, on application, the title deed executed by his father in favor of the Raja, may be delivered.

Rupees 2,469-9-2.

Rs.	2,469-9-2.
	2,231-12-0.
	237-13-2.

No. 12. Yeshwant Rau Zadhow—As manager of the gardens in the small fort up to the date of the Raja's demise, this person had become indebted to the Raj in a sum of Rupees 44-8-1 for advances which he had made from funds belonging to the garden establishment. Deducting that amount from the salary now payable to him, the difference Rupees 23 may be paid.

Rupees 67-8-1.

No. 13. Govindarau Nunbalkar.—For advances made to his father before the demise of the Raja, amounting to Rupees 160-1-1, this person's salary of Rupees 30 was stopped prior to my taking charge of the Residency, in January 1857. After a period I learnt that his mother Apparúpa Bhai had been "dismissed" and that the stipend of Rupees 40 which she had drawn, had been withheld from her for many months. The account of the matter which I got from the Residency Sarishtadar, Vencat Ráu, was so unsatisfactory and so suspicious, that feeling it was beyond the power of an Officer in the position of Resident so severely to punish what was stated to be "misconduct," that I could secure no description of, I ordered her to be treated as if no action had been taken

Rupees 683-0-0.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department, for the month of May 1860.

against her. From that period this claimant's stipend was again issued to him, though without orders from me. Having, however, up to that time been under stoppage, as was alleged to recover Rupees 160-1-1, the stoppage monthly of Rupees 30 had accumulated to the amount marginally shown. There was no doubt something spiteful at the bottom of all this on the part of the late Sirkele or, as he was a mere puppet, of the party who moved him. After all, the present Sirkele was unable to deduct the sum due and pay back the difference, as the funds in the Raj Treasury had intermediately been placed under seal, or at least such was the excuse given for non-refund, and no complaint was ever made to me of non-payment.

At present, I recommend that the difference *viz.* Rupees 522-14-11 be paid to the claimant.

No. 21. Pataprudra Babu Rau Ingle.—The father of this person whilst manager of the gardens in the little fort, incurred a liability to the Raj by taking advances from the funds of the establishment. These, in all probability, would have been presented to him at one time or the other by the Raja (to whom he was related) had the Raja lived. But, as no order in his favor had been issued, his name was noted as the Raja's debtor. Rupees 560-3-2 is the portion of the father's liability which this claimant, as one of two sons, has been saddled with. Deducting that sum from the amount at his credit, the difference Rupees 20-5-6 should be paid to him.

Rupees 580-8-8.

No. 22. Bhanagoji Baburau Ingle.—This person is the brother referred to in my statement of the last case above. The circumstances being the same and the sum in deposit similar, I make the same recommendation.

Rupees 580-8-8.

No. 45. Sivaji Mallarji Gadi.—The sum shown marginally is the accumulated amount of the stoppage for about 40 months of this person's stipend of Rupees 15. He is one of the two co-proprietors who refused to sell to the Raja the house to which I have adverted in case No. 10. Strange to say, however, such stoppage commenced only *after* the Raja's demise and must have been made under the Sirkele's own order or by order of the person who moved him, for he was a mere puppet. No complaint on the subject ever reached me.

Rupees 566-8-0.

The sum thus accumulated Rupees 566-8-0 should now be paid to the claimant.

No. 87. Subarow Govindaran Gauday.—Subarow, it appears, was incarcerated for a period of seven years in the jail at Combaconum commencing prior to the death of the Raja. When he was originally incarcerated 40 Rupees were at his credit for arrears of stipend. On his release the Darbar officers re-entered his name in the Palace Lists, but the Raja directed that no stipend should be paid to him. Owing, however, to the entry of his name, certain sums appeared to be at his credit and these form the amount marginally noted. Nothing seems due to him under these circumstances except the 40 Rupees payable before he was sent to jail which I would disburse to his representative, an adopted son.

Rupees 178-14-3.

No. 92. Ry Jeevaji Govindaran Mohite.—This person was a brother-in-law of the Raja. He demised early in 1857. The amount in the margin is an arrear of stipend due to him up to the date of his demise, but he was largely indebted to the Raj on account of the money rent of some land which he had for years failed to discharge.

Rupees 312-1-0.

Under such circumstances I do not recommend that this sum be admitted.

No. 12. Pambaia Naik.—Personally, this man is not a claimant. His name has been inserted in the list of persons to whom sums are due by this, the Dowlat Lasker Padak department; but it appears that his pay, Rupees 3 a month, was held back from him in consequence of an injunction from the department of the Avusabiba's Dumat or Revenue Catcherri of the late Raja, to which under such circumstances, it is to be inferred, Pambaia Naik was in some way indebted. This inference

Rupees 228-2-3.

and the fact of his not coming forward to demand the arrear, cause me to decline payment of it.

Rupees 97-2-8.

No. 56. ANNU NAIK.—This case is similar to that above.

No. 71. VAIAPURI NAIK.—This man was security for persons to whom grain belonging to the Mangalavas department was given to be husked. The grain was not restored and its value being irrecoverable, Vaiapuri Naik's pay in arrears becomes liable and should not be disbursed. Rejected.

Rupees 51-0-4.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

TANJORE,
26th April 1860.

Statement of sums recommended for payment subject to approval by Government on account of 38 claims above 50 Rupees on the Huzúr Pamlok Establishment.

No.	No. of claim.	Name of the claimant.	Amount of claim. R.	A.	P.	Amount awarded. R.	A.	P.	Remarks.
1	36	Cakóji Annaji	155	11	6	155	11	6	
2	40	Bapuji Appaji	57	10	8	57	10	8	
3	44	Banaji Abaji	52	11	8	52	11	8	
4	64	Jivaji Sivaji	107	1	9	53	9	9	
5	147	Kristna Vencatasuba Tasgeri	89	7	10	89	7	10	Payable to certain priests.
6	152	Zajoji Gunaji Toarsker	68	3	0				Rejected.
7	210	Dowlat Rau Balavanta Rau	88	9	4	...	...	...	Do.
8	211	Dhóndabá Nanaji...	74	13	8				
9	238	Ponam Appú	50	8	4	50	8	4	
10	254	Marudé Naraina	62	9	2½	...	...	...	Do.
11	257	Lakshmi, mother of Marudé Naraina ...	78	14	3½	...	...	...	Do.
12	276	Subaraya Pillé Calveroya Pillé	87	8	2	...	...	...	Do.
13	277	Muttusami Marudé	88	13	8	88	13	8	
14	298	Balakristna Jetti Vastad...	83	0	0	...	...	...	Do.
15	369	Muttukristnappa Naik	101	2	6	...	...	...	Do.
16	370	Subba Naik Séshappa Naik	74	12	4	...	...	...	Do.
17	563	Chitambaram Ausary	90	11	3	...	...	...	Do.
18	565	Naraina Méstri	141	4	5	141	4	5	
19	566	Kariappa Méstri	152	5	4	...	...	...	Do.
20	589	Subaramania Ramalinga	214	6	3	...	...	...	Do.
21	590	Muttusami Akelandam	186	3	6	...	...	...	Do.
22	593	Venkatachellam Kristnacharry	160	3	8	...	...	...	Do.
23	938	Bhujanga Vasudéva	96	4	1	96	4	1	
24	957	Subbaji Venkaji	97	10	2	97	10	2	
25	959	Srinivas Nagoji Nisindé	62	1	10	62	1	10	
26	962	Dévaji Sreenivás	102	0	10	102	0	10	
27	968	Venkaji Konair	59	5	10	...	...	...	Do.
28	979	Viramma, wife of Venkatasami	84	0	10¼	36	6	6	
29	981	Lakshmi, wife of Marudé Colondavélu...	69	10	0	...	...	...	Do.
30	1,024	Danakodi alias Ramasami Pillé... ...	271	2	6½	271	2	6½	
31	1,517	Venkatachela Pillé	303	3	10	303	3	10	
32	1,206	Govind Rau Gunaji Tagat Rau	54	9	9	54	9	9	
33	1,266	Mannarú Kalahasti	160	1	5	...	...	...	Do.
34	1,267	Shamuga Muttia...	161	12	3	...	...	...	Do.
35	1,269	Arumugam Subba Patta	234	12	9	...	...	...	Do.
36	1,424	Venkatachelam Veerappa	68	1	10	...	...	...	Do.
37	1,428	Kristna Panchanadi	137	2	3	...	...	...	Do.
38	1,637	Ramasami Patta	160	15	3	160	15	3	
			4,389	11	9¾	1874	4	7½	

TANJORE, COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
26th April 1860.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

Statement of sums recommended for payment, subject to approval by Government on account of 18 *claims on the Dowlat Lushkur Pattack Department of the late Raj.*

No.	No. of the claim.	Name of the claimant.	Amount of claim. R.	A.	P.	Amount awarded. R.	A.	P.	Remarks.
1	12	Pambia Naik	228	2	3	...	...	...	Rejected.
2	56	Annú Naik	97	2	8	...	...	...	Do.
3	71	Viapuri Naik	51	0	4	...	...	...	Do.
4	1	Saccarám Sahib	125	0	0	125	0	0	
5	2	Narraina Ráu Hybatráu	53	10	8	53	10	8	
6	4	Kanmdé Ráu Shama Ráu	53	10	8	53	10	8	
7	117	Ramachendra Ráu Esavant Ráu Súrvé	122	8	0	122	8	0	
8	118	Mannaji Mesji Mohité	122	8	0	122	8	0	
9	119	Prataparudra Manaráu Inglé	122	8	0	122	8	0	
10	3	Abaji Ramachendra Ráu	129	0	8	53	10	8	
11	10	Mankoji Ramachendra Ráu Gádé	2,469	9	2	237	13	2	
12	12	Yesavant Ráu Zadow	67	8	1	23	0	0	
13	13	Govinda Ráu Nimbalker	683	0	0	522	14	11	
14	21	Prataparudra Babérau Inglé	580	8	8	20	5	6	
15	22	Bhangoji Babé Ráu Inglé	580	8	8	20	5	6	
16	45	Sivaji Mallarji Gaudé	566	8	0	566	8	0	
17	87	Subba Ráu Govinda Ráu Gadé...	178	14	3	40	0	0	
18	92	Jeevaji Govind Ráu Mohité	312	1	0	...	...	...	Do.
			6,543	13	1	2,084	7	1	

TANJORE, COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
26th April 1860.

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

Order of Government, dated 1st May 1860, No. 279.*

No. 27. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner at Tanjore, to THOMAS PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 1st May 1860, No. 1,092.

I have the honor to reply to the three questions contained in the Proceedings of Government, dated the 1st instant, No 279, relative to claims against the Estate of the late Raja of Tanjore.

2. All such additions as were made under the requisition of Mr. H. Forbes, form part of the claims embodied in the list laid before that gentleman by the late Sirkele and are disposed of, whether by admission or rejection, in the suggestions which I have submitted to the Government in my separate memoranda.

Paragraph 1.

3. The claim for Rupees 23,576 has been preferred to myself direct, by one Ramanada Bhut, a Soucar of considerable wealth, who was very generally employed by the late Raja and his Darbár in supplying Hundies and effecting purchases of different kinds. On one occasion he seems to have been instructed to buy for the Raja, a large upstair house on the bank of the Vettaur river and received in advance, as I recollect, 6,000 Rupees in ready money, to open the transaction. This done he himself obtained possession of the property and now retains it, but is most desirous to transfer it to those by whom the Raja may be represented. He demands, however, the payment with interest of the difference between what he received from the Darbár and what he disbursed in securing the property; and it is this difference which constitutes his claim.

Paragraph 2.

4. The house is useless for any purpose connected with the comfort of the relatives of the late Prince and is not in good repair.

5. As, however, it had been the object of the Residents, Mr. Bishop and Mr. H. Forbes, to check the system of purchasing houses on which the late Raja was so bent; and as the Sirkele had been warned to oppose it, Ramanada Bhut's claim was not accepted as such by the late

*Entered in Proceedings 10th May 1860.

Sirkele when the list of claims was under preparation. In fact, as I have understood, Ramanada Bhut was told, that as he had contravened the injunction of the Resident by mixing himself up in this purchase he must stand by the consequences; that the Resident would not aid him in the recovery of what he deems to be his dues. The search for the accounts connected with the advance of Rupees 6,000 was in progress when I finished my examination of the claims in the Sirkele's list, and is still being pursued.

6. In the ten or twelve days preceding the 22nd ultimo, sixty-eight claims had personally been preferred to me which are at present awaiting disposal. The amount involved in them is Rupees 79,371-6-11; but I apprehend it will become my duty to reject the two principal ones. Besides these, there is a batch of trifling claims, about 300 in number, arising out of the non-payment for a month and a broken period of a month in most cases, of the wages in grain due to minor servants whom the late Sirkele left in arrear to that extent when the Dowlut Pamloke establishment was abolished.

Paragraph 3.

No. 59. *Rs.* 23,850
„ 68. „ 38,198
62,048

7. The grain payments present no difficulty. Their adjustment is a mere matter of examination of the pay list and of a statement founded thereon.

8. Adverting, however, to the late period at which most of the sixty-eight claims, above referred to, reached me, it appears obvious that unless a date be now fixed for their presentation, I may be indefinitely detained at Tanjore. The notice of my preparedness to receive claims has for some weeks past been regularly entered in the local Gazette, and as the individuals interested in their adjustment are in or near Tanjore, there is no reason why such delay should have occurred in addressing me. I would therefore submit for consideration by Government, whether it is not desirable to fix a period beyond which no claims shall be accepted for registry; and if the proposal be approved, I would specify the 10th proximo as the latest date for their presentation.

No. 28.

ORDER THEREON, 18th May 1860, No. 316.

1. By the Orders of Government, 21st February 1860, No. 90, the Commissioner at Tanjore was directed to give his immediate attention to ascertain the nature and extent of the debts due by the late Rájá.

2. In his letter of 14th March last, the Commissioner brought to notice, that the claims against the Rájá were in several instances of very petty amount, and proposed that he should be authorized to pass at once for payment, all under Rupees 50, which he might on investigation find to be well founded. To this course the Government assented.

Order 23rd March 1860, *No.* 178.

3. With his letter of the 11th April, the Commissioner has submitted a Statement of claims above 50 Rupees each, which he had investigated, and a Memorandum shewing his decision in each case and the grounds of it.

From Commissioner 11th April 1860, *No.* 983.

4. The number of these claims which have been enquired into is 48, the amount claimed Rupees 8,13,986. Of these 16 have been rejected and 32 admitted. The aggregate amount awarded under these 32 claims is Rupees 1,11,509-12-6½.

5. Mr. Phillips explains that, subsequently to the death of the Rájá, and while all the members of the family were united in their desire to secure the succession to the Rāj for his daughter, the affairs of the Durbar were in most instances honestly and regularly conducted. Among other measures a list of the pecuniary liabilities of the deceased Prince was prepared in the Sirkele's Department. Additions to it were made often. Mr. H. Forbes had been appointed Commissioner, but these had mostly reference to claims arising on the supply, loan, or deposit, of articles of which the prices had not been definitely fixed at the date of the Rájá's demise. This Statement was closed in October 1856; but it should be understood that its preparation must have been conducted independently of the individual members of the Rāj family, whose names appear in it as creditors for large amounts.

6. The old Mahratta Dufters no doubt support these amounts, and the sums which Mr. Phillips has recommended for payment may, he says, be regarded as due to the creditors, if the Government are satisfied that the circumstances under which the debts have originated, call for discharge by the State, in the absence of a successor to the Rāj.

7. The Commissioner proceeds to explain generally the manner, and mode of action on the part of the Rájá, under which these claims accrued. Many of them can hardly be regarded as debts in the ordinary acceptation of the term. They were not for value received, but rather of the nature of presents, not actually made, but of which the amount or value was credited in account to the intended donee. In however making a final settlement of Tanjore affairs, the Government are of opinion that such claim should be admitted.

8. The aggregate number of claims entered in the lists prepared by the Sirkele is 602, embracing a sum of Rupees 8,30,068-1-2; of these there are,

Above 50 Rupees..... 114 = Rupees 8,25,060
Below 50 „ ..... 488 = „ 5,007

These last Mr. Phillips is himself disposing of, under the authority given him by the Order of 23rd March last.

9. The 48 claims entered in the statement and memorandum which accompanied the Commissioner's letter belong to the 1st class. They include with one* exception, all the debts standing against the Rájá in the Sirkele's list of which the amounts respectively exceed Rupees 1,000.

* *This exception is partially noticed in Mr. Phillip's subsequent letter of 1st May.*

10. The heavier of these claims will, under the instructions of the Government of India, 8th September 1856, No. 4,644, paragraph 5, have to be reported to them, with the recommendations of this Government in respect to them, before they are disposed of. There are however 14, in each of which the award is below Rupees 150. These the Commissioner will discharge at once.

11. Besides the 602 claims borne in the Sirkele's lists, there are as many as 2,976 others originating in arrears of stipend, salary and wages from periods prior and subsequent to the Rájá's death up to the dates of the abolition in 1857, of the three minor establishments. These 2,976 claims amount to Rupees 36,591. Of these 86 aggregating Rupees 15,615, are each in excess of Rupees 50. The remaining 2,890, amounting collectively to Rupees 20,976, will be at once settled by Mr. Phillips under the power given him.

Dowlut Pamloke.
Hoozoor Pamloke.
Dowlut Lushker Puttack.

12. From Mr. Phillips' letter of 12th April 1860, it seems that of the above 2,976 claims, 992 belong to the Dowlut Pamloke, 956 are for sums respectively below Rupees 50, and these Mr. Phillips has settled at an aggregate disbursement of Rupees 6,995-1-10. Two above Rupees 50, were settled by the Sirkele, and the Commissioner reports on the remaining 34 above that amount.

From Commissioner 12th April 1860, *No.* 987. *Dowlut Pamloke.*

13. The total of all these 34 claims is Rupees 4,936-1-7. Mr. Phillips has rejected 19 and allowed 15, the aggregate amount awarded is Rupees 1,314-8-6. The highest award is for Rupees 192-2-7, the lowest Rupees 17-0-8. These will be paid at once.

14. The similar claims in the Hoozoor Pamloke and Dowlut Lushker Puttack Departments are as per margin.* Those above Rupees 50 (increased however to 56 in number), of an aggregate amount of Rupees 10,933-8-10¾, have since been reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of the 26th ultimo. He has allowed 31 at an aggregate sum of Rupees 3,958-11-8½, which should be paid at once.

	Above Rs. 50.	*Below Rs.* 50.
* *Hoozoor Pamloke.* ...	37	1,633
Dowlut Lushker Puttack...	13	301
	50	1,934

15. Above in paragraph 4, it was mentioned that of 114 claims above Rupees 50 on the Sirkele's lists, 48 were reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of 11th April. In his letter of the 19th ultimo, the Commissioner reports on 61 more of the same class, the remaining 5 having apparently been settled by the Sirkele.

16. These 61 claims amount in the aggregate to Rupees 12,227-13-6. Twenty-five have been rejected and thirty-six admitted, involving a disbursement of Rupees 7,499-3-2. Of the thirty-six allowed, twelve are for sums below Rupees 100 each. These may be at once disbursed.

17. Thus all the claims, 602, entered in the Sirkele's lists have been reported on or disposed of. It seemed however doubtful whether the additions* made after Mr. Forbes had been appointed Commissioner were included in these lists, and a reference was made to Mr. Phillips on that and other points.

* *Vide Supra paragraph* 5.

18. It appears from Mr. Phillips' answer of the 1st May, that Mr. Forbes' additions *are* entered in the Sirkele's lists, and are among those which have been disposed of in the Commissioner's letters of 11th and 19th April. Mr. Phillips likewise gives some account of the claim for Rupees 23,576 alluded to in paragraph 17 of his letter of 11th April and yet only partially investigated.

Supra paragraph 9.

19. In respect to the enquiry whether there were yet any more claims to be gone into, Mr. Phillips, paragraphs 6 and 7, says, that in the 10 or 12 days preceding the 22nd ultimo, 68 claims had personally been preferred to him, which are at present awaiting disposal. The amount involved in them is Rupees 79,371-6-11, but he apprehends it will become his duty to reject the two principal ones. Besides these, there is a batch of trifling claims, about 300 in number, arising out of the non-payment for a month and a broken period of a month in most cases, of the wages in grain due to minor servants whom the late Sirkele left in arrear to that extent when the Dowlut Pamlake establishment was abolished. The grain payments present no difficulty. Their adjustment is a mere matter of examination of the pay list and of a statement founded thereon.

	Rupees
No. 59 ...	23,850
„ 68 ...	38,198
	62,048

21. He then continues: "adverting however, to the late period at which most of the 68 "claims above referred to, reached me, it appears obvious that unless a date be now fixed for "their presentation, I may be indefinitely detained at Tanjore. The notice of my preparedness to "receive claims has for some weeks past been regularly entered in the Local Gazette, and as the "individuals interested in their adjustment are in or near Tanjore, there is no reason why such "delay should have occurred in addressing me. I would therefore submit for consideration by "Government whether it is not desirable to fix a period beyond which no claims shall be accepted "for registry, and if the proposal be approved, I would specify the 10th proximo, as the latest "date for their presentation."

22. Under these circumstances the Government resolve—

1st.—That the claims above Rupees 50, each, but still of a trifling amount, which have been reported on by the Commissioner and are noticed above in paragraphs 10, 13, 14, 16, of this Order, be paid at once.

2nd.—That the Commissioner proceed as quickly as possible with the investigation and settlement within the limit laid down by the Order of 23rd March last, of all claims yet remaining for enquiry, and that the period which he has suggested, the 10th proximo, as that within which all claims must be registered, be adopted. Mr. Phillips will cause this to be made generally known in Tanjore and its vicinity and published in the District Gazette.

3rd.—That on the whole enquiry terminating, the reports of the Commissioner on the larger claims or those which he has not been or may not be authorized to discharge, be forwarded with the views of this Government for the Orders of the Government of India.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

" claims above referred to, reached me, it appears obvious that unless a date be n
" their presentation, I may be indefinitely detained at Tanjore. The notice of my pr
" receive claims has for some weeks past been regularly entered in the Local Gazett
" individuals interested in their adjustment are in or near Tanjore, there is no reaso
" delay should have occurred in addressing me. I would therefore submit for cons
" Government whether it is not desirable to fix a period beyond which no claims shall
" for registry, and if the proposal be approved, I would specify the 10th proximo, a
" date for their presentation."

22. Under these circumstances the Government resolve—

1st.—That the claims above Rupees 50, each, but still of a trifling amount, been reported on by the Commissioner and are noticed above in paragraphs 10, I this Order, be paid at once.

2nd.—That the Commissioner proceed as quickly as possible with the inves settlement within the limit laid down by the Order of 23rd March last, of all claims ing for enquiry, and that the period which he has suggested, the 10th proximo, a which all claims must be registered, be adopted. Mr. Phillips will cause this to be rally known in Tanjore and its vicinity and published in the District Gazette.

3rd.—That on the whole enquiry terminating, the reports of the Commissio larger claims or those which he has not been or may not be authorized to dischar warded with the views of this Government for the Orders of the Government of India.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT
Chief S

Tanjore
21 July 60

14

My dear Pycroft

Here you let him
People allow in my
Room as below, please?

Le Sahebs last No 187.
No 505-11-10. Soojee
ambassenker Joey's
claim; the word "surplus"
should be "excess" and
"sale" the fourth word
following should be "rate".
I said my own notes have
been erroneously copied here &
after that the error also appears
in what has come to you from
Kumbakonam

I mention
to your notice
attention to ascertain the
nature and extent of the
debts due by the late Raja.
2— On his letter of 14th
March last, the Commis-
sioner brought to notice,
that the claims against
the Raja were in several
instances of very petty
amount, and proposed
that he should be au-
thorized to pass at
once for payment, all
under Rupees 50, which
he

21. He then continues: "adverting however, to the late period at wh
"claims above referred to, reached me, it appears obvious that unless a date
"their presentation, I may be indefinitely detained at Tanjore. The notice of
"receive claims has for some weeks past been regularly entered in the Local
"individuals interested in their adjustment are in or near Tanjore, there is no
"delay should have occurred in addressing me. I would therefore submit fo
"Government whether it is not desirable to fix a period beyond which no claim
"for registry, and if the proposal be approved, I would specify the 10th prox
"date for their presentation."

22. Under these circumstances the Government resolve—

1st.—That the claims above Rupees 50, each, but still of a trifling am
been reported on by the Commissioner and are noticed above in paragraph
this Order, be paid at once.

2nd.—That the Commissioner proceed as quickly as possible with the
settlement within the limit laid down by the Order of 23rd March last, of all c
ing for enquiry, and that the period which he has suggested, the 10th proxi
which all claims must be registered, be adopted. Mr. Phillips will cause this
rally known in Tanjore and its vicinity and published in the District Gazette.

3rd.—That on the whole enquiry terminating, the reports of the Com
larger claims or those which he has not been or may not be authorized to
warded with the views of this Government for the Orders of the Government o

(Signed) T. PYC

Political Department.

Memorandum.

Re the following letters.—

~~From the Commissioner, Tanjore~~ (Here enter No^s 1, 12 & 19 and 19 & 20 April 1860 Nos 983 987 & 1029)
26 April No 1089 —

Order of Govt 1 May 1860 - No 279 -
From Commissioner 1 May 1860 -

1 By the orders of Govt^r
21 February 1860 Political Dep^t
No 90, the Commissioner
at Tanjore was directed
to give his immediate
attention to ascertain the
nature and extent of the
debts due by the late Raja.
2 In his letter of 14th
March last, the Commis-
sioner brought to notice,
that the claims against
the Raja were in several
instances of very petty
amount, and proposed
that he should be au-
thorized to pass at
once for payment, all
under Rupees 50, which
he

Order. 26th March 1860. No 178.

From Com 11 April/60
No 903.

he might on i=
=tion find to be
To this course
=ment assen
Which his
the 11th April the
=sioner has subm
statement of
Rs. each, which h
investigated, and
Memo showing his
=cision in each case
the grounds of it.—

4.— The number of
these claims which h
been inquired into is
the amount claimed
Rs. 8,13,906. Of these 16
have been rejected, an
32 admitted. The aggr
=gate amount awarded
under these 32 claims
is Rs. 1,11,509-12-6½.—

5.— Of the claims
rejected, those of the
largest amount are
on account of certain
Choultries. These Choul
=tries have been taken
charge of by Govt, who
have

15 17

Hamd

In the matter of the
claim referred to in this
Note, there is in Phil.
-lips' Hamd the word
"surplus," but not "sale."
"Rate" is correctly given.
If considered necessary,
the word "surplus" may
be altered into "excess," as
desired by Mr Phillips, tho'
it will make no great
difference.

C.R.S.
26 July/60.

No — Mr Worth
Write Letter
JP

e over
ment
Revenue
ion VI
uffici=
paud
the pr=
ueed,
are such
distan=
under
uces to
would
y money
ject to
other.—

6.— Mr Phillips ex=
=plains that, subse=
=quently to the death
of the Raja, and while
all the Members of the
family were united
in their desire to se=
=cure the succession
to the Raj for his daugh=
=ter, the affairs of the
Durbar were in most
instances honestly and
regularly conducted.
Among other measures

a list of the pecuniary liabilities of the deceased Prince was prepared by the Serkele's Department. Additions to it were made after Mr. H. Forbes had been appointed Commissioner, but these had mostly reference to claims arising on the supply, loan, or deposit of articles of which the prices had not been definitely fixed at the date of the Rajah's demise. This statement was closed in October 1856, but it should be understood by the Govt., that its preparation must have been conducted independently of the individual members of the Raj family whose names appear in it as creditors for large amounts.

7.- The old Mahratta Duftars no doubt support these amounts

(and

amounts respectively exceed Rupees 1,000.—

11.- The heavier of these claims will, under the instructions of the Govt. of India, 8 Sep. 1856. No 4,044 p. 5 have to be reported to them, with the recommendations of this Govt. in respect to them before they are disposed of. There are however 114 in each of which the award is below Rs. 150. These had better be discharged at once.

12. Besides the 602 claims borne in the Serkele's lists, there are as many as 2,976 others originating in arrears of stipend, salary and wages from periods prior and subsequent to the Rajah's death up to the dates of the abolition in 1857 of the three minor establishments. These 2976 claims amount to Rupees 36,591. Of these

Dowlut Pamloke —
Hoojoo Pamloke —
Dowlut Sunkun Puttuck

From Commissioner
12 April – 1860 No
Dowlut Pamboke

them 86, aggregating
Rs: 15,615, are each
exceed of Rs: 50. The
maining 2090, amount
ing collectively to
2976, will be about
settled by Mr. Phillips
under the power given
him.–

13.– From Mr. Phillips's letter
of 12th April 1860, it
seems that of the above
2976, claims, 992 belong
to the Dowlut Pamboke
956 are for sums re-
spectively below Rs. 50
and these Mr. Phillips
has settled at an ag-
gregate disbursement
of Rs: 6995–1–10. Two
above Rs: 50 were settled
by the Sirkek – and the
Commissioner reports
on the remaining 314
above that amount.

14. The total of all
these 314 claims is Rs
4936–1–7. Mr. Phillips
has rejected 19 – and
allowed

and the sums which
he has recommended
for payment may be
regarded as due to the
debtors, if the Govt. are
satisfied that the cir-
cumstances under
which the debts have
originated, call for
discharge by the State,
in the absence of a
successor to the Raja.

2. The Commissioner
proceeds to explain
generally the manner,
and mode of action
on the part of the Raja,
under which these claims
accrued. Many of
them can hardly be
regarded as debts in
the ordinary accepta-
tion of the term – They
were not for value re-
ceived – but rather of
the nature of presents,
not actually made,
but of which the a-
mount or value was
credited in account to
the

the intended donee.
In however making
a final settlement of
Tanjore affairs, the Go
may not be indisposed
to admit them.—

9.— The aggregate num
=ber of claims entered
in the lists prepared by the
Sirkels is 602 rumbracing
a sum of R. 8,30,068-1-2-

Of these Above 50 Rs-114 = amounting to Rs: 8,25,060—
Below 50 Rs-488 = —"—"— 5,007—

These last Mr. Phillips
is himself disposing of
under the authority con
=ferr'd him by the order
of 23rd. March last.—

10. The 48 claims en
=tered in the statement
and Memo: which ac
=companied the Com
=missioner's letter belong
to the first class. They
include, with one ex
=ception, all the debts
standing against the
Rajah in the Sirkels
lists of which the
amounts

	about Rupees	Rupees
Hoozoor Pauloke	37.	1823
Dowlut Sirishtar Pathuck.	13	341
A	50.	1934

A. These (increased however to 56 in number) of an aggregate amount of R. 10,933-8-10¾ - have been reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of the 26 ult. - he has allowed 31 of an aggregate value of R 3958. 12. 2½ which had better be paid at once —

allowed 15 - the aggre
=gate amount awarded
is Rs: 1,314-8-6. The high
=est award is for Rupees
192-2-7 the lowest Rs: 17-"-8.
These had better be paid
at once.—

15. The similar claims
in the Hoozoor Pauloke
and Dowlut Sirishtar
Pathuck Departments
have yet to be settled
or reported on.—

16. Above in para: 4
it was mentioned that
of 114 claims above Rs:
50 on the Sirkels lists,
48 were reported on by
Mr. Phillips in his letter
of 8th. April. In his let
=ter of the 19th. ultimo
the Commissioner re
=ports on 61 more of the
same class - the remain
=ing 5 having ap
=parently been settled
by the Sirkels.—

17. These 61, claims
amount in the ag
=gregate to Rs. 12,227-13-6.

Twenty

+ Note. This exception is partially noticed in Mr Phillips subsequent letter of 1 May.

Twenty five have been rejected and thirty-six admitted, involving a disbursement of Rs. 7499-3-2. Of the thirty-six allowed, twelve are for sums below Rs. 100 each- these I think, may be dis-bursed at once.-

8. Thus all the claims -602- entered in the Serkeles lists have been reported on, dis-posed of- I do not however quite under-stand whether the additions made by Lt. Forbes and alluded to in para: 4 of Mr. Phillips's letter of the 11th Ultimo, are included in these lists- and whether thus in fact all the debts above Rupees 50 have been reported on.-

---

9. Since the above was written I have referred to Mr. Phillips on the above and other points- and submit his answer 1st May- It seems from this that Mr. Forbes' assertions are entered in the Serkeles lists and are among those which have been dis-posed of in the Commis-sioner's letters of 11th and 19th April. Mr. Phillips likewise gives some account of the claim for Rupees 23,576 alluded to in para: of his letter of 8th April and yet only partially investigated.-

10.- In respect to my inquiry whether there were yet any more claims to be gone into Mr. Phil-lips, paras: 6&7 says: In the 10 or 12 days preceding the 22d Ult-imo, sixty eight claims had person-ally been preferred to

Rs.
No. 59 = 23,850.
" 68 = 38,198.
62,048.

to me which are
present, awaiting
-postal. The amount
-volves in them is
-pees 79,377-6-11; but
apprehend it will
-come my duty to
-pute the two prin
ones. Besides these,
is a batch of fif
claims, about
number, arising
of the non-payme
for a month and
two then period of
month in most
of the wages in Gra
due to minor
whom the late
left in arrear
extent when
but Pandara
rent was abol
The Grain
present no
their adjustment
the matter of
mation of the
and of a statute

form

22

founded thereon."—

21.- He then continues:-

"Adverting, however, to the late period at which most of the sixty-eight claims above referred to, reached me, it appears obvious that unless a date be now fixed for their presentation, I may be indefinitely detained at Tanjore. The Notice of my preparedness to receive claims has for some weeks past been regularly entered in the local Gazette, and as the individuals interested in their adjustment are in or near Tanjore, & there is no reason why such delay should have occurred in addressing me. I would therefore submit for consideration by Govt. whether it is not desirable to fix a period beyond which no claims

shall

shall be accepted for registry; and if the proposal be approved, I would specify the 10th Proximo, as the latest date for their presentation.

22.- In reference to the above, I would beg to suggest:—

1st That the claims above Rs: 50 each, but still of a trifling amount, which have been reported on by the Commissioner and are noticed above in paras: 13 to 17 of this Memo: be paid at once. Their total amount as far as I can calculate will not exceed Rs: 8,000.-

2nd That Mr. Phillips be desired to proceed as quickly as he can with the adjudication of all claims yet uninvestigated and that the period which he has suggested the 10th Proximo - within which all claims must be registered, be adopted.-

3rd That the heavier debts - with any opinion which the Govt. may see fit to pass on Mr. Phillips' treatment of them in his Memo: of 4th April be reported to the Govt. of India either now, or when the inquiry has been entirely closed.-

It should be done when the Inquiry has closed

3 May 60 -

2/5/60.

JP

Memo: para: 11.- 14 claims duly at Rs: 100 each 14×100. —— Rs. 1,400.
" Para: 14- Dowlut Ram: -Loke —— 1,314.
" Para 15- Hoozoor Ram: -Loke and Dowlut Sukkar Pathuck } —— 3,958.
" Para: 17- 12 at 100 each —— 1200.
7872.

W

W

Inram

Political Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following

letters from

From the Commissioner of Tanjore - } Here enter 11th, 12th, 19th & 26th April 1860 Nos 967 1032 1058 1059

Order of Government - } Here enter 1st May 1860 No 1279

From the Commissioner of Tanjore - - - } Here enter 1st May 1860 No 1042

Order thereon [illegible] 3/6

1 By the orders of Govt: 21st February 1860 No 90, the Commissioner at Tanjore was directed to give his immediate attention to ascertain the nature and extent of the debts due by the late Raja.

2 In his letter of 14th March last, the Commissioner brought to notice, that the claims against the Raja were in several instances of very petty amount, & proposed that

that he should be authorized
to pass at once for payment,
all under Rupees 50, which
he might on investigation
find to be well founded. To
Order. 23d March 1860 No 178. this course the Govt. assented.
3. With his letter of 11th
From Commissioner — April the Commissioner had
11th April 1863. submitted a statement of claims
above 50 Rupees each, which
he had investigated, and a
Memo: shewing his decision
in each case and the grounds
of it.
4 The number of these
claims which have been enquir
=ed into is 48, the amount
claimed Rupees 8,18986. Of
these 16 have been rejected and
32 admitted. The aggregate
amount awarded under these
32 claims [illegible] 12-12
5. Mr Phillips applied

that, subsequently to the
death of the Raja, and
while all the Members
of the family were united
in their desire to secure
the succession to the Raj
for his Daughter, the
affairs of the Durbar were
in most instances honestly
and regularly conducted.
Among other measures
a list of the pecuniary
liabilities of the deceased
Prince was prepared in the
Bikaleé Department. Additions
to it were made after
Mr Rivett had been
appointed Commissioner, but
these had mostly reference
to claims arising on the
supply, loan, or deposit of
articles of which the prices
had not been definitely
fixed

fixed at the date of the Rajas demise. This statement was closed in October 1856; but it should be understood [redacted] that this preparation must have been conducted independently of the individual members of the Raj family whose names appear in it as Creditors for large amounts.

6 The old Mahratta Drafters no doubt support these amounts, and the sums which Mr. Phillips has recommended for payment may be supposed regarded as due to the Creditors, if the Govt. are satisfied that the circumstances under which the debts have originated, call for discharge by the State, in the absence of a successor to the Raj.

The

7 The Commissioner proceeds to explain generally the manner, and mode of action on the part of the Rajas, under which these claims accrued. Many of them can hardly be regarded as debts in the ordinary acceptation of the term. They were not for value received, but rather of the nature of precedents not actually made, but of which the amount or value was credited in account to the intended donee. In however making a final settlement of Sanjore affairs, the Govt. are of opinion that such claims should be admitted.

The

8. The aggregate number of claims regis=tered in the lists pre=pared by the Sirkele is 602, embracing a sum of Rupees 830,068-1-2. Of these [redacted] there are,

[redacted] 50 Rs 114= Rs
amounting to Rs. 25,060-

Below 50 Rs. 488=
amounting to Rs. 5007-

These last Mr. Phillips is himself disposing of, under the authority given him by the order of 23rd March last.

9. The 48 claims entered in the Statement and Memo: which accompanied the Commissioner's letter belong to the [redacted] They include with one exception, all the debts [redacted] standing against the Rajas in the Sirkele's list of which the amounts respectively exceed Rs. 1,000-

10. The bearing of these claims [redacted] the instructions of Govt. of India 8th Sept. 56 No. 4644 Paras. 5, have to be reported to them, with the recommendations of this Govt. in respect to them, before they are disposed of. There are however 14, in each of which the award is below Rs. 150-

The Sirkele Commissioner [redacted] Rupees

11. Besides the 602 claims borne in the Sirkele's lists, there are as many as 2976 others originating in arrears of stipend

stipend, salary and wages
from periods prior and
subsequent to the Rajá's
death up to the dates of
the abolition in 1857 of the
three minor Establishments -
These 2,976 claims amount
to Rupees 36,691 - Of these
86 aggregating Rupees 15,615 -
are each in excess of Rs. 50 -
The remaining 2890 amount-
-ing collectively to Rs. 21,076
will be at once settled by
Mr. Phillips under the power
given him -

12 From Mr. Phillips'
letter of 6th April 1860, it
seems that of the above 2976
claims, 992 belong to the
Dowlut Jumlah, 95 are
for sums respectively below
Rupees 10 - and these Mr. Phillips
has settled at an aggregate
disbursement of Rs. 1,990 - 1 - 10.

Of the above 86 were
settled by the Chiefs
and the Commissioner
reports on the remaining
34 above that amount -

13 The total of all
these 34 claims is Rs. 1,94,847 -
Mr. Phillips has rejected 19 and
allowed 15 - the aggregate
amount of which is Rs. 44,8-6 -
for Rs. 22-7-6 - leaving
the highest claim Rs. 7,8-
These will be paid at once -

14 The similar claims
in the Jhansi Jumlah and
Dowlut Sirkhás Establish-
-ments are as per
margin - These should be
(inserted however 606 in
numbers) of an aggregate
amount of Rs. 19933 - 8 - 6 have
since been reported on by Mr.
Phillips in his letter of the 26th
Ultimo

Ultimo. He has allowed 91 at an aggregate sum of Rupees 13,50-14-8 which should be paid at once.

15. Above in Para 4 it was mentioned that of 44 claims above Rs.100 on the Sirkele's list, 18 were reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of 11th April. In his letter of the 19th Ultimo the Commissioner reports on 6 more of the same klass, the remainings having apparently been settled by the Sirkele.

16. These 62 claims amount in the aggregate to Rupees 12,227-0-0 Seventy five have been rejected and thirty six omitted, leaving a disbursement of Rupees 2- of the thirty six allowed, Twelve

Twelve are for sums below Rupees 100 each. These may be at once disbursed.

17. Thus all the claims 692 entered in the Sirkele's lists have been reported on or disposed of. It seemed however doubtful whether the additions made after Mr Forbes' mission were included in these lists, and a reference was made to Mr. Phillips on that and other points.

18 It appears from Mr. Phillips' answer of the 1st May that the further additions are not in the Sirkele's lists, and are among those which have been disposed of in the Commissioner's letters of 11th and 19th April. Mr. Phillips likewise gives some

some account of the claim
for Rs 2,576 alluded to in
Para 7 of his letter of 11th
April and yet only partially
investigated -

19 In respect to the
inquiry whether there were
yet any more claims to
be gone into - Mr Phillips, has
that in
very few. In the 10 or 12 days
preceding the 22nd ult. 68
claims had personally been
preferred to him, which are at
present awaiting disposal -
The amount involved in these
is Rs 7,937-6-11½ but he appre-
hends it will become his
duty to reject the two principal
ones - Besides these, there is a
batch of trifling claims, about
300 in number, arising out of
the non-payment for a
month and a broken period
of

of a Month in most cases,
of the wages in Grain due
to minor servants whom
the late Sirkle left in
arrear to that extent when
the Dowlut Pamboke Estab-
=blishment was abolished -
The Grain payments present
no difficulty - Their adjust-
=ment is a mere matter of
examination of the pay list
and of a statement founded
thereon -

21 He then continues:
"Adverting however, to the
"late period at which most
"of the 68 claims above reported
"to, reached me, it appears
"obvious that unless a date
"be now fixed for their presen-
"=tation, they may be indefinitely
"detained at Tanjore - The
"notice of this prepared not to

// to receive claims has for
// some Weeks past been
// regularly entered in the
// Local Gazette, and as the
// individuals interested in
// their adjustment are in or
// near Penjore, there is no
// reason why such delay
// should have occurred in
// advertising ~~the~~ Mr. Powell
// therefore submit for consid-
// eration by Govt: whether
// it is not desirable to fix a
// period beyond which no
// claims shall be accepted
// for registry, and if the pro-
// posal be approved, he
// would specify the 10th
// Proprio, as the latest
// date for their presentation.
2d Under that arrangement the Govt: possibly
1st Put the claims above
Rupees 50. each, but still
of

of a trifling amount
which have been
reported on by the
Commissioner and
are noted above in
Paras 10 ~~to~~ 13 - 14 - 16
of this order, be paid
at once.

2nd That the Commissioner
proceed as quickly as
possible with the inves-
tigation and settlement
within the limit laid
down by the order of 20th
March last - of all
claims yet remaining
for enquiry, and that the
period which he shall
~~suggested~~ ~~the~~ ~~Proprio~~
as that within which all
claims must be registered,
be adopted - Mr Phillips
will cause this to be made
generally known in Sikkim
and its vicinity and
published

not to be published —

NB - I have already
instructed Mr Pinkney &
this effect demi-officially
JP.

published in the District
Gazette -

3rd That in the whole
enquiry terminating, the
reports of the Commissioners
on the longer claims or
those which he has not
been or may not be autho-
rized to discharge, be for-
warded with the views
of this Govt for the orders
of the Govt of India -

To the Commissioner at Tanjore
" Govt Agent at do
" Accountant general
" Civil Auditor

Dep. 18th

Pol. Le. to Govt. Bom. Cast
No. 39 of 1860.

15-2-92
31-8-94

Political Department
Proceedings
No. 816.

Proceedings of Govt.

of 18 May 1860.

Reporting orders
on the several letters
from the Commissioner
at Sanjan respecting
the nature and extent
of the debts due by
the late Rajah.

24028