

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 392	Press Mis
Dated 23-6-1918.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
23rd June 1860.

Read again letters from the Commissioner of Tanjore, dated 11th, 12th, 19th and 26th April and 1st May last, and recorded in Proceedings of Government for the month of May 1860.

No. 81. ORDER THEREON, 23rd June 1860, No. 392.

The Government have again had under their consideration the reports of the 11th, 12th, 19th and 26th April, and 1st May last, made by the Commissioner of Tanjore upon the claims against the late Rajah.

2. Claim No. 19 of the Sirkele's list, reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of 11th April, is preferred by Vencut Row, Sheristadar of the Government Agency. The total amount is Rupees 37,487-3-4, the major part of which, or Rupees 31,110, is for arrears of an allowance assigned by the Rajah Sarabji, to Vencut Row's wife, whom the Rajah is stated to have adopted. Mr. Phillips has discussed this claim at some length, and has rejected it, on the ground that it is not supported by the accounts.

3. The Government must however observe that this claim, then stated to amount to between 28,000 and 32,000 Rupees, was advanced by Vencut Row in the year 1816, in Petitions which he addressed to Sir H. Montgomery, then conducting the duties of Resident at Tanjore, and that in forwarding it to Government, Sir Henry stated that the Rajah had on one or two occasions mentioned to him his desire to discharge these arrears. The Government were however of opinion that so long as Vencut Row was in the employment of the British Government, he could not receive money from the Tanjore Sircar, they therefore would not sanction his receipt of the arrears unless he previously vacated his appointment as Residency Sheristadar.

4. It seems to Government that this distinct recognition by the Rajah of Vencut Row's claim must be held to compensate for any defect of proof as far as the Palace Accounts are concerned. They could not therefore feel themselves warranted in rejecting it, and in reporting to the Government of India on the subject of these debts generally they will recommend to that authority that the amount, Rupees (31,110) thirty-one thousand one hundred and ten, be paid.

4. In respect to the Commissioner's reports on the Rajah's debts generally, it does not clearly appear whether all the parties whose claims have been rejected, or materially reduced as exhibited in the statements appended to the reports have had an opportunity of appearing before him, and urging what they thought fit in support of them. In the case of the Dowlat Pannlok Department, it is stated by Mr. Phillips' letter 12th April 1860, paragraph 4, that all the individuals who are interested in the disposal of the claims in question had not appeared before him 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 ordered for adoption in June 1857, and the 54 claims on which he was then reporting had been laid before Government, on the examination of this list for the Dowlat Pannlok Department, and its collation with the original accounts."

5. The Government consider that all the persons whose claims have been reported on by the Commissioner and are shown in his Statements should have had the opportunity of being present whilst the claims were under investigation, of examining the accounts or other documents, answering objections and affording any explanation which they might desire to offer in their several cases. They now desire that in every instance reported on in which this may not

have been done, and in which the claims may have been rejected or considerably reduced, (including among this last class, those above Rupees 50 each already ordered for payment)

the parties may as far as practicable be sent for, and the course above indicated be followed. The Commissioner will then submit a final report stating what parties appeared before him, the result of his further inquiry, and the extent, if any, to which it may have induced him to modify his previous award.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
23rd June 1860.*

Read again letters from the Commissioner of Tanjore, dated 11th, 12th, 19th and 26th April and 1st May last, and recorded in Proceedings of Government for the month of May 1860.

No. 81. ORDER THEREON, 23rd June 1860, No. 392.

The Government have again had under their consideration the reports of the 11th, 12th, 19th and 26th April, and 1st May last, made by the Commissioner of Tanjore upon the claims against the late Rajah.

2. Claim No. 19 of the Sirkele's list, reported on by Mr. Phillips in his letter of 11th April, is preferred by Vencut Row, Sheristadar of the Government Agency. The total amount is Rupees 37,487-3-4, the major part of which, or Rupees 31,110, is for arrears of an allowance assigned by the Rajah Sarabaji, to Vencut Row's wife, whom the Rajah is stated to have adopted. Mr. Phillips has discussed this claim at some length, and has rejected it, on the ground that it is not supported by the accounts.

3. The Government must however observe that this claim, then stated to amount to between 28,000 and 32,000 Rupees, was advanced by Vencut Row in the year 1846, in Petitions which he addressed to Sir H. Montgomery, then conducting the duties of Resident at Tanjore, and that in forwarding it to Government, Sir Henry stated that the Rajah had on one or two occasions mentioned to him his desire to discharge these arrears. The Government were however of opinion that so long as Vencut Row was in the employment of the British Government, he could not receive money from the Tanjore Sircar, they therefore would not sanction his receipt of the arrears unless he previously vacated his appointment as Residency Sheristadar.

4. It seems to Government that this distinct recognition by the Rajah of Vencut Row's claim must be held to compensate for any defect of proof as far as the Palace Accounts are concerned. They could not therefore feel themselves warranted in rejecting it, and in reporting to the Government of India on the subject of these debts generally they will recommend to that authority that the amount, Rupees (31,110) thirty-one thousand one hundred and ten, be paid.

4. In respect to the Commissioner's reports on the Rajah's debts generally, it does not clearly appear whether all the parties whose claims have been rejected, or materially reduced as exhibited in the statements appended to the reports have had an opportunity of appearing before him, and urging what they thought fit in support of them. In the case of the Dowlut Pamlok Department, it is stated by Mr. Phillips' letter 12th April 1860, paragraph 4, that all the individuals who are interested in the disposal of the claims in question had not appeared before him 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 ordered for adoption in June 1857, and the 54 claims on which he was then reporting had been laid before Government, on the examination of this list for the Dowlut Pamlok Department, and its collation with the original accounts."

5. The Government consider that all the persons whose claims have been reported on by the Commissioner and are shown in his Statements should have had the opportunity of being present whilst the claims were under investigation, of examining the accounts or other documents, answering objections and affording any explanation which they might desire to offer in their several cases. They now desire that in every instance reported on in which this may not

have been done, and in which the claims may have been rejected or considerably reduced, (including among this last class, those above Rupees 50 each already ordered for payment)

Proceedings, 18th May 1860, No. 316, paragraphs 10, 13, 14, and 16.

the parties may as far as practicable be sent for, and the course above indicated be followed. The Commissioner will then submit a final report stating what parties appeared before him, the result of his further inquiry, and the extent, if any, to which it may have induced him to modify his previous award.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

of India when Mr Phillips had concluded the inquiry of those yet to be investigated.

3. We have gone carefully thro' all these, and see no reason to dissent from the Commissioner in respect to the conclusions at which he has arrived in any of them.

4. There is however one claim to which I would wish to draw attention viz. that of Venut Row, late Residency Sheristadar for Rs 37,110 3/4. None in the Sarkar's list. See memo annexed to Commissioner's letter of 11 April 1850. The major part of this or Rs 37,110 is for arrears of an allowance said to have been assigned by the Rajah Suraj Choyi - father of the late Rajah to Venut Row's wife. Mr Phillips seems to have investigated this claim carefully, and I see no cause to dissent from his conclusions if the force of the Revenue was what he represents it to have been, and this is

Sir H. Montgomery
states in his letter, re-
ferred to in para 5 of
his memo. that the
Rajah had repeatedly
continued to have
his share of the share
the amount claimed
by Venut Row. This
assertion of the Rajah
referred to in 1846 -
must be in every opinion
false. Inasmuch as
Venut - its validity
renders the irregular
statement of the Rajah
wrong. It is not
likely that the
by the Commissioner.

a point which must be well known at Tanjore.

5. On the other hand it is stated by Sir H. Montgomery in his letter of 14 October 1856 that the Rajah had on one or two occasions mentioned to him his desire to discharge these arrears, and Mr Forbes in his letter of 15 January 1857 para 6 refers to the claim. It is doubtless true that in 1846 when the Rajah expressed his willingness to pay the arrears, Venut Row had resumed his office as Residency Sheristadar, and the Rajah had an obvious motive for wishing to stand well with him.

6. It is not clear from Mr Phillips' report whether all the parties whose claims have been rejected, or un-serially reduced have had an opportunity of appearing before him, and urging what they thought fit in support

in his late dated
 10th April 1860 really
 of no value -
~~of~~ of Missions that
 the money claimed
 must be paid to these
 to now -

support of them. In the case
 of the Lowbit Puntok Se.
 partment it is stated by
 Mr. Phillips. Letter 15th April
 1860 para 4. that all the
 individuals who are interested
 in the disposal of the claims
 in question have not ap-
 peared before him personally
 to prefer them. A list of
 advances recoverable from
 the accounts of each of the
 three minor departments
 and of the arrears of wages
 due to them was prepared
 in the office of the Super-
 intende. under an arrange-
 ment. be ordered for ad-
 mission in June 1857 and that
 the 34 claims on which
 he was then reporting had
 been laid before Government
 on the recommendation of the
 Com. for Lowbit Puntok
 Department and its colla-
 tion with the original accounts.
 These claims however are
 for the most part small
 and due to servants who
 could know little about
 them themselves, and where
 reliance

but
 happens that
 if Mr. P. has not had
 the parties before
 him - when he had
 these claims under
 his direction - he
 must now issue a
 notice for their return
 claims, & place
 to them the view to
 have taken of these
 claims any explanation
 & then that they wish
 to see & hear
 make a

final report
 to Govt -
 for the Govt. to
 reduce claims amounting to a great degree with all
 the claims. -
 to be placed in the account to -
 indeed this must be the case
 J.P.
 185
 I concur in Mr. Morehead's
 remarks - W.L.
 I do likewise J.G.

Mr. A. B. C. 17. C. 17. 17. 17.
f. 17.

Political 1860 Dept.

N^o 392.

Proceedings of Govt.

21/23 June 1860.

Political Department

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Read again letters from
the Commissioner of Tanjore.
dated 11, 12, 19th & 26th April and
1st May last, and recorded
in Proceedings of Govt. for the
month of May 1860.

order thereon 23 June 1860 N^o 392

The Government have
again had under their
consideration the reports
of the 11th, 12th, 19th and 26th
April, and 1st May last,
made by the Commissioner
of Tanjore upon the claims
against the late Rajah.

2. Claim N^o 19 of the
Sirkar's list, reported on
by Mr. Phillips in his
letter of 11th April, is
preferred by Vincent Row
Sheristadar of the Govern-
ment Agency. The total
amount is Rs. 37,107-3-11,
the major part of which,
or Rs. 31,110 is for arrears
of an allowance assigned

W. dt
G.

W.

by

by the Rajah Saraboji to Venut Row's wife, whom the Rajah is stated to have adopted. Mr. Phillips has discussed this claim at some length, and has rejected it on the ground that it is not supported by the accounts.

3. The Government must however observe that this claim, then stated to amount to between 20,000 and 32,000 Rupees, was advanced by Venut Row in the year 1846 in Petitions which he addressed to Sir H. Montgomery then conducting the duties of Resident at Tanjore, and that in forwarding it to Government Sir Henry stated that the Rajah had on one or two occasions mentioned to him his desire to discharge these arrears. The Government were ^{however} of opinion that

that so long as Venut Row was in the employment of the British Government, he could not receive money from the Tanjore Shikar, they therefore would not sanction his receipt of the arrears unless he previously vacated his appointment as Residency Sheristadar.

4. It seems to your Lordship that this distinct recognition by the Rajah of Venut Row's claim must be held to compensate for any defect of proof as far as the Palace Accounts are concerned. They could not therefore feel themselves warranted in rejecting it and in reporting to the Government of India on the subject of these debts generally ^{they} will recommend to that authority that the amount, Rupees 3,110 Shikar
one

one thousand one hundred
and ten, be paid.

4.- In respect to the
Commissioner's reports on
the Rajah's debts generally,
it does not clearly appear
whether all the parties
whose claims have been
rejected, or materially
reduced, have had an
opportunity of appear-
ing before him, and
urging what they thought
fit in support of them.
In the case of the Dowlat
Pumlok Department, it
is stated by Mr. Phillips
Letter 12th April 1860 para.
4- that all the indivi-
duals who are interested
in the disposal of the
claims in question had
not appeared before him
personally to prefer them.
A list of advances recov-
erable from the servants
of each of the three minor
departments, and of the
arrears of wages due to
them was prepared in
the

as exhibited in the
-men 5, appended to
the Report

+ and are shown in
his statement

the office of the late Sir-
Rele under an arrange-
ment ~~he~~ ordered for
adoption in June 1857- and
the 34 claims on which
he was then reporting
had been laid before Go-
vernment, on the ex-
amination of this list
for the Dowlat Pumlok
Department, and its
collation with the origi-
nal accounts."

5.- The Government
consider that all the
persons whose claims
have been reported on
by the Commissioner
should have had the op-
portunity of being pre-
sent whilst the claims
were under investigation,
of examining the ac-
counts or other docu-
ments, answering ob-
jections and affording
any explanation which
they might desire to
offer in their several
cases. They now desire
that

Proceedings - 18th May 1860.
No. 316 - Paras. 10, 13, 14 & 16.

that in every instance
^{reported on}
in which this may not
have been done, and in
in which the claims
may have been rejected
or considerably reduced,
(including among this
last class, those already ^{above Rs 5000}
ordered for payment) the
parties may as far as
practicable be sent for,
and the course above in-
dicated be followed. The
Commissioner will then
submit a final report
stating what parties ap-
peared ~~before~~ before him -
the result of his further
inquiry - and the extent,
if any, to which it may
have induced him to
modify his previous
award.

JF

To the Commissioner of Sanjore. Dated 27th

PK

2000/111