M.R. O. 1—30,000—16-10-26.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	4 9	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	28 – 1 –	19 1860

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 13. Read the following Despatch from the Right Honorable Sir C. WOOD, Bart., Secretary of State for India; to His Excellency the Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated India Office, London, 22nd December 1859, No. 23.

I transmit herewith, copies of correspondence which has taken place between this Office and Mr. Gregory, the Solicitor of Mr. J. Wilkins, professing to be the Agent in this country of the Ranee of Tanjore, from which you will perceive, that I have declined to recognize Mr. Wilkins as the Agent of the Ranee; but I have to request that you will proceed with as little delay as possible to adjust all matters relating to the family on their own merits. You will apprize the Ranee, that if she is not satisfied with the decision at which you may have arrived, she may then make any appeal to the Secretary of State for India in Council, which she may think advisable through the channel of your Government.

From G. B. GREGORY, Esq.; to the Right Honorable Sir C. WOOD, Bart., M. P. &c., &c., &c., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Bedford Row, W. C. 21st October 1859.

I have the honor to transmit, for the consideration of yourself and the Council for India, a Memorial on behalf of the Ranee of Tanjore signed by her Agent in this country, Mr. Wilkins.

To the Right Honorable Sir CHARLES WOOD, Baronet, Member of Parliament, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India and to the Council of India.

The Memorial of KAMACHEE BOYE SAHIBA, eldest widow of His Highness SEEVAJEE, late Rajah of Tanjore by JOHN HENRY WILKINS, Her Agent in England.

SHEWETH,

Memorial of the eldest widow and successor of the late Rajah of Tanjore.

I. That the husband of your Memorialist His Highness Seevajee, who in his life time was Rajah of Tanjore, died in the 29th October 1855, intestate and without male issue. That he was an Hindoo of the Soodra caste, and that by Hindoo Law as well as by the custom of the Hindoos and of the Raj of Tanjore, your Memorialist as his senior widow became entitled on his death to succeed him in the dignity of the Raj, to inherit and possess his Estate and to the administration of the same.

Who had treaties of alliance and friendship with the British Government.

II. That the Rajahs of Tanjore who were formerly the absolute Sovereigns of the country from time to time and particularly by certain Treaties, dated in 1787 and 1792 respectively and made between the British Government of the one part and the Rajah for the time being for himself his heirs and successors on the other part, entered into certain engagements with the British authorities by which their Sovereign rights were considerably circumscribed. That by a subsequent Treaty made in November 1799 between the Rajah Serfojee, the father of the late Rajah Seevajee and the British Government by which the arrangements between them were "strengthened "and confirmed, it was stipulated and agreed that the Rajah of Tanjore should be treated on "all occasions in his own territories as well as in those of the Company with all the atten- "tion, respect and honor which is due to a friend and ally of the British nation, that "the Honorable East India Company should provide a permanent system for the collection "of the Revenue and for the administration of justice" within the Raj "that a Court or Courts "should be established for the due administration of Civil and Criminal Justice under the sole "authority of the English East India Company" and that provision should be made for the collection of the Revenue by the Governor in Council and for the payment of a certain fixed money allowance together with an annual proportion of the Revenue to the Rajah.

III. That from the date of the Treaty down to the death of the Rajah Seevajee in 1855, the Rajahs of Tanjore maintained the most honorable intimate and friendly relations with the British Government, the conditions of the Treaty being honorably observed and fulfilled on both sides "the friends and enemies of either being considered the friends and enemies of "both" and the late Rajah, especially, receiving at various times honorable proofs of the respect and esteem of the British authorities whose protection he enjoyed. That on the death of Seevajee the territories of Tanjore were in a state of profound tranquillity and prosperity and no political objection existed to the continuation of the rights and powers exercised by him to his successor except as will be seen hereafter, the pecuniary payments reserved by the last Treaty and which were to be made out of the Revenues of the country; that the political or other rights which the Rajah Seevajee exercised at the time of his death were the Civil and Criminal jurisdiction within the Fort of Tanjore, the maintenance of a small body of Sepoys for purposes of ceremony and certain outward attributes of a Sovereign Prince.

And enjoyed the esteem and protection of British Authorities.

IV. That upon the death of the late Rajah being made known to the Court of Directors of the late East India Company by letters of the Madras Government dated the 9th and 22nd November 1855, the Directors addressed a Despatch to the Governor General of India in Council under date 16th April 1856 entirely ignoring the rights of your Memorialist as successor to her husband and declaring as follows:

On his death in 1855.

The late East India Company overlooking the rights of Memorialist.

2. "The Rajah died without leaving a son by birth or adoption. He was himself the "only son of his father the Rajah Serfojee, with whom the Treaty of 1799 was concluded and "Serfojee was only the adopted son of his predecessor Rajah Toolfajee, consequently there "cannot be any male claimant to the dignity claiming through a male. But the Rajah has "left two daughters, the younger of whom (the elder being disqualified by ill health) Mr. Forbes "the Resident proposed to the Madras Government to recognize as a successor to the titular "diginity."

3. "By no law or usage however has the daughter of a Hindoo Rajah any right of succession to the Raj and it is entirely out of the question that we should create such a right for "the sole purpose of perpetuating a titular principality at a great cost to the public Revenue."

4. "We agree in the unanimous opinion of your Government and the Government of Madras that the dignity of Rajah of Tanjore is extinct."

Declared that the dignity of Rajah of Tanjore was extinct.

5. "It only remains to express our cordial approbation of the intention you express of "treating the widows, daughters and dependants of the late Rajah with kindness and liberality. "We shall doubtless receive at an early period from you or from the Madras Government a "report of the arrangements made for carrying this intention into effect.

6. "The Resident was very properly directed to continue all existing allowances until he "could report fully on them to Government but to inform the recipients that Government were "not to be considered as pledged to their continuance.

We are your affectionate friends,

(Signed) W. H. SYKES.
(,,) R. D. MANGLES.
(,,) M. T. SMITH.
(,,) R. ELLICE.
(,,) T. CURRIE.
(,,) W. J. EASTWICK.
(,,) H. C. RAWLINSON.
(,,) H. T. PRINSEP.
(,,) HENRY WILLOCK.
(,,) J. SHEPHERD.

LONDON,
16*th April* 1856.

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

V. That in pursuance of the determination that "the dignity of the Rajah of Tanjore was extinct, the Governor of Madras in Council proceeded to take measures for the annexation of the Raj and that on the twenty-sixth September one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, by and with the consent of the Governor General in Council, the Governor in Council at Madras appointed Henry Forbes, Esq., one of the Members of the Board of Revenue to be Special Commissioner to proceed to Tanjore to take charge of the Residency with directions to enquire into and report upon the various important questions demanding settlement in connexion with the extinction of the dignity of the Rajah of Tanjore together with any others that may hereafter occur to this Government as demanding enquiry in connexion with the general subject.

Whereupon the Governor of Madras appointed a Special Commissioner to report upon the questions consequent on the extinction of the Raj,

VI. That Mr. Special Commissioner Forbes, arrived at Tanjore on the thirteenth September one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, and that on the fifteenth he requested the members of the Durbar and certain members of the family of the deceased Rajah to attend him at the Residency, where he "communicated to them generally the purport of the Orders of the Government of India, and announced to "them the decision of the Home Authorities, regarding the Raj of Tanjore, informing them at "the same time that liberality and consideration would be shewn to the family and retainers "and putting them in possession of the general principles on which claims to stipends and gratuities would be disposed of, but without pledging the Government to any particular mode of "dealing with individual cases." Mr. Commissioner Forbes in reporting these circumstances states:

The Special Commissioner proceeds to Tanjore, summons the Durbar and announce the extinction of the Raj.

2. "Prior information had evidently reached the Durbar of the extinction of the Raj but "they appear to have clung to the hope that a succession might still be possible, until the official announcement made to them by me shewed "that that hope was vain, much sorrow was "expressed and much grief was shewn, but "all at once submitted to the authority of "Government and placed themselves in its hands."

An announcement received with sorrow and grief.

3. "I took no further steps to make the announcement public, but it had become so in great measure from the fact of my arrival and the news communicated to the Durbar soon spread throughout the palace. No demonstration of the public feeling was made and I had no reason to require "any aid to the ordinary Police of the Town."

But with submission.

VII. That having thus announced the extinction of the Raj to the great sorrow and grief of the Durbar and of the public of Tanjore, Mr. Commissioner Forbes proceeded to take measures for taking possession of the same. In a letter to his Government of the eighteenth October he states:

The Commissioner proceeds to take possession.

4. "On the 29th ultimo, I requested the Officiating Resident to order the preparation of "certain lists of the family and retainers of the Rajah, and certain statements of lands and other "State property of the Raj, which I should require to have before me before I could enter on "the duty on which I am engaged, I am aware that Mr. Cherry at once issued the required Orders "and that he continued to press upon the Sarkeel the necessity of expedition. On my arrival "however I found that nothing had been prepared, and although, I have not failed since to "urge the propriety of despatch, I know that up to this time nothing has been even commenced. "This arises partly from dilatory habits of business which have at all times made it difficult to obtain "any accounts from the palace, partly from a natural and perhaps unconscious unwillingness on

" the part of the late Rajah's servants to take an active part in the downfall of their master's family " and partly from the Sarkeel's referring to the ladies for permission to prepare the accounts re- " quired, which permission has been always withheld."

VIII. That on the seventeenth October following, Mr. Commissioner Forbes addressed to the Officiating Sarkeel an imperative communication announcing that the duty he was performing under the peremptory orders of his Government brooked no delay " and that it was " his intention to assume possession in the name of the British Government of all the late Rajah's " villages and gardens including endowment to Choultries and Pagodas, of the public property in " the Fort of Tanjore and of all the records connected with the Raj."

He peremptorily summons the Sarkeel to deliver up all the Rajah's property.

Also that he had " requested the Collector to resume for the time all the villages and gar- " dens, to give notice to the village servants to produce their accounts before him and to warn the " Merassadars and Renters to pay their kists only to the Government."

He further informed the Sarkeel that he proposed to take charge of the public property within the Fort early the next morning, and to place it in charge of a detachment of British troops, and he requested the Sarkeel to meet him at the East gate of the Fort at half past five o'clock in company with the Officers of the Arsenal, the Wardrobe Department, the Library, the Magazine, the late Rajah's silver Howdahs, Coaches and Palanquins and of the public records " and he desired the Sarkeel to warn such Officers that the displeasure of the British Government would be shewn to any who might be found to have evaded his demands."

IX. That accordingly on the morning of the 18th October Mr. Commissioner Forbes accompanied by a detachment of the 25th Madras Regiment of Infantry proceeded to the Fort of Tanjore, the residence of your Memorialist and the other Ladies of the Court and proceeded to take possession of the same and of all the property therein, placing his private seal upon the doors of the jewel house, the library, the wardrobes and other apartments and placing Sentries at the doors of the rooms and a relief party at the outer gate of the Fort. That he also took possession of the Rajah's stables, horses, ponies, elephants carriages and palanquins, of his menagerie, containing a collection of wild animals and birds; of his armoury and valuable collection of arms, including his fowling pieces, swords and pistols; of all his cash including a sum of money " intended for and awaiting distribution amongst the " creditors of the late Rajah," of his cows and bullocks, sheep and lambs, of all the jewels, gems and precious stones within the Fort, including many belonging to pagodas and divers persons, and to all and sundry the property within the Fort, whether belonging to the late Rajah or to others. That the said Mr. Commissioner Forbes also took possession of the public Arsenal of the late Rajah and directed the powder found therein to be thrown into the ditch, and that he subsequently sent to Madras and caused to be sold by public sale large numbers of the late Rajah's horses, elephants, camels, bullocks (203 in number), buffaloes (150 in number), 310 cows (including heifers and calves) together with upwards of 150 carriages and private vehicles.

He takes Military possession of the Fort.

Seizes the library, wardrobes &c., and places Sentries at the doors of the apartments.

He seizes the Rajah's stables, menagerie, armoury, money, cows and sheep jewels, &c.

Destroys the contents of the Arsenal,

And sells the horses and carriages.

X. That a very considerable portion of the property thus seized by the Commissioner was admittedly a property not belonging or in any way appertaining to the Raj of Tanjore, and in no way coming within the description of State property. That the Rajah possessed real

The seizure includes not only State but private and personal property.

estate, villages, messuages, garden lands and other property purchased with and out of portions of the revenue received by him under the Treaty with the British Government and also jewels and personal effects of various sorts purchased from his private purse and which at the time of his death the Rajah Seevajee was possessed of, and entitled to, as of his own right and private property and distinct from and independent of the property, rights, claims and privileges appertaining to and belonging to the Raj of Tanjore and all of which your memorialist, as the eldest widow of the Rajah became and was entitled by Hindoo Law to inherit and possess.

Inherited by Memorialist.

XI. That in order to prevent the interference and intermeddling of Mr. Commissioner Forbes with such, the property of your memorialist, arising out of the deceased Rajah's private and particular estate and to prevent the sale and distribution of other valuable estate and effects the property of your memorialist, your memorialist filed a bill on the equity side of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras and obtained an injunction restraining the East India Company and their officers from further interfering with the property until the decision of the Court. That your memorialist's suit was limited to the private and personal estate of her deceased husband under the counsel of her legal adviser and with the impression that questions relating to the seizure of the Raj would not fall within the jurisdiction of a Court of equity. Your memorialist's bill prayed (1) That as the eldest widow of the said Seevajee she might be declared entitled to inherit and possess as his heir and legal representative, his private and particular estate, real and personal, (2) That the East India Company might be declared trustees for your memorialist for and in respect of the private and particular estate seized by them, (3) for an account of the estate so seized, (4) that the East India Company might be directed to deliver up to your memorialist such of the estate and effects as might be held by them, (5) that they might be restrained by injunction from further interference, (6) for a receiver, and (7) for costs of suit.

Memorialist appeals to the Supreme Court at Madras.

For an injunction, &c.

XII. That the Honorable East India Company on the 16th of March 1857, filed an answer to this bill stating amongst other things that the Rajah Seevajee was at the time of his death the Rajah and reigning Monarch of Tanjore entitled to and in exercise and enjoyment of the rights, privileges, powers and dignity of an absolute Sovereign; subject to certain engagements or relations between himself and the British Government and particularly to the Treaty of 1799. That on the Rajah's death it was determined as an act of State by the East India Company and the British Government that the Raj and dignity of Tanjore was extinct and that the State of Tanjore had therefore lapsed to the Company, in trust for Her Majesty, and that it was thereupon also determined by the Company as an act of State and Government that the whole Dominions and Sovereignty of the State of Tanjore together with the property thereto annexed should be assumed by the Company in trust for the Queen and should become part of the British Territories and Revenues in India, in trust for Her Majesty as aforesaid. The Company further insisted that their right to take possession of the estate and property of the Rajah Seevajee was a question of State involving the construction of Treaties and acts of State which could not be inquired into by any Municipal Court within Her Majesty's Dominions.

The East India Company's answer.

That their acts are acts of State.

They deny the jurisdiction of the Court.

XIII. That in addition to this main plea, the Honorable East India Company put several others in their answer as that it was not intended to retain possession of the private property of the Rajah for the benefit of the Company. That it was impossible to distinguish between the private property of the Rajah and his State

They also deny Memorialist's title &c.

property, that your Memorialist was not entitled to succeed to the Estate by law of Hindoo inheritance, that the property of the Rajah was not liable to be administered as that of a private individual. That the late Rajah was not a member of an individual Hindoo family, &c, but that on these points it is unnecessary to make comment as they have all been decided against the Company and in your Memorialist's favor and as there has been no appeal respecting them.

XIV. That the cause of Kamachee Boye Sahiba *versus* the East India Company and others was argued on the equity side of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras on the 29th and 30th September and on the 1st October 1857, before full Court and that on the 11th December following the Honorable the Chief Justice delivered the judgment of the Court declaring the plaintiff your Memorialist entitled to the Decree as prayed. In delivering judgment His Lordship the Chief Justice declared that the Court "was satisfied that the late Rajah "Seevajee was not the absolute Sovereign "suggested by the Defendants and that he had "private property real and personal" that the seizure or detention of other than State property or in other words of the property of the Raj passing with it to the East India Company was unauthorised, that the seizure of the Fort of Tanjore by Mr. Commissioner Forbes was "an indiscriminate seizure of both public and private property, the order of the Government having been expressly confined to State property," that "such detention could not be considered an act "of State nor that the subsequent adoption of "the Company (of their Officer's act) could "make that an act of State which originally "was not so." The Court finally resolved "that "the Company had failed to establish any of their grounds of defence."

The case is heard and decided in Memorialists favor.

And the seizure is strongly condemned by the Court.

Which declares that the Company has failed to establish any defence.

XV. That the Honorable East India Company being dissatisfied with this Decree appealed from the same to Her Majesty in Council alleging, *inter alia* that "the acts which formed "the grounds of the suits were acts done by "or on behalf of the Company in their public "capacity and were all acts immediately connected with and legitimately consequent upon the assumption of the Raj of Tanjore and were "fully justified and authorised as acts of State and by the circumstances of the case." The case having been duly argued the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was delivered by the Right Honorable Lord Kingsdown, on the 27th day of July 1859. The judgment advised Her Majesty to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras and to dismiss your Memorialist's bill but without costs, the ground of such decision being "that the property claimed by your Memorialist had been seized by the British Government acting as a Sovereign power through its "delegate, the East India Company, and that the act so done with its consequences was an act "of State over which the Supreme Court of Madras had no jurisdiction."

The Company appeal to the Judical Committee of Privy Council.

The Judical Committee reverse the Decree.

XVI. That in delivering this judgment their Lordships declined to express any opinion "of the propriety or justice of the act." "It is "sufficient" they observed "to say that even if "a wrong had been done it is a wrong for which "no Municipal Court of Justice can afford a "remedy." "That the seizure was an exercise of Sovereign power effected at the arbitrary discretion of the Company, by the aid of Military force can" observed their Lordships "hardly "admit of doubt. It is extremely difficult" the Court further stated "to discover in these

But "declined to express any opinion on the "propriety or justice of the act."

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

And "discover no legal right on the part of the "Company or the Crown to the Raj or any "part of the Rajah's property.

"papers any ground of legal right on the part "of the East India Company or of the Crown "of Great Britain, to the possession of this "Raj, or of any part of the property of the "Rajah on his death and indeed the seizure "was denounced by the Attorney General, who from circumstances explained to us at the "hearing appeared as Counsel for the Respondents and not in his official character for the "Appellants, as a most violent and unjustifiable measure. The Rajah was an independent Sovereign "of Territory, undoubtedly minute and bound by treaties to a powerful neighbour which left him "practically little freedom of free action but he did not hold his Territory, such as it was, as a fief "of the British Crown or of the East India Company nor does there appear to have been any "pretence for claiming it on the death of the Rajah without a son by any legal title, either as "an escheat or as *bona vacantia*."

XVII. Your Memorialist respectfully submits to the consideration of the Secretary of State and Council of India whether a decision thus delivered, however favorable to the late East India Company in its effect, is not in reality a severe condemnation of its proceedings and its policy. In expressing its inability to sustain the Judgment of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras in your Memorialist's favor, the Lords of the Judicial Committee expressed no doubt of the equity of that Judgment, they only doubted the power of any Municipal Court to afford a remedy for such a wrong. The Judicial Committee preferred to designate as "acts of State" acts for which they professed themselves unable to find "any ground of legal right." Quoting the expression of Mr. Commissioner Forbes, that "much sorrow was expressed and much grief "shewn, but all submitted at once to the authority of the Government and placed themselves in "its hands," their Lordships observed that though no "resistance was offered by the family of "the Rajah or the inhabitants of the Fort to the seizure of the Raj or of the palace and property "of the Rajah, it was regarded on both sides as a mere act of power not resisted because resistance was vain." True to the policy of her husband and her family your Memorialist submitted to this spoliation in grief and in sorrow and without offering resistance other than that which the law appeared to offer her, but now that that law professes the wrong done to her too great for redress by its instrumentality she makes her appeal for justice to the representative of the Justice of the British nation.

Memorialist submits that this Judgment is a condemnation of the Company.

And appeals for Justice.

XVIII. Your Memorialist submits that upon every principle of honor, of equity and of public policy the treaties whereby the Rajahs of Tanjore have for more than half a century been protected on their thrones by the Government of Great Britain should not have been infringed. In honor they were faithfully maintained during the life-times of your Memorialist's husband and his father though at severe sacrifices to both. Upon the ground of equity the high authority of the great Judicial tribunal to which the appeal of the East India Company was carried has declared that it is extremely difficult to discover any ground of legal right on the part of the East India Company or of the Crown of Great Britain to the possession of this Raj or any part of the property of the Rajah on his death. On the ground of public policy the fact recorded by the Commissioner at Tanjore that the announcement of the extinction of the Raj was received by the Durbar and people of Tanjore with much "sorrow and grief" though with submission and without any demonstration of resistance, indicates that a change of Government so needless in a State which had already placed in British hands the control of its revenues, its judicature and its military was as impolitic towards those whose laws, customs and sympathies it outraged as it was unjust towards the family whose treaties it infringed and whose faithful attachment to British power it ungratefully requited.

On the grounds of

Honor,

Equity,

And public policy.

Memorialist prays that the dignity of Rajah of Tanjore may not be declared extinct.

XIX. Your Memorialist humbly hopes that now another order of Government for India obtains in England, and now that a different policy prevails in regard to the observance of treaties with the Native Princes of India and the general management of Indian affairs that the policy under which she has suffered together with other members of the late Rajah's family may be reversed. She prays of the Secretary of State and Council for India that the decision of the Directors of the East India Company of the 15th April 1856 may be taken into their deliberate consideration and that Hindoo law being respected, the dignity of the Rajah of Tanjore may not be declared to be extinct, but that your Memorialist may be declared, as she lawfully is, the successor of her deceased husband the late Rajah in dignity and titles subject to the stipulations and conditions of the treaty still in force between the family of the Rajah and the British Government.

But that she may be declared her husband's successor.

Subject to the treaty.

She also prays for the restoration of the private and personal Estate.

XX. And your Memorialist respectfully submits to the Secretary of State and Council for India that in respect of the private and personal estate of the late Rajah she is entitled at their hands to that relief which the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have decided it is not in the power of the law of Great Britain to afford. She submits to your consideration that this seizure has been condemned by every tribunal to whose cognizance it has been submitted by the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras as "indiscriminate" "unauthorised" "unnecessary" "wilful" and "illegal" by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council "as an exercise of Sovereign power "effected at the arbitrary discretion of the Com-"pany by the aid of Military force" by Her Majesty's Attorney General as a "most violent and unjustifiable measure." She submits that the seizure of the private estate and personal effects of a deceased prince to the injury of his widow and his household must be as unnecessary for the purposes of an act of State as it is inconsistent with the dignity of a great country and the honor of a protecting power. And your Memorialist accordingly prays that having regard to the principles of equity by which the British Government always professes to be regulated, the Council of India will give effect to the decree of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Madras in her favor, a decree delivered in equity not impugned or questioned on the ground of justice and only overruled because the wrong inflicted as an act of State was regarded as beyond the jurisdiction of a Civil Tribunal and too great for the remedy which a Court of Justice can afford.

The seizure of which has been condemned by the Supreme Court of Madras.

By the Judicial Committee and by Her Majesty's Attorney General.

And which is inconsistent with the honor and dignity of the Nation.

21*st October* 1859. (Signed) J. WILKINS.

From J. COSMO MELVILL, Esq.; to G. B. GREGORY, Esq., 1 Bedford Row, W. C., dated India Office, 25th November 1859, No. 4.

I am instructed by the Secretary of State for India, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st October, enclosing a Memorial from Mr. Wilkins, calling himself Agent in this country of the Ranees of Tanjore, and in reply to state that, before taking the Memorial in question into his consideration, Sir Charles Wood, desires that Mr. Wilkins will produce for his inspection the powers which he holds from the Ranees, constituting him their Agent in this country.

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

From G. B. GREGORY, Esq., for Partners and Secretary; to the Under Secretary of State for India, dated 1 Bedford Row, 29th November 1859.

In answer to your letter of the 25th, we beg to inform you, that Mr. Wilkins has received a letter from Kestmagee Carava, the confidential Agent of Kamáchee Boye, the Ranee of Tanjore, dated 3rd October 1859, which contains the following passage: "The matter is now entirely left in your hands, and to your exertions alone, for the present. The Ranee, as you are aware, is entirely out of her property. She cannot manage to send down Mr. Norton for the present, as you wish, though we lament it extremely. It is our misfortune to be now situated in this dilemma. However, the Ranee fully depends on you for the restoration of the Raj and her property, after the solemn declaration of the Lords and the Attorney General, that the Government of India has no right whatever to interfere with the Ranee."

Mr. Wilkins is also in possession of a letter from the same person, dated 16th September 1859, to a similar effect, and will be happy to produce both letters for your inspection, if you will favour him with an appointment for the purpose.

From J. COSMO MELVILL, Esq.; to G. B. GREGORY, Esq., 1 Bedford Row, W. C. dated 17th December 1859, No. 17.

I am instructed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letters dated the 21st of October and the 29th of November, and I am to inform you in reply that, as Mr. Wilkins has submitted no satisfactory credentials from the Ranee of Tanjore, he cannot be recognized as her Agent.

No. 14. ORDER THEREON, 28th January 1860, No. 49.

Ordered that a copy of the above Despatch and its enclosure be furnished to the Commissioner at Tanjore, who will make to the Ranee Kamashi Bhái Sahiba, the communication desired by the Right Honorable the Secretary of State.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

Political Depart.

Proceedings of the Rajah's Government.

Read the following Despatch from the R. H. the Secretary of State for India.

(Dated 22nd Dec. 1859)

Order thereon 28th January 1860. No. 49.

Ordered that a copy of the above Despatch & its enclosure be forwarded to the Commissioner at Tanjore, who will make to the Ranee Rajakshi Bhai Sahiba the communication desired by the R. H. the Secretary of State

J. H. D. Phillipps Esq.
Commissioner at Tanjore
(Dispatch)

Pro. 31st January 1860

Political 1860 Depart.t

No. 109

Proceedings of Govern.t

Dated 28th January 1860

13-14