

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	524	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	11-9-1860	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

~~TOP~~

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.

Read the following papers :—

No. 33. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner of Tanjore, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 19th July 1860, No. 1,294.

Adverting to the Order by Government, 18th May
* *Enclosure No. 2, 7th June 1860.* 1860, No. 319, I have the honor to submit copy of an
† *Enclosure No. 1, 26th May* „ explanation* by Venkat Rau and of my letter† to him, on
the subject of the pension assigned to his son, who, adopting
his father's communication as his own, has no separate observations to offer.

2. As the assertions made by Venkat Rau are in some respects materially at variance with my previous information in this matter, I called for further particulars from the Sirkele. These are contained in a fuller report than the one first made to me. I therefore lay a translation of the latter† with its two
† *Enclosure No. 3.* enclosures before Government.

3. I beg to conform to the requisition of Government that Venkat Rau and his son's explanation be submitted with my own remarks on it. There is, however, nothing in the explanation which calls for any modification of the representation which I have already made.

4. Two questions have arisen : The first is whether Latchman Venkaji Pandit, who, when a lad of 17 years of age, was nominated to the high office of Muzamdar in the late Raj, at the time his father was Residency Sarishtadar, was ever a servant of that Raj in the strict sense of the term. The second is whether, if so appointed, his service has been of a character to entitle him to a pension of Rupees 20 a month, or half the permanent salary of the office in question, which he filled for only two months and 21 days before the death of the late Raja.

5. That Latchman Venkaji Pandit never for one moment entered on the duties of the Muzamdarship, is clear beyond question ; that he has not drawn salary for a single day of the period he is supposed to have been in office, is equally clear. In the absence of these essential conditions, it would be scarcely reasonable to hold that Latchman Venkaji Pandit has been a servant of the late Raj.

6. Admitting, however, for argument sake, that he *was* a servant, it has to be determined whether he has established a claim to a retiring allowance of the character described.

7. The ordinary and natural meaning of the term “ hereditary service,” seems to be that an office has been held by a father, a son, a grandson and so on, in the direct male line ; but, in the case of the pensions assigned to the servants of the Tanjore Raj, it has in practice been allowed a more liberal signification ; that is, it has not been deemed of necessity that the *same* office should have been held hereditarily. It has been regarded as sufficient for a pension, that the father, the son and grandson should have served the Raj in the same or in different offices.

8. Adverting to this liberal application of the term, Venkat Rau's object, it is obvious, is to make it appear that the post of *Deputy* Muzamdar was hereditary in his family, and by that means to secure for his son a Muzamdar's pension.

9. In making a statement to that effect, he gives a list of the Deputy
Paragraph 5. Muzamdars, and shows in what manner they were his relatives. The person first named by him as an incumbent of the office, is Nana Pant, who is set down as Venkat Rau's “ great grandfather.” This is so far correct ; but it was in the *female* line, Nana Pant being Venkat Rau's grandfather's maternal uncle.

10. The successor of Nana Pant was his son, Bapanna Pant, according both to Venkat Rau and a list taken from the Palace Daftars and received by me from the Sirkele. The succession to the Deputy Muzamdar was, thus, still retained in the female line.

11. According to Venkat Rau, “ his uncle, Kistnaji Pant ” (whether paternal or maternal is not stated), was the successor of Bapanna ; but the Palace records do not bear him out in this assertion, nor do they show that any person of that name ever held the office.

11th September 1860.

12. Bapanna's successor was Razumallar, an individual in no wise related to Venkat Rau. The hereditary privileges of even the *female* line in a remote branch of Venkat Rau's family, were thus ignored and fell through; and his argument fails, therefore, even if it could justly be acknowledged that he should succeed hereditarily through such female branch.

13. Again, the successor of Razumallar was Setu Tiagaraj who, also, was not of Venkat Rau's family. The break in the hereditary rights, if they ever existed, was widened by this arrangement.

14. Venkat Rau admits the introduction of outsiders, but goes on to state that the office reverted to his family by the appointment in 1832 of his father Naro Pant to the Deputy Muzamdarship, which he held when he demised in 1837.

15. It is thus evident that the hereditary servitude of Venkat Rau's family should be deemed to have begun with his father and with him alone; for, whatever hereditary credit is due to the services of Nana Pant and his son Bapana, should, I apprehend, be entered for the advantage of their sons and grandsons, and not for that of Venkat Rau and his son, who were related to Nana Pant in the female line.

16. In paragraph 12 of my letter dated 13th April last, No. 983, I have described the character of the employment which Venkat Rau's father is known to have filled. This description is borne out by the Sirkele's Statement* of the 27th ultimo, to test which I called up at random one of the old Gumastas of the Palace now at work outside my office with the

* Column, No. 3, Statement No. 1, accompanying enclosure No. 3.

Darbar Daftar, and, on questioning, learnt from him, that he was unable to give me the names of successive Deputy Muzamdars because they never received their appointments from the Palace authorities, and were employed solely as private aids to the person who might be the Muzamdar for the time being.

17. Acknowledging, however, that Venkat Rau's father Naro Pant was a recognized Raj servant when Deputy Muzamdar, he was succeeded in his employment, it is seen, not by his own son Venkat Rau, or by a brother of Venkat Rau, but by Ramaji Sakaji, a husband of one of Naro Pant's daughters, whose services should therefore be estimated as conferring hereditary benefits, if such are due, on himself and his male descendants, and not on those of Venkat Rau.

18. Venkat Rau asserts that the successor of Naro Pant was his nephew Subaji Jevaji, but the office of Deputy Muzamdar does not appear to have been ever held by that person, or by a person of that name. Neither can I procure the slightest clue from the Raj records, as to Venkat Rau's allegation that his son Ramaji Pant ever succeeded to an office in the Palace.

19. Assuming, however, that Venkat Rau is entitled to benefit by the service as Deputy Muzamdar of his sister's husband, Ramaji Sakaji, there was no continuance in the person of that man's successor, of that hereditary link. For, the Ramaji Pant who appears to have then taken up the office and is asserted by Venkat Rau to be his brother-in-law, was the original nominee according to the Sirkele's statement; and he appears periodically to have furnished receipts for the full amount of the salary of the office, whilst nothing whatever is known to any one but Venkat Rau, of the private arrangement alleged by him to have been in force, that a moiety of the salary should be paid to Ramaji Pant, his son.

20. In regard to the entry of Latchman Venkaji Pandit's name in the Mahratta statement of the hereditary servants of the Raj; and in regard, also, of the introduction of the lad's name in the list of persons having claims for arrears of pay on the Dowlat Pamlok establishment, it is not practicable to show that he or his father took an active part. Those papers were prepared in the office of the Sirkele of the Raj, and for their correctness, as his signature is attached to them, the Sirkele is necessarily responsible. The Sirkele who signed the former is dead. His son, the present Sirkele, laid the latter before me, but no blame can attach to him, as his subordinates prepared it from muster rolls already in existence.

11th September 1860.

From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner at Tanjore, to VENKAT RAU, late Serastadar in the Government Agent's Office, Tanjore, dated 26th May 1860, No. 1,116.

In conformity with an Order by Government, dated 18th instant, No. 319, I am to call on you to explain the circumstances under which your son Lakshman Venkaji Pandit became a pensioner with 20 Rupees a month, as No. 215 on the Dowlat Pamloke List.

You will be so good as to explain:

1st.—How he obtained the office of Muzumdar and when; specifying the precise date of his appointment?

2nd.—How long he held it?

3rd.—Whether he held it hereditarily and how?

4th.—Whether he succeeded yourself in it, or any one of your own family who held the office prior to your son's accession to it?

6th.—If it was not enjoyed by persons of your family immediately preceding Lakshman Venkaji Pandit's accession to it, you will state who were the last four or five holders of the Muzumdarship.

You will also state how it has happened that in the list of arrears of pay said to be due to servants of the late Raj which was prepared and laid before me by the late Sirkele, your son's name is down as a claimant for Rupees 539-9-4 on account of the Muzamdarship.

From VENKAT RAU, to H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner at Tanjore, dated 7th June 1860.

With reference to your letter of the 26th ultimo, I have the honor to reply to the questions you put me in explanation of the circumstances under which my son Latchman Venkaji Pandit became a Pensioner with Rupees 20, as No. 215 on the Dowlat Pamloke List, which I trust will prove satisfactory.

1st.—He obtained the Muzamdar on the 23rd Jilkath or 7th August 1855 by His Highness the late Raja's appointment.

2nd.—He held the appointment until the time the Dowlat Pamloke was abolished.

3rd.—The Muzam Mahal was hereditary to my family and my ancestors, and eldest son held the appointment of the Deputy Muzamdar or Padnavis, but the Raja appointed my second son Latchman Venkaji Pandit as Muzamdar as he raised Annaji Theyagaraj Pandit to Sirkele, Bhoojunga Latchman Pandit to Soornis, and others to higher appointments to which they were not hereditarily entitled.

4th.—He did not succeed me nor any member of my family as they were hereditarily Deputy Muzamdars.

5th.—My great grandfather Nana Pant, my father's uncle Bapana Pant, and my uncle Kristnaji Pant, were Deputy Muzamdars, after which the office was filled by others not hereditary; and again, in 1832, my father Naro Pant was appointed, who was succeeded by my nephew Soobaji Jeevaji, who was succeeded by my eldest son Ramaji Pant in 1842, but my brother-in-law Ramaji Pant acted for him on receiving a moiety of his salary until March 1855, when my brother-in-law died, and as my eldest son Ramaji Pant was assisting me in the Resident's office and was unwilling to remain in the Raja's service, I applied for the situation for my second son Latchman Venkaji Pandit; but the Raja instead of giving him that situation, and as he was displeased with the Muzamdar of the time, Rachandra Pandit, appointed him Muzamdar at once, and made some other quite new appointments in the same day, which can be ascertained from the Palace records.

6th.—It was not enjoyed by persons of my family immediately preceding my son Latchman Venkaji Pandit's accession to it, but it has been held by my mother's uncle Theyagarajasamy and his son Yeakanathsamy for about 12 years; after the above two persons Bavah Pandit and Ramachendra Pandit were Muzamdars.

7. According to the orders of the late Commissioner the Sirkele may have prepared a Schedule of the Palace accounts, and as my son had not drawn any salary during the time he held the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

office of Muzamdar it is very probable that the Sirkele may have entered the amount due to my son as arrears of salary like others, at the rate of 40 Rs. per mensem.

8. There are many thousands of hereditary and unhereditary pensioners of the late Raja's service, and my family is one of them without any distinction; but what should have induced Government to call for an explanation of my son's pension only, is beyond my comprehension. I am led to believe that some individual who is disposed to injure me in any possible way has misrepresented matters to Government, which has been the cause of the present called for explanation;

* As the points raised by me in my communication to Government of date the 13th April 1860, No. 988, are embodied in my letter to Venkat Rau, a copy of the former was unnecessary.

wherefore I beg that you will do me the favor to forward this letter to Government and obtain for me a copy* of any representations that may have been made against my son, wherefore I will not only be enabled to refute any mis-statements, but will also enable me to bring to the notice of Government several cases similar to my son's. Being kept in the dark of what

has been done clandestinely against me, and being called upon suddenly for an explanation, I can only submit the present one, which I trust will be satisfactory to Government and yourself.

(True copies.)

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

No. 147.

MEMORANDUM.

1. I have received your letter dated 9th instant and its enclosure, a Petition from Venkat Rau, setting forth certain particulars respecting his family's hereditary service so as to show his son Lakshman Venkaji's eligibility to a pension.

2. As required in your letter, I have examined the records and submit two lists of the Padnavises and Muzamdars who were entertained from the days of Sarabhaji to the demise of Sivaji, showing the relationship in which they stood to Venkat Rau.

3. These lists show that the statement of Venkat Rau in his petition has no foundation. For, there is nothing on the record to show that, as set forth in it, the office of Padnavis was held successively by his great grandfather, grandfather's brother, father's brother, nephew (son of his younger brother) and by his eldest son. Nor, as he states, do his relatives appear to have filled it. Bappanna Pandit does not appear to be his grandfather's brother, but his father's maternal uncle's son. His service and the hereditary character of such service will go to the credit of his descendants and not to those of Venkat Rau, a distant relative. As regards the case of Venkat Rau's father, he appears to have been for some time a Gumasta in the Muzum Mahal and then in 1832 appointed as Padnavis. On the death of this incumbent on the 19th May 1837, Venkat Rau alleges the appointment was successively filled up by his nephew and his eldest son, an assertion which is not borne out by either documents or facts. Venkat Rau is

Synonymous with Ramaji Pandit.

H. D. P.

his name, and that his brother-in-law, Ramasawmy Pandit, was conducting the duty as substitute. I consider this the effect of his bad

Synonymous with Ramaji Pandit.

H. D. P.

competent person to hold the post, and he continued to discharge the duty as its original nominee and not as substitute.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

4. As, after the death of Venkat Rau's father, the appointment of Padnavis ceased to be held by his descendants, it is clear that that family ceased to possess the elements essential to hereditary service.

5. Turning to the appointment of Muzamdar, it is not necessary for me to give a detailed account in respect of it, as Venkat Rau himself admits in his petition, that that post was not hereditarily held by his family. Still, two of the persons who held that post appear to have been related to Venkat Rau, they are the father and elder brother of the late Sirkele Annaji Tiagaraj Pandit; but as they are distantly related on the mother's side, their service can be of no avail to Venkat Rau's hereditary service.

6. Venkat Rau's second son, Lakshman Venkaji Pandit, was not competent to hold the Muzamdar's post. I am prepared to admit the Raja newly gave the place to such a lad, for the sake of pleasing Venkat Rau. But, it is rumoured that on the then Resident, Mr. Forbes, learning this, he directed Venkat Rau not to allow his son to take the office, because people would say that, to please the Resident's Seristadar and to obtain his friendship, the Raja had assigned so high an appointment as that on a mere lad. I have further heard that, therefore it was, he never for a moment entered on the duties of his office, nor received his salary for a single month; and that therefore the Raja did not pay him his wages.

7. For these reasons, and as on the death of Venkat Rau's father, his office ceased to be retained in his family, I have observed in my letter No. 79, that Lakshman Venkaji Pandit is entitled neither to pension nor arrears of salary.

8. Should Venkat Rau, perchance, object to the correctness of the above statements, I do not know what consistent replies he can give to the questions, as to why his son did not draw his salary from the date of his appointment; why his salary alone was not paid when those of others were paid; and who opposed the payment of a salary which the Raja had deliberately and kindly granted.

9. I cannot, myself, but be astonished on reading the 8th paragraph of his petition. He states there are several pensioners whose services under the Raja are both hereditary and non-hereditary. By this he tries to injure the character of these servants who are dead. After the death of the Raja, there was an important change made in this Palace which never happened before; and it is widely known that my father, acting as he did, on the principle that to be trustworthy to Government was his duty to his master, conducted himself accordingly.

H. D. P.

Late Sirkele.

In the absence of such master, the influence of the Resident's Seristadar was very extensive; and he it was who managed all the Palace affairs.

This is known to all. While so, how could he have let pass such errors as then crept in? how did he, so long as he continued to be the Agency Seristadar, pay pensions to parties who he knew were not entitled to them? He must be responsible for these acts. As an instance, I allude to the case of Viswanada Ramaji, mentioned in my letter, No. 93, whom Venkat Rau

G. O. 12th May 1860, No. 310.

H. D. P.

employed after the death of his Highness. How did Venkat Rau continue paying him his pension when the Government had conferred no pensions on such as had been employed after the demise of the Raja? This single fact is sufficient to shew that he is to blame.

10. His attempt to show that in the Pension Diary, there are several errors, which I hold are not in existence, shows that his aim is that the error in the instance of his son alone must not be corrected.

11. But I have entered in detail to show that Venkat Rau's dissatisfaction and argument are of no use, since it is but consistent with the Darbar custom to correct such errors only

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

as are truly and clearly established. Besides, I send one Gopal Manaji who is acquainted with certain particulars connected with this case. I return the Petition.

(Signed) SUBBA RUA NILAKANT RAU ZADOW,
Acting Sirkele.

TANJORE,
27th June 1860.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT No. 1.

List of persons who were appointed as Deputy Muzamdars from the accession of Sarabhoji up to the death of the late Raja.

Names.	Their relationship to Venkat Row.	Length of Service.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4
Bapanna Pant son of Nana Pant....	Father's Maternal Uncle's son.	The dates of the appointments of these persons are not on the records; because they were engaged at his discretion by the Muzamdar, to whom a certain sum was allowed for establishment.	It is stated in Venkat Rau's letter that his son Ramaji Pant and his nephew Subbaji Jeevaji held the office of Padanavis (Deputy Muzamdar). The former never held any office in the Durbar and the latter got a salary of 15 Rupees on his father's death, but was never appointed Padanavis (Deputy Muzamdar).
Rajo Mallar.....	No way related.		
Setu Tiagaraj....	Do. do.		
Naro Pant.....	Father.		
Ramaji Sakaji....	Sister's husband.		

(Signed) SUBBA RAU NILAKANT RAU ZADOW,
Acting Sirkele.

TANJORE,
27th June 1860.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT No. 2.

List of Muzumdars from Raja Sarabhoji's accession to the demise of His late Highness.

Names.	From what to what period.	Relationship to Venkat Rau.
1	2	3
Abaji Jagannath	From June 1798 to December 1804.	No way related.
Tiagaraj.	From December 1804 to Feb. 1813.	Mother's maternal uncle.
Aikanath Tiagaraj.....	From do. to November 1817.	The son of do.
Babaji Ramaji Pant	From do. to March 1832.	No way related.
The son of do.	From do. to August 1855.	Do.
Lakshmana Venkaji Pant.	From do. to the abolition of Havalas that is 1st March 1857.	Son never resumed charge of office.

(Signed) SUBBA RAU NILAKANT RAU ZADOW,
Acting Sirkele.

TANJORE,
27th June 1860.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) H. D. PHILLIPS,
Commissioner.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

No. 34. From H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner of Tanjore, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 2nd August 1860, No. 1,328.

7th June 1860.

In connection with my letter dated the 19th ultimo, No. 1,294, forwarding an explanation from Venkat Rau, late Residency Sarishtadar, relative to the pension secured for one of his sons.

* 25th June 1860.

2. I have the honor to transmit in original with four enclosures, a second communication* on the same subject from the late Sarishtadar which reached my office seventeen days subsequent to the receipt of the explanation in question, and which, from its discussive character, did not in the first instance seem to me to call submission to Government.

3. As, however, when I was adjusting my correspondence yesterday, in order to have things prepared for closing the Commissioner's office, I observed that the Ex-Sarishtadar has requested that his later address may be sent on, I now beg to forward it.

4. There is nothing in its contents which appears to call for observation from me other than what I have already written on his original explanation.

From VENKAT ROW, to H. D. PHILLIPS, Esq., Commissioner at Tanjore, dated 23rd June 1860.

Adverting to my letter to your address of the 7th instant, I have the honor to submit the following statement together with documents to support it, which I could not then give for want of sufficient particulars which I have since obtained and to request that you will forward the same for the information of the Honorable the Governor in Council appended to my letter above adverted to.

The questions put by you in your letter to my address of the 26th ultimo, regarding my second son Lutchman Venkaji Pandit's pension, clearly show that the term, "hereditary service" which forms one of the principal columns introduced in the pension lists and the chief subject of this letter is now interpreted as "the same office or situation held by all the succeeding members of ones family" instead of as "services rendered by the members of the same family one after the other not holding one and the same appointment but many of different descriptions and calling, as interpreted in the beginning and hitherto obtained, and advantage of this difference of interpretation appears to have been taken to deprive my son of his pension on the score of his not holding the same office which was held by his forefathers, while the three-fourth, of the pensioners have obtained and draw their pensions even on the present day on the strength of the first interpretation, of which I think you do not consider as part of your duty to take notice.

I shall, however, lay before you a more succinct statement in the matter, so that the Government may not be misguided in their proceedings in the present case.

No sooner did the order of the Government of India, dated about the middle part of November 1856, allowing pensions for all those who were hereditary servants of the Raja, notwithstanding their period of service falling short of the standard number of years laid by the Government of India in Mr. Secretary G. F. Edmondstone's letter of 6th September 1856, to entitle a man for a pension equal to the moiety of his former pay, reach the then Commissioner, Mr. Henry Forbes, than that officer ordered the late Sirkele of the Raja to prepare lists of all the Raja's Servants with a column inserted in them with the heading "services whether hereditary or otherwise," which was then done accordingly; the meaning of this heading having then been interpreted and approved as "services rendered by the Ancestors of the Incumbents for whom the pension was to be granted, whether in one and the same family which the first man of his family filled at the commencement, or otherwise;" the word *hereditary* was entered against the name of every pensioner, though they or their forefathers did not serve the Raja in one and the same office, as an instance of which I beg to annex the Lineage Tree marked A, containing the full account of the family of the late Sirkele Annaji Tiagaraj Pandit alias Annusami, and request your particular attention to the same.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

From the above document it will be observed that Annusami's grandfather, Bava Pandit, the originator of this family, was Sirkele of Rajah Tooljaji in the latter part of his reign, his son Tiagarajamsami the father of Annusami was Manager of the 96 gardens, &c. and Muzamdar, and again Annusami held the appointment of Sirkele, to which office he was promoted in 1844, previous to which he held the appointment of the Manager of Avusahib's gardens and many other minor offices; his son Gungadhara Annaji who did not hold the same appointment which his or any one of his predecessor held, gets a pension as hereditary servant of the Raja, so do all other brothers of Annusami and their children. To convince you further that this is not the only case, but all the cases stand in the same position, I enclose two Lineage Trees, marked B and C, of two other principal families, &c., Nilacuntarau Zadhaw alias Samirau Appa and Muthaji Rau alias Paria Anna, a careful inspection of which and perusal of the remarks contained in them will, it is presumed, surely convince the Government that my son's case is not the only one which requires any enquiry, and that I am unnecessarily troubled about this whilst others are quietly passed off.

I shall further beg of you to let me know why they have called only on me for explanation in regard to this my son's pension case, while they have done nothing of the kind with all the pensioners who stand in similar position with my son in every respect.

It is but very true as I have said in my last letter to you on this subject that my forefathers did not hold the same office of Muzamdar which my son now holds, but that of Deputy Muzamdar; in consequence of which the Government appear to doubt the claim of my son for a pension as hereditary servant of the Rajah, while they entertain no such doubt with regard to the family of Annusami more than 12 members of which draw pension while only 3 of my family do so, nor that of Samirau Appa's Lineage Tree marked B and Paria Anna's Lineage Tree marked C who now have the bounty of Government as well as many thousands.

The former two families were in the service of the Raja; but what claim could Govind Rau alias Chungamalum Appasami, the first man in document marked C, have upon the Raja. He is a Golla in caste not at all eligible for a respectable public post, nor did he or any of his ancestors serve the Raja in any capacity until the sister of Appasami named Mukta Boyee the founder of the charitable institution at Ortanad became the favorite concubine of the Raja Serfoji in 1800. Cases like this of a most important nature are quietly passed off, and exception is taken to my family which it will be seen from Lineage Tree marked D came to this country with the Rajah Yakoji the brother of the father and famous Maratta Rajah Seevaji.

From the whole the Government will, I am sure, clearly see that no father, son, grandson and great grandson, has served the Raja in one and the same office by which he is entitled to and can claim a pension. I can assure the Government that one-fourth of the pensioners stand in similar position with my son and the three families adverted to, and if they will institute an enquiry on the claims of each individual to pension under the present modified interpretation of the term "hereditary service," they will scarcely find one per cent. eligible to pension under this rule; and I humbly submit that they cannot under these circumstances take away my son's pension while they allow the others to continue, nor is it proper for a just and impartial Government to lay one rule in one particular case and another in other cases, and moreover ruin thereby an old and faithful servant of their Government, who has served them for upwards of half a century at the risk of his life and fortune, in addition to the disgrace and humiliation to which he has been of late subjected by his being compelled out of office.

In conclusion, I cannot but express my regret at the Government having been hitherto kept on the dark side of the case and myself put under the vain obligation of having recourse to such a long correspondence.

To convince the Honorable the Governor in Council, that my son is beyond any reasonable doubt entitled to the pension which he drew till very lately on the same grounds as the others, I have enclosed the Lineage Tree of my family marked D, and hope that my case will with all its details be taken into their mature consideration before any conclusion is come to, and thereby justice rendered to one of their old, faithful and lately much injured servant.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
11th September 1860.*

The names, posts, dates and salaries of parties mentioned in this letter, are transcribed from memory, wherefore there may be any little difference from the Palace records, which I beg you will kindly excuse as I have no record to give those particulars exactly nor have I access to the Palace records to enable me to give precise informations, wherefore I beg that you will be so good as to ascertain these particulars from the Palace records direct, whereby you will see whether my statements are corroborated or not, whereupon you can report the matter to Government, and I hope to derive justice therefrom.

No. 35. ORDER THEREON, 11th September 1860, No. 544.

The Government having considered the above letter and its enclosures, are of opinion that the claim of Ry Latchman Venkaji Pandit to hereditary service, has not been established, and that he cannot be admitted to pension as Muzamdar nor be allowed arrears of salary from that Office.

2. The Government fully admit the principle contended for by Vencat Row, in his letter to the Commissioner, under date the 23rd June last, that service under the Tanjore Raj to be regarded as hereditary, need not have been performed by successive members of the family in one and the same Office. It will suffice if the several members through whom service is claimed were all employed consecutively under the Raj, although in different situations. Thus taking the genealogical tree D of his family which Vencat Row has produced, Kistnagee Ramajee, and Soobajee Iwajee have been admitted to pensions of Rupees 3 and Rupees 7½ respectively, the ancestors of each having been successively in the Tanjore service from the time of the alleged founder of the family, Nauro Punt. Had Venkat Row himself been in the service of the late Rajahs as was his brother Jevajee Punt, Vencat Row's son, Lutchmenah Venkojee's claim would have been valid. But this link is wanting, and on account of this break, the title of Lutchmenah Venkojee to take credit for ancestral service must be regarded as barred.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,

Chief Secretary.

25-6-60
WV

H. D. Phillips Esq^r
Commissioner at
Tanjore

Sir,

Adverting to my letter to your address
of the 7th Instant, I have the honor to submit the
following statement together with documents to support
it, which I could not then give for want of sufficient
particulars which I have since obtained and to request
that you will forward the same for the information
of the Honorable the Governor in Council appen-
ded to my letter above adverted to.

The questions put by you in your letter to
my address of the 28th Ultimo regarding my second
son Letchman Venkaji Pandit's Pension clearly show
that the term, "Hereditary Service" which forms one of
the principal columns introduced in the Pension Lists
and the chief subject of this letter is now interpreted
as "the same office or situation held by all the
succeeding members of our's family" instead of as "Ser-
vices rendered by the members of the same family one
after

unintelligible
to WOH
not at all
see my
Phillips
report

after the other not holding one and the same
ment but many of different descriptions and
as interpreted in the beginning and hitherto
and advantage of this difference of Interpretation
seems to have been taken to deprive my
Pension on the score of his not holding the
Office which was held by his fore fathers and
three fourth of the Pensioners have obtained
draw their Pensions even on the present day
strength of the 1st interpretation, of which I think
you do not consider as part of your duty to take notice.

I shall however lay before you a more
cise statement in the matter so that the Government
may not be misguided in their proceedings in
the present case.

No sooner did the order of the Government
of India dated about the middle part of November
1856. allowing pensions for all those who were heri-
ditary Servants of the Rajah, notwithstanding their
period of Service falling short of the standard num-
ber of years laid by the Government of India in
Mr. Secretary G. F. Edmondstone's letter of 6th
September 1856 to the effect that in equal

2nd Son.
Thimmasa, yet
a Pension of 100 Rupees
a month as an heir.
-ary Second of the
Rajah.-

1st Son.
Vidwanatha was
employed 1836 and
draws a Pension of
Rupees 3 1/2 a month as
an heir.
-ary Second.

3rd Son. Ananda
-dawnny. He was in-
-dawnny, but was yet
-ing, Rajah.-

2nd Son Rajan
-dawnny, died childless
while very young.-

4th Son.
Rajonathasamy
died 15 years ago.
-dawnny yet a Pension
of 3 Rupees a
Month.-

1st Son. Raja
-rajahdawnny left
Saugur in 1834 for
Savane.-

Second Son.
Thimmasasamy, on the
receipt of a Pay of 17 1/2 Rs
a month in the beginning of
the reign of Surfoze.-

3rd Son. D. Sub
-Suble of Surfoze
in the latter Part of his
reign. 1st Son of the family
on the receipt of 70 Rupees a
Month in the beginning of
reign of Surfoze.-

1st Son.
Thimmasa
-dawnny
-ary Second.

2nd Son.
Vidwanatha
-dawnny
-ary Second.

3rd Son.
Rajan
-dawnny
-ary Second.

4th Son.
Rajonathasamy
-dawnny
-ary Second.

5th Son.
Mallavarasamy
-dawnny
-ary Second.

6th Son.
Appannasamy
-dawnny
-ary Second.

7th Son.
Rangasamy
-dawnny
-ary Second.

8th Son.
Rajagajahsamy
-dawnny
-ary Second.

9th Son.
Sobbasamy, died
about 10 years ago while
in the service of the
Rajah of Poottoor.
Consequently he has not
been in the Rajah's
-rice.-

10th Son.
Sungahsamy, Anaga
-dawnny draws a Pension of
Rupees 15 a month as he
-dawnny servant his
Services extend to only
15 years being entertained
in 1845.-

11th Son.
Annoorasamy alias
Anagie, Rajagajah
-dawnny, was employed as
Suble in 1844. & died in
December 1859 while in the
receipt of a full Pension
of Rupees 130 a
Month.-

12th Son.
First Son.
Rajagajahsamy
on the receipt of a Pay of
Rupees 17 1/2 a month in the
beginning of the reign of
Surfoze.-

13th Son.
Ojakerasamy
employed under the
Rajah and died about
20 years ago.-

14th Son.
Rangasamy was
not employed under
the Rajah.-

15th Son.
Sona Poddava
-dawnny died about
10 years ago, leaving a
widow, who draws a
Pension of Rupees 10
a Month.-

16th Son.
Sunkar Rao was
first entertained as an
-dawnny in Poottoor in
1835, and promoted as an
-dawnny in 1842 on a salary
of Rupees 25 a month.

17th Son.
Rajagajahsamy
draws a Pension of
Rupees 25 a month & about 2 years
old child, residing
in Poottoor.

1840-1845
1846-1848

1848-1850
1851-1852

1853-1854

6th Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
was appointed as
manager of the
company in 1855
and died in 1857
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

5th Son.
Sankaragathu
has not shown his
Pension yet.

3rd Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
got 15 Papes
as Pension.

1st Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
got 15 Papes
as Pension.

3rd Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
died childless.

4th Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
was appointed as
manager of the
company in 1855
and died in 1857
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

2nd Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
He was appointed
as manager of the
company in 1855
and died in 1857
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

Annanda Rowgathu
died in 1820
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

1st Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
was appointed
as manager of the
company in 1855
and died in 1857
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

1st Son.
Dwarkanathgathu
He was appointed
as manager of the
company in 1855
and died in 1857
at the age of 30.
He was succeeded by
his son, Dhanrajgathu.

1855-1856

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 My son was
 established in 1840 and
 was yet a Pacific from
 goods as he was
 towards of the Pacific
 before 15

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.

2nd Don.
 Had been away
 to the Pacific of
 long & was now a
 boy of about 18 years
 old.



Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

Handwritten text in a circular arrangement, possibly a seal or a specific type of script.

for communication to
Lachman Venkaji Pandit.

under orders of the Govt
of

Handwritten text on the left margin.

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 a pension of Rupees
 3 per month.

2nd Son
 = father Pant, He
 died in infancy.

3rd Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 entertained in the Loomahel
 Dept as accountant in
 the beginning of the present reign
 1852 was he was promoted
 as Manager of the Banking
 Department on a salary
 of 20 Rupees & died
 in 1854.

2nd Son
 Rishajit Pant, He
 served in different Capac-
 ities in the Hooprahahel
 and at last succeeded his mother
 Ranthumahel as Father &
 died without issue.

Only Son
 Pant, who was promoted
 in the present reign
 as a salary of 20 Rupees
 while holding Office
 of the present father

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 was promoted in the
 of the Department in which his
 elder brother & his ancestors have
 served as Deputy & in other offices
 the time of Chitja. He was employed
 in 1855 and he now has a pension
 of Rupees 20 a month. This case
 is now at issue.

3rd Son
 Seajit Pant, who
 was entertained in 1855
 as a salary of Rupees
 10 a month.

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 was promoted in the
 of the Department in which his
 elder brother & his ancestors have
 served as Deputy & in other offices
 the time of Chitja. He was employed
 in 1855 and he now has a pension
 of Rupees 20 a month. This case
 is now at issue.

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 was promoted in the
 of the Department in which his
 elder brother & his ancestors have
 served as Deputy & in other offices
 the time of Chitja. He was employed
 in 1855 and he now has a pension
 of Rupees 20 a month. This case
 is now at issue.

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 was promoted in the
 of the Department in which his
 elder brother & his ancestors have
 served as Deputy & in other offices
 the time of Chitja. He was employed
 in 1855 and he now has a pension
 of Rupees 20 a month. This case
 is now at issue.

1st Son
 Ramajit Pant, who
 was promoted in the
 of the Department in which his
 elder brother & his ancestors have
 served as Deputy & in other offices
 the time of Chitja. He was employed
 in 1855 and he now has a pension
 of Rupees 20 a month. This case
 is now at issue.

[illegible]

To the Honble. of Tanjore
for communication
Lachman Venkaji Pan

Political Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government.
Read the following
from the Commissioner
Bangalore.

(Here rules 19th July 1860
22 August 1860, Bangalore)

Order thereon 11th September 1860, No. 544.

The Govt. having considered the above letter and its enclosures are of opinion that the claim of Raj Satchman Venkaji Prasad to hereditary office has not been established, and that he cannot be admitted to pension or Muqamdar nor be allowed arrears of salary from that office.

The Govt. fully admits the principle contended for by Venkat Rao in his letter to the Commissioner under

Will
G

W

Political Dept. Secy.

N. 544.

Per. H. Government

11th September 1860

33035

under date the 29th June
last that ~~the~~ service under
the Tanjore Raj to be re-
-garded as hereditary, need
not have been performed
by successive Members
of the family in one and
the same office. It will
suffice if the several
Members through whom
service is claimed were
all employed consecutively
under the Raj, although
in different situations,
thus taking the genealo-
-gical tree D of his
family which Venkat
Row has produced.

Kistnagar Ramajee, and
Sookajee Swajee have
been admitted to pen-
-sions of Rupees 3 and
Rupees 7⁵ respectively -
the ancestors of each
having been successively
in the Tanjore Service
from the time of the
alleged founder of
the family Nannu Punt.

Had

Had Venkat Row himself
been in the service of
the late Rajahs, as was
his brother Javajee Punt,
Venkat Row's son, Sutch-
manah Venkojee's claim
would have been valid.
But this link is wanting
and on account of this
break, the title of
Sutchmanah Venkojee
to take credit for suc-
-cessoral service must
be regarded as barred.

J.P.

Agent
To the Commissioner of Tanjore,
for communication to Raj
Sutchman Venkojee Punt.

Sept. 15th

Mulani