

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	608	Press Mis
Dated	12-10-1860	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
12th October 1860.

No. 35. To the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, dated Fort Saint George, 12th October 1860, No. 608.

In continuation of my letters dated the 5th May last, Nos. 292 and 294, relating to the disposal of the jewels, and of the contents of the armoury of the late Raja of Tanjore, I am now directed by the Honorable the Governor in Council, with reference to paragraph 5 of Mr. Secretary Edmonstone's letter of 8th September 1856, No. 4,644, to submit for the information and orders of the Government of India, copies of letters from the Commissioner of Tanjore, and of the Proceedings of Government thereon, as noted in the margin, respecting the investigation and settlement of the debts due by that Prince.

Proceedings 23rd March 1860, Nos. 19 & 20.
 „ 1st May „ „ 1 & 2.
 „ 18th „ „ „ 24 to 28.
 „ 23rd June „ „ 81.
 „ 14th July „ „ 25 & 26.
 „ 16th August „ „ 43 to 45.
 „ 21st Sept. „ „ 76 & 77.

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

3. With his report of the 11th April, the Commissioner submitted a statement of claims above 50 Rupees each which he had investigated, and a Memorandum showing his decision in each case and the grounds of it. The number of these claims was 48, and the amount claimed Rupees 8,13,986-11-7½. Of these, 16 were rejected and 32 admitted. The aggregate amount awarded under these 32 claims was Rupees 1,11,509-12-6½.

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

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

Above 50 Rupees.....	114 =	Rupees 8,25,060
Below 50 „	488 =	„ 5,007
	-----	-----
	602 =	8,30,067

These last Mr. Phillips proceeded to dispose of under the authority given him, as stated in para. 2 of this letter. The 48 claims entered in the Statement and Memorandum which accompanied the Commissioner's letter belong to the first class. They include, with one exception, all the debts standing against the Raja in the Sirkele's list of which the amounts respectively exceeded Rupees 1,000.

6. Among these 48 claims in excess of Rupees 50 each, there were however 14, in each of which the sum awarded by the Commissioner was below Rupees 150, and he was authorized to discharge these at once.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
12th October 1860

7. Besides the 602 claims borne on the Sirkele's lists, there were as many as 2,976 others, originating in arrears of stipend, salary and wages from periods prior and subsequent to the Raja's death up to the dates of the abolition in 1857 of the three* minor establishments. These 2,976 claims amounted to Rupees 36,591. Of these 86 aggregating Rupees 15,615 were each in excess of Rupees 50. The remaining 2,890 amounted collectively to Rupees 20,976, and Mr. Phillips was authorized to settle them at once under the power previously given him.

8. From the Commissioner's letter of the 12th April, it will be seen that of the above 2,976 claims, 992 belong to the Dowlut Pamloke Department, of which two above 50 Rupees were settled by the late Sirkele after a list of them had been prepared, 956 are for sums respectively below Rupees 50, which the Commissioner has settled by awards involving an aggregate disbursement of Rupees 6,995-1-10, and the remaining 34 above that amount are reported on by him.

9. The total of all these 34 claims is Rupees 4,936-1-7. The Commissioner has rejected 19 and allowed 15, the aggregate amount awarded being Rupees 1,314-8-6. The highest award, as will be seen from the Statement appended to the report, was for Rupees 192-2-7, and the lowest Rupees 17-0-8. These were ordered to be paid at once.

10. The similar claims in the Hoozoor Pamloke and Dowlut Lushkur Puttak Departments are as follows:

	Above Rupees 50	Below Rupees 50
Hoozoor Pamloke	37	1,633
Dowlut Lushkur Puttak.....	13	301
	50	1,934

Those above Rupees 50 (increased however to 56 in number) of an aggregate amount of Rupees 10,933-8-10½ have been reported on by the Commissioner in his letter of the 26th April. He has rejected 23 and allowed 33 at an aggregate sum of Rupees 6,319-9-1½, which he was authorized to discharge at once. The 1,934 cases each under Rupees 50, he disposed of at once under the general power given him.

11. Above, in paragraph 3, it was mentioned that of 114 claims above Rupees 50 on the Sirkele's lists, 48 were reported on by the Commissioner in his letter of the 11th April. In his letter of the 19th idem, the Commissioner reported on 61 more of the same class, the remaining 5 having apparently been settled by the Sirkele. These 61 claims amount in the aggregate to Rupees 12,227-13-6, 25 have been rejected and 36 admitted, involving a disbursement of Rupees 7,499-3-2. Of the 36 allowed, 12 are for sums below Rupees 100 each, which this Government has ordered to be at once disbursed. Thus all the claims, 602 in number, entered in the Sirkele's lists have been reported on or disposed of.

12. Besides the claims borne in the Sirkele's lists and those connected with the Dowlut Pamloke, Hoozoor Pamloke and Dowlut Lushkur Puttak Establishments, several claims were preferred to the Commissioner in person. In his letter of the 25th June, Mr. Phillips reported on all such claims remaining for enquiry, which had been preferred to him up to the 10th of that month, the date fixed by this Government as that within which all claims must be sent in. Deducting claims which were mere repetitions of those already reported on, and 4 of which the Commissioner himself disposed of as being below Rupees 50 each, there remained 28.

13. The sums claimed by these 28 parties amount to Rupees 1,02,382-12-6. The Commissioner has rejected 20, and admitted in part 8, the aggregate sum awarded to these last being Rupees 14,225-8-2.

14. The Commissioner was authorized to disburse at once the sums awarded to the parties named in the margin, if the claimants were willing to accept them in full of all demands. The sum of Rupees 127 3-11, awarded to No. 24, Gopaul Naik, was, as will be observed from the Commissioner's Memorandum, to be paid from the amount in deposit on account of the claimant in the Collector's Treasury.

15. This Government do not altogether concur in the view taken by the Commissioner of Ramanatha Bhat's claim, No. 5, and in his award of only Rupee 4,611-8-0. They observe that the sale price fixed for the houses purchased for the Raja was Rupees 16,611-8-0, and that only Rupees 6,000 have been paid towards this sum. They therefore do not see any reason why possession is to be given on payment of only Rupees 4,611-8-0. They are of opinion that the full balance of Rupees 10,611-8-0, ought to be paid, and this sum they accordingly recommend for the sanction of the Government of India. The further demand for interest, they consider, must be refused, the enjoyment of the property being viewed as its set off.

16. In case No. 6, the sum of Rupees 8,100 has been allowed by the Commissioner as principal due to the claimant, as admitted in the year 1841. It seems to the Government then but fair that interest should be allowed on this amount. This for 19 years will amount to a sum equal to the principal. Payment of Rupees 16,200 to this claimant is therefore recommended to the Government of India.

17. There is another case, No. 19 of the Sirkele's list, reported on by the Commissioner in his letter of the 11th April in which this Government has seen reason to differ from the view taken by that Officer. The claim 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 Saraboji 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.

18. 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 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 then 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.

19. It seems to the Madras 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 they accordingly recommend to the Government of India that the amount, Rupees 31,110 be paid to him.

20. In the opening paragraphs of his letter of the 28th July last, the Commissioner has offered a few remarks on the conclusion arrived at by Government in favor of Vencut Row's claim, but the Governor in Council does not see cause for modifying his views.

21. It will be seen that the Commissioner has, in obedience to the Order of this Government, dated 23rd June, taken steps for bringing before him the various persons whose claims upon the late Raja had come under his enquiry, and affording them opportunity to state in person any objections which they might have to urge to his awards. The means employed seem to have been sufficient. Mr. Phillips explains why he did not adopt them in the first instance, and shows the peculiar character of the dealing between the Raja and his creditors, and that nearly all the information on the subject of his debts had to be obtained from the Palace Accounts, the correctness of which hardly any claimant had attempted to gainsay.

* These Establishments are described by the former Commissioner, Mr. H. Forbes, in general terms in his letter 16th January 1857.

Dowlut Pamloke.—Servants only who were appointed to Office by the late Raja.

Hoozoor Pamloke.—Servants who were in Office at the time of the Raja's accession.

Dowlut Lushkur Puttak.—Raja's relations, and all connected with His Highness' Troops.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
12th October 1860.*

22. In a few instances only has the Commissioner modified his previous awards in consequence of the personal intercourse held with such of the creditors as chose to appear before him. These amended awards have been substituted for those forwarded in the several cases with the Commissioner's previous reports.

23. With his letter of the 1st August the Commissioner has submitted a tabulated Statement, showing at one view the result of his examination of the pecuniary liabilities of the late Raja.

24. The total number of claims, including those for arrears of wages due to the servants of the Raja's various establishments, was 3,957, of which 3,730 were claims for sums below Rupees 50, and 227 for larger amounts. The aggregate of the sums claimed was Rupees 9,71,684, viz.

On account of claims above Rupees 50 each, Rupees 9,41,467.
" of claims below Rupees 50 each, Rupees 27,217.

NOTE.—The amounts given in paragraph 25 differ from those entered in the Statement appended to the Commissioner's letter of the 1st August 1860, in consequence of the amount of the original award instead of that of the amended one in the case, No. 11, having been included in the Statement.

No. 11. Sakkaram Sahib.
Original award Rupees 23,691-4-9
Amended " " 8,117-4-6
Difference Rupees 15,574-0-3

25. The total amount awarded was Rupees 1,86,332, of which Rupees 1,41,122 was awarded by the Commissioner, and Rupees 45,210 has been added by Government. Again, of the above award Rupees 1,86,332, Rupees 23,396 was for claims below Rupees 50, and Rupees 1,62,935 for claims above Rupees 50.

26. The Commissioner has paid awards to the amount of Rupees 15,066, being for the most part those of petty sums which he was himself authorized to adjudicate, with a few sums of somewhat larger amount, which the Government on review of his reports directed him to disburse.

27. There still remains for payment Rupees 1,71,265 to be distributed to 2,215 individuals. Such of the sums included in this amount as are below Rupees 50, or in respect to which special authority in that behalf has been given, will be paid by the Government Agent, due notice being given to parties entitled, by means of the District Gazette, as provided in the Order of Government, 23rd March last. The major part, however, is due on account of heavier claims, of which a separate Statement prepared in this Office is submitted for the Orders of the Government of India, and I am now directed to solicit their sanction for the disbursement of Rs. 1,52,336-9-6½ in liquidation of these claims.

28. I am desired on this occasion to forward also for the information of the Government of India a copy of the Proceedings noted in the margin, containing the instructions given for the disposal of the sums due to creditors which were in deposit in the Raj Treasury on the death of the late Raja on the 29th October 1855, and ready to be paid to them at that time.

29. The total amount in deposit for the above purpose was Rupees 1,01,857-0-10. On his own authority the late Sirkele discharged claims on this deposit to the extent of Rupees 1,791-10-0, leaving for distribution the sum of Rupees 1,00,065-6-10. Of this amount the Government, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, directed Rupees 77,324-2-10½ to be paid to the creditors, Rupees 12,712-2-6 to be carried to the public account, and the remainder Rupees 10,029-1-5½ to continue in deposit until further orders.

30. In conclusion, I am desired to report that the Commission was closed on the 14th August last, and that Mr. Phillips has returned to Madras and resumed his seat in the Sudder Court.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
12th October 1860.*

Statement of the claims against the late Raja of Tanjore recommended for the sanction of the Government of India.

No. of the claims.	Name of the Claimant.	Amount of claim.			Amount recommended for payment.			Remarks.
		RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	
IN THE SIRKELE'S LIST.								
1	The Avu Sahiba...	5,561	4	5	1,387	6	3	Award modified by the Commissioner, Vide letter, 23rd July 1860, No. 1313.
2	Kamakshi Bhai Sahiba ...	10,875	1	2½	2,181	3	2½	
3	The Bahai Sahibs ...	19,373	10	7	17,609	7	3	
4	S. C. Rajasa Bhai Ammani Raja Sahib ...	65,905	2	5	1,477	4	4	
5	S. C. V. Mohana Mukta Bhai Ammani Raja Sahib.	17,216	13	11	3,498	4	8	D. do.
6	Sulatchanabhai Ammani Raja Sahib ...	2,498	4	4	2,496	1	1	
7	Sakvarabhai Ammani Raja ...	3,040	2	4	3,040	2	4	
9	Mangalavas...	27,465	13	9	27,465	13	9	
11	Sakkaram Sahib...	30,765	2	6	8,117	4	6	Admitted by Government, Vide Proceedings, 23rd June 1860, No. 392.
12	Ramachandra Row Surve...	5,756	5	2	5,756	5	2	
14	Ramabadra Bhonsle ...	238	8	10	238	8	10	
15	Gnanambabhai ...	630	0	0	630	0	0	
16	Rajakumarabhai Ammani Raja ..	780	9	11	780	9	11	
18	Ramachandra Row Ingle...	925	10	11	925	10	11	
19	Vencut Row ...	37,487	3	4	31,110	0	0	
33	Chitubavaswami ..	1,000	0	0	1,000	0	0	
303	Row Sahib Gantge ...	20,755	2	8	4,621	13	0	
313	Komalu ...	803	1	2	803	1	2	
451	Guzer Ramnad Bhat...	1,945	2	0	1,945	2	0	
77	Rakhmaji Gantgay ...	527	0	0	411	7	2	
78	Govindasamy Mestri...	188	14	0	188	14	0	
129	Rakhmaji Gantgay ...	108	8	5	108	8	5	
149	Vaithilingam, at Saraya Choultry ...	180	14	4	180	14	4	
150	Permal Naik, Herdsman ...	155	15	7	155	15	7	
246	Modali Ausary, Carpenter...	850	2	0	850	2	0	
253	Rudra Cotti ...	150	0	0	150	0	0	
442	Narrainasami Naik ...	644	4	11	644	4	11	
444	Annamale, female servant...	179	1	3	179	1	3	
446	Kumarasami, Tailor ...	639	5	6	639	5	6	
449	Sitambara Ausary, Carpenter ...	166	14	10	166	14	10	
452	Zegannath Pondia Guzar...	169	1	7	179	1	7	
453	Ramachandra Davi ...	173	6	0	173	6	0	
454	Ramakristna Zasi ...	349	9	7	349	9	7	
455	Amreswara Taker ...	285	0	0	285	0	0	
456	Toppe Venkatakrishna Chetty...	228	0	0	228	0	0	
457	Toppe Subba Chetty...	322	0	9	322	0	9	
462	Bhaji Vira Chetty ...	115	14	4	115	14	4	
463	Kumbi Aligiri Chetty ...	215	2	9	215	2	9	
464	Subba Naik ...	185	4	0	185	4	0	
465	Bhaji Venkatachela Naik...	118	12	0	118	12	0	
457	Devanna Mannaru ...	144	6	4	144	6	4	
473	Satwaji Sevaji Navadkar ...	480	0	0	480	0	0	
475	Gangathara Rakhmaji...	409	4	8	409	4	8	
CLAIMS PREFERRED TO THE COMMISSIONER IN PERSON.								
5	Ramanada Bhat...	21,223	0	0	10,611	8	0	Award modified by Government, Vide Proceedings, 14th July 1860, No. 425.
6	Nagoji Appaji.....	23,850	0	0	16,200	0	0	
21	Ramabadra Bhonsle and Gnanba Bhai...	1,100	0	0	1,100	0	0	
DOWLAT LUSHKUR PUTTAK.								
10	Mankoji Ramachandra Rau Gade ...	2,469	9	2	2,469	9	2	Award modified by the Commissioner, Vide letter 28th July 1860.
Total Rupees...				1,52,336	9	6½		

Sept 15. 1900
Encl. 10

Political Department.

N. 608.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India.

Foreign Department.

Sir,

In continuation of my letters dated the 5th May last. N^{os} 292 & 294, relating to the disposal of the Jewels & of the contents of the Armory of the late Raja of Tanjore, I am now directed by the Honble the Governor in Council, with reference to para 5 of Mr Secretary Edmonstone's letter of 8th September 1886, N^o 4644, to submit for the information and orders of the Govt. of India, copies of letters from the Commissioner of Tanjore, and of the Proceedings of Govt. thereon, as noted in the margin, respecting the investigation & settlement of the debts due by that Prince.

W. M.
J. L.

W. M.

Recd. 28 March 1900. N^o 19420.
1st May ———— 1900.
18 ———— 26 to 28.
25 June ———— 27.
14 July ———— 28 & 29.
16 August ———— 29 & 30.
21 Sept ———— 30 & 1.

Sh

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

3 With his report of the 11th April the Commissioner submitted a statement of claims above 50 Rupees each, which he had investigated, and a memorandum showing his decision in each case, and the grounds of it. The number of these claims was 48, and the amount claimed Rs. 5,12,986-11-7/2. Of these, 16 were rejected & 32 admitted. The aggregate amount awarded under these 32 claims was Rs. 1,45,009-2-6/2.

4 Mr. Phillips, the Commissioner, explained that, subsequently to the death of the Raja, & while all

all the members of the family, were united in their desire to secure the succession to the Raj for his daughter, the affairs of the Durbar ^{had been} were, in most instances, honestly & regularly conducted. Among other measures, a list of the pecuniary liabilities of the deceased Prince ^{had been} was prepared in the Sirke's Department. Additions to it were made after Mr. H. Forbes had been appointed Commissioner, but these had mostly reference to claims arising on the supply, loan, or deposit of articles of which the prices had not been definitely fixed at the date of the Raja's demise. This statement was closed in October 1886, but it should be understood that its preparation must have been conducted independently of the individual members of the Raj family, whose names appear in it as creditors for large amounts.

5 The aggregate number of claims entered in the lists prepared

prepared by the Sirkela ¹⁰⁰⁰ is 602, embracing a sum of Rs. 2,25,060-1-2, of these there ¹⁰⁰⁰ are

Above 50 Rupees - Rs. 2,25,060
Below 50 ———— 488 ———— 5007
602 = 2,30,067

These last Mr. Phillips proceeded to dispose of under the authority given him, as stated in para 4 of this letter. The 48 claimers entered in the Statement Villenorepandum which accompanied the Commissioner's letter belong to the first class. They include, with one exception, all the debts standing against the Raja in the Sirkela's list of which the amounts respectively exceeded Rs. 1000.

6. Among the 48 claimers in excess of Rs. 50 each, there were however 141

There were however 141 of these claims in each of which the award was below Rs. 50 & the Commissioner was authorised to discharge these at once.

7 Besides the 602 claims borne on the Sirkela's list, there were many as 2976 others, originating in arrears of stipend, salary & wages from periods prior and subsequent

* Dowlut Pambola
Hozore Pambola
Dowlut Lushkar Pambola

* Hoot Hole.

These establishments are detailed by the former servants, Mr. H. Forbes, in quoting 2890 amounting collectively in his letter to the Commissioner, 1857. Dowlut Pambola - servants who were appointed to offices by the late Raja. Hozore Pambola - servants who were in office at the time of the Raja's accession. Dowlut Lushkar Pambola - Raja's relations & all connected with his troops.

subsequent to the Raja's death up to the date of the abolition in 1857 of the three minor establishments. There 2976 claim amount to Rs. 36,591. Of these

86 aggregating Rs. 15,615 are each in excess of Rs. 50. The remainder to Rs. 20,976, Mr. Phillips was authorised to settle at once under the power given him.

From the Commissioner's letter of the 12th April, it will be seen that of the above 2976 claims 992 belong to the Dowlut Pambola Department, of which two above 50 Rs. were settled by the late Sirkela after a list of them had been prepared - 906 are for sums respectively below Rs. 50, which the Commissioner has settled by awards involving an aggregate disbursement of Rs. 6,995-1-11 and the remaining 34 above that amount are those reported on by him.

9 The total of all these 34 claims is Rs. 4936-1-7. The Commissioner has

has rejected 9 and allowed 5, the aggregate amount awarded being Rs. 92-0-6. The highest award, as will be seen from the Statement appended to the report, was for Rs. 92-2-7, and the lowest Rs. 17-4-2. These were ordered to be paid at once.

The similar claims in the Hojor Panbake and Daulat Lushkur Pattak Departments are as follows:

	Above Rs. 50	Below Rs. 50
Hojor Panbake	50	1533
Daulat Lushkur Pattak	15	501
	50	1934

Those above Rs. 50 (increased however to 56 in number) of an aggregate amount of Rs. 13,933-8-0 have been reported on by the Commissioner in his letter of the 26th April. He has allowed at an aggregate sum of Rs. 14,344, which he was authorised to discharge at once. The 1434

above in para 8 it was mentioned that of 11 claims above Rs. 50 on the Birhale's lists, 48 were reported on by the Commissioner in his letter of the 11th April. In his letter

letter of the 19th idem, the Commissioner reported on 61 more of the same class, the remaining having apparently been settled by the Birhale. These 61 claims amount in the aggregate to Rs. 12,227-13-6. 25 have been rejected & 36 admitted involving a disbursement of Rs. 7,499-8-2. Of the 36 allowed, 12 are for sums below Rs. 100 each, which this Govt. has ordered to be at once disbursed. Thus all the claims, 604 in number, entered in the Birhale's lists have been reported on or disposed of.

12. Besides the claims borne in the Birhale's lists, some are also in the Hojor Panbake - Hojor Panbake and Daulat Lushkur Pattak Departments. Several claims were reported to the Commissioner in his letter of the 11th April.

12. In his letter of the 25th June the Commissioner reported on all the claims against the late Rajah remaining for inquiry, which had been preferred up to the 30th of that month, the date fixed by this Govt. as that within which all claims must be sent in. Deducting claims which were mere repetitions of those already reported on, and 4 of which the Commissioner himself disposed of as being below Rs. 50 each, there

entirely in the Rs. 50, the Commissioner reported on 61 more of the same class, the remaining having apparently been settled by the Birhale.

there remained 28.

18 The sums claimed by these
20 parties amount to Rs. 2,302-12-6.
The Commissioner has rejected
20, and admitted in part 8, the
aggregate sum awarded to these
last being Rs. 1,225-0-2.

14 The Commissioner was au-
thorised to disburse, at once the
sums awarded to the parties
named in the margin, if the
claimants were willing to accept
them in full of all demands.

The sum of Rs. 127-8-4 awarded
to Mr. 24 Lofed Nath and, as will
be observed from the Commis-
sioner's Memorandum, to be
paid from the amount in deposit
on account of the plaintiff in
the Collector's Treasury.

15 This ^{will do} ~~has not~~ altogether
satisfied in the view taken by
the Commissioners of Ramanatha
Sethi's claim, &c, & in his award
of only Rs 4, ~~the~~ 000. They observe
that the sale price fixed for the
houses purchased for the Rajah
was

was Rs. 16,611-8-0. and that only Rs. 6,000 have been paid towards this sum. They therefore do not see any reason why possession is to be given on payment of only Rs. 4,611-8-0. They are of opinion that the full balance of Rs. 10,611-8-0. ought to be paid. and this sum they accordingly recom-
-mend for the sanction of the Govt. of India. The further de-
-mand for Interest, they consider, must be refused, the enjoyment of the property being viewed as its set off.

16. In case No 6 the sum of Rs. 2,100 has been allowed by the Commissioner as principal due to the claimant, as admitted in the year 1841. It seems to the Govt that but for that interest should be allowed on this amount - This for 19 years will amount to a sum equal to the principal. Payment of Rs. 2,200 to this claimant is therefore recommended to the Govt of India.

17 There is another page, N^o 19
of the Birkebe's List, reported on
by

by the Commissioner in his letter of the 11th April in which this Court has seen reason to differ from the view taken by that Officer. The claim is preferred by Vincent Row, Sheristadar of the Court Agency.

The total amount is Rs. 37,875-4, the major part of which or Rs. 31,110,

is for arrears of an allowance assigned by the Rajah Saraboji, to Vincent Row's wife, whom the Rajah is stated to have adopted.

Mr Phillips has discussed this claim at some length, & has rejected it, on the ground that it is not supported by the accounts.

18 The Court must however observe that this claim, then stated to amount to between Rs. 20,000 & 32,000, was advanced by Vincent Row in the year 1846, in Petition which he addressed Sir H. Montgomery & their conducting the duties of Resident at Tanjore, & that in forwarding it to Court, Sir Henry stated that the Rajah had on one or two occasions mentioned to him his desire to discharge these arrears.

The

then

The Court were however of opinion that so long as Vincent Row was in the employment of the British Court, he could not receive money from the Tanjore Durbar, they therefore would not sanction his receipt of the arrears unless he previously stated his appointment as Resident Sheristadar.

19 It seems to the Madras Court that this distinct recognition by the Rajah of Vincent 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 they accordingly recommended to the Court of India that the amount, Rs. 31,110 be paid to him.

20 In the opening paras of his letter of the 28th July last, the Commissioner has offered a few remarks on the ^{conclusion} decision arrived at by Court in favor of Vincent Row's claim, but the Governor in Council does not see cause for modifying that decision. his views.

It

21 It will be seen that the Commissioner has, in obedience to the Order of this Court, dated 23rd June, taken steps for bringing before him the various persons whose claims upon the late Rajah had come under his enquiry and affording them opportunity to state in person any objections which they might have to urge to his awards. The means employed seem to have been sufficient.

Mr Phillips explains why he did not adopt them ^{before}, & shows the peculiar character of the dealing between the Rajah & his creditors, & that nearly all the information on the subject of his debts ^{had to} be obtained from the Palace Accounts, the correctness of which hardly any claimant had attempted to gain say.

22 In a few instances only has the Commissioner modified his previous awards in consequence of the personal intercourse held with such of the creditors

as chose to appear before him. These amended awards have been substituted for those forwarded in the several cases with the Commissioner's previous reports.

23 With his letter of the 1st August the Commissioner has submitted a tabulated statement of the result of his examination of the pecuniary liabilities of the late Rajah.

24 The total number of claims, including those for arrears of wages due to the servants of the Rajah's various Establishments, was 3,957, of which 2,730 were claims for sums below Rs. 50, & 227 for larger amounts. The aggregate of the sums claimed was Rs. 9,71,684. viz:

On account of claims above Rs. 50 each Rs. 9,44,467.
 " " of claims below Rs. 50 each Rs. 27,217.

25 The total amount awarded was Rs. 14,38,227, of which Rs. 14,12,700 was originally awarded by the Commissioner, & Rs. 25,527 has been added by Court. Again, of the above award Rs. 14,38,227, Rs. 23,396 was for claims below Rs. 50 & Rs. 14,14,831 for claims above Rs. 50.

Showing it one view

Note. The amounts given in para 25 differ from those given in the statement appended to the Court's Order of the 1st Aug. 1880, in consequence of the amendment of the original award, & that of the amended one in the case, & Rs. 25,527 being included in the statement.

Rs. 25,527
 Original award Rs. 23,396-4-9
 Amended " " 2,131-4-6
 Difference Rs. 2,131-4-3

① in the first instance

The

26 The Commissioner has paid awards to the amount of Rs. 1,066, being for the most part three of petty sums which he was himself authorised to adjudicate, with a few sums of somewhat larger amount, which the Govt. on review of his reports directed him to disburse.

27 There still remains for payment Rs. ^{57,265} ~~25,000~~ to be distributed to 2,215 individuals. Such of the sums included in this amount as are below Rs. 50 or in respect to which special authority in that behalf has been given, will be paid by the Govt. Agent - due notice being given to parties entitled by means of the District Gazette, as provided in the Order of Govt. 23rd March last. The major part however is due on account of heavier claims, of which a separate statement prepared in this Office is submitted for the Orders of the Govt. of India - and I am now directed

to

to solicit their sanction for the disbursement of Rs. 1,52,336-9-6 1/2 in liquidation of these claims.

28 I am desired on this occasion to forward also for the information of the Govt. of India a copy of the Proceedings, noted in the margin, containing the instructions given for the disposal of the sums due to creditors which were in deposit in the Raj. Treasury on the death of the late Rajah on the 29th October 1856, and ready to be paid to them at that time.

29 The total amount in deposit for the above purpose was Rs. 1,01,857-0-10. On his own authority the late Sirkele discharged claims on this deposit to the extent of Rs. 1,791-10-9 leaving for distribution the sum of Rs. 99,065-6-10. Of this amount the Govt., on the recommendation of the Commissioner, directed Rs. 77,324-2-10 1/2 to be paid to the Creditors

Expenditure - (Rs. 12,712-2-6) to be car-
ried to the public account - and
the remainder (Rs. 10,29-1-5 1/2) to
continue in deposit until
further orders.

30 In conclusion I am
desired to report that the
Commission was closed on
the 16th August last, and that
Mr Phillips has returned to
Madras and resumed his
seat in the Sudder Court

T. St George
12th Oct 1860



No. of the Claim	Name of the claimant	Amount of claim	Amount recommended for payment	Remarks.
		<u>R. A. P.</u>	<u>R. A. P.</u>	

No.	Name	1857	1858
1	The Hon Sahib	5361 4 5	5378 3
2	Kimokshi Bhai Sahib	10,875 1 2 1/2	2,700 3 2 1/2
3	The Bhai Sahib	17,273 10 7	27,400 7 3
4	S. L. Rajasa Bhai Dhanmani Raja Sahib	65,905 2 5	15,777 4 1/2
5	S. L. T. Mohana Mahabhai Dhanmani Raja Sahib	17,216 10 1	2,198 4 8
6	Sulataharabhai Dhanmani Raja Sahib	2,198 4 4	2,198 1 1
7	Saktarabhai Dhanmani Raja	3,060 2 4	3,060 2 60
9	Mangalawas	27,665 13 9	27,665 13 9
11	Saktaram Sahib	30,765 2 6	2,117 4 4
12	Ramachandra Row Surge	5,756 5 3	5,756 5 2
14	Ramabadra Bhande	238 8 10	238 8 10
15	Yannambabhai	620 . .	620 . .
16	Rajakumarabhai Dhanmani Raja	780 9 11	780 9 11
18	Ramachandra Row Shigle	925 10 11	925 10 11
19	Venkat Row	27,107 3 4	3,110 . .
32	Chitubhawanani	1,000 . .	1,000 . .
303	Row Sahib Chintar	24,705 2 8	4,621 13 .
343	Komal	803 1 2	803 1 2
451	Luzer Ramnand Bhat	19,45 2 .	19,45 2 .
77	Rakhuji Pantgar	427 . .	411 7 2
78	Ravindranath Bhat	188 14 .	188 14 .
129	Rakhuji Pantgar	108 8 5	108 8 5
189	Vaithilingam, pt, Paraya Choultry	180 14 4	180 14 4
150	Permal Bhat, Dhanmani	155 15 7	155 15 7
246	Modali Anusary, Carpenter	850 2 .	850 2 .
253	Rudra Bhat	150 . .	150 . .
442	Narainasami Naik	644 4 11	644 4 11
444	Annamala, female servant	179 1 3	179 1 3

5/12. 2 ed. 62m 107m

To the Hon. Secy. of the Navy

273. Do to 19. (10. 4. 1860)
Do 39 of 1860.

Adelphi

C3Q47

No. of the
Claims

Name of the Claimants

Amount of claim	Amount recommended for payment	Remarks
Rs. as P.	Rs. as P.	
639 5 6	639 5 6	
166 14 10	166 14 10	
169 1 7	169 1 7	
173 6 -	173 6 -	
349 9 7	349 9 7	
285 - -	285 - -	
228 - -	228 - -	
322 - 9	322 - 9	
115 14 4	115 14 4	
215 2 9	215 2 9	
185 4 -	185 4 -	
118 12 -	118 12 -	
144 6 4	144 6 4	
480 - -	480 - -	
409 4 8	409 4 8	

Claims preferred to the Commissioner
in person.

6 Ramnada Bhat	21,223 - -	10,611 8 -	Award modified by Hony Secy. No. 14 Jilch, 1860 No. 425
6 Nagaji Appaji	23,850 - -	16,200 - -	
21 Ramabadra Bhonsle and Gmamba Bhai	1,100 - -	1,100 - -	
Total		14,907 - 8 1/2	
Dootat Lashkar Pattak			

10. Shankoji Ramachandra Rau Gadi	}	2,409 9 2	2,409 9 2	Award made by the Com. Secy. Jilch, 1860 No. 14
Total		Rs. 16,233 6 9 1/2		

Oct 13 to Oct 19th Oct 20
No. 39 of 1880.