

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 266

Press

~~Mis~~

Dated

25. 5. - 1861

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
25th May 1861.*

No. 66, Read the following letter from Lieutenant Colonel CUTH. DAVIDSON, C.B., Resident at Hyderabad; to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Hyderabad Residency, 4th May 1861, No. 836.

Political Department.

Adverting to my letters as per margin, I beg to forward for the information of His Excellency

No. 785, dated 22nd April 1861.

" 786, " 23rd " "

" 810, " 30th " "

the Governor in Council the accompanying copy of a note which I have received from His Highness the Nizam's Minister, stating that Rajah Rughnath Ram and Rai Tak Chund are unable to proceed to Madras.

From Nabob MUKHTAR UL MOOLK BAHADOOR; to Colonel DAVIDSON, dated 3rd May 1861.

In acknowledging the receipt of your letters dated 9th* 11th* and 19th* of Shuvval of the current year bearing numbers 698, 705, and 758, accompanied
*20th, 22nd, 30th April 1861. with the letters of Madras Government requiring the attendance of Rajah Rughnath Ram and Rai Tak Chund at Madras in the month of July next, I have to inform you that the said two individuals having been accordingly called upon to proceed to Madras, replied that it was impossible for them to do so. One of these two, Rajah Rughnath Ram states that he has already appointed an Agent to conduct his suit on his behalf in the Supreme Court at Madras, who is accordingly conducting the suit agreeably to the rules of the Court. The letters are herewith returned.

No. 67. To the Resident at Hyderabad, dated Fort Saint George, 25th May 1861, No. 266.

I am directed by His Excellency the Governor in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter under date the 4th instant, No. 836, enclosing a copy of a note from His Highness the Nizam's Minister, stating that Rajah Rughnath Ram, and Rai Tak Chund are unable to proceed to Madras. In the note no cause is assigned for this alleged inability; but it is said to have been represented by Rajah Rughnath Ram, that he had already appointed an Agent to conduct his suit on his behalf in the Supreme Court at Madras, and that the Agent was accordingly conducting it agreeably to the rules of Court.

2. My previous letter will have apprized you that the Madras Government are very anxious that these two men, and particularly Rajah Rughnath Ram, should not be examined by a Commission, but that any evidence which they may give should be delivered in open Court, where their manner of giving it may be observed, and they may be subjected to cross examination. The Supreme Court have already refused to issue a Commission in the case of Rajah Rughnath Ram, but a second application will not improbably be made, and it will be asserted that Rajah Rughnath Ram is unable to quit Hyderabad, as he is engaged in Sircar duties which he cannot relinquish and that he cannot obtain leave of absence from His Highness the Nizam.

3. That the Government may be able to meet this plea, I have the honor to request that you would move His Highness to interpose no objections to Rajah Rughnath Ram proceeding to Madras in July next to give testimony in his suit, and would request His Highness to intimate to Rajah Rughnath Ram, that he has his full and free permission, and such leave of absence as may be necessary for his visit to Madras. I have further to beg that you would be so good as to inform this Government of any order or permission to the above effect which may be given by His Highness.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

Political Department

C No 266.

To
The Resident at Hyderabad.

Sir,

I am directed by
His Excellency the Governor
in Council to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter under
date the 4th instant No 836.
enclosing a copy of a note
from His Highness the
Nizam's Minister, stating
that Rajah Rughnath Ram,
and Rai Lak Chund are
unable to proceed to Madras.
In the note no cause is
assigned for this alleged
inability, but it is said to
have been represented by
Rajah Rughnath Ram,
that he had already
appointed an agent to
conduct his suit on his
behalf.

M

W. L.

W. L.

2012/10/12
behalf in the Supreme
Court at Madras and
that the agent, was
accordingly conducting
it agreeably to the rules
of Court.

2 My previous letter
will have apprized you
that the Madras Court
are very anxious that
these two men, and parti-
cularly Rajah Raghunath
Ram, should not be examined
by a Commission, but that
any evidence which they
may give should be
delivered in open Court -
where their manner of
giving it may be observed,
and they may be subjected
to cross examination. - The
Supreme Court have already
refused to issue a Commis-
sion in the case of Rajah
Raghunath Ram, but a
second application will
not improbably be made,
and it will be asserted
that

3
that Rajah Raghunath
Ram is unable to quit
Hyderabad, as he is
engaged in Sircar duties
which he cannot ^{relinquish} quit
and that he cannot
obtain leave of absence
from H. H. the Nizam -

3. That the Court may
be able to meet this plea,
I have the honor to request
that you would move
His Highness to interpose
no objection to ^{Rajah} Raghunath
Ram proceeding to Madras
in July next to give testi-
mony in his suit, and
would request His Highness
to intimate to Rajah
Raghunath Ram, that he
has his full and free
permission and such
leave of absence as may
be necessary for his
visit to Madras. - I have
further to beg that you
would be so good as
to inform this Court of
any order or permission
to

to the above effect which
may be given by His
Highness -

J.P.

Fort St George }
25th May 1861.

Attendant 1861 De part

17200

To

The Resident at

Hyderabad

17308

25th May 1861.

As known to you
the receipt of this letter
of the 14th June 1861.
and advising that it is
now the intention for
sending to the same in
July next to the 15th day
of the month and the
14th June.

St. Peter's