

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 515

Press

Mis.

(59-60)

Dated 23 - 12 - 1862

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from G. LEE MORRIS, Esq., Officiating Government Agent, Tanjore ;
to A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George,
dated Vallam, 13th November 1862, No. 331.

I have the honor to submit for the consideration and orders of Government the accompanying petition addressed by Her Highness Kámákshiamba Bayisáhib to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, in which she advances her claim to the Residency premises, and prays for a re-consideration of the order* in which the Government have directed the said premises to be appropriated to the Zillah Courts.

10th November 1862.

* Judicial Department, dated
23rd September 1862, No.
1,571.

2. On a reference to the records of the Rajah's Palace, it appears that the Residency with all the furniture and conveyances belonging thereto, as also the Bungalow, &c., at Chetubava were purchased by Rajah Sarbhoji in the year 1823, from the Resident General Blackburne, for the sum of Rupees 67,900. The records also show that the repairs of the Residency, as well as the Establishment attached thereto, were maintained at the expense of the Rajah till His late Highness' death and even subsequently ; but there is nothing in these papers from which it can be inferred that the late Rajah at any time alienated the Residency in favor of the Government.

3. Under these circumstances, and with reference to the arguments advanced in the accompanying Memorial, it is for Government to decide whether the Residency is to be considered as falling within the scope of State property and treated as such, or not.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

&c. &c. &c.

The humble Petition of Her Highness KAMATCHI
BOYEE SAHIBA.

SHEWETH,

That your Petitioner has heard with much concern that your Government has ordered the dwelling house known at the Residency at Tanjore to be forthwith converted into a Court House, without any communication with your Petitioner as to her wishes or consent.

2. It is obvious that such order can only have issued upon the hypothesis that the dwelling house in question is *State* property, a proposition which in the face of the facts about to be submitted, she respectfully submits cannot be maintained, and at which she believes your Government must have arrived on imperfect or incorrect information.

3. The Rajah *purchased* the house in question from the late General Blackburne for the very considerable sum of 1,800 Rupees, which he paid out of the money which he was at liberty to deal with according to his will and pleasure. Whether he choose to let it lie in his Treasury, to convert it into Jewels, to invest it in the public funds, or to purchase a house with it, the property is essentially and exclusively private. It did not descend to him from former Rajahs before the execution of the Treaties ; it was his own self acquired property.

4. There is therefore no pretence for asserting that in its *inception* this property partakes of the nature of State property.

5. As little is there for asserting that it has *since* become State property by any act of the Rajah.

6. If this house has been made a present of to the British Government, it must be either by some *formal Deed* executed by the Rajah ; or by "*dedication*" in the legal sense, presumed in the absence of any Deed from adverse long user.

7. There is not, and never was, any Deed or other instrument of gift or transfer from the Rajah to the British Government and therefore the first hypothesis is conclusively negatived.

8. And though true it is, that the Rajah always permitted successive Residents to occupy the house in question, such occupation was purely *permissive*; and did not, and could not confer any legal title to the premises upon the British Government.

9. For all the Rajah's acts are conclusive to show that while he permitted the Resident for the time being to dwell in this house, this was only as a mark of respect to the British Government, and in furtherance of his own dignity; not as parting with his right, title and interest therein.

* They were sent for by the Resident after the Rajah's death.)

10. For the Rajah always kept the muniments of title in his own possession.* He always paid for all repairs; he paid for the erection of the Racket Court in the compound; he paid the wages of the gardeners and all incidental expenses; all which facts appear in the Palace Accounts. He purchased the furniture, portion of which was sold after his death by the then Government Agent.

11. Your Petitioner observes that in Schedule F to the Government answer filed to her Bill in 1857, this house is described as "*appropriated*" to the Residents.

12. This word is very remarkable; and considering that the answer and Schedules were prepared by the Law Officers of the Government, the absence of any statement that the property in question had been *dedicated* by the Rajah to the British Government is very significant of the opinion of the legal advisers that the facts forthcoming in the matter would not admit any assertion of a *dedication*.

13. The fairest way of deciding this question would be to try it as if your Petitioner were suing in a Court of Law to eject the Secretary of State from the premises. If the facts which she could establish would give her a verdict then incontestably, she submits, the property must be private, and cannot be State.

14. Upon this point if necessary your Petitioner craves that the question, upon the facts, may be put to the Advocate General and the Solicitor of the Government.

15. A bed room is "*appropriated*" by the Landlord of an Inn to any guest who occupies it for the night, the week, or the month, and in this sense the Residency was no doubt "*appropriated*" by the Rajah to the use of the Resident at his Court. Unlike the Innkeeper the Rajah made no charge, for that would not have been consistent with his dignity, or his inclination. But the *continual* acts of ownership exercised by the Rajah over the premises from the date of its purchase till his death, the absence of any such acts on the part of the Government, who never paid a Rupee for maintenance or repairs—entirely, as your Petitioner submits, rebut the possibility of any presumption of any thing approaching *dedication* as well might the carriage and harness which the Rajah always kept for the use of the Resident be claimed as State property, on the ground of "*appropriation*."

16. The Duke of Norfolk and other great Landholders in London "*appropriate*" portions of their properties to roads for the public, but to avoid all inference of a *dedication* they put up bars and gates and notices. Just so, while permitting the Residents to occupy the house, the Rajah has always excluded all notion of giving up his title and property in it by such possession, by keeping the title deeds, and paying for repairs and maintenance.

17. Satisfied as your Petitioner is, that the Order under reference has been issued under a misconception of the facts, she will nevertheless be happy to meet the convenience of the Government as far as is in her power, after her title shall have been recognized; for she feels deeply grateful for the liberal measures which have been extended to her and the other members of her late husband's family.

She prays therefore that the Order in question may be stayed, and that your Excellency will be pleased to do her justice upon a full consideration of the facts now brought to your Excellency's notice.

And Your Petitioner shall ever pray, &c.

PALACE TANJORE,
1st November 1862.

ORDER THEREON, 23rd December 1862, No. 515.

With the foregoing letter the Acting Government Agent at Tanjore has submitted for the Orders of Government a Petition from Her Highness Kamatchi Boyee Sahiba, senior widow of the late Rajah of Tanjore, in which she prays that the order passed under date the 23rd September last appropriating the buildings known as the Tanjore Residency as Court Houses for the Zillah Judge and Principal Sudder Ameen, may be cancelled on the ground that the buildings in question were the self acquired property of the late Rajah.

2. The Acting Government Agent states that "on reference to the records of the Rajah's Palace, it appears that the Residency with all the furniture and conveyances belonging thereto, as also the Bungalow, &c., at Chetubava were purchased by Rajah Sarbhoji in the year 1823, from the Resident General Blackburne, for the sum of Rupees 67,900. The records also show that the repairs of the Residency, as well as the Establishment attached thereto, were maintained at the expense of the Rajah till His late Highness' death, and even subsequently; but there is nothing in these papers from which it can be inferred that the late Rajah at any time alienated the Residency in favor of the Government."

3. Under the circumstances stated by the Acting Agent, His Excellency the Governor in Council sees no reason to question the validity of the claim preferred by Her Highness Kamatchi Boyee Sahiba to the buildings in question. Her Highness, it is to be inferred from the concluding paragraph of her Petition, is willing to sell or rent the buildings to Government, and as there are no other buildings in Tanjore equally well adapted for the Courts, the Governor in Council directs that Mr. Morris will ascertain from Her Highness on what terms she is prepared to part with the buildings, and will submit a proposal for their purchase or rental at an early date.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Acting Government Agent at Tanjore.

Exd. T. McMootry.

59060

Political Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the AG. Govt. Agent at Tanjore

(Here enter 13th Novr/62)

Order thereon 23rd December 1862 No. 5

This seems to show a case but I have not thought it necessary to make a reference to the Law Officers.

by A

Wd
gp Wd

Wd
Wd

With the foregoing letter the AG. Govt. Agent at Tanjore has submitted for the Order of Government a Petition of Mrs Highness Kamatchi Saluba, senior widow of late Rajah of Tanjore, in which she prays that an order passed under date 23rd September last approving the buildings known as the Tanjore Residency

MADRAS 1862

18515

Proceedings of the

Madras Government

Date 25th Decr 1862

Adverting that the AG. Govt. Agent at Tanjore has submitted for the Order of Government a Petition of Mrs Highness Kamatchi Saluba, senior widow of late Rajah of Tanjore, in which she prays that an order passed under date 23rd September last approving the buildings known as the Tanjore Residency

Wd
Wd

as Court Houses for the Zillah
Judge and Principal Sudder
Amra, may be cancelled
on the ground that the
buildings in question were
the self acquired property of
the late Rajah.

2. The Acting Govt. Agent
states that "on reference to the
records of the Rajah's Palace,
it appears that the Residency
with all the furniture and
conveyances belonging thereto,
as also the Bungalow ^{at}
at Chetubari were purchased
by Rajah Sarbhoji in the
year 1823 from the Resident
General Blackburne for the
sum of Rupees 67,900. The
records also show that the
repairs of the Residency, as
well as the Establishment
attached thereto, were maintained
at the expense of the Rajah
till His late Highness' death,
and even subsequently, but
there is nothing in these papers
from which it can be
inferred

The Petn says 18,000 - is the
a clerical error somewhere
The

inferred that the late Rajah
at any time alienated the
Residency in favor of the
Government."

3 Under the circumstances
stated by the Acting Agent
His Excellency the Governor in
Council sees no reason to ques-
tion the validity of the claim
preferred by Her Highness
Kamatchi Boyce Sahiba to
the buildings in question.
Her Highness, it is to be in-
ferred from the concluding
paragraph of her Petition,
is willing to sell or rent the
buildings to Government,
and as there are no other
buildings in Tanjore equally
well adapted for the Courts,
the Governor in Council directs
that Mr. Morris will ascertain
from Her Highness on what
terms she is prepared to part
with the buildings, and will
submit a proposal for their
purchase or rental at
an early date.

To the Acting Agent }
at Tanjore } Decd 23^d

Delivered to Cong Sep 12th 1863
17th of 1863.

Replied to 16th March
of 4 of 1864-

J. L.

1864- Department.

No. 575

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT,

Feb 127 7/63

Dated 23 Dec/62

Carried
on Saturday

Observing that the Secretary
the Governor in Council has
returned to question the validity
of the claim presented by the
Seymour, Hanks & Co. for the
value of the building known
as the "Empire Building" and
directing the attention to the
fact that the Secretary has
been upon the subject the will
be able to the building and to
purchase or rental and to
verify date

57 460

14.2502

N^o 218

From Clement Dale Esquire The Receiver of the Carnate Property
To The Honorable A. J. Arbuthnot Chief Secretary to Government

Madras 15th December 1862

Sir,

Paral.

With reference to the Order of Government

Order of Gov^t 21st July 1860 N^o 443.
Political Department.
On my letter to Government dated
12th July 1860 N^o 133.
Inclosed Copy Enclosed

under the date and number noted
in the margin. I have the honor
to forward a Copy of Correspondence
which has since passed between

myself and the Accountant General.

2. It is to be deplored that the letter of the 19th
March 1860 N^o 3002 should have been couched in the
terms in which it is written, and that a ~~copy~~ ^{copy}
investigation of the Accounts was not previously made.
I feel fully convinced however that it was in error
that the 3 sums named by Mr. Mangles were paid
to me. In my letters dated the 29th April 1861 N^o 81
and 4th September 1861 N^o 142, I have pointed out the
difficulties which might arise, and the disadvantages
under which Government might be placed, consequent
on the letters from the Accountant General should the
Administration of the Nabob's Estate become a subject
of litigation under the provisions of Act N^o 30 of 1858.
Having done this I feel it unnecessary to enter into the
subject in this communication.

3. The whole of the Rupees 70380-7-11, now
desired to be refunded, was paid by me to Government on

the 28th July 1860, having been included in a sum of
Rupees 119,000. transmitted by me to the Sub Treasurer on
that date. If therefore His Excellency the Governor in
Council should be of opinion, that the former sum -
should be repaid as required by the Accountant General,
I have the honor to request that the Accountant General
may be ordered to repay me that amount so paid
by me to Government, when I will replace the same
Amount to the Credit of Government with the Bank
of Madras; No money actually will pass, the
transaction will amount in fact to little more than
book entries, I shall in my books give the Estate
of the Nabob Credit for that amount as repaid to me
by Government, at the same time Debiting the Estate
with the same amount as repaid by me to Government.

I think it right to mention that

August 1861 I was with Mr Harrison on another business
when he entered into the present question, and it was fully
 canvased, after which he stated that he thought the
best way would be to adjust the books by writing off the
whole Rupees 123,613 - 12 - 4, and he decided to speak to the
Chief Secretary (Mr Pym) on his return to the Presidency.
Mr Harrison however left Madras prior to Mr Pym's return,
and on delivering over charge to Mr Washington he referred
him (as I was informed) to my letter of the 14th September 1861 No 142,
stating that the business would require his attention, but without
expressing his own views on the subject.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Wm. Lamb.

The Secy to the G.P.

No 21 Dec 1910 Adm 162

List of 13. Jan 4.

507

23/12/11

Roll 1862 Def 121

From the Review of the
Private Property
to the Lordship of
the Governor

Dated 15 December 1862

Dec 17

No 569 Dec 18

(with an enclosure)

Submitted with enclosure

Observation a copy of 1871

Reference that the above

has been printed by the Press

and in ref. 69. 1 no 443.

of 21st July 1870 the subject

of 1871 and 1872 the subject

of 1872-1873 1874-1875

the Review of the subject

the subject of the subject