1

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultations

12th March 1858

Back no. 61 to 62

Order no 309 to 379 [illegible] March 1858

(83 nos)

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு-1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர்: ஸ்ரீ ராமசுப்பு

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் :- டிசம்பர்/2008 ஆகஸ்ட்/2008

சரிபார்க்கும் முதல் முறையாள கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்க்கும் 2ம் முறையாள கையொப்பம்

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 12th March 1858.

No. 61. Read the following letter from G. S. FORBES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government Revenue Department; dated Fort St. George 19th February 1858, No. 661.

SIR,

Dated 28th Jan. in Cons. 19th Feb. 1858.

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Collector of Madras together with the Memorial of Ingoovah Vencata Lutchmee Ummal on which he had been requested to report, the parties concerned in the case being residents at Madras.

In Con. 30th Nov. 1857. { Nos. *787 and 1123 R. D.

In Extract Minutes Consultation dated respectively* 5th August and 4th November 1857, the Government called upon the Board to procure a further report from the Collector of Nellore regarding points at issue between the Memorialist and one Vencata Naraina who claims to be the adopted son of her late husband. The Collector of Nellore referred to the Collector of Madras and the letter now submitted to Government gives the result of Mr. Cunliffe's personal enquiries made in consequence, and of a previous investigation relating to the same subject. The opinion of the Board regarding the validity of the asserted adoption was given at some length in their Secretary's letter of 16th June 1851, at which time the question had formed the subject of an extended enquiry and had received their best consideration. The present reference to the Collector of Madras is replied to, as the Government will perceive, in terms which support the conclusions already recorded by the Board and as the Memorialist may fairly be presumed to have employed in her address the license of assertion common to such documents, the Board see no cause to alter their former opinion solely on the strength of this memorial.

No. 62. ORDER THEREON, No. 309; dated 9th March 1858.

Ordered that the Memorial of Ingoova Vencata Luchmee Ummal, be transmitted to the Honorable Court by the next Steamer together with the correspondence regarding it that has passed with the Board of Revenue, and the letter of the Collector of Madras, and that the attention of the Honorable Court be called to the letter from this Government No. 12 of 1857, dated 3rd April, forwarding a Memorial on the same subject from C. Vencata Narraina, in which the opinion of this Government as to the truth of the alleged adoption of Ramasamiah by the late Enamdar of Purlapilly in Nellore District was expressed, and the previous history of the case detailed.

2. The letter submitted by the Board in the above Proceedings affords further evidence of the fact, the question regarding which is, it appears, about to be brought before a Court of Law

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

30/13

No. 661.

From

G. S. FORBES Esq.,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

To

H. FORBES Esq.,
Acting Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Collector of Madras together with the Memorial of Ingoovah Vencata Lutchmee Ummal on which he had been requested to report, the parties concerned in the case being residents at Madras.

Dated 28th Jan. in Con. 19th Feb. 1858.

In Extracts Minutes Consultation dated respectively* 5th August and 4th November 1857, the Government called upon the Board to procure a further report from the Collector of Nellore regarding points at issue between the Memorialist and one Vencata Narainah who claims to be the adopted son of her late husband.

In Con. 30th Nov. 1857 } Nos. 2787 and 1123 R. D.

The Collector of Nellore referred to the Collector of Madras and the letter now submitted to Government gives the result of Mr. Cunliffe's personal enquiries made in consequence, and of a previous investigation relating to the same subject. The opinion of the Board regarding the validity of the asserted adoption was given at some length in their Secretary's letter of 16th June 1851, at which time the question had formed the subject of an extended enquiry and had received their best consideration. The present reference to the Collector of Madras is replied to, as the Government will perceive, in terms which support the conclusions already recorded by the Board and as the Memorialist may fairly be presumed to have employed in her address the licence of assertion common to such documents, the Board see no cause to alter their former opinion solely on the strength of this memorial.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
19*th February* 1858.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Secretary.

Revenue 1858 Dept
Fort St. George 12th March
No 252.

From
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
To
The Sy. Secretary to
Government
Rev. Dept.

Dated 19th
Recd 22d } February 1858
2 Encls. Returned
No 661

Read 309. 9th March 1858

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Madras with its enclosure the Memorial of Govoo Venkata Lutchmi Ammaul, and stating that the Board see no cause to alter the opinion already expressed in regard to Pd. Arunachellum's case in their Secretary's letter of 16th Feby 1854

661.

Copy in a L to C
5th April 1858 No 11

Under 16th 618th

309/4

No 21.

Madras, 25th January 1858.

From
B. Cunliffe Esqr.
Collector of Madras.

To
G. J. Forbes Esqr.
Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.

Sir,

1. I have the honor to forward the Appeal to the Honorable Court of Sudder Venkata Lutchmi Ammal's Petition dated the 26th Instant, together with the Copy of Extract Board's Proceedings, 30th November 1857 No. 4767 from the Collector of Ns Nos.

2. It appears to me that the Memorial dose not assert that Seeta Ramachundra was adopted by her late husband, but only that he had been brought up in the house by him and heirs of.

3. The alledged adoption by Ramachundra Iyen of Ramasamy the son of his sister and Cullian Venkatadry Iyen, which is the point to which she directs her opposition, came before me when awarding Compensation for some lands adjoining the Mint, taken possession for public purposes under Act VI of 1857.

4. The land was the property of the late

Parish.

later Raimé henderu Iyer, and to the compensa-
tion was claimed by Venkatarama Iyer for
his son on the strength of the alleged adop-
tion, and by Venkato Lutchmi Ammal
as widow, and denying the adoption.

5. It was necessary under Sections VIII of the
Act to declare one of the parties in possession
as owner, in order to take measures with him
for fixing the Compensation.

6. The widow was in possession, receiving
the rents for the land, under an agreement
produced by Venkatarama Iyer, that she
should manage the property until the
adopted Son should be of age.

7. The Compensation was settled in
concert with them, but the parties declined
to submit the question of its apportionment
under Section XX to arbitration, and there-
fore the amount has been invested by
me in Government Securities under Sec-
tion XXIX, to await the decree of a com-
petent Court.

8. The claimants now intend to try
the fact of adoption in the Courts.

9. From enquiries made by me, I have
no doubt that the alleged adoption
took

309/5

took place, and this is certain that the
adoption of a sister's son and of another
got rain is recognised by the Hindoo
Law, as followed in Southern India.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant
H. Munro
Coll. Madras.

Madras,
28th January 1858.
End. in Rem. Cor. awing

309/6 R. D.

No 309

Extract from the Minutes of Council at Kingston

Under date the 9th March 1858

Read the following letter from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue

(Were entered 19th February 58 No 661)

Ordered that the Memorial of Augustus Pricaud Esquire Principal Collector of Customs at Sandwich be transmitted to the Hon. Commissioners of Customs with the recommendation that the same be forwarded with the Memorial to the Board of Revenue at Toronto and that the attention of the Hon. Commissioners

1858 Dispatch from the Board
From
No 1880
Hon. Commissioners of Customs
To
The Secretary of the Board of Revenue
Toronto
Dated 28th January 1858
Received 29th "
Ans'd 19th Feby 1858
Registered 19th Feby 1858
Memorial to the Honorable the Board of Inspection Gen. of Customs Pricaud Collector at Sandwich praying for an increase of salary with his report and declaration in relation thereto
Recorded in Collectors Book
Recorded 22nd Feby 1858

Sept 8th Feb 58

Revenue 1862
Dated Bangalore 12th March.

309/7

Transmits a Memorial from Pp Pallanjee Sett

(2) Praying that the Memorial of Sreepathi Mudaly Sukuna himself be forwarded to the Honorable Court, together with the correspondence regarding it with the Board of Revenue and the Collector of Madura, and that the intention of the Honorable Court be called to the letter from the Government of the 3d April 1857 on the same subject.

No 61 of 62.

called to the letter from this Govt. No. 12. of 1858.
Ult. 3d April forwarding a Memorial on the same subject from Chinnatambi Karrana in which the opinion of this Govt. as to the truth of the alleged adoption of Ramasamiah by the late Zemindar of Pudukotta in Matters is expressed.
So much has appeared and the previous History of the case detailed in the letter submitted by the Bd in the above Memorandum afford further Evidence of the facts in question regarding which it appears unnecessary that the Court of Land. Reference to the Govt of 10th Feby 58.

Ct Thomas 16th