

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

1126

Press
Mis.

Dated

26th. August 1857.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
from 20th to 26th August 1859.*

No. 9. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th August 1859, No. 3107.

Read the following letters from the Collector of Madura, dated 1st August 1859, Nos. 138 and 141.

(In Con. 5th August 1859, Nos. 3909 and 3910.)

Plaintiff.

Parvata Vurdany Natcheyar, Zemindar of Ramnad and guardian and adoptive mother of the minor Moottoovejia Ragoo nada Moottoo Ramalinga Sathoopady.

versus.

R. Sullivan, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura.

With the first of the above letters the Collector forwards an Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of Madura, dated 18th July 1859, striking off the file O. S. No. 9 of 1857, brought by Parvata Vurdany Natcheyar, Zemindar of Ramnad, for the purpose of having the validity of her alleged adoption of a son tried and established

2. The case was thrown out on technical grounds, the Zemindar having failed to shew that she was interested in the cause, or had received authority from her alleged adopted son, who is not a minor, to prosecute the suit on his behalf.

3. The Plaintiff seems to have admitted her error in denominating her alleged adopted son a minor and suing as his guardian, and wished to rectify it under Section 10 of the Rules of Procedure, by inserting the adoptee's name as Plaintiff, but the Court would not permit her to do so.

4. The Collector states that, he believes, the Plaintiff purposes shortly filing an amended plaint: the point at issue will, therefore, in all probability, come on for hearing in some other shape.

5. The Collector adverts also to the fact, that the present Zemindar of Ramnad waived her rights to succeed to the property in favor of her daughter the former Zemindar, although she was aware at the time of her prior claim according to Hindoo law, and raises the question whether, after abdicating her rights, she could legally revive them on the decease of her daughter.

6. The Board are of opinion that this question can hardly be mooted now, the Zemindar having been in possession since 1846, and the estate having been then surrendered to her with the sanction of Government. They are not prepared to maintain that the waiving of her right by the present Zemindar, in favor of her daughter, constituted *per se* an absolute relinquishment of all her future claims after that daughter's death. The question, however, is a legal one, and can be considered if the suit is revived.

7. In the second letter, recorded at the head of these Proceedings, the Collector reports that, in consequence of the Civil Court having thrown out the Ramnad suit, there is no present intention, on the part of the Agent employed, to conduct that suit and the one relating to Shevagunga, to engage the services of an English Barrister.

*Board's Proceedings 15th July 1859.
From Government, 25th in Con.
25th July 1859.*

8. As there appears, therefore, to be no probability of Council being engaged by the opposite parties, there is no necessity for seeking such aid on behalf of the defence.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 10. ORDER THEREON, 22nd August 1859, No. 1126.

Ordered that this report, together with Government Proceedings dated 25th July 1859, No. 986, be communicated to the Home Government in continuation of former correspondence on the subject of the Ramnad Zemindary.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

No. 3107.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 11th August 1859.

Read the following letters from the Collector of Madura, dated 1st August 1859, Nos. 138 and 141.

(In Con. 5th August 1859, Nos. 3909 and 3910.)

With the first of the above letters the Collector forwards an Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of Madura, dated 18th July 1859, striking off the file O. S. No. 9 of 1857, brought by Parvata Vurdany Natcheyar, Zemindar of Ramnad, for the purpose of having the validity of her alleged adoption of a son tried and established.

Plaintiff.
Parvata Vurdany Natcheyar, Zemindar of Ramnad and guardian and adoptive mother of the minor Moottoorejia Ragoonada Moottoo Ramalinga Sathoopady.
versus
R. Sullivan, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura.

2. The case was thrown out on technical grounds, the Zemindar having failed to shew that she was interested in the cause, or had received authority from her alleged adopted son, who is not a minor, to prosecute the suit on his behalf.

3. The Plaintiff seems to have admitted her error in denominating her alleged adopted son a minor and suing as his guardian, and wished to rectify it under Section 10 of the Rules of Procedure, by inserting the adoptee's name as Plaintiff, but the Court would not permit her to do so.

4. The Collector states that, he believes, the Plaintiff purposes shortly filing an amended plaint: the point at issue will, therefore, in all probability, come on for hearing in some other shape.

5. The Collector adverts also to the fact, that the present Zemindar of Ramnad waived her rights to succeed to the property in favor of her daughter the former Zemindar, although she was aware at the time of her prior claim according to Hindoo law, and raises the question whether, after abdicating her rights, she could legally revive them on the decease of her daughter.

6. The Board are of opinion that this question can hardly be mooted now, the Zemindar having been in possession since 1846, and the estate having been then surrendered to her with the sanction of Government. They are not prepared to maintain that the waiving of her right by the present Zemindar, in favor of her daughter, constituted *per se* an absolute relinquishment of all her future claims after that daughter's death. The question, however, is a legal one, and can be considered if the suit is revived.

7. In the second letter, recorded at the head of these Proceedings, the Collector reports that, in consequence of the Civil Court having thrown out the Ramnad suit, there is no present intention, on the part of the Agent employed, to conduct that suit and the one relating to Shevagunga, to engage the services of an English Barrister.

Board's Proceedings 15th July 1859.
From Government, 25th in Con. 25th July 1859.

8. As there appears, therefore, to be no probability of Counsel being engaged by the opposite parties, there is no necessity for seeking such aid on behalf of the defence.

(A true Extract.)

Secretary.

To

J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.
Copies to Collector of Madura and Government Pleader.

Com of Court 29th July/57
June 1850 June 46 - 41-42.

July 31st & Aug 1859 at 46

From 13th Decy 24 Jan 57
172 2169.

20/8/57

109 & 110.

Revenue 1859 Report
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue.

Dated 11th Aug. 1859
Copy 17 -
Recd 18th Dec -
£2100 (1859)

To Secy. No 3104
Revenue 22-8-59
R. O. 9 Dec 1859
1859
Submitting with

13th remarks letter from
the Comr of Madras for
ending the Proceedings
of the Civil Court of Madras
standing off the file O. J.
29th July 1859 brought by
the Revenue & Remitted
for the purpose of review
liking the validity
of the ~~order~~ ^{order} and of the
of the ~~order~~ ^{order}

No 1126. 22nd Aug 1859.
With an order.

No 1126

Ordered that the
together with the Proceedings
of 25th July 1859 & No 986
communicated to the
for confirmation of
order of the Madras
Court.

W
From 22nd Aug 59
22nd Aug 59

6 copies
to the Board of Madras Dis 13th 59.