

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2045	Press
		Mrs.
	167-168	
Dated	14-11-	191863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.*

No. 167. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd October 1863, No. 6,235 :—

Read the following letter from V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madura, 22nd September 1863, No. 192 :—

SIR,

To Board, 21st July 1863, No. 154.
Board's Proceedings, 29th July 1863.

1. With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, relating to Original Suit Nos. 1 of 1860 and 3 of 1856 on the file of the Madura Civil Court, I have the honor to inform the Board that the Suits came on for hearing in the Civil Court on the 1st instant, which continued for three days, and on the 4th the Judgment was pronounced by the Court, copy of which is herewith submitted.

2. The documents filed by the Plaintiff and the Government in the adoption Suit are now being translated, and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Madura Civil Court.

Present, R. R. COTTON, Civil Judge.

Original Suit No. 1. of 1860.

In this Suit the Plaintiff alleging himself to be the adopted son of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, the husband of 1st Defendant the present undisputed holder of the Ramnad Zemindary, claims to be put in possession of the Estate and for an order to set aside the order of the 2nd Defendant, the Collector on the part of Government, in which the escheat of the Estate to Government is directed on the demise of the 1st Defendant.

The 1st Defendant admitted the adoption and her readiness to give up the Estate to Plaintiff.

The 2nd Defendant however contended that the adoption set forward was not valid under Hindu Law, and that as there were no heirs, he was fully justified in issuing the order for the escheat of the Estate after 1st Defendant's demise.

The Civil Judge in his Judgment dated the 18th March 1861, ruled that 2nd Defendant, the Collector, was not competent to question the adoption, and that inasmuch as it appeared there were heirs to the Estate, his order to escheat it on the death of the 1st Defendant was unjustifiable, and it accordingly decreed that the orders of the 2nd Defendant and his subordinates having reference to the escheat of the Estate on 1st Defendant's demise should be cancelled, and that the 2nd Defendant should not summarily interfere with the Estate or acts of the 1st Defendant. It also decreed on the strength of the Sudder Court's Judgment in Special Appeal Nos. 103 and 136 of 1857 as published in the Reports of October 1860, that the 1st Defendant had a right to alienate her Estate without reference to the 2nd Defendant. These decisions of the Sudder Court having been over-ruled by the Privy Council in appeal, the Civil Judge's Judgment on them, as far as the right of the 1st Defendant's title to alienate her property, has of course been upset likewise.

The 2nd Defendant on the part of Government appealed to the Sudder Court against the Civil Judge's decision, Appeal No. 35 of 1861, basing his objections principally on the fact that the alleged adoption was invalid and had not been proved.

The Civil Judge in the 16th paragraph of his judgment expressed his opinion that proof of the alleged adoption seemed unnecessary as it was acknowledged by the 1st Defendant, and 2nd Defendant had not shown his title to question it.

On hearing the Appeal No. 35 of 1861, the High Court on the 26th March 1863, passed Proceedings remanding the case to the Civil Court for the determination of the following issue :—

" Was the adoption made with the authority of Muttuveiyee Nachiar, widow of Annasawmy alias Rangunada Sethupathy, or with that of any others of the kindred of the late Zamindar Ramasawmy Sethupathy in whose behalf the said adoption was made ? "

The Civil Judge was further directed to require the Plaintiff to file copies of the Pleadings and Razinama in Original Suit No. 3 of 1843, and to admit such further evidence bearing on the issue as the respective parties might offer.

In Original Suit No. 3 of 1856, the Plaintiffs set up a claim to the reversionary right to the Zemindary on the demise of the present Zemindar Ramee Purvatavurdhany Nachiar whom they sued as 1st Defendant, the Collector on behalf of Government and four others being made parties as Defendants.

The Civil Judge in his judgment dated 12th April 1861, decided against her right to succeed for the reasons set forth in his judgment in Original Suit No. 1 of 1860, but declared she had established the fact of her being a widow of the late Annasawmy alias Rangunada Sethupathy, and as such entitled to maintenance which he awarded.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.*

Dissatisfied they appealed to the Sudder Court pleading in supplemental appeal that the adoption of the Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 1 of 1860, was invalid under Hindu Law.

The High Court in Appeal No. 49 of 1861 passed Proceedings, 26th March 1863, remanded the case, and directed that the Civil Judge will be pleased to decide the same issue in this case as has been laid down in Appeal No. 35 of 1861.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the above Proceedings the Civil Judge fixed the 8th August 1863, for the determination of the above issue, and directed the respective parties to produce their exhibits referred to therein, and any further evidence they might require.

The hearing was subsequently by mutual consent of all the parties put off until the 1st September 1863, on which date the following parties appeared in Original Suit No. 1 of 1860:—

Gurusawmy Sastry, Civil Court Vakeel
John Norton, Esq., Barrister, and P. Rungiah Naidu, High Court Pleader. ... For Plaintiff.
Narain Row, Civil Court Vakeel. ... For 1st Defendant.
V. H. Levinge, Esq., 2nd Defendant.
C. Dale, Esq., Barrister for 2nd Defendant and Government.

In Original Suit No. 3 of 1856.
J. D. Mayne, Esq., Barrister, and Carnagara Menon, High Court Pleader. ... For Plaintiffs.
Narain Row, Civil Court Vakeel. ... For 1st Defendant.
John Norton, Esq., Barrister.
P. Rungiah Naidu, High Court Pleader, and Gurusawmy Sastry, Civil Court Vakeel. ... For Supplemental 5th Defendant.
V. H. Levinge, Esq., Supplemental 6th Defendant.
C. Dale, Esq., Barrister for Supplemental 6th Defendant.

It was unanimously agreed by the above that the evidence should be recorded in English by the Civil Judge under Section 172 of the Code of Civil Procedure. It was further unanimously agreed that the evidence of the witnesses produced and examined in Original Suit No. 1 of 1860, should be accepted as evidence in Original Suit No. 3 of 1856, Mr. Mayne on behalf of the Plaintiffs being allowed to cross examine them.

Plaintiff produced and filed the Pleadings and Razinamah in Original Suit No. 3 of 1843 as directed by the High Court, and they are marked B to M inclusive.

Plaintiff further filed.

True copy of Sudder Decree in Appeal 66 of 1857.	N. To show Pedigree.
Deed of gift by 1st Defendant to Plaintiff, dated 21st February 1862.	O. Consent of parties who signed it.
Razinamah of Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 3 of 1853 filed in Sudder Court.	P. Consent of Sivaswami.
Will of Mangalaishwara Nachiar Istimirar Zemindar, dated 11th May 1807.	Q.
True copy of Will by Annasawmy Sethupathy, dated 26th January 1826.	R.
The original was produced from the Court records.	
Urzi from the Collector to 1st Defendant, 28th July 1855.	S.
Objected to by Mr. Mayne, as it cannot affect his client.	
True copy of Extract Proceedings of the Sudder Court, dated 20th April 1846.	T.
Original Istimirar Sunnad, dated 22nd April 1863.	U.
Copy of Decree of the Sudder Court in Appeal No. 18 of 1814.	V.
Collector's Urzi to Muttuveroyee Nachiar, dated 7th September 1827.	W.
Do. do. 27th September 1827.	X.
Do. do. 2nd October "	Y.
Do. do. 3rd October "	Z.
Do. do. 1st November "	A A.
Do. do. 9th November "	A B.
Do. do. 5th December "	A C.
Do. do. 28th November 1828.	A D.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.*

The following produced (A E to A J) by 2nd Defendant according to notice through Rajaram Row from his Office and acknowledged as from proper custody:—

Letter from 1st Defendant to the Collector	19th May 1847.	A E.
Do.	23rd do.	A F.
Do.	24th do.	A G.
Letter from 1st Defendant to the Board of Revenue	21st August 1846	A H.
Will of Dorarajah Nachiar, 23rd September 1845		A I, to prove 4th witness's relation
Registry of Collector showing Zemindary in 1st Defendant's name		A J, withdrawn.
Vakalat filed with the Razinamah M		A K.
Do.		A L.
Takeed from Collector to 1st Defendant, dated 30th March 1849		A M.
Do.	dated 4th October 1849	A N.

Plaintiff produced and examined the following witnesses:—

3rd. Muttusawmy Tever		Alleged kindred of Ramasawmy Tever to prove consent to the adoption.
4th. Annasawmy alias Sivasamy		
5th. Samy Iyen.		
6th. Ramarajah		
7th. Ramasawmy Tever		1st Defendant's relatives to prove consent to adoption.
8th. Chittranaraina Tever		
9th. Chinnasawmy Tever		
10th. Ungusawmy Tever		
11th. Ponnusawmy Tever		to prove Ranees signatures.
12th. Cadumbavana Tever		
13th. Chinnasawmy Tever, brother of 11th witness		
14th. Subbiah, Javabnavis		
15th. Samiraja		1st Defendant's relative to consent to adoption.
16th. Camaboye		Palace female attendants to prove signature of Ranees, and consent to the adoption by Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 3 of 1856, and signatures in O.
17th. Kuroyee		
18th. Ungummal		
19th. Oodia Nachee		
20th. Meenachi		

2nd Defendant produced and admitted from proper custody the following exhibits:—

Arzi by Ramasawmy Sethupathy 19th April 1830	Filed I.
Do. by Muthuveroyee Nachiar, and Muttuchella Tever, 21st April 1830, objected to and withdrawn.	
Letter dated 27th September 1845, by 1st Defendant to Collector	Rejected by the Court as it could not affect the adoption made in 1847.
Letter from Rani Dorarajah, 1st Defendant's daughter, and her husband Muttuvejia Rangunada Tever, 24th September 1845	Filed II. Reporting adoption of Plaintiff's 4th witness.
Letter by his 2nd witness Ramasawmy to Collector 25th May 1847	Filed III. Objecting to adoption.
Letter by Muttuchella Tever, 2nd witness's father, 22nd May 1857	Filed IV. Do. do.
Copy of Petition by 2nd witness to Sudder Court, 12th August 1850	Filed V. Do. do.
Do. of his father Muttuchella Tever, 12th August 1850	Filed VI. Do. do.
He also called and filed Original Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 4. of 1863	Filed VII. Do. do.

2nd Defendant examined the following witnesses:—

1, Ramarajah, and 2, Ramasawmy Tever.
No fresh evidence oral or documentary was produced by any other parties.
Mr. Norton, Mr. Dale, and Mr. Mayne addressed the Court for their respective clients.

Judgment.

I. The Court has given its best attention to the several arguments pleaded by the Counsel for the respective parties in these two Suits, and also the evidence oral and documentary which has been produced.

II. It conceives there can be no question that an adoption was made, and this is admitted by opposing Counsel, and appears also to have been so by the High Court.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.

III. It has been contended by the Counsel for 2nd Defendant in Original Suit No. 1 of 1860, and Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 3 of 1856, that the adoption was not made on behalf of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, but by 1st Defendant for herself only.

IV. The Court would have little difficulty in disposing of this question were it one that it was called upon to determine; but it has been argued, and the Court considers justly that it is a question for determination by the Upper Court where the points of Law and the effect of the adoption will have to be discussed and determined, and that the issue to be now decided by it is simply one of fact, namely, "was the adoption made with the authority of Muttuveroyee Nachiar, widow of Annasawmy alias Ragnada Sethupathy, or with that of any others of the kindred of the late Zemindar Ramasawmy Sethupathy in whose behalf the said adoption was made."

V. The first point therefore is whether Muttuveroyee Nachiar consented to the adoption, or rather if the adoption was made with her authority.

VI. The Court is of opinion that there can be no question that she gave her authority and was a consenting party to the adoption.

VII. By the exhibit M the Razinamah filed by her as plaintiff in Original Suit No. 3 of 1843, and proved by the exhibits A K and A L her consent to 1st Defendant's adopting, is clearly shown as above stated it is contended that this consent was to an adoption by 1st Defendant on her own account, and not in behalf of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, and was given under an erroneous idea that as stated in the supplemental rejoinder, Ramasawmy Sethupathy had desired 1st Defendant to adopt which statement is now shown to be false.

VIII. The consent to adopt therefore given by Muttuveroyee Nachiar must have been to a regular adoption, for it is absurd to suppose that Ramasawmy Sethupathy on the strength of whose alleged requisition the adoption was to be made would have desired 1st Defendant to adopt a son in behalf of herself only, and that he was to have no benefit by the adoption.

IX. The plea of Plaintiff in Original Suit No. 3 of 1856 amounts in fact to this, that Muttuveroyee Nachiar believing the statement made by 1st Defendant in her supplemental rejoinder to be true, viz., that she had been authorized by her deceased husband Sethupathy to adopt a son if his daughters died without male issue gave 1st Defendant her consent and authority to adopt a child to herself, not on behalf of Ramasawmy Sethupathy.

X. The Court cannot accept this, for if the consent of Ramasawmy Sethupathy to the adoption and his direction to 1st Defendant to adopt were facts and susceptible of proof, there would have been no necessity to have got Muttuveroyee's consent to adoption at all, and again such an adoption as Plaintiff (3 of 1856) pleads Muttuveroyee gave her authority and consent to is not known under Hindu Law, and consequently the consent or otherwise of Muttuveroyee could be of no possible moment.

XI. The right of adoption under Hindu Law is absolute in the husband though after adoption the son becomes son to the wife also, and has to perform the funeral ceremonies of both, and it is noted by Strange, page 79, that whenever a woman duly authorized adopts it is on her husband's account and for his sake not her own.

XII. The Court therefore without giving any opinion as to the validity or otherwise of the adoption in question, repeats that it is of opinion, that Muttuveroyee Nachiar in giving her consent to an adoption intended it to be an adoption under the Hindu Law for no other could be valid or require her consent.

XIII. It is further in evidence and not contradicted that she (Muttuveroyee Nachiar) was an inmate of the palace when the adoption actually took place, and though not present when Plaintiff was brought in to 1st Defendant must have known of the fact of his adoption and never objected, till after she had heard that the Government had refused to acknowledge the adoption when she as pleaded by Plaintiff 3 of 1856 in 1843 (Document K 3 of 1856) declared that the adoption was false, but this repudiation subsequently made cannot affect her previously given written consent to it.

XIV. The next point is was the adoption made with the authority of any others of the kindred of the late Zemindar Ramasawmy Sethupathy.

XV. The Plaintiff's 3rd witness Muttusawmy has given a statement of the kindred of the said Ramasawmy Sethupathy, which agrees with the table which was accepted by the Sudder Court in its Decree 66 of 1857, and incorporated therewith (N.) he goes from Ramasawmy Sethupathy, 1st Defendant's husband up to Ramasawmy Sethupathy, the husband of Mungalaiswera Nachiar the Istimir Rane. Zemindar, and from him to his uncle Ragnada Tever of whom he positively declares he was acquainted with, and who was his grand-father, and that Rachoory Poolaur Tever was his father, and had but one other son beside his grand-father, namely, Ram Rajah Tever, the father of Ramasawmy Tever.

XVI. It was contended by Plaintiff (3 of 1856) that this witness and the parties he mentions could not be kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, 1st Defendant's husband, inasmuch as there was a break at Ramasawmy Tever, his grand-father, who had nothing to do with the

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.

Zemindary, or the adoption of Annasawmy Sethupathy, but in the opinion of the Court Plaintiff has shown (2) that Annasawmy was adopted by Ramasawmy the husband of Mungalaiswera Nachiar, the Istimir Rane.

XVII. On the part of Government 2nd Defendant it was contended that the statement of Muttusawmy and the table (N) showing kindred was incorrect, and that Rachoory Poolaur Tever, who is entered at the head of that table had three sons (vide 3rd witness' deposition cross examination); this however Muttusawmy Plaintiff's 3rd witness positively denies, and 2nd Defendant has not shown that he had more than two sons though by his 2nd witness Ramasawmy Tever he makes out that Muttusawmy's (3rd witness for Plaintiff) grand-father was not Ragnada Tever, but Chinnasawmy. The effect of this 2nd witness' evidence is to make Muttusawmy and his relatives more distant kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, but nevertheless kindred, and himself the nearest of kin.

XVIII. The Plaintiff denies that 2nd witness for Government is of the Rachoory Poolaur Tever's family at all, and his 3rd witness positively swears that he does not belong to it. The point for determination therefore is which of these two witnesses' statement are most probable, and worthy of credit.

XIX. The 3rd witness for Plaintiff's statement is in accordance with the table accepted after hot contest in Original Suit No. 3 of 1853 Appeal 66 of 1857, as showing the relationship of all parties then connected with the Ramnad Zemindary. He further positively swears to a fact within his own cognizance, namely, that his grand-father was Ragnada Tever. Ramasawmy Tever, the Government 2nd witness, gave a pedigree very different which he states he has learnt from priests and deeds; he can give no information whatever except names, and he excludes altogether Ragnada Tever, and avers Plaintiff's 3rd witness' grand-father's name was Chinnasawmy; as to this latter the Court has no hesitation in giving the greater credit to Plaintiff's 3rd witness, who is much more likely to know who his own grand-father was, than Ramasawmy, the Government 2nd witness, who knows nothing about him save his name which he says he heard from a priest.

XX. Then again, if the statement of the Government 2nd witness could be credited, he and his father would have been much nearer of kin to Ramasawmy Sethupathy than Sivasawmy Tever, Plaintiff in 3 of 1853, and it is incredible to suppose he would under such circumstances have been silent when Sivasawmy was claiming and suing for the Zemindary; besides it is shown in evidence (Documents IV, VI) that Muttuchella Tever, his father through whom of course he title descends, never set himself up to be of the Rachoory Poolaur Tever's family, and of Ramasawmy's kindred, but merely his NATURAL brother.

XXI. The Court therefore under these circumstances decides in favor of the Plaintiff's 3rd witness' credibility, and the table put in in Decree N. and altogether discredits Ramasawmy Government 2nd witness' story, and that he is of the kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, and it follows consequently that his consent or otherwise to the adoption was immaterial.

XXII. Having thus accepted the statement of 3rd witness Muttusawmy, and the table filed in N. to be substantially correct, it remains to be seen who of the kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy were consenting parties to the adoption.

XXIII. Muttusawmy, 3rd witness himself, the eldest member of the family alive and is two sons Sami Iyen, 5th witness, and Ramarajah, 6th witness, his nephews (elder brother's sons) Ramasawmy Tever, 7th witness, and Chinnasawmy Tever, 9th witness, as well as Chittranarraina Tever, 8th witness, a distant connection through the female side of Ramasawmy Sethupathy, all declared positively that they were consenting parties to the adoption and present at it, and also that two other nephews Ramarajah (Government 1st witness) and his brother Colundasawmy were also present and consenting which latter facts are also deposed to by 10th witness who called them to the ceremony, and 11th, 12th and 13th witnesses (1st Defendant's relatives), who were also present when the adoption took place and saw them there.

XXIV. Ramarajah, Government 1st witness, denies that he ever was present, averring that the statements of the above witnesses are false; he admits he was on intimate terms with the 1st Defendant at the time, and cannot account for his not having been invited to the ceremony when all the rest of the family were so; he states he did not object to the adoption as it never struck him to do so, but that he does object now as 1st Defendant should have adopted one of his family, and not taken Plaintiff from another family.

XXV. The demeanor and manner in which this witness gave his evidence precludes the Court placing any reliance in his testimony; he is no doubt and is admitted to be one of Ramasawmy Sethupathy's kindred, and though he now denies having consented to the adoption, the Court is of opinion that there is abundant evidence to show that he did so, and was present at the time.

XXVI. Plaintiff pleads that this witness' denial now of all that happened is owing to a quarrel he has had with Ponnusawmy Tever, the present manager of the estate, and although on cross examination he would not admit this to be the case, yet the Court from his manner from the time he entered the witness box, does not believe his evidence. It has been urged that this

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th November 1863.*

manner was owing to the cross examination, and threats of the Court to commit him if he refused to reply to the questions put: but if he were a true witness he could have had no object in prevaricating from the first, and refusing afterwards to give direct answers to the simple questions put by Counsel in cross examination.

XXVII. For the above reasons the Court is of opinion that the consent of all the now surviving kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy was obtained to the adoption.

XXVIII. The Plaintiff's 4th witness the adopted son of Dorarajah Nachiar and Muttuvejia Ragunada Tever, her husband though a minor at the time of adoption has never dissented, and has now given his consent to the adoption; his adoptive father it is also shown by 12th witness was present at the adoption and signed the Deed of Gift O.

XXIX. The only remaining member of the family appears to be Sivasawmy, the Plaintiff, in Original Suit No. 3 of 1853. It is argued that his consent is shown by the Razinamah filed by him in that suit before the High Court, and it (P) certainly shows that when he presented it he had no objection to the adoption. It has however been contended first that P. is not shown to have been filed by authority from Sivasawmy; and secondly, that consent subsequently given is not the consent to which the High Court refer, which is consent at the time which it is clear from his suit that he did not give as he contested the alleged adoption in that suit.

XXX. As regards the first objection to P. the Court is of opinion that it is not valid; it is an officially attested copy signed by the Registrar of the High Court, which it is to be fairly presumed would not have been granted, had it not been filed, and that it would not have been filed had not authority been shown for filing it. "Omnia præsumuntur rite et solemniter esse acta donec probetur in contrarium."

XXXI. As to the 2nd objection the Court considers it of weight. The maxim "Omnia Ratihabito retro trahitur et mandato priori æquiparatur" may possibly apply as pleaded, but the issue in this suit is, was the adoption made with the consent, &c., and it is clear Sivasawmy was not a consenting party or, apparently consulted when the adoption was made.

XXXII. The Court however is of opinion that it has been clearly established that the adoption was made with the authority of Muttuveroyee Nachiar, and with many of the kindred of the late Zemindar Ramasawmy Sethupathy.

XXXIII. As regards the evidence which shows that Plaintiff in 3 of 1856 was a consenting party to the adoption, and which evidence is declared by her Counsel to be false and fabricated, the Court would remark that it has not been called upon to record its opinion on this point, and therefore considers it unnecessary to do so.

Pronounced in open Court this 4th September 1863, A. D.

(Signed) R. R. COTTON, Civil Judge.

Post Judgment.

Counsel for Plaintiffs in Original Suit Nos. 1 of 1860 and 3 of 1857, desiring to have the Court's opinion as to Curpayee alias Coonjara Nachiar being a consenting party or not to the adoption, the Court records that it considers that the fact of her having been present, and a consenting party at the adoption of Plaintiff by 1st Defendant is proved by the evidence of the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th witnesses.

(Signed) R. R. COTTON, Civil Judge.

(True Copy.)

4th September 1863.

(Signed) V. H. LEVINGE, Collector.

Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government.

No. 168.

ORDER THEREON, 14th November 1863, No. 2,045.

Ordered to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

XXIV. Ramarajah, Government 1st witness, denies that he ever was present, averring that the statements of the above witnesses are false; he admits he was on intimate terms with the 1st Defendant at the time, and cannot account for his not having been invited to the ceremony when all the rest of the family were so; he states he did not object to the adoption as it never struck him to do so, but that he does object now as 1st Defendant should have adopted one of his family, and not taken Plaintiff from another family.

XXV. The demeanor and manner in which this witness gave his evidence precludes the Court placing any reliance in his testimony; he is no doubt and is admitted to be one of Ramasawmy Sethupathy's kindred, and though he now denies having consented to the adoption, the Court is of opinion that there is abundant evidence to show that he did so, and was present at the time.

XXVI. Plaintiff pleads that this witness's denial now of all that happened is owing to a quarrel he has had with Ponnusawmy Tever, the present manager of the estate, and although on cross examination he would not admit this to be the case, yet the Court from his manner from the time he entered the witness box, does not believe his evidence. It has been urged that this manner was owing to the cross examination, and threats of the Court to commit him if he refused to reply to the questions put: but if he were a true witness he could have had no object in prevaricating from the first, and refusing afterwards to give direct answers to the simple questions put by Counsel in cross examination.

XXVII. For the above reasons the Court is of opinion that the consent of all the now surviving kindred of Ramasawmy Sethupathy was obtained to the adoption.

XXVIII. The Plaintiff's 4th witness the adopted son of Dorarajah Nachiar and Muttuvejia Ragunada Tever, her husband though a minor at the time of adoption has never dissented, and has now given his consent to the adoption; his adoptive father it is also shown by 12th witness was present at the adoption and signed the Deed of Gift O.

XXIX. The only remaining member of the family appears to be Sivasawmy, the Plaintiff, in Original Suit No. 3 of 1853. It is argued that his consent is shown by the Razinamah filed by him in that suit before the High Court, and it (P) certainly shows that when he presented it he had no objection to the adoption. It has however been contended first that P. is not shown to have been filed by authority from Sivasawmy; and secondly, that consent subsequently given is not the consent to which the High Court refer, which is consent at the time which it is clear from his suit that he did not give as he contested the alleged adoption in that suit.

XXX. As regards the first objection to P the Court is of opinion that it is not valid; it is an officially attested copy signed by the Registrar of the High Court, which it is to be fairly presumed would not have been granted, had it not been filed, and that it would not have been filed had not authority been shown for filing it. "Omnia præsumuntur rite et solemniter esse acta donec probetur in contrarium."

XXXI. As to the 2nd objection the Court considers it of weight. The maxim "Omnia Ratihabito retro trahitur et mandato priori æquiparatur" may possibly apply as pleaded, but the issue in this suit is, was the adoption made with the consent, &c., and it is clear Sivasawmy was not a consenting party or, apparently consulted when the adoption was made.

XXXII. The Court however is of opinion that it has been clearly established that the adoption was made with the authority of Muttuveroyee Nachiar, and with many of the kindred of the late Zemindar Ramasawmy Sethupathy.

XXXIII. As regards the evidence which shows that Plaintiff in 3 of 1856 was a consenting party to the adoption, and which evidence is declared by her Counsel to be false and fabricated, the Court would remark that it has not been called upon to record its opinion on this point, and therefore considers it unnecessary to do so.

Pronounced in open Court this 4th September 1863, A.D.

(Signed) R. R. COTTON, Civil Judge.

Post Judgment.

Counsel for Plaintiffs in Original Suit Nos. 1 of 1860 and 3 of 1857, desiring to have the Court's opinion as to Curpayee *alias* Coonjara Nachiar being a consenting party or not to the adoption, the Court records that it considers that the fact of her having been present, and a consenting party at the adoption of Plaintiff by 1st Defendant is proved by the evidence of the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th witnesses.

(Signed) R. R. COTTON, Civil Judge.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) V. H. LEVINGE, Collector.

4th September 1863.

Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government.

(True Copies and Extract.)

J. D. Sim
Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to C. Dale, Esq., Government Pleader.

„ to V. H. Levinge, Esq., Collector of Madras.

Ed. J. Wright.

*Delivered to C. Dale
23-12-63
alias*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

No. 2421

Recd. 1863. Department.

Original for case

Dated 2nd October 1863.

Copy to

No. 6,235.

Submitting letter from the Collector of Madras forwarding copy of the judgment pronounced by the Court on Original Suit Nos 1 of 1860 and 3 of 1856.

RECORDED.

22-20-63

22/6/64

14th Nov 1863