

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2294	Press ~~Mis.~~
	477.479	
Dated	23. 9. 1865.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd September 1865.*

Read the following :—

No. 477. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 31st August 1865, No. 5,375.
Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 19th August 1865, No. 139.

SIR,

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 5th instant, communicating the Order of the Government, dated 2nd idem, No. 1,792, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of an extract from the Proceedings of the late Sudder Udalt, dated 16th April 1849, directing the Civil Judges of the Guntoor and Masulipatam Districts to recover from the appellant Rajah Vasseretty Lutchme-

£	s.	d.
* 8,262	10	11
2,525	15	5
10,788	6	4

putty Naidu, or from his representative or representatives, the sum of Rupees 1,12,573-11-7,* on account of the costs incurred by the late East India Company in bringing the cases Nos. 4 of 1826 and

11 of 1827 to a hearing before His Majesty in Council.

2. A Petition from the one and the same person referred to in Mr. Dale's letter, embodied in the Order of Government No. 1,792, alluded to above, was received by me on 29th ultimo. It gave the same information as that contained in the Petition addressed to Mr. Dale.

3. I referred it to the Civil Judge of Guntoor, with a request to take such notice as he may deem necessary.

4. From Mr. Hodgson's reply, copy of which is herewith forwarded, it appears that the amount due to the East India Company on account of their costs is not known; but that a sum of Rupees 11,192-13-8 was remitted to the Sudder Udalt on account of the sale proceeds of the Vasseretty property in the year 1855. The Judge confirms the statement in the Petition, that an application has been made to the Court for the transfer of the Decree in Appeal Suit No. 50 of 1861 to M. Anantha Lutchme Nursimha Puntulu, the son of the suspended Deputy Collector, Narsimha Puntulu.

5. On reference to the records of the late Masulipatam Collectorate, it appears that a sum of Rupees 576 only was realized by the sale of the Vasseretty property, situated in the Masulipatam portion of the District.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. HODGSON, Esq., Civil Judge of Guntoor, to G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, dated 4th August 1865, No. 148.

1. In reply to your letter of the 29th instant, No. 181, I have the honor to state that a copy of the Petition (returned) therewith sent was also received by the Court, and that the application for transfer of the Decree in Appeal Suit No. 50 of 1861 from the name of V. Lakshmipati Naidu to that of M. Anantha Lutchme Nursimha Puntulu, has been made in this Court.

2. The amount which was originally claimed as due by Lutchmiputty Naidu to the East India Company on account of their costs, is not to be found in the records of this Court. But from the Precept Return of this Court, dated 7th April 1855, it appears that a sum of Rupees 11,192-13-8 was remitted to the Sudder Court by a Bill on the Accountant General, being the sale proceeds of the Vasseretty property, under the Decree of Her Majesty the Queen in Council.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd September 1865.*

3. This information is furnished to you in order that you may, if necessary and so advised, protect the interests of Government, either on the matter of costs, or any other demands there may have been against the Vassareddy estate prior to its purchase by Government in default of Peishcush.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL, *Collector.*

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of an extract from the Proceedings of the Sudder Udalt, under date the 16th April 1849.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of an extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court at Masulipatam, dated 9th May 1849.

1. Submitted to Government, with reference to their Order under date 2nd August 1865, No. 1,792.

2. As Mr. Thornhill has omitted to return the Petition, as he should have done, the Board are unable to express an opinion on the matter. Mr. Thornhill will now be requested to forward it without delay.

No. 478. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th September 1865.
Read the following letter from T. A. N. CHASE, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 29th August 1865, No. 146.

Sir,

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 12th instant, communicating the Order of the Government, dated 9th idem, No. 1,850, I have the honor to refer the Board to Mr. Thornhill's report,* and to inform the Board that

* No. 139, 19th August 1865.
the Government Vakeel at the Zillah Court of Guntoor has subsequently sent an Arzee to the Collector, stating that the person mentioned in Mr. Dale's letter, embodied in the Government Order alluded to above, has sent a letter to him on the subject of the transfer of the Decree by the Vassareddy Zemindar to Mungamoory Anantha Lutchmee Nursimha Puntulu, and requested the Collector's orders on the subject.

2. In reply to the above, the Government Vakeel was directed to move the Court to stop the enforcement of any order of the Court which may have been passed on the Petition of Lutchmepaty Naidu transferring the Decree, until the final orders of the Government on the report of Mr. Dale shall have been received.

Submitted to Government, with reference to the order quoted by the Acting Collector. The Government will observe that the transferee is the son of the suspended Deputy Collector Nursimha Puntulu. The Petition should have been

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd September 1865.*

N. 479.

ORDER THEREON, 23rd September 1865, No. 2,294.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government desire to have some further information as to the nature of the Appeal Suit No. 50 of 1861, and of the Judgment passed therein.

2. The object of the Petitioner appears to be to prevent the transfer of the Decree in this Suit from Lutchmupathy Naidu to the son of the Deputy Collector Nursimha Puntulu, and to induce Government to assert their right to any property devolving under it on Lutchmupathy Naidu, as being liable to meet the Government claim against him on account of the Law costs incurred for his benefit by Government in the Vassareddy Suits.

3. The Acting Collector has, it is observed, instructed the Government Vakeel to move the Court to stop any order sanctioning the transfer of the Decree from Lutchmupathy Naidu in such manner as to defeat the Government claim.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

"The Government Pleader"

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Read.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Ind. Adalat
Under date the 16th April 1849.

In Appeal No 4 of 1826.

In Appeal No 11 of 1827.

Rajah Vasserreddy Ramana-
tha Bamboo.

Versus.

Athamma the senior widow
of the late Rajah Vasserreddy
Jagannadha Bamboo.

Ranganma the junior widow
of the late Rajah Vasserreddy
Jagannadha Bamboo, on behalf
of Lakshminarayana Naidu the
alleged adopted son of her
late husband.

Versus.

1st. Athamma.

2^d. Rajah Vasserreddy Ramana-
tha Bamboo

3^d. P. Kaledoss.

Before Her Majesty in
Council. Athamma the
senior widow of the late
Rajah Vasserreddy Jagannadha
Bamboo.

Versus.

Rajah Vasserreddy Rama-
natha Bamboo.

Before Her Majesty in Council.
Ranganma adoptive mother
and guardian to Rajah
Vasserreddy Lakshminarayana
Naidu

Versus.

1st. Athamma.

2^d. Rajah Vasserreddy Ra-
manatha Bamboo.

3^d. P. Kaledoss.

Read Extracts from the minutes of consultation under date the 12th December last, forwarding with a Despatch from the Honorable the Court of Directors, the Decree of Her Majesty in Council on the appeals made from the judgement of the Judge Udalt in Appeals Nos 1, of 1826 and 11, of 1827, with instructions to give effect to the Orders of Her Majesty in Council and to take measures for recovering on behalf of the Honorable the Court of Directors the costs incurred by the East India Company in bringing the cases to a hearing.

Read also Petitions presented on the 20th November & 23rd December 1842, 29th January and 2nd April 1849, by T. Appiah and N. Seth. Sam Esq^r Nuts on behalf of Rajah Vasserreddy Lakshminpaty. Naidu Bahader adopted son and heir of the late Rajah Vasserreddy Jagannadha Baboo and Appellant in Appeal. No 11 of 1827 submitting copy of a Decree of Her Majesty in Council and praying that an Order may be issued to the Civil Judges of Guntoor and Masulipatam directing them to make over to the Petitioner according to Her Majesty's Decree the whole of the real and personal Estate of the late Rajah Vasserreddy Jagannadha Baboo as particularized

in the schedule, alleged by the Petitioner to have been annexed to the Plaint in original suit. No 29 of 1826 on the file of the late Provincial Court in the Northern Division.

The Decree of Her Majesty in Council is to the effect that against Puttoory Balakrishna the appeal of Rangammah ought to be dismissed with costs; and that the Decree of Judge Udalt pronounced in Appeals Nos 1, of 1826 & 11 of 1827 "ought in other respects to be reversed"; that the adoption of Ramanadha Baboo was invalid and that he was not entitled to be considered as a co-heir with Jagannadha Baboo to Venkatadry Naidoo, but that under the circumstances appearing in evidence he was entitled to such property included in the gift made by Venkatadry Naidoo after Jagannadha Baboo came of age as Venkatadry Naidoo had the power to dispose of and that it should be declared that Ramanadha Baboo was entitled to retain those portions of such property which came into his possession and to have restored to him such portions thereof as came into the possession of Jagannadha Baboo or to have compensation made for the rent of the Estates of Jagannadha Baboo "that the adoption of Lakshminpaty Naidu by Jagannadha Baboo was well proved and that

that Lakshminipaty Naidu is entitled to succeed to the whole Estate of Jagannadha Bauloo and the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have directed that there be paid to the United East India Company or their agents by the Appellant and respondent respectively or by their respective representatives or representatives; the following sums for the costs, charges, and expenses of bringing this Appeal to a hearing viz by Rangamma as mother and guardian of Lakshminipaty Naidu Bahader or by her or his representative or representatives the sums of Eight thousand two hundred and sixty two pounds, ten shillings and eleven pence, sterling for costs incurred on her behalf and likewise the further sum of two thousand five hundred and twenty five pounds, fifteen shillings, and five Pence sterling for costs incurred on behalf of Puttoory Kaledoss & by Acheamma or by her representative or representatives the sum of three thousand five hundred and Eighty three pounds, seventeen Shillings, & four pence sterling for costs incurred on her behalf as Respondent in the 1st Appeal and likewise the sum of five thousand nine hundred and fifty nine

L. S. D.
8262 - 10 - 11
2525 - 15 - 5
10788 - 6 - 4.00
Comp. 112573 - 11 - 9.00

L. S. D.
3583 - 17 - 4
5959 - 14 - 11
9543 - 12 - 3.00
C. R. 49585 - 8 - 4

hundred and sixty two pounds, ten shillings and eleven pence, sterling for costs incurred on her behalf and likewise the further sum of two thousand five hundred and twenty five pounds, fifteen shillings, and five Pence sterling for costs incurred on behalf of Puttoory Kaledoss & by Acheamma or by her representative or representatives the sum of three thousand five hundred and Eighty three pounds, seventeen Shillings, & four pence sterling for costs incurred on her behalf as Respondent in the 1st Appeal and likewise the sum of five thousand nine hundred and fifty nine

Pounds, fourteen Shillings, and eleven pence sterling incurred on her behalf as Appellant in the second Appeal, and finally by Ramuadha Bauloo by his representative or representatives the sum of five thousand six hundred and twenty two pounds, eighteen Shillings and one penny sterling for costs incurred on his behalf as Respondent in the first Appeal, and the further sum of five thousand nine hundred and eighty one pounds eight shillings and nine pence sterling for costs incurred on his behalf as Respondent in the second Appeal."

L. S. D.
6222 - 18 - 1
5981 - 8 - 9
11201 - 6 - 10.00
R. 121088 - 12 - 6

Appeal, and the further sum of five thousand nine hundred and eighty one pounds eight shillings and nine pence sterling for costs incurred on his behalf as Respondent in the second Appeal."

2. In conformity with the Decree of Her Majesty in Council, and with reference to the orders of the Sudda Udalat under date the 23rd December 1848 directing the Civil and Nazulipatana to take proper measures to secure by immediate attachment such property real and personal as may be found to belong to the above Parties, the Court of Sudda Udalat now direct that the said Civil Judges be commanded by Precept returnable in six weeks from and after its receipt to carry the said Decree into full execution.

3. And the Court further direct that the said Civil Judges do cause to be recovered from the Appellant Rajah Vasserreddy Lakshminipaty Naidu or from his representative

^{L. S. d.}
 10,758-6-1 or
 Rs 112,573-11-9.

or representatives the sum of two thousand seven hundred and eighty eight Pounds, six shillings and four pence, sterling or Rupees, one lac twelve thousand five hundred and seventy three annas eleven, and Pice nine, at the exchange of 1-11 per Company's Rupee in account of the costs incurred by the East India Company on his behalf and on behalf of Puttooy Kaledow who has been exonerated by the Decree of the Privy Council from all liability on account of the said costs.

^{L. S. d.}
 7,563-12-3 or
 Rs 99,585-8-4.

4. Ordered also that the civil judges of Guntoor and Masulipatam be required to recover from Vasseraddy. Achanna the Appellant in the first, and 1st Respondent in the second. Appeal before her Majesty in Council or from her representative or representatives the sum of nine thousand five hundred and forty three Pounds, twelve shillings and three pence sterling or Rupees ninety nine thousand, five hundred and eighty five, annas eight, and pice four, at the exchange of 1-11 per Company's Rupee for the costs incurred on her behalf by the East India Company in the above appeals.

5. Ordered further that the civil judges of Guntoor and Masulipatam be required

^{L. S. d.}
 11,604-6-10 or
 Rs 121,088-12-6.

required also to recover from Rajah Vasseraddy. Ramanadha. Baboo Respondent in both the above Appeals before Her Majesty in Council or from his representative or representatives the sum of eleven thousand six hundred and four pounds, six shillings, and ten pence, sterling or Rupees one lac, twenty one thousand, & eighty eight, annas twelve, and pice six, at the exchange of 1-11 per Company's Rupee, on account of the costs incurred by the East India Company on his behalf in the above two Appeals. The above sums when so recovered from the parties aforesaid to be remitted to this Court by a Bill on the Accountant General in favor of the Register of the Sudder Adalat.

x x x
 Ordered, accordingly, that Extract from these Proceedings be sent to the civil judges of Guntoor and Masulipatam for their information and guidance by precept returnable in six weeks from and after its receipt.

Ordered also that the above be communicated to the Vakeels of the Parties respectively for their information.

(True Extract.)
 (Signed) J. H. Davidson
 Register.

(True copy)
 (Signed) W. Dowdeswell
 Civil Judge.

(True copy)
 J. Marshall
 Collector.

E?
 J. D. Chandra
 HC

Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court at
Masulipatam. Dated 9th May 1849.

Present

W. Dowdeswell Esq.

Civil Judge

In. Appeal. No. 4 of 1826.

In. Appeals. No. 11 of 1827.

Rajah Vasserreddy Rama-
madha Baboo.

Versus.

Atchamma the Senior widow
of the late Rajah Vasserreddy
Jagannadha Baboo.

Ranganma the Junior
widow of the late Rajah

Vasserreddy Jagannadha Baboo
on behalf of Lakshminipaty
Naidu, the alleged adopted
son of her late husband.

Versus,

1st Atchamma.

2^d Rajah Vasserreddy Ramamadha
Baboo.

3^d Puttoory Kaledoss.

Before Her Majesty in Council
Atchamma the Senior wi-
dow of the late Rajah Vasse-
reddy Jagannadha Baboo

Versus.

Rajah Vasserreddy Rama-
madha Baboo.

Before Her Majesty in Council
Ranganma, adoptive mother
and guardian to Rajah Vasse-
reddy Lakshminipaty Naidu

Versus.

1st Atchamma.

2^d Rajah Vasserreddy Rama-
madha Baboo.

3^d P. Kaledoss.

Read.

1865 29th Oct
Rev 24/29/65
In a letter from

The Collector of
Madras District

dated 19 August 1865

Mr. J. J. J.
to Mr. J. J. J. of 1865

Copy of an

extract from

the 13th of the

last volume

under date the

16th April 1849.

Read Precept and Extract from the Proceedings of the Sudda Udalut under date the 16th ultimo; directing the civil judges of Guntur and Masulipatam to carry into full execution the Decree passed by Her Majesty in Council, in the above Appeals, and to recover from the Appellant Rajah Vasserreddy Lakshminarayana Naidoo from his representative, or representatives the Sum of Rupees (1,12,573-11-9) One lac, twelve thousand five hundred and seventy three, annas eleven, and pice nine; and from Vasserreddy Atchamma the Appellant in the 1st, and 1st Respondent in the 2nd Appeal before Her Majesty in Council or from his representative or representatives the Sum of Rupees (99,585-8-4) Ninety nine thousand five hundred and eighty five, annas eight, and pice four; and from Rajah Vasserreddy Ramachandra Baboo, Respondent in both the above Appeals or from his representative or representatives, the Sum of Rupees (1,21,088-12-6) One lac, twenty one thousand, and eighty eight, annas twelve, and pice six, on account of the costs incurred by the East India Company in bringing the above cases to a hearing.

2. Ordered that copies of Paras 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the foregoing Extract be transmitted

transmitted to the collector of Masulipatam with a request to give effect to the instructions therein contained, and to collect the above sums from the Parties aforesaid, or in the event of their failing to pay the same, to attach and sell such property real, and personal, as may belong to them respectively, and remit the sale proceeds thereof to this Court, by a Bill on the Accountant General, in favor of the Register to the Court of Sudda Udalut.

3. Ordered further that an Extract from these Proceedings be sent to the collector of Masulipatam for his information, by Precept returnable in 4 Weeks after its receipt -

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. Dowdeswell
civil judge.

(True copy)

Mamulla
collector.

Ed
Sd binha
Ac

Revenue Department

N^o. 2294.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 23^d September 1865

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Submitting letter from the
Collector of the Kistna Dist.,
forwarding extract from the L^ors.
of the late Sudr Adalat direct-
ing the recovery of Rs. 112573-11-7
from the Vassireddy Zemindars,
on account of costs incurred by
the late East India Company in con-
nection with certain suits; and
requesting the Coll^r to forward
the Petition on the subject.

(Here entered 31st August
1865)

Submitting with remarks
letter from the A^d. Collector of the
Kistna Dist. on the subject of the
transfer of the Decree passed in the
Vassireddy Zemindars suit, to Mr.
Arantia Lutchmechurnimha Pundarik.

(Here entered 8th Sept^r 1865)

The Government de-
sire to have some further in-
formation as to the nature of
the

1865 Aug.

See a letter from

the Collector of
Kistna Dist.

date 19 Sept 1865

7.129

Rev. 1426/65

Copy of an

extract from the

Proc^{es} of the Civil

Court at

Madras

date 9. May 1865.

23.11.65/23.11.7.47

23.11.65/23.11.7.47

the appeal suit No. 50 of 61
and of the judgment passed
therein.

The object of the Petitioner appears to be to prevent the transfer of the Decree in this suit from Lutchmyputhy Naidu to the son of the Deputy Collector Kuraimba Puntulu and to induce Govt. to assert their right to any property devolving under it on Lutchmyputhy Naidu as being liable to meet the Government claim against him on account of the Law costs incurred for his benefit by Government in the Vassareddy suits.

The Acting Col.lector has, it is observed, instructed the Government Vakil to move the Court to stop any order sanctioning the transfer of the decree from Lutchmyputhy Naidu

Naidu in such manner as to defeat the Government claim.

L.B.

11. To the Board of Res. Decs. Refd
3. The Govt. Pleader

$\frac{21}{3}$

There is no doubt
that the Govt. Pleader
is not a party to the
suit and that the
claim of the Naidu
is not a claim of the
Govt.

Co No. 150-151
9-8-65

35-36
2-8-65

C. No. 2427/65

Revenue 1865 Sept.
D. of Govt. Sept.

182294.

D. of the Madras Govt.
23 Sept/65

D. of the Madras Govt.
October 1865 & 1866

Regarding with reference
the official letter of
1861 and the Madras Govt.
formation and the Govt. not
to transfer the Govt. to
the Govt. Madras Govt.
which was.

18229479.