M.R.O. 1—38,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 3212 Press ~~Mis.~~

223-225

Dated 18th December ~~19~~ 1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 20th December 1869.

Read the following :—

No. 273. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th October 1869, No. 7,403.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tanjore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Vallam, 7th September 1869, No. 191.

Board's Pros., 21st Dec. 1867, No. 8,236.
,, ,, 31st ,, ,,
,, ,, 1st June 1869, ,, 3,880.
,, ,, 29th ,, ,,

With reference to the correspondence marginally noted I have the honour to submit herewith copies of the Judgment and Decree of the Civil Court of Tanjore, dismissing the Suit instituted by Rangasami Pannikondan for the establishment of his alleged adoption by the late Poligar of Sillatur.

2. As will be seen from this Judgment and Decree, it has been distinctly declared by the Court that the alleged adoption did not take place; and it is therefore now a question for the dicision of Government how this unsettled estate, which has been under my direct management since the death of the late Poligari, Ayiammal Ayi, should be death with.

Enclosure No. 1.

In the Civil Court of Tanjore.

Present :—W. S. Whiteside, Esq., Acting Civil Judge.

Original Suit No. 20 *of* 1866.

Plaintiff. *versus* *Defendants.*

Vijaya Regunada Rangasami Pannikondan, G. LEE-MORRIS, Esq., and thirty-five others.
Zemindar.

This Suit having come up for final hearing after examining the witnesses cited on behalf of the plaintiff, and perusing the plaint and documents filed on behalf of plaintiff, and the written statements and exhibits filed on behalf of the defendants, and after hearing the arguments of Sundaram Pillay, Vakeel, on behalf of the plaintiff, Samiaiyar on behalf of the first defendant, Kuppusawmi Aiyar, Vakeel, on behalf of the second defendant, Strinivassa Aiyangar, Vakeel, on behalf of the third and fourth defendants, and Subramania Aiyar, Vakeel, on behalf of the 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 27th, 31st, 32nd, and 33rd defendants, the Court pronounced the following—

Judgment.

1*st*.—The plaintiff in this Suit, declaring himself to be the lawfully adopted son of the late Vijaya Regunada Kistnan Pannikondan, Poligar of Sillatur, in the Pattucottai Talook of this district, sued to recover possession, from the Collector of Tanjore, of the lands forming the above-named Poliput, and from the other defendants, lands as well as the movable articles appertaining to the estate of the late Poligar. The whole of the plaintiff's claim was valued at Rupees 13,377-10-8.

2. The plaintiff sets forth in his plaint that he, on the 6th February 1856, was adopted by the above-named late Poligar of Sillatur, who, on that date, executed to plaintiff's natural father a regular and formal Deed of Adoption A., which was signed by the first defendant in this Suit and duly registered, and that he died in the month of April 1856 (exact date unknown). That subsequent to the death of the Poligar disputes arose as to who should succeed to his estate, and one Muttu Pannikondan, whom the late Poligar had declined to adopt, claimed that he should be recognized as his heir and successor, and on the 13th May 1857 the Board of Revenue decided that the Polliem would be made over to any one who was declared by the Civil Court entitled to succeed as the adopted son, and that till then, the first defendant should remain in possession of the estate, and that this was accordingly done. The plaintiff therefore has now sued to recover possession of the landed and movable estate of the late Poligar from the first defendant and from the other defendants who have obtained illegally certain portions of the lands.

3. The Collector, the supplemental first defendant, admits that he is in possession of the lands belonging to the Sillatur Polliem, and pleads that the Polliem in question was unsettled, in which the holder had only a life-interest, and succession to which, on his death, was dependant solely on the pleasure of Government, and is not a question upon which the Courts are competent to adjudicate ; and he declared that he was in possession of no portion of the movables pertaining to the estate of the late Poligar.

4. The defendants, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 26th, 27th, 31st, and 32nd, filed statements, wherein they admitted that they are in possession of portions of the lands claimed by plaintiff, but denied his claim to be regarded as the adopted son, and as such, entitled to bring this Suit. The 33rd defendant denied having possession of any portion of the land specified in the plaint. The other defendants were declared *exparte*.

5. The plaintiff filed the following documents :—

A. An agreement of adoption executed by plaintiff's adoptive father, Vijaya Regunada Kristnan Pannikondan, and his adoptive mother, Ayiammal Ayi, to his natural father, Vijaya Regunada Shengara Narayana Pannikondan, dated 26th February 1856.

B. Arzi addressed by the plaintiff's adoptive father to the Special Assistant Collector of Tanjore, dated 10th February 1856.

C. Arzi addressed by plaintiff's adoptive father to the said Special Assistant Collector of Tanjore, dated 10th February 1856.

D. Petition put in before the Tahsildar of Pattucottai by plaintiff's adoptive father, dated 17th February 1856.

E. Deposition taken by the said Pattucottai Tahsildar from plaintiff's adoptive mother, dated 8th March 1856.

F. Do. do. plaintiff's adoptive father, dated 8th March 1856.

G. Yadast addressed by plaintiff's adoptive father to the said Tahsildar of Pattucottai, dated 13th March 1856.

H. Arzi addressed by the plaintiff's adoptive father to the Special Assistant Collector of Tanjore, dated 24th April 1856.

I. Order issued to the Tahsildar of Pattucottai by the Special Assistant Collector of Tanjore, dated 26th May 1857.

J. Register book of Exhibit A.

K. Marrattah Memorandum, dated 16th Ramjan Aval.

6. The defendants filed the following documents :—

I.—Order issued to the Zemindar of Sillatur by the Tahsildar of Pattucottai, dated 28th January 1856.

II.—Yadast written to the Zemindar of Sillatur by the Tahsildar of Pattucottai, dated 1st June 1857.

III.—Copy of a Takeed issued by the Acting Special Assistant Collector to the Tahsildar of Pattucottai, dated 17th January 1856.

IV.—Copy of deposition given by Kristnan Pannikondan before the Tahsildar of Pattucottai, dated 10th January 1856.

7. The following issues were framed :—

I. Whether this Court has jurisdiction in this Suit as it affects the plaintiff's claim to the Zemindary or Polliem claimed or not.

II.—Whether the plaintiff's alleged adoption is true in fact and valid in law.

III.—Whether the movables sued for, and the Kudikani right in the Sillattur village, with the houses therein, are private properties or property included in the Polliem.

8. The Court also recorded an order, under the provisions of Section 9 of the Civil Procedure Code, to the effect that on the above-stated three issues being disposed of in plaintiff's favour, his claims as against defendants 2 to 37 might be proceeded with, and investigated in a separate Suit. With regard to the first issue the plaintiff's Vakeel admitted that his client was unable to produce any Sunnud-i-Milkeat Istimrar granted by the British Government to the Sillatur Poligar,

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th December 1869.

or to adduce any evidence to show that such a Sunnud had ever been conferred ; but time having been allowed him by this Court to enable him to file a document which he alleged was to be found in the Record Office in the Tanjore Palace, and which he asserted was equivalent to a Sunnud-i Milkeat Istimrar, after some delay information was given as to this document ; it was called for at plaintiff's request, and the original has been filed on the record of this suit as plaintiff's Exhibit K. It is to be observed that this is a sort of memorandum apparently drawn up by one of the Revenue officials of one of the former Rajahs of Tanjore, altering the lands and Peishcush of the Sillatur Poliput, and declaring the kind of grain, etc., in which it should be paid; and it concludes with the words "it is therefore requested that the Sahib may be pleased to pass an order directing the said tribute-money and the Natcheni grain to be paid to the Circar in proportionate shares, and the people to render their services according to the usage of the district." There is below this the endorsement—"The said arrangement should be carried out," "Ramjan Aval ;" but it is important to notice that both the memorandum and the endorsement are unsigned, and there is nothing whatever to show by whom they were written or when. This document clearly cannot be relied on as equivalent to a Sunnud-i-Milkeat Istimrar constituting the Polliem lands hereditary property, and as the plaintiff is unable to adduce any other evidence with regard to the first issue, the Court finds that, so far as it affects the plaintiff's claim to the Sillatur Polliem, this Court has no jurisdiction in this Suit.

9. As regards the second issue the Court is compelled also to record a finding adverse to the plaintiff's claim. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory and contradictory than the evidence brought forward by plaintiff to prove his adoption by the late Poligar. A few of the more important weak points, discrepancies, and contradictions may here be noticed.

10. It is admitted that the late Poligar some time prior to his death intimated to the Revenue authorities his intention of adopting the late Muttu Pannikondan as his son, but soon afterwards withdrew that letter and asserted that his choice had fallen on the plaintiff. The Tahsildar of Pattucottai, Kondal Rao, (first witness for plaintiff) was then (since disputes as to the adoption had even then commenced) ordered to visit the Poligar and ascertain from him which of the two boys he had really adopted. His deposition with reference to this interview is very important. He declares that the Poligar was very sick, wandering in his mind at the time, and only capable occasionally of replying in a collected manner to questions put to him. The statement that he then gave to the Tahsildar shows this very clearly, the replies being almost throughout monosyllabic, while although he attempted to sign it, he only was able to write the single word "Zemindar." The Deed of Adoption is an eminently suspicious document ; it is on plain paper, although stamped paper was procurable at a short distance, and as it is said to have been written specially in view to registration and with a knowledge of the opposition that would be raised to the plaintiff's adoption, it is difficult to see why this should not have been avoided. The document was not written out by any of the writers who were regularly employed by the Poligar to conduct his correspondence with the Collector and Talook Revenue authorities, although it is proved that they were then in the village : it is said to have been written out by an unknown Brahmin who came from the south and then disappeared, and who has not now been produced before this Court. The document itself was not signed by any of the Village Officers, either those appointed by Government or by the Poligar, although they were all close at hand. Neither was it signed by one of the Zemindar's relations or chief friends, although it is alleged in evidence that from forty to fifty members of his family had assembled for the express purpose of witnessing the adoption of the plaintiff. The witnesses who admit that they did sign this deed of adoption are men of no social importance ; in fact, of so low a position as rather to throw discredit on the important document in the execution of which they declare they assisted. The second witness, Rungasawmy Naick, is a Talook Peon, and the fourth witness, a brass-smith, and they assert that out of curiosity one day they walked unsummoned into the Zemindar's house, entered his private room, saw the Deed of Adoption A. executed and signed by the parties, and attested it themselves. The second witness declares that the Zemindar was ill and giddy at the time, sitting down on his bed. The third witness says he was sitting on a carpet that was spread for him with his senses all right ; whereas the fourth witness declares

that the Zemindar was ill and l[illegible] down on a carpet. The second and third witnesses declare that the wife of the Poligar came out of an inner-room where she had been sitting, and signed the Deed of Adoption publicly before the assembled crowd. The fourth witness, on the other hand, avers that it was carried by the Writer into the inner-room, and that she signed it there without coming out at all; second witness says the adoption was commenced and written out simultaneously with the ceremonies of adoption, and that they were begun at ten Indian hours and finished at fifteen Indian hours in the day. The fifth witness, the Zemindar of Batharamkotai, states that he came there at fifteen Indian hours and found the Deed of Adoption already written out, that it had been signed and completed, and was shown to him, and that the ceremony of adoption was then commenced, and went on till three Indian hours in the evening. The sixth witness, however, declares that *after* the ceremony of adoption was over the Deed of Adoption A., was commenced and written out. This witness is a notorious and very wealthy man, and he cautiously declined to swear that the signatures to A. were those of the late Poligar and his wife.

11. The evidence as to the fact of the plaintiff's adoption is thus, as has already been observed, most contradictory and unsatisfactory, and it is impossible to place any reliance upon it. The Court observed that in the end memorandum signed by the Sub-Judge of Combaconum on A., certifying its having been registered in his Court, the words "of adoption" had been inserted in two places as an interlineation after the words "this Deed of Agreement;" and in order to satisfy itself as to whether this was to be viewed as a suspicious point in the document, the Court called on plaintiff's behalf, under the provisions of Section 138 of the Civil Procedure Code, for the original volume of Registration from the Register's Office, and then found that these interpolations do not exist in the corresponding entry in that volume. The fifth defendant's Vakeel then contended, that as this volume of registration had been admitted by the Court as evidence for the plaintiff and filed in the record, it was open to him to file another document bearing upon the entry of the registration of the Deed of Adoption, but which he previously had no occasion to file, the plaintiff not having referred to the said registration entry. The Court after hearing the arguments of the Vakeels on both sides decided, under the provisions of Section 128 of the Civil Procedure Code, to admit the document tendered by the 5th defendant, and which was thereupon filed on the record as defendant's Exhibit IV. This document is an attested copy of a statement made by the late Poligar of Sillatur on the 10th January 1856 before the Pattucottai Tahsildar, with reference to a complaint which had been addressed to the Special Assistant Collector by one Marimutta Pillai, asserting that a certain robbery of jewels had taken place. The Poligar then stated that that complaint was false, having been concocted by him out of enmity on account of his having been dismissed by him (the Poligar) from his employ for misconduct.

12. It is a noteworthy fact that one of the individuals who took this most suspicious Deed of Adoption to the Sub-Court of Combaconum, and there had it registered, was this very individual who had been dismissed by the Poligar for bad conduct, and who, the Poligar declared, had concocted a false complaint with intent to annoy him. There is no evidence whatever to show that this Deed of Adoption was registered during the Poligar's life time, or with his knowledge and consent. The plaintiff carefully abstained from specifying in his plaint or from proving in evidence by his witnesses the exact date of the Poligar's death, and the plaintiff's Vakeel declared himself unable to furnish the Court with any information on the point; but it is unquestionably one of great importance; for A. is said to have been executed about two months before the Poligar's death, but it was not registered until the 5th April 1856, and the Poligar, it is asserted by plaintiff, died some time in that month; it is very material to plaintiff's case to prove that A. was registered before that death took place, and that the individual who was entrusted with the document was duly authorized by the Zemindar, in writing, to have it registered in the usual manner. This, however, the plaintiff has carefully abstained from attempting to do, although the importance of such proof being adduced was specially pointed out by the Court.

13. It is to be noted that not one of the reports written by the Tahsildar on the subject of the Poligar's statement as to his adoption of plaintiff, the death of the Poligar, the registration of the Deed of Adoption, its being filed in his Office, etc., have been produced by plaintiff, but merely

divers letters or petitions asserted to have been written by the Poligar's wife declaring that plaintiff had been adopted, the deed registered, etc., etc. The Exhibit B., announcing the adoption having taken place, is in the same hand-writing as A. itself, and this is of importance when it is borne in mind that that communication was one of the utmost importance to the Poligar and his family, and that he had Writers or Accountants of his own then in his employ who ought to have written this letter.

14. For the foregoing reasons the Court is unable to consider the evidence adduced by plaintiff as credible, and accordingly finds that the fact of the plaintiff's adoption has not been proved, and having thus found against his claim on the 1st and 2nd issues, it is unnecessary to take evidence upon the 3rd issue. The Court therefore dismisses the plaintiff's claim with costs.

Dated this 23rd day of March 1869.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Decree.

From G. LEE-MORRIS, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Vallam, 1st September 1869, No. 185.

WITH reference to the Board's Proceedings marginally noted I have the honour to report, that having received notices from the Principal Sudder Ameen of Tanjore, as indicated in paragraph 3 of my letter of the 12th April 1869, No. 65, relative to the contemplated sale of the unsettled Polliem of Sillatur in the case therein referred to, as also in another similar * case, I caused petitions to be presented by the Government Vakeel on my behalf under Section 246 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and that the Principal Sudder Ameen has in consequence ordered that the right to the Melwaram or revenue of this unsettled estate be excluded from the sale, and that the "Kudikani" or the right of tenancy alone which belonged to the deceased Poligari, be put up to sale.

6th January 1869, No. 42.
15th May ,, ,, 3,329.

* In Suit No. 35 of 1866.

RESOLVED that the letter, dated 7th September, be submitted to Government, in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 1st June 1869, No. 3,880, recorded in Government Order of 22nd June, No. 1,768. It now remains for Government to give the decision reserved in Government Order, 30th December 1867, No. 3,046.

2. As the second letter recorded above refers to the same subject, the Board resolve to submit it also (together with the papers noted in the margin) for the information of Government.

Board's Procs., dated 6th January 1869, No. 42.
Do. ,, 15th May ,, ,, 3,329.

3. It will be seen that the Collector reported in a letter, dated 30th December 1868, No. 268, that he had been informed by the Principal Sudder Ameen that a village, forming a portion of the Sillatur Polliem, was to be sold, the same being then and still remaining under the management of Government, pending the result of the Suit now decided.

4. The Board directed the Collector to present a petition under Section 246 of the Civil Procedure Code, embodying his objections on behalf of Government to the sale of anything other than the Mirassi right to the village.

5. The attachment was withdrawn on the ground that due notice had not been given to the Collector, who however pointed out to the Board that he was liable on a future occasion to be called on to show reason why the sale should not take place.

6. This has occurred and the petition has been presented as the Board directed.

7. The result has been that the right to the revenue has been excluded from the sale and the "Kudikani" and "Mirassi" right (being the right of tenancy only) ordered to be put up for sale.

No. 274. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th November 1869.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tanjore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Vallam, 1st November 1869, No. 239.

In continuation of my letter of the 1st September 1869, No. 185, I have the honour to report that the Decree-holder in Suit No. 35 of 1866 on the file of the Tanjore Principal Sudder Ameen's Court, has preferred an Appeal to the Civil Court against the order of the Principal Sudder Ameen as therein reported by me.

* Printed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 6th October 1869, No. 7,403.

2. The only plea urged in this Appeal Petition is, that the forefathers of the deceased holder of the Sillattur Polliem for a long period paid a fixed beriz to Government, and that therefore the decision of the lower Court that the estate was an unsettled one merely because there was no Istimrar Sunnud, is wrong.

3. The point at issue, however, is not whether or not a fixed payment was made, but whether the estate is or is permanently settled under Regulation XXV. of 1802. That it was so settled can only be proved by the production of an Istimrar Sunnud, but no such document has been produced or even alleged to have ever existed, and it has moreover been established beyond all doubt by the Judgment* of the Civil Court in Suit No. 20 of 1866, that this estate is an unsettled one, and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the ordinary Courts of Judicature.

* Printed in the same Proceedings.

4. I have accordingly directed the Government Vakeel to urge the foregoing facts at the hearing of the Appeal Petition in question, which, as intimated to me by the Civil Judge by a formal notice, has been posted for the 9th instant.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 6th October 1869, No. 7,403.

2. Meanwhile the Board approve of the course proposed by the Collector.

No. 275. ORDER THEREON, 18th December 1869, No. 3,212.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government resolve to place the nearest heir of the late Poligar in possession of the Sillatur Estate, and to

endow it with a permanent Sunnud. The Board will therefore call upon the Collector for a report on the surviving claimants to the Estate, with reference to the genealogical sketch submitted with his letter to the Board, dated 30th November 1867, No. 234.

2. Proceedings of the Board, dated 5th November 1869, are approved.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd, F. R. Bantleman.

Rev: 1841

Memo: for orders on A 33 to 43 / 84.

The question which awaits the decision of Govt is whether the Sillatur Pollium is to be granted by Govt or to be handed over to the deceased Poligars nearest heirs. If the latter shd be decided on, the question into the nearest heir may be will be a subject for further consideration at present there is no specific

specific information
on the subject before
Government.

2. The Petitioner[x] Estate is now engrossed Billions in the Common District with a Revenue of about $1,600 Sterling a Decision of the Privy Council has been given in favour of the Petitioner, but the Claimants have appealed against the same and the Petitioner

[x] I cannot obtain any information as to the ancient history or origin of this Family

validity of each of the adoptions was very questionable, and the widow was allowed to retain possession pending the decision of the subject by the Privy Council. The widow died in October 1867. The only survivors of the two claimants by adoption, not having by that time established their rights to the Pollicon in the Courts, the Collector attached the Estate.

on behalf of Govt
and reported the steps
which he had taken
in his letter embodied
with Pro. of Govt dated
30th December 1867 No 3046.

3. In their order of
that date, the Govt ap-
proved of the course
which the Collector had
adopted and empowered
him to retain direct
management of the
Pillaiyar Polliem until
the suit instituted by
the Claimant by appe-
-ters of Painganaiyamma
or Kondayi had been decided.
The Govt reserved their
decision as to the future
disposal of the Polliem.

4. It will be observed from
Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue dated 6th October 1869,
No 7403, that the Civil Court
of Tanjore has now decided
that the alleged adoption
did not take place, and con-
-sequently that Ramasamy
Pommikoudan's claim is invalid
The Collector does not appear
to have had any doubt on
this point.

5. If the Govt decide against
the presumption of the estate,
it would appear from para 19
of the Collector's letter, embodied
in Proceedings of Govt dated 30th
December 1867, No 3046 that
the Polliem will go to one
of the sons of the paternal

uncles

Uncles of the deceased Poligar's
husband, who are the nearest
of kin. In the same letter
the Collector recommended
that the estate should be
assumed by Govt, but the
Board dissented from his
view.

6. Board's Proceedings
dated 5th November 1869, and
a portion of their Proceedings
dated 6th October 1869 No 1103
relate to a village forming
a portion of the Zillaiur
Polliem which was about
to be sold in execution of
a suit before the Principal
Sudder Ameen regarding
private debt of the late
Poligar

Poligar. The Collector took the
necessary steps to bring to the
notice of the Court the il-
legality of any alienation
by civil process of an un-
settled estate. The result
was that the Principal Sudder
Ameen properly excluded the
right to the revenue from
the sale of the village, and
ordered the right of tenancy
only to be put up for sale.
The decree holder has since
preferred an appeal to the
Civil Court against the
order of the Principal
Sudder Ameen: but as
his claim seems to be
wholly baseless, and as
the

the Collector has already brought the fact that the Sillattur Pollicum is unsettled to the notice of the Civil Court × no action on the part of Govt appears called for.

× The Civil Court has already decided that the Pollicum is unsettled.
Mr Atkins
4/12

% The question before Govt is contained in para 1

Rte

There appears to me to be sufficient reason for resuming this small Poliyam. When the last male proprietor died, its possession was wisely left with his widow. She demised in October 1867, and the claim to the late by an alleged adoption; Wh the Govt were willing to leave for determination by Civil action, has recently been declared to be invalid.
In order to create a new proprietor, the Govt will now have to go back to a son of a paternal uncle of the husband of the late female Poliyar. Originally, these Poliyams were, as I always understood when Collectr of Tanjore, assigned as means of subsist. for the Poliyar who intervened as a barrier between the peaceable, mild, cultivating classes of the Tanjore plains against incursions by the lawless Maravars of the Madura province - they were, in fact, frontier police. But as Tanjore ceased to require such police about those parts, and many thousand Sepoys were disbanded for general economy, what was intended for temporary foreign service became permanent.
This course will be in conformity with the view taken by the local Collector, Mr G. Lee. Morris - the Rev: Board also obtain from recording an opinion "that the Govt are under the belief "that the Govt are prepared to hand over the Estate to "collateral" rather than resume it". It seems strange that a body constituted as the Board is should abdicate its proper functions by anticipating what the fancies of the ruling people of the Council Chamber. -
15 Nov 1869.

It appears to me that as in this case a permanent pension was granted for support as an hereditary office as a permanency settled on the rights of heirs of the original grantee
Nov 22 1869

No. 3212. Rev. Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 26th Decem. 1869.

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Subm.g letters from Coll.r forwarding copies of Judgment and decree in Suit No 26 of 1866, instituted in Tanjore Civil Court by Rungasami Pannikondan, to establish his alleged adoption by late Poligar of Sillatur — } No. 6th Oct. 1869 No. 7408.

Subm.g appeal from decree in Suit No 35 of 1866 on file of Tanjore P. Sud.r Ameens Court — } No date

See No.

The Govt resolve to place the nearest heir of the late poligar in possession of the Sillatur Estate and to endow it with a permanent Summud.

The

The Board, will, therefore, call upon the Collector for a report on the surviving claimants to the Estate, with reference to the genealogical sketch submitted with his letter to the Board, dated 30th Nov 1867, N 234.

2. Proceedings of the Board, dated 5th November 1869, are approved.

[illegible]

H. Folio Bof Claims au Sud 2
6 — Aeek Girl 7

[illegible]