

1435
77
186

Mellors July 11

To
D. J. Carmichael Esq
Secretary to Govt.
R.D.

1st With concurrence to the local authorities and the sanction of Govt in last year I have adopted the therdison of Venkatagery Rajah on the 1st February last.

2nd When leaving my Commission the Collector Mr. Melville allowed me 6 months leave to adopt and to return to my country. I have overstayed this leave by 3 months and have received 2 letters from the Collector requesting my immediate return.

3rd I am quite ready now willing to go back to my country but there Venkatagery Rajah puts obstacles in the way of the boy accompanying me, I therefore beg you will be so.

Dunder & Sons
 Dealers of Robbery

Prays that the
adopted son may
be caused to be re-
turned to her so that
she may take him
to her country & edu-
cate him there ac-
cording to the Govt. Regu-
lations & to 134 dated 1844

Government of Madras.
Revenue 1871 DEPARTMENT.
No 2215
Petition No. 1485 of 1871.
From Sri Rajah Laksh
ma Pillai
Occupation. Zamindar of
Village.
Talook. Bobbili
District. Vizagapatam
Dated 12 July 1871
Received 12 July 1871

Enclosures
5. 3-44 1234-15 July/41
Abstract.
States that the Vellu
gave permission for 6
months to proceed to
Vellu to adopt
the 3^d son of the Rajah
of Venkatarang, that
the accordingly a report
1. 178

Vincent Hughes
16th July 1876.

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your note of
last night. I saw the Pajaro yesterday
afternoon & communicated to him your
views of the Probate question. He heard
all the arguments I urged & seemed
to be willing to make certain reasonable
proposals. He even made a rough draft
of his proposals in my presence at the
Barrington where we met, & went home to
consult his counsel. He then asked

Handwritten text on a small, torn piece of paper, mostly illegible due to fading and damage.

me to furnish him with a translation
your memo to be shown this evening,
this I did. This evening we again
he showed me the draft of an answer
which he proposed sending to you. In my
~~view~~ it was worse than what he
I already written before.

I again repeated my arguments,
told him how matters stand at present,
what the result of not following the
our suggestion. He would be knowing
I am sure of your answer, I think
it better to hasten, but I am here

No 1234

15th July 1871

Petition from her

Ranee of Bottili.

The ancient Zamindari of "Bottili"
is in the Vijayapatnam district; her
possession is nearly a lac of rupees.

Pet's husband died S.p. 17th Aug
1868 & the Estate was consequently
registered in her name. It was
conceded that her husband had on
his death had empowered her to
adopt a son.

Two years after, she wished to adopt
accordingly, but was afraid her
Estate would be taken under
the management of the C. of Wards,
who had hitherto not interfered
on a report that she (with her
servant) was capable of managing
it herself.

Govt. informed her, that no change
in that respect would be made, so
long as her management was approved,
& she conformed to the views of Govt.
with reference to the Education
of her adopted son.

It seems that the 3rd son of her
husband's kinsman, the Thikatagiri
Prasanna, was adopted on 7th Feb last.

G.O. 26th Nov/68

G.O. 9th Sept/70
No 1432

G.O. 5th April/71
No 650

for further consideration & promised
to postpone my departure till tomorrow.

The matter is therefore still under his
consideration.

I shall obtain his final answer
tomorrow and immediately start for
Belore, where I shall relate by
every thing personally.

Yours faithfully
H. J. J. J.

he is about 9 years of age.

Peta now states that she cannot
set possession of the boy - he Raja
making various excuses - that she has
overstayed her leave from Vijayapattinam
by several months, & that the folks of
that district is pressing her to
return - She therefore prays for inter-
position of Govt. She has sent

vakils to me twice - her account
is that one day the Raja says
here is cholera on the road, and then
day & night post & so on. This is the
universal law of the country that an
adopted son belongs as entirely to
his adoptive parents as if he were
her legitimate son - and the Ranees's
case is a hard one.

However "ubi jus ibi remedium".

If she chooses to absolve the Govt. from
its pledge not to bring the Estate
under the Ct of Wards - all is clear,
because then the boy's custody is the
Court's proper concern - otherwise she
must apply for a habeas corpus in the
Madras Civil Ct under Act IX of 1861
(put up).

What her objection to the Estate

The Ranees of Bobbili has complained
in regard to the Venkatacherry
the act of adoption and I think that the
conduct of the Venkatacherry Ranees in
continuing to refuse the boy has adopted
parents would justify some interference
the imputation of falsehood and
ingratitude. I think as a preliminary
step that the Govt. should interfere
amicably as a friend of the two houses
& induce the Venkatacherry Ranees
to give up the child to the Ranees
where that case would be left in the
management of the Estate & the
child's education as long as she
gave satisfaction to Govt. in both
respects. The Collector might be
charged with this negotiation.
The Collector might also authorized

Para 7. &c
See Governor's note.

1. Introduction of the Bill
2. - Bill of Rights, from the
3. - Bill of Rights, from the

& intimate to the Rajah, should he
meet with difficulties, that in case
the question should not be amicably
arranged in this way the Govt. would
affirm of recourse being had to the
Courts of Law - a course which in
reference to his character & dignity
the Rajah never should permit - the
Courts of wards might also be held
over the Rajah in terror. - But
I think the Rajah to settle the
Rance might perhaps not object
to the intervention of the Courts of
wards which would probably
save money for his son. N

being taken under charge is,
I can readily conceive. Very often,
he (Colon) begins by turning all the
existing arrangements upside down,
the old family servants are hustled
out; hangers on of the (Catharine)
introduced, & everything that is done
is as distasteful as possible to the
local traditions & feelings -

But this need not be so; if
the C. of Wards were instructed
to secure & conserve the property
into the minimum of interference
compatible with the terms of the
Regⁿ, all will go well.

It seems most desirable that the
boy's Education sh^d be placed
systematically in hand,
and until the Estate is under
their superintendence, the C. of
Wards have no power to contest
it.

27-12-83/84

S. I believe there are numerous cases
where the education of young Zamindars
slips through our hands. A Zamindar
dying childless is succeeded by his widow
she adopts a boy for the inheritance
of the C. of Wards is too late - though often
at the moment of adoption he may be a minor
& the C. of Wards may be able to take him over.

This is an intricate
case. We told the lady
he would not inter.

11/1 36/14

for if she can't manage the estate
properly - (2) if her adopted son was properly edu-
cated - The first condition she is, as far as we
know, fully fulfilling - the second she cannot fulfil
because the Rajah will not give up the boy.
But if he intervenes as he should in the matter, the
Rajah may urge that he is properly educating
the boy along with his other sons - that our object
is then an idle - perhaps better attained - and
that therefore we should not interfere - Messrs
~~knowing that the Rajah is a Hindu~~

On the whole I think an early
plan - as the case is a hard one - is to
instruct the Clerk - through the Court of Wards -
to ascertain the boy's intentions - telling him
that the House can enforce surrender of the boy
by recourse to the Court - that ~~within~~ the Court
of Wards by assuming charge of the estate
can bring about the same result - but that either
course would derogate from his dignity. The
Clerk could ascertain at the same time
what is being done about the boy's education.

It is further to be borne in mind that the
boy may be better brought up as he has been - than
among a parcel of old Rajas. Also the Prince
may have been left alone since his father's death.
C. 8/10/1871 12.7.71

