

(1) Number of Pages..... 64
(2) Date of repair..... 10.12.65
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... My

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

REV DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>40</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	<u>8 - 2.1873</u>	196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Revenue Department

No. 229.

To
The Ag. Chief Secretary to
Government

Sir,

Para 1.

24th April in Cons. 3.
May 1830.

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will submit to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Principal Collector of Madras reporting the death of the Zamindar of Ramnad.

2. It appears that the Zamindar died of Small pox on the morning of the 21st April. He has left two daughters, minors. The Zamindar was desirous that the Zamindari should be left under the charge of his adoptive mother during the minority of his daughters. Mr. Vincent states that this person has great abilities and is fully capable of directing the affairs of the Zamindari.

the family he says have expressed objections to the estate being placed under the management of the Court of Wards, and he himself does not see the necessity of interference.

3. In cases of small estates it has been thought consistent with the scope of Regulation of 1804 to leave them during the minority of the proprietors under the charge of their nearest relations and friends without the interference of the Court of Wards. In the case of large zamindaries however with a view to which undoubtedly the provisions of the Regulation were framed, it appears to the Board both to be required by a fair construction of the law and to be in itself highly expedient that they should be put in force when such properties devolve to minors. They recommend accordingly that they may be authorized to assume charge of the zamindari of Ranna and their

their capacity of Court of Wards in behalf of the infant daughters of the late zamindar

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George
3^d May 1830 -

I have signed ✓
/ Signed / D. Elliott ✓
Secretary

/ True Copy /

Calcutta
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

Amos M.L.



No 380.

To
The Ag Chief Secretary to Govt
Fort St George.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue
to submit for the purpose of being laid
before the Right Honble the Governor in Council,
the papers noted in the margin, having reference
to some malversations in the Ramnad
Zemindary, now the property of a minor,
and hitherto in the hands of a manager,
but not under the charge of the Court of
Wards. Under the circumstances stated
in Mr. Blackburne's letter, the Board have
deemed it necessary to act without delay
in their latter capacity, and to direct
that the Estate should be taken under
the

* From Principal Collr
of Madras to the
President of the Bd of
Rev: 27th Augt 1842
with one enclosure.
To Principal Collr of
Madras, 8th Sept 1842.

5:1

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board to
3rd May 1830 No 229.

No. 361/73

the Court of Wards without previously obtaining
the authority of government; they instruct
me to solicit the approval and sanction
of government for this proceeding and
direct me to add that further report shall
be made on the subject as soon as they
have the requisite information before
them.

Rev. Mr. Office

Forth-gate

10 September 1842

Signed / J. D. Hamilton
Secretary,

[True Copy]

Chas. A. M.
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

Comp. P. H. S.

N^o 477

To,
The Acting Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence
noted in the margin, I am directed by the
Board of Revenue to forward for the
information of the most Honble the
Governor in Council the accompanying

To Chief Secretary
8th September 1842.
Extracts from: of Cons.
Sept^r 11th 1842
To Chief Secretary
Sept^r 1842.

From Principal Collect^r
October 22 - 1842.

ing letter from the Principal Collect^r
of Madras, reporting that he has taken
the jurisdiction of Ramanad under charge
of the Court of Wards.

Revenue B^d Office } /Signed/ J. D. Dondillon
Fort St. George } Secretary
31st October 1842.

/True Copy/

Cal. Alm
Ag: Under Secretary to Govt.

Comp^d [Signature]

N^o 3

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board dated
10th September 1842 -

Rev. 361/23



Revenue Board Office
Fort Saint George.
29th February 1844.

N^o 77.

From. E. C. Lovell Esq^r.
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue.
To.

G. B. Deury Esq^r.
Chief Secretary to Government.

Sir

Adverting to the share which the affairs of the Ramnad Zemindary have occupied in the discussions of Government for many months past, it may be interesting to the Most Noble the Governor in Council to learn that the Court of Wards have upon the application of the Principal Collector Mr. Blackburne given their sanction for the espousal of the Minor Heiress Dorajah Nachyor by her relative Mostos Vizia Ragoomatha Thaven an unmarried youth of 24 years of age, and have authorized the disbursement from the Funds of the Estate of 4,000 Rupees for the due celebration of the ceremony.

Marriage Rs 25,000
Jewels " 15,000
Rupees 40,000

(True copy) Signed E. C. Lovell.
Acting Secretary.

As Under Secretary to Gov^t.

Comp^d M^{rs}

N^o 4

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board dated
31st Dec 1842.

Recd. 361/70

Copy of a letter from
Russon Board & Co
29 February 1844 (No. 7)
No. 361/73.

No. 5

N^o 117.
Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
28 March 1844

From
E. C. Lovell Esq^r
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue
To
G. S. Drury Esq^r
Chief Secretary to Government
Sir,

I am directed by the Court of wards
to acknowledge the receipt of the extract
from the Minutes of Consultation under
date the 12th Instant requiring the Court
to explain the grounds on which they have
given their sanction to the repurchase of the
disqualified heirs of Rammad upon the
application of the Principal Collector
Mr. Blackburn without the consent of the
members of her family or set forth in
certain Petitions herewith transmitted,
and directing the postponement of the
marriage and the disbursement of funds
on that account. The attention of the
Court of Wards is also directed to
certain correspondence and orders of the
Honorable

Honorable Court respecting the disposal of the Tenors belonging to the estates of Minors under their charge.

2. In reference to the first point the Court desire to explain that the proposition for the marriage of the disqualified heiress came before them recommended in the strongest terms by the mother of the heiress, by the Manager of the estate, and by the Principal Collector, and the only objections were from a party, the late manager in hostility to this branch of the family, to which Mr. Blackburn attached little importance. The Objections now forwarded by Government are from the same party, and from the Grand Mother of the heiress, who is also in open and avowed hostility to this branch of the family. Unanimity in a house so completely divided was not to be expected, and an arrangement which promised so many advantages was not in the opinion of the Court to be foiled by vexatious oppositions proceeding from such a quarter.

3. The age of the disqualified heiress also rendered her settlement in

in life desirable, and the party soliciting the alliance had the approval of the minor and mother, to these advantages the Court had also in view by the arrangement the settlement of a question of no small importance as legalizing their proceedings in respect to this estate which had perplexed the late Commissioner and the Principal Collector to with the nomination of a guardian to the Minor heiress. On these grounds the Court of Wards readily gave their support to the recommendation of the Principal Collector that the marriage should be allowed, and with every respect the Court would now beg to repeat their recommendation that the sanction of the Most Noble the Governor in Council should now be accorded.

4. In reference to the second point, the Court of Wards desire me to explain that they had not overlooked the correspondence and order of the Honorable Court of Directors to which their attention has been drawn, but they viewed the result of the above correspondence

correspondence and orders rather as
formally recognizing and acknowledging
the right and power of Government under
Regulation V of 1804 to interfere in
particular cases when they saw fit
with the Proceedings of the Court of Wards,
than as requiring the Government to
interfere, and as it has always been
customary for the Court of Wards to
sanction disbursements of the description
alluded to on account of their Wards,
whenever the Stewards admitted of it
without reference to Government, so
on this occasion the Court accorded
their sanction, reporting the circumstance
for the information of Government in
consequence of the affairs of this
Estate having been recently brought
so prominently to notice, and in
doing this the Court believed that
they were acting in strict conformity
to the Regulation and the wishes of
Government.

Since writing the foregoing
the Court have received the accompanying
letter from the Principal Collector
Mr. Blackburn in reply to one trans-
mitting to him, the minutes of
Consultation

Dated 21st
In Consultation
28 March 1844

Consultation now under acknowledgment.
The most Noble the Governor
in Council will observe that the marriage
has been postponed until the receipt of
further instructions.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
28 March 1844

Signed / E. C. Lowell
Ag. Secretary

/ True copy /

Calcutta
Acting Under Secretary to Govt

Copy

Revenue Department.

No. 310.

12/10

Extract from the Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
dated 18th July 1844.

Read the following letter
from the Principal Collector of Madras
dated 12th July 1844.

(Here enter No. III)

Resolved that the foregoing
letter be submitted for the information
of the Most Noble the Governor in Council
with reference to the Extract from the
Minutes of Consultation dated 8th June
last No. 552.

/ True Extract /

/ Signed E. C. Lovell

Ag Secretary.

/ True Copy /

Calcutta

Ag Under Secy to Govt.

Camp. H. S.

86

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board dated
28th March 1844 No. 117
No. 361/73

Revenue Board Office
Fort Saint George
25th July 1844.

N^o 319
From, E. C. Lovell, Esquire,
As. Secretary to the Board
of Revenue,
To, G. D. Drury, Esquire,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Sir,
Para 1 I am directed by the Board
of Revenue to forward for the orders
of the most noble the Governor in
Council the accompanying letter
from the Principal Collector of Madras,
recommending that the Pagodes of
Rammad may be made over to
Mootoo Vizia Ragoonatha Shaver
whose marriage to the minor
heirs of Rammad was reported
in the Board's Proceedings dated
18th July 1844.

2. The Pagodas have usually
been under the control of the Zemindars
except when the estate has been under
the Collector's management. The
Board

Rev. Dep.

12th in Cons. 25th July 1844.

From Collr. G.
in Cons. 21st Oct.
1841 Para 8.

57

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board on 18th July 1844. N^o 319
No. 361/73

Board therefore beg to recommend
that they may be entrusted, agreeably
to the Principal Collector's suggestion, to
Mootoo Vizia Ragoonatha Shaver the
husband and guardian of the heiress
as the fittest person to have charge of
them.

3. In connexion with this subject
I am instructed to forward for the
purpose of being laid before the Most
Excellt the Governor in Council the
accompanying Petition from Vizia No 851 of 1844
Ragonada Mootoo Chella Saver, the
late manager of the Ramnad Estate,
which does not appear to call for any
particular remark from the Board.

Revenue W^d Office,
Fort St. George,
25th July 1844

I have &c
Signed E. C. Louell
Acting Secretary

(True Copy)

Col. Arthur
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt

Comd^r H. S.

Read the following letter

Peninsula Board Office.

Fort St. George.

23^d September 1844.

No 433.

From,

E. L. Lovell, Esquire

Ag. Secretary to the Board of Revenue

To
J. D. Drury, Esquire

Chief Secretary to Government

Sir,

Revenue Dept.

With reference to the Extract from
the Minutes of Consultation dated 5th Instant
No 913, I am directed by the Board of Revenue
to request that you will lay before the most
Honble the Governor in Council the accompany-

10 info. 16th Sept 1844

ing letter from the Principal Collector
of Madras, explaining the grounds of his
recommendation of the transfer of the
Rammad Devashammus to the charge of the
husband of the minor heiress of Rammad.

Rev: B^d Office,
Fort St. George,
23^d Sept 1844

I have &c.

/ Signed E. L. Lovell
Ag. Secretary

N: 8

Copy of a letter from
Revenue Board dated
25 July 1844 No 319
No. 361/73

No 1150.

Before passing orders on the foregoing letter, the Government desire to learn the sentiments of the Court of Ward on the opinion expressed by the Principal Collector of Madras that the Ramnad Devastanams might be abandoned to the charge of the husband of the Ormior heiress of Ramnad though he would not for a moment accept him as a controlling Officer under himself.

For St. George
12 Nov 1844
/ True Extract,
/ Signed G. Drury
Chief Secretary
Copy to the Board of Revenue

/ True Copy /

W. C. Drury
Adj. Secy. to Govt

Revenue Office
Fort St George
14th July, 1845

No 446

From J. Pycroft, Esqr.
Secy to the Bd of Revenue
To J. F. Thomas, Esqr.
Chief Secy to Govt.

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will submit for the orders of the most noble the Governor in Council the accompanying correspondence with the Principal Collector of Madras on the subject of a suit (No 3 of 1843) on the file of the Civil Court of that Zillah, in which that Officer has been included as a supplemental Defendant.

2. From these papers it will be seen that the suit in question has been brought by most the Venoye Nachyar Agent of the Minor Heiress of Ramnad, against Parovatha Vuntany Nachyar Mother of the Heiress and against most the Chella Tavar the late manager of the Zemindary and that in consequence of the Estate being at

Rev: Deptt.

From R. Collr.
18th in Cons: 28th Sept 1843
From R. 4th in Cons: 31st March 1845.
Extract No: 18 of Rev.
31st March.
From R. Collr 18th April
in Cons: 22 May "
To R. 22 May "
From R. 24 May in Cons.
12 June "
From R. 27th June in
Cons: 14 July "

No 9

Revenue 1844 Department

No 1094

From
By Secy to the
Board of Revenue
To the Chief Secy to Govt

Dated 23rd Sept 1844.
Revenue 27th

Submitting with reference to the Extract from the Principles of Consultation dated 5th Inst. a letter from the Principal Collector of Madras explaining the grounds of his recommendation of the transfer of the Revenue & assessment to the charge of the husband of the minor heiress of Ramnad.

With Orders

At present under the Court of Wards, the Principal Collector has been included as Supplemental Defendant by order of the Court of Sudder Adawlat. The object of the Plaintiff in instituting this action is to prove that the adoption of the Father of the present Ramee, in virtue of which the Estate has devolved successively upon that individual - On his death in 1830 upon his eldest daughter - and on her death in 1840 upon his younger daughter the present minor Heiress - was altogether null and void as being contrary to Hindu Law - that it should consequently be cancelled, and that the Plaintiff should be placed in possession

of the Zemindary. It will be remembered that on the death of the Zemindar Ragomada Ramaswamy in 1830 the Plaintiff was appointed guardian to his successor the elder sister of the present Ramee - but that on her death in 1840 and on the succession of the present minor, Plaintiff was removed from the Guardianship which was conferred upon

From N. O. 24 Apr.
in Cons. 3 May 1830.
N. O. 3 May "
Extract Min. of Cons. 2
28 May "

From N. O. 22 Feb.
in Cons. 5 March 1840
To Chief Secy. 16 Apr.
Extract Min. Cons. 1
1st June "

upon the minor's mother Parosvatha Vantany Natchyar - that removal, with other family disputes with which the Government are not unacquainted, have in all probability led to the institution of the present suit.

3. In his proposed Answer the Principal Collector has confined himself to a simple denial of liability on the ground that the suit is exclusively for right of inheritance to the Ramana Zemindary turning upon the validity of a long passed adoption, in which the Principal Collector of the District was in no way concerned and that his having been included as a Defendant can only have been to satisfy some matter of Form.

4. It appears to the Board that the view taken by Mr. Blackburne is correct. The interests of Government do not appear to them to be in any manner affected by the suit - and Section VIII Reg. V-1804 prescribes that "Disqualified persons being in the custody" of Guardians, shall not be liable to be sued

"sued on any action in Courts of Judicature"
"other wise than as under the protection and"
"in the joint name of their Guardians." In the
present instance the husband of the minor
heir is her guardian. The Board therefore
beg to recommend that the Principal Collector
may receive authority for putting in his
proposed answer which the Board have slightly
modified - and of conducting the defence on his
part as far as may be necessary at the
public expense.

5. In his letter of 4 March last Mr Black-
burne requests sanction for disbursement from
the funds of the Estate to the husband and guardian
of the minor heiress the sum of Rs 1,436-12-0
being the amount already advanced by
him and by the mother of the minor for
the defence of the suit - as also for the
payment of such further sum as may be
required for the purchase of certain Law
Books likely to be of service in the conduct
of the defence - As it is obviously but
reasonable

Statement No 1
March 4th 1845.

Statement No 2
March 4th 1845.

reasonable that those acting in behalf of the
Estate should be reimbursed any sums which
they may have expended for the purpose of maintaining
her title to the zemindari, and as, in a matter
which turns entirely upon questions of Hindu
Law, and in which interests of such magnitude
are involved, it is desirable that every facility
should be given for consulting such authorities
as may be expected to throw light upon
the subjects at issue, the Board beg to recommend
that to the requests of the Principal Collector may
be complied with. They also request that he
may be empowered to advance from time to time
from the funds of the zemindari such further sums
as may be required for payment of legal expenses,
and to afford to the minor such advice and
assistance as may properly be expected
from him in his capacity of Agent to the Court
of Wards.

I have &c
(sd) J. Dyer
Secretary.

No. 918.

1. The Most Noble the Governor in Council.
Authorizes the Principal Collector of Madras
to file the Answer referred to in the foregoing
letter in the suit instituted by most Hon. Veerayya
Nachyar and to conduct the defence on his part;
as far as may be necessary, at the public expense.

2. His Lordship in Council also authorizes the
Principal Collector to disburse from the funds of the
Rameswari Estate, to the husband and guardian
of the minor Heiress the sum of Rs (1436-12-0)

One thousand and four hundred and thirty six
and annas twelve, already advanced by him
and the minor's mother for the defence of the suit
and such further sums as may be requisite
for the purchase of law books and the payment
of legal expenses.

Forw'd
2 August 1845

/Signed/ J. F. Thomas.
Chief Secy to Govt.

/True Copy/

Collected
by Under Secy to Govt.

Am. M.

20
Extract from a letter from the Principal Collector
of Madura, dated 13th September 1843 -

29th March - 43.

25th January - 43.

Para 11. I find a letter of the 14th February from
Government, forwarding a petition of Purvatha
Vurdhane Raochyan to Government and
enclosing copy of an order from the same body
to the Commissioner, on the subject of the suit
filed by Moota Veerayee Raochyan for the
Estate of Ramnad, in which Government tell
him they rely on his caution not to do any
thing calculated to prejudice proceedings
on her behalf in the Court -

On the 16th December the Rance Purvatha
Vurdhane Raochyan applied to the Principal
Collector for 1500 Rs for Vakeels fees &c to enable
her to file answer to the suit brought by
Moota Veerayee Raochyan, in No 11 of 1842,
in the Provincial Court for recovery of the Ramnad
Estate. On the 19th the Principal Collector informed
her that as she was no longer Guardian of the

No 10

Revenue 1845 & 46
By 6th Dec: 5th August

Rs 979
From Dec. 30/173
being to the 14th Dec.

To Chief Secy to Govt.

Rs 14th Dec 17th 1845.

No 446.

Submitting Compendium
with the Principal Collector of
Madura on the subject of a
suit brought by Mrs M
Veerayee Raochyan against
the minor heirs of P. Ramnad
to prove that the 13th Dec 1842
the father of the present Ramnad
was allotted Rs 1000 & 1000
as being Contingent to the said
and to the Commission of the
Sunderbans.

the suit must be defended under the
orders of the Court of Wards; and on the same
day he made application for extension of time
to enable the Commissioner, daily expected
to supersede him, to consider the subject
and prepare an answer.

On the 24th December the forwent
Vakeel informed the Commissioner the Court
could file no defence unaccompanied
by a power of Attorney from the Guardian,
to which the Commissioner answered on the
9th March that the Estate being then under
the Court of Wards, the Rance Parvatha Kundhane
Kachyar could have no concern whatever
in the matter.

On the 7th April the Commissioner required
the manager to read to the Rance an address
to him from her, and his endorsement on it
to the same effect as his order to the forwent
Vakeel of the 9th March.

To his call of the 6th April the forwent
Vakeel informed the Commissioner,
On the 18th Idem, that the Rance had found
means

H. Copies & translations
of addresses from
Rance & forwent Vakeel
of 11th & 18th April 1843.

means to advance her Vakeel's fees of 1000
and had filed her answer, and mean time
on the 11th April the Rance repeated her request
for funds to enable her to repay what she
had borrowed to save the case from being disposed
of ex parte.

No steps appear to have been taken
towards defending the suit on the part of the
Court of Wards: The delay likely to arise from
the great judicial changes at this moment
taking place may prevent prejudice to
the cause if the Court will early favor me
with their instructions on this point.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue, dated 31st March 1845.

Read the following letter from
the Principal Collector of Madras dated 4th March 1845.
/Here enter No 48./

Before passing orders on the above letter
the Board are desirous of receiving some further
explanation in regard to the suit No 3 of 1843
therein referred to. They beg to be informed
who

Who are the parties by whom the suit has been brought; and, briefly, what are their grounds of action - and what parties have been made defendants. Whether the institution of the suit was reported to the Principal Collector and the defence conducted with his sanction & with the aid in the Court of the Government Vakeel, from what sources the expenses have been hitherto defrayed and what is the present state of the proceedings -

(A true Extract)

(sd) J. Tyndal
Secy.

From

J. Tyndal, Esq.

Secy to the Secy of Revenue

To

J. Mackinnon, Esq.

Principal Collr of Dist

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Court of Revenue Dept Wards to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th ultimo furnishing further information in regard to the suit No 3 of 1843
Called

Called for in their Proceedings of 31st March last.
2. From your letter the Court of Wards now learn that you have been included as a defendant in the suit, and that the notification of the Civil Judge to that effect was served upon you as far back as the 21st December last. It cannot but surprise them, that you have so long delayed to bring this circumstance to their notice and that you made no mention of it in your previous letter on the subject. The Court are of opinion that it will be necessary for you to put in an answer but as they have not seen the plaint and are not acquainted with the nature of the claim advanced they can offer no opinion as to the line of defence which you should adopt, whether simply to disclaim all liability, or to meet the case upon its merits. I am therefore requested to direct that you will with all convenient despatch submit to the Court of Wards copy & translation of the plaint, and draft of the

The answer which, on consideration
of all circumstances of the case, may
appear to you most appropriate. after
receipt of which the Court will furnish
you with further instructions both as
regards this subject and that referred
to in your previous letter of the 4 March.

Rev^d Office

Forb^d 1845

22 May 1845

I have rec^d

/s/ J. Pycroft

Secy.

True copy 1

Chatham

By Under Secy to Gov^t.

28
60

Comp^d M.S.

Read the following letter

Revenue Board Office
Fort Saint George
27 August 1846

N^o 411.

From

J. Oycroft Esquire
Secretary to the Board of Revenue

To

J. F. Thomas Esquire
Chief Secretary to Government

Sir

Revenue Department

21st July in Council: 17th
August 1846.

Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit for the orders of the Most Noble the Governor in Council the accompanying letter from the Principal Collector of Madras 21st July 1846, reporting the surrender of the Ramnad Zemindary to Ramesh Peruvatha Vardhaman Ratchiar, and submitting her request that the Promissory Notes of the Supreme Government at present in deposit in his Treasury and forming part of the property of the estate may also be delivered to her. These notes are the investments of the surplus proceeds

Enc: in N^o 10

1845 Report

No. 361/73

Copies of Para II of letter
from the Principal Collector
of Madras dated 12th Sept

1843-

1845 Proving 21st March

1845

Letter to the Principal Collector

of Madras dated 22 May

1845-

No 446.

P. 1845-85

No 979

In C. S. August 1845

proceeds of the Zaminidary made on various occasions - they stand in the name of the Principal Collector of the District for the time being and amount in the aggregate to the sum of Rupees 6,74,983.

2. On the first consideration which they can give to the subject the Board are decidedly of opinion that it would not be expedient to authorize the transfer of these notes to Raneer Purwatha Virohanur Natchyar except upon her furnishing ample security to indemnify the Government against all future consequences. In the extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Sudder Udalat of the 20 April, laid before Government with the Board's Proceedings of 21st May last, that Court, in cancelling the order of the Acting Civil Judge of Madura whereby the surrender of the Raneer Zaminidary to Raneer Purwatha Virohanur Natchyar had been prohibited have remarked that supposing that the estate were likely

likely to be injured by misappropriation or otherwise on coming into the possession of that individual, legal measures were available for its protection. This observation may be perfectly just as regards the landed property of the estate, but it is evident that it does not equally apply to its funded accumulations, inasmuch as although the Civil Court might interpose promptly and with effect to prevent any injury to the landed estate, the promissory notes once made over to Purwatha Virohanur Natchyar might be forthwith converted into cash and expended in any manner which she might think fit and it would clearly be scarcely within the power of the Court or of any other authority either to prevent the expenditure or to recover the sums expended.

3. It is true indeed that in the same extract the Sudder Udalat have expressed a very decided opinion in favor of Purwatha Virohanur Natchyar's title to the

the Remindary, but it is to be observed that the Suds have not the final jurisdiction in the case. The matter is appealable and will very probably be pressed to appeal before the Privy Council, and however weak the pretensions of Woottoo: every Natchyar may appear, if by any possibility the ultimate decision should be in her favor the circumstance of so large a sum of money having been made over to her rival without due security for its refund cannot but be productive of much embarrassment.

4. Under all circumstances therefore the Board would beg to suggest that Rance Purwatha Vudhanee Natchyar should be required in the event of the Promissory Notes being made over to her to give full security that she will indemnify the Government against any demands which may be hereafter made upon them in consequence of the transfer and that if as may be expected she be unable to

to furnish such guarantee that the Principal Collector should move the Civil Court for permission to lodge the Promissory Notes in their charge to remain in deposit in the Court pending the issue of the legal proceedings now in progress. Should the Civil Court refuse to receive the notes, appeal should be made to the Court of Sadr Munsif, and if that Court should also decline the Board would recommend that the Principal Collector be instructed to retain the securities under his own charge, drawing the interest and reinvesting it from time to time for the benefit of the estate, until the question in regard to the succession to the Ramnad Remindary be finally determined.

Revenue Board Office
Fort Saint George
27 August 1846

I have &c
Signed / J. Pycroft
Secretary

N^o 1068
Under all the circumstances communicated in the foregoing letter the Governor in Council is of opinion that

No 209

Collector's Office
Madura
4th February 1872

From
W. McDubae Esquire
Acting Collector
Madura
To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Referring to Government Proceedings of the 1st October 1872 No 1, I have the honor to state that the documents numbered 7, 11, 12, 13 & 14 in the list therewith received have been filed in the Civil Court and that the other papers which were not required, are now returned herewith.

Yours truly
W. McDubae
As Collector

N^o 15
Revenue 1846

N^o 949
Rev 361/73

From
Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
To
Chief Secretary to
Government

Dated 22nd August 1872
Rev 1846

N^o 411

Submitting a letter from the District Collector of Madura regarding the purchase of the land of the Government of the District of Madura in the District of Madura and forming part of the purchase of the land of the District of Madura to the Board of Revenue, and also a letter from the District Collector of Madura regarding the purchase of the land of the District of Madura.

to Messrs. DeForest
Nov 361.

Mr. J. S. Ellinger
& J. S. Ellinger

Mr. Secretary of the
New York State
Museum

Albany, N. Y. 1219
Nov 361.

Nov 361.

Stating that some
of the documents
received with the
Bones of Youth of the
1st Oct. 1872 No. 1
Bones were filed in
the Smith's Court
that the other papers
and documents
and

LODGED