

(1) Number of pages 40
 (2) Date of repair 24.5.79
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2696	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	11.9.1877	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 2,547.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 4th June 1877.

Read the following letter from W. F. GRAHAME, Esq., Acting Principal Assistant Collector, to C. G. MASTER, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, dated Puri Kinedy, 28th March 1877, No. 72 :—

I HAVE the honor to submit the following for your orders.

2. Kapila Bangarammah, Agraharamdarni of Inakavalsa, in the Chicacole Taluq, died on the 20th June 1875, leaving no legal heirs to succeed to her property. Bangarammah's husband, the late Ramadoss Puntulu, had in his life-time acquired the Agraharam in question, an Inam garden in Balaga village, half of the Danta and the whole of the Sowdam estate, all situated in the Chicacole Taluq, and Kamannavalsa Agraharam in the Suler Zemindari of Vizagapatam District.

3. Bangarammah succeeded to her late husband's movable and immovable property, and subsequently, in 1853, sold her half share in the Danta estate to the late Iripurani Raghavados, father of the present proprietor Jagga Rao, and a co-sharer of the Danta estate. She also sold, in 1868, the whole of the Sowdam estate to her daughter's daughter Kapavarapu Papammah and Timmarazu Venkata Row, a brother of the son-in-law of her deceased husband. Papammah and Venkata Row are now joint Malugzars of the Sowdam estate.

4. I enclose for reference a genealogical statement of the Kapila family. This statement shows that Ramadoss Puntulu had one son and four daughters by Bangarammah, of whom the son and the first three daughters died while young. The fourth daughter, Neelamah, was married to Timmarazu Sooryanarain Row, to whom Neelamah bore three sons and two daughters, of whom the first two sons and the second daughter died when young. The third son, Timmarazu Appa Row, died in 1868; while Neelamah herself died long before Appa Row. Bangarammah died long after all the deaths I have mentioned. Kapavarapu Papammah who is a childless young widow and granddaughter of Bangarammah by a daughter, and Kapila Venkammah, widow of the paternal uncle of Bangarammah's husband, have both applied to me to register in their respective names the landed estate of the deceased Bangarammah because she left no nearer heirs than themselves.

5. It was Bangarammah's husband, Ramadoss, who acquired the landed estate, and his paternal uncle, Venkata Ramadoss, died before Ramadoss died. After Ramadoss died there were disputes between Bangarammah and Venkammah, the present claimant. Bangarammah divided her husband's property between herself and Venkammah, and they both lived separately afterwards. As both the movable and immovable property was self-acquired by Bangarammah's husband Ramadoss, Bangarammah allowed Venkammah to take only a very small share for her maintenance, that is Inam land yielding twelve garces of paddy in Makavalsa, a tiled house at Chicacole, and some ready cash. When Venkammah accepted this small share she agreed in writing to waive all future claims to the property. Neither Venkammah nor Papammah comes within the category of heirs according to Hindu law.

6. For Inakavalsa Agraharam, the Inam Commissioner issued a title-deed in the joint names of the deceased Bangarammah and Venkammah, while for the Inam garden in Balaga he issued one in the name of Bangarammah alone. Papammah has no right in law to succeed to Bangarammah's estate, and although Venkammah's name is entered in the title-deed as joint Inamdar with Bangarammah, nevertheless she accepted a small share of the property and agreed to waive her future claim on Bangarammah's property. I think therefore that Venkammah cannot now advance a claim. Papammah further claims the Agraharam in virtue of a will said to have been executed in

1868 in her favor by the deceased Bangarammah. In the copy of the will marked D, herewith sent, Bangarammah transferred all her estate both real and personal to her daughter's daughter Papammah, giving her power to dispose of the same as she might please, more particularly in charity. A Hindu widow has no power to alienate immovable property inherited from her husband, and the will of a Hindu widow has no effect or validity whatever beyond her life-time except so far as it may be consistent with Hindu law. Bangarammah, a brahmin widow, died without legal heirs, and this being the case I consider that her property ought to escheat to Government, as I consider the Crown to be the direct heir to the landed estate of a deceased Hindu widow without legal heirs.

Similarly the transfer by private sale of the Danta and Sowdam estates made by Bangarammah ought not to be recognized, inasmuch as the alienations only good for her life, and are invalid and void after her death.

8. On 14th April 1853, the deceased Bangarammah sold her half share in the Danta estate to L. Raghavados for Rupees 5,600, and the transfer by sale was approved by the late Commissioner of the Northern Circars—*Vide* his proceedings, dated 15th June 1853. From the deed of sale it appears that the estate was bought from Inosalikanti Ramiah Puntulu by Bangarammah after her husband's death, and the funds for the purchase were undoubtedly derived from the income of the lands, &c., inherited by her. Papammah endeavored in her petition to show that Bangarammah sold the Danta estate to discharge certain private debts contracted by Bangarammah's husband during his life-time, a story which is highly improbable. I have however heard that Bangarammah sold the Danta estate to discharge debts contracted by her son-in-law Simmarazu Sooryanaran Row who was a very extravagant man.

9. As stated in paragraph 3 *supra* the deceased Bangarammah sold the Sowdam estate in 1868 to her granddaughter Papammah and Timmarazu Venkata Row for Rupees 10,000, the purchasers being her relations. The Tahsildar of Chicacole says that there was no necessity for Bangarammah to sell her estates to satisfy her private creditors. Her husband, Ramados, was famous for his riches in this part of the country, and was supposed to have left at his death about a lakh of Rupees in cash and rich apparel, besides the landed estate. The Tahsildar further thinks that the Sowdam estate would have fetched 30,000 or 40,000 Rupees if sold to a stranger and not Rupees 10,000, a very small amount. Bangarammah had ample means to discharge debts, and if there had really been any debts necessitating the sale, she would have sold the estate for a much larger sum. What she really wanted to do was to give the estate to her granddaughter Papammah and Papammah's father's brother, T. Venkata Row. I think the transaction open to objection on the ground that the sale was fictitious. We may safely assume that there was fraud: 1st, because the sale was to Bangarammah's granddaughter; and, 2ndly, because so large an estate was sold for so low a price, considering the then and now prevailing prices of land in the taluk. Even if the sale was a *bona fide* one, the arrangement could not hold after Bangarammah's death.

10. The annexed table gives particulars of the land acquired by Bangarammah's husband Ramados Puntulu:—

Description of the Estate.	Area.	Produce or quit-rent.	Annual income after deducting the Government dues.	Present value of the property.
Danta Estate	3,071 05	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Sowdam Estate	1,032 88	320 2 10	1,955 3 1	1,00,000 0 0
Makavala Agraharam	217 0	178 8 8	1,143 8 8	40,000 0 0
Balaga Inam garden	4 52	2 3 0	37 4 0	500 0 0

11. The value of the property whether alienated by Bangarammah or willed away by her, and which, in the circumstances of the case, I think ought to escheat to Government, is about a lakh and a half of Rupees. As the registration in the Collector's

register of these two estates in the name of the purchasers and the issue of the Inam title-deed in the name of the widow as the holder at the time do not affect the right of Government to the escheat in case of the failure of legal heirs, I beg to request that you will lay the matter before the Board of Revenue in order to obtain their orders to take possession of the whole property both real and personal. If this be done any persons who may consider that they have claims to the property can establish their rights in a Civil Court of competent jurisdiction.

- * 1 Chicacole Tahsildar's report, No. 625, dated 16th October 1875, with sixteen enclosures.
1 Chicacole Tahsildar's report, No. 19, dated 20th January 1876, with eleven enclosures.
1 Chicacole Tahsildar's report, No. 351, dated 18th July 1876, with one enclosure.

12. I forward herewith T papers as per list attached.*

No. 1,601.

SUBMITTED for the orders of the Board of Revenue.

2. The transfers of the estates of Danta and Sowdam herein referred to were registered in this office respectively in 1853 and 1870, the registry of the former estate being made with the sanction of the Commissioner of the Northern Circars, (vide copies of Collector's letter to the Commissioner, dated 10th June 1853, and his reply thereto, dated 15th idem, No. 256, copies herewith submitted), while the registry of the latter estate was made with reference to Principal Assistant Collector's letter, dated 2nd October 1868, No. 121, and the decree of Civil Court, Berhampore; in Original Suit No. 11 of 1869.

3. I am doubtful whether the Makavala Agraharam, for which a title-deed has been issued in the joint names of the deceased Bangarammah and Kapila Venkammah, can be supposed to be an escheat while the latter is alive, notwithstanding that she seems to have been satisfied with a small portion of the said Agraharam land.

4. The alleged will, a translation of which accompanies, provides for the disposal of a portion of the immovable property for charitable purposes, in starting a choultry and distributing food to travellers (Page 529 of Moore's Indian Appeals). The widow can dispose of her husband's property, even while there are heirs, for charitable purposes, and this being admitted so much of the will as is consistent with the Hindu law is valid (*Vide* Section 175 of Hindu Law Manual).

5. As regards the heirs of the deceased Bangarammah, her daughter's daughter who is a childless widow, and her husband's uncle's widow (childless), are the two now living. It is very doubtful whether they both or either can come under the category of bandhus or cognate kindred as mentioned in Sections 314 and 315 of the Manual of Hindu Law. But it was once decided by the High Court that a sister's son comes under this head (*Vide* page 278, Volume VI.)

6. It is so far clear from the above-quoted page of Moore's Indian Appeals that the Crown takes by escheat for want of heirs, and therefore can impeach an unauthorized alienation by the widow of her husband's property.

7. This depends upon the solution of two other questions, viz., 1st, whether any of the present claimants is a bandhu; and, 2ndly, whether the disposition of property by will for charitable purpose is valid.

8. In the event of these points being settled in the negative, the right of the Crown to claim the property as escheat prevails.

9. I would therefore suggest that the matter may be referred for the opinion of the Advocate-General.

10. A regular suit for the recovery of the property will have to be instituted on behalf of Government should it be held that the Crown can interfere, and for this

purpose it would be desirable that a Barrister of the High Court should be engaged to conduct the suit in the Civil Court (Board's Standing Order, No. III of 1877).

11. I think that we cannot summarily take possession of the property in question, except through a Court of competent jurisdiction by a regular suit.

CHETTERPORE,
5th May 1877.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER
Collector of Ganjam.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Translation of Will.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Proceedings of Commissioner of Northern Circars.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Genealogical Statement.

THE Government Pleader will be requested to advise on the question whether the property is claimable as an escheat or not.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Government Pleader, with three enclosures to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Ganjam.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

JUNE
No. 2,547.

Property left by deceased Kappa Bappa-
annab, Asribarambanni of Malavalli in
Chiccole Taluk, Ganjam District.—Requesting
Government Pleader to advise on the question
whether the — is claimable as an escheat or not.

PROCEEDINGS, 4TH JUNE 1877, No. 2,547.

1877.
BOARD of REVENUE,
MADRAS.

Exd

811-2-77/2696

Recd
Per 3724/77

Revenue Department

No. 3811

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 15th August 1877

Read again Board's Pns. 7th June 1877

Read also the following;

No. 93

From J. W. Handley Esqr
Government Pleader
Madras.

To C. A. Galton Esqr
By Secretary to the Board of
Revenue.

Sir
With reference to the Board's

4th June 1877 Proceedings noted in the margin

No. 2547 I have the honor to submit the
following opinion.

The

The question referred to me
is whether, assuming that there are
no nearer heirs to Ramadas Pun-
tula than his daughters daughter
Kapanorapu Papamma and
his paternal uncle's widow Kapi-
la Venkammah, his property
whether ancestral or self acquired
passed to the crown by escheat
on the death of his widow

Bangarammah. The claim
of the paternal uncle's widow
is absolutely untenable. She is
no blood relation and her
husband predeceased Ramadas
Puntula so that she is entitled
to nothing. Main cause.

The estate
of the
uncle's
widow
is
not
entitled
to
the
property
of
the
deceased
Ramadas
Puntula
as
she
is
not
a
blood
relation
and
her
husband
predeceased
him.

But likely

2
But the claim of Papamma
is not so easily disposed of.
She is a blood relation and a
near one, and although Sir
J. Strange (Vol 7 pp 138, 139) follow-
ed by most text writers (see Grady's
Hindu Law p 284. Cunningham's
Digest of Hindu Law p 106
section 213) excludes a daughter
daughter from the line of heirs
it does not follow that, even
if that exclusion is well founded
as between herself and other
claimants to heirship, her
right may not exclude the
title of the crown by escheat.
That

The conclusion appears to rest upon the general principle that females being incapable of benefitting the deceased by funeral rites cannot inherit a rule to which the only exceptions are said to be the widow, the daughter the mother and the Grand mother. But whether female relations other than these do not come in before the Crown is a question which has, as far as I know, never been expressly decided though some recent decisions seem to imply that they do. In the

Case of Gridhari Lal Roy, v.
the

3
the Government of Bengal reports at page 457 of Vol. XII of Moore's Indian appeals it was held that the enumeration in the Mitacshara of Bandhoo (cognate kindred) capable of inheriting in preference to the King is not exhaustive but illustrative & that other relations than those there specified have a prior claim to the title of the crown by escheat, and although the only point actually decided was that a paternal grand-mother's ~~claim may be set aside~~ to inherit to decisions that all blood

of the crown, there are passages
in the judgment of the Judicial
Committee which indicate
that the view of their Lordships
was that all blood relations
must be exhausted before the
Crown can take (See particular-
ly p 463).

case before the High
Court of Madras (Mad. High
Court Reports p 278) where the
point decided was that a
sister's son is in the line of
heirs, the above decision of
the Privy Council was followed
and upon and
subject to his ref the learned
Judges

Judges seem also to favor the
wider application of the principle
of the Judicial Committee's de-
cision which I have suggested
(see particularly the judgment
of Mr Justice Ives p 288)
On the authority of these cases
I incline to the opinion that
the crown does not take the
property of Ramadoss Puntutur
by reheat during the lifetime
of Papammah. The question
however being one on which
I have some doubts and
the value of the property in-
volved being all the enclosures
I have
would see (Sd) J. W. Handley
1877
Govt Pleader

of the Advocate General be taken.

3. I think that the Will of Bangarammah is valid as to that part of it which creates a charitable endowment and therefore that if the Crown took by escheat it would take the property subject to the trust for the charity of which Papammah would probably be entitled to be the manager.

The Advocate General says that gifts for charitable purposes made by B. in her lifetime or by will are not valid.

4. As to the alienations of Bangarammah of the Danté and Towdar Estates it is clear on the authority of the Hon. Secy of the Govt of Madras that the alienations of Bangarammah by Venkata Narainappa

Narainappa & Moore's Indian appeals page 529, that the Crown if it takes the property of Ramaswami Puntulu by escheat has a right to impeach those alienations, and to have the same set aside unless made for any of those purposes for which a widow can by Hindu law alienate her husband's property such as payment of his debts, religious and charitable purposes. I do not think that the action of the Revenue officers in sanctioning the transfer of Registry of these estates would affect the right of Govt.

to impeach the transactions.

5. On the whole I should be disposed to advise that any legal steps to assert the title of Government by reschat should be deferred until the death of Papammah. There would be no fear of the claim being

This is approved
by the
Advocate
General

Barred by Limitations of 60 years and the cause of action arises on the death of Bangarammah. To avoid any question of waiver or acquiescence, Papammah might be informed that Government claim the estate on the death of Bangarammah by reschat for want

The new bill cuts the time down to 30 years.

of heirs, but are pleased to allow her to hold the property during her lifetime subject to the performance of the charitable trusts under Bangarammah's will. A difficulty might arise on her attempting to alienate, for it is not quite clear that if she is entitled to inherit, her power of alienation is as restricted as that of a widow over her husband's estate; but she might be told that if she attempted to alienate, the Govt. would at once assert their title by reschat.

6. I retaining considerable, I

Madras suggest that the opinion of
2nd August of

Kapila Bangarammah
Agraharamdarni of Inakavalli
in the Chicaicole Taluk died on
the 15th June 1875 after having
alienated or willed away
immovable and immovable prop-
erty of an estimated value of
about a lakh and a half which
the Acting Principal Assistant
Collector considers to have
escheated to Government as
the only persons claiming to
stand in the position of heirs
are her daughter's daughter,
and the childless widow of
her husband's paternal uncle.
Case of the Collector that as
-lipatham V. Canas a widow
her

her alienation of property
acquired by her husband, can
be set aside if the property is
declared an escheat.

2. The question was referred
for the opinion of the Joint Pleader
who advises that the claim of
the widow of the paternal uncle
of Bangarammah's husband
to anything more than main-
tenance is absolutely untenable.
As regards the claim of the daughter's
daughter Papammah the Joint
Pleader is inclined to believe
that though she is excluded from
the line of heirs under ordinary
circumstances it must be
from reason to the exclusion
of

blood relations must be exhausted
before the Crown can take. He
suggests that the opinion of the
Advocate General be taken on
this point, but would himself
be disposed to advise that legal
steps to assert the title of Govt.
by escheat should be deferred
until the death of Papammah

(a childless widow) the rights
of Government being protected
by an intimation to her that
the property is claimed as an
escheat from the date of Banga-
rammah's death, that the Govt.
are pleased to allow her to hold
the same ^{undisturbed} ~~undisturbed~~ ^{undisturbed} her lifetime
the observations arising from
alienation.

alienation and performing the
charitable trusts under Banga-
rammah's will. 26/10/10

3. On the minor questions raised
the Govt. Pleader advises that
if the property is declared an
escheat the alienations can be
set aside unless made for any of
those purposes for which a widow
can alienate her husband's prop-
erty - that Bangarammah's will
is in favor of Papammah is valid
as to that part of it which creates
a charitable endowment - and
that transfer of Registry of
estate by Govt. officers does not
affect the rights of Govt. in the
matter.

4. The Board considers that

It is desirable that the exact
position of Govt. should be known,
whether the property be claimed
as an escheat or not and the
papers will be submitted to
Govt. in view to the opinion
of the Advocate General being
obtained as suggested by the
Government Pleader.

(True copy abstract)

J. H. M. W.

Att. Secy.

To The Secretary to Govt. R. D.
with 3 origl. copies to be ret'd
& copy of B. P. No. 74 June 1877
No. 2547.

SR. 16
28/12

Opinion.

I have read the papers referred to in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated the 15th August 1877 - N^o 3724 and the Order of Government thereon dated the 17th August 1877 referring the questions raised for my opinion. One question is whether the daughter's daughter of Ramados Puntulu is entitled to succeed to his property upon the death of his Widow Bangaramma in preference to the Government claiming by Escheat. Upon this point I entirely concur in the opinion given by the Government Pleader dated the 2nd August 1877 and the reasons stated in support of it, and I think the course suggested by the Government Pleader in Para. 5 of his opinion down to the words "to hold the property during her life time" ought to be adopted. Upon two points I differ from the opinion of the Government Pleader - I think it is quite possible that Kapiela Venkammah, the paternal Uncle's Widow of Ramados Puntulu, may be entitled to succeed upon the death of Papannah in preference to the Government claiming by Escheat. Venkammah's husband was a Sapinda of Ramados Puntulu and it is a question not yet determined so far as I am aware what is the position of the Widow of a Sapinda in the absence of any nearer heirs. In this case the question will probably not arise for I take it that Papannah is much younger than Venkammah and therefore likely to

Referred through the Govt
Solicitor, to the Advocate General
for his opinion

Quarster
Secretary to Govt

Forth George
17 August 1877

papers regarding property
left by deceased Papulu
Bangaramma's wife
in the name of Venkammah
subject of the property that
will be found in my
last statement as to right of
joint heirs

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
No 3724
15-9-77
16-9-77
17-9-77
18-9-77
19-9-77
20-9-77
21-9-77
22-9-77
23-9-77
24-9-77
25-9-77
26-9-77
27-9-77
28-9-77
29-9-77
30-9-77
1-10-77
2-10-77
3-10-77
4-10-77
5-10-77
6-10-77
7-10-77
8-10-77
9-10-77
10-10-77
11-10-77
12-10-77
13-10-77
14-10-77
15-10-77
16-10-77
17-10-77
18-10-77
19-10-77
20-10-77
21-10-77
22-10-77
23-10-77
24-10-77
25-10-77
26-10-77
27-10-77
28-10-77
29-10-77
30-10-77
31-10-77
1-11-77
2-11-77
3-11-77
4-11-77
5-11-77
6-11-77
7-11-77
8-11-77
9-11-77
10-11-77
11-11-77
12-11-77
13-11-77
14-11-77
15-11-77
16-11-77
17-11-77
18-11-77
19-11-77
20-11-77
21-11-77
22-11-77
23-11-77
24-11-77
25-11-77
26-11-77
27-11-77
28-11-77
29-11-77
30-11-77
1-12-77
2-12-77
3-12-77
4-12-77
5-12-77
6-12-77
7-12-77
8-12-77
9-12-77
10-12-77
11-12-77
12-12-77
13-12-77
14-12-77
15-12-77
16-12-77
17-12-77
18-12-77
19-12-77
20-12-77
21-12-77
22-12-77
23-12-77
24-12-77
25-12-77
26-12-77
27-12-77
28-12-77
29-12-77
30-12-77
31-12-77
1-1-78
2-1-78
3-1-78
4-1-78
5-1-78
6-1-78
7-1-78
8-1-78
9-1-78
10-1-78
11-1-78
12-1-78
13-1-78
14-1-78
15-1-78
16-1-78
17-1-78
18-1-78
19-1-78
20-1-78
21-1-78
22-1-78
23-1-78
24-1-78
25-1-78
26-1-78
27-1-78
28-1-78
29-1-78
30-1-78
31-1-78
1-2-78
2-2-78
3-2-78
4-2-78
5-2-78
6-2-78
7-2-78
8-2-78
9-2-78
10-2-78
11-2-78
12-2-78
13-2-78
14-2-78
15-2-78
16-2-78
17-2-78
18-2-78
19-2-78
20-2-78
21-2-78
22-2-78
23-2-78
24-2-78
25-2-78
26-2-78
27-2-78
28-2-78
29-2-78
30-2-78
31-2-78
1-3-78
2-3-78
3-3-78
4-3-78
5-3-78
6-3-78
7-3-78
8-3-78
9-3-78
10-3-78
11-3-78
12-3-78
13-3-78
14-3-78
15-3-78
16-3-78
17-3-78
18-3-78
19-3-78
20-3-78
21-3-78
22-3-78
23-3-78
24-3-78
25-3-78
26-3-78
27-3-78
28-3-78
29-3-78
30-3-78
31-3-78
1-4-78
2-4-78
3-4-78
4-4-78
5-4-78
6-4-78
7-4-78
8-4-78
9-4-78
10-4-78
11-4-78
12-4-78
13-4-78
14-4-78
15-4-78
16-4-78
17-4-78
18-4-78
19-4-78
20-4-78
21-4-78
22-4-78
23-4-78
24-4-78
25-4-78
26-4-78
27-4-78
28-4-78
29-4-78
30-4-78
31-4-78
1-5-78
2-5-78
3-5-78
4-5-78
5-5-78
6-5-78
7-5-78
8-5-78
9-5-78
10-5-78
11-5-78
12-5-78
13-5-78
14-5-78
15-5-78
16-5-78
17-5-78
18-5-78
19-5-78
20-5-78
21-5-78
22-5-78
23-5-78
24-5-78
25-5-78
26-5-78
27-5-78
28-5-78
29-5-78
30-5-78
31-5-78
1-6-78
2-6-78
3-6-78
4-6-78
5-6-78
6-6-78
7-6-78
8-6-78
9-6-78
10-6-78
11-6-78
12-6-78
13-6-78
14-6-78
15-6-78
16-6-78
17-6-78
18-6-78
19-6-78
20-6-78
21-6-78
22-6-78
23-6-78
24-6-78
25-6-78
26-6-78
27-6-78
28-6-78
29-6-78
30-6-78
31-6-78
1-7-78
2-7-78
3-7-78
4-7-78
5-7-78
6-7-78
7-7-78
8-7-78
9-7-78
10-7-78
11-7-78
12-7-78
13-7-78
14-7-78
15-7-78
16-7-78
17-7-78
18-7-78
19-7-78
20-7-78
21-7-78
22-7-78
23-7-78
24-7-78
25-7-78
26-7-78
27-7-78
28-7-78
29-7-78
30-7-78
31-7-78
1-8-78
2-8-78
3-8-78
4-8-78
5-8-78
6-8-78
7-8-78
8-8-78
9-8-78
10-8-78
11-8-78
12-8-78
13-8-78
14-8-78
15-8-78
16-8-78
17-8-78
18-8-78
19-8-78
20-8-78
21-8-78
22-8-78
23-8-78
24-8-78
25-8-78
26-8-78
27-8-78
28-8-78
29-8-78
30-8-78
31-8-78
1-9-78
2-9-78
3-9-78
4-9-78
5-9-78
6-9-78
7-9-78
8-9-78
9-9-78
10-9-78
11-9-78
12-9-78
13-9-78
14-9-78
15-9-78
16-9-78
17-9-78
18-9-78
19-9-78
20-9-78
21-9-78
22-9-78
23-9-78
24-9-78
25-9-78
26-9-78
27-9-78
28-9-78
29-9-78
30-9-78
31-9-78
1-10-78
2-10-78
3-10-78
4-10-78
5-10-78
6-10-78
7-10-78
8-10-78
9-10-78
10-10-78
11-10-78
12-10-78
13-10-78
14-10-78
15-10-78
16-10-78
17-10-78
18-10-78
19-10-78
20-10-78
21-10-78
22-10-78
23-10-78
24-10-78
25-10-78
26-10-78
27-10-78
28-10-78
29-10-78
30-10-78
31-10-78
1-11-78
2-11-78
3-11-78
4-11-78
5-11-78
6-11-78
7-11-78
8-11-78
9-11-78
10-11-78
11-11-78
12-11-78
13-11-78
14-11-78
15-11-78
16-11-78
17-11-78
18-11-78
19-11-78
20-11-78
21-11-78
22-11-78
23-11-78
24-11-78
25-11-78
26-11-78
27-11-78
28-11-78
29-11-78
30-11-78
31-11-78
1-12-78
2-12-78
3-12-78
4-12-78
5-12-78
6-12-78
7-12-78
8-12-78
9-12-78
10-12-78
11-12-78
12-12-78
13-12-78
14-12-78
15-12-78
16-12-78
17-12-78
18-12-78
19-12-78
20-12-78
21-12-78
22-12-78
23-12-78
24-12-78
25-12-78
26-12-78
27-12-78
28-12-78
29-12-78
30-12-78
31-12-78
1-1-79
2-1-79
3-1-79
4-1-79
5-1-79
6-1-79
7-1-79
8-1-79
9-1-79
10-1-79
11-1-79
12-1-79
13-1-79
14-1-79
15-1-79
16-1-79
17-1-79
18-1-79
19-1-79
20-1-79
21-1-79
22-1-79
23-1-79
24-1-79
25-1-79
26-1-79
27-1-79
28-1-79
29-1-79
30-1-79
31-1-79
1-2-79
2-2-79
3-2-79
4-2-79
5-2-79
6-2-79
7-2-79
8-2-79
9-2-79
10-2-79
11-2-79
12-2-79
13-2-79
14-2-79
15-2-79
16-2-79
17-2-79
18-2-79
19-2-79
20-2-79
21-2-79
22-2-79
23-2-79
24-2-79
25-2-79
26-2-79
27-2-79
28-2-79
29-2-79
30-2-79
31-2-79
1-3-79
2-3-79
3-3-79
4-3-79
5-3-79
6-3-79
7-3-79
8-3-79
9-3-79
10-3-79
11-3-79
12-3-79
13-3-79
14-3-79
15-3-79
16-3-79
17-3-79
18-3-79
19-3-79
20-3-79
21-3-79
22-3-79
23-3-79
24-3-79
25-3-79
26-3-79
27-3-79
28-3-79
29-3-79
30-3-79
31-3-79
1-4-79
2-4-79
3-4-79
4-4-79
5-4-79
6-4-79
7-4-79
8-4-79
9-4-79
10-4-79
11-4-79
12-4-79
13-4-79
14-4-79
15-4-79
16-4-79
17-4-79
18-4-79
19-4-79
20-4-79
21-4-79
22-4-79
23-4-79
24-4-79
25-4-79
26-4-79
27-4-79
28-4-79
29-4-79
30-4-79
31-4-79
1-5-79
2-5-79
3-5-79
4-5-79
5-5-79
6-5-79
7-5-79
8-5-79
9-5-79
10-5-79
11-5-79
12-5-79
13-5-79
14-5-79
15-5-79
16-5-79
17-5-79
18-5-79
19-5-79
20-5-79
21-5-79
22-5-79
23-5-79
24-5-79
25-5-79
26-5-79
27-5-79
28-5-79
29-5-79
30-5-79
31-5-79
1-6-79
2-6-79
3-6-79
4-6-79
5-6-79
6-6-79
7-6-79
8-6-79
9-6-79
10-6-79
11-6-79
12-6-79
13-6-79
14-6-79
15-6-79
16-6-79
17-6-79
18-6-79
19-6-79
20-6-79
21-6-79
22-6-79
23-6-79
24-6-79
25-6-79
26-6-79
27-6-79
28-6-79
29-6-79
30-6-79
31-6-79
1-7-79
2-7-79
3-7-79
4-7-79
5-7-79
6-7-79
7-7-79
8-7-79
9-7-79
10-7-79
11-7-79
12-7-79
13-7-79
14-7-79
15-7-79
16-7-79
17-7-79
18-7-79
19-7-79
20-7-79
21-7-79
22-7-79
23-7-79
24-7-79
25-7-79
26-7-79
27-7-79
28-7-79
29-7-79
30-7-79
31-7-79
1-8-79
2-8-79
3-8-79
4-8-79
5-8-79
6-8-79
7-8-79
8-8-79
9-8-79
10-8-79
11-8-79
12-8-79
13-8-79
14-8-79
15-8-79
16-8-79
17-8-79
18-8-79
19-8-79
20-8-79
21-8-79
22-8-79
23-8-79
24-8-79
25-8-79
26-8-79
27-8-79
28-8-79
29-8-79
30-8-79
31-8-79
1-9-79
2-9-79
3-9-79
4-9-79
5-9-79
6-9-79
7-9-79
8-9-79
9-9-79
10-9-79
11-9-79
12-9-79
13-9-79
14-9-79
15-9-79
16-9-79
17-9-79
18-9-79
19-9-79
20-9-79
21-9-79
22-9-79
23-9-79
24-9-79
25-9-79
26-9-79
27-9-79
28-9-79
29-9-79
30-9-79
31-9-79
1-10-79
2-10-79
3-10-79
4-10-79
5-10-79
6-10-79
7-10-79
8-10-79
9-10-79
10-10-79
11-10-79
12-10-79
13-10-79
14-10-79
15-10-79
16-10-79
17-10-79
18-10-79
19-10-79
20-10-79
21-10-79
22-10-79
23-10-79
24-10-79
25-10-79
26-10-79
27-10-79
28-10-79
29-10-79
30-10-79
31-10-79
1-11-79
2-11-79
3-11-79
4-11-79
5-11-79
6-11-79
7-11-79
8-11-79
9-11-79
10-11-79
11-11-79
12-11-79
13-11-79
14-11-79
15-11-79
16-11-79
17-11-79
18-11-79
19-11-79
20-11-79
21-11-79
22-11-79
23-11-79
24-11-79
25-11-79
26-11-79
27-11-79
28-11-79
29-11-79
30-11-79
31-11-79
1-12-79
2-12-79
3-12-79
4-12-79
5-12-79
6-12-79
7-12-79
8-12-79
9-12-79
10-12-79
11-12-79
12-12-79
13-12-79
14-12-79
15-12-79
16-12-79
17-12-79
18-12-79
19-12-79
20-12-79
21-12-79
22-12-79
23-12-79
24-12-79
25-12-79
26-12-79
27-12-79
28-12-79
29-12-79
30-12-79
31-12-79
1-1-80
2-1-80
3-1-80
4-1-80
5-1-80
6-1-80
7-1-80
8-1-80
9-1-80
10-1-80
11-1-80
12-1-80
13-1-80
14-1-80
15-1-80
16-1-80
17-1-80
18-1-80
19-1-80
20-1-80
21-1-80
22-1-80
23-1-80
24-1-80
25-1-80
26-1-80
27-1-80
28-1-80
29-1-80
30-1-80
31-1-80
1-2-80
2-2-80
3-2-80
4-2-80
5-2-80
6-2-80
7-2-80
8-2-80
9-2-80
10-2-80
11-2-80
12-2-80
13-2-80
14-2-80
15-2-80
16-2-80
17-2-80
18-2-80
19-2-80
20-2-80
21-2-80
22-2-80
23-2-80
24-2-80
25-2-80
26-2-80
27-2-80
28-2-80
29-2-80
30-2-80
31-2-80
1-3-80
2-3-80
3-3-80
4-3-80
5-3-80
6-3-80
7-3-80
8-3-80
9-3-80
10-3-80
11-3-80
12-3-80
13-3-80
14-3-80
15-3-80
16-3-80
17-3-80
18-3-80
19-3-80
20-3-80
21-3-80
22-3-80
23-3-80
24-3-80
25-3-80
26-3-80
27-3-80
28-3-80
29-3-80
30-3-80
31-3-80
1-4-80
2-4-80
3-4-80
4-4-80
5-4-80
6-4-80
7-4-80
8-4-80
9-4-80
10-4-80
11-4-80
12-4-80
13-4-80
14-4-80
15-4-80
16-4-80
17-4-80
18-4-80
19-4-80
20-4-80
21-4-80
22-4-80
23-4-80
24-4-80
25-4-80
26-4-80
27-4-80
28-4-80
29-4-80
30-4-80
31-4-80
1-5-80
2-5-80
3-5-80
4-5-80
5-5-80
6-5-80
7-5-80
8-5-80
9-5-80
10-5-80
11-5-80
12-5-80
13-5-80
14-5-80
15-5-80
16-5-80
17-5-80
18-5-80
19-5-80
20-5-80
21-5-80
22-5-80
23-5-80
24-5-80
25-5-80
26-5-80
27-5-80
28-5-80
29-5-80
30-5-80
31-5-80
1-6-80
2-6-80
3-6-80
4-6-80
5-6-80
6-6-80
7-6-80
8-6-80
9-6-80
10-6-80
11-6-80
12-6-80
13-6-80
14-6-80
15-6-80
16-6-80
17-6-80
18-6-80
19-6-80
20-6-80
21-6-80
22-6-80
23-6-80
24-6-80
25-6-80
26-6-80
27-6-80
28-6-80
29-6-80
30-6-80
31-6-80
1-7-80
2-7-80
3-7-80
4-7-80
5-7-80
6-7-80
7-7-80
8-7-80
9-7-80
10-7-80
11-7-80
12-7-80
13-7-80
14-7-80
15-7-80
16-7-80
17-7-80
18-7-80
19-7-80
20-7-80
21-7-80
22-7-80
23-7-80
24-7-80
25-7-80
26-7-80
27-7-80
28-7-80
29-7-80
30-7-80
31-7-80
1-8-80
2-8-80
3-8-80
4-8-80
5-8-80
6-8-80
7-8-80
8-8-80
9-8-80
10-8-80
11-8-80
12-8-80
13-8-80
14-8-80
15-8-80
16-8-80
17-8-80
18-8-80
19-8-80
20-8-80
21-8-80
22-8-80
23-8-80
24-8-80
25-8-80
26-8-80
27-8-80
28-8-80
29-8-80
30-8-80
31-8-80
1-9-80
2-9-80
3-9-80
4-9-80
5-9-80
6-9-80
7-9-80
8-9-80
9-9-80
10-9-80
11-9-80
12-9-80
13-9-80
14-9-80
15-9-80
16-9-80
17-9-80
18-9-80
19-9-80
20-9-80
21-9-80
22-9-80
23-9-80
24-9-80
25-9-80
26-9-80
27-9-80
28-9-80
29-9-80
30-9-80
31-9-80
1-10-80
2-10-80
3-10-80
4-10-80
5-10-80
6-10-80
7-10-80
8-10-80
9-10-80
10-10-80
11-10-80
12-10-80
13-10-80
14-10-80
15-10-80
16-10-80
17-10-80
18-10-80
19-10-80
20-10-80
21-10-80
22-10-80
23-10-80
24-10-80
25-10-80
26-10-80
27-10-80
28-10-80
29-10-80
30-10-80
31-10-80
1-11-80
2-11-80
3-11-80
4-11-80
5-11-80
6-11-80
7-11-80
8-11-80
9-11-80
10-11-80
11-11-80
12-11-80
13-11-80
14-11-80
15-11-80
16-11-80
17-11-80
18-11-80
19-11-80
20-11-80
21-11-80
22-11-80
23-11-80
24-11-80
25-11-80
26-11-80
27-11-80
28-11-80
29-11-80
30-11-80
31-11-80
1-12-80
2-12-80
3-12-80
4-12-80
5-12-80
6-12-80
7-12-80
8-12-80
9-12-80
10-12-80
11-12-80
12-12-80
13-12-80
14-12-80
15-12-80
16-12-80
17-12-80
18-12-80
19-12-80
20-12-80
21-12-80
22-12-80
23-12-80
24-12-80
25-12-80
26-12-80
27-12-80
28-12-80
29-12-80
30-12-80
31-12-80
1-1-81
2-1-81
3-1-81
4-1-81
5-1-81
6-1-81
7-1-81
8-1-81
9-1-81
10-1-81
11-1-81
12-1-81
13-1-81
14-1-81
15-1-81
16-1-81
17-1-81
18-1-81
19-1-81
20-1-81
21-1-81
22-1-81
23-1-81
24-1-81
25-1-81
26-1-81
27-1-81
28-1-81
29-1-81
30-1-81
31-1-81
1-2-81
2-2-81
3-2-81
4-2-81
5-2-81
6-2-81
7-2-81
8-2-81
9-2-81
10-2-81
11-2-81
12-2-81
13-2-81
14-2-81
15-2-81
16-2-81
17-2-81
18-2-81
19-2-81
20-2-81
21-2-81
22-2-81
23-2-81
24-2-81
25-2-81
26-2-81
27-2-81
28-2-81
29-2-81
30-2-81
31-2-81
1-3-81
2-3-81
3-3-81
4-3-81
5-3-81
6-3-81
7-3-

to survive Venkammah. The estate which Papannah
or Venkammah would take is merely an estate
tenable for her life and upon the death of the survivor
both being as I understand childless widows, the
next person to succeed would be the heir of Ramdoss
Pantulu according to Hindu Law and in default
of heirs the Government would take by Escheat.

I do not think the gifts for charitable purposes
made by the widow Bangarammah, in her life time or
by her Will, are valid. The Will itself seems to be
wholly ultra vires. She professes to dispose of property
left to her by her husband. But such disposition
especially in the case of immovable property, is not valid
whether made for charitable or other purposes. A Hindu
widow might make a good gift for charitable purposes
if it appeared that it was made about the time of her
husband's death and was made in the bona fide
belief that it was for the spiritual benefit of the
husband. Nothing of this kind appears in the present
case. On the contrary the testatrix assumes that
she herself has the fullest testamentary power which
in my view, is an erroneous assumption. The
alienations made by Bangarammah in her life
time are only good for her life unless the alienees
prove necessity which, so far as I can judge, they
will find it difficult to do. But I concur in the
opinion of the Government Pleader with regard
to these alienations and I think his suggestions

ought

ought to be followed.

[Signed] P. O'Sullivan

Sty. Ad. General

Madras 20th August 1877

2696
13

[True copy]

L. S. S. S.

Government Solicitor

N^o 385.

Madras, 22nd August 1877

From

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor

Madras,

To

C. G. Martin Esq^{re}

Secretary to Government

Revenue Department,

Fort St. George,

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the Order of Government dated 17th August 1877 (made on Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 15th August 1877, N^o 3811, Revenue Department) and its inclosure requesting the Acting Advocate General's opinion as to the right of Government to the property left by the late Kapila Bai, grandmother of the late Rajah of Maravalla in Chicacole Taluk, Ganjam district.

I submitted the matter for the consideration of the Acting Advocate General and I now forward him with a copy of his opinion and return the inclosures which accompanied the above Order of Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most Obedient Servant,

Ernest Barclay

Government Solicitor.

8011-9-77 N^o 2646

1/1/87

From the Government
Solicitor to the Secretary
to Government Revenue
Department, Madras
1877 N^o 385

Memo for order

2696
6

Proceedings Board of Revenue

Subj papers regarding property
left by deceased Kojika Bangarum
-wa Agraharamdaram of Mahavallab
in Chiravale Taluk Ganjam District
and requesting that Advocate General's
opinion may be obtained as to right of Guts
Hents.

(H.E. 15. August 1877 No. 3811)

Letter from the Guts Collector, Madras.

Forwarding in copy of the Advocate
General's opinion as to the right of Guts to the
property left by the late Kojika Bangarum
Agraharamdaram of Mahavallab in
Taluk Ganjam District.

(H.E. 20. August 1877 No. 385)

MD 1019

If the opinion of the

Advocate General is accepted

the Board should, I presume

be simply directed to act upon it.

The effect apparently

I am of opinion that as
claim of the estate as an
Escheat can be advanced
in Raperum's life time
she is her natural grandfathers
natural heir in default of nearer
blood relations of Raperum

MD 1011

80 11-2-77 No. 2696.

171-173

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

2696 & 2695

is to leave Papammah in
possession of what was alienated
to her and her uncle by Ram-
gammah viz the Sawdun
estate; and of the rest of Ram-
gammah's property, real and
personal, named Rangam-
mah's will (which will is
stated to have no force) not
because it is willed but be-
cause she is the next heir.

3 The other alienation
was of half the Danta estate
to one Raghbaradoss in 1853
for Rs. 5,600. The whole estate
is now valued at a lakh of rupees
and as the annual income after
deducting Govt. dues is Rs. 35,500
it would seem that Rangammah

Much that Papammah
is in clear - that
she must be left in posses-
sion. This being so, I do not
prefer the other suggestion
of the Rev. Secy.

The public consid-
eration of the case must
await her decease.

319 757

296 17 296
sold her $\frac{1}{2}$ share procuring
Rs. 1,777 and worth Rs. 50,000 for
about a tenth of its value.

4 But as I read the Ad-
vocate's general opinion he thinks
that the Crown cannot impeach
this alienation until it takes the
property of Rammidoss Puntulu
by escheat and this will not be
until Papammah's demise, i. e.
the Government must look on it
as in Papammah's possession -
pro tem.

5 Notwithstanding the
views expressed in favor of
Papammah's rights both the law
officers think she should be
sold that Government claim the
property ~~now~~ as an escheat but
are

are pleased to allow her to hold
it during her lifetime, and that
if she attempts to alienate they
will at once assert their title.

This would think
be unimpaired
the position
we would be
that
will

b. This threat - so to call it,
it hardly seems compatible with
the recognition of her rights as
the heir of the deceased Bangarwah.

896
18

103700 + 2709
Memo. for order

Right of Govt. to the property
left by late Prince Bannu
Apurandun of Bannu
in Chhota Bannu, Bannu
District.

Recd. Department

2696

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 11 September 1877

Read the following papers.

Proceedings Board of Revenue

Subj. papers regarding prop-
erty left by deceased Hojula Bannu
Revenue Apurandun of Bannu
in Chhota Bannu Bannu District and
requesting that Advocate General's opinion
may be obtained as to right of Govt. thereto.

(H. E. 15. August 1877 No. 3811)

Letter from the Govt. Solicitor General

Forwarding copy of the Advocate
General's opinion as to the right of Govt. to the
property left by the late Hojula Bannu
Apurandun of Bannu in Chhota
Bannu District.

(H. E. 22. August 1877 No. 385)

The opinion of the
Advocate General will be com-
municated to the Board of
Revenue.

His Grace the Governor
in Council considers that no
claim to the estate is now

rested

Bocheat can be advanced in
Papamun's lifetime. The
further consideration of the
case must await her decease.

The Government do not
think it necessary to make any
intimation of the kind alluded
to, at the close of para. 2 of
the Board's Proceedings
dated 15th August 1877 No. 3811.

102. 1/2 of Revenue 2529-77 with 3/4
4 = 10000

2696
20

L. O.

Regarding the property
of the late Benjamin
C. Anderson of the
Church of the Holy Spirit
and the Church of the Holy Spirit.

Wm. C. Anderson
of the Church of the Holy Spirit