

Sept 10 1869 Conjuerum Saliz
 Feb 1869 Sandalam gahaphis Conjuerum Saliz

[illegible]

5/16/61
This is called "Chlorine"
Chlorine - 3/4 is
used to treat water for
drinking

Sheet 289 319

18-5-23
 18-5-23

Cant. gracie. *Sturges*
 by the Right Hon. *Sturges*
 the Governor in Council. *Sturges*
 of St. George. *Sturges*
 dated 4th Feb. *Sturges*
 1845- *Sturges*
 For three hrs. *Sturges* of *Sturges*

Handwritten notes and lists on aged paper, organized into columns and rows. The text includes names, dates, and various entries, possibly related to a historical record or inventory. The paper shows signs of age, including discoloration and some staining.

Top Section:

1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848	1849	1850
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Middle Section:

1851	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859	1860
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Bottom Section:

1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Right Margin:

1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880

in the District of

[illegible]

J. Andrew
ag. Juan Camacho

in the District of

MINISTRY OF DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, AND SECRETARY OF THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS - INQUIRY INTO THE MATTER.					REMARKS.		Division of the State Commissioner in his province.
Particulars regarding present Dispute. If the State has been divided, the names, etc., of both States should be entered: In cases otherwise.							
Name and age.	Place of residence.	Religion to which he belongs, or to which he is inclined to belong.	On what point of the present Dispute.	If claimed, with the date of claim, previous law, statute, or other point.			
10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
<p><i>1857 of 1858</i></p> <p><i>Petition No. 657</i></p> <p><i>of 1858</i></p> <p><i>which they were entitled according to the Muhammadan law and that all landed shares should revert to that state. To the known Ruknuddin, to whom objection as decreed in the above resolution from the proceeding of the Government of Madras that with the exception of the portion relating to landed shares - which in his original prayer he requested might be divided among the children. The Board did not recognize his claim to a greater share and neither did they see the cause to disturb their decision in regard to landed shares. On this view of the case they were upheld by Government, who declared their assent in an endorsement on petition No. 607 of 1856. Ruknuddin seems to have preferred a second appeal, modifying his original prayer in regard to landed shares which he claimed currently, to himself and the heirs of the appeal which is so made after an undisturbed enjoyment of nearly 2 years was a trifling order of Government above justified.</i></p> <p><i>he would of a greater share than he had been given and the other heirs of the deceased to the necessity of an appeal filed to Government and subsequently, to the Secretary of State in India in Council whose final decision is looked with great anxiety by the British Consul at Madras and the French Consulate.</i></p> <p><i>However being mainly the disposal of claims between the Government and the Muhammadan and not a question of dispute between one individual and another the anxiety of the Commission need not be deepened by the receipt of the order by the Secretary of State on his appeal above alluded to.</i></p> <p><i>Ruknuddin and the other holder to discontinue the entire village as joint property of a line and the carrying out of the final decision of the House authorities the Government are so done by the Government is not such as the price paid of his share as a gift on a fair compensation to the proprietorship and the Government considering the young age of the present proprietorship, which the life of the generation is rather remote. For the attendance of Ruknuddin, the eldest son of the trustee repeated notices as above in the village were issued but he has failed to present himself either personally, or through a friend and has expressed a few angry apparently to waste the call.</i></p>					<p>and female in the property</p> <p>Petition of No. 1 Aided 7 April 1858 No. 200 will be considered accordingly. Endorsed 17 October 1858 (Signed) A. Venkiah M. A. B. B. 15th June 1858 Approved (By) W. T. Blair, Offy. Secy. Commr. 19-6-65.</p> <p>% not entered in the original</p>		

Recent instructions of the Commission recommended the enforcement of the entire paragraph in as much as the three principal share holders and leading