

# INDIAN POLITICAL PRACTICE

C. L. TUPPER

B. R. PUBLISHING CORPORATION

DELHI - 110052

# INDIAN POLITICAL PRACTICE.

A

COLLECTION

OF THE

DECISIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

IN

POLITICAL CASES.

COMPILED BY

C. L. TUPPER,

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE,

ON SPECIAL DUTY IN THE FOREIGN DEPARTMENT.

---

VOLUME III.

---



B. R. PUBLISHING CORPORATION

461, Vivekanand Nagar, DELHI-110052

**B. R. PUBLISHING CORPORATION**  
461, Vivekanand Nagar, DELHI-110052

First Published in 1895 by Office of the Superintendent  
Government Printing, Calcutta.

Reprinted            1974

Rs. 120-00  
\$ 30-00

Printed by Kohli Offset Works, Shahzada Bagh, Delhi-110035

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### BRITISH JURISDICTION IN STATE TERRITORY.

PAGE

- § 439. Introductory—§ 440. British enactments may be applied, but cannot be extended, to State territory—§ 441. Powers of the Governor-General in Council to legislate for subjects and servants of the British Government in State territory—§ 442. British enactments may extend as personal laws to subjects and servants of the British Government in State territory. The Bangalore stamps case, 1862-63—§ 443. Proposed Mysore Postal Regulation, 1893—§ 444. The liability of British subjects and public servants for offences committed in State territory—§ 445. Indian Acts which extend as personal laws to British subjects and public servants—§ 446. British criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects in Native States—§ 447. The Mysore Code of Criminal Procedure, 1884-85—§ 448. The Hyderabad Jail Outbreak, 1885—§ 449. The case of Philip Wilson, Hyderabad, 1886—§ 450. Jurisdiction over European British subjects in Travancore and Cochin—§ 451. European officials in Travancore and Cochin empowered in 1875 to try European British subjects in certain cases—§ 452. Rulings in the Liddell case, 1873, relating to the present subject—§ 453. Summary—§ 454. British territorial jurisdiction in State territory—§ 455. Distinctions drawn by the Bombay Government between substituted, delegated and residuary jurisdiction—§ 456. State jurisdiction exercised by British officers—§ 457. The position of a Superintendent defined in the Charkhari case, 1881—§ 458. The Khairagarh case, 1870—§ 459. States under management in the Central Provinces, 1890-92—§ 460. Summary—§ 461. Cantonment Jurisdiction. The leading case of 1875—§ 462. Rajama's case, Secunderabad, 1872—§ 463. Various Cantonments, 1873—§ 464. The Dewa case, 1874—§ 465. Authorities in International Law quoted from Macpherson's Lists—§ 466. British laws made for or applied to Cantonments in State territory—§ 467. Powers of British Courts and officers in these Cantonments regulated by the British Government—§ 468. The Kherwara case, 1878-79—§ 469. The Secunderabad Jurisdiction case, 1883-84—§ 470. The Cantonments of the Hyderabad Contingent, 1884 to 1894—§ 471. Chinnabi's case, Secunderabad, 1887-89—§ 472. The Baroda Cantonment case, 1886 or 1890—§ 473. The Erinpura Cantonment case, 1892—§ 474. The Bhuj Cantonment case, 1890-91—§ 475. Residency jurisdiction—§ 476. Application of British laws to the Hyderabad Residency Bazars, 1891—§ 477. Civil jurisdiction within Indore Residency limits, 1885—§ 478. The Kolhapur Residency and Civil Station, 1886-87—§ 479. The case of Ghulam Dastagir, Hyderabad Residency Bazars, 1892—§ 480. Lord Lansdowne's minute of February 9, 1892—§ 481. Summary . . . . . 1

## CHAPTER XV.

### RESIDUARY, CEDED, AND DELEGATED JURISDICTION.

- § 482. Introductory—§ 483. Residuary jurisdiction defined—§ 484. Residuary jurisdiction in the Bombay Presidency—§ 485. Non-jurisdictionary Chiefs, Bombay—§ 486. Classification of Chiefs, Bombay—§ 487. Powers of Chiefs of the first and second classes, Bombay—§ 488. System of appeal proposed by the Bombay Government, 1890—§ 489. The proposal negatived by the Government of India, 1891—§ 490. Orders of 1891 regarding the powers of first and second class Chiefs, Bombay—§ 491. Bombay Chiefs and Chiefships may be raised to higher rank in the classification—§ 492. Constitution of the Chief Criminal Court, Kathiawar—§ 493. Residuary jurisdiction in the Feudatory States of the Central Provinces—§ 494. Provisions of the Prisoners' Act, 1871—§ 495. Sentences of imprisonment confirmed by officers exercising residuary jurisdiction may be executed in British jails—§ 496. Provisions of the Prisoners Act as amended in 1894—§ 497. Sentences of imprisonment when referred to a political authority should not be enhanced to sentences of death—§ 498. Residuary jurisdiction in the Tributary Mahals of Orissa and Chhota Nagpur—§ 499. Summary—§ 500. Residuary jurisdiction in the case of the guaranteed Thakurs of Central India—§ 501. Note of 1889 by Mr. Henvey—§ 502. The Agra Barkheda case, 1890—§ 503. The powers of mediated Chiefs defined in 1862—§ 504. The powers of the Chief of Rewa and the Bundelkhand Chiefs, 1864—§ 505. The powers of certain Bundelkhand Chiefs extended in 1867—§ 506. Further *sanads* empowering certain Bundelkhand Chiefs granted in 1887. The powers of other *sanad* Chiefs defined—§ 507. Orders of 1888 regarding interjurisdictional cases in Western Malwa—§ 507 A. Principles laid down in 1890 to guide the discretion of the Political Agent—§ 508. Powers of Central India officers in the exercise of residuary jurisdiction defined in 1883 and 1891—§ 509. Summary—§ 510. The Rajasthanik Court, Kathiawar—§ 511. Constitution of the Court—§ 512. Jurisdiction of the Court—§ 513. Working and continuance of the Court—§ 514. Distinction drawn between ceded and delegated jurisdiction—§ 515. The case of Sala-uddin, Bhopal, 1888—§ 516. British jurisdiction in Kashmir. The Rules of 1873—§ 517. Revised Rules of 1891—§ 518. Summary—§ 519. Ceded jurisdiction—§ 520. Ceded jurisdiction within Railway lands—§ 520 A. Form of notification for applying British Indian enactments to State territory under British jurisdiction—§ 521. Jurisdiction in Berar—§ 522. Other instances of ceded jurisdiction—Bamandrug, 1847—Rajputana Salt Sources, 1869, 1870, 1879—The Civil and Military Station of Bangalore, 1881—The Station of Abu, 1845 to 1894—Kasumti, 1885—The Umaria Coal-fields, 1885—The Periyar Project Camps, 1892—§ 523. Civil Stations in State territory, Bombay—§ 524. Delegated jurisdiction. The case of Vrijeshji Vrijnathji, Maharaj of Nuwanagar, 1882—§ 525. The case of Prabhas Patan, Junagarh, 1892-94—§ 526. Other delegations of authority to special Courts for special trials. The Kunj Behari Lal case, Alwar, 1892—§ 527. The Murder of General Azim-ud-din Khan, Rampur, 1891-92—§ 528. Summary—§ 529. The Thagi and Dacoity Department—§ 530. The functions of the Department—§ 531. Orders of 1877 and 1883—§ 532. Jurisdiction in Thagi and Dacoity trials in Baroda, 1875-1878—§ 533. In Hyderabad, 1881—§ 534. In Rajputana—§ 535. In Central India—§ 536. Powers of pursuit and arrest exercised in State territory by officers of the Thagi Department—§ 537. Provisions of certain repealed enactments—§ 538. Provisions of the present law—§ 539. Reorganisation of the Department sanctioned by the Secretary of State in 1893—§ 540. Summary . . . . . 32

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XVI.

EXTRADITION BETWEEN BRITISH INDIA AND FOREIGN OR NATIVE STATES.

	PAGE
§ 541. Introductory—§ 542. General exposition of the subject addressed to the Straits Settlements, 1884—§ 543. Extradition arrangements with Foreign States—Afghanistan—§ 544. Nepal—The attack upon Hanumannagar, 1887—§ 545. Nepalese officials charged with bribery, 1887—§ 546. The case of Muhammad Ali, watchman, 1891—§ 547. Extradition to the French Settlements—The case of Pir Bakhsh, 1884—§ 548. The case of Pole, a deserter from the Austrian man-of-war "Aurora"—§ 549. The case of Seth Srichand, a Jaipur subject, 1886—Amendment of the Rajputana and Hyderabad Extradition Treaties, 1888—§ 550. The case of Najaf Ali, 1884—§ 551. No extradition of European British subjects to Native States—§ 552. The case of Trumpeter Phillips, Mhow and Hyderabad, 1893—§ 553. Extradition of Natives of India to Native States. The Baroda extradition correspondence, 1876-77—§ 554. The extradition of Native British subjects for trial by State Courts is permissible in certain circumstances—§ 555. The extradition of Native servants of the British Government—§ 556. The case of the Mahi Kantha Policeman, 1889—§ 557. The case of Balwant Rao Bute and Ram Sahai, Central India, 1891—§ 558. The murder of General Azim-ud-din Khan, Rampur, 1891—§ 559. Punjab extradition. The orders of 1884—§ 560. The Kashmir Extradition case, 1884 to 1892—§ 561. The regular extradition procedure does not prevent the immediate pursuit and arrest of offenders in State territory—§ 562. Acceptance of bail in extradition proceedings—§ 563. Abetment of an offence is not a scheduled extradition offence under the Act of 1879—§ 563 A. A surrendered person may ordinarily be tried for any offence which he may have committed in the State to which he is surrendered—§ 564. Extradition of prisoners—Chandria's case, Hyderabad, 1893—§ 565. General instructions of 1875 as to the working of the Extradition Act and Rules—§ 566. The effect of Extradition Treaties considered in connection with the Act—§ 567. Extradition must not be so granted as to risk a second conviction of the same person for the same offence—§ 568. Summary . . . . .	66

CHAPTER XVII.

EXTRADITION BETWEEN STATE TERRITORIES UNDER DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS AND BETWEEN SUBORDINATE STATES.

§ 569. Extradition from State territory under British jurisdiction. Secunderabad case, 1884—§ 570. Interstatal extradition is not regulated by British laws—§ 571. The Rajputana Courts of Vakils—§ 572. Origin of the Courts of Vakils, 1841-44—§ 573. The jurisdiction of the Courts of Vakils is a substitute for extradition—§ 574. Extradition on the Rajputana and Bombay border—§ 575. The Rajputana and Guzerat Border Court . . . § 576. Rules for extradition between various States—Jaipur and Patiala Rules, 1873—§ 577. Extradition between States need not be limited to heinous offences—§ 578. Extradition Rules, Bhartpur and Alwar, 1882—§ 579. Banswara and Partabgarh Rules, 1883—§ 580. Bikanir and Jaisalmir Rules, 1891—§ 581. The case of Natha Dola, Baroda and Barwani, 1882-83—§ 582. Interstatal extradition in Central India—§ 583. Interstatal extradition in the Bombay Presidency—Baroda claim for a <i>prima facie</i> case 1889-91—§ 584. The Baroda claim admitted, 1890—§ 585. Extradition warrants under the Act do not run in State territory—§ 586. The authority of Political Agents in extradition matters is derived from the Paramount Power—§ 587. Provisions of various rules and treaties regarding the <i>prima facie</i> case—§ 588. The case of the Rao of Kutch, 1891—§ 589. Summary . . . . .	90
--	----

CHAPTER XVIII.

SERVICE OF PROCESSES AND EXECUTION OF DECREES AND SENTENCES.

§ 590. Introductory—§ 591. Execution of decrees of British Courts by State Courts or officers in State territory—§ 592. Correspondence and orders of 1867 and 1868. Ruling of 1895 that States whose decrees may be executed in British India may be asked to reciprocate—§ 593. Summary—§ 594. Rules of 1863 left unaltered in 1880 and 1886—§ 595. Provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure regarding the execution of certain decrees—§ 596. Provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure as to the service of summonses in certain cases—§ 597. Summonses and decrees of State Courts, and of British Courts in State territory, Bombay, 1880 to 1885. Notification of March 1880—§ 598. Correspondence regarding Summonses, 1882—§ 599. Correspondence regarding execution of decrees, Bombay, 1883-84—§ 600. Service of Summonses again referred to—§ 601. Decrees and Summonses of Mysore Courts, 1882. Execution of British processes in Mysore territory—§ 602. Decrees of Travancore and Cochin Courts, 1885—§ 603. Reasons why legislation was not undertaken in 1870—§ 604. Views of Lord Napier of Merchiston—§ 605. Decrees and State demands—Secunderabad, Hyderabad Residency Bazaars, and Nizam's City and Suburban Courts, 1884—§ 606. Reciprocity in fees on Civil processes, Gwalior, Mysore and Hyderabad—§ 607. General measures adopted in 1889 to promote permissible reciprocity—§ 608. Notifications of March 1889—Execution of decrees—§ 609. Lists of British Courts in State territory—§ 610. Privileges of Nizam's City and Suburban Courts and of Mysore State Courts—§ 611. Service of summonses by British Courts in State territory—§ 612. The Bombay Courts included in the system of reciprocity, 1890—§ 613. Inclusion of the Courts of the Resident in Kashmir and his Assistants, 1891—§ 614. Summary—§ 615. Criminal processes—Case of Tota Ram and Panna Lal, Indore, 1885-86—§ 616. Kuch Behar case, 1886—§ 616 A. Criminal processes of British Courts can be executed in Mysore territory—§ 617. Attendance of witnesses—Bombay Presidency, 1888—§ 618. Purcell's case, 1892—§ 619. Proposed reciprocity in service and execution of certain criminal processes by all British Courts whether in State or British territory—§ 620. Commissions for the examination of witnesses—§ 621. Summary—§ 622. Death sentences passed in the exercise of residuary jurisdiction may, in certain circumstances, be executed in British India . . . . .	104
--	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE POSITION OF RULING CHIEFS AND THEIR SUBJECTS IN BRITISH TERRITORY.

§ 623. Introductory—§ 624. Present law as to the position of Ruling Chiefs in Civil matters in British territory—§ 625. Holkar's case, 1867—§ 626. Can a British Court distinguish between the	
--	--

public and private property of a Ruling Chief?—§ 627. The Raja of Nahan's case, 1874—§ 628. Amendment of the Civil Procedure Code, 1877—§ 629. Summary—§ 630. Opinion that permission to sue a Chief on the ground that he trades in British territory should not be granted unless the suit is connected with his trading—§ 631. Practice of the Government of India in dealing with applications for leave to sue Ruling Chiefs—§ 632. Appointment of recognised agents of Chiefs. The Courts must decide who are Ruling Chiefs for the purposes of section 433 of the Code of Civil Procedure—§ 633. Summary—§ 634. The acquisition of immoveable property by Ruling Chiefs in British territory should be discouraged—§ 635. The grounds of the policy noted above—§ 636. Government lands must not be granted or sold to Ruling Chiefs—§ 637. The Kashmir case, 1871 and 1882—§ 638. Repeated objections to the acquisition of lands in British territory by Maharaja Holkar and his family—§ 639. Proposed loan on mortgage by the Muli State disallowed, 1894—§ 640. Bhopal cases, 1886-87—§ 641. Exceptions made from the general rule for special reasons. Holkar permitted to purchase a building site at Khandwa, 1884—§ 642. The Raja of Mailhar permitted to retain certain properties, 1890—§ 643. No interference in a case of bequest, Kothi, 1892—§ 644. Kapurthala allowed to make a small addition to an existing holding near Lahore, 1893—§ 645. Pudukota allowed to buy two residences at a hill station, 1893—§ 646. Permission given, 1894, to a Deccan Sardar to buy building land at Poona—§ 647. Acquisitions by the Amir of Afghanistan in the Peshawar District—§ 648. The Bhartpur case, 1893—§ 649. Hundelkhand and other cases in which Chiefs and others have not been pressed to dispose of their properties—§ 650. Transactions in British territory must be governed by British law—§ 651. Summary—§ 652. Liability of certain transactions to British laws further illustrated—§ 653. Liability of transactions connected with the Kapurthala Oudh Estates to the operation of the Stamp Law—§ 654. Liability of the Sultan of Zanzibar's trading vessels to the operation of the Native Passenger Ships Act—§ 655. Liability of the Amir's almond trade to Khaibar tolls and Peshawar City duties—§ 656. Grant of honorary Commissions in the Army to Ruling Chiefs and others—§ 657. The employment of the relatives of Ruling Chiefs in the military service of the British Government—§ 658. The employment of Ruling Chiefs in civil affairs under the British Government—§ 659. Position of the subjects of Native States (1) residing outside India, (2) in relation to Foreign Powers, (3) on the high seas in Native State vessels—§ 660. Civil employment under the British Government is open to the subjects of Native States—Hyderabad Attachés, 1872—§ 661. Rajputana and Central India Attachés, 1876—§ 662. Bombay reference regarding naturalisation, 1892—§ 663. The civil employment of the subjects of Native States by the British Government is not barred by the Act of Settlement—§ 664. The case of Chimanram Rambhagat, Bombay trader, 1892-93—§ 665. The case of Shah Ram Lal of Jodhpur, 1892-93. The subjects of Native States are eligible for appointment to the Provincial Service—§ 666. Summary—§ 667. Counsel may not appear in political cases, but petitioners may engage aid in preparing memorials—§ 668. Case of the Maharani of Rewa, 1882—§ 669. Cases of Dr. Kavanagh and Mr. Dawson, 1883—§ 670. Case of the Thákur of Tharad, 1884—§ 671. Summary—§ 672. In political cases the reference of disputed questions of law or fact to High Courts is inexpedient and without legal sanction—§ 673. General amenability of subjects of Native States to British Courts in respect of things done in British India . . . . . 123

CHAPTER XX.

THE POSITION OF BRITISH OFFICIALS, EUROPEANS AND THE LIKE, IN STATE TERRITORY.

§ 674. Introductory—§ 675. General instructions to Political Officers—§ 676. Lord Ellenborough's Circular of 1842—§ 677. Mr. Thomason's letter of 1843 to Sir Henry Lawrence—§ 678. Sir John Malcolm's instructions to his subordinates, 1821—§ 679. The old general instructions approved by the Government of India in 1874—§ 680. Orders of 1838 as to circumstances under which a Resident should give advice to a Ruling Chief—§ 681. Summary—§ 682. Instructions relating to particular matters of conduct—Political Officers must not guarantee loans to Native States. The Kota case, 1875—§ 683. Circular of 1832 prohibiting interference in certain pecuniary dealings—§ 684. Orders of 1838 to a similar effect—§ 685. It is usually undesirable that Political Officers should guarantee engagements between Ruling Chiefs and their subjects—§ 686. Political Officers must not act as arbitrators in disputes between British subjects and Ruling Chiefs—The case of Dr. Williams, 1878—§ 687. The case of Mr. Larmie, 1884—§ 688. The Nilgiri case, 1890—§ 689. Political Officers must not execute commissions for Ruling Chiefs—§ 690. Rules regarding the use of Darbar vehicles and animals—§ 691. Political Officers may not borrow money from, or lend it to, Natives within their circles—§ 692. Rules relating to the acceptance of presents—§ 693. Rules as to the remuneration of Medical Officers for attendance on Ruling Chiefs and others in Native States—§ 694. Political Officers must not hold land in Native States—§ 694 A. As a general rule Political Officers should not use Darbar houses or furniture—§ 695. Except with previous sanction officers of Government may not ask Ruling Chiefs or officials of Native States for subscriptions—Officers of Government must not collect subscriptions for political objects—Political officers must not influence Rulers or Ministers of Native States to subscribe to public or private funds—§ 696. Rules regarding the communication of orders of Government to Darbars—§ 696 A. Political Officers are under the rules of discipline generally applicable to public servants of like rank—§ 697. The duty of impartiality—§ 698. Summary—§ 699. Escorts of Political Officers in Native States—§ 700. Summary—§ 701. The operation of the Income Tax Act in State territory—§ 702. The position of Europeans and foreigners in Native States—§ 703. Holding of immoveable property by Europeans and foreigners in State territory—Cases of Messrs. Russell and Neve, Kashmir, 1884-86—§ 704. The Murree Brewery, 1886—§ 705. Mr. Ward's case, 1892—§ 706. Residence of Europeans in Native States; Mr. Currie's case, Bhopal, 1886—§ 707. Summary—§ 708. The limited jurisdiction of Native States over Native Officers and soldiers of the British army in respect of offences committed in State territory—§ 709. Limited jurisdiction of the Kathiawar States over the Kathiawar Agency Police—§ 710. Alien servants of the British Government are to be made liable for offences under the Indian Penal Code committed in State territory . . . . . 155

CHAPTER XXI.

TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS.

711. Introductory—§ 712. Instructions of 1884 relating to the execution of treaties and agreements—§ 713. Instructions of 1884 compared with the instructions of 1868—Instructions of 1868 repeated in 1878—Instructions of 1884 communicated to the Punjab Government in 1887 and 1892—§ 714. Orders relating to the sealing of treaties—§ 715. Treaties and agreements must

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XVI.

EXTRADITION BETWEEN BRITISH INDIA AND FOREIGN OR NATIVE STATES.

	PAGE
§ 541. Introductory—§ 542. General exposition of the subject addressed to the Straits Settlements, 1884—§ 543. Extradition arrangements with Foreign States—Afghanistan—§ 544. Nepal—The attack upon Hanumannagar, 1887—§ 545. Nepalese officials charged with bribery, 1887—§ 546. The case of Muhammad Ali, watchman, 1891—§ 547. Extradition to the French Settlements—The case of Pir Bakhsh, 1884—§ 548. The case of Pole, a deserter from the Austrian man-of-war "Aurora"—§ 549. The case of Seth Srichand, a Jaipur subject, 1886—Amendment of the Rajputana and Hyderabad Extradition Treaties, 1888—§ 550. The case of Najaf Ali, 1884—§ 551. No extradition of European British subjects to Native States—§ 552. The case of Trumpeter Phillips, Mhow and Hyderabad, 1893—§ 553. Extradition of Natives of India to Native States. The Baroda extradition correspondence, 1876-77—§ 554. The extradition of Native British subjects for trial by State Courts is permissible in certain circumstances—§ 555. The extradition of Native servants of the British Government—§ 556. The case of the Mahi Kantha Policeman, 1889—§ 557. The case of Balwant Rao Bute and Ram Sahai, Central India, 1891—§ 558. The murder of General Azim-ud-din Khan, Rampur, 1891—§ 559. Punjab extradition. The orders of 1884—§ 560. The Kashmir Extradition case, 1884 to 1892—§ 561. The regular extradition procedure does not prevent the immediate pursuit and arrest of offenders in State territory—§ 562. Acceptance of bail in extradition proceedings—§ 563. Abetment of an offence is not a scheduled extradition offence under the Act of 1879—§ 563 A. A surrendered person may ordinarily be tried for any offence which he may have committed in the State to which he is surrendered—§ 564. Extradition of prisoners—Chandria's case, Hyderabad, 1893—§ 565. General instructions of 1876 as to the working of the Extradition Act and Rules—§ 566. The effect of Extradition Treaties considered in connection with the Act—§ 567. Extradition must not be so granted as to risk a second conviction of the same person for the same offence—§ 568. Summary . . . . .	66

CHAPTER XVII.

EXTRADITION BETWEEN STATE TERRITORIES UNDER DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS AND BETWEEN SUBORDINATE STATES.

§ 569. Extradition from State territory under British jurisdiction. Secunderabad case, 1884—§ 570. Interstate extradition is not regulated by British laws—§ 571. The Rajputana Courts of Vakils—§ 572. Origin of the Courts of Vakils, 1841-44—§ 573. The jurisdiction of the Courts of Vakils is a substitute for extradition—§ 574. Extradition on the Rajputana and Bombay border—§ 575. The Rajputana and Guzerat Border Court—§ 576. Rules for extradition between various States—Jaipur and Patiala Rules, 1873—§ 577. Extradition between States need not be limited to heinous offences—§ 578. Extradition Rules, Bhartpur and Alwar, 1882—§ 579. Banawara and Partabgarh Rules, 1883—§ 580. Bikanir and Jaisalmir Rules, 1891—§ 581. The case of Natha Dola, Baroda and Barwani, 1882-83—§ 582. Interstate extradition in Central India—§ 583. Interstate extradition in the Bombay Presidency—Baroda claim for a <i>prima facie</i> case 1889-91—§ 584. The Baroda claim admitted, 1890—§ 585. Extradition warrants under the Act do not run in State territory—§ 586. The authority of Political Agents in extradition matters is derived from the Paramount Power—§ 587. Provisions of various rules and treaties regarding the <i>prima facie</i> case—§ 588. The case of the Rao of Kotah, 1891—§ 589. Summary . . . . .	90
---	----

CHAPTER XVIII.

SERVICE OF PROCESSES AND EXECUTION OF DECREES AND SENTENCES.

§ 590. Introductory—§ 591. Execution of decrees of British Courts by State Courts or officers in State territory—§ 592. Correspondence and orders of 1867 and 1868. Ruling of 1895 that States whose decrees may be executed in British India may be asked to reciprocate—§ 593. Summary—§ 594. Rules of 1867 left unaltered in 1880 and 1886—§ 595. Provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure regarding the execution of certain decrees—§ 596. Provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure as to the service of summonses in certain cases—§ 597. Summonses and decrees of State Courts, and of British Courts in State territory, Bombay, 1880 to 1885. Notification of March 1880—§ 598. Correspondence regarding Summonses, 1882—§ 599. Correspondence regarding execution of decrees, Bombay, 1883-84—§ 600. Service of Summonses again referred to—§ 601. Decrees and Summonses of Mysore Courts, 1882. Execution of British processes in Mysore territory—§ 602. Decrees of Travancore and Cochin Courts, 1885—§ 603. Reasons why legislation was not undertaken in 1870—§ 604. Views of Lord Napier of Merchiston—§ 605. Decrees and State demands—Secunderabad, Hyderabad Residency Bazar, and Nizam's City and Suburban Courts, 1884—§ 606. Reciprocity in fees on Civil processes, Gwalior, Mysore and Hyderabad—§ 607. General measures adopted in 1889 to promote permissible reciprocity—§ 608. Notifications of March 1889—Execution of decrees—§ 609. Lists of British Courts in State territory—§ 610. Privileges of Nizam's City and Suburban Courts and of Mysore State Courts—§ 611. Service of summonses by British Courts in State territory—§ 612. The Bombay Courts included in the system of reciprocity, 1890—§ 613. Inclusion of the Courts of the Resident in Kashmir and his Assistants, 1891—§ 614. Summary—§ 615. Criminal processes—Case of Tota Ram and Panna Lal, Indore, 1885-86—§ 616. Kuch Behar case, 1886—§ 616 A. Criminal processes of British Courts can be executed in Mysore territory—§ 617. Attendance of witnesses—Bombay Presidency, 1888—§ 618. Purcell's case, 1892—§ 619. Proposed reciprocity in service and execution of certain criminal processes by all British Courts whether in State or British territory—§ 620. Commissions for the examination of witnesses—§ 621. Summary—§ 622. Death sentence passed in the exercise of residuary jurisdiction may, in certain circumstances, be executed in British India . . . . .	104
---	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE POSITION OF RULING CHIEFS AND THEIR SUBJECTS IN BRITISH TERRITORY.

623. Introductory—§ 624. Present law as to the position of Ruling Chiefs in Civil matters in British territory—§ 625. Holkar's case, 1867—§ 626. Can a British Court distinguish between the	
--	--

public and private property of a Ruling Chief—§ 627. The Raja of Nahan's case, 1874—§ 628. Amendment of the Civil Procedure Code, 1877—§ 629. Summary—§ 630. Opinion that permission to sue a Chief on the ground that he trades in British territory should not be granted unless the suit is connected with his trading—§ 631. Practice of the Government of India in dealing with applications for leave to sue Ruling Chiefs—§ 632. Appointment of recognised agents of Chiefs. The Courts must decide who are Ruling Chiefs for the purposes of section 433 of the Code of Civil Procedure—§ 633. Summary—§ 634. The acquisition of immoveable property by Ruling Chiefs in British territory should be discouraged—§ 635. The grounds of the policy noted above—§ 636. Government lands must not be granted or sold to Ruling Chiefs—§ 637. The Kashmir case, 1871 and 1882—§ 638. Repeated objections to the acquisition of lands in British territory by Maharaja Holkar and his family—§ 639. Proposed loan on mortgage by the Muli State disallowed, 1894—§ 640. Bhopal cases, 1886-87—§ 641. Exceptions made from the general rule for special reasons. Holkar permitted to purchase a building site at Khandwa, 1884—§ 642. The Raja of Mailhar permitted to retain certain properties, 1890—§ 643. No interference in a case of bequest, Kothi, 1892—§ 644. Kapurthala allowed to make a small addition to an existing holding near Lahore, 1893—§ 645. Pudukota allowed to buy two residences at a hill station, 1893—§ 646. Permission given, 1894, to a Deccan Sardar to buy building land at Poona—§ 647. Acquisitions by the Amir of Afghanistan in the Peshawar District—§ 648. The Bhartpur case, 1893—§ 649. Hundelkhand and other cases in which Chiefs and others have not been pressed to dispose of their properties—§ 650. Transactions in British territory must be governed by British law—§ 651. Summary—§ 652. Liability of certain transactions to British laws further illustrated—§ 653. Liability of transactions connected with the Kapurthala Oudh Estates to the operation of the Stamp Law—§ 654. Liability of the Sultan of Zanzibar's trading vessels to the operation of the Native Passenger Ships Act—§ 655. Liability of the Amir's almond trade to Khaibar tolls and Peshawar City duties—§ 656. Grant of honorary Commissions in the Army to Ruling Chiefs and others—§ 657. The employment of the relatives of Ruling Chiefs in the military service of the British Government—§ 658. The employment of Ruling Chiefs in civil affairs under the British Government—§ 659. Position of the subjects of Native States (1) residing outside India, (2) in relation to Foreign Powers, (3) on the high seas in Native State vessels—§ 660. Civil employment under the British Government is open to the subjects of Native States—Hyderabad Attachéships, 1872—§ 661. Rajputana and Central India Attachéships, 1876—§ 662. Bombay reference regarding naturalisation, 1892—§ 663. The civil employment of the subjects of Native States by the British Government is not barred by the Act of Settlement—§ 664. The case of Chimanram Rambhagat, Bombay trader, 1892-93—§ 665. The case of Shah Ram Lal of Jodhpur, 1892-93. The subjects of Native States are eligible for appointment to the Provincial Service—§ 666. Summary—§ 667. Counsel may not appear in political cases, but petitioners may engage aid in preparing memorials—§ 668. Case of the Maharani of Rewa, 1882—§ 669. Cases of Dr. Kavanagh and Mr. Dawson, 1883—§ 670. Case of the Thákur of Tharad, 1884—§ 671. Summary—§ 672. In political cases the reference of disputed questions of law or fact to High Courts is inexpedient and without legal sanction—§ 673. General amenability of subjects of Native States to British Courts in respect of things done in British India . . . . . 123

CHAPTER XX.

THE POSITION OF BRITISH OFFICIALS, EUROPEANS AND THE LIKE, IN STATE TERRITORY.

§ 674. Introductory—§ 675. General instructions to Political Officers—§ 676. Lord Ellenborough's Circular of 1842—§ 677. Mr. Thomason's letter of 1843 to Sir Henry Lawrence—§ 678. Sir John Malcolm's instructions to his subordinates, 1821—§ 679. The old general instructions approved by the Government of India in 1874—§ 680. Orders of 1838 as to circumstances under which a Resident should give advice to a Ruling Chief—§ 681. Summary—§ 682. Instructions relating to particular matters of conduct—Political Officers must not guarantee loans to Native States. The Kota case, 1875—§ 683. Circular of 1832 prohibiting interference in certain pecuniary dealings—§ 684. Orders of 1838 to a similar effect—§ 685. It is usually undesirable that Political Officers should guarantee engagements between Ruling Chiefs and their subjects—§ 686. Political Officers must not act as arbitrators in disputes between British subjects and Ruling Chiefs—The case of Dr. Williams, 1878—§ 687. The case of Mr. Larminie, 1884—§ 688. The Nilgiri case, 1890—§ 689. Political Officers must not execute commissions for Ruling Chiefs—§ 690. Rules regarding the use of Darbar vehicles and animals—§ 691. Political Officers may not borrow money from, or lend it to, Natives within their circles—§ 692. Rules relating to the acceptance of presents—§ 693. Rules as to the remuneration of Medical Officers for attendance on Ruling Chiefs and others in Native States—§ 694. Political Officers must not hold land in Native States—§ 694 A. As a general rule Political Officers should not use Darbar houses or furniture—§ 695. Except with previous sanction officers of Government may not ask Ruling Chiefs or officials of Native States for subscriptions—Officers of Government must not collect subscriptions for political objects—Political officers must not influence Rulers or Ministers of Native States to subscribe to public or private funds—§ 696. Rules regarding the communication of orders of Government to Darbars—§ 696 A. Political Officers are under the rules of discipline generally applicable to public servants of like rank—§ 697. The duty of impartiality—§ 698. Summary—§ 699. Escorts of Political Officers in Native States—§ 700. Summary—§ 701. The operation of the Income Tax Act in State territory—§ 702. The position of Europeans and foreigners in Native States—§ 703. Holding of immoveable property by Europeans and foreigners in State territory—Cases of Messrs. Russell and Neve, Kashmir, 1884-86—§ 704. The Murree Brewery, 1886—§ 705. Mr. Ward's case, 1892—§ 706. Residence of Europeans in Native States; Mr. Currie's case, Bhopal, 1886—§ 707. Summary—§ 708. The limited jurisdiction of Native States over Native Officers and soldiers of the British army in respect of offences committed in State territory—§ 709. Limited jurisdiction of the Kathiawar States over the Kathiawar Agency Police—§ 710. Alien servants of the British Government are to be made liable for offences under the Indian Penal Code committed in State territory . . . . . 155

CHAPTER XXI.

TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS.

711. Introductory—§ 712. Instructions of 1884 relating to the execution of treaties and agreements—§ 713. Instructions of 1884 compared with the instructions of 1868—Instructions of 1868 repeated in 1878—Instructions of 1884 communicated to the Punjab Government in 1887 and 1892—§ 714. Orders relating to the sealing of treaties—§ 715. Treaties and agreements must



be executed in English, and the English version is the accepted text. The Bundi case, 1868—§ 716. The Gwalior exchange case, 1871—§ 717. The Hathmati river case, Idar, 1874—§ 718. Only permanent transactions should be recorded in treaties—§ 719. Treaties and agreements may be executed in triplicate—§ 720. Treaties and agreements with Ruling Chiefs are acts of State—§ 721. The Banganapalle succession case, 1870—§ 722. Treaty making powers of the Governor-General in Council—§ 723. Treaty-making powers of Local Governments—§ 724. The Shaikh Othman case, Aden, 1882—§ 725. Kutch and Nawanager, 1883—§ 726. Additional Postal Agreement, Gwalior, 1888—§ 727. A minor Chief may make an agreement with the British Government—§ 728. Summary—§ 729. No engagements except treaties are ratified by the Viceroy—Railway agreement with Holkar, 1870—§ 730. The Patiala, Jind and Nabha Postal Conventions, 1885—§ 731. The Gwalior Postal Convention, 1885—An agreement approved and confirmed by the Government of India, is complete and binding without a *kharita* from the Viceroy—§ 732. In the case of conventions or similar engagements not ratified by the Viceroy, the usual formalities should be observed—The Kutch and Nawanager case, 1884—§ 733. In many understandings with Native States it is expedient to avoid conventions and similar formal agreements—The Rajkot Tank case, 1890—§ 734. The Surgana case, 1893—§ 735. The Akalkot case, 1894—§ 736. Summary—§ 737. Present preference for *sanads* and *kharitas* in recording engagements with Native States—The Periyar jurisdiction case, 1891—§ 738. Reasons for the form of the Mysore instrument of transfer, 1881—§ 739. The Sawantwari *sanad*, 1884—§ 740. *Sanads* are used to confer or confirm territorial possessions and to grant powers, honours, and rewards—§ 741. *Kharitas* are now often used for treaty purposes—The Marwar-Merwara case, 1885—§ 742. The Mewar-Merwara case, 1883—§ 743. The Jhansi and Morar exchange, 1886—§ 744. Summary—§ 745. The interpretation of Treaties and other written engagements with Native States—§ 746. Minute of Sir Henry Maine in the Rampur Cession case, 1868—§ 747. No special form of agreement is necessary for the cession of jurisdiction—§ 748. The terms of an agreement may be varied by consent without the formal alteration of documents—§ 749. Summary—§ 750. The participation of India in Commercial Treaties between the British Government and Foreign Powers—§ 751. Exclusion of India from the Commercial Treaty with Italy, 1884—§ 752. India desires in 1884 to be excluded from the proposed treaty with Paraguay—§ 753. The Secretary of State in 1885 withdraws his assent to the participation of India in the proposed Treaty with Mexico—§ 754. India desires to withdraw from the Salvador Treaty, 1885—§ 755. The Goa Treaty of 1878 is not a precedent for separating the States from British India in relations with Foreign Powers—§ 756. Extradition agreements with Dharampur and Jauhar—§ 757. Summary . . . . . 178

## CHAPTER XXII.

### TITLES AND CEREMONIAL.

§ 758. Introductory—§ 759. The grant of titles in India—The Resolution of Lord William Bentinck, 1829—§ 760. Lord Canning's despatch of 1859—§ 761. No one but the Viceroy can grant Native titles to Chiefs or Native British subjects in India—Case of the Raja of Pudukota, 1870—§ 762. Case of Mr. Edulji Pestonji, Bombay, 1870—§ 763. Powers of Ruling Chiefs in regard to titles—Case of Muhammad Faiz Ali Khan of Jaipur, 1870—§ 764. Case of Mardan Ali Khan, Jodhpur, 1872-73—§ 765. Captain Clerks's case, Hyderabad, 1875—§ 766. Hyderabad cases—Abdul Hakk, 1882—Abdul Hakk, 1884—Mehdi Ali Khan, 1887-88—Cases of Mushtak Husain and Saiyid Husain Balgrami, 1891—§ 767. Ruling Chiefs should not propose for British subjects in their service titles the same as those usually conferred by the Viceroy—§ 768. The Viceroy may grant titles to subjects of Native States—The Patiala Khalifas, 1883—§ 769—Procedure in delivering grants of titles to inhabitants of Native States. Kashmir case, 1887, Baroda case, 1893—§ 770. Summary—§ 771. Ruling Chiefs may not institute Orders of Distinction. The proposed revival of the Order of the Ali Band, Hyderabad, 1885—§ 772. Proposed institution of the Order of Gandabherunda, Mysore, disallowed, 1891—§ 773. Hereditary titles granted by the British Government—§ 774. Many hereditary titles not expressly conferred or recognised by the British Government are in common use—§ 775. Express recognition of hereditary titles held by usage—Case of the Chanchra family, 1884—§ 776. Case of the Naldanga family, 1884—§ 777. Decision in the Chanchra and Naldanga cases—§ 778. Decision in the Susang case—§ 779. Case of the Madras Zamindars and Carnatic titles, 1889—§ 780. The full style and titles should be used in addressing Ruling and Titular Chiefs—§ 781. What titles are granted as hereditary distinctions—Case of Seths Gokul Das and Balabh Das, Jabalpur, 1893—§ 782. Case of Raja Amir Hasan, Oudh, 1884—§ 783. Case of Sir Jotindra Mohan Tagor, 1890-94—§ 784. Measures for legalising settlements of property made to support hereditary titles proposed but abandoned—§ 785. Titles conferred by the British Government are personal unless stated to be hereditary—§ 786. Summary—§ 787. The title of Prince—§ 788. The title of Prince occasionally allowed merely as a courtesy title—§ 789. The title of Shahzada—The Kabul Saddozais—§ 790. The family of Tipu Sultan of Mysore—§ 791. Courtesy titles of sons of Titular Chiefs—§ 792. The titles of His Highness and His Excellency—§ 793. Native titles are now distributed periodically—§ 794. Titles should not be proposed for persons of inferior social position—§ 795. Establishment of titles for the reward of literary merit—§ 796. Proposals for badges or symbols of honour rejected in Bombay, but accepted in Burma—*Khilats* may be given with titles but not medals—§ 797. Titles may be withdrawn for misconduct—Case of Maulavi Izhar Husain, 1875—§ 798. Case of the Raja of Puri, 1878—§ 798 A. Case of Abdul Ali, 1881-81—§ 799. Case of Anup Singh, 1883—§ 800. Case of Sadik Husain of Bhopal, 1885—§ 801. Case of Raja Ram Singh of Bansri, 1886—§ 802. Case of Raja Mokham Singh of Partapner, 1893—§ 802 A. Case of K. Kunjan Menon, 1888—§ 803. Summary—§ 804. *Ex-officio* titles in British India—§ 805. *Ex-officio* titles in vernacular correspondence in the Punjab and elsewhere—§ 806. *Ex-officio* titles for members of local boards, 1882 and 1891—§ 807. *Ex-officio* titles in the Public Works Department, 1886 and 1891—§ 808. *Ex-officio* titles in Native States—§ 809. Summary—§ 810. Analysis of the table of salutes. Permanent or dynastic, personal and local salutes distinguished—§ 811. As a general rule salutes are granted only to Ruling Chiefs—§ 812. Powers of the Viceroy in respect to salutes in India—§ 813. Principles observed in framing the Table of Salutes—§ 814. The question of precedence is not affected by the number of guns—§ 815. Powers of Ruling Chiefs in respect to salutes—§ 816. The Royal salute in India—§ 817. Grant of salutes in certain cases of regency—Case of Sir Ganpat Rao of Gwalior, 1888—§ 818. Use of alterations in salutes as rewards or punishments—§ 819. Summary—§ 820. The Viceroy determines precedence in Darbars—The Jodhpur case, 1870—§ 821. Arrests should not be made in Darbar—The proposed arrest of the Senapati, Manipur, 1891 . . . . .