

Home (1917) Department.
(Miscellaneous)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No. 557.

DATED 8-6-1917

INDEXED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Certificate of age and nationality.

Requesting the Resident in Travancore and Cochin to inform the petitioner, Sankaranarayana Panikkar, that the Government see no reason to interfere with the orders already passed relating to grant of citizenship to his nephew Mr. S. Kunjunn Panikkar, owing to the contradictory statements as to his age made by him on different occasions.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No. _____

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (= O.) or spare copy (= S.O.)	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, etc., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.
1119	27-4-17			
732	9-6-16	Pub.		
	16.4.16	"		

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number	Date.	Original (= O.) or spare copy (= S.O.)	Initials with date of (1) Referencer acknowledging returns of the paper concerned or (2) Despatcher to denote the return of the papers to the department concerned.

C.F.—29.

DEPARTMENT.

Received _____ 191 . Registered _____ 191 .

Subject.

Forwarding a petition from Sankaranarayana Panikkar of Mathoor House, Ambalapuzhai Taluk appealing against the order passed by the Resident refusing to grant a certificate of age and nationality to his nephew S. Kunjunni Panikkar.

Recd: 981-1
24/5/17

Fd Home dept. (Misc.) no
24-5-17

24-5-17

ENCLOSURES.
No. _____
Spare copies _____

Conf. No. Roc 41

Station Camp-Residency, Dated the 11th May 1917.

From (Name) H.L. Braidwood Esquire, I.C.S.,

(Designation) Resident in Travancore & Cochin.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

Political Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a petition from Sankaranarayana Panikkar of Mathoor house, Ambalapuzhai Taluk appealing against the orders passed by Mr. Graham and myself refusing to grant a certificate of age and nationality to his nephew, S. Kunjunni Panikkar.

2. Kunjunni Panikkar was granted a certificate of identity by Mr. Forbes in 1913 and a copy of the certificate was forwarded to Government with his letter R.O.C. No. 1342 dated 5th August 1913. In July 1914 Kunjunni Panikkar applied from Edinburgh for a certificate of age and nationality to

enable him to apply for a nomination in the P.W.D, India, and stated that his uncle and guardian Sankaranarayana Panikkar would furnish the necessary evidence. The latter produced what purported to be the original horoscope of his nephew and requested that necessary enquiries might be made. The papers were accordingly forwarded to the Darbar. The Tahsildar of Ambalapuzhai who conducted the enquiry recorded statements from 7 persons said to be respectable landlords of affluent circumstances. These statements went to show that Kunjunni Panikkar was the grandson of one Sankaran Eswaran Embran, a native of South Kanara and that Kunjunni Panikkar was born at Mathoor house on the date mentioned in the horoscope viz., 9th Makarom 1070 M.E corresponding to 21st January 1895.

3. In the meanwhile Mr. Graham had obtained the applications put in by Kunjunni Panikkar for admission to the Matriculation and Intermediate Examinations of the Madras University also information regarding the date of Kunjunni Panikkar's birth as entered in the registers of the Maharaja's College, Trivandrum, and the S.P.G. College, Trichinopoly, where he had studied. The following statement shows the date of birth as gleaned from the various documents.

Document.	Date of birth.	Age in January 1915.
Horoscope	9th Makarom 1070 21st January 1895.	20 years.
Statements of witnesses.	Do.	Do.
Maharaja's College Register.	Makarom 1069 January-February 1894.	21 years.
S.P.G. College Register.	Do.	Do.
Application for admission to the Matriculation Examination of 1909.	March 1894.	21 years.
Do. of 1910	On 15th December 1910 age was shown as 16 years and 9 months.	20 years. 10 months.
Application for admission to the Intermediate Examination 1912.	On 18th December 1912 age was shown as 18 years and 11 months.	21 years.

It will be seen from the above that there was a glaring discrepancy in regard to the age of the applicant as disclosed by the horoscope and statements and as recorded in the School and University records. Mr. Graham accordingly refused to grant a certificate.

4. On the 16th February last Sankaranarayana Panikkar put in a petition to me for a reconsideration of the orders already passed but I declined to reopen the question. On the 23rd of the same month he put in a further petition and requested that he might be furnished with the reasons for refusing the certificate. He also prayed for copies of the statements recorded by the Tahsildar of the reports made by the latter, the Diwan Peishkar and the Diwan and of the orders of Mr. Graham dated 27th July 1915. A copy of the last mentioned document was furnished but the other documents were refused. I also declined to furnish him with the reasons for refusing the certificate.

5. It will be seen from the above that the applicant's representative has produced recently oral and documentary evidence to prove that the applicant is a year younger than he purported to be while a student in India. The acceptance of the lower age as corrected would have given him an extra year to appear as a candidate for the P.W.D. The higher age would make him eligible in 1917 only and it is now too late for him to apply. The grant of the petitioner's request now would make him eligible to appear in 1918, as he would be about 23½ on 1st July 1918 on which date he must be under 24 years of age. (Vide Regulations on page 231 of India Office List for 1916). The fact that the applicant's birth was originally placed in January-February 1894, then shifted to March 1894 and subsequently to January 1895 seems to show that no horoscope was in existence in 1909 and earlier and that the recently produced horoscope is of doubtful authenticity. Mr. Graham also noted on 23rd July 1915 that the applicant's nationality was also doubtful, as though a Nayar by caste, he

claims British descent through his paternal grandfather. In his identity certificate of 1913 he is shown as a Nair and a Travancore subject, though his father is shown as a Kshatriya by caste. It seems to be undoubted that a Nair must trace his nationality as well as his caste through his mother.

In these circumstances it seems to me that the certificate was rightly refused and that no interference is called for.

6. The connected papers Dis.files 370 of 1913, 41 of 1915 and 15 of 1917 are enclosed for reference.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. S. S. S.
Resident.

N.R.

To

His Excellency The Governor in Council,
of
Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of Sankara-
narayana Paniker of Mathoor house, -
in Ampalapuzhai Taluq, Travancore,
sheweth that,

The petitioner is the maternal uncle and guardian of S. Kunjumi Paniker M.A. B.S.C. now in England as an apprentice in Engineering, having taken his degree in the University of Edinburgh.

On the 10th April 1915 the petitioner on behalf of the said Kunjumi Paniker applied to the British Resident in Travancore and Cochin for a certificate of the age and nationality of Kunjumi Paniker to enable him to enter the service of British Indian Government in the Public Works Department.

The said Kunjumi Paniker is a British subject - his grand father Sankaran Eswaran Embran, having been born in and a native of South Canara in British India.

Kunjumi Paniker is at present 22 years of -
age, he having been born on 9th Makaram 1070
corresponding to 21st. January 1895.

At the instance of the British Resident an
enquiry was held by the Tahsildar of Ampalapuzhai
Taluk and oral and documentary evidence was given
before him as to the age and parentage of the -
said Kunjumi Paniker.

Although all the information called for by
the British Resident, was submitted to him, he
on 27th July 1915, without assigning any reason -
declined to grant the Certificate and sent to the
petitioner the memorandum, a copy of which is -
herewith submitted and marked A.

The petitioner on the 16th February 1917 -
requested the then Resident to reconsider the -
decision which request was refused. The reply
received by the petitioner is herewith submitted
and marked B.

The petitioner on the 23rd February 1917 -
requested ~~the then Resident to reconsider~~ to be
informed of the reasons why the certificate was
refused, and to be furnished with copies of the
evidence taken in the enquiry; but this request
was also refused. (vide the reply marked C).

As the petitioner is ignorant of the grounds
on which the certificate has been refused and as
the petitioner had no opportunity of explaining
to the Resident any doubts he might have felt, the
petitioner is unable to set out in this petition,
the points on which the Resident may have fallen
into error.

Your petitioner submits that he has in this
matter advanced to the Resident nothing which is
not strictly and absolutely true.

Your petitioner has undergone great priva-
tions and immense expenditure in trying to -
confer the benefits of English education and
association on Kunjumi Paniker and he and I -
have lived in the hope that these great sacri-
fices will be recompensed by the opportunity
of honourable service under the British --
Government.

It is a great hardship to your Excellency's
petitioner and Kunjumi Paniker that without -
knowing whether it is the age or the parentage

as alleged that is ~~considered~~ considered unreliable they should be refused the certificate and a young man's career should be damaged, if not destroyed before it has begun.

The petitioner therefore most humbly prays that your Excellency may be pleased.

- (1) to reconsider the order of the Resident refusing the certificate and direct the certificate to be issued and for that purpose,
- (2) to direct that copies of the - evidence taken in the enquiry and grounds of the Residents decision be furnished to the - petitioner within a certain time, and
- (3) to consider any further representations that your petitioner - may be able to make to your --

excellency after the above papers have been obtained and within a time to be fixed by your excellency.

For which act of kindness and charity the petitioner shall ever pray,

I beg to remain,

Your Excellency's most humble and obedient servant,

Sankaranarayana Paniker

27th April }
1917 }

X
R.O.C.No.1491/15.

12
Resident's Office,
Trivandrum, 27th July 1915.

M E M O.

With reference to his petition dated 10th April 1915, M. R. Ry.,
Sankaranarayana Panikkar of Ambalapuzha is informed that the Resident,
after making careful enquiries into the matter, is not prepared to grant
a certificate as to the age and nationality of S.Kunjunni Panikkar.

To

M.R.Ry., Sankaranarayana Panikkar,
with Horoscope returned.

(True copy.)

Sd/- R. A. Graham,
R e s i d e n t.

T. Austing
For R e s i d e n t.

T.S.P. *Cap.*

8

B

13

Resident's Office,
Trivandrum, 21st February 1917.

Read petition dated 16th February 1917 from Mr. Sankaranarayana Panikar praying for the grant of a certificate of age and nationality on behalf of his nephew Mr. S. K. Panikkar.

The Resident sees no reason to reopen the question of the grant of a certificate of age and nationality to Kunjunni Panikkar, which was refused in this office Memo R.O.C.1491 of 15 dated 27th July 1915.

M. S. A. S.
21.2.17
Resident.

T.S.P.

Resident's Office,
Trivandrum, 27th February 1917.

M E M O.

With reference to his application dated 23rd instant for copies of certain records connected with the question of the grant of a certificate of age and nationality to his nephew, Mr. Sankaranarayana Panikkar of Ambalapuzha is furnished with a copy of the Resident's decision of the 27th July 1915. Copies of the other documents asked for cannot be granted nor can the reasons for the refusal of the certificate be -- furnished.

T. Aushi
For Resident.

To
M. R. Ry., Sankaranarayana Panikkar,
Ambalapuzha.

T.S.P. *Ans.*

Home (Misc) Dept.

Certificate of age & nationality.
(G.O. 1786) From the Resident in D.C., Capt 418 11.8.17.
It will be observed from para 3 of the letter, of the Resident in Travancore and Cochin that the date of birth advanced by Mr. Kunjunnai Panikkar varies ~~differently on different occasions~~. In view of the glaring discrepancy disclosed, submitted that the evidence adduced does not lead to any certain conclusion, and that it is impossible to certify to any certain date. Reference is solicited to G.O. Nos. 1119 Pub. of 9-6-16, and 421 Home (Misc) of 27-4-17 in which the grant of a certificate of age and nationality was ^{refused} ~~declined to be issued~~ to Mr. P. Sathianarayana Rao under circumstances similar to the case now under consideration. The petitioners may accordingly be informed that the Govt. are unable to interfere with the orders already passed.

Draft order is subd. *[Signature]*

Not
6/6/17

[Signature]
6.6.17

Issued *[Signature]*
8.6.17

pmB
12/6

Home (Hus)

22

Requesting the Resident in DC to see us

READ AGAIN G.O. No.

” ” ”

READ ALSO:—

C. No. 1786

" "

” ”

ORDER

No. 557

His

The Resident in Travancore or
Cochin is requested to
inform the petitioners that the
Govt. ^{See no reason} ~~are~~ unable to
interfere with the orders
already passed.

रुद्र

৬/৮/১৭

Yder

562

~~22~~
~~6.6.17~~

The Resident in D.C.

(920)

(with his files 370 of 1913, 41 of 1915
and 15 of 1911. returned,

When given for copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

12/17/191
10/16

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
191

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

P = Copy abstract only.

Q = Copy heading only.