municipality.

[L. & M. / 2,000—28-10-97.]

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 985 M.

DATED 26-4-97.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Munl. limits

Informing Nilakanta Rao & others of Samudram village that Govt. sees no reason to comply with their request for the exclusion of their village from Tiruvannamalai _____, & stating that the Munl. Council should remove such of the toll-gates as are placed within the town at considerable distance from the →

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

---

[5]
500—27-5-95.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 2864 m of 1896, dated 22nd October from the Nilakanta Rao & others of Samudram village
Current No. 3316 m of 1896, dated 10th December from the Collector of South Arcot.
" 1197 m of 1897, " 15th March " Do

Order. No. 985 Mmis d/ 26-4-97

H.M.

The petitioners will be informed that the Government sees no reason to comply with their request.

2. But from ~~From~~ the plan submitted by the Collector, it wd appear~~s~~ that two of the municipal toll-gates are placed within the town at a considerable distance from the municipal limits. But ~~There~~

Under sections 91 and 92 (2) of the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, tolls can be levied only on the borders of the municipality. ~~The~~ If this is so, the Municipal Council should ~~therefore~~ remove each of these gates as soon as possible to a situation satisfying the requirements of the law.

HM
20/4/97

VR
21/4/97

S.K.
24/4/7

Petitioners. (Para. 1 only) D.O
Collector of South Arcot (with a map return) D.O
Chairman M.C Tiruvannamalai D.O

Desp. 29/4/97

Municipality

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 2864. M. of 1896, dated 22d October from ~~the~~ Nilakanta Ra
Current No. 3316. M. of 1896, dated 10th December from the Samudram Collector of S
" 1197. M. " 1897 " 15th March " Do

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the dra order and the notes on the fi two of the letters read abov

2. With the las letter read above, the Collect submits a plan of the Tiruvannamalai municipality showi the relation of the village o Samudram to the rest of the town, the municipal limits be marked by a blue line. From this plan, it appears that as stated by the villagers of Samudram in para. 18 of thei petition, two of the toll-gate are placed within the town at a considerable distance from the municipal limits. The council's attention may now be dra to the irregularity — Vide. Secti [illegible] LIV of

with plans (Forwarded)

On Her Majesty's Service only.

No. M 98

To

Nilakanta Ra

D. L. O.-11.

REFUSED LETTER. fm

FROM THE MADRAS Dead Lette

To

Clerk, Chief Secretariat.

3/1. Hanumantarayan Koil Street

418/Eng Enclo of 96

Current No 247/Eng of 1896

cal & Munl. (1896) Department.

G. D. DEPUTY COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
22 NOV. 96
CUDDALORE

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

CURRENT No. 2864.M.

No 1348 dy 20-11-96

~~Order~~

Referred to the Collector of South Arcot — for early remarks.

Secretary to Government.

V.R. 18/11/96

~~Fort St. George — 18th November 1896~~

418/Eng Enclo of 96 (To be returned)

Forwarded to the Sub Coll. and ex-officio Chairman, Municipality of Tiruvannamalai for very early report.

DESPATCHED
23 NOV. 96

Collector
23.XI.96

RK 22/11,

To the Collector of South Arcot.

with plans (to be returned)

From Nilakantarao and other Pattadars of Samudram village, Tiruvannamalai

No.

Dated 22-10-96.

Received 23-10-96.

Registered 23-10-96.

Enclosures two Rupees postage stamps & one plan.

Spare copies \ (with CD. 23/10/96)

Converted to Govt- 10/2/98

SUBJECT.

Praying that their lands may be excluded from the municipal limits of Tiruvannamalai.

Papers - see

+ Per Parcel Post

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

3/1. Hanumantharayan koil Street
Triplicane (Madras)
22nd October 1896

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 2864 M

To
His Excellency the Governor ~~in Council~~,
Fort St. George,
Ootacamund.

Enclosures
1. Plan by Book-post
2. Two Rs worth of Postage stamps attached to this.

Since ~~not~~ received

The humble petition of Nilakanta Rao
and others Pattadars of Samudram Village,
Tiruvannamalai Taluk, South Arcot. Care of M.R.Ry. R. Padmanabha Raoji 3 Hanumantarayan Street Triplicane.

May it please Your Excellency in Council,

The petitioners are the land-holders of certain dry and wet fields in the Samudram Village now grouped in the late Revision of Village Establishment ~~with the Village of~~ as a Separate Village by itself.

Name and No. of Pattadars.	Survey Nos. owned.	Extent.	
110. Neelakanta Row	69	9. 35	
52 Kunthoonatha Nainar	266	5. 18	
20 Perama Kavundan	265	3. "	
183 Boopala Nainar	264	2. 85	
129 Kanthapattan	4; 86	3. 28	
48 Arunachella Aiyer	8a	3. 71	
62 Arunachella Mudaly	9.10.40.86. 258.280.	12. 84	
56 Murahary Row	14	2. 22	
1 Venkatapathee Naick	256	1. 31	
2; 69. Ponnooswamy Pillay	127.147.199 201.206	8. 45	
3 Venkataramapillay	100.175.162.304	11. 24	
9 Cuppuswamy acharry	298	. 90	
14 Sawmy Mudaliar	115.142.177.181	17. 22	
15 Oosan Sahib	38.219	3 86	
19. Ramalinga Mudaly	188.271.277	5. 56	
24. Muthuswamy Mudaly	178.244.257	7. 14	
30. Kuttee chettiar	319	0. 72	
44 Aiyaswamy chetty	20	1. 84	
159 Chinnaswamy Mudaly	241.57.250 301.304.295	6. 28	
140. Soanachella chettiar	30.32.145 147.176	11. 26	

2. From Enclosure A, being the Survey plan of the Village, it will be seen that almost all lands of this Village are situated to the south-west of the houses or Village site of Tiruvannamalai or more properly speaking, to the due south of the Hill.

The red ink line A B C D, which has now been drawn [illegible] the Enclosure A, for clearness sake, represents the road from Tindivanam to Chengam. This road forms the northern boundary of the Samudram Village (lands) or the southern boundary of the Tiruvannamalai Hill.

no– The scale is 8"/4 a mile – the distances not be less than 2 & 1 1/8 miles

(A) The distance from S. No. 97, the north-easternmost field of this Village to S. No. 267 is nearly 5 miles: that from S. No. 119 to 271 is nearly 4 miles and that from S. No. 97 to S. No. 1 is about 3 miles.

(B) The fields S. Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 345, 347 and 350 are the only fields that may be said to form the border between Tiruvannamalai Village lands (not Village site or houses) and Samudram lands or to form the fields just adjacent to the road from Tindivanam to Chengam.

(C) There is not a single field of Samudram (it may be stated generally) on the northern side of that road, *i.e.*, of the red ink line A. B. C. D.

3. The most noteworthy point in the case of this Village is that this is **no Village** in the ordinary acceptation of the term. It has no houses nor residents there. It is named a Village only for the purposes of Revenue. It is what is called a *Bécharak* or *Nattappal* or uninhabited Village.

4. The lands have already been very heavily assessed in the Revenue Settlement; and yet the misfortunes of the owners thereof did not stop there. They are destined to suffer more.

Wrong hypothesis

5. If Tiruvannamalai has to be improved in its sanitation and if Tiruvannamali is not able in itself to bear its own cost of an elaborate of Municipality and if Tiruvannamalai **cannot** be made to be self-supporting—and if yet Tiruvannamalai should be made to have the honour of being classed with the 56 other places in the Presidency and ranked as a Municipal Town, all the same—the petitioners who are, of course, put to **peculiar trouble and cost** by the mere sad fact of their Village being *Becharak* are to be saddled with an addition to the already heavy assessment of their lands.

6. This is a charity which the Samudram lands can ill afford to undertake with its heavy Revenue assessment.

There is not a single human dwelling place in the Village and why then should the lands be saddled with this additional cost.

7. The dry and wet lands of which **alone** the Village is made of, do not want a pie for their education—for indeed lands do not need any. Nor do the lands want a Medical man and his Establishment to look after them. A vaccinator is not needed for the lands: much less a Sanitary Inspector. They require no lamps at nights.

They do want water in plenty, which however, the Municipality do not mean to supply: for to supply water for irrigation forms no part of the duties of a Municipality. The bathing and drinking water for which the Municipality may make schemes to supply, the petitioner's lands do not want.

8. The lands do not want sweepers or scavengers to remove the sweepings from them: or rather they would be too glad that sweepings from

other places are brought and thrown on them and they would even pay for such rubbish.

9. In short none of the purposes of the Municipal Act is needed for the petitioners' lands. They derive **no benefit** at all from the Municipality: and yet they are made to pay a tax on them and over and above the Revenue assessment.

No. They want roads & conservation of tanks & wells

10. The petitioners most humbly and respectfully appeal to the Gracions heart of Your Excellency in Council to consider.—

(1). Whether it is at all legal that the petitioners' lands alone (it must be borne in mind that there is not a single house in the village) should be included into the Municipality of another village merely for the benefit of the latter.

(2) Whether it is at all just or equitable that there should be this additional land tax for no reason at all or without any additional benefit conferred on them.

(3) Whether the law allows the imposition of land tax on any lands which **stand alone unconnected with any human dwellings** in the village and quite unconnected with the Municipal Village.

11. If that part of the Tindivanam to Chengam Road which lies between the western most end of Tiruvannamalai house-sites or houses on the east and the Chengam branch on the west, *i.e.*, that part of the red ink line lying between points M and N, should necessarily be included in the Municipality, there is apparently no reason, legality or equity as to why the fields (wet and dry) situated 5 miles, 4 miles and 3 miles south of that road should pay the Municipal tax ??

If by any straining of the scope of the Municipal Act, the fields bordering on the Municipal Road (the question as to whether it is at all proper to call it a Municipal Road does not pertain to us) such as S. No. 97 and other fields mentioned in clause B para 2 supra, are considered to be necessarily taxed for Municipality—there is not even that shadow of reason for the other fields being included within the Municipal limits.

All the field owners use the roads

12. It may perhaps be argued against the petitioners that the owners of the lands do live in the Tiruvannamalai limits. If they live they pay House tax, Professional tax and other Municipal taxes. If they bring into Tiruvannamalai the produce of their lands, they would of course pay Tolls.

Moreover if it were deemed proper to include the dry and wet lands 5 miles, 4 miles or 3 miles away from the boundary line of Tiruvannamalai within the Municipal Town, merely because the owners thereof for the time being live within it, it would amount to saying that a coffee estate on the Nilgiris or the Sherveroy's should be included within the Madras Municipality or the Salem Municipality because the owners live within them.

Even Totis other Pariahs working on Samudram lands live within the limit of Tiruvannamalai.

Again the owners may change and a resident of Madras or Cuddalore may purchase the Samudram lands and why should he pay Municipal land tax for his lands in addition to his Revenue assessment.

13. It will be seen from the Sub-Collector's proposal in paras   of his letter embodied in G. O.   (1) that he proposes to impose land tax at 5 per cent. **of three times the assessment** (2) and that fhe petitioner's **plough bullocks** are to be taxed too. Thus if a land is assessed at Rs. 100, for Revenue assessment, the Municipal land tax will be $\frac{300}{100} \times \frac{5}{7} =$ Rs. 15. *i.e.,* the Revenue assessment is increased practically by $\frac{15}{100}$ or 15 per cent. Why is this increase made? What is the corresponding benefit bestowed on the lands? In tact none.

~~There are~~ no bullocks kept in this village

14. Again the petitioner's **plough bullocks,** why should they pay any additional tax.

15. Then is it a penalty which the lands are destined **to pay merely** owing to for the geographical position thereof, *i.e.,* for their being within **half a dozen miles** from Tiruvannamalai, the big hill and temple of which attract the attention of the public so conspicuously?

The boundaries were published in Fort St. George gaz

16. Even when in pursuance of the orders of Government contained in G. O. No 377M d 5-3-96 it was notified in the middle of March 1896, that Tiruvannamalai would be constituted a Municipality, the petitioners could not even dream (of course no one could dream under the circumstances of these lands and the terms of the notice) that our dry and wet fields 5 to 3 miles far away from the remotest boundary line would be included in the Municipal limits. Otherwise the petitioners would have put in their protest before the Government sanctioned the proposal.

17. It was only when a demand was made on the petitioners for land tax and it was only when their plough bullocks, the main agricultural stock (exempted generally from all sorts of legislative responsibility,) were being taxed—it was only when they came to be harassed in all sorts of ways in the actual *modus operandi* of the Act that their eyes were opened and that they came to know for the first time in their life that the Municipal Act, intended by the legislators to be applicable to human dwellings is capable of being strained to be a Revision of Revenue of assessment of lands in spite of the notification of the Government that the last Revenue Settlement was permanent for 30 years at least.

True

18. Except that the Municipal Servants harass the petitioners for money there is not the least patent sign to show that their lands have actually been included in the Municipal limits. For the **Toll gate** which of course **marks in the eye of the law,** the limit of the Municipal Town has been located at a place marked in the plan as T in Red Pencil in Enclosure A: and this location very naturally and properly leads one to believe that theMunicipality extends only to that point on the south or south-west and no further.

19. It is an anomoly to them to conceive how a Municipal Act may be extended and applied to 3, 4 and even 5 miles away from the Tollgate.

---

20. Under these circumstances the petitioners most earnestly pray that your Excellency in Council will kindly be pleased—

(1) to consider as to what necessity exists to treat the Samudram dry and wet lands 5, 4 and 3 miles away from the **nearest house** of Tiruvannamalai a fit thing for Municipal taxation.

(2) to exclude the petitioner's lands from the operation of the Act on the score:

(*a*) that it is a straining and a clear abuse of the Municipal Act to apply it to dry and wet lands, **situated** as **the petitioners' lands are.**

(*b*) that it is **unjust and improper** and highly illegal and inequitable to do?

(*c*) to issue **early orders to stop demanding the additional land tax and harassing them until final orders are passed.**

(*d*) to issue such orders by **wire** at the petitioner's **cost** for which two Rupees worth of Postage stamps are enclosed.

(e) to send Endorsement to the address of Mr. R. Ry R. Padmanabha Rao 3/1 Hanumantaraya Street Triplicane

For this act of justice and favour, the petitioner shall ever be prove greatful by Loyalty etc.

✓ ✓ 11 நெ. [illegible]

✓ ✓ 159 நெ. [illegible]

✓ ✓ 69 நெ [illegible]

✓ ✓ [illegible] 20 நெ [illegible]

✓ ✓ [illegible]

✓ ✓ 30. [illegible]

✓ ✓ 24 - நெ - [illegible]

✓ ✓ 62 நெ - [illegible]

✓ ✓ 44 நெ [illegible]

✓ 187. [illegible]

✓ 52 - [illegible]

✓ 9 நெ - [illegible]

✓ 140 நெ [illegible]

✓ 6 நெ [illegible]

✓ 147 நெ [illegible]

✓ 174 நெ [illegible]

✓ 1 நெ. [illegible]

✓ 129 நெ [illegible]

✓ 9 நெ [illegible]

47 வ பச்சியப்ப ஆசாரி எழுத்து

× 66 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

178 [illegible] கையெழுத்து

60 வது [illegible]

17 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

81. வ. [illegible] வீரசாமி

35 வது [illegible]

102 வது [illegible]

151. குப்புசாமிப்பிள்ளை

184 லச்சுமணநாய்க்கன் கையெழுத்து

173-152 வது [illegible]

55 வது முத்துசெட்டி [illegible] கையெழுத்து

179 வது சோணா[illegible]

78 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

114 [illegible]

165 [illegible]

137 [illegible] கையெழுத்து

118 [illegible] கையெழுத்து

120 [illegible] கையெழுத்து

93 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

119 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

123 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

128 வ

117 வது [illegible] அய்யாசாமி [illegible] கையெழுத்து

128 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

122 வது [illegible]

116 வது [illegible] அருணாசலமுதலியார் கையெழுத்து

135 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

166 வது [illegible] அய்யாசாமி [illegible] கையெழுத்து

171 வது [illegible] கையெழுத்து

Mr Narainasawmy for Puttakudar No 143.

13—57— Venkata Row

27-ம- [illegible] கையெழுத்து

27	Sied Kapher	1. 28	2	98
6	Thandaraya Naicken	2	0	68
3	Nalla Naick & Cuppoo Naick	3	8	39
	Oommar Sahib &c.	6	2	16
0	Jamaul Sahib &c.	7	1	11
71	Meerja Mohomedally Saib	8	3	71
4	Parasarama Mudaliar	330	1	10
5	Venkatachella pillay	145. 245. 185	4	74
6	Arunachella Mudaly	350. 344. 345 336. 296	15	42
7	Ramaswamy poosaly	31	3	76
8	Sembada Ramaswamy	92	7	7
10	Bapoo Sahib	186	1	41
11	Laul Sahib	166	2	67
1	Thandoo Vanatham	138	4	8
13	Venkata Row &c.	42	2	36
17	Chinnapillay &c.	98	4	94
18	Otta Muneyan	247	2	46
22	Para V. Soobban	113. 192	5	45
23	Ramaṇ &c.	107. 309	1	1
24	Peram Muthuswamy Mud.	257. 178. 244	7	14
25	Mathudoo Saib &c.	170	0	94
26	Ramaswamy aiyer	172	0	15
28	Para Raman	116. 136	4	12
29	Sawmy Gureckal	84	1	18
31	Abboyee chettiar	190. 246. 248	3	71
33	Ramaswamy	164	1	88
34	Krishtnaswamy Naick	187	0	61
35	Navitha Aulwar	156. 239	0	57
36	Navitha Latchmanan	191	1	71
38	Valluva Ammeyapandaram	182	1	75
39	Para Vattan	193. 210	1	73
42	Navitha Abboo	189	1	86
43	Musthabah Saib	252. 180. 183. 233	3	94
44	Aiyaswamy chetty	20	1	84
45	Cuppuswamy Naick	248. c	0	96
46	Meerasaib	187. 214. 235.	4	0
47	Pacheyappachary	93. 155	1	12
49	Oonnamoolay	333. 343.	6	75
50	Ramaswamy Aiyer &c.	173	3	93
53	P. Krishtna Aiyer	23	6	22
54	Thoattam Muniswamy Naick	146. 123	3	33
55	Muthuchetty	106. 195	11	81

✓ 168-79ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 72ஆ [illegible] செட்டியார் கையெழுத்து
70ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 111 ஆ [illegible]

✓ [illegible]

✓ 25ஆ. [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 11ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 157 ஆ [illegible] சாமய்யர் கையெழுத்து

✓ 181 ஆ. [illegible]

90 ஆ. [illegible]

✓ 5 ஆ. [illegible]

✓ 48ஆ. [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ — 156. ஆ. [illegible]

✓ 102ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 4 ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 25ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 36. ஆ. [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 134. ஆ. [illegible]

✓ 38ஆ [illegible]

✓ 164ஆ [illegible]

✓ 26ஆ. ராமசாமி ஐயர் கையெழுத்து

✓ 50 ஆ ராமசாமி ஐயர் கையெழுத்து

✓ 188 ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 103. ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து

✓ 105. ஆ [illegible] கையெழுத்து
[illegible] ஐயர் கையெழுத்து

✓ 49ஆ. [illegible]

Address

M. R. Ry

R Padmanabha Raoji

3/1 Hanumanta rayan koil street

Triplicane (madras)

To

The Govt. of Madras,
L. F. and M.
Department.

From Nilakanta Rao &
A few Pattadars of
Samudram Village,
Tiruvannamalai,
South Arcot.

Dated 22nd } October ~~September~~ 1896.
Received 23 }

Enclosures—1 Plan.
& 2. Two Rupees Postage Stamps

ABSTRACT.

1. Samudram is an uninhabited village and has not even a single human dwelling.

2. The **dry and wet** lands of which alone the Revenue Village is made, are situated 5, 4 and 3 miles away from the nearest place in Tiruvannamalai.

3. These lands are taxed for Municipality of Tiruvannamalai, with which he has not got the least connection.

4. Our Revenue assessment is thus raised by 15 per cent.

5. Our plough bullocks are also taxed.

6. We are much harassed.

7. We **do not derive the least benefit by the Municipality.**

8. We pray that our lands be **excluded** from the Municipal limits.

VR
23/10

C.Nos 2864 & 3316 M

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

PR

CURRENT No. 3316 M

C Nos 2864 m & 3316 m

Misc

Order

The petitioners will be informed that the Govt sees no reason to comply with their request.

V.R.
7/1/97

Note — that maps should be tacked on to currents when put in the file — S.H.

Noted VR

Please mark on the map with redchalk the area the petrs wish to be excluded S.H. 11/1.7

Done. The lands which are stated to belong to the signatories to the petition are marked with red pencil dots on the plan, but it is the whole village of Samudram, to which the map relates, that will have to be excluded from the municipality.

To the Petrs with two Rupees ~~worth of~~ postage stamps V.R. 15/1/97

To the Collector of S. Arcot

18/12. Then I want a map showing the relation of the village to the rest of the Mnty. S.H. 15-1-7

6/1

P.T. 16/1

From The Collector of South Arcot

No. 418 of 96.
Secy Expost

Dated 10th December 1896

Received

Registered

Enclosures 2 C. M 2864 M with a plan

Spare copies.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT * LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

DESPATCHED
10 DEC. 96

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the ~~Govt.~~ Petition of Nilakanta Rao and other pattadars of Samudram village, Tiruvannamalai Taluk, South Arcot District, praying for the exclusion of their lands from the Tiruvannamalai Municipal limits.

C.M. Nos. 2864 & 3316.M.

Reference. 56/21/1/97

The Collector of South Arcot is requested to forward a plan of the Tiruvannamalai municipality, showing clearly the relation of the village of Samudram to the rest of the town.

19/1/97

V.R. 18/1/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	1552	L & M	11-4-96
G.O.	677	Do	30-3-96
G.O.	377	Do	5-3-96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

The Collector of South Arcot. ✓

Despd. 21/1/97

Copy & desp. Keep papers together

V.R.

M.S.

V.R. 19/1

21/1

---

4 × 18 / Eng. Sup.

Camp Tiruvannamalai

6th December 1896

No. 247 / English Of 1896

From

Muhammad Raza Khan Esquire

Sub-Collector and Ex-officio Chairman

Tiruvannamalai Municipality.

To

The Collector of

South Arcot.

Sir,

In reply to your endorsement of the 23rd ultimo, Ref. on 418/Eng. Sup. on the petition of Nilakanta Row (who is an acknowledged notorious Budmash of the Tiruvannamalai Cusbah and its surroundings) and other signatories who are ryots of Samudram and were screws in his hands, praying for the exclusion of the Samudram village from the limits of the Municipality, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The Samudram village lies very close to Tiruvannamalai and is uninhabited.

Its

cattle market, the tanks and the wells about these places are duly looked after and guarded from a sanitary point of view. It is with this view of having a proper control over this area that the village of Samadram had been included within the limits of the late Tiruvannamalai Union also.

5. The Municipality derives no large pecuniary benefit at all as the signatories hastily allege. The land-tax which is the only tax to which this village is assessed amounts to only Rs 294; it is barely sufficient to maintain the 3 miles of road enclosing this village on two sides.

6. I beg to refer below to a few mendacious statements and exaggerations contained in the petition

(1) The land-tax is not wholly an additional burden as it does away with the road-cess hitherto levied, the Local Boards Act under which road-cess is imposed being inoperative in areas to which the District Municipalities Act has been extended.

(2)

---

(2) The distances given in paragraph 2(a) of the petition are not 5, 4 and miles. The longest distance is only 2 miles, the scale being 8 inches a mile.

(3) No plough bullocks are kept at all in the Samudram village. In this connection I submit that your suggestion to recommend exemption from taxation the agricultural cattle throughout this Municipality is likely to be carried out at the approaching Budget meeting.

(4) Regarding their allegation that they could not even dream that their lands 5 to 3 miles distant from the remotest boundary line would be included in the Municipal limits, I beg to submit that those allegations are false, the longest distance being only 2 miles as shown above and that due publicity for including the Samadram village also within the Municipality was made by beat of tom tom at the time besides its being published in the Fort St. George and District Gazettes.

cattle market, the banks and the

7. I feel it my duty to submit for your information that in view to throw obstacles by misrepresentations to Government in the way of the quiet working of the Act which we have been doing as you are fully aware, a sum of Rs 1800 having been collected from the ryots of Tiruvannamalai who are generally the land-holders of Samudram by the above-said Nilakanta Row have been paid I understand to Padmanabha Row referred to in para. 20 of the petition under report and to other petty-fogging petition-writers in Madras. This Padmanabha Row is the dismissed sub-divisional Sheristadar of the North Arcot Collectorate whose ostensible means of livelihood is, I am told writing petitions containing false allegations

8. In conclusion, I have only to state that it only looks but just and proper that the villagers should pay for the benefit they enjoy by the Municipality maintaining their roads at a very great cost, that no more than a petty allotment for the road is to be collected of them and that they have no real grievances to be redressed. The petition under report and the plan are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Mo Aza Ullah

Sub Collector and

Ex-Officio Chairman

y

~~418~~ 1896.

From
The Sub Collector and
Ex-Officio Chairman
Tiruvannamalai
Municipality

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
7 DEC 96
SOUTH ARCOT

To
The Collector of
South Arcot.

Dated 6th } December 1896
Despatched 6th }

No. $\frac{247}{\text{Eng}}$ of 96

Enclosures Two.

Reporting on the Government petition of Nilakanta Row and other puttahdars of Samudram village, praying for the exclusion of their lands from the Tiruvannamalai Municipal limits

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 3316 M

Submitted to Government.

The village of Samudram, though it is uninhabited, forms part of the town of Tiruvannamalai for all practical purposes, for the reasons given by the Sub Collector. The petitioners have no real grievance, the land tax not being an addition but only a substitute for the road-cess; and the amount realised from this source is less than the cost of maintenance of the two roads referred to from which petitioners derive benefit. As regards the agricultural cattle my suggestion to exempt them from tax is likely to be adopted by the Council. The village formed part of the late Tiruvanna-malai Union, and the petitioners have not given sufficient reasons why it should now be excluded from the Municipal limits. For the reason given in para 4, Samudram must be included in the Municipality.

Stuart

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

R.

CURRENT No. 1197 M

Order.

From The Collector of South Arcot

No. 32 of 97
Eng: supr

Dated 15th March 1897

Received 17-3-1897

Registered 17-3-1897

Enclosures (one plan)

Spare copies

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
DESPATCHED
17-MAR-1897
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT

Submitting a plan of the Tiruvannamalai Municipality called for in Memo: No: 56 of 21st January 1897

9.16
17/3/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	1552	Local	11-9-96.
G.O.	577	L. M.	30-3-96
G.O.	377	L. M.	5-3-96.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

---

[28]

32/Eng Sup. of 97

Memorandum.

Dated the 21st Jany 1897.
No. 56

Read letter from the Collector of South Arcot № 418/Eng Sup. dated 10th December 1896 submitting report on the petition of Nilakanta Rao and other pattadars of Samudram village praying for the exclusion of their lands from the Tiruvannamalai Municipal limits.

The Collector of South Arcot is requested to forward a plan of the Tiruvannamalai Municipality, showing clearly the relation of the village of Samudram to the rest of the town.

Secretary to Govt.

1/1197 Mis 1847

To

The Collector of South Arcot.

MK

32/1897
Reg. pub

20/S.C.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
SOUTH ARCOT

(To be returned)

Forwarded to the Sub. Colr. & Ex-Officio Chairman of the Tiruvannamalai Municipality who is requested to submit the plan required by Govt. at an early date

Collector

22.1.97

DESPATCHED
22 JAN. 97

Mr. Ranga[illegible] Iyer
Local
[illegible]
28/1/97

F.C.
Local
[illegible]
23/1/97

Forwarded to the municipal chairman Tiruvannamalai for early compliance

26/1/97
Sub Collector

25/1/97

Endorsement No. 125/97.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
Tiruvannamalai 10' March 1897.

FROM Muhammad Razakhan Esquire
Sub Collector and
Ex officio CHAIRMAN, MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
TIRUVANNAMALAI.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
[illegible]
1197 M

To
THE Collector of
South Arcot.

SIR,

Adverting to your endorsement No. 32/Eng dated 22' January 1897 on Memorandum No. 56 of the Local and Municipal Department dated 21st January 1897 herein enclosed I have the honor to forward per book post the plan of this Municipal town showing clearly the relationship of Samudram Village to the rest of the town and to request that the plan may be returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
Sub Collector and
Ex Officio Chairman

10 3/97

C. No. 32 ~~13M~~ → Enc Reply

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE ARCOT

From

THE CHAIRMAN,
Municipal Council,
TIRUVANNAMALAI.

To

THE Collector of
South Arcot

Dated 10th }
Despatched 13th } March 1897.

Cur No. 125 of 1897.
Enc Two
ENCLOSURE. ~~One~~

Subject.

Forwarding plan of this Municipal Town called for in Endorsement dated 22d January 1897.

✓
Submitted to Government with the map

A. [illegible] Stuart.
Collector
15.3.97

Rh
15.3.97

---

en given for copying
hen copied 29/4/97 } 189 .
When examined
When signed 29/4

d again G.O., No. , dated
189

ourrent No.

Enclosures to C. No.

der of Government .. .. .. A A A A A A A

tter of Government.

tatement 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.