[illegible] 1—83,000—15-12-92

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1356	Press Mark
650-57 Dated	30-8-1870.	19

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 450. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th July 1870, No. 4,971 :—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Malabar, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 28th June 1870, No. 240.

I HAVE the honour to report that several complaints have been made to this Office since 1867 by the representatives of two of the branches of the Palghaut Rajah's family, to the effect that their shares of the Malikhana had not been paid by the Rajah for several years. These complaints were at first rejected on the ground that they were not of a nature requiring the interference of officers of Government, but petitions still continued to pour in, and the Collector thought it necessary to direct the Rajah to avoid giving rise to such discontent and to settle the matter amicably.

2. After a prolonged delay and many subsequent communications from the Collector, warning the Rajah that should the disputes be not amicably settled, he would be under the necessity of recommending the division of the Malikhana and payment direct from Government of the shares due to the several branches of the family; the Rajah sent in a reply, stating that the persons who complained against him, defrauded him of a considerable portion of his own property under the pretence of being the Ananthravans or nephews of the former Rajah, and that notwithstanding their faithlessness, he was willing to come to an understanding with them and proposed an interview with them which he said they studiously avoided, [illegible] that their object was nothing else than to harrass and annoy him.

3. The Collector then directed the petitioners to appear before the Rajah and settle their differences, but petitioners again appeared before the Collector and represented that although they went several times to the Rajah's palace, the Karyesthans would not permit them to go into the Rajah's presence. On this the Head Assistant Collector was requested to arrange a meeting between petitioners and the Rajah, and to bring about an amicable adjustment.

4. This officer, after an inquiry instituted through his Tahsildar, reported as follows:—"You will observe that the Tahsildar has failed to effect an amicable "settlement between the parties, and I would have visited them myself for the "purpose, had not the Tahsildar assured me that my doing so would be without "avail, owing to the bodily infirmity and mental obtuseness of the Rajah. I "think the best course to pursue now will be to pay the parties their shares of the "Malikhana direct, and to this the Rajah cannot object, as Mr. Ballard a year ago "informed him it would be the result, should he continue in the line of conduct "he had adopted."

5. The Palghaut Rajah's family comprises twenty-two branches, of this the representatives* of two alone have come forward to complain, a third branch has become extinct.

* Rupees 14,587 is the amount of Malikhana paid to the Rajah in a year.

6. The names of the petitioners are:—

(1.) Keyaka Konikal Edatha Chathu Achen.

(2.) Elayachen Edathil Itticombi Achen.

From an account furnished by the predecessor of the present Rajah, it appears that the shares due to Nos. 1 and 2 are Rupees 170-13-9 and Rupees 517-13-9 respectively per annum. No. 1 states that his share has not been paid him by the Rajah from March 1862, and No. 2 from September 1866. The latter also claims the share due to the extinct family, viz., Rupees 517-13-9, and his right thereto is not disputed either by the Rajah or the other branches of the family.

Called Penmayi Edam.

7. Malikhana being an allowance intended for the maintenance of the family to which it is granted, and the senior member in each case being simply a recipient and a representative, it has always been considered desirable that Government should interfere where the recipient abuses his trust by withholding payment to any of the members entitled to a share. I would request the special attention of the Board to their Proceedings, dated 27th November 1857, No. 4,225, and Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 9th December 1857, No. 1,279.

8. The Palghaut Rajah is in his dotage, and is entirely guided by intriguing agents. It is impossible to bring about a reconciliation between him and the petitioners by mere advice or suggestion. There appears to have been a Civil Suit between him and the petitioners regarding certain family property; and I do not think the Rajah is justified in withholding petitioners' share of the Malikhana as a set-off for debts due to him from them, and for which he has sued them in Court. The Malikhana is a payment made by Government for the maintenance of the family, and should not be allowed to be mixed up with or any way affected by the private disputes of the several members. I would therefore recommend that an order similar to that issued in 1857, in the Extract Minutes of Consultation, above noted, be now passed, empowering me to notify to the family that unless they come to an amicable arrangement among themselves, within a given time, the share of the petitioners will be deducted from the Malikhana and issued separately from the Treasury.

9. Should this Notification fail to produce the desired effect, I trust Government will authorize me to disburse the share due to petitioners direct on their receipts.

SUBMITTED to Government, with the Board's recommendation that the Collector be authorized to issue a Notification as in the parallel case of the Cartenad Rajah, disposed of in Extract Minutes of Consultation, No. 1,279, of the 9th December 1857.

2. The Rajah of Palghaut has persistently refused to give any share of the Malikhana granted for their maintenance to the rest of the family, and it seems to be time to take the course suggested by the Collector.

No. 451. ORDER THEREON, 30th August 1870, No. 1,356.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government regret that the affairs of the Palghaut family should call for their interposition. As, however, the Collector reports that repeated advice has failed in inducing the head of the family to pay his relatives their shares of the Malikhana, the Government authorize the Collector to notify to the Rajah that unless he satisfies the just claims of his family within a stated time (to be fixed by the Collector), the share of each member will be deducted from the Malikhana, and issued separately from the Treasury. The Rajah is not at liberty to stop the allowance due to his relatives on account of private debts without the sanction of Government.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30*th August* 1870.

(True Extract.)

(Sign'd) H. E. STOKES,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant-General.

Erd. F. R. Bantleman.

Revenue Department.

No. 1356

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 30th August 1870.

Read the following. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Submy. letter from Coll. bringing to notice that constant complaints are made by representatives of two branches of the Palghat Rajahs family, that their shares of Malikhana have not been paid by Rajah for several years past.

R. 20 July 1870, No. 4971.

The Govt. regret that the affairs of the Palghaut family should call for their interference. As however, the Collector reports that repeated advice has failed in inducing the head of the family to pay his relatives their shares of the Malikhana

S. D. S.

H. A.

Madras: Printed by Pharoah & Co. Publishers to Government.
Number.—Office of Publication of the Madras Government Gazette, and of the Records of Proceedings of the Government and Boards.
Price 4 annas each. Published and Issued on Tuesday, 30th Aug. 1870.

the Govt. authorize the Collector to notify to the Rajah that unless he satisfies the just claims of his family within a stated time (to be fixed by the Collector) the share of each member will be deducted from the Mali-
-khana and issued separately from the Treasury. The Rajah is not at liberty to stop the allowance due to his relatives on account of private debts.

Vide

- I would add "in the event of the sanction of Govt. if we decide the sentence. The debt were to be left.

In Public Dept Revenue Despatch 7 Letter
6 — Settlements

4-4