M.R.O. 1—38,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1822 Press Mis.

296-97.

Dated 21-11-1870.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st November 1870.

No. 296. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th November 1870, No. 6,541 :—

Read the following letter from the Officiating Collector of Nellore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 20th September 1870.

In Enclosure No. 1 in Statement marked B., prepared by the late General Deputy-Collector, and submitted to this Office with letter, dated 31st December 1864, No. 55, copy of which was submitted to the Board with letter, dated 5th June 1865, No. 118, a sum of Rupees 12-2-5 was entered as the russum or fees collected by the Turrawar Poligar in the village of Penuparti, Rapur Taluq.

2. The correspondence marginally noted took place on the subject of the fees in question.

Board's Procs., No. 5,613, dated 11th Sept 1865.
" " 6,449, " 10th " 1866.
" " 7,573, " 20th Oct. "

3. In letter, dated 22nd July 1870, No. 144, the present Deputy-Collector reports that a part of the above fees, to the extent of Rupees 8, was alienated in favour of one Penuparti Ramanna, Curnum of the village referred to, and recommends that the sum of Rupees 8 may be allowed to him as a life-grant, as in similar cases already sanctioned. Copy of the Deputy-Collector's letter is enclosed, from which it will be seen that the omission to include the amount in the proper statement was the result of an oversight. As Penuparti Ramanna is now upwards of 60 years old, I beg to recommend, under the circumstances stated by the Deputy-Collector, that the sanction of Government may be obtained for the grant of Rupees 8 per annum, as a life-grant, with retrospective effect from the year in which similar grants have been sanctioned.

4. In Enclosure No. 3 in the same Statement marked B., a sum of Rupees 24-3-0 is entered as the amount payable to Duvur Hanumanta Charlu in the Shrotriyam village of Parlapalli in the Gudur Taluq, on account of Chittetiwar russums. A life-grant of Rupees 24-3-0 has accordingly been sanctioned in his name.

5. The Gudur Tahsildar in his Arzi No. 1,089-51, dated 25th December 1869, states that the said Duvur Hanumanta Charlu died on the 1st May 1868.

6. The Shrotriyam is confirmed by the Inam Department under Title-deed, No. 1,308, to four persons named below, and eleven alienees :—

1. Duvur Venkatahanumanta Charlu.
2. Hanumanta Charlu (deceased.)
3. Narasamma.
4. Rama Charlu.

7. The 1st, 3rd, and 4th persons, as well as the widow of the 2nd, laid claim to the life-grant, alleging that they were all entitled to the life-grant.

8. The Tahsildar states that the russum in question was enjoyed by all the Shrotriyamdars, and that the name of only one of them who had been managing the village, having been entered in the accounts prepared at the time, the life-grant happened to be entered in his name alone.

9. As all the Shrotriyamdars seem entitled to the grant, I beg to recommend that it may be sanctioned accordingly.

10. I am not of opinion that the name of the widow of the deceased should be entered as a sharer, as such a course would be contrary to the terms of what was avowedly a life-grant.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From the Deputy-Collector of Naidupett, to the Officiating Collector of Nellore, dated 22nd July 1870, No. 144.

IN docket No. 2,406 of 30th July 1868, addressed to Mr. Knox, when in charge of this office, certain information was called for in respect to the resumed russums (fees) of the Turra Poligar in Rapur Taluq, claimed by Penuparti Ramanna, Curnum of Penuparti. In calling for this information, Mr. Boswell requested that definite proposals should be submitted as regards the claim advanced.

2. As the correspondence on this subject appears to have been going on from the year 1867, I beg to submit a brief report of the whole case from the commencement

3. In the year 1864, the Government have resumed the russums (fees) collected by certain Poligars in this district. The amount thus resumed from the Turra Poligar was Rupees 12-2-5, according to the accounts rendered by the late Deputy-Collector Toolasinga Moodelliar to your Office.

4. On the 7th December 1867, Penuparti Ramanna presented a petition to the Collector, stating that out of the resumed russums of Turra Poligar, 8 Rupees were due to him, being the allowance transferred to him about forty years ago by a deed of gift by Poligar Ramanna, and continued to him by his successors up to Fasli 1273 when they were resumed by Government, and requested its continuance to him and the payment of the arrears.

5. This petition was endorsed to the Tahsildar of Rapur for report. In his Arzi, No. 214, of 25th May 1868, the Tahsildar reported that the claim made by petitioner was valid, that his deed of gift was destroyed by fire, and that the Gumasta of the existing female Poligar admitted the claim advanced by petitioner, and in support of it forwarded an account (herewith sent) said to have been filed in Fasli 1273. This account is a Statement showing the fees realized by the Poligar in the village of Penuparti for Fasli 1269 to 1273. In column 6 of this Statement, it is stated that 2 Pagodas (8 Rupees) were paid every year to Penuparti Ramanna from the Mirassi fees. But in the account sent to the Huzur by the Tahsildar in December 1864, this information was not given.

6. On the receipt of this Arzi, the Tahsildar was called upon to explain by whose negligence this information was omitted in the accounts sent to this office. In reply, the Tahsildar in his Arzi, dated 8th June 1868, No. 256, reported that, as the information was given in the shape of a remark in column 6 of the Statement, it escaped notice. The late Deputy-Collector then reported the whole matter to the Collector in his No. 80 of 3rd July 1868. It was in reply to this that the docket quoted in the opening paragraph of this letter was received.

7. In that docket, attention was drawn to the fact of the Statement found in the Taluq records not bearing the signature of any competent authorities, and the institution of further inquiry ordered as to the genuineness of the document, and whether it was filed in the taluq by the Curnum at the time of the first inquiry, and if so, why the information therein given was not shown in the statement prepared by the Taluq authorities.

8. In obedience to an order sent upon this reference, the Tahsildar instituted a further inquiry into the matter. He inquired of petitioner Ramanna and Patoor Tikkama whose signatures the statement bears. They both admitted their signatures, and stated that the statement was filed in Fasli 1273. The Tahsildar further inquired the present female Poligar's brother, Sunkati Narasimha Naidu, who looks after her affairs, and he bears evidence to the petitioner having enjoyed the 8 Rupees in question up to the date of attachment by Government. In a further Arzi, dated 23rd May 1869, No. 84, the Tahsildar reported that the resumed Turra Poligar's fees, amounting to Rupees 12-2-5, as well as the Kavilgar fees, viz., Rupees 4-1-3 (the amount shown in the Vernacular Statement) are being collected annually from Fasli 1275, ratably on the beriz of the village from every ryot.

Arzi, dated 15th December 1869, No. 645.

9. I have myself examined the accounts now in the Taluq record. Most of the statements filed by the Curnums during the inquiry in Fasli 1273 do not bear either the initials or the signatures

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st November 1870.

of any competent authorities, or the date of receipt of the Taluq. As a specimen, I have herewith sent two more statements of the same description for the villages of Palur and Doggoonta. This inspection will show that there is nothing suspicious or exceptional about the Penuparti Statement.

10. It was clearly an oversight in the taluq that the amount claimed by petitioner was not separately shown in the Statement prepared in the taluq, and the mistake arose from the fact of the amount in question having been entered in column 6 of the Village Statement which was intended for the *names* of the grantees. Under these circumstances, I have the honour to recommend that the allowance of the 8 Rupees in question be continued to petitioner, who is now about 60 or 65 years of age, for his life, as was done in the case of the other grantees from Poligars, and the arrears paid to him from Fasli 1275.

11. The enclosures of the docket under reply and the Arzies subsequently received from the Tahsildar are enclosed for reference as per accompanying list.

SUBMITTED for the favourable consideration of Government, with the Board's recommendation that the arrangements proposed by the Collector may be sanctioned.

2. The Curnum of Penuparti is clearly entitled to the grant of 8 Rupees per annum, and there seems no reason to doubt but that all the Shrotriyamdars had an equal claim to the allowance specified in paragraph 4.

No. 297. ORDER THEREON, 21st November 1870, No. 1,822.

Miscellaneous.

THE Acting Collector's proposals are sanctioned as recommended by the Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

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

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 3561

Rev. 1870. Dept 4

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 8TH NOVEMBER 1870, No. 6,541.

Dep.s to Harpe Encl.

Received 16

NOVEMBER.

No. 6,541.

Russums.—Recommendation to Government that Rupees 8 may be allowed to P. Ramanna, Curnum of Penubarti, as a life grant, out of resumed Russums or fees of Turrawar Poligar, and that allowance enjoyed by deceased Duvur Hanumantacharlu on account of Chilletiwar Russums, may be continued to certain parties.

Ag 1822 - 21 Nov 1870

Ld 17 Nov 70 Ry