28.3.55 D2

M.R.O. 1—77,000—8-6

(1) Number of pages________

(2) Date of repair________

(3) Initials of the Referencer ________

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 165 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 23-2 1888.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

23rd February 1888, No. 165, Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following G.O., dated 4th July 1887, Mis. No. 3811, Revenue :—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st February 1887, No. 170 :—

Read—the following letter from R. SEWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 13th December 1886, No. 2929 :—

I have the honor to state that, on the death in 1880 of Malrazu Venkata Kondalrao, his pension, viz., Rs. 800 per mensem, was sanctioned in the name of his adopted son Venkata Narasimha Row, a minor, but ordered to be paid to his mother during his minority (see G.O., No. 1202, dated 20th September 1880, passed on Board's Proceedings, No. 1158, of 13th August 1880).

2. The allowance was accordingly paid to the mother up to end of July last.

3. Venkata Narasimha Row requests that the allowance may be paid to him from August last as he has attained majority.

The mother objects to this, on the ground that because Venkata Narasimha Row was put under her guardianship by the Revenue Board, he should be considered a minor till he completes his 21st year of age according to the Majority Act IX of 1875; and that on a similar occasion when her father-in-law claimed the renewal of his adoptive mother's pension in his name during her lifetime, Government refused to comply with his request.

This has no bearing on the present question, inasmuch as the pension (in the case cited by her) was originally sanctioned in the name of the adoptive *mother*, but not in the name of the *son*.

As to age, the mother and the son admit that the 21st year will be completed by April 1887.

Venkata Narasimha Row is not under the Court of Wards, and therefore attained majority in April 1884.

4. I had a personal conversation with him, in the course of which he made bitter complaints to me against his mother, and I feel pretty certain that he will do nothing for the support of his mother if the whole pension is ordered to be paid to him. He has been lately married, and the mother complains that since then he has not been obedient to her.

The mother requests, therefore, that sufficient allowance be made to her out of the pension; and I believe this to be necessary; otherwise she will get nothing.

5. To fix the amount, I take the Vasireddi case as a precedent, where a provision of Rs. 300 out of Rs. 1,000 was made to the mother when the allowance was ordered to be paid to the son (see Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 25th April 1877, No. 1894). At this rate, in the present case, Rs. 240 should be separately paid to the mother, and I request that this may be sanctioned. Since August all the pension has remained unpaid. Venkata Narasimha Row consents by his vakil to receive now from August last Rs. 560 a-month out of the pension, allowing Rs. 240 to be deposited in the cutcherry on behalf of his mother agreeably to my decision, and to have the matter finally adjusted on receipt of Board's orders in the case.

6. I have therefore directed that Rs. 560 should be paid to Venkata Narasimha Row from August last and the rest kept in deposit. I hope that this will receive the approval of the Board.

Telegram from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 7th January 1887.

Abstract.—Praying for postponement of orders on Collector's letter of 13th December last in the matter of the pension enjoyed by him, pending receipt of his petition to Board.

Telegram from RAJA MALRAZU LAKSHMI VENKAYAMMA ROW, Zemindarni of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 4th January 1887.

Abstract.—Requesting to defer passing orders on the Collector's report regarding the allowance of Malrazu family until receipt of her petition to Board.

From RAJA MALRAZU LAKSHMI VENKAYAMMA ROW, Zemindarni of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 7th January 1887.

Abstract.—Praying for orders either to pay her her monthly allowance of Rs. 800 until her adopted son, who is yet a minor, comes of age, or to pay her Rs. 500 a-month out of the allowance, if it be thought inexpedient to pay her the whole allowance.

From RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 8th January 1887.

Abstract.—Praying that his mother may be ordered either to live with him or receive a monthly allowance of Rs. 100.

Resolution—dated 1st February 1887, No. 170.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In G.O., dated 20th September 1880, No. 1202, Government sanctioned the continuance of a pension of Rs. 800 a-month to one Malrazu Venkata Narasimha Row, a minor, and this sum has since been paid, during Venkata Narasimha Row's minority, to his mother.

3. The minority has now ceased and Venkata Narasimha Row asks to be allowed to draw his pension himself; this the Collector has permitted.

4. In reporting the fact, however, to the Board, the Collector points out that Venkata Narasimha Row and his mother—an adoptive mother only—are on bad terms with each other, and that the mother in the new arrangement is likely to receive no maintenance at all.

5. The Collector therefore recommends that from the pension of Rs. 800 a-month, sanctioned for the son, a sum of Rs. 240 a-month should be deducted and paid direct to the mother; this arrangement, except that for Rs. 240 he proposes Rs. 100, the son agrees to.

6. The Board think that a deduction of Rs. 200 a-month for the mother would be fair, and this arrangement they submit for the sanction of Government.

7. The son's and mother's counterpetitions are enclosed.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with three petitions and enclosures with enclosures in
Petition Register Nos. 1, 2, 198 and 257.
Copy to the Collector of the Kistna District.

Read—Telegram from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Masulipatam, Kistna district, dated 23rd February 1887.

Abstract.—Appealing against Board's recommendation to grant Rs. 200 as allowance to his widowed mother.

Read—Telegram from MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR of Narsaraopet taluk, Kistna district, dated 1st March 1887.

Abstract.—Regarding his offer of Rs. 100 to his mother as allowance.

Read—Petition from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar, Kistna district, dated 1st March 1887.

Abstract.—Praying that his offer to allow Rs. 100 to his mother may be accepted.

Read—Petition from RAJA MALRAZU LAKSHMI VENKAYAMMA ROW, Kistna district, dated 23rd March 1887.

Abstract.—Praying to be granted an allowance of Rs. 500 or 400.

Read—Telegram from RAJA MALRAZU LAKSHMI VENKAYAMMA ROW, Zemindarni of Narsaraopet taluk, Kistna district, dated 28th March 1887.

Abstract.—Praying for postponement of orders for allowance pending her petition.

Read—Petition from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 14th April 1887.

Abstract.—Praying that his mother may receive a pension not exceeding Rs. 100.

Read—Petition from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna, dated 2nd May 1887.

Abstract.—Praying that his mother's allowance may not exceed Rs. 100.

Read—Endorsement from the Private Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, dated 6th May 1887.

Abstract.—Transferring a petition from Raja Malrazu Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, praying that a portion of the subsistence allowance paid to her adopted son may be granted her.

Read—Telegram from SRI RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar, Kistna district, dated 8th May 1887.

Abstract.—Praying to wire final orders regarding his mother's allowance.

Read—Petition from RAJA MALRAZU VENKAYAMMA ROW GARU, Kistna district, dated 15th June 1887.

Abstract.—Submitting certain information in continuation of her previous petition praying for the grant of a monthly allowance.

Order—dated 4th July 1887, Mis. No. 3811, Revenue.

Before passing final orders in this matter, Government are of opinion that further inquiry should be made. The Collector has not explained why he has taken the

Vasireddi case as a precedent or how far its circumstances are similar to that at present under consideration. But it is alleged by both the mother and the son that the two cases are not parallel, and they have also preferred sundry allegations, the former to show that the amount recommended for her maintenance is too small, and the latter to prove that it is too liberal. As Government have no means of verifying their statements, the Collector should be directed to consider them and to, after doing so, state what he thinks would be a fair and proper allowance to make to Lakshmi Venkayamma Row. In determining this point, he should take into consideration the wealth and social status of the family, the wants of a person in the position and rank of life of Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, the number of relatives or dependents she has to maintain, and any other circumstances likely to influence the decision as to the amount of her maintenance one way or another, such as the mode in which she managed the property during her son's minority, and so forth.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue,
with nineteen enclosures.

READ—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 7th January 1888, Mis. No. 55 :—

J. H. GARSTIN, ESQ., C.S.I.

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. R. SURIA ROW NAIDU GARU, General Deputy Collector, Kistna, to the Collector of Kistna, dated Vinukonda, 19th November 1887, No. 1039 :—

Referring to your office letter No. 4004, of the 12th August 1887, I have the honor to state that neither Malrazu Venkata Narasimha Row, the ex-Zemindar of Narsaraopet, nor his mother Lakshmi Venkayamma Row is in this district. The former is at Ellore, Godávari district, and the latter at Pedapamidi, Nellore district.

2. Though the Malrazu family possesses no zemindari now, it is held in great esteem in this part of the country. It is connected with many a zemindari family of the Velama caste. Venkata Narasimha Row married the daughter of Raja Rangayya Appa Row of Núzvíd, who is closely related to the Mylavaram and Sanivarapet Zemindars. Lakshmi Venkayamma Row's step-daughter is the widow of a brother of Rangayya Appa Row. Lakshmi Venkayamma Row herself descended from one of the noble families of the Nellore district. She is the sister of Raja Bhoopala Bhalerow, the Zemindar of Pedapamidi. Her younger sister married a close relation of the Zemindar of Kálahastri in the North Arcot district.

3. The Malraz family is not in a prosperous state now. It has an empty coffer. The jewellery has been almost disposed of. I do not think the family possesses more than Rs. 15,000 worth of jewels. The mansion house at Narsaraopet is out of order. The family holds some mango gardens, inam and patta lands, which yield about Rs. 2,400 a year. The representative of the family is the dharmakarta or trustee of the celebrated Siva temple at Kotappakonda. He gets on an average a net income of Rs. 8,000 per annum by the temple. The allowance granted by Government for the maintenance of the family amounts to Rs. 9,600 a year.

4. Venkata Narasimha Row himself admits in his plaint (Original Suit No. 11 of 1887) which he filed against his mother and uncles in the District Court, Kistna, that the annual income is Rs. 20,000. His mother contends that, besides this amount, the temple at Arepalli in the Répalle taluk yields Rs. 500 or 600 a year. B. Seshayya, one of Venkata Narasimha Row's gumastas, says that the temple yields only Rs. 200. Venkata Narasimha Row's vakil says that the income does not exceed Rs. 71. The total income of the family may, in my opinion, be safely taken at Rs. 20,000 per annum.

5. It appears from the report received from the Tahsildar of Kandukúr, Nellore district, through the Sub-Collector, Ongole, that Lakshmi Venkayamma Row maintains a vakil on Rs. 12, a gumasta on Rs. 8, a reciter of religious books on Rs. 12, a native physician on Rs. 8 per mensem, besides 32 male and 16 female servants. She also supports one of her relations at a monthly cost of Rs. 19-8-0. The total cost of her establishment comes to Rs. 220 per month. The inquiries made by the Tahsildar of Narsaraopet show that the Kandukúr Tahsildar's report is pretty correct. I need not say that the establishment is unnecessarily large. But it must be observed that, until recently, Lakshmi Venkayamma Row was virtually the head of the family, her son being a minor. I think the following establishment is quite sufficient for one in her position and rank :—

	Per mensem. RS.	A.	P.
A male relative on	20	0	0
A gumasta on	15	0	0
A physician on	8	0	0
A reciter of religions books	7	0	0
10 male servants on Rs. 4 each	40	0	0
10 female servants on Rs. 3 each	30	0	0
Total ...	120	0	0 per mensem.

6. Venkata Narasimha Row also maintains a large establishment at a monthly cost of Rs. 316, the number of servants employed being 117. I think he must also reduce his establishment. The petitions presented to Government by both Venkata Narasimha Row and Lakshmi Venkayamma Row will show that there is bitter ill-feeling between the mother and the son. There is no probability of their ever coming to an agreement. Lakshmi Venkayamma Row wants Rs. 400 or 500 for her maintenance out of the monthly allowance of Rs. 800 granted by Government, and Venkata Narasimha Row offers Rs. 100. The latter is no doubt a representative of the family, but the former, as the widow of the late zem[illegible]r and senior member of the family, also holds an important position and is look[illegible] to in this country both by her relatives and the people. Venkata Narasimha Ro[illegible] chief reason for declining to pay her more than Rs. 100 is that she is a widow. But it is greatly to be regretted that he has lost sight of the fact that he owes his present position and rank to this widow and her late husband, by whom he was adopted. Rs. 300 a month is, in my opinion, none too much for the maintenance of Lakshmi Venkayamma Row.

7. I do not think this case is parallel to that of Venkata Lakshmama of the Vasireddi family. The will of this lady, which was [illegible]istered in the office of the Registrar of Kistna, shows that she possessed Rs. 70,000 or Rs. 80,000 worth of Sreedhanam or separate property, whereas Lakshmi Venkayamma Row possesses no property worth speaking of. So far as I am aware the Vasireddi family does not possess any temples which yield a large revenue like the Kotappakonda temple. In the case of the Malraz family the pension was originally granted to a lady.

8. Venkata Narasimha Row complains that his mother and uncles ill-treated him, that they mismanaged his property during his minority, leaving a debt of Rs. 8,000 for him to clear, and that his uncles set his mother against him. He himself admits in one of his petitions that he cannot tell how the Government grant was spent by them during his minority. The evidence of his vakil and gumastas shows that a sum of Rs. 8,000 was borrowed for his marriage, out of which Rs. 6,000 was repaid. Some Rs. 14,000 was expended for the marriage. The gumastas cannot say what property was taken away by Lakshmi Venkayamma Row. They heard that she took some jewels. The vakil says that she took away jewels worth Rs. 1,00,000, but that he cannot give the details. From what I hear, the family jewellery has been almost sold. I do not think that she took away any of the family jewels with her. The vakil and gumastas of Venkata Narasimha Row say that Lakshmi Venkayamma Row's brothers used to pay occasionally 400 or 500 rupees to their debtors out of the income of the Malraz family. The shroff's evidence shows that they also brought some money occasionally from their estate for spending the same on account of Venkata Narasimha

Row. It must be observed here that the brothers of Lakshmi Venkayamma Row possess a landed estate in the Nellore district yielding some Rs. 14,000 a year, besides other property. I cannot believe that they misappropriated any of Venkata Narasimha Row's property. The matter is now before the District Court.

9. Lakshmi Venkayamma Row complains that her son has ill-treated her since his marriage, at the instigation of his father-in-law. But I know for a fact that the misunderstanding between Lakshmi Venkayamma Row and her son arose nearly a year before the marriage took place. It was in a great measure due to the evil counsels of their dependents. I think both parties are to blame in this matter. Venkata Narasimha Row was not liberally treated during his minority, and his natural brother and sister, who depended on him, were not cared for. This no doubt gave rise to some heartburning on his part. But on the other hand he behaved very badly towards his mother after his marriage. He opened in her absence the rooms in which the family property was deposited and took possession of the same without her permission.

10. I herewith submit the reports received from the Tahsildars of Narsaraopet and Kandukúr and further return the papers received with your letter under reference.

Endorsement by the Collector of the Kistna District, dated Masulipatam, 2nd December 1887, No. 6204.

Forwarded to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with reference to their Proceedings, No. 2146,* dated 26th July 1887. From the Deputy Collector's report it appears that Venkata Narasimha Row has a total income of about Rs. 20,000 per annum. His adoptive mother, Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, occupies a position of social importance and maintains a position in accordance with the traditions of the family. The Deputy Collector is disposed to recommend an allowance to the mother of Rs. 300 a-month which is more than the Board or Mr. Sewell r[illegible]mmended. I think that the sum named by Mr. Sewell, viz., Rs. 240 a-month, is s[illegible]ent, and this sum has been retained monthly in the treasury since Venkata Narasimha Row came of age in August 1886, as explained by Mr. Sewell, and it is available for delivery to the mother. The son, however, has not drawn his pension since January last.

* Communicating G.O., dated 4th July 1887, Mis. No. 3811.

Resolution—dated 7th January 1888, Mis. No. 55.

Submitted to Government with reference to G.O., dated 4th July 1887, No. 3811.

2. Without going so far as to say that there is any parallel between the present case and that of the Vasireddi pension, the Board are now inclined to think that Rs. 240 would be sufficient for the widow, that being the amount recommended by the present Collector as well as by his predecessor.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. S. BENSON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with Collector's report and its twenty-two enclosures.
Copy to the Collector of Kistna.

Read—also telegram from RAJA MALRAZU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW BAHADUR, Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 4th February 1888.

Abstract.—Praying that an allowance, not exceeding Rs. 100, be paid to his mother.

Read—also telegram from LAKSHMI VENKAYAMMA ROW, Zemindarni, Narsaraopet, Kistna district, dated 15th February 1888.

Abstract.—Praying for early orders on her petition.

Order—dated 23rd February 1888, No. 165, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Government accept the Board's recommendation and accordingly direct that an allowance of Rs. 240 a-month be separately paid to Malrazu Lakshmi Venkayamma Row for her life or until further orders.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
,, the Petitioners (Order only).
,, the Accountant-General.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.

50 Copies.

Original

Govt. of (1888) Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 23rd February 1888, No. 165.

FEBRUARY.

Ex-Zemindar of Narsaraopet, Kistna District.

Board's recommendation that out of the pension of Rs. 800 drawn by the —, Rs. 240 be separately paid to his adoptive mother, Malrazu Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, accepted, and orders passed accordingly.

T—14.

Class P

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No. 34

Station Nungumbaukum

From Station Ellore

GOVT. ... REVENUE DEPARTMENT 6 FEB

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.
32	4	13	36	Two addrs

To (Person) The Chief Secretary to Govt

From (Person) Rajah malrajee Venkata narasimha rao Bahadur Zamindar of narsaraowpetta

I beg to inform your excellency that I have ex-zamindar of narsaraopetta Kistna district enjoying monthly allowance of rs 800 my mother luckshimi vencayamma row has been claiming seperate maintenance from

Recd. from

At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

NUNGUMBAUKUM FEB 5 W

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

Class

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

Station

From Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

II

my allowance and
amount to be
given to her
is now under
your excellencys consideration
reports Submitted by
Collector and board
on recent enquiry
under your excellencys
orders are also
in your council
allowances granted by
government and judicial
authorities to widows

Recd. from L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB 5

Class	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.	Monthly Local No.	13
Station		From Station	

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

III

in nuzvid repalley
challapally and kamadana
Zamindary families show
that my mother
is not entitled
to more than
rs 50 a
month there are
other instances to
support the above
statement income of
temples leaves little
or no balance
after expenditure and

Recd. from N. At Hrs. Ms. By

Sent to L. N. At Hrs. Mts. By

Date Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB 5

Class	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.	Monthly Local No.

To	From
Station	Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)	From (Person)

even what remains must be Spent for repairs of temples I cannot appropriate it nor can my mother claim allowance from it her monthly expenditure is nearly rs 50 and accounts produced by her are incorrect I being male member of my

Recd. from	L. N.	Sent to	L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By		At Hrs. Mts. By	

Date

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM
W
FEB 5

Board's recommendation that out o

Kistna District.

Board's recommendation that out

Class

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

Station

From Station , 17

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

family have to bear expenses of relatives charities etc to keep up family dignity She can live comfortably with four female Servants while my allowance is hardly sufficient for the above expenses and also for my own and my wifes establishments I

Recd. from L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB. 5.

Class	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.	Monthly Local No.

Station

From Station 19

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

1 am however willing
2 to give her
3 a liberal Sum
4 of rs 100
5 per month after
6 my fathers death
7 She contracted debts
8 by evil advice
9 of her brothers
10 which I have
11 not yet been
12 able to discharge
13 and She also
14 misappropriated the allowance

Recd. from L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Date Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM FEB. 5 W

oard's recommendation that

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

Class

To

Station

Words. | Day. | Hour. | Minute.

From

Station

4

Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

money and the whole of my ancestral property worth Some lackh which had been in my family for Several generations I have filed Suit against my mother And her Brothers I therefore beg your excellency to peruse this telegram And the petitions

Recd. from L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB 5

To

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No

Station

Words. | Day. | Hour. | Minute.

From

Station

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTION.

To (Person)

From (Person)

I Submitted on 5th march 27th april 2nd may 1887 and order Suballowance not exceeding rs 100 to be paid by me to my mother ×

NUNGUMBAUKUM
W
FEB. 5.

RECD. FROM

L. N.

AT Hrs. Mts. By

Date

SENT TO

L. N.

AT Hrs. Mts. By

Sub Postmaster.

T—14.

Class V

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No. 34

To Station Nungumbaukum

From Station Ellore

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.
329/7	11	13	36	Two adars

To (Person)
The Revenue
Secretary to
Government

From (Person)
Rajah Malraju
Venkata narain
rao Bahadur
Zamindar
of narsarowpeta

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
6 FEB 28
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

I beg to inform your
excellency that I have
ex-zamindar of narsaraopetta
Kistna district enjoying
monthly allowance of
Rs 800 my mother
Lukshimi Venkayamma
now has been claiming
separate maintenance from

RECD. FROM L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By

SENT TO L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By

NUNGUMBAUKUM
W
FEB 5.

Date

Postmaster.

Class

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

To

Station

From

Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

II

my allowance and amount to be given to her is now under your excellencys consideration reports Submitted by collector and board on recent enquiry under your excellencys orders are also in your council allowances granted by government and judicial authorities to widows

Recd. from L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB 5

recommendation tha
sion of Rs. 800 drawn by th
separately paid to his adopti

T—14.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

ss

To

Station

Words. | Day. | Hour. | Minute.

To (Person)

Monthly Local No.

From

Station a 9

Official Instruction.

From (Person)

III

~~in nuvid repalley~~ challapally and kamabana Zamindary families show that my mother is not entitled to more than rs 50 a month there are other instances to support the above statement income of temples leaves little or no Balance after expenditure and

Recd. from

At Hrs.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W. L. FEB 5

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

mmendation tha
sion of Rs. 800 drawn by th
separately paid to his adoptive
Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, acc

Class

To

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No

Station

From

Words.

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Station

Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

even what remains must be spent for repairs of temples I cannot appropriate it nor can my mother claim allowance from it her monthly expenditure is nearly rs 50 and accounts produced by her are incorrect I being male member of my

Recd. from

At Hrs. Mts. By L. N.

Date

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAKKUM W FEB 6.

mmendation tha
of Rs. 800 drawn by th
separately paid to his adoptiv
Lakshmi Venkayamma Row, acc
passed accordingly.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH. Monthly Local No.

Class

To

Station

Words. Day. Hour. Minute.

To (Person)

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

From

Station .37

Official Instruction.

From (Person)

family have to
bear expenses of
relatives charities etc
to keep up
family dignity She
can live comfortably
with four female
servants while my
allowance is hardly
sufficient for the
above expenses and
also for my
own and my
wifes establishments I.

Recd. from

At Hrs. Mts. By L. N.

Date

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB. 5.

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

Class

To

Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.

To (Person)

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

From

Station . 5

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTION.

From (Person)

am however willing
to give her
a liberal sum
of rs 100
per month after
my fathers death
She contracted debts
by evil advice
of her brothers
which I have
not yet been
able to discharge
and she also
misappropriated the allowance

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB. 5.

RECD. FROM L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By
Date

SENT TO L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

Class

No.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

Station

From Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

money and the whole of my Ancestral property worth Some lackh which had been in my family for Several generations I have filed Suit against my mother And her Brothers I therefore beg your excellency to peruse this telegram And the petitions

Recd. From L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.

At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Postmaster.

NUNGUMBAUKUM W FEB 5

Class

To

Station

Words.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

Day. | Hour. | Minute.

From

Station

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTION.

To (Person)

From (Person)

I Submitted on 5th March 27th April 2nd May 1887 and order Suballowance not exceeding rs 100 to be paid by me to my mother ×

NUNGUMBAUKUM
W
FEB. 5.

RECD. FROM L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By

SENT TO L. N.
AT Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Postmaster.
Sub

GRAPH. Local No. 236

To Station: Fort St George

From (Station): Sowcarpet

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.
31/4	15	8	50

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

To (Person)
Secretary to
Govt Revenue
Dept

From (Person)
Lutchmi
Venkayamal
Zahmindar
Narasaraopet
Kistna District
Madras

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
15 FEB 88
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Petition submitted on 26 March 87 Petitioner suffers for want of allowance Prays for early disposal

RECD. FROM	L. N.	SENT TO	L. N.
At Hrs. Mts., By		At Hrs. Mts., By	

Date

MADRAS FORT 15 2 8

Telegraph Master.

18-11

27.9.47"

(180.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 1189

Tel.
From Lutchmi Venkayam
Rao, Zemindarni
Narsaraopet,
Kistna Dt.
(address within)

2 2

Dated 15 Feb.
Received 15 Feb.
Enclosures –

No. –

SUBJECT.
Praying for early
Orders on her Pet.

12

Class. P	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.		Local No. 74

To (Station) Mount Road

From (Station) Ellore

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTION. 6 FEB 88 REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute
329/27	4	13	36

To (Person)
His Excellency the
Right Honorable the
Governor in Council

From (Person)
Rajah Malraju
Venkata Narasimha
Rao Bahadur
Zemindar of
Narsaraopetta

I beg to inform your Excellency that I have "ex-Zamindar" of Narsaraopett Kistna district Enjoying monthly allowance of rs 800 my mother Lukshmi Venkayamma row has been claiming seperate maintenance from my allowance and amount to be given to her is now under your Excellencys ~~under~~ consideration reports submitted by Collector and board on

Recd. from L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Telegraph M

MOUNT ROAD 5-2-88

1 47

Class. | INDIAN TELEGRAPH. | Local No.

To (Station)

From (Station)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

Recent enquiry under your Excellencys orders are also in your council allowances granted by Government and judicial authorities to widows in nuzvid repalley Challapally and Kamadana zamindary families show that my mother is not entitled to more than rs 50 a month there are other instances to support the above. Statement income of temples leaves little or

Recd. from L. N. At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N. At Hrs. Mts. By

Date MOUNT ROAD 5-2-88 Telegraph Master

B. Eel. C.P.G.I.S.P.—P—No. 4001—14,600,000—20-12-84.

49

Class.	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.	Local No.

To (Station)	From (Station)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute	Official Instruction.
				1

To (Person)	From (Person)

1 not balance after expenditure
2 and even what remains must
3 be spent for repairs of.
4 temples I cannot appropriate
5 it nor can my mother claim
6 allowance from it her monthly
7 expenditure is nearly rs 50
8 and accounts produced by
9 her are incorrect I being
10 male member: of my family
11 have to bear expenses of
12 relatives charities etc to
13 keep up family dignity she

Recd. from N. Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. Pg At Hrs. Mts. By

Date

Telegraph Ma ste.

B. Ellis C P G I S F—S P—No. 1001—14,000,000—20-12-84.

MOUNT ROAD 5-2-88

Class.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

53

Local No.

To (Station)

From (Station)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute

Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

She also misappropriated the allowance money and the whole of my ancestral property worth some lacks which had been in my family for several generations I have filed suit against my mother and her brothers I therefore beg your Excellency to peruse this telegram and the petitions I submitted on 5th march 27th april 2nd may 1887 and order

Recd. from L. N. At Hrs. Mts., By

Sent to L. N. At Hrs. Mts., By

Date

Telegraph Master.

B. XIII. C P G I S P—S P—No. 1001—14,000,000—[illegible] 12-84.

MOUNT ROAD 5-2-88

Class.	INDIAN TELEGRAPH 55	Local No.

To (Station)

From (Station)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute

Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

suballowance not exceeding
rs 100 to be paid by
me to my mother.

Recd. from L. N.
At Hrs. Mts., By

Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts., By

Date

Telegraph Master

B. Ellis, C P G I S F—8 P—No. 4001—14,000,000—20-12-84.

MOUNT ROAD 5-2-88

(1888.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 934

Tel.

From Rajah Malraju Venkata Narasimha Rao Bahadur Zamindar of Narsaraopett ~~Kist~~ Kistna Dt.

2 3.

Dated 4 } Feb
Received 6 }
Enclosures ..

No. ..

SUBJECT.

Praying that an allowance not exceeding Rs 100 be paid to his mother.

12

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

59 | Local No. 08094

Class. D	
To (Station) Fort St. George	From (Station) Masulipat

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute	Official Instruction.
60/6	23.	17.	35	

CHIEF SECRETARY MADRAS 24 FEB 87

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 24 FEB 87 REVENUE DEPARTMENT

To (Person) Chief Secretary Government.

From (Person) Raja Malraju Venkata Narasimharow Bahadur Zamindar of Narasaraopet

Revenue Board recommended 200 rupees allow to my widowed mother this too large and unbearable Compare allowances in Zamindaries with their incomes in this district 100 rupees sufficie to a single widow I maintained family my dependants servants and repair houses choultries temples posted petition

Recd. from	Hrs.	L. N. Mts., By	Sent to At	Hrs.	L. N. Mts., By
8 / 158/88. Rev. Date					

MADRAS 23-2-87

Telegraph Master.

C No. 1524

R.D. ?

7
P.R. 4927/87

8
P.R. 320/87

Class F …IAN-TELEGRAPH …al No. 9

To (Station) Fort

From (Station) Bezwada

Words 86/19 1 Hour 10 Minute 45

To (Person) Government

From (Person) Raja Malraju Venkata Narasinha Row Bahadoor of Narasaraopett

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
1 MAR 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

CHIEF SECRETARY
1 MAR 87

Boards Proceedings February Petitioners request is to order hundred rupees to his mother Board recommended 200 great injustice government already reduced family allowance from thousand to 800 further deduction by 200 will surely tell very much against Petitioner family and Retinue & every Zemindari widow getting 30 and 50 I offer liberally 100 Pray for perusal of his Petition to Board and

Recd. From L. N.
At 9 Hrs. 18 Mts., By
Sent to L. N.
At Hrs. Mts. By
Date 15/8

MADRAS FORT 1-3-87

Telegraph Master

… F. No. 1009—G. P. Press—No 496—18-9-83,—100000.

RAT OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (inc uding name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures, is reckoned as on word.
Ordinary "	... Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

---

lass | NDIAN TELEGRAPH. | Local No.

Station) | From (Station)

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.

(Person) | From (Person)

2 1

for justice Petitions Posted today

ECD FROM | L. N. | Sent to | L. N.
Hrs. | Mts., By | At | Hrs.

ate

ADRAS FORT 1-3-87

Telegraph Master.

F. No. 4000—G. T. Press,—No. 125,—18-9-83,—100000.

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures, is reckoned as one word.
Ordinary "	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

9 / BR 3rd Mar/87

8 / PR 1197 4/87

8 / BR 3rd Mar/87

67

65

1

T—14.

Class p	INDIAN TELEGRAPH.	Monthly Local No. 5

To Station Nungumbaukum

From Station Bezvada

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.
97		10	35	

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
2 MAR 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

To (Person) 2nd Member of His Excellency the Governor in council

From (Person) Raja Malraju Venkata Narasimha Row Bahadoor of Narasaraowpett

Boards proceedings february 1 petitioners request is to order hundred rupees to his mother board recommended 200 is great injustice Government already reduced family allowance from thousand

NUNGUMBAUKUM
MAR 87

Recd. from	L. N.	Sent to	L. N.
At Hrs. 10 Mts. By		At Hrs. Mts. By	

Rev. 155/88

Postmaster.

is transmitted free.

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures is reckoned as one word.
Ordinary "	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 Miles.

Class

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Monthly Local No.

To

Station

From

Station

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instruction.

To (Person)

From (Person)

to 800 further deductio
by 200 will surely tell
very much against
petitioner family and
retinue. Every Zemin
widow getting 30 and
50 I offer liberally
100. Pray for perusal
of this petition to board
and for justice petition
posted today ×

NUNGUMBAUKUM
RECD. F
1 MAR. 87

Recd. from L. N. At Hrs. Mts. By

Sent to L. N. At Hrs. Mts. By

Postmaster.

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures is reckoned as one word.
Ordinary „	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent „	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 Miles.

[illegible] 2 Mar/87
3

9
P. R. 1974/87

4

69

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Class R

To (Station) Fort

From (Station) Bezvada

Words		Hour.	Minute.
86/19		1	10

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS REVENUE DEPARTMENT 1 MAR 87

To (Person) ~~Gov~~.

(2) Chief Secretary to Government Revenue Dept

From (Person) Raja Malraju Venkata Narasinha Row Bahadoor of Narasarowpett

Boards Proceedings february 1 Petitioners request is to offer hundred rupees to his mother Board recommended 200 Great injustice government already reduced family allowance from thousand to 800 further Deduction By 200 will surely tell very much against Petitioner family and Retinue every Zemindari widow getting 30 and 50 I offer liberally 100 Pray for perusal of his Petition to Board and

RECD. FROM

At 11 Hrs. Mts., By

Date 1/3/88

MADRAS FORT 1-3-87

At Hrs. Mts., By

F. No. 4000.—G. T. Press,—No. 429,—18-9-83.—1000000.

Telegraph Master.

4

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.
Deferred Message ...	8 Annas	... 1 Anna.
Ordinary " ...	1 Rupee	... 2 Annas
Urgent " ...	2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.

A group of 3 or less figures, is reckoned as one word.

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH

Local No.

From (Station) 71

Words | Hour. | Minute. | Official Instructions.

From (Person)

2

for Justice Petitions Posted today

D. FROM | L. N. | Hrs. | Mts. By | Sent to | At | Hrs.

Telegraph Master

MADRAS FORT 1-3-87

No. 1000 G. T. Press.—No. 105.—1-9-83.—1000

C. No. 1666.

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures, is reckoned as one word.
Ordinary „	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent „	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

P.R 1197 of /87

16/2

09478

29 MAR 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

F C°

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Class. XP

Local No.

To (Station) Madras

From (Station) Sowcarpet

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.
33	28	8	44

Official Instruction. urgent

28/3

CHIEF SECRETARY 28 MAR 87

To (Person) The chief Secretary To Government

From (Person) Raja Mulraju Lutchmi Vencayamma Row Zemindar Narasarowpett

Prays for postponement of orders on resolution of board of revenue for allowance until receipt of her petition sent

Recd. from
At Hrs. L. N. Mts., By
Sent to
At 28-3 Hrs. 8.6 L. N. Mts., By
Date

Telegraph Master.

estate during her son's minority

2. As regards I, it appears
the Dy. Collector's report that there is no pa
lel between the present case and that of
Vasireddi pension. In the latter the widow

C. No. 2532

14/ [illegible]

13/ [illegible]

14/ Rev. 158/88.

16/2

75

No. C. Nos 158 & 934

75

From Board of Revenue & Venkatanarasimha Rao

Dated 7th Jan. & 4th Feb. 1888.

FOR ORDERS.

In G.O., dated 4-7-87
No 3811 Misc., information was called for on the
following points in order to determine the a-
mount of allowance to be granted to Raja M
razu Lakshmi Venkayyamma Row, the wido
the deceased pensioner Malrazu Venkata Kond
Rao of Narasaraopet and the adoptive mo
of Malrazu Venkata Narasimha Row, one
~~present~~ last petitioners:—

I. The extent of resemblance between the
Vasireddi case cited as a precedent and the
present one.

II The opinion of the Collector as to wh
would be a fair and proper allowance for
widow, taking into consideration.

(1) the wealth and social status of the Ma
razu family.

(2) the wants of a person in the position
rank of life of the widow.

(3) the number of relatives and others wh
look up to her for maintenance, and,

(4) any other circumstance that will go to
termine the amount of allowance to be ma
her, such as the mode in which she managed
estate during her son's minority and so forth.

2. As regards I, it appears
by Collector's report that there is no p
lel between the present case and that of
Vasireddi pension. In the latter the widow

(Pre
pare

reported to have possessed private property worth about Rs 80,000, whereas, the Dy. Collector states that Venkayyamma Row possesses no property worth mention.

3 With reference to II it is reported (1) that although the Mabiayu f has lost all its wealth now, it is still very connected and is held in high esteem by the people and that its present annual income about Rs 20,000 as admitted by Venkatanarasimha Row himself in a civil suit which he has filed against his adoptive mother and her brothers in the District Court;

(2) that Venkayyamma Row occupies a position of social importance and maintains a position in accordance with the trad of the family;

(3) that her establishment costs her Rs 220 per mensem at present but th might be curtailed to Rs 120; and

(4) that she borrowed for her adopt s marriage a sum of Rs 8000 of which ,000 was repaid, that she and her brothe do not appear to have mismanaged the pr rty during her son's minority, and tha e did not carry away any of the famil wels with her when she removed to her br ers house.

4 The Dy. Collector states th e ill feeling between the mother and the son is ch that there is no hope of their ever comm an agreement. Taking all the circumstan the case into consideration, therefore, he is f opinion that Rs 300 a month will be a air allowance to the former. The Collector ks that Rs 240 a month — the sum med by his predecessor Mr Sewell — is suf- t and the Board now agree with him al- ugh they originally recommended only 200 a month.

5 The second paper quoted the head of this note is a telegram from katanarasimha Row in which he re- s his former allegations against his [illegible] and further states that he monthly [illegible]

[illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

77

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 77

From

Dated 188 .

FOR ORDERS.

expenditure is only Rs 50 and the accounts produced by her are incorrect, that receipts from temples are just sufficient to cover the expenditure and what remains has to be spent ~~on~~ in the repairs, that he cannot appropriate to himself any portion of the balance and so his mother cannot claim any allowance therefrom, and that he has filed a suit against his mother and her brothers who have misappropriated all his ancestral property.

6 It will be seen from the previous note for orders that in her petition to the Board the mother asked for an allowance of Rs 500 a month, whereas in that to Govt she begged that at ~~allow-~~ least ~~ance of~~ Rs 240 a month might be given her as recommended by Mr Sewell. The amount now recommended, therefore, will satisfy her expectations. The case, however, is ifferent with the son. He, ~~however~~ has all along been urging that he can spare only Rs 100 a month for his mother and that it is quite sufficient for her maintenance. The Dy. Collector has taken his annual income as Rs 20,000, but he (Venkatanarasimha Row) ~~the latter~~ points out that he does not get any income from ntales and that even if he gets any, h

reported to have possessed private property worth
about Rs 80,000, whereas, the Dy. Collector
states that Venkayyamma Row possesses no pro-
perty worth mention.

3 With reference to II it re-
ported (1) that although the Mahaya f
has lost all its wealth now, it is still very
connected and is held in high esteem by t
people and that its present annual income
about Rs 20,000 as admitted by Venkatanara-
simha Row himself in a civil suit which h
has filed against his adoptive mother and two
brothers in the District Court;

(2) that Venkayyamma Row occupies
a position of social importance and main-
ns a position in accordance with the trad
ire of the family;

(3) that her establishment costs he
ut Rs 220 per mensem at present but th
might be curtailed to Rs 120; and

(4) that she borrowed for her adop
's marriage a sum of Rs 8000 of which
000 was repaid, that she and her brothe
o not appear to have mismanaged the pr
rty during her son's minority, and tha
e did not carry away any of the famil
jewels with her when she removed to her bro
er's house.

4 The Dy. Collector states th
e ill feeling between the mother and the son i
ch that there is no hope of their ever comin
an agreement. Taking all the circumsta
the case into consideration, therefore, he is
f opinion that Rs 300 a month will be a
air allowance to the former. The Collecto
tes that Rs 240 a month — the sum
ned by his predecessor Mr Sewell — is suf-
t and the Board now agree with him al-
ugh they originally recommended only
200 a month.

5 The second paper quoted
the head of this note is a telegram from
katanarasimha Row in which he re-
to his former allegations against his
ther and ~~states that~~ ^further^ her monthly ex
[illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

77

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 77

From

Dated 188 .

FOR ORDERS.

l
expenditure is only Rs 50 and the ac-
counts produced by her are incorrect, that
e receipts from temples are just suf-
ficient to cover the expenditure and what
^little^ remains has to be spent ~~on~~ repairs, that
he cannot appropriate to himself any
portion of the balance and so his mother
cannot claim any allowance therefrom, and
at he has filed a suit against his mother
and her brothers who have misappro-
priated all his ^ancestral^ property.

6 It will be seen from the pre-
vious note for orders that in her petition
to the Board the mother asked for an al-
lowance of Rs 500 a month, whereas in
that to Govt she begged that at ~~allow-~~
~~ance of~~ ^least^ Rs 240 a month might be given
her as recommended by Mr Sewell. The
amount now recommended, therefore, will
satisfy her expectations. The case, however, is
different with the son. He, ~~however~~ has all
along been urging that he can spare only
Rs 100 a month for his mother and that it
is quite sufficient for her maintenance.
The Dy. Collector has taken his annual in-
come as Rs 20,000, but ^he (Venkatanarasimha Row)^ ~~the latter~~ points
out that he does not get any income from
[illegible] and that [illegible]

must expend it ~~on~~ repairs. whether t
latter statement is correct or not, the Dy
Collector's report does not show. If corre
the receipts from temples which the
Collr calculates at ~~about~~ Rs 8000 pe
num should certainly be deducted fro
the total income (Rs 20000) taken for the purpose
determining the mother's allowance.
question then is whether a report on t
point must be called for, or the una
-nimous recommendations of t
Collector and the Board shall be giv
effect to. As the Dy. Collector does
appear to have fixed the amount o
allowance to be paid to the mother sol
with reference to the income of the
razu family, nor to have calculat
it at a certain percentage of that
come, and as the amount recomm
by the Collector and the Board is
less than what the Dy. Collector has
proposed ~~commended~~, it is submitted that fu
enquiry seems unnecessary ~~necessary~~ and that t
Board's recommendation may b
accepted.

16/2

[illegible]

16/2

R ORDERS.

A case of pension, Kistna District.

I concur. The ex-Zemindar himself estimates his income at Rs 20,000 which includes the temple revenue & it is notorious that [illegible] by the family.

G.O. 23-2-88, no: 165

The Hon'ble Mr. [illegible] C.S.I.

1

23rd March 1887

To

His Excellency The Right Honorable
Robert Bourke P.C.
Governor-in-Council
Madras.

31 MAR 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The humble petition of Raja Malraja Lukshimi Venkayamma Row widow of Mulraj Venkata Kondal Row, Zemindar of Narasarowpett, Kristna District,

Respectfully Sheweth,

That your Petitioner respectfully begs to submit the following circumstances for the favourable consideration and orders of Your Excellency in Council.

2. That the said estate was resumed by Government and an allowance of Rs 1050 was granted to Mulraj Lutchmiah Zemindar Garu the grand-mother of your Petitioner's husband, who continued to enjoy the pension till her death when an allowance of Rs 800 was granted to Mulraj Venkata Kondal Row the diseased husban

15
Rev. 15c/88

husband of your Petitioner. He enjoyed the pension till his death in 1880, when it was transferred with the consent of your Petitioner as his widow, in the name of his adopted son Venkata Narasimma Row, a minor on the 20th September 1880 and the amount ordered to be paid to your Petitioner as the guardian of the said minor, and as the widow of the late Zemindar Vide G.O. 20th September 1880 No. 1202 passed on Board Proceedings Dated 30th August 1880. No. 1158.

3 That this pension was accordingly continued to be paid to her up to July 1886 and she continued to maintain the family out of the said and other incomes as explained below. She then in right earnest, performed the marriage of the adopted son in the month of May 1886, and ever since the celebration of that marriage, the father-in-law of the minor began to create feuds and dissensions in the family and the minor indiscreetly yielding to the evil council and advice of his self interested father in law, began to disobey her orders, and treated her with the greatest indifference and disregard.

4 He was next illadvised and pursuaded to make an application to the Collector to pay the pension to him instead of to the Petitioner

as heretofore, although he has not yet attained his maturity under the Indian Majority Act IX of 1875, not having as yet fully attained his 21st Year.

5. That your Petitioner was thereupon obliged to send in a protest or counter petition against the said application of the minor as the management of the family could not satisfactorily and consistently be carried on under the present circumstances and as she could not stop herself to the awkward position of being placed under the illadvised minor and receive bad treatment from him, especially as the minor was not a natural born son of the family but only an adopted son taken from a distant relation, and from a distant village of Jenegaum in the Nizams territories, and who is now actually in the hands of his wife's relations.

6. That the Collector thereupon made a careful investigation of the matter, and recommended to the Board of Revenue that a sum of Rs 240 should be paid to the Petitioner out of the pension of Rs 800, as was done in the case of Vasureddy Venkata Lutchumammagaru when a sum of Rs 300 was ordered to be paid to the mother out of a pension of Rs 1000, that is 30 per

of the pension Vide Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 25th April 1877 No 1894. This proposal was acceded to by the adopted Son and no objection was then raised by him.

7. That your Petitioner should not fail to bring to the prominent notice of your Excellency in Council the particulars of all the income received by the family to maintain its position and dignity in the world:—

(1.) The pension granted by Government at the rate of Rs 800 per mensem amounts to Rs 9600. 3

(2.) The average annual income received from the estates attached to Yellamunda Koteeswara Sawmy temple after defraying all established and reasonable charges and expenses Rupees 8000

(3) The average annual income derived from landed properties and other sources Rs 2000

The total annual income thus amounts to Rs 19,600.

8. That it would thus appear that the allowance fixed upon, and recommended to the Board by the Collector has reference only to the first or pensionary allowance and not to the other two items of income which amount to a large Sums of Rs 10,000 a year, and in which your Petitioner has an equal right and claim. This point deserves the serious attention and

Consideration

Consideration of your Excellency in Council.

9. That your Petitioner has duly brought these circumstances to the notice of the Collector and of the Board and complained of the insufficiency of the provision made to her and specially requested them to increase the allowance so as to be suitable to her position and rank and for the maintenance of relations and dependants hitherto remaining under the family support and for whom there is no other source of income for maintenance.

10. That the pension was only registered in the name of the adopted minor with the Consent of your Petitioner on the understanding that he will continue to be under the protection of your Petitioner. It should also be mentioned here that according to the custom of the family respect and regard are due to her as Senior member of the family, and as the widow of the late Zemindar, over and above the adopted minor who has only joined the family recently owing to the said adoption and whose states must therefore be certainly below her in the family. It is therefore absolutely necessary that a suitable provision should be made to

her according to the provision contained in para 383 of Mayne's Hindu Law, 3rd Edition as befitting her high position and rank as the head of the Surviving members of the late Raja a position acknowledged as such even by the Government of India.

11. There is one distinctive features to be noticed between your Petitioner and the Case of Vasureddy Venkata Lutchumamma garu. She possesses an estate worth not less than a lac of rupees as her private fortune, 3 and to her 30 percent of the pension was allowed which may be sa[illegible]ut, but in the case of your Petitioner she possesses no private fortune at all, Sav the pension allowance which may be sanctioned, and she therefore begs that a Sum of Rs 4 or 500 is likely to be required to meet her expenses; such a Sum at least may be sanctioned out of the gross income of the family to be paid out of the said pension and which Sum would still be below the 30 percent of the gross income referred to above.

12. That the Minor who first of all agreed to the 4 payment of Rs 240 to your petitioner out of the said pension has since fallaback under the

evil persuation of his father-in-law & has now received Rs 560 per mensem leaving the remaining Sum of Rs 240 in Deposit until the decision of t Board & government are known in the matter.

13. Your Petitioner has not drawn a cash since August 1886 and she is therefore put to the greatest difficulties and troubles to meet her reasonable demands and has even been obliged to run into debts on that account. His first consent to the proposal of the Collector and his subsequent retractation of that consent under the evil influence of his father-in-law, are matters deserving the serious attention and consideration of your Excellency-in-Council.

14. That your Petitioner is now given to understand that the Board have recommended to government, that a pension of Rs 200 should be paid to her, a sum much below her requirements, & which is likely to put her to pecuniary difficulties & troubles to meet all her resonable demands.

15. That your Petitioner therefore most earnestly entreats your Excellency-in-Council would be graciously condescended to accord to the abo facts and circumstances, your best & deliberat consideration & after referring to the Collector's

recommendat

8

C. No 2644

recommendation, & the proceedings of the Board along with this Petition, & after attaching due weight & importance to the peculiar circumstances of her case, as already detailed above, be pleased to sanction an allowance of Rs 500 or 400 out of the total income to be paid out of the pension allowance for the support of herself as well as the relations & dependents &c which is about 30 percent upon the gross income, or Rs 240 as recommended by the Collector, & agreed to by the Minor to be paid out of the said pension as in the case of Vasureddy quoted in para 5 of this Petition and thus afford her relief, a favor for which and the relations and dependants as in duty bound shall ever pray.

CHIEF SECRETARY
31 MAR 87
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

31. 3. 87

14
P.R. 1977A/17

87

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES
14-4-87

MADRAS
27
DEPARTMENT

WS 21/4

To

His Excellency
The Right Honorable
Robert Bourke P. C.
Governor in Council of
Madras

The humble Petition of Ra
Mulraze Venkata Narasimharao
Bahadoor, Zemindar of Narasa
Kistna District

Right Honorable Sir

1. With reference to my recent
Petitions on the subject of the pe
claimed by my adopted Mother, I
to submit that during my mino
her brothers were enabled to sp
my allowance of Rs 800, accordin
their sweet will, and now that
could not do so they have put her up to exto
from me a portion of the p

16
Rev. 158/88

2. She seems to lay much stress
upon the amount of the allowan
granted to the late Vasireddi
Venkata Lutchumma garu but th
was a special case and the only
instance in which one third of th
family pension was allotted to a wi
And perhaps done so because th
adoption was a posthumous one
made by Venkata Lutchumma gar
long after the death of her husban
and because the adopted son ow
his elevation solely to her. But the
case is otherwise with your Excellen
Petitioner. My adopted Mother
seems to base her claim to three-
($\frac{3}{10}$) of my allowance with referenc
also to the income derived from my
landed Estates which is estimate
by her to yield Rupees ten thousa
although they are not worth even
of the amount. She might as well
come in for a share also of my
personal property. The income of t
shrine of Koteswaraswami which cons
of the offerings made by the devote
leaves scarce any savings after defray
the expense [illegible] the Temple.

3. If the grant to Lutchmi Venkayyammarow garu of a separate pension be at all deemed necessary, I humbly pray that your Excellency in Council may be pleased to hav in view the special favor shown to my family by the Home Government as expressed in thei Despatch of 16th February 1864 No. and considering that she is mere a widow, who should according to Hindu law and usage remain under the roof of the male hea of the family, and that she wa to live a part from me, solely by reason of the evil counsel of he brothers, the Government may be pleased to allot to her a sum not exceeding Rs 100/, a month which is not comparatively speaking below what has been assigne to others in her position. And your Excellency's humble Petitioner need not repeat that any further in on his pension will cripple his means of supporting himself a

his

his numerous dependants with becomi
dignity. I have no objection to allo
Mother to live with me. On the
contrary I should only be too happy
to keep her with me and be guid
by her advice in conducting my
household. I beg to add that duri
my minority She not only sp
a great portion of my pension f
the benefit of her brothers but h
left a debt of Rs. 8000, to be clea
by me hereafter; whereas it is no
of note that Vasireddy Lutchumma
left to her adopted son a perso
Estate worth nearly one lack of Rup
after paying a debt of 40, thousand
Rupees left by her husband.

For this act of justice I shall ever p

Your Excellency's humble petition

Rajah Mahraz Venkata Narasimh
Row Bahadur Zamindar of Narasarowp

Narasarowpett
14th April 1887

C. No 3146

15
Dis 1997 4/9

Rev 3 of
16

To

2-5-87

97

F C¹

INDIAN TELEGRAPH.

Local No. 420

Class	D P
To (Station)	Ootacamund
From (Station)	Narsarowpett thro Guntur
Words	54
Day	8
Hour	18
Minute	45
Official Instructions	depd R one Re
From (Person)	Sri Rajah Mulrazu Venkata Narasimha Row Bahadur Zemindar
To (Person)	C. G. Master Esq. Chief Secretary to Government of Madras

9 MAY 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Sent petitions and telegrams to Government about my mothers allowance fixed by Collector and board decision not yet given Undergoing pecuniary difficulties please wire me final orders Reply prepaid one Rupee

Sri Rajah Mulrazu
Venkata Narsimha Row
Bahadur Zemindar

SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 9 MAY 87

Recd. from — At — Date: OOTACAMUND 8-5-87

L. N. — Mts., By — Sent to — At — Telegraph Master

Thomlee

le Robert Bourke, P.C.
Council of
dras

tition of
Venkata
Bahadoor
Narasaropetta
a District

at the govern
by the
made
by one of
my adopted mother,

I have ventured to submit the following additional points for the impartial consideration

18
Rev. 15/8/88

C. No 3116

C. No 3619

420

RATES OF CHARGE FOR INLAND TELEGRAMS.

The address (including name of Sender, and name and residence of Addressee) is transmitted free.

	First 8 words.	Each additional word.	
Deferred Message	... 8 Annas	... 1 Anna.	A group of 3, or less figures, is reckoned as one word
Ordinary "	... 1 Rupee	... 2 Annas.	
Urgent "	... 2 Rupees	... 4 Annas.	

No charge for delivery within a distance of 5 miles.

9-5-87

COURT FEE

[illegible]
2-5-87
[illegible]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
MAY 87

97

To

His Excellency
The Right Honorable Robert Bourke, P.C.
Governor in Council of
Madras

The humble Petition of
Rajah Malrauze Venkata
Narasimharow Bahadoor
Zemindar of Narasaropetta
Kistna District

Right Honorable Sir,

1 Apprehending that the government may be misled by the erroneous representations made in person at Madras, by one of the Brothers of my adopted mother, I have ventured to submit the following additional points for the impartial consideration

18
Rev. 158/88

of your Excellency in Council.

2 During my m[illegible]ity the Government honored my adopted mother, Lutchmi Venkayamma Row garu, by entrusting her with my guardian-ship; but she has abused her trust by saddling me with a heavy debt of Rs. 8000. for which I am obliged to pay monthly Rs. 80, in the shape of interest. And if the allotment of my separate allowance to her be deemed necessary the above sum should be deducted from such allowance. I have further to bring to the notice of your Excellency in Council that my adopted mother has removed herself to her brothers' house with jewellery worth about one and a half la[illegible] of rupees

which forms both her Stridhanam and the personal property of my adopted father. In determining the amount of allowance to be awarded to my adopted mother this point is also entitled to your Excellency's mature consideration.

3 If a single widow were to claim a sum of Rs. 240, or even 200, out of my allowance of Rs. 800, the maintenance of myself and my wife must be admitted to cost, at least twice as much viz. Rs. 400, leaving barely Rs 200, for the support of the numerous old dependents and servants still attached to the family whom I cannot turn adrift.

In this connection I beg permission to submit that in point of Law there is not the least difference between an adopted son and a natural born son. And she cannot claim more respect and regard than the adopted son, who is the principal male member of the family. And there are repairs to be executed to the valuable and picturesque mansion and the other buildings occupied by my family. In this stronghold my great grand-father, Malrauz Venkata Goonda Row, afforded a safe asylum to Mr Oakes, a late Collector of Guntoor, and his family in 1805, when the Maharattas invaded the Country.

4 My adopted mother seems to base her whole claim on my consent alleged to have been given to the proposal of the Collector and my subsequent retractation of that consent as was stated by her in paras 12 & 13 of her petition to your Excellency in Council. This Statment is

is utterly false as will be perceived from the following Circumstances. The Collector passed his orders on the subject of my adopted mothers separate allowance on the 9th December 1886 directing Rs. 240 to be paid to her out of my net allowance. But subsequent to this decision I caused my Vakil to put in a petition to the Collector asking his permission to draw Rs. 560 to which, according to his decision, there is not the least dispute and leaving the balance to be held in deposit as I was about to protest against that part of his decision dealing with the sum set part by him for her allowance. This course I was compelled to adopt, because I have been laboring under a heavy debt as shown above and put to the greatest difficulties and troubles in pecuniary matters. It does not amount at all to a consent to the proposal made by the Collector. She rather colored the matter so as to mislead your Excellency in Council from coming to a fair and impartial conclusion on the subject.

5 In her petition she repeated several times that my father-in-law ill-advised and persuaded me to put in my petition to pay the pension to me. This statement is quite unreasonable. In fact it was the mismanagement of my estate made by my adopted mother and her brothers that forced me to present this application. Seeing that this fact will become apparent on an inquiry being held in the matter she invented a new story and threw on my father-in-law a blame, which had no foundation at all. She also set forth several allegations, which are futile in themselves and which have no bearing upon the present case, and I need not, therefore, comment upon them.

6 In conclusion I humbly solicit that your Excellency in Council may be pleased to take into your benign consideration the foregoing facts along with those submitted in my former Petitions to Government, and allot to Lutchmi Venkayamma Row garu if it is at all

C No 3685

deemed necessary, a sum not exceeding Rs. 100 a month. Any further indent on my pension would, I need not repeat, cripple my means for the support of myself and my family with my dignity.

For this act of justice I shall ever pray.

I am, Your Excellency's
humble Petitioner,

Narasarowpett
2nd May 1887.

Rajah Malraz Venkata Narasimha-
Row Bahadur Zamindar of
Narasarowpetta

7-5-87

Office
7/5/87

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
of Fort Saint George
Madras.

23 MAY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The humble petition of Raja
Malraz Latchmi Venciahumma
Row Zamindar of Narasarow-
pet in Kristna District.

Most Respectfully Showeth,

1. That your Excellency's petitioner has presented your Excellency in Council a petition dated 26th March last praying that in the monthly allowance granted by the British Government for the maintenance of their family a portion may be deducted and paid her for Subsistance Separately owing to the misunderstanding that exists between herself and her adopted Son Vencata Narasimha Row.

2. That your Excellency's petitioner has been given to understand that the above named Narasimha Row has by wire communication falsely intimated

Your

21

19
Rev: 158/88.

your Excellency in Council his desire to live with her or her being put up with him and that he has no other sources of income, with the object of creating displeasure in your Excellency's mind also.

3. That the recommendation of the Collector to transfer a portion of the said allowance in the name of your Excellency's petitioner was only owing to his not having given his consent to live amicably with your Excellency's petitioner when called upon to do so ~~by~~ in the presence of the Collector himself.

4. That the above named Narasimha Row in the presence of the Collector consented to the separate payment of Rs. 240-0-0 per mensem to your Excellency's petitioner and subsequently informed the Honourable Board that he never gave such consent. This individual whilst bringing himself to your Excellency's notice his desire to live with your Excellency's petitioner has sent her by Post a registered letter dated 1st April 1887 informing her that he would take civil action against your Excellency's petitioner for Rs. 31,000 on the ground that she and her brothers have

unlawfully

unlawfully spent that amount during his minority. He has even endeavoured to fabricate such charges, which were never heard or thought of by your Excellency's petitioner, owing to the ill feeling that she represented the above facts to your Excellency. From the above facts it may be easy to your Excellency to decide whether his statement that he is willing to live with your Excellency's petitioner amicably is true or not.

5. That ~~the~~ above named Narasimha Row, at the time of the first misunderstanding promised to come and live with your Excellency's petitioner and took her to Noojeemedoo and left her with a promise that he purely to go to Sanimarpet and return; but he went away to Narasarowpet the original place of residence and broke open the doors of the rooms locked up by your Excellency's petitioner and removed all the properties and records therein and took possession of the same and never made his appearance to this moment. This matter was represented to the Collector then alone.

6. That your Excellency's petitioner not having been allowed any allowance from August last, had been managing her affairs by incurring debts. She having had no allowance whatever for the last ten months your Excellency's petitioner and her servants suffer a great deal

real from the troubles of creditors who has already granted loans and from the refusal of granting further loans.

7. There is no objection to prove to your Excellency's satisfaction that there are other sources of income also to the above named individual as stated in the petition submitted by your Excellency's petitioner.

8. Your Excellency's petitioner therefore prays that your Excellency ~~like the Honorable Board~~ may, without heeding the false statements to your Excellency just as he did to the Honorable Board made by the aforesaid individual with the object of ruining her, consider the difficulties to which your Excellency's petitioner a female belonging to the family of a big Zamindar of a village which yields an annual Land Revenue of about Rs 2,00,000 under the management of your Excellency's Govt. now, is subjected to and pass early orders on her petition.

For this act of charity your Excellency's petitioner will as in duty bound ever pray.

6th May 1887.

Sd/. Raja Malraz Lakshmi Venkatamma Row

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
21 JUN 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Dated 15-6-87
Peddapavani
Kandukur Taluq
Nellore District.

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council, Ft. St. George, Madras.

The humble petition of Raja Malraza Venkayamma Row Garu, sub-pensioner, Narsaraopett, Kistna District

CHIEF SECRETARY
13 JUN 87
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Humbly showeth:-

That the petitioner humbly begs to state

(1) that she has already submitted petitions to His Excellency in Council, one on the 26th March and the other on the 6th May 1887, requesting the grant of monthly allowance separately to the petitioner and her adopted son, Rajah Malraza Venkata Narasimha Row Garu.

(2) The petitioner, by mistake, failed to include in the list of annual income submitted in her petition of the 26th March (87), the net income of Rs 500 or 600, arising from the lanka of Balakoteswaraswamy varu of Anapalle, Repalle Taluq.

(3) That His Excellency will evidently see, by the succeeding para, that the statement of Rajah Malraza Venkata Narasimha Row Garu that the annual income

20
Rev. 158/88.

income of all items including the temples &c does not amount to Rs 10,500, is utterly false.

(4) That the said Venkatanarasimha Row Garu filed a suit under No 11 of 1887 against the petitioner &c in the District Sessions Court Western, in accordance with his fugitive letter to the petitioner; and the Court served on the petitioner a notice with a copy of the Plaint translation of which is herein enclosed. His Excellency may be graciously pleased to observe that Rajah Narasimha Row Garu himself admits in his plaint that the annual income amounts to Rs 20,000. as detailed in her last petition the amount minus the allowance comes up to that shown in the petition.

(5) His Excellency may be pleased to be convinced from the papers now before the Government as to the irregularities committed by Narasimha Row Garu towards the petitioner.

(6) That the petitioner, in conclusion, begs to solicit His Excellency to be gracious enough to order to separate payments of allowance to the petitioner's adopted

adopted son, and to her who has been suffering much for want of pecuniary help both for herself and her servants; for which act of kindness the petitioner shall, as in duty Bound, Ever pray.

O.S. No. 11/1887

Plaint under Section 50 C. C. P.

To

The District Munsiff's Court

Krishna

Complainant	Defendants
Sri Rajah Malraju Venkatanaraswha Row, Bahadur, Zamindar, Velama, Narasaraopett, Krishna district	1. Rajah Malraju Lukshmi Venkagammarow Garu, Zamindar, Sub. Pensioner, Velama, Narasarowpett, Krishna district now residing at Peddapanam, Kavali Munsiff's Court, Nellore district.
	(2) Rajah Venkatanaraswha Bhupal Bhalai Row Garu, Zamindar, Peddapanam, Kavali Munsiff's Court, Nellore district.
	(3) Rajah Lukshmichendra Bhupal Bhalerow Garu, Zamindar, now residing at Gollapalli, Bezawada Munsiff's Court, Krishna district.
	(4) Raja Streerunga [illegible] Bala Row garu. [illegible], [illegible] Court Nellore district

Rev. 4919/87

2/1 Rev. 158/88.

(1) The complainant is the adopted son of the deceased Rajah Malraju Venkatakundalrow, Bahadur, Zamindar, husband of the 1st Defendant, who died on the 13th March 1880. The complainant was then a minor. ——

(2) The complainant has had immoveable property of forts and palaces &c. at Narasaraopett and other Villages. He also gets an annual income of Rs 20000-0-0 from his Gardens, Kamathams, (cultivation), Government allowances, temples under his trust and other miscellaneous items. He had at the demise of his adopted father, moveable property of Jewellery &c. worth thousands of Rupees. ——

(3) After the death of the complainant's father (adopted), the 1st defendant (complainant's Guardian) and her brothers, defendants nos 2.3 & 4 on the plea of management jointly took charge of all his moveable property, his annual income of all items and the monthly allowance granted by the Government; and instead of properly spending the same towards the complainant and his family and keeping regular accounts for the income and expenditure, supported by necessary Vouchers, they (the defendants 1.2.3 & 4), with a view to deprive [illegible] of the said moneys (income minus the expenditure) and misappropriate the same, intentionally put him (complainant) to loss by using a portion of the sum in discharging their (the defts') own debts; and by pretending to have given certain sum on loans to others; and by misappropriating the rest to their own interests. Schedule A shows the loss in detail as far as brought out of the accounts &c. kept by the Defendants. ——

The present suit is, therefore, for the recovery of the loss and its interest. ——

The interest is charged to make up the loss sustained as if the moneys were improved without being misappropriated.

(4.) The Defendants not only misused the income of the minor (complainant) from the death of the complainant's adopted father on the 1st April 188 to the 22nd April 1884 when his minority expired, but also collected even after his minority, the monthly allowance of Rs 800 and the income of all other remaining items in name of the 1st

32,279-15-6 defendant up to August 1886, and thereabouts, and made ill use of the same as detailed

18,335-10-11 in para 3.

50,615-10-5 The Defendants misappropriated also the Jewellery (as per Schedule C) of the complainant's

1225-6-0 deceased adopted father, which should, otherwise, legally go to the complainant. Then the complainant came to understand all the irregularities committed by the defendants and the expiry of his minority and took charge of his remaining estate and the cash &c. Meanwhile the defendants attempted to deprive the complainant of the allowances but in vain.——

(5) The defendants, though asked for, did not give proper accounts for the income and expenditure during their management, nor made good of the sums they misappropriated, nor returned the jewelling as detailed in Schedule C.

(6) The cause of action begins with the interval between the 16th April 1880 and August 1886 and thereabouts, during which the defendants caused damage to the complainant, and with the [illegible] April 1886 when his minority expired. The suit is brought within 3 years since then.

(7) The sum claimed by the complainant from the defendants is shown below:——

Amount misappropriated by the defts. nos. 1·2·3 & 4 as per Schedule A.	33,279-15-6
Interest up to 16th April 1887 at 1 per cent per mensem	18,335-10-11
	51,615-10-5
Amount due returned to the defts as per Schedule B	1225-5-0

Interest as above	Rs 740-2-
	1963-7-10.
The net amount misappropriated by the defts as per col. 4 Schedule D.	48,652-2-5
The value of the jewellery misappropriated by the Defts. as per sch. C. . .	9970-11-0.
	58622-13-5

(8) The complainant shall file a separate suit for the recovery of the debt taken by the Defendants no. 1·2·3·4 with its interest.

He prays for the decree, with costs of the sum misappropriated by the defendants as shown in col. 4 of the Schedule D. of the jewellery or its value as per Schedule C with the future interest at Rs 1 per cent per mensem and of such compensation as the Court may deem proper.——

Schedules A. B. C & D are herewith filed with a list of all such referrible & necessary documents as known at present.

(Sd/ Singaraz [illegible]ubbarayan

Vakil.

(84) Puranam Venkat[illegible]
Gam, Pleader

(85) Ramaraju Venkata
Brahmin Gam, Pleader

Verified

9th April 1887

Signature of the complainant

TWO RUPEES

5-3-87

10 MAR 87
REVENUE DEPARTMENT MADRAS

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL FORT SAINT GEORGE.

The humble representation of RAJAH MALRAJU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW, Bahadur Zamindar Sirdesamukh Mannavar Paragana Bellamkonda, va, Vinukonda, va, Taluq Rachur, Kadaly, va, Sydapoor, Sircar Mruthujanagar, va, Mustuphanagar, va, Rajamandry, va, Nellore of Narasarow Petta Taluq, Kistna District.

MAY IT PLEASE HIS EXCELLENCY.

I. The petitioner is the representative of the Malrazu Family.

II. He was asked by the Collector to pay Rs. 240 a month to his mother for the sake of her maintenance while his entire income *i. e.* the pension granted by Government is only Rs. 800 a month. (See Collector's letter dated 13th December 1886.)

III. Petitioner then solicited the Board to allow him to pay Rs. 100 to his mother. Upon this they recommended as it appears from their Proceedings dated 1st February 1887 Rs. 200 to her.

IV. As neither the Collector nor the Board did justice to petitioner's request, he is compelled to appeal to His Excellency's Generosity for redress on the following grounds.

(*a.*) The petitioner has not only to maintain his family and servants but also his dependants, who have been maintained by his family for a long time.

(*b.*) His mother is a widow and she has no one to protect as the members of the family naturally elect to be protected by the male branch.

(*c.*) The petitioner has cited several instances in his Petition to the Board in which the mothers of Zemindars have been allowed trifling sums such as Rs. 30 or Rs. 50.

(*d.*) Here in the present case the petitioner has offerred a liberal sum of Rs. 100 though with this deduction he cannot afford to maintain himself and his large family.

V. In these circummstances the Petitioner prays His Excellency to peruse this his petition with that sent up to the Board and order the payment Rs. 100 only to his mother, a sum sufficient, and more than enough, to meet all the requirements of a widow.

For this act of justice and benevolence the memorialist shall as in duty bound ever pray.

The memorialist begs to state that he has already sent in a petition a few days ago, and that he sends this 2nd one for a favorable and ready disposal of the affair

Nursarowpeta,
1st/4 March 1887.

Your most obedient Servant
Rajah Malraz Venkata Narasim[illegible]
[illegible] Zamindar
Narasaraopetta

12/158/88.

12
P.R. 3202/87

11
P.R. 1197 of/87

TO

THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

MADRAS.

The humble representation of RAJAH MALRAJU VENKATA NARASIMHA ROW, Bahadur Zamindar Sirdesamukh Mannavar Paragana Bellamkonda, va, Vinukonda, va, Taluq Rachur, Kadaly, va, Sydapoore, Sircar Mruthujanagar, va, Mustuphanagar, va, Rajamandry va, Nellore of Narasarow Petta Taluq Kistna District.

Humbly Showeth.

1. That the memorialist is the representative of the well known family of Malraju who held the estates of Bellamkonda, Vinukonda, Rachur, Sydapoore, and Kadaly, yielding an annual income of Rs. 5,68,000.

2. That a pension of Rs. 1000 a month was sanctioned to Lakshmayya Row the great grand mother of the memorialist in consideration of the large Estate taken up by Government and after her death the pension was reduced and Rs. 800 sanctioned in the name of the memorialist's father and after his demise the same continued to the memorialist to keep up his dignity and respect of the family.

3. That the memorialist being a minor when the sanction was accorded in his name it was ordered that this pension should be paid to his mother and guardian Lakshmi Venkayyamma Row.

4. That the memorialist was not allowed by his mother to draw his pension even after his majority for reasons unknown to him.

5. That the memorialist waited for about two years though he was not properly treated by his mother and her brothers who held the management and control of the pension.

6. That the memorialist had to keep quiet in the matter in spite of the natural love and affection towards his mother who brought him up from his child-hood (of course the memorialist is unable to say how the pension was spent during his minority either for good or bad as no accounts have been rendered to him to make out the assets and liabilities of the family.)

7. That she (mother) having abused her trust in its entirity the memorialist was compelled to bring this to the notice of the collector and request him to pay the pension to him direct from the Treasury.

8. That the memorialist begs to state that the Collector being thoroughly convinced in the matter ordered that the pension should be paid to him on the ground of his having attained his majority but that he compelled his vakil without any consideration whatever and during the memorialists absence to consent to pay his mother Rs. 240 a month.

9. That the memorialist is unable to spare Rs. 240 a month out of the pension of Rs. 800 to a single widow for the following grounds ;—

(a). that the pe[illegible] riginally sanctioned was reduced from Rs. 1000 to Rs. 800; that [illegible] memorialist as head of the family has to incur several expenses such as the maintenance of servants both males & female about fifty in number : the performance of the usual ceremonies on festive &c. days; the payment of salaries &c. to gumastahs and the people who have been as they are permanently living upon this family; and the repairs &c. of Bungalows and other houses and choultries.

13
Rev. 158/88.

(*b*). that the memorialist having been connected with the Nuzvid, Mylavaram and Sanivarappeta Zamindars had to defray various extra charges with reference to marriages and return of visits &c.

(*c*). that if Rs. 240 are to be given to a widow what amount should be alloted to the memorialist and his family and servants, the Board only should consider.

(*d*). that the memorialist's mother did not put in any petition for any allowance to her maintenance.

(*e*). that the collector says that the memorialist and his mother cannot under the present circumstances live in peace with each other; what led the collector to presume thus the memorialist is in a state of dilemma to explain.

(*f*). that if it is intended that something or other must be set apart for the mother even in spite of the memorialist's allegations, it must be done with reference to the income derived to the family. The Collector's plea for ordering Rs. 240 to her is that in one case Rs. 300 out of Rs. 1000 were given to a widow viz, Vasireddi Venkata Lakshmamma Garu. This has no bearing with the present question. Vasi Reddi Venkata Lakshmamma Garu made a good landed property during her management clearing the heavy debt left to her by her husband, at the time of his death; where as in this case the mother spoiled the whole estate by making it over to her 'brothers' family probably as security for her and left a debt of Rs. 8000 for the memorialist to clear.

(*g*). Even in the case of Challapalli Zamindary the Zamindar's mother is allowed a maintenance of Rs. 300 a month when the estate is yielding an income of three lacks of rupees a year.
In the case of Nuzvid Zamindary Rs. 150 have been set apart for the first wife of the late Rajah Narayya Appa Row Bahadur Zamindar by the Court of Wards when the estate yielding some six lacks of rupees was under their management in 1877-1878.

In the Case of Rapalli Zamindary a provision of Rs. 50 was made for the mother of the Zamindar Vide G. O. No. 240. of 19th February 1884.

In the case of Kamadana family where the monthly pension is Rs. 600, a sum of Rs. 33-5-4 was made to the widow of the late Kamadana Venkatrama Gopala Jagannadha Sobhanadri Row Bahadur Zamindar. Vide G. O. No. 1253 of 11th November 1884.

10. That in these circumstances the memorialist most respectfully begs to state that the Collector is not justified in asking the memorialist to pay Rs. 240 to his mother and reporting* the same for Board's approval without any application from her as he is in always willing to support her should she come and live with him. If the Board wish to make her some provision the memorialist as head of the family and in the interests of his mother, is very willing to pay a liberal allowance of Rs. 100 per mensem to her as sub-pensioner.

* 13-12-86.

For this act of justice and benevolence the memorialist shall as in duty bound ever pray.

Nursarowpeta,
th January 1887.

C. No. 1975

CHIEF SECRETARY
10 MAR 87

10-3-87

13 / PR 3 [illegible]

12 / P.O 1972 [illegible]

Rev: 1975/87

127

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE
MADRAS

15/

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

Dated 7th January 1888.

No. 55 Mis.

J. H. Garstin Esqre. C.S.I.

READ .... Endorsement of the Collector of Kistna, dated 2nd December 1887. No. 6204, on letter from the General Deputy Collector, dated 19th November 1887. No. 1039.

51

Resolution:— Submitted to Government with reference to G.O. dated 4th July 1887. No. 3811.

2. Without going so far as to say that there is any parallel between the present case and that of the Vasireddi pension, the Board are now inclined to think that Rs 240 would be sufficient for the widow, that being the amount recommended by the present Collector as well as by his predecessor.

(True extract)

To
The Secy to Govt. R.D. with [illegible] report and its 22 enclo[illegible].
Copy to the Collr. of K[illegible]

R. W. Benson
Ag. Secretary

G.O. 4-7-87 No. 3811 Mis

Print - My [illegible]
order 23/2

Read again Mis. G.O. d/4th July (87) No. 3811
Read also C. No. 158 & 934 & 1189.

G.O.
23-2-88, No: 165

The Government accept the Board's recommendation and accordingly direct that an allowance of Rs 20 a month be separately paid to Malrazu Lakshmi Venkayamma Rao for her life or until further orders.

22/2.

Issue orders

To the Board of Rev. Land Rev.
To the petitioners (ordinarily)
to Accountant General

Issued 1/3/88

50/3

R C Reg-114-3

E. 16/2
R. 21/2

Revenue 1888. Dept.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

MADRAS.

No. 158.

10 JAN 88
DEPARTMENT

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

RD 9 Jany.

Proceedings, dated 7th January 1888.

No. 55 Mis. ~~Routine~~. Enclosures. 23

Subject.

Submitting to Government with remarks report from the Collector of Kistna furnishing further information regarding the pensions of Malrazu Venkata Narasimha Row, Ex-Zemindar of Narasaraopet and his mother

11

Wilson