

Public (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 905-

DATED 25-8-96

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere with the action
taken by the Comr. of Chingleput
in the case of the treasure
discovered in the temple of
Sri Vyankata Perumal in Attameru.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு
செய்துள்ளதற்கு

To
His Excellency the Governor in Council
Government House

Cotacamund
15 APR. 1896

The humble appeal petition (under section 9 of Act 6 of 1878) of A. Ramamujachariar, a native of Utaramallur, Madurantakam Taluq, Chingleput District, against the proceedings (under section 13 of the said act) of the collector of Chingleput Dist. dated 9th December 1895 respectfully sheweth,

That the appellant has proved that he was the finder of the treasure which formed the subject of enquiry in the proceedings now appealed against and not one Parasuraman as the collector says in his Proceedings. That appellant has sworn that Parasuraman was not at all present when he found the treasure, that A. Srinivasa Raghavengar, A. Venkatesa Iyengar, K. Krishna Iyengar and Ramavadiar have deposed before the Deputy Tahsildar of Utaramallur that the appellant was the finder of the treasure, that the village munsiff also reported that the appellant found the treasure and that the Deputy Tahsildar after a careful inquiry came to the conclusion that the appellant was the finder of the treasure.

That the said Parasuraman himself did not appear either before the Deputy Tahsildar of Utaramallur or the collector and say that he found the treasure, nor was he cited and examined although a notice inviting claimants for the treasure in question was published more than thrice in the Gazette.

- 3
3. That it is upon the voluntary statement of one Varadiengar, who was never summoned either at the instance of the claimants or by the collector, who did not appear and depose before the Deputy Tahsildar and who is on inimical terms with the appellant, that the collector bases his finding that Paraswaman was the finder of the treasure.
 4. That the appellant submits that upon these facts the collector ought to have found that he was the finder.
 5. That the collector directed the rival claimants to seek redress in a civil court within the period prescribed by law and they have not as yet done anything although the period has expired.

Under these circumstances the appellant prays that Your Excellency in Council will be pleased to find that he is the finder of the treasure in question and direct that the property be given him in accordance with the Provisions of Act 6 of 1878 as he is very anxious to use it for charity. He has herewith enclosed the Proceedings of the Collector and his depositions before the Collector and Dy. Tahsildar. Please to remain,

Most Respected Sir,

Your most obedient and
loyal subject -
13th April 1896.

(Signature)
(Acha Ramanuja Aiyengar),
Uthamallur, Madurantakam
Taluk, Chingleput District)

Pub. No. 131-15-2

Current No. 11

DEPARTMENT.

Rider

From

A. Ramanuja Chari

Kramallur

Madurantakam T.

Chingleput

No.

Dated 13

Received 15

Registered 16

Enclosures 2

April 1896

SUBJECT.

Appealing against the Prop.
of the Collr of Chingleput
declaring one Paruraman
and not him the finder of
certain treasure.

SA
2/14

W.D.

The first declaration
by the Collector - This
petition was submitted before
the Collector two months after the
date of the
Collector's declaration - vide
Sec. 1878.

To Rlv.

no
no 10 2318 15-2-96
The Collector's final order is
dated 17-1-96. It is
noted that the
two months
mentioned
in § 9, Act VI
of 1878
30 B
13/7/96

There is no appeal
against the Collector's
declaration. The
Collector's order is
dated 17-1-96. It is
noted that the
two months
mentioned
in § 9, Act VI
of 1878
30 B
13/7/96

Copy of Petrie kaifyat given
before the Dy Tahsildar of K.A.
-ramallur on 2.6.95.

On the 24th May last when
repairs were executed to the
Vaikuntha Perumal temple in K.A.
-ramallur a small iron pot
containing treasure valued in all
at Rs 132 was found on re-
moving one of the stones that
formed the pavement in front of
the temple idol. As I was not
aware that I must make over
the treasure to Govt. I sent for
Seshadri Aiyangar the dharma-
karta of the temple and gave it
over to him. Raghav Aiyangar
also was then present on the spot.
It was about one o'clock noon
when the treasure was found. The
iron pot was rusty and fell to
pieces when struck with the
crowbar. The treasure was handed
over to the dharma-karta in order
that it may be made use of for
the temple.

(an abstract)

C.O.
22-4-96

This is not really
an appeal under
Sec. 9 of Act VI of 1878. The petitioner does not
complain of the
Collector's order
declaring the treasure
to be oversteal,
but he claims that
he was the finder,
& not Paracuraman,
as stated by the Collector.
I submit the following
draft order for
approval.

Endorsement of 2/4/41
"It is ordered that the
Collector of Chingleput
who is requested to
report whether there
is any truth in the
petitioner's statement
that he was the finder
of the treasure.

2. The circumstances
under which the
treasure came into
the hands of the
present authorities
must also be supported
by some papers
confirming the
petitioner's statement
that the treasure

as delivered up by
in pet. ~~stated~~
advice to the ~~thru~~
into the ~~g~~ in 6
of 1878, in ~~1878~~
under ~~might~~ be
considered to have
complied with the
provisions of sec. 4
of Act II of 1878,
the sale proceeds
wd. be handed over
to him under sec. 15
of the Act.

The following attention
is drawn to the delay
of two months in giving
the pett. copy of the
order appealed against.

Yours
15/7/96

we collector of Chingleput
with petition & four copies in origl
to be returned with reply.

No. 2273 of 1896

Chingleput
District Collector's Office.

Recd. per 12th August 1896.

From

J. S. Forbes Esquire,
Collector of the
Chingleput District.

To

Chief
The Secretary to Government,
Public Department,
Madras.

SIR,

I have the honor to reply to
memorandum No. 1441 dated 21st ultimo
regarding the claim put forth by A. Rama-
mja Aiyengar of Ulthamerur, Madurantaka
village to the treasure discovered in the temple
of Sri Vythimta perumal in that village.
2 I was found at the enquiry that
the petitioner was not the finder of the
treasure but a cooly Parasuraman who
was engaged in repairing the temple. The
petitioner apparently attempted to have
himself regarded as the finder because
he happened to be present and as a person
interested in the temple work was watching
the coolies employed in the work. But the

and does not recognize the
discovery but regards only the actual
finders.

Taraswami was not examined
because he was in jail under sentence,
but the evidence of his identity was ample
and satisfactory. The treasure was
dug up with the crow bar, and a
Bahmin like the petitioner is not usually
the habit of employing that instrument.
and indeed it was admitted by him that
the treasure was found by the coolies.

After the find, the dharmakarta
came to the spot and he and the petitioner
took possession of the treasure but made
no notice or report whatever to the
authorities nor deposited the treasure in the
government treasury, and did not do so
until the Deputy Tahsildar who had
heard a rumour of the circumstances of
the find sent for the petitioner and asked
him whether it was a fact which he
admitted. Neither the petitioner nor
the dharmakarta therefore, even were
they the real finders, complied with the
provisions of section 4 of Act VII of 1878.

In these circumstances, rejected the
petitioner's claim as untenable.
5 Taraswami having failed to
give notice of the discovery of the treasure
to the revenue authorities, the treasure vested
in Her Majesty under section 20 of the Act,
and it was sold in auction and the proceeds
credited to Government.

The records received with the memo-
randum under reply are returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

J. G. G. G.
Collector

rom

The Collector of
Chingleput District

Chief -
The Secy. to Govt.,
Public Dept.,
Madras.

ated 12:
received 14:
17/8 } August 1896.

SECRET
CHIEF
AUG 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
No. 273 of 1896.
Enclosure 4.

2 and no. 1326 of 1896.
SUBJECT.

Submitting a report on the
petition of A. Ramannja
Sagar of Ultramar
Durantakam Salug
regarding his claim to the
treasure discovered in the
temple of Sri Vykhantaperumal
that village.

Currents 1326 & 2670
Jue.

After considering
a report from the Collec
tor on this case the
Govt declines to inter
fere with the action
taken by him in it.

26/8/96

22/8
18.8.96

The Secy. of Chingleput
Jue. 28/8