பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு-1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் - ரா. வையல்நாயகி

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 11/2006

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் 3/2007

சரிபார்த்தும் முதல் மு.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்த்தும் உ.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

கூராய்ந்தி உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்

2/990

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 29th September 1857.

No. 35. Read the following petition.

To the Right Honorable the Governor in Council Fort St. George.

The humble petition of P. Narasinga Pillay and P. Vegayarunga Pillay, the Merasseedars of Ramanjary and other villages subject to the taulook of Pareyapaliem in the Zillah of Chengleput, dated Madras 21st September 1857.

Humbly Sheweth,

That in the year 1824, your Petitioners' ancestors lent Rupees 2,762-14-8 to Pedathala Nagier and his son Sashier, and in the year 1829, before the promulgation of Regulation VI. of 1831, and received from them on conditional mortgage the Meerassy of Ramanjary and other villages, Punjangum Meerassee with the Maniems attached to its sunnud Maniems, &c., of the said villages subsequently the Mortgagers having failed to fulfil the conditions of the mortgage, the said Meerassee Maniem, &c., have been sold and became the property of the petitioners' ancestors and they were accordingly registered in their names, and Puttahs for the Panjangum maniem, &c., were issued in the names of the petitioners' ancestors and themselves for the second crop cultivation raised on the said manium, as will appear by one of the Puttahs herein enclosed, Petitioners' ancestors and themselves since the year 1829, enjoyed the said meerassee, &c., undisputedly and performed the duties of the Punjangum office by Goomastahs appointed by them.

2d. In the year 1848, the son of the said Sashier having filed a suit in the taulook Moonsiff's Court against his father, and Petitioners' ancestors for the recovery of a share in the said Punjangum and sunnud maniem, the talook Moonsiff passed a decision in the favour of Petitioners' ancestors rejecting the suit on the ground that the said maniem and, &c., were sold to Petitioners' ancestors, and the said decision was afterwards confirmed in appeal by the Principal Suder Ameen, as will appear by the decrees herein enclosed.

3d. While your Petitioners' ancestors themselves were in the undisturbed possession and enjoyment of the Meerassee maniem, &c., the said Sashier filed a suit against the Petitioners, in the Session Court for the recovery of the said Meerassee sunnud and Punjangum maniem, now in their enjoyment, and that tribunal without any enquiry referred him to the Collector, as regards the maniem, he accordingly presented a petition to the Collector in the month of June 1856, and that officer without examining the documents bearing on the subject issued a Taukeed to the Sheristadar in charge of the talook to put the said Sashier in possession of Punjangum maniem, which was in the undisturbed enjoyment of Petitioners' ancestors and themselves since 33 years; the endorsement of the Collector is herewith enclosed.

4th. Your petitioners thereupon presented a petition to the Board of Revenue appealing against the decision of the Collector, and enclosing all the documents in support of their right for enjoyment of the said Meerassee Maniem, &c., and they also without any enquiry, passed the enclosed endorsement confirming the Collector's decision.

5th Your petitioners beg to submit that the above decision is very extraordinary, being inconsistent with the provisions of Regulation, &c., quoted in it, and that it is very prejudicial to their interests entailing upon them an immense loss of money, the Maniem should be in their humble opinion restored to them for the following reasons.

The purchase of the aforesaid Maniem is in no way opposed to law inasmuch as it was effected long before the year 1831 in which Regulation prohibiting the alienations of maniems was passed, and that Regulation itself declares that it cannot affect alienations made prior to the passing of the said Regulation. The other Act and Circular Orders cited in Collector's Taukeed can be applied only to sales made subsequently to the passing of the said Regulation, but not to those made prior to it.

7th It is erroneous to take the Civil Judge's Diary as an authority for the Collector's investigation of this case; as Sashier complained to the Civil judge who having no jurisdiction to receive the suit, merely referred him to the Collector, it cannot be assumed thereby that the Civil Judge has ordered the Collector to receive this case.

8th In the year 1829, the Zemindar of the said Ramunjary village having attached the Maniem in question for certain balance due to him by the said Nagier and Sashier, the then Collector Mr. Cotton enquired into the matter through the Tahsildar and issued orders in the year 1830 for the release of the said Maniem, &c., to their ancestors, on the ground of the same being mortgaged and sold to petitioners' ancestors. In the year 1836, the said Maniem having again been attached by the circar for certain balance due by the said Nagier, the then Collector Mr. McLean on a complaint being preferred by the petitioners' ancestors, on the subject investigated the matter and released the said Maniem, &c., on the same ground of their being mortgaged and sold to the petitioners' ancestors, the copies of the said two Taukeeds are herein enclosed.

9th. It is clearly ruled in the Regulation that the decision of one authority cannot be altered by his successor, and that a case once adjudicated cannot be brought on again ; under the above provisions this suit ought to have been dismissed at the very first issue, without being done so, undue right has been attached to the order of the late Collector, Mr. Taylor, dated 27th November 1831, and it is therefore assumed that Sashier's claim was pending long since while a first order is to be generally considered as being annulled by a second one.

10th. There are several instances wherein service Maniems have been sold to others, and such sales which were made prior to the promulgation of Regulation VI. of 1831, are confirmed by the Board of Revenue and Government and Civil authorities. It is therefore incumbent on his Lordship in Council, to maintain the Petitioners in the long enjoyment of the Maniem in question.

Under these circumstances, your Petitioners pray your Lordship in Council, will be pleased to take into their consideration the Taukeeds of the Collector, the previous decrees of the Courts herein enclosed, and refer the other authorities therein quoted, and then reverse the orders now issued by the Collector and the Board of Revenue, and it maintain the Petitioners in the long enjoyment of the Maniem in question.

No. 36. ORDER THEREON, No. 990 ; dated 26th September 1857.

Ordered to be referred to the Collector of Chingleput, for report through the Board of Revenue.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

C. L. Shubrick Esq.
Collector of Chingleput

The humble Petition of Ponnarayanga Pillay and Venkatarangha Pillay the Hereditary Maniagars of Ramunjary and other Villages in Pareyapaliem Taulook in the District of Chingleput

Humbly Sheweth

That in the Year 1824 your Petitioners ancestors lent Rs 2763. 14. 8. to Pedathale Nagier and his son Shashier and in the year 1829 before the promulgation of Regulation VI of 1831 they received from them on conditional Mortgage the Maniagam of Ramunjary and other Villages Punjangum Meerasie with the Maniums attached to it, termed Inaums and the of the said Villages. Subsequently the Mortgagers having failed to fulfill the Conditions of the Mortgage the said Meerasie Maniums &c became the property of the Petitioners ancestors and they were accordingly registered in their names as Pattahs for the Punjangum Maniums and &c were issued in the names of the Petitioners ancestors and themselves for the second Crop Cultivation raised in the said Maniums as will appear by one of the Pattahs herein enclosed. Petitioners ancestors and themselves since the Year 1829 enjoyed the said Meerasie &c undisputedly and performed the duties of the Punjangum office by Goomastahs appointed by them.

In the Year 1848 the son of the said Sashier having filed a Suit in the Taulook Moonsiffs Court against his Father and the Petitioners ancestors for the recovery of a share in the said Punjangum and termed Maniums, the Taulook Moonsiffs on a full enquiry passed a decision in favour of Petitioners ancestors rejecting the Suit on the Ground that the said Maniums &c were sold to Petitioners ancestors

that the Suit was brought to defraud their ancestors the purchasers of the same and the said decession was afterwards confirmed on appeal by the Principal Sudder Ameen as will appear by the decrees herein enclosed which if perused the statement in the Collectors decession herein enclosed that the decession was only regarding the adoption is not Correct.

3rd While your Petitioners ancestors and afterwards themselves were in the undisturbed possession and the enjoyment of the said Meerasee Mannium &c. the said Sashier filed a Suit against the Petitioners in the Sessions Court for the recovery of the Meerasee named and Punyangum Mannium now in their enjoyment and that tribunal without any enquiry referred him to the Collector as regards the Mannium he accordingly Presented a Petition to your honor in the Month of June 1856 which your honor without examining the documents bearing on the subject and instituting any enquiry into the matter forwarded Yaadeek to the Serishtadar in charge of the Taalook a Copy herein enclosed to put the said Sashier in possession of Punyangum Mannium which was in the undisturbed enjoyment of Petitioners ancestors and themselves since 33 Years.

4th Your Petitioners thereupon presented a Petition to the Board of Revenue, who also without any enquiry Confirmed the Collectors decision

5th On 17th November 1856 Your Petitioners presented a Petition to the Government, stating that the above decision is very extraordinary being inconsistent with the provisions of Regulations &c. quoted in it and that it is very perjudicial to their interests entailing upon them an immence loss of money the Mannium should be in their humble opinion restored to them for the following reasons

The purchase of the aforesaid Mannium is in no way opposed to law in as much as it was effected long before the year 1831 in which regulation prohibiting the alienation of Mannium was passed on that Regulations clearly declare that it Cannot affect alienations made prior to the passing of the said Regulation, the other act and Circular orders cited in Collectors Yaadeek Can be applied only to sales made subsequently to the passing of the said Regulations but not to those made prior to it, but the Government favoured with an endorsement stating returned under Para 3 of the Petition Rules for the production of the Collectors endorsement, which is herewith enclosed for the inspection of your honor and two Yaadeeds of Mr Cotton and Mr M Vean the then Collector are herein enclosed and also another Yaadeed of Mr Breeze late Collector will be produced soon as received from the Court regarding the said Mannium &c.

Your Petitioners have therefore thus brought all their effective Circumstance to the Knowledge of your honor and Pray your honor will graciously be pleased to look into all the papers hereby and refer the other Authorities therein and then pass the order to the effect putting the Petitioners possession of the said Mannium &c. or to favour them with an endorsement as prayed.

For which act of kindness
Your Petitioners as in duty bound
Shall ever Pray
P. Narasinga Pillay
P. Vezia Runga Pillay

Madras
December
1856

To

6/990

The President and Members
of the Board of Revenue
&c &c &c
Fort Saint George

19/4/20

The Respectful Petition of P. Narainapa Pillay and P. Veja Ranga Pillay the Mirasidar of the Village Ramanjary in the Taluk of Pareampettai residing at Pareampettai &c Madras

Most Noble Gentlemen

1st Our ancestor had in 1824 sent 19 Pagodas 2762-12-8 to Pidittala Nagiah and his Son Sashier and received from them a conditional mortgage of the Meerasy Puyamtham Manzum and Sunnadoo Manzum of the Village Ramanjary, as also, their Puyamtham and Sunnadoo Manzums in the Villages Carney Nigalapatton & Coonnavalum in 1829 our ancestor obtained a sale of the same; and ever since, we continue enjoying them undisputably.

2nd In the year 1848 the Son of the said Sashier having filed a suit in the Taluk Moonsiffs Court against his father & our ancestor for the recovery of a Share in the Puyamtham Sunnud Manzum above referred to the Taluk Moonsiff on a full enquiry passed a decision in our favor rejecting the suit on the ground that the said Manzum &c were sold to our ancestor by his father and grandfather & that the suit was brought to defraud our ancestor the purchaser of the same, and the said decision was afterwards confirmed on appeal by the Principal Sudder Ameen as will appear by the decrees herein enclosed which of course the Statement in the Collector decision herein

Puyamtham — 31 — 9 — 00

enclosed that the decision was only regarding the adoption is not correct.

3 While our ancestors and afterwards ourselves were in the undisturbed profession and the enjoyment of the said Meerasy Mauzums &c the said Sashier filed a Suit against us in the Sessions Court for the recovery of the Meerasy & Dunnud Pungarum Mauzums now in enjoyment and that tribunal referred him to the Collector as regards the Mauzums he accordingly presented a Petition to the Collector in the Month of June 1836 that office without examining the documents bearing on the Subject & instituting any enquiry sent a Peon to the Shirestadar in charge of the Talook (a copy herein enclosed) to put the said Sashier in possession of Perichangum Mauzums which is the undisturbed enjoyment of our ancestors since 33 years

4. We beg to submit that the above decision is very extraordinary being inconsistent with the Provisions of the Regulations & quoted in it and that it is very prejudicial to our interests entailing upon us an immense loss of money the Mauzums should be restored to us the decision reversed for the following reasons.

5. The Purchase of the aforesaid Mauzums is in no way opposed to Law in as much as it was effected long before in 1831 when the Regulation forbidding the alienation of Mauzums was passed that Regulation itself declares that it cannot affect alienations made prior to the passing of the Regulation. The other Act & Circular orders cited in Collector's Letter can be applied only to sales made subsequently to the passing of the said Regulation but not to those made

made prior to it

6. It is erroneous to take the Civil Judge's Decree as an authority for the Collector's investigation of this Case As Sashier complained to the Civil Judge who having no jurisdiction to receive the suit merely referred him to the Collector it cannot be assumed thereby that the Civil Judge has ordered the Collector to receive this Case

7. In the year 1829 the Zamindar of the said Pennungary Village having attached the Mauzums &c in question for certain balance due to him by the said Napier & Sashier the then Collector Mr Cotton enquired into the matter thro the Tahsildar & issued orders in the year 1830 for the release of the said Mauzums &c to our ancestors on the ground of the same being mortgaged to our ancestors. In the year 1836 the said Mauzums having again been attached by the Circar for certain balance due by the said Napier the then Collector Mr M'Leod on a complaint being preferred by our ancestors in the Subject investigated the matter and released the said Mauzums &c on the same ground of their being mortgaged to the Petitioners ancestors

8. It is clearly ruled in the Regulation that the decrees of one Authority cannot be altered by his successor that a case once adjudicated cannot be brought up again Under the above provision this suit ought to have been dismissed at the very first sight Without being done so undue weight has been attached to the order of a late Collector Mr Taylor dated 27th November 1831 but it is there from apparent that Sashier's claim was pending long since, what a just order it is to be generally considered as being annulled by a second one

9th There are several instances wherein Service Mauzums have been sold to others but such sales were cancelled by the Board of Revenue & Government Vide

Authorities. It is incumbent on your Honorable Board of Revenue to maintain us in the long enjoyment of the Mamoom in question.

We therefore pray your Honorable Board will be pleased to take into consideration the Petition of the Collector & the decrees of the Court herein enclosed and reverse the order now issued by the Collector & maintain us in the long enjoyment of the Mamoom in question.

We beg to remain with respect
Most Noble Gentlemen
Your most obedient & humble
Servants
P. Narasinga Pillay
P. Vezia Rungu Pillay

Madras
29th July 1856

Rec'd 2/10/56

From P. Narasinga Pillay & P. Vezia Rungu Pillay

Praying to be maintained in the enjoyment of the Mamoom in question

Referred to the Collector of Chingleput for report & return

By Order

[illegible]

Dated 2nd October 1856

Dispatched 3rd October 1856.

1 8/990

G141

1 R 227/58. 3 Jan 3 Jan

In Dr 4032/57
In Cons Feb 4/58.

15/990

To

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council

Fort St. George

The humble Petition of P. Narasinga Pillay and P. Vegayarunga Pillay the Merapeedars of Ramunjary Cum Ootoo Village in Parepapaleum Talook in the District of Chingleput — " — "

Humbly Sheweth

That in the year 1824 Your Petitioners ancestors lent Rx 2762–14–8. to Pedakala Nagier (and) his son Sawkien, and in the year 1829 before the promulgation of Regulation V. of 1831 V received from them an conditional Mortgage the Merapeedary of Ramunjary (and) other Villages Punganum Merapeem with the Manium attached to it Sunnud Manium &c of the said Villages. Subsequently the Mortgagors having failed to fulfill the conditions of the Mortgage the said Merapeem Manium &c became the property of the Petitioners ancestors (and) they were accordingly registered in their names (in) Pullahs for the Punganum Manium &c were issued in the names of the Petitioners ancestors and themselves for the second Crop Cultivation raised on the said Manium as will appear by one of the Pullahs herein enclosed –

Petitioners

Petitioners ancestors and themselves since the Year 1829 enjoyed the said Meerasy Vs undisputedly and performed the duties of the Punyangam Office by Gomastahs appointed by them.

2nd In the Year 1846 the Son of the said Sashier having filed a suit in the Jaffnapatam Moonsiffs Court against his father and Petitioners ancestors for the recovery of a share in the said Punyangam and Sumed Manium, the Jaffnapatam Moonsiff on a full enquiry passed a decision in favour of Petitioners ancestor rejecting the suit on the ground that the said Manium Vs were sold to Petitioners ancestors by his father and grand father and that the suit was brought to defraud their ancestors the purchasers of the same, and the said decission was afterwards Confirmed in appeal by the principal Judge Ameen as will appear by the decrees herein enclosed, which if perused the Statement in the Collectors decission herein enclosed that the decision was only regarding the adoption is not Correct

3rd While Your Petitioners ancestors and afterwards themselves were in the undisturbed possession and the enjoyment of the said Meerasy Manium &c the said Sashier filed a suit against the Petitioners in the Jaffnapatam Court for the recovery of the Meerasy Sumed & Punyangam Manium now in their enjoyment and that Tribunal without any enquiry referred him to the Collector

as

16/990

as regards the Manium, he accordingly presented a Petition to the Collector in the month of June 1850 & that Officer without examining the Documents & that bearing on the Subject & instituting any enquiry into the matter issued a Taukeed to the Sheristadar in charge of the Jaffnapatam, a Copy herein enclosed to put the said Sashier in possession of Punyangam Manium which was in the undisturbed enjoyment of Petitioners ancestors and themselves since 33 years

4th Your Petitioners thereupon presented Petition to the Board of Revenue appealing against the decission of the Collector & enclosing all the Documents in support of their right & the enjoyment of the said Meerasy Manium Vs and they also without any enquiry passed the enclosed endorsement Confirming the Collectors decision

5th Your Petitioners beg to submit that the above decission is very extraordinary being inconsistent with the provisions of Regulation & quoted in it and that it is very prejudicial to their interests entailing upon them an immense loss of money the Manium should be in their humble opinion restored to them for the following reasons -

6th That purchase of the aforesaid Manium is in no way opposed to Law in as much

as

18

Under these Circumstances Your Petitioners Pray your Lordships in Council will be pleased to take into their Consideration the Proceedings of the Collector the previous Decrees of the Courts herein enclosed and reverse the orders now issued by the Collector and the Board of Revenue and it maintain the Petitioners in the long enjoyment of the Mauniam in question.

By doing which act of benevolence Your Lordships' humble Petitioners are in duty bound shall ever Pray

Madras
17th November 1856

P. Narasinga Pillay
P. Verija Runga Pillay

18/990

Petn. 1911-56
No 2617 dated 19 Sept 1856
From Petitioners
Collector's Decision
for Collector's Proceedings
Extract of Proceedings
Decree of Court
Petition
Dated 17th
Rec'd 18th November 1856
Petitioners under
Case of the Poor
Rule for the
Appointing Pleader
Collector's Proceedings
Decree of Court
Mauniam Land
Petitioners
Exhibits &c
Ex. No. 50

To The Right Honorable the Governor in Council
Fort St. George

19/22

The humble Petition of P. Narasinga Pillay and P. Vegayarunga Pillay the Meerasdars of Ramanyam and other Pillays subject to the Taaluk of Parayapalaim in the Zillah of Chengleput

Humbly Sheweth

That in the year 1824 your Petrs ancestors lent Rs 2762-14-8 to Pitchikala Nazier and his son Sashier and in the year 1829 before the promulgation of Regulation VII of 1831 received from them on Conditional Mortgage the Meerasy of Ramanyam and other Pillays Punyangum Mirasy with the Manieams attached to its Summed Manieams &c of the said Pillays Subsequently the Mortgagors having failed to fulfil the conditions of the Mortgage, the said Meerasee Manieam &c became the property of the Petitioners ancestors and they were accordingly registered in their names and Puttahs for the Punyangum Manieams &c were issued in the names of the Petitioners ancestors and themselves for the second Crop Cultivation raised on the said Manieam as will appear by one of the Puttahs herein enclosed, Petitioners ancestors and themselves since the year 1829 enjoyed the said Meerasee &c undisputedly and performed the duties of the Punyangum Office by Proxies by them appointed

In the year 1848 the son of the

said Sashier having filed a Suit in the Tanbork Moonsiffs Court against his father and Pets ancestors for the recovery of a share in the said Puryangaum and Sunnud Manieum, the Tanbork Moonsiff passed a decision in the favour of Pets ancestors rejecting the Suit on the Ground that the said Manieum and &c. were sold to Petitioners ancestors and the said decision was afterwards confirmed in Appeal by the Principal Sudder Ameen as will appear by the Decrees herein enclosed.

3rd. While your Pets ancestors themselves were in the undisturbed possession and enjoyment of the Meerassee Manieum &c the said Sashier filed a Suit against the Petitioners in the Sudder Court for the recovery of the said Meerassee Sunnud & Puryangaum Manieum now in their enjoyment and that Tribunal without any enquiry referred him to the Collector regards the Manieum, he accordingly presented a Petition to the Collector in the Month of June 1856. & that Officer without examining the Documents bearing on the subject issued a Tanbeed to the Sherastadar in Charge of the Tanbork to put the said Sashier in possession of Puryangaum Manieum which was in the possession & undisturbed enjoyment of Petitioners ancestors and themselves since 33 years the Endorsement of the Collector is herewith enclosed.

4th. Your Pets thereupon presented a Petition

20/290 Petition to the Board of Revenue appealing against the decision of the Collector & enclosing all the Documents in support of their right for the enjoyment of the said Meerassee Manieum &c. and they also without any enquiry passed the enclosed Endorsement Confirming the Collectors decision.

5th. Your Pets beg to Submit that the above decision is very extraordinary being inconsistent with the provisions of Regulation &c. quoted in it and that it is very prejudicial to their interests sustaining upon them an immence loss of money the Manieum should be in their humble opinion restored to them for the following reasons.

The purchase of the aforesaid Manieum is in no way opposed to Law in as much as it was effected long before the year 1831 in which Regulation prohibiting the alienation of Manieums was passed and that Regulation itself declares that it cannot affect alienations made prior to the passing of the said Regulation. Neither Act and Circular orders cited in Collectors Tanbork Can be applied only to Sales made Subsequently

to the

to the passing of the said Regulation but are to those made prior to it.

7th. It is erroneous to take the Civil Judges Diary as an authority for the Collectors investigation of this Case — as Sookhee Complains to the Civil Judge who having no Jurisdiction to receive the Suit merely Referrd him to the Collector it cannot be ajuged thereby that the Civil Judge has ordered the Collector to receive this Case.

8th. In the year 1829 the Zamendar of the said Ramnugary Village having attached the Mauzems in question for certain balance due to him by the said Nazir (and) Sookhee the then Collector Mr Cotton enquires into the Matter brought the Jahedder (and) issued orders in the Year 1830 for the release of the said Mauzems &c. to their ancestors, on the ground of the same being Mortgaged (and) sold to Petitioners ancestors, In the Year 1836 the said Mauzems having again been attached by the Circar for certain balance due by the said Nazir the then Collector Mr. M Vean on a Complaint being preferred by the Petitioners ancestors on the subject, investigated the Matter (and) released the said Mauzems &c. on the same ground of their being mortgaged (and) sold to the Petitioners ancestors, the Copies of the said 2 Jaubeds are herewith enclosed. 21/1870

9th. It is clearly ruled in the Regulation that the decision of one Authority cannot be altered by his Successor (and) that a Case once adjudicated cannot be Brought on again — under the above provisions this Suit ought to have been dismissed at the very first Step without being done so, undue weight has been attached to the order of the late Collector Mr. Taylor dated 27th November 1831 (and) it is therefore ajuged that Sookhee's Claim was pending long since while a first order is to be generally Considered as being annulled by a second one.

10th. There are several instances wherein Service Mauzems have been sold to others (and) such Sales which were made prior to the Promulgation of Regulation VI of 1831 are Confirmed by the Board of Revenue (and) Government (and) Civil Authorities. It is therefore incumbent on his Lordship in Council to Maintain the Petitioners in the long enjoyment of the Mauzems in question.

Under these Circumstances your Petitioners Pray your Lordship in Council will be pleased to take into their Consideration the Jaubeds

of the Collector the previous Decrees of the Courts herein enclosed, and refer the other Authorities therein quoted and then reverse the orders now issued by the Collector and the Board of Revenue and it maintain the Petitioners in the long enjoyment of the Maniems in question.

Your Petrs as in duty bound
Shall ever Pray

P. Narasinga Pillay

Order on the back

Madras
21st September 1857

22/990

Revenue 1857 Septr.
Dd to Coms 29th Sept.

No. 1097

From P. Narasinga Pillay & P. Vezayarunga Pillay the Merasseedars of Ramunjary & other Villages in Chinglepput.

Dated 21st Septr. 57
Recd. } 4 Enclosr.

Praying under the circumstances set forth that the Orders of the Collr. & the Bd. of Rev: may be reversed, & that Petrs. may be put in the enjoyment of their Manien of Ramunjary & other Villages, subject to the Talook of Parimapolium in Chinglepput.

Write an order.

From Bd. 15th Feby/58 No. 227 } 12th March/58 } 19-20

No. 35 & 36.

No. 990.

Ordered to be referred to the Collector of Chinglepput for report thro' the Board of Revenue.

(Initialled)

Fort St. Geo. } 26th Septr. 1857.

Copy to the Collr. of Chinglepput with 4 Origl. Encls. Dispd. 26
Do. to the Bd. of Revenue

(1)

(90)

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultations

29th Sept 1857

Bundle No: 35 & 36

Order No 990 P/26 Aug 29th 1857