0

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultations

9th April 1858

Back No. 3 & 4

Order No 426 of 31st March 1858

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு-1

செப்பளிடுபவர் பெயர்:

செப்பளிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக்-
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள்

சரிபார்க்கும்
முதல் முறியாள
கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்க்கும்
2ம் முறியாள
கையொப்பம்

ஆராய்ச்சி
உதவியாளர்
கையொப்பம்

(1)

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 9th April 1858.

No. 3. Read the following letter from C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Collector of North Arcot to H. FORBES, Esq., Secretary to Government Fort Saint George, dated Chittoor 10th March 1858, No. 13.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit the report called for by Government, in their endorsement on Petition No. 2943 of 1857.

2. The Petitioner Lutchemeeboyee requests that the full allowance of 20 Rupees per mensem which her father-in-law received from the Arnee Jagheerdar may be continued to her. The sum of 20 Rupees was paid by the Jagheerdar to Petitioner's Father-in-law till his death. The Jagheerdar then allowed Petitioner's husband Poorooshothma Row 16½ Rupees and granted the remaning 3½ to Poorooshothma Row's brother's widow Tolasee Boyee. In A. D. 1850-51 Petitioner's husband died, when the Zemindar offered to allow the Petitioner 5 Rupees a month. The Petitioner declined and appealed to Mr. Brett, who on the 5th August 1853 decided that the Arnee Jagheerdar was justified in decreasing the amount of the allowance on Petitioner's husband's death, and that 5 Rupees was a proper sum to give her, but that the widow of Petitioner's husband's brother ought to have 5 Rupees instead of 3½ per mensem. The Petitioner again appealed when Mr. Bourdillon in an order dated the 25th January 1858 stated his opinion that as Petitioner was a childless woman the allowance of 5 Rupees per month proposed by the Jagheerdar was sufficient. Mr. Bourdillon also stated that he concurred in the decision passed by Mr. Brett on the 5th August 1853. The Petitioner then presented a petition to me, to which I replied on the 27th August 1857 that as the question had already been decided by my predecessors I could not interfere in the matter.

3. The endorsement of Government was received by me when I was on Circuit in the District and the absence of the necessary documents prevented my reporting on the subject within 20 days as required by Government.

No. 4. ORDER THEREON, No. 426; dated 31st March 1858.

Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on Petition No. 2943 of 1857.

"As the Government learn by a report from the Collector, that two former Collectors, Messrs. Brett and Bourdillon, considered the allowance of Rupees 5 per mensem offered by the Jaghiredar to Petitioner, who is a childless widow, to be quite sufficient under the circumstances of the family, they see no cause to interfere further on her behalf."

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

No 13 (B) Statement

Collectors Cutcherry

Chittoor 10th March 1838

To

The Honble C. Whittingham Esqr

Collector of Salt Revenue

&c &c &c

To

H Baker Esqr

Secretary to Government

Fort St George

Sir,

I have the honor to submit

the Report called for by Government

in their Endorsement on Petition No 295

of 1837.

2 The Petitioner Lutchmayya

Requests that the full allowance of 70 Rupees

per mensem which her father in law Ve-

-ceived from the Arcot Jaghire may

be continued to her. The sum of 70 Rupees

was paid by the Jaghire to petitioners

Father in law till his death. The Jaghire

then allowed petitioners husband

Veeraraghavamma Row 15 Rupees and

granted the remaining 55 to Veera-

-Shetty and Rama Brothers under Sala-

-de Bogee In A.D. 1830/31 petitioners

husband

husband died, when the Jagheerdar offered to allow the petitioner 5 Rs a month. The petitioner declined and appealed to Mr Brett, who on the 5th August 1833 decided that the Amildar was justified in decreasing the Amount of the allowance on petitioners husbands death; and that 6 Rupees was a proper sum to give her, but that the widow of petitioners husband (the Amildar) ought to have 6 Rs instead of 3 Rs per Mensem. The Petitioner again appealed when Mr Bourdillon in an order dated the 25th January 1834 stated his opinion that as petitioner was a Childless woman an allowance of 3 Rupees per Month proposed by the Jagheerdar was sufficient. Mr Bourdillon also stated that he Concurred in the decision passed by Mr Brett on the 5th August 1833. The petitioner then presented a petition to me, to which I replied

on

3

(4)

on the 27th August 1834 that as the question had already been decided by my predecessor I could not interfere in the matter.

The Government of Guzerat was informed by me when Surat was visited by the Circuit in the District and the above papers documents presented by the Petitioner on the Subject on the 20th of September as required by Government

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedt Servt

W. Simpson

Collector

To

H. Forbes Esqr

Secretary to Govt

Bombay

10-5-05

13-8-02 II

21-7-03

4-7-05

63-606

23-1-85

26/10/20

№ 344

A. 18 to Allowed R25

Rec. 1857 Jan 7th
Dy to Coll. G. Mfnt
Form J. № 352

The Collector
of Settlement

The Secretary to Govt.
Fort St. George

Dated 10 March 1857.
Rec. 12th — Do —

Ans. of letter 13.
Enclosures.

Respectful Petition
No 2943 of 1857 - protesting
against the reduction of her al-
lowance (payable to her by the
Inheritors of Arnee) from Rs 20
per Month to Rs 5, and praying
that the Collector may be directed
to exercise his authority in
obtaining the amount of arrears
and the full amount of her
monthly allowance.

Write an order
No 426. 31st March 1858

№ 426

Ordered that the following
endorsement be passed on Petition
№ 2943 of 1857

"As the Government learn
by a report from the Collector, that
the former Collectors Messrs Brett
and Boundell considered the
allowance of Rupees 5 per mensem
offered by the Zaghirdars to Petition
of is a liberal one to be given
to a person under the circumstances
of the family - they see no cause
to interfere further on her
behalf"

For the Sec. to Govt.
31st March 1858