

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

1103

Press
Mis.

Dated *19th August* 18*59*.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
from 13th to 19th August 1859.*

No. 38. Read the following Petition.

To the Right Honorable Sir CHARLES TREVELYAN, Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

The humble Petition of Aroonachella Naicken Nattamay and Village Moonsiff in the Village of Chinnareddeputtee in the Talook of Strcevellepoottoor in the Zillah of Tinnevely; dated 22nd July 1859.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That the Sub-Collector having in Fusly 1267 dismissed me from service causelessly, I presented to the higher authority an appeal Petition, but obtained no redress. Consequently I prepared a Memorial to Her Majesty the Queen in Council and have herewith submitted three Memorials with decrees and endorsements.

I therefore most humbly solicit your honor will be graciously pleased to submit the above Memorials for the inspection and consideration of Her Majesty the Queen in Council.

No. 39. ORDER THEREON, 17th August 1859, No. 1103.

Ordered that the Memorial be forwarded to the Home Authorities, and that Petitioner be informed of its dispatch.

(Signed) W. C. SIM,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

To

The Secretary of the State for
India.

The humble Memorial of
Arconachella Naiken Nattam
Village Moonsiff in the Village
of Chinnareddy puttee in the
Talook of Streevillepothoor in
the Zillah of Tennevelly.
fully Sheweth.

The "Moorthy anurcoolam" Tank
of the said Village is to be filled with rainy
water flowing through wilderness, but it
has no canal or river to get in water
fully 1267 Pungah Crops were raised with
a small portion of rainy water which first
flowed in the Tank, but for want of water
for the irrigation of the crops and of further
rain, the same instead of growing became
dry.

This matter was reported to the
Talook and under the order received there
from, myself and the said Village Curm
in Company with another Nattam curm

the Ryots took views around the said land, and sent an account to the Talook. Upon which, the Talook Gomastah Rajagopal Royer came, made ajimah or inspected the dry state of crops, and forwarded an account to the Talook to that effect.

3^d On the 13th April of the said fushy a Summad was received from the Talook stating that the stalks of the dried crops must be cut for cattle eating, but as the amount (the estimate of the dried crops) is payable to conditions, they must be cut according to the estimate, and to receive, and send, an account for the same. On the 14th of the said Summad, the Ryots cut the crops.

4th The Muttangary Village Curnum Gomastah of the said Village Seeneyapillay, thro' hatred towards me, attempted to obtain, by fraudulent means, of this Curnum Officer and represented to the Sub Collector of the said Zillah as if the dried crops had grown ^{in full} while the same were not complained of. On this that Officer having enquired, into the matter, it was proved that the crops were

were in a dried state.

5th While so, the Sub Collector having dismissed me, the said Village Curnum, and the Talook Gomastah, gave a decision under Regulation IX of 1822. This decision declares that no charge against the Defendants was proved.

6th The 1st Witness Seeneyapillay deposed that before the Talook Gomastah (1st Defendant) ajemashu or inspecting further the crops on the 11th April 1858, they were reaped. He (1st witness) with a view of usurping the said Curnumship, gave such a false deposition, but it is not true. His having stated so, is a proof of his being appointed to the Curnum duty. If the Ryots in the said Village and those in the next Village were sent for, & examined in the matter of the crops being reaped, it would have appeared that the statement of the 1st Witness is quite false but no such examination took place.

7th The 2^d Witness Gamaabunee Gos. mustah) states that on the 9th April the 2^d Dept

2^d Defendant (Curnum) was at his Cutchery in Streetville post town, and that as he did not permit him to go, he thinks that he would have remained there on the 10th. As the 2^d Witness saw him on the 9th, the Ajemash made of the crops on the 11th would not have been untrue. The said Village is at 24 Miles distance from Streetville post town. They are also so near for people to start in the morning and to reach them in the evening. Consequently, there is not the least doubt that the 2^d Def^t started on the 10th and Ajemashed the Crops on 11th.

8. The Sub Collector expresses his opinion that the Defendant (Curnum) is stricken in Years, that he should have passed 72 Miles distance in 3 days, & that it is impossible for him to do so. This sentiment is not at all just. The said Curnum can easily walk 30 Miles distance per diem. There is not the least doubt that the said Village is at a distance of 24 Miles, nor is it to be concealed by

any one. The said Officer remarks that the statements of the Defendants as to the preparation of the Accounts are contradictory. The declarations of the Defendants prove that the said Orungah Crops have been dried, but there is not any such contradiction. 9. It is customary that if the Orungah Crops had been previously dried up, the Village Officers would have first estimated the same, & sent the Account to the Talook; that the Talook Officers would further estimate them, and send the Account to the Hoogoor, and that by order of the Hoogoor, other Officers, would have cut and put them in possession of the Ryots and estimated the Crops. On the Sub Collector having on the 2^d February in July 1267 sent an order No. 40 to the Talsildar, directing him to allow the Ryots to reap the produce of land yielding 2 Cottahs of paddy for 1 Cottah of paddy, the latter sent a Summons to the Curnum Merassidur, stating that the Ryots, after the Crops were further estimated, they should reap the produce.

But as they as per the surnum, reaped, and
carried away, the produce I am subject
to such troubles & difficulties.

10 On this occasion I presented
Petitions of Appeal to the Head Collector,
the B. and of Revenue, and the Government
respectively, but they without considering
at all the above circumstances, confirmed
the decision of the Sub Collector, and gave
me respective endorsements. The Crops
in several Villages of the said Talook
being dried up, necessary steps were
taken in the same manner as were done
in the Village, and Tervah was thereupon
expunged. But the Sub Collector dismissed
me from Prattamay and Village Moonsiffship
(hereditarily and long held from the time of
my Ancestors, as also from the time of his highness
the Nizam, and which was registered in 1211
in the name of my father Soobanaikhan who
held the Office, and after his death, I held
the same) Consciously and without any charge
against ^{me} ordering me to pay the Tervah also.
I therefore most humbly pray

Your Lordship will be pleased to prove the
decision & endorsements submitted herewith
and to order restoration to me of the said my
Services because I am a respectable Member
of family & Cammencethu holder, in the said
Village, & because I have faithfully held
the same for 34 Years without any Complaint
against me - Your Petitioner is in duty bound

22 July 1858

Shall Ever Pray

TO THE HONORABLE

Copy of Tamil Endorsement.

Aroonachella Naiken Pattamay of Shima
redderputtee Village in the Talook of Thre-
villeepathoor.

Petition of Appeal No 311.

Endorsement given to the Petitioner.

In the matter of this Appeal Petition
the whole record of the original Decree
having been called for and perused it appears
that against the statement of the Petitioner
an account shewing Manceevode (scorched
state of crops) has been prepared for defrond-
ing the Government Seroval payable on
the land which yielded produce. Consequently
I see no reasons to reverse the decision of the
Sub Collector in this matter.

9th August 1868.

Signed D. Mayne
Collector

Trinistation

N^o 411 of 1858.

Endorsement to the Petitioner.

This subject matter an appeal without being disposed of according to Reg.ⁿ IX of 1822 is decided with reference to Reg.ⁿ VII of 1831 and to the Revenue Authority. Consequently, if it is your wish to appeal in the matter to the Board of Revenue, you are at liberty to do so in person. I see no reason to admit & forward the appeal.

Petition to the Board

10th September 58.

/Signed/ D. Mayne
Coll^r

മലബാറിലെ ൧൭-ാം നമ്പറിലെ കയ്യെഴുത്തു

[illegible]

1858 சென்னை
சென்னை 1858

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

1855
 1855
 1855

Dec 26/38

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or date, with some illegible markings.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a letter or document. The text is written on a piece of paper pasted onto a larger sheet. The script is dense and difficult to decipher, but appears to be a continuous passage of text.

Handwritten text, likely a signature or name, possibly "John" or "John" followed by a surname, written in cursive script.

1853
December 1/92
D. H. H. H.

58
Dec 12/26

Jan. 20th 1822

[illegible]

the 1st and
2nd days
on the
3rd day
1858.

2nd Japan
1854, which
of the 1854

to prepare a
to, and the

10

10

11

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Name & office of the account.	Particulars	Of house and the same as defined in clause 2nd Section II.	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.	4th Class.	5th Class.

2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Expenses of the account.	Particulars	Of house and the same as defined in clause 2nd Section II.	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.	4th Class.
Household expenses	10-8-	11th April 1853 paid for a gallon	Charges with laundry are the			
Cost of the account		are paid by the system of charging at				
Cost of the account						

Expenses of the account.	Particulars	Of house and the same as defined in clause 2nd Section II.	1st Class.	2nd Class.	3rd Class.	4th Class.	5th Class.
--------------------------	-------------	--	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

The deposition of the day's work with the account is signed as into the papers and is returned to the Controller from the night, and the day's work is

2nd day's work is as at

[The page contains dense handwritten text in Tamil script, which appears to be a legal or official document. The handwriting is cursive and fills most of the page area.]

[illegible]

[The page contains dense handwritten Tamil script, which appears to be a legal or official document. The handwriting is cursive and fills most of the page area.]

...was molines, a false charge of
having "fabricated a false account of

சென்னை நகரில் உள்ள பண்டாரத்தில்
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 யார் என்று தெரியவில்லை. இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

1/ இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

11/ இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

சென்னை நகரில் உள்ள பண்டாரத்தில்
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 யார் என்று தெரியவில்லை. இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.
 இவ்வாறு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்
 என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு
 செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று
 சொல்லுகிறார். இவ்வாறு செய்து
 கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

False accounts of cer-
 tam Cultivation as
 having yielded scanty
 produce - Prays for
 inquiry and rectification
 in consideration of his
 34 years service.
 M

^{inland 2}
 No 212 of 1858
 Call No 10/80
 From Aronachella
 Nadan Nattamy
 of Chennareddy puthy
 in Strevelly pootore
 Talook in the Dis-
 trict of Sivevelly
 Dated 14th August 58
 with 2000

Complains against
 the Sub Collector
 dismissing him from
 his hereditary Nattamy
 office, on a charge
 of having fabricated
 Decr 1459 of 1839

The B. having
received a report on the
subject of this Petition
and duly considered the
Sub. Coll^y & Coll^y deci-
sions decline to interfere
on Pet^r's behalf.

Rev. B. Office,
Fort St. George,
2. Sept. 1858.

By Order

L. M. L. W.

Sub. Secy.

The Honorable the Governor
in Council
Fort St. George
Madras.

The humble petition of
Arundachetta Saik R.
Attamigar and Moonsiff
of the Village of Chinnaruddy
petty, Satak of Mierulli-
pattor: Timucally.

Respectfully Sheweth,

1. That being aggrieved with his unjust dismissal
from his hereditary Attamigar and Moonsiff offices by the
local Authorities, and failing to obtain a reversal
of the decision passed on him from the Board
of Revenue, Petitioner respectfully sheweth to
your Honor in Council
proper his appeal to your Honor in Council
humbly, believing that his case will meet
with due consideration and that justice will be
rendered him.

2. Petitioner is the hereditary Mierafey
Attamigar and Moonsiff of the Village, his
Ancestors having held said offices from
time immemorial during the Mahomedan govt.
and his father Sathiah Saik R. having been
registered at the Syul in 1211. In succession
to his father and on his demise in 1234, Petitioner
was appointed, and he continued to hold
the said offices till 1267, a period of 34 years,
discharging the duties attached thereto to the
satisfaction of the ruling Authorities as well
as to the subordinate officials & Villagers.

3. In the early part of last year one
Chenniah Pillay preferred, from interested
and malicious motives, a false charge of
having fabricated a false account of

The pretext of drought and short produce against
Petitioner, the Curnum and a Salok Godmashtak
of which all three were acquitted. The Sub Coll.
who tried them under Reg 18 of 1822 declaring
that "there is no evidence to prove the charge."

4. Notwithstanding their acquittal, yet
the Sub Coll. thought proper to dismiss them
from their respective offices on the ground
stated in the "Return" herewith enclosed, and
that Officer's decision was confirmed in
appeal by the Collector & Board of Revenue.
5. In accordance to the reasons assigned by
the Sub Coll. Petitioner most respectfully
begs to submit the following explanation
in his defence:—

1. As Nattamigar he has nothing to do
with the mode in which the accounts
are prepared; his duty is simply to attest
the accounts after ascertaining the items
therein entered to be substantially true, the
Curnum alone is responsible for the manner
in which the accounts are drawn up. That
the accounts in the present instance are false
the pretext of drought and short produce more
correct. Petitioner can most solemnly
swear, as it was after personal inspection
in company with the Curnum and the Ryots
of the Village, that he affixed his signature
to the Accounts in question.

2. The Accounts reporting the unfavorable
of the season from the fall of rain at undue
periods, its insufficiency and consequent
failure of the crops, were duly forwarded
to the Salok Cutcherry, and the Sahildar
deputed one of his Godmashtaks to inspect
and report on the state of the produce.
The Godmashtak's report confirmed

x Vol 3.

that of the Village officers. It was upon the
Sahildar directed the crops to be reaped,
which was accordingly done. This being the
case, Petitioner would humbly enquire, on
what just grounds the accounts can be declared
to be unworthy of credit? There is the assertion
of one man and of one alone, and he an
interested party that they were false. But
what other proof is there to that effect? Were
there any other witnesses to speak to that point?
There were not, for besides the one alone alluded
to, there was only another individual, who was
the Jumsahund Godmashtak, whom
examined during the whole course of the
Proceedings. Were the crops inspected by
any one besides the Salok Godmashtak?
No. Were the cultivating Ryots examined
as they should have been, with a view to the
state of the crops? They certainly were not,
and yet it has been assumed that the accounts
are unworthy of credit. If indeed they are
false, then must the accounts of the whole of
the 124 Villages of the Salok and indeed of the
District throughout be false. For there has been a
general drought and short produce as may be
seen from the Season Reports of the Collector.

6. The charge was preferred, as already stated,
by a party under the influence of interested
motives, he having had a view of ousting
the Curnum whose place he now fills. On
the unsupported allegations of this person, after
a superficial enquiry, and without evidence
of any sort, direct and indirect, Petitioner,
with the two others, was arbitrarily dismissed
and an undeserved stigma attached to
his name.

In view of the foregoing circumstances

Petitioner most humbly solicits your Honor
in Council to take his case into merciful
consideration and direct his restoration
to his hereditary Nattamay and Maonsiff
offices which he creditably held for
34 years.

In which act of justice and
mercy, Petitioner, as in duty bound

Madras
21st April
1859

Shall Ever Pray
1557 24 25 26 27

1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27

Complicating
the have been unjustly
disinherited from his

Government have
prevented the Petitioner
admitted with the
Collectors Letter and etc
no reason to interfere -
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27
1557 24 25 26 27

Complicating
the have been unjustly
disinherited from his

1557 24 25 26 27

The Right Honorable Sir Charles Trevelyan
Governor in Council
Fort St. George.

The humble Petition of Aronda-
chella Naiken Nattamay & Village
Maonsiff in the Village of Chinnal
reddiputtee in the Taluk of St. Paul
in the District of the British of
Tinnevely.

Humbly Sheweth

That the Sub Collector having in July 1867 dis-
missed me from service causelessly, I presented to
the higher Authority an Appeal Petition, but obtained
no redress. I prepared a Memorial
to Her Majesty the Queen in Council and have herewith
submitted three Memorials with Deuces and
Endorsements.

Therefore most humbly solicit your
favor will be graciously pleased to submit the
above Memorials for the inspection and consideration
of Her Majesty the Queen in Council.

Shall Ever Pray.

22nd July 1869 1557 24 25 26 27

15th May 1869

15th May 1869