

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<i>1156</i>	Press Mis.
Dated <i>2nd September</i> 18 <i>89</i> .		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
from 27th August to 2d September 1859.*

No. 13. Read the following Petition from CAMATCHI, Iyer the grandson of MUNG-
AMMAL, late Shrotriendrar of Chendianellore, Trivatoor Talook, North Arcot; to
T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government; dated Madras, 25th July 1859.

HONORED SIR,

I respectfully beg to submit for transmission to the Right Honorable the Secretary of
State in Council the enclosed triplicate copies of my Memorial to that authority relative to my
claim to the moiety of the Shrotriem village of Chendianellore held by my late maternal
grandmother Mungammal.

No. 14. ORDER THEREON, 29th August 1859, No. 1156.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for report as to the Petitioner's claim.

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

if the family should have succeeded

The Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company &c &c &c
London.

Most Respectfully Sheweth The Humble appeal petition of Ramaswamy
Merasar of Anlattoor in the Province of Tanjore
Province subject to the Government of Madras.

With due submission your memorialist humbly begs leave to address these few
lines to your Honourable Court & Tribunal that the late Collector granted 48 Coolies & land
free of tax to Cotta Padayachy late Perakody of your memorialist in which the said Perakody
built a house and lodged a few days & was dismissed for his Caracass. Instead of whom another person
was appointed for Cultivation, then as the Cotta Padayachy lodged in the same house your
memorialist informed him to restore the house ground as usual for which the Cotta Padayachy
complained & finally to the late Collector who permitted that your memorialist should sue
in the Civil Court where a decree passed that the house ground should be decided through
the Revenue authorities thereabout a petition were forwarded to the Board of Revenue who
on the 6th February 1859 referred to the Collector on which Mr. Bird late Acting Collector
passed an Order to confirm whether the house ground in question was granted to the Perakody
or Causavethum thereupon Pungish Nace & late Tailor took depositions from for
Perakodies they willingly confessed that each of them enjoyed 100 Coolies without tax in the
house ground for cultivating sugar & Panyah lands of the Merasars & if the
Perakody failed to Cultivate he has nothing to enjoy with the house ground
and that he would restore it to the owners. Beside Pungish Nace of the Perakody of your
memorialist restored his house ground for not cultivating according an attahy given before
the 1st of January of the Cotta Padayachy & acknowledged in his deposition that your memorialist is a co-
heir to the house ground in question & likewise the Merasars of the village proved plainly in their
depositions that the Perakodies has nothing to do with the house ground wherein they lodge if
they fail to Cultivate the lands of the Merasars and after the death of Cotta Padayachy who was
Causavethum still enjoying unjustly the house ground in question while he is Perakody to the Merasars
thereby the present Perakody of your memorialist is unwilling to Cultivate as usual and when your
memorialist began to enjoy the house ground he was mainly fined & punished by the late Special
Resident Magistrate because he failed to perceive the heirship of your memorialist who afterwards
submitted to the Board of Revenue who on the 25th August 1859 referred to the Collector for which
Forbes Esq. late Collector endorsed on the 3rd November of the said year that your memorialist
is referred to the said Acting Collector's endorsement in Petition No. 225/1859. His very objections
are because the said endorsement does not appear a final order while being so the Board
and Honble Government confirmed the above stated endorsement without putting the heirship

of the family which have been

of the house ground in question.

Therefore Your Memorialist humbly implors Your Honorable Court would graciously be pleased to examine before Your Honorable Tribunal the undersigned and his movements with the proceedings taken by the late Collector. Perogiahnaick & pass a final Order that Your Memorialist may peacefully enjoy the house ground in question without any objection.

From which act of Benevolence Your Memorialist as in duty bound will ever be
Number and year of the petitions } Condemned
Endorsement

No 154 of 1854 } Board of Revenue
From Perogiahnaick
Merassary Talloorkin
the District of Tanjore.
5th July 1854

Petitioner should address the Collector
Revenue Office } By Order
Port St George } (Signed)
24th August 1854 } Sub Secretary
Petitioner should be of Collector's endorsement No 225 of 1849
Tullum 15th November 1854 } Signed H. Bird
Collector

No 166 of 1855 } Board of Revenue

Petitioner is repudiated to Mr Bird's endorsement dated 24th April 1854 can assert his claims if he thinks fit in the Court of His Honor

Revenue Office } By Order
Port St George } (Signed) H. Bird
8th March 1855 } Sub Secretary

No 50 of 1855 } Board of Revenue
Lord Harris Government of the Government of the
Collector and Board of Revenue the Court are
open to Perogiahnaick.

Port St George } By Order
14th March 1855 } (Signed)
Ch. J. L. Bird to Govt

Perogiahnaick's petition
Cultivation }
5th August 1856 }
No 22 of 1856 }
Perogiahnaick

Duplicate

To the Honorable Court of Directors of the East India Company &c &c &c
London

The humble petition of Perogiahnaick Merassary Talloorkin
in Mannargody Talloork of Tanjore Province Subject to the
Government of Madras

Most Respectfully Sheweth

With due submission Your Memorialist humbly begs leave to shew these
few lines to Your Honorable Court & Tribunal that the late Collector granted 100 Coolies
of land free of tax to Cothapadachy late Perakoody of Your Memorialist in which the
said Perakoody built a house & lodged a few days and was dismissed for his Caracal instead
of whom another Perakoody was appointed for Cultivation. Hence as the Cothapadachy
lodge in the same house Your Memorialist informs him to restore the house ground
as usual for which the Cothapadachy complains & falsely to the late Collector who per-
mitted that Your Memorialist should sue in the Civil Court where a decree passed
that the house ground should be decided through the Revenue authorities thereabout.
A petition was forwarded to the Board of Revenue who on the 2nd February 1849 referred
to the Collector in which Mr Bird late Acting Collector passed an order to confirm
whether the house ground in question granted to the Perakoody at Causamurkum thereupon Perogiah-
naick late Talloork took depositions from 40 Perakoodies they willingly confessed that each
of them enjoyed 100 Coolies without tax in the house ground for Cultivating mungah and
Pongiah lands of the Merassary if the Perakoody failed to cultivate he has nothing heirship
to enjoy with the house ground & that he would restore it to the owners. Perogiahnaick
pillay one of the Perakoodies of Your Memorialist restored his house ground for not Cultiva-
ting according to the attachment given before the Talloork & the Cothapadachy acknowledged
in his deposition that Your Memorialist is lawful heir to the house ground in question.
Likewise the Merassary of the Village proved plainly in their depositions that
the Perakoodies has nothing heirship with the house ground wherein they lodge & they failed
to cultivate the lands of the Merassary and after the death of Cothapadachy
whose widow Carary still enjoys unjustly the house ground in question while she

of the family should have the
land & the house & the land

she is Brahmoo to another her assent thereby the present Perakooty of your memorialist, unwilling to cultivate unusual and when your memorialist began to enjoy the said house ground he was vainly fined 20 Rupees by the late Special Assistant Magistrate because he failed to perceive the heirship of your memorialist who afterwards submitted to the Board of Revenue who on the 25th August 1854 referred to the Collector which H Forbes Esq. late Collector endorsed on the 13th November of the said year that your memorialist is referred to the said Acting Collector endorsement in petition of the 25th 1849. This is very objectionable because the endorsement does not appear a final order while being to the Board and Hable Governor Confirmed the above stated endorsement without finding the heirship of the house ground in question.

Therefore your memorialist submissively implores your Honourable Court would graciously be pleased to examine before your Honourable Court the endorsement with the proceedings taken by the late Collector and to pass a final Order that your memorialist may peacefully enjoy the house ground in question without any objection.

For which act of benevolence your memorialist acutely bound will ever pray.

Number and year of the petition	To whom addressed	Endorsement
No. 1549 of 1854 From Ramaswami Maraas of pulatoot in the District of Bangalore 25th July 1854	Board of Revenue	Petitioner should address the Collector. Revenue Board Office Hort St George 24th August 1854 It is referred to the Collector endorsement on the 13th 25th of 1854. Hort St George 25th April 1854 He can assert his claim if he thinks fit in the Court of Revenue. Revenue Board Office Hort St George 3 March 1855 The Government approve of the endorsement of the Collector Board of Revenue the Court are open to the petitioner. Hort St George 14th March 1855 Hort St George
No. 1549 of 1855 Do	Do	It is referred to the Collector endorsement on the 13th 25th of 1854. Hort St George 25th April 1854 He can assert his claim if he thinks fit in the Court of Revenue. Revenue Board Office Hort St George 3 March 1855 The Government approve of the endorsement of the Collector Board of Revenue the Court are open to the petitioner. Hort St George 14th March 1855 Hort St George
No. 1549 of 1856 Do	Lord Home's Governor	It is referred to the Collector endorsement on the 13th 25th of 1854. Hort St George 25th April 1854 He can assert his claim if he thinks fit in the Court of Revenue. Revenue Board Office Hort St George 3 March 1855 The Government approve of the endorsement of the Collector Board of Revenue the Court are open to the petitioner. Hort St George 14th March 1855 Hort St George
Total 3 petitions which were 5th August 1855		

16

The Right Honorable the Secretary of State
for India in Council.
East India House
London.

The Humble Memorial of
Samarachia, Grandson of
Mungamul, late Chotia of
Chendianellu, Sivatoor
Taluk R. N. Dist.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

more than 135 years ago

That the Village of Chendianellu was granted as Chotia to Memorialist's Ancestors by the Mahomedan Court and it has been in the uninterrupted enjoyment of the family for several generations.

2. That Memorialist is the Grand Son of Mungamul, who was up to the time of her death in 1850 half share holder in the Chotia, Lohak being the other half share holder.

3. That said Lohak having no issue adopted Kuntachellu who was the demise of his adoptive father in 1839, his only heir succeeded to the enjoyment of all his property including the half share of the Chotia which was conferred to him by Government.

4. That in like manner Memorialist who is the only heir of his maternal Grand Mungamul, and the only living representative of the family should have succeeded to the share of his grand mother in the half

Half share of Shobriens held by her. but Govt. thought proper to pass an order dated 12th April 1851, directing the resumption of said Mungamuals Half share, thereby dispossessing Memoriat of his just rights. He being a Minor at the time was unable to urge his claims.

5. In reference to this subject Memoriat would most humbly plead that he is the only legitimate heir of Mungamual, being her daughters son; and that as he is the adopted son of Sordiala was allowed by Govt. to inherit the half share of his adoptive father. In like manner Memoriat should have been placed in the place of his maternal grand mother Mungamuals half share.

6. There are no promises of stipends existing to Memoriat according to the law in question. For according to Indian Law he being the only legal heir of his maternal Grand mother he is fully entitled thereto.

Moreover, in Vol. of the 20th January 1851, it is ruled "that the circumstances of the legal heir being a female, or of the succession having formerly descended through a lineal female heir shall not hereafter be held to be a bar to continued enjoyment of vacant lands."

7. Agreeably to this view of the case, Memoriat humbly submits that he should have been put in possession of the moiety of the Shobriens which has been resumed, and by its resumption he has been reduced after his Grand mother's death from a state of independence and comfort to one of utter destitution.

8. Memoriat most humbly solicits Your Honor in Council to take his case into merciful consideration, and with reference to the order of Govt above quoted, and his claim to succeed his Grand mother as her only legal heir and as the only representative of this branch of the family, graciously pass orders directing the restoration to him of the half share of Shobriens which has been unjustly resumed.

And Your Honor's Memoriat

Madras S.
25th July
1851.

Will Suermay

J. Suermay

most Respectfully Submitted,

x more than 135 gms.
app.

3. That said Indian having no issue, a adopted Kewasa Chelton, who on the demise of his adoptive father in 1839, being his only heir, succeeded to the management of all his property, including the half share of the Shoshone, which was confirmed to him by order of Govt.

4. That in like manner, Peabody, who is the only heir of his maternal Grandmother Mumpgummal, and the only living representative of the family, should have succeeded, on the

1871

From Penna to Dela. the
frontier of Maryland
into the jurisdiction of
Chandeleur; the latter
valley; in the north

Baked 25th }
Rice }
Chickens }
Boys }

CP 1464/59.

By the same that he has
been disposed of of the
half share he had in the
Grand Jurors estate only
now he is paid in also the
whole purchase of the
family and consequently
should have inherited
it according to him who
was and the order of 1692
of the 25th January 1854;
hence we state a violation
of the covenant and see

known to ~~the~~ that
there may be ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~
nothing but the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~
of the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~
nothing but the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~
the ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~

7. Agreeably to this view of the case, I must
humbly submit that he should have been
sent in possession of the moiety of the
land which has been returned, and by
its re-sumption he has been reduced to the

Anna's }
25th July }
1859 }

Willmer Quay
St. George's Quay

The Right Honorable the Secretary of State
for India in Council
East India House
London.

The Humble Memorial of
Camatchiah grandson of
Mungammal, late Shroffian
of Choudanellore, Sivastoor
Taluk D. K. Soot.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That the Village of Choudanellore was
granted as Shroffian to Memorialist's Ancestors by
the Mahomedan Govt. and it has been in the continuous
possession of the family for several generations.

2. That Memorialist is the Grand Son of
Mungammal, who was up to the time of her death
in 1850, half share holder in the Shroffian,
Sadiab being the other half share holder.

3. That said Sadiab having no issue, adopted
Yemondachellian, who on the demise of his adopted
father in 1839, being his only heir, succeeded to the
possession of all his property, including the
half share of the Shroffian which was con-
firmed to him by Government.

4. That in like manner Memorialist, who
is the only heir of his maternal Grand mother
Mungammal, and the only living representative
of the family, should have succeeded on the
death of his Grand mother to the half share of
Shroffian held by her, but Govt. thought proper
to pass an order dated 12th April 1851, directing
the possession of Mungammal's half share, then
dispossessing Memorialist of his just rights, the being
a Minor at the time, was unable to urge his claims.

From Camatchiah the
Grandson of Mungammal,
late Choudanellore, Sivastoor
Taluk D. K. Soot.

Dated 12th July 1854.

At 14th/54.

Camatchiah the Grandson of
Mungammal, late Choudanellore,
Sivastoor Taluk D. K. Soot.

of the circumstances
wherein it is proved that
I was the only heir of
my Grand mother at
the time of her death
in 1850, and that I
was the only living
representative of the
family, which has now
been proved.

Camatchiah the Grandson of
Mungammal, late Choudanellore,
Sivastoor Taluk D. K. Soot.

5. In reference to this subject Memorialist would most humbly plead that he is the only legitimate heir of Mungamual, being her daughter's son and that as Kocatachellin the adopted son of Kadiato is allowed by Govt. to inherit the half share of his adoptive father, so in like manner Memorialist should have been placed in possession of his maternal grand mother Mungamual's half share.

6. There are no grounds of objection existing to Memorialist succeeding to the share in question, for according to Hindoo Law, he being the only lineal heir of his maternal grand mother, he is fully entitled thereto. Moreover in Vol. of the 15th January 1854, it is ruled that the circumstance of the legal heir being a female, or of the deceased having formerly resided through a lineal female heir should not hereafter be held to be a bar to continued enjoyment of Inam lands.

7. Agreeably to this view of the case, Memorialist humbly submits that he should have been put in possession of the moiety of the Thotrien which had been resumed, and by his suspension he has been reduced after his grand mother's death from a state of comparative comfort to one of utter destitution.

8. Memorialist most humbly requests Your Honor in Council to take his case into merciful consideration and with a view to the order of Government above quoted, and his claim to succeed his grand mother

as her only legal heir and as the only representative of this branch of the family, graciously pass orders directing the restoration to him of the half share of Thotrien which has been unjustly resumed.

And Your Honor's Memorialist

M. S. S.
25th July
1857.

Willis S. S.
of the Government

16

L. S. G. Esq.
Chief Secretary to Govt.

Honored Sir,

I respectfully beg to submit
for transmission to the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State, in Council the
enclosed triplicate copies of my
Memorial to that Authority relative
to my claim to the moiety of the
Phostien Village of Cheudiamellie
held by my late maternal Grandmother
Mangammal.

Madras.
25th July
1857.

I beg to remain
Honored Sir
Your most Obedient Servant.
J. S. G.

original

From Government the
Grandson of Mangammal,
late Chief of the
Cheudiamellie, District
Subordinate. N. S. G.

Subscribed
25th July 1857.
N. S. G.

Memorial that he has been
dispossessed of the half
share of Cheudiamellie
by the late Grandmother
Mangammal. He is now
in possession of the half
share of Cheudiamellie
held by my late maternal
Grandmother Mangammal.

and contents of the
in some instances
not fully stated
many he pointed out
the restoration of the
half share of the
Cheudiamellie
Village of Cheudiamellie
held by my late maternal
Grandmother Mangammal.

1857-1858
N. S. G.

Com 15th April 57
2nd June 57

1857-58 23rd March
1858-59 14th June
1859-60 14th June

29th June 1859
29th June 1859
29th June 1859

From the L. of the
31st July 1860
27th in C. M.

Received
1. 73 + 116

14893 of 1859
Revenue 1859
Pres. of Govt 2nd Sept.

P. 1464

From Samatchiah the
Grand Son of Mungam.
-mal, late Shostriem
-lar of Chendranellore,
Tiruvator Talook North
Arcot.

Dated 25th July 1859
Recd 10th Aug 59
3 lacs.

Requests transmission
to Home Govt, of his memorial
relative to his claim to the
moiety of the Shostriem Village
of Chendranellore in North
Arcot.

10th 1859 29th Aug 59
With an order