M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

68-69

G.O. No. 1573 — Press / Mis.

Dated November 19, 1859.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 68. Read the following Petition.

To the Honorable Sir EDWARD CHARLES TREVELYAN, K. C. B., Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

The humble Petition of Putchandi Naiken late Nattamagar of the village of Vittleputty attached to the Zemindary of Saptoor in Seevilpoottoor talook, Zillah Tinnevelly under the Presidency of Madras, dated Madras 14th October 1859.

Dissatisfied with the order of Government dated August 1859, passed on Petition No. 2601 of 1859, by him presented to your Lordship, your petitioner presents herewith an appeal memorial to the address of the Secretary of State for India, with copies of all papers, in triplicate, which, it is requested may be despatched to the Home Authorities.

No. 69. ORDER THEREON, 19th November 1859, No. 1573.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be submitted to the Home Authorities, and that intimation of its dispatch be given to Petitioner.

(Signed W. C. SIM.

Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

To The Honorable

Sir Edward Charles Trevelyan K.C.B.

Governor in Council

Fort St. George

The humble Petition of Patchiandi
Paicken late Vattamayar of the Village
of Vettlepathy, attached to the Zemindary
of Sattoor in Seevilpoottoor Taluk,
Zillah, Tinnevelly under the Presidency
of Madras.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

Dissatisfied with the order of Government
dated 4th August 1859 passed on Petition No. 2601 of 1859 by him
presented to your Lordship, Your Petitioner presents herewith
an Appeal Memorial to the Address of the Secretary of State for
India, with Copies of all papers, in Triplicate, which, it is
requested, may be despatched to the Home Authorities —

And Your Petitioner shall ever Pray —

Madras ----
14th October 1859

To

The Secretary of State for India

The humble Petition of Pulchiande Naiken late Nattamagar of the Village of Mettlepully, attached to the Zemindary of Sattoor in Seevilpoottoor taluk Zillah Tinnevelly under the Presidency of Madras.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

Being aggrieved by the Endorsement made by the Madras Government Secretary on a Petition No. 2601 to it presented under date the 4th August 1859 which are herewith kept, together with the Boards Endorsement and Collectors Decision and other Enclosures in all 10 Documents, your Petitioner has made this Appeal to her Majesty the Queen on the following Grounds:

The Office of Nattamay of the said Village Mettlepully was, during the Mahomedan Government, acquired by your

Pets

Petitioner's Ancestors, whose duties were to
Attend to the regular Cultivation, and collection
of the revenue of the same Village and to whom
allowance was granted in land. On the
District being taken by the Honorable Company,
a Standard Account was prepared throughout
in fusly 1211 (1801). In the Similar Account
of the said Village the name of your Petitioner's
great Uncle, Beemanaik, was entered as
Nattamaygar, on his death in 1809, your
Petitioner's father Narasapanaiken
succeeded to the Office, which he held and
died in 1834. Your Petitioner succeeded
him in the same, but the Village having
been attached to the Saptoor Zemindary, the
Zemindar referring to the former Accounts
* Vide Nº 1 * Wº has appointed your Petitioner to be the
Nattamay to the Village in question: Your
Petitioner continued in the same Office
for 9 Years from 1838 to 1847, but the same
Zemindar having on some other occasions
objected to your Petitioner's enjoying certain
other lands he (Petitioner) has complained
to the then Collector Wº Elliot who gave

through all the Accounts and the orders of the
† Vide Nº 2 said Zemindar sent † orders recognizing your
Petitioner as Nattamagar of the Village.
From 1847 to 1853 your Petitioner continued
in the Office, but in consideration of his infir-
mity he has applied to the then Sub Collector
to transfer his Offices of two Villages including
the one, which has reference to the present
Appeal, to his two Sons. The said Sub Collector
Mr. Whittingham enquired into the matter
and then ordered that your Petitioner's Son
shall succeed to the Nattamay Office of
Vellepully. When one Sunyaralinga reddy
appeared before the Collector and claimed
that he is the real incumbent. The present
Acting Collector Mr. Levenge without
reference to the records and especially to
† Vide Nº 3 his predecessor's decision has decided that
† Sunyaralinga reddy is entitled to the Office
removing at the same time your Petitioner's
† Vide Nº 4 Son. Upon your Petitioners † appealing
to the Board they having confirmed the
Acting Collector's decision your Petitioner
† Vide Nº 5 † appealed to the Government. The
Govt.

Government also declined to interfere with the Collector's decision it being Confirmed by the Board.

The Petitions Nos 4 & 5, presented to the Board, and to the Government contain all most all the origen of the Case at length. As a reference to them will put the home authorities in possession of all features of the Case it will be an unnecessary task to make a repetition thereof at this place but, however, your Petitioner would respectfully give only such succinct items of explanations as will be supported by Documentary Evidence which Mr. Levenge and higher Authorities have not weighed.

Altho in the Decision marked No 3 passed by Mr. Levenge it shewn as if Sengaralinga Reddy is entitled to the Office in question and as if your Petitioner had no right thereto. Yet your Petitioner has shewn sufficient Grounds in the Appeals Nos 4 & 5 made to the Controlling powers but no notice was taken by them except simply

simply confirming the Collector's decision No 3 as right. Therefore it is fully incumbent on the home Authorities to go through the Documents, discover whether your Petitioner's claim is legal, or whether the Sengaralinga Reddy's. To come to this clearly decision of each of the strong grounds hereunder shewn was considered. Your Petitioner's fully trusts that the home Authorities will revive the justice which sunk to the bottom by the non attention paid by India Authorities.

First of all it should be borne in mind that the Acting Collector Mr. Levenge of Sincerely was the mere Cause for the disturbance and for the loss of several lives recently occurred in the District. Hence his decision must be taken with no less false story. Yet your Petitioner takes this opportunity of shewing public Documentary proofs to call his decision by that name.

1. Mr. Levenge's decision No 3 shows that in fact 1221 Pollos reddy appears — All these are the words inferred or in other words mentioned without being

Government also declined to interfere with the Collectors decision it being confirmed by the Board.

The Petitioners Nos 4 & 5 presented to the Board and to the Government contained almost all the origin of the Case at length As a reference to them will put the home authorities in possession of all features of the Case it will be an unnecessary task to make a repetition thereof at this place but, however, your Petitioner would respectfully give only such succinct items of explanations as will be supported by Documentary Evidence which Mr. Lavenge and higher Authorities have not weighed.

Altho in the Decision marked No 3 passed by Mr. Lavenge it shews as if Sengaralinga Reddy is entitled to the Office in question and as if your Petitioner had no right thereto, yet your Petitioner has shewn sufficient grounds in the Appeals Nos 4 & 5 made to the Controlling powers but no notice was taken by them except simply

simply confirming the Collectors decision No 3 as right. Therefore it is fully incumbent on the home Authorities to go through the Documents, decision whether your Petitioners claim is legal, or whether the Sengaralinga reddys. To come to this clearly decision if each of the strong grounds hereunder shewn was considered your Petitioners fully trusts that the home Authorities will rewrite the justice which sunk to the bottom by the non attention paid by India Authorities.

First of all it should be borne in mind that the Acting Collector Mr. Lavenge of Innevelly was the mere Cause for the disturbance and for the loss of several lives recently occurred in the District. Hence his decision must be taken with no lip false story - yet your Petitioner takes this opportunity of shewing public Documentary proofs to call this decision by that name.

1. Mr. Lavenges decision No 3 shows that in fusly 1221 Pethoo reddy appears

All these are the words inferred or in other words invented without being

Nattamagar, he was succeeded by his brother Sungaralinga reddy who continued to hold the Office till Fusly 1267 (1857) when his son was appointed in his stead at Sungaralinga reddy's request that this Office had been in the enjoyment of this family for 46 years, and that your Petitioner Petchumundenaik has claimed the Office only in 1853 -

supported by any Documentary proofs: In Fusly 1211 your Petr's Uncle Beemanaiken is inserted as Original incumbent on his death in 1219 your Petitioner's father Nursapanaiken succeeded him and continued in office and died in 1834 - all the your Petitioner succeeded to him yet the Village in question being attached to the Sapt'oor Zemin. during the then Zemindar of that Estate Cummanaiken has given a Summons (marked Pet'r 1) of appointment to your Petitioner to be Nattamagar of the Village now in question in 1838 and also a similar Order to the Villagers on the same subject when your Petitioner continued to do the duties of the Office; the same Zemindar having prevented your Petitioner from enjoying the Manneem land allotted for the Office on some other objection he had with the Petitioner as regards the other Circar lands of your Petitioner therefore complained

* vide No 6

complained to the then Collector Mr. Elton who going through all the records issued an Order No 2 - In this Sanneed your Petitioner has nothing to shew any more than that that Authority clearly recognizes your Petitioner as Nattamagar of the Settepathy Village and that your Petitioner would act to the will of the Zemindar as regards the Circar land but of your Manneem land. If, as shewn in Mr. Levenge's Decision No 3, that the Office was in Sungaralinga reddy's family till Fusly 1267 (1857) how can the full Collector Mr. Elton be justified to state in his Sanneed No 2 abovementioned as if your Petitioner was Nattamagar of the Settepathy Village. If this Sungaralinga reddy was in Office at the time (1847) will he be quite without appealing against his Orders. Cannot this public instance No 2, which a full Collector (Mr. Elton) as Mr. Levenge has disrespected and called your Petitioner "Nattamagar" be considered as having been disrespected by the decision

No 3

No 3 According to the order No 2 quoted above when your Petitioner continued to do the duties of the Office he has applied to the Sub Coll.r Mr. Whittingham that being worn out by age, his Office should be ordered to be transferred to his sons. The said authority referred his application to the Tasildar to enquire into, and report upon. The said Sungaralinga reddy appeared before the Tasildar and claimed that the Office should not be transferred to your Petitioner's sons as he is the heir of the Original incumbent of Justy 1211. The Tasildar having reported to the Sub Collector by his Arzee No 467 that as your Petitioner appears from the records and Summuds No 1 & 6 of the Zemindar to be Nattamayar of the Village of Vellesatty and another Village they may be restored upon to your Petitioners sons, that the claim of Sungaralinga reddy is the one that was set up at the instigation of the Villagers &c. your Petitioner has no Copy of the Tasildars report

report but has a Copy of the Endorsement No 7. given by Mr. Sub Collector Whittingham a reference thereto will convince the Home Authorities that your Petitioners sons have been ordered by that Authority to succeed to his Nattamayar Office and that your Petitioner is not a man that has, as stated in the Collectors decision No 3. not Commenced his Claim only in 1853 except he is recognized by the late Zemindar in 1838 as succeeded to his father's Office and by the late full Collector Mr. Elton and Sub Collector Mr. Whittingham as holding the Office as such. Cannot your Petitioner be permitted by the two instances quoted above to speak boldly that the Acty Collector Mr. Lewenge's decision No 3 is Apparently wrong, and that the non notice of it on Appeal by the Board & Govern.t is highly reproachable in Consideration of the pious and charitable disposition which the home Authorities proclaimed by their publication in India that the British

British Government will sooner injure the
interests of the natives in any respect.

2 The Acting Collector Mr. Levenge states in his decision that Mr. Silver reversed the Sub Collector Mr. Whitting hams decision.

Mr. Silver reversed it but even that was opposed to the Tahsildars Appeal No 8. The decision of the former and reversal of the latter being in favor of the same & one Your Petitioners Appeal is against the orders of both. These both being Acting Collectors are not authorized to supercede the full Collector Mr. Elton's pending.

3. The Acting Collector Mr. Levenge quotes in his Decision certain Documents dated 1828. 1830. 1831. 1832 & 1834 as tending to support Gungaraleinga Reddy's right.

All these are quite forgeries These are the orders said to have been sent to Lingaraleinga Reddy by the Zemindary Ameenahs who are not competent officers except temporary Servants employed in the Zemindary. If these were in his hand why did he not produce them before the Tahsildar and why did he give his Deposition Verbally stating that he has no Documents to produce to shew that he is entitled to the Office. When (Tahsildar) enquired into the matter. While these Documents are attended with so much doubt as no European Authorities can trust them; the Acting Collector exaggeratedly upholds them as establishing Lingaraleinga Reddy's long possession.

4th The Acting Collector states in his decision that one witness who is your Petitioners relation denied that he is bear to the 1818 fusly in- cumbent, and certain witnesses spoke in his favor before the Tahsildar but this Tahsildar was dismissed for corruption any Deposition before him are worthless.

One witness who is your Petitioners relation is long Enemy to him it is not uncommon for such an Enemy to injure your Pet.rs interest. The other evidence may have been admitted but the Acting Collector rejected them for their Depositions were taken before a Tahsildar who was dismissed for Corruption There is no where prescribed in the law that any Documents taken before

before a tribunal which in Office is inadmissible if that authority was since removed or any Plea whatever. Hence Acting Collectors Conclusion is of most vague & vexatious nature as no other but European have ever had followed or thought of This your Petitioners Son to whom his hereditary Office was transferred in 1853, was removed by the Acting Collector Mr. Lewenge's Decision No. 3 in injury to his long enjoyment of the Office and Sungaralinga Reddy placed in his stead. Your Petitioner trusts that the Home Authorities will take into consideration the foregoing Documents, as well as the Board and Government Petitions, and, if necessary, call for the Original Records and reverse the decision No. 3 and give instructions to the Local Government in order that Your Petitioners or his Son may be replaced in the Patamay Office of the Village of Willepatty in question.

And Your Petitioner shall ever Pray

Madras
14th October 1859

Depasition given before the Tahsildar of Sevilleputtur
Talook Zellah Tinnevilly by Sengaralinga reddy the
Nattamay gar of Vettleputtty village attached to the
Zemindary of Sapfaar, underdate. 27 Decr 1856.

Q. When were the office of Nattamay conferred on yaw, and what Documentary evidence have yaw to shew.

A. I do the duties of that office but have no Documentary proof to shew that I have title to the office. I am now aged 90 years having short sight and in a deaf state. I was collecting the money untel before this 3 years. I ceased to do so this 2 years but my son Rayapettoar did by himself collects the money and in granting receipts to the collectors for such collection, he (my son) sets my mark and is granting them in my name I never set my signatures in the Puttahs and Receipts.

Q. yaw sons collecting the money as yaw stated is apposed to the rules of the Circar what say yaw to this

A. The Circar must maw do/go it think it

Copy in a Dpt to C.
2/19th Nov. 1857. No 69

(20 cents)

Memorial to the Worshipful the Secretary for India
for India Council
Copy of Petition and Depositions
to Nattamay Fees
Tinnevelly

Dated 5th October 1857

Enclosures 9

Recd 19/12/57

it proper wishat can I say for it.

Marked / Sengaralingareddy

Signed / Seenivasarayer

Tahsildar

A true Copy

signed J. H. Levenge

acting Coll.r

by Zemindar

Order sent to Putchiandi Naiken Son of Narasappa Naiken

under date the 13th Cartikee Year Velumbee (or 1838)

According to the Muchmool in which your father

Narsapa Naiken had been doing the duties of the Patteam

office of Kittlepully Village, you are hereby appointed to

the same office. Therefore you will continue to discharge

the duties of the office holding and enjoying the Manieum

Lands of Punjah and Poonjah attached

(Signed) Canna Naiken

Zemindar.

Decision or order passed by Mr Elton the Collr of Tinnevelly
sent to the Tasildar under date the 8 april 1847 —

In your arzee No 106 dated March 1847
which you addressed to the Hoozoor after enqu
iring into and reporting upon the subject of the
complaint preferred by Pulchiandehaiken the
Pattamagar of the villages Moottoonaiga poorum
and Nittlepetty attached to the Zemaindarry
of Sapteor in your Talook, you stated that
it is allotted to the Petitioner on Inamiem tenure
one cattay of land for his Pattamay office from
long time that the renter of the Zemindar un-
justly compelled the Petitioner to passed rent
to him on certain other lands including the
Pattamay Inamiem land —"

It appears proper in this case that the
Petitioner should hold and enjoy such extent
of land as entered in the account of fusly 1211
in Inamiem tenure as attached to his Pattamay
office, and that in the matter of other lands
which the Zemindar may have allotted to
him, he and the Zemindar should, either by
their amicable adjustment or by law suits,
set

get their difference settled.

you are therefore ordered that you will refer to the accounts and allow the Pettioner to enjoy the land originally attached to his office of Pottamay and that the Pettioner might arrange his difference with the Zemindar as stated above. The Zemindar having addressed an arzee to the Honorable the Lieutenant that there being some balance of the collection against the Pettioner a security must be ordered to be taken from him (Pettioner) for his Pottamay office you will direct him to give security for his Pottamay office in the Zemindarry Village as is the case with the other Govt. Villages under the existing general orders and will communicate to the Zemindar that he may continue him in the Pottamay office

8th April 1847. (signed) A. P. Elton

Collector

Examined (signed)

Decision or order of the Collector Mr. Elton

Copy of Decision or order of the Collector Mr. Elton

To

The President and Members of the Board
of Revenue
Fort St. George

The humble Petition of Appeal
presented by Patchayandiaik
the Nattamayar of Vittleputty
Village attached to the Sappatoor
Zemindary in Seevilpoottoor
Talook. Zillah of Tinnevelly.

Humbly Sheweth.

Under Section V Regulation VII of 1831.
your Petitioner appeals to your Honorable Board
against the decision of the Acting Collector of
Tinnevelly, Mr. Levenge, dated 25th March
1859.

The Renter Ramasawmeah Pillay
of the Zamindary, in which the Village Vittle-
putty is included, having fraudulently set up
one Sunkaralingum Reddy to lay Claim before the
Revenue Officer to the Nattamay Office, which
I held and enjoyed for several past Years,
the late Acting Collector Mr. Silver decided in
favor of the New Claimant unjustly. Your

Petitioner

Tinnevelly
Collectors Abstract
Appeal number Pagula
Fasc VI of 1831

No 3.

Q 1179/54

Tinnevelly
Collects
1859

Appeal from Swaminathan Pillay Collectors Decision Confirmed in Part

Petitioner in March 1858 addressed a long Petition with several Documents to reverse that Decision. Your Honorable Board forwarded that Petition with orders that the case may be disposed of under Regulation VII of 1831.

The present Acting Collector Mr. Lemenge without referring to your Petitioners former Petition and the Documents herewith submitted or trying the matter has passed his Decision on the 25th March 1859 marked A

Your Petitioner being aggrieved by the Decision A aforementioned he has made this Appeal to your Honorable Board on the following among other Grounds.

On a perusal of the Acting Collector's decision and of the grounds your Petitioner states to each of the reasons therein stated, your Honorable Board will be surprized at his overpassing of the important points & Documents and stating weightless story in upholding the Defendants title to the Office & removing your Petitioner from that Office which he held for several years.

Acting

Acting Collector's reasons	Petitioner's Explanation
1. "That Beemanaick is admitted as Original incumbent in fusly 1211."	1. It is fully proved by the Petitioner's witnesses before the Tafsildar that he is heir to his incumbent Beemanaick. The Depositions of these witnesses are now on the record, the Acting Collector refering to them rejects their integrity on the ground of their having been taken before a Tafsildar who was since removed on a Charge of Bribery Corruptions. It is very rare opinion of the Acting Collector. The proceedings held by any Officers are by all judicial Courts and other Officers held good, however such Officers have been since dismissed upon any Charge whatever. Nowhere in the Regulations is prescribed that the functionaries shall reject the records held before any Tafsildars if they were since removed

Acting Collectors reasons	Petitioners Explanation
	Collector as Nattamayar of the Village now in question, that the Zemindar unjustly interfered in the Maniem land allotted to his Office, and the Sapildar enquired the matter & reported to the Hoojoor, & the Collector Rt. Ellon sent an order Rc. 108 dated 8th April 1847 to the Sapildar in favor of the Petitioner declaring that he is Nattamayar of the Village, & that the Zemindar be communicated not to interfere with his Maniem land &c; but that the Zemindar must only take security from him &c
	Your Petitioner accordingly gave security & obtained Summd from the Zemindar. Ever since he collected the Money and paid it in Zemindars Cutchery and obtained receipts (6) Your Petitioner also obtained 6 Summds from the

Acting Collectors reasons	Petitioners Explanation
	the Renter, & also a receipt Pattah. all those Documents are produced in the Collectors Office. Leaving so many Documents as above alluded to, on your Petitioners part the Acting Collector without shewing them at all in his Decision under Appeal passed it (Decision A) giving Crute or imaginary Grounds in favor of the Defendant. Hence the Acting Collectors reasons will have no weight.
	3rd Here it is most necessary to remark for your Honorable Board with reference to the Acty. Collectors Statement that the Deft. was in Office till fasly 1267, & that the Office was in his family for 46 years, that when so long enquiry was made & so many orders were issued in 1847 as above stated, What was this Defendt. Smitcharling a peddy doing without saying

	Acting Collector's Reasons	Petitioners Explanation
		saying his Claim as he does now where was he sleeping at the time because the Year 1847, in which said Inquiry took place and order issued, is 11 Years Antecedent to July 1267, up to which the Collector thinks the Defendant was in Office. It is therefore highly incumbent on this Board to call for the Documents & set aside the Acting Collectors decision.
3	That the Petitioner Pulchay Andrasike claimed the Office in 1853. & the Sub Collector decided in his favor on a report of the Tofsildar, and that Mr. Silver reversed that order & appointed the Defendants Son to the Office. In the interval between 1853 and 1857 Petitioner did not obtain possession.	From this it would inspire your Board that as your Petitioner claimed the Office only in 1853. This is really not the Case. The Petitioner has not claimed the Office but requested the Court to transfer to his two Sons the Pottamagars Office of this Valley including the one in question, but the Defendant objected to the transfer only of the disputed Village. The Sub Collector after full

	Acting Collector's Reasons	Petitioners Explanation
		full Inquiry rejected the Defts. objection & sanctioned the transfer of the Office in the Names of the Petitioner's two Sons, who were in Office until they were removed by Order of Mr. Silver in 1857 January 10.
		The Petitioner & Sons have respectively held the Office and enjoyed their Emoluments until July 1266 as would Appear by the Sub Collector Order and his Endorsement as well as the Tafsildars Orders to the Villages all which are in the Collectors Office now. The Acting Collector without shewing all these in his decision falsely states that the Petitioner was not in possession until 1857 or July 1267. a Circumstance which will be known if your Honorable Board would call for the said Documents which the

Pet.

Acting Collector's reasons	Petitioner's Explanation
	Petitioner produced in Board with his former Petitions & which the Board forwarded to the Collr in 1858.
4. That "the Petitioner relies on the Office Order of the Zemindar in 1837 (rectius 1847). appointing him to the Nattamangar sheep	It is true that the Zemindar gave his Summud appointing the Petitioner to the Nattamany of the Villages as his father died in 1837. and another Order to the Subdivisions on the Subject. From that year to 1857 the Petitioner and his sons held the Office. The said Documents are now in the Collector's Office which should be called & referred by the Board. The Documents herein referred to Viz't will if your Board call for and refer be of no importance or be of no competent Authorities as Collector, Sub Collector, Tahsildar or Zemindar, except Hereby Amer. nitis, an inferior or temporary Servants. These inferior Officers being
5. "To dispute this the Deft produces orders from Government Officers when the Zemindary was under attachment dated 1828. 1830. 1831. 1832. & 1844: and up to this period".	

Acting Collector's reasons	Petitioner's Explanation
	being all most all dead the Defts has fabricated them in the deceased's Name. If these were in his hand why did he not make an allusion in his "pleadings or produce them before the Tahsildar Mr. Silver, or Sub Collector Mr. when Inquiries were made in 1857.
6. "The Evidence is in favor of the Defendant that his family has held the Office uninterruptedly."	Two Witnesses examined for the Defendant have spoken in his favor. These Witnesses are long Enemies to the Petitioner as would be seen from the records held before the Collector Mr. Bird on another matter. Your Petitioner observes that it is the precedented practice of the Government functionaries to rely the Documentary proofs in preference to the Oral Evidence for it will be had easily as suited to the subscribers. Hence the Acting Collector's reliance on this Evidence is quite insufficient.
	The

Acting Collectors Reasons	Petitioners Explanation
7. That relation of the Com- plainant deposes that the Pet. is not the Heir of Peemanaik whose Name appears in fusly 1211.	The Acting Collector shews the witness ambiguously that he is separate whereas that Witness is one of the said two for the Defendant. It is not surprizing for him to speak ill of the Petitioner for reasons stated above.
8. That certain Witness deposed in Petitioners favor before the Tasildar. This Tasildar was dismissed for Corruption, any Depositions taken before him are worthless.	Vide remarks afforded in Explanation No. 1 in this Petition.
9. That Complainant him- self now declines having them examined on his behalf as they would depose Contrary to him.	The Petitioner did not decline with that view as is shewn here, but with a view that their former Depositions will do, as some of them died, and some will be subjected to un- necessary trouble of appearing before the Collectors Office in inquiry to their private avocations.

Therefore Your Petitioner prays that Your Honorable Board will be pleased to call for all the Documents which he submitted to them formerly, and which were by them forward- ed to the Collector, together with one receipt Puttah which Your Petitioner produced before the Acting Collector now & refer to them, and reverse the decision of the Acting Collector with orders that the Office inquisition may be bestowed on my Elder Son Puttaiya and dismiss

Shall Ever Pray

Madras
22d June 1859.

To

The Honorable Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

&c. &c. &c.

The humble Appeal Petition of
Pitchayandenaick late Nattamai
gar of Wallajanutty attached to the
Sapjestoor Zemendary in Trive-
villesjestoor Talook &c of the
Zillah Innavelly.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

That your humble Petitioners
Uncle Veeranaick, who held the above situation
in July 1811. died leaving Petitioners father
Parisappa Naick as his legal heir & ext, and
that at the death of the said father the then
Zemindar Rajyasawmy Comanaick gave
up the said Office to Petitioners in July 1247
whilst thus, a Stranger by name of Venkata.
s. Ungaredy who has no concern whatever
in it, now fraudulently obtained the situation

That your humble Petitioner begs
to bring to your favorable notice the injustice
done to him by the Subordinate Officers &c &c.

That

Copy in a Rs to C
9/10th Nov.r 1859. No. 69

Triplicate (Duplicate)

Board's Petition
No 1847/59.

P 19/11/59
Read

Submit.
The Board's Secretary
to state that the notice
Collector's Answer
March 1859
Rec'd Board's Office
Fort St. George
6 July 1859

(Signed) S. Sankaran
Asst Secretary

That one Ramasawmeah pillay,
who contracted the Zamindary for 10 Years (from
fusly 1254 to 1263) attempted to practise frauds
in the place; but that as the Petitioner was
unwilling to Comply with such Acts. he re-
solved to defraud the Petitioner by dismissing
him from the Office of Pattamaay but God
took his life from the world before doing such
injustice to Petitioner. and that the deceased Ven
Soobramanea pillay had likewise instigated
the Petitioners opposite party Sunkaralinga
Reddy, who is an old man, to prefer a Com-
plaint as if he had entitled to the Office in
question, and in support of which fraudulent
intention the said Soobramanea pillay had
gained over the inferior Servants of the Collector
Cutcherry, and obtained the situation in the
name of the said Sunkaralinga Reddy's Son
Rajoobetteareddy in opposition to the former
decisions of the late Sub Collectors Messrs Whitley.
Shum and Elton that were passed only on the
Complaints of the said Sunkaralinga Reddy.
and that after having come to understand the
Melancholy Circumstances Petitioner went
and

2d

and applied for Copy of the said Order on
Stampt paper. On a perusal thereof it is
mentioned in the 5th line of that order that all
the exhibits were considered but appeared at
the same time that no perusal to the objec-
and grounds thereon started has been made
by the present Collector; so that he failed to
weigh such and such documents adduced
by the Petitioner or his opposite party, and
which of them was favorable or unfavorable
to either party but a line shewing that he has
taken all the proceedings into Consideration
without assigning on what ground the Petitioner
met his dismissal. He has therefore presumed
to lay this address before your goodness for
justice in the absence of supplying the defici-
encies and discrepancies of the enquiry held
in this Case by your Subordinate Officers.

That as the Petitioner was igno-
rant of the documents filed by defendant in
the Case, he and his Vakeel applied for
Copies of them on Stampt or plain papers to
which the Collector did not agree, notwithstand-
ing he begged of that Officer to grant Copies

to

to enable him to move the Higher Authority, but to no purpose, and that Petitioner sent an application by Post for the same purpose he be reports the same refusal. The Post Office Receipt for the said application is in his possession which he humbly begs to produce if necessary.

That every applicant like Petitioner will have means of obtaining redress if an upper Tribunal had referred to all the Proceedings of a lower Tribunal, and will be able enough to determine as to whether the decision passed therein is right or wrong, and that all the rules are enacted only for these things, but to his misfortune they could not have applied to his present Case.

That your humble Petitioner further begs to state that whenn right is litigated between two parties, and authority under the control of the President of India is empowered by Regulations to examine oral and documentary Evidence adduced by both parties and then to decide it on its merits but in this Case no trace of any reasonable investigation appears to have been conducted by

the authority, and it will therefore be apparent to your Lordship if considered that the order passed in this Case is absurd.

That your humble Petitioner begs leave to state that if the delay, that was occurred in this Case from the date of presentment of this complaint upto the date of the accompanying decision, be taken into Consideration, it will be manifest to your Board that the lengthened period was allowed to elapse until the completion of a fraud that was practised by perty-

The following few objections which the Petitioner begs to pause upon the order or decision of the Collector Viz:-

Portions of the Order of the Collector	Objections stated by Petitioners upon the order in question
1. In 1st para of the order it is stated that the defendant Sunkuralinga Reddy says that the Office of Nattamay was anciently entertained in the name of his forefather that his elder brother and himself afterwards held it, that	were the forefather of the said Sunkuralinga Reddy held the Nattamayship anciently why he admits that Veerana-nark had also held the above Capacity in fasly 1211, when another caste Vannanark had been remunerated in the Office

Veemanaik who held the
situation in fusly 1211. was
not the Petitioners forefather
according to his assertion,
that the said Veemanaik was
a Commawar Gentoo Caste,
that the Petitioner is a Cattay
Reddy Caste; that Consequently
no relationship has been exis-
ting between Petitioner and the
said Veemanaik, and that
the Petitioner has never held
the Nattamaysship inquestion.

and moreover the said order
ought to have Contained an
enquiry made respecting who
are the descendants of the said
Veemanaik, Petitioner therefore
proved by Accounts that his
Uncle the said Veemanaik
was Nattamagar in fusly
1211.

2

The 2d para of the order
shews that an Arzee addressed
by the Tahsildar of Streeville[illegible]

Agreeably to the Buzzoor
order the Tahsildar enquired
into the matter of Nattamaysh[illegible]
inquestion, how can the assertion
of this individual, who is said
to be the hereditary heir to it,
we believe it is stated in the
order that Veemanaik who
was Nattamagar in fusly 1211
was a Commawar Gentoo Caste,
and that the Petitioner is
another one but is it not Cus-
tomary to obtain evidence
from the opposite party as to
the relationship between Pet[illegible]
and the said Veemanaik

stating to the effect that the
said Sankuratinga Reddy in-
formed that he has no docu-
ments at all to prove his
title to the Nattamaysship,
that although no account was
kept prior to fusly 1258 still
the name of the opposite
party was collusively entered
in the Account of the latter
fusles; during which time
the Petitioners enemy Contracted
the Zemindary, and that the
Tahsildar who found out
this trick requested the Collector
to give the Nattamaysship to
the Petitioner.

3

In 2d para of the order it is
stated that the Acting Manager
of the said Zemindary submitted
an Arzee to the Buzzoor as if
the ryots were unwilling to
pay the balance of 500 Rs.
through the Medium of the
Petitioner.

and reported the truth thereof,
although the son of the late
Contractor of the Zemindary
instigated that Officer to do
according to his bad designs
The said Arzee was excluded
from this Order. If it found
a false one the Buzzoor ought
to have in made a personal
investigation into the matter
and reject it.

If the ryots were declard
their unwillingness, in what
manner the Petitioner was
accused to have appropriated
the Circar Money. They may
have Communicated to the
Buzzoor if any fraud is
said to have committed by

him. During the enquiry before the said Arumagam how did he find Petitioner is man of bad character and by what document he attempted to accuse him, so whilst there is no documents against him. If so, the Huzzoor ought to have ascertained as to what made him to accuse the innocent. It would be obvious to your Honorable Board that the assertion of the Acting Dmo. Arumagam who was employed for a short time is a false one owing to Petitioner's but time the said false allegation escaped the notice of the Huzzoor.

4

In 3d para of the order it is stated that the Defendant Runkerulinga Peddy has produced many Summuds and Receipts to the effect that his Elder brother Pettoreddy held the Nattamanyship since fusly 1215, and that the Defendant himself for a period of 40 Years, and that the Record keeper has reported that the Name of Pettoo reddy was entered in the Jamabundy Account of 1221 fusly alone.

If he were entitled to the Nattamanyship since fusly 1215 in whose name it was entered from fusly 1211 to 1214. Besides this the Accounts of fusly 1215 upto present date might have consentively held the Nattamanyship since fusly 1215, and that the Defendant himself for a period of 40 Years, and that the Record keeper has reported that the Name of Pettoo reddy was entered in the Jamabundy Account of 1221 fusly alone.

5

In para 4 of the order it is specified that it appears from the Papers Argee that the Petitioner had proved by his documents that he held the Nattamanyship for 20 Years while the said Runkeralinga Peddy got it for 30 Years according to certain Summuds & Accounts of fusly 1255 upto this date, that Petitioner's son was therefore appointed to that situation according to the Huzzoor order No 210. and that the Defendant appears from

arranged and then the Huzzoor ought to have examined all the Accounts of Authior and latter fuslies for the purpose of finding out the true assertion of the Petitioner.

It appears that the case was referred to the said Papildar for investigation but the Huzzoor has wholly failed to call for an explanation from the said Papildar and quote it in the order for the purpose of being supplied the deficiency of the enquiry conducted by him let given in a mere Abstract of all the Argees and therefore the objections made by Petitioner will appear to the Board just and proper.

his deposition that he has no document at all in his favor.

In the said para of the order it is further esplained that the late Contractor's Arzee shows that on Petitioners failure of tendering the required security for the Office of Pattamay one Sunkuralenga reddy was appointed to it.

6

If any man contracted a Zemindary, he should conduct it according to immemorial Customs obtained for the Office of Pattamay &c. and perhaps, if he frames fresh agreeable rules for requiring security from Petitioner he may order Petitioner in person to tender Security. On failure he should inform the Revenue Authorities and get their order for that purpose. on contrary how could he appoint a Stranger. From the date of such appointment the Petitioner is obliged to come forward with his claims to the Revenue Offices. How could the Buzzoor admit such an illegal nomination in the order? and consequently the Board will find that Petitioner losed his situation through the enmity excisted between him and the Contractor and moreover Petitioner also tendered security in the Talook after having been written to the Buzzoor or by the Zemindar.

7

In the said para it is further stated that it appears from the Arzee No. 147 of 1853 as if Petitioner had given a Deposition to the effect that Sunkuralinga reddy has discharged the duties of Pattamay of Pittapully in connection with Petitioner and his father and that he has enjoyed the provision thereof.

Petitioner has never given such a Deposition either to the Talook or to the Buzzoor Cutcherry but it is apparent that it should have been fabricated owing to his bad time.

8

When a dispute has been rising between two parties for an Office of Pattamay, the right of either party is to appertain by Authorities themselves. Is it proper to ask

In the said para it is also mentioned that the ryots gave a Mazgerennamah in favor of the opposite party.

the Consent of ryots in the matter of giving such appointment to a legal heir or to obtain Mazgerennamah which appears to have received in order to get the Defendant employed.

9

In the 4th para of the order it is added that the accounts of fuslies 1254 upto this date show that the Office of Muttumay in question was entertained in the name of Sunkaralinga reddy and that it is therefore impossible to give it up to Petitioner.

Ramasawmen pillay and his son who contracted the Zemindary in fusly 1254, did not enter the Petitioners name in the Account prepared by former. whilst thus is it just for the Authorities to admit such Account as evedence in favor of Sunkaralinga reddy.

10

No enquiry was held regarding the person who was entertained as Muttamagar in fusly 1211. but it is merely mentioned that Petitioner has possessed no title exhibit. who was the person that stood in fusly 1211? Petitioner has proved

It is also embodied in the order, that Petitioner bases hereditary title excluded to prove that he is sole heir to the Vallamagar who stood in fusly 1211.

proved by an Ayaent Account from the Palace of the Zemindar that Veemanaik was only the Muttamagar in the above fusly, he was Petitioners fathers elder brother and paternal Uncle to him and as he had no male issue, Petitioner's father Narasappanaik succeeded him, and then the Zemindar gave Summons to Petitioner for the Office enquestion as well as another Mootlamayaga pooroom in fusly 1247. Commanding him to conduct the same as his demised forefathers did. The Huzzoor also approved of the appointment of Veemanaik who stood in fusly 1211. but failed to enquire into the relationship between Petitioner and Veemanaik by a Genealogical tree for pointing out in the order The Petitioners opposite party is clearly admitting the above appointment which is co.

is it not the Collectors duty to know
the Cause of Sunkeralinga Reddys
Elder brother Pellos reddy obtaining
the Pattamayship in July 1215.
As the opposite party denied the
Relationship of Petitioner and the
said Veeranaik the Petitioner
proved this fact by 7 respectable
persons. which circumstance is
not mentioned in the order the
Contractors Son having gained
over the Huzzoor Moonshees &c.
The Petitioner is totally unable
to inform the Honorable Board
the exact injustice done to him.

For the foregoing reasons the Petitioner most respectfully begs your Honorable Board will be good enough to reverse the order of the Collector and to restore his Son to the situation of Pattamay with reference to the Accompanying Material Circumstances that declare openly he is a Gentoo Caste and not Collay Reddy as the Defendant asserts.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound.

Will Ever Pray

March 1858

No 252/28.

9/x/28

6/11/28

Petition presented to Parliament by the
Inhabitants of Parish of Colchester by Lieut.
Governor for the Erection of Lunatic Asylum at Madras
in the Village of Nungambaukum, adopted
by the Justices for Assembly 1858.

To the Honorable Members of the Legislative Council of the Presidency of Fort St. George.

The Petition of the Undersigned Inhabitants of Parish of Colchester

Humbly Sheweth,

That your Petitioners are desirous of establishing a Lunatic Asylum in the Village of Nungambaukum in the Vicinity of Madras, and have for that purpose collected by Subscription the Sum of Rupees 5 Lacs 5 Thousand, being the Amount of Estimate for erecting the Buildings necessary for the Establishment.

That your Petitioners have been credibly informed that the Village of Nungambaukum belongs to the Government of Fort St. George, and that the Government are willing to grant the Land for the purpose aforesaid on Reasonable Terms.

That your Petitioners are desirous of having the Asylum established in the Village of Nungambaukum, as the Situation is healthy, and the Land is well adapted for the Purpose.

That your Petitioners, on the 3rd day of May Instant, presented a Petition to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council praying that the Land in the Village of Nungambaukum might be granted for the purpose of erecting an Asylum for Lunatics, but that Petition was rejected.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honorable Board will be pleased to grant the Land in the Village of Nungambaukum for the purpose of erecting an Asylum for Lunatics, and your Petitioners will ever pray.

(Signed) Cumming Parker
Chairman

By unanimous Order

Copy of a Dft. to E.
D/19th Novr. 1859. N:69

Finally (3 Copies)
Board Reference
No 828/58.

Nath
2

P 1979/59

Copy in a Lr. to E
D/ 19th Novr. 1859 Nº 69

R 1979/59

Endorsement made by Mr. Sub Collector W Mingham 4
Sub Collector of Tinnevelly on Petition No. 46 presented
by Putchandi naiken 7th May 1853.

With reference to your Petition requesting
to enter in your two Pois names the Nattamay
offices of the Villages Moottoonaiga pooroum
and Vellepatty in consequence of infirmity,
the Tasildar who was directed to inquire into
and report upon the subject has reported in his
Arzee No. 147. that in consideration of your
being an old man, the Office of the Village
of Moottoonaiga pooroum should be transfered
to your Son born by your 1st Wife, and that
of the Vellepatty Village to that of your Son
born by your 2d Wife; but states that, with
regard to the objection which another Nattamay
Sungaralinga reddy, it appears to him (Tasildar)
from the Summud granted by the Zemindar
and by other Mouchilka Pts you are or
were doing the duties of the Office of the
said Vellepatty Village and that at the
[illegible] of the Village Curnum the said
Sungaralinga reddy has objected & complained

20

as above said.

Therefore Orders have been sent to the Talook directing the Tasildar that he may transfer or enter the names of your two sons as Pattamagars to the two Villages above mentioned, as you requested.

(Signed) I Willingham
Sub Collector.

Enquired
Sept

Ordered by the Board of Revenue that Mr Willingham the Collector of the Northern Division do inquire into the Petition of Pulchandinaiken Pattamagar of Moottoonagapooram Village in the Talook of Tinnevelly and report his opinion thereon to the Board

By Order
(illegible)
Secretary

Dated 19th Feby 1857

Arzee addressed to the Collector Mr. I Silver of Tinnevelly by the Tasildar of Seevilpoottoor Talook under date January 1857.

With reference to the order No. 168 of 1855 forwarding the Petition presented by Pulchandinaiken Complaining that while the Pattamay Office of the Village of Moottoonagapooram & Villiputty in Sattoor Zemindary, one Sangaralinga reddy lays unjust claim to the Office of the latter Village, & another Rungapa Naiken to that of the former Village, and directing me to enquire into and report upon the subject. I have to state for the information of your honor that a Yaddast No. 210 dated 1853 is received in this Talook from the Sub Collector, finally deciding that the Pattamay Office of the Moottoonagapooram should be given to son born by the 1st Wife and that of the Villiputty Village to the son born by the 2d Wife of Pulchandinaiken who is Original incumbent of both the Villages, that thereupon the said Sangaralinga reddy Complained to the Hoozoor, that upon his being repeatedly required to produce such Document whereby.

whereby his Claim can be established he delayed doing so so that days may elapse afterwards a Deposition was taken from that Sungaralingareddy, wherein he declared that he has no Document to produce whereby his right shall be established, that he being an old of 90 years of Age and thereby became of short sight and deaf, he ceased to receive the Collection Money this two Years, and that, in such a state of his, the Circar may dispose the Office as to it may seem proper. The present Curnom Reported that the Records or Account dated antecedent to fusly 1256 have been destroyed by fire, and that therefore the name of the said Sungaralingareddy was entered in the Jamabundy Account for fusly 1256 and that he is not aware of any thing prior to that fusly. From the Commencement of fusly 1264 a Manager has been appointed to the Minor Zemindar. The Zemindarry Estate was afterwards under

under the Management of the Renter Ramasawmy Pillay and his Son. Even after the Hooz oor Hookoums have been joined to and received in the Talook in 1853 that the Office of Nattamay may be bestowed upon the son of Putchi-Vandinaiken, they (Villagers or Curnum) have not entered his name in the Accounts. From the former Records and from the Summuds and receipts which are in possession of the said Putchiandenaiken, it is evident that he (Putchiandinaiken) is the real Nattamagar of the Villepully Village. I hear now that the present Zemindar being at Variance with the said Putchi-Vandinaiken, his Renters Ramasawmy Pillay and his Son are setting up the said Sungaralingareddy to lay claim to the Office in injury to the interests of that real Nattamagar Putchiayandi-Vandi. In proof of this there is sufficient reason to believe that the Name of the Son of Putchiandenaik was not entered in the Jamabundy Account

while

while Hooz our order is to do so, and on the
Contrary Seengaraleinga Reddy's name is
made to appear in that Account - let the
Case lie at any Rate but the said Seengara-
leinga Reddy having pleaded that he has
no Document to produce in proof of his
right to the Office, it does not that he is
Real incumbent from the Ancient time,
Besides this, he is old and unfit for the
Office, he admits so to be - It does not
appear proper that his son should
Receive the Collection Money which is
Contrary to the Rules Therefore according
to the Sub Collectors Lanked No. 210 dated
1853 I am of opinion that the Patchi-
andencadeen himself may be made to do
the duties of the Office and enjoy the
Emoluments thereto attached - ~~Instructed~~
I returned the Petition and shall act
as orders may be received

(Signed) Seemenaicken
Jaspdar

(A true Copy)
(Signed) J. H. Levenge
Actg Collector

Copy in no. 5 to 8/19th Novr 1859 No 64

(3 Copys)
Examined
for Sd
Collectors Office to Ho
Actg Collector Cocos Island
Dated 8th Sept 1857

P 19/9/59