M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1551	Press ~~Mis.~~
133—135	
Dated 8—9—	1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th September 1860.

No. 133. Read the following Petition from KISTNIER, an inhabitant of Chidambaram in the District of South Arcot, dated Chidambaram, 19th April 1860 :—

Submits in triplicate a Memorial to the Home Government praying for the continuance of a Mányam in his favor in South Arcot. (Here enter 19th April 1860.)

No. 134. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th July 1860, No. 3,486 :—

Read the following letter from H. WOOD, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Cuddalore, 18th July 1860, No. 109 :—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 14th ultimo, communicating the Order of Government of 12th idem calling for further information regarding the Dutta Inám case therein referred to, I have the honor to state that the name of the original grantee who is stated to have died many years ago is entered in our accounts as Venkatakistna Sastri. The name of this man's successor does not appear in the accounts, but the present claimant, Kistna Ayer, who got possession in 1838, was in the enjoyment of the Inám when it was resumed by Government in 1842.

In Cons., 13th June 1860, *No.* 2,837. 1. Submitted to Government with reference to their Order dated 12th June 1860, No. 975.

2. It will be observed that the records of the Collector's Kacherí do not show the name of the person, who succeeded the original grantee of the Dutta Inám, referred to by Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 135. ORDER THEREON, 8th September 1860, No. 1,551.

1. This Memorial relates to a Mányam, resumed by Order of Government and for which Memorialist claims compensation.

See Extract Minutes Consultation, 4th February 1858, *No.* 151, *Revenue Department.*

2. In 1842, the Kávalgárs of Chidambaram and Mannárgudi in South Arcot were relieved of their Police functions, and the Ináms held on that account were resumed. It was then found that portions of these Ináms had been alienated to individuals and charitable institutions rent free. The principle of adjustment approved both by Government* and the Honorable† Court of Directors, was, in the case of alienations to individuals, that money allowances equivalent to the full annual value of the Mányams resumed, be granted to the incumbents for their respective lives; in the case of grants to institutions, a single payment, equal to five years income, was made in full of all claims.

* *Extract Minutes Consultation, 31st January* 1842, *No.* 138.

† *Despatch 1st February* 1843, *No.* 2.

3. A number of cases were accordingly disposed of under these rules. Some delay took place with regard to others, and the latest were reported on to the Board of Revenue by the Collector in 1857. The whole number of cases thus last reported, in both Táluqs, was ninety-two.

26th February 1857.

4. The Inám which forms the subject of the present memorial is entered as No. 60 in the Register of claims for the Mannárgudi Táluq. It consisted of four kánis of nanja land, valued at Rupees 34-5-4 yearly, stated to have been granted about the year 1772 to *Venkatésa Sástri* who is said to have died many years ago. The Memorialist claimed it as the grandson of the original grantee *Venkatakistna Sástri*; and in support of his claim he produced a deed written on an unstamped Cadjan, in the name of *Venkatésa Sástri*. The village Officers deposed that the grant was originally made to *Venkatakistna Sástri* and the old accounts were found to contain entries of the Inám in that name. The Collector considered that if the grant had been

really made to *Venkatesa Sástri*, as set forth in the document produced by petitioner, his name would also have appeared in the accounts, and on account of this discrepancy he did not recommend that any allowance should be made to Memorialist.

Ex. Mins. Cons., 4th February 1858, No. 151, paragraph 2.

5. The judgment of the Collector in the case was approved by Government.

6. In the present Memorial and its enclosures it is set forth that when the land in question was given by the Pálayagár to Venkatésa Sástri, his father *Venkatakistna Sástri* was also living; that the deed of gift was in the name of the former, (*Venkatesa Sástri,*) but that he dying soon after, his father (Memorialist's grandfather,) *Venkatakistna Sástri* took the land and held it till *his* death, when it was enjoyed by Memorialist until the date of resumption in 1842. The cause of its entry in the old accounts in the name of *Venkatakistna Sástri* is alleged to be that the Paimáish accounts were prepared after the death of the original grantee, and when *Venkatakistna Sástri* was in possession. In the authenticated copy of the Pálayagárs deed of gift, which forms enclosure 1, to the Memorial, it is observed that the grant was made "to *Venkatésa Sastri,* 'son of *Venkatakistna Sástri.*"

Board's Proceedings dated 30th July 1860, No. 3,486.

7. It appears from the Collector's letter of 18th July 1860, No. 109, "that the name of "the original grantee who is stated to have died "many years ago," is entered in the accounts as *Venkatakistna Sástri*, but that the name of his successor does not appear. In his Register of claims, in 1857, Mr. Hall apparently alluded to *Venkatésa Sástri,* as the original grantee who had died many years ago.

8. Memorialist also alleges that the original deed of gift had been for 15 years prior to the inquiry, in the Collector's Office, and that there is no reason to doubt its genuineness.

9. Such are the particulars of the information before Government; there are a few points on which further explanation is necessary. In the first place a difficulty appears as to the Petitioner's age. The gift of the land is alleged to have been originally made to Petitioner's father about 1772, and he is stated by Mr. Hall to have died "shortly after." Supposing him to have died within twelve years of that time, Petitioner must now be at least eighty years old; is he of such great age, or, if not, can he give any explanation as to the time of his fathers' demise and of his own birth?

10. Secondly, as to the succession to Venkatakistna Sástri. He is stated by Mr. Wood to have died many years ago; and this statement agrees well with the other facts stated; for, as he had a son of some age in 1772, he may be supposed to have been at least 25 or 30 years of age at that time; and in either case, he would have been above 90 in 1838 when Petitioner states he obtained possession of the land. It occurs therefore to ask whether there is reason to believe that he really did live so long, or whether any one succeeded him, intermediately, before the Petitioner; and if so, who, and by what right?

11. Thirdly, as to Petitioners actual possession of the land prior to the resumption in 1842. He states that he obtained possession in 1838, and retained it till 1842. If this was really the case, it does not appear why any question arose about the Inám at all; as the Order of Government directed that those actually in possession should receive the money allowance in lieu. But nothing is said in Mr. Hall's Report in 1857, as to Petitioner having been in possession, or as to his claiming on that ground. Mr. Wood indeed in his recent letter (July 18th 1860,) states that Petitioner got possession in 1838 and held it in 1842; but the statement is made very generally, without any facts to support it, or anything to show that its truth had been ascertained.

12. The Board will be requested to obtain and submit more satisfactory information on the three points above stated.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

R. D.

No. 1551.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 8th ~~August~~ September 1860.

Read the following papers.

From Kistnaveran inhabitant of Chidambaram in the District of South arcot.

Submits a memorial to the Home Government claiming compensation for the Mánygam resumed by Government.

(Here enter 19th April 1860.)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Submitting with observation a letter from the Collector of South arcot furnishing the further information required by Government regarding a Sotta Enam in South arcot.

(Here enter 30th July & No. 3,486)

¶1 This Memorial relates to a Mánygam, resumed by order of Government and for which Memorialist claims compensation.

See Ep: Mi: 6: 4th February 1858. No. 151 R.D.

2 In 1842, the Cavilgars of Chidambaram and Manargudi in South arcot were relieved of their Police functions, and the inams held on that account were resumed. It was then found that portions of these inams had been alienated to individuals and charitable institutions rent free.

The

The principle of adjustment approved both by Government* and the Honorable Court of Directors, was, in the case of alienations to individuals, that money allowances equivalent to the full annual value of the Manyam resumed, be granted to the incumbents for their respective lives; in the case of grants to institutions, a single fragment, equal to five years income, was made in full of all claims.

3 A number of cases were accordingly disposed of under these rules. Some delay took place with regard to others, and the latest were reported on to the Board of Revenue by the Collector in 1857. The whole number of cases thus last reported, in both Taluqs, was ninety two.

4 The inam which forms the subject of the present Memorial is entered at №60 in the Register of claims for the Managudi Taluq. It consisted of four Kanis

* E. M. L. 31st January 1842 №138.
* Despatch 1st February 1843 № 2.

28th February 1857.

Kanis of nanja land, valued at Rupees 34-5-4 yearly, stated to have been granted about the year 1772 to Venkatésa Sástri who is said to have died many years ago. The Memorialist claimed it as the grandson of the original grantee Venkatakistna Sástri; and in support of his claim he produced a deed written on an unstamped Cadjan, in the name of Venkatésa Sástri. The village officers deposed that the grant was originally made to Venkatakistna Sástri and the old accounts were found to contain entries of the inam in that name. The Collector considered that if the grant had been really made to Venkatésa Sástri, as set forth in the documents produced by Petitioner, his name would also have appeared in the accounts, and on account of this discrepancy he did not recommend that any allowance should be made to Memorialist.

The

5 The judgment of the Collector in the case was &c. approved by Government. R: Proc: 4th February 1858 № 151/p 2.

6 In the present Memorial and its enclosures it is set forth that when the land in question was given by the Poligar to Venkatésa Sastry, his Father Venkatakrishna Sástri was also living: that the deed of gift was in the name of the former, (Venkatésa Sástri) but that he dying soon after, his father (Memorialists grandfather,) Venkatakrishna Sástri took the land and held it till his death, when it was enjoyed by Memorialist until the date of resumption in 1842. The course of its entry in the old accounts in the name of Venkatakrishna Sástri is alleged to be that the Pymáish accounts were prepared after the death of the original grantee, and when Venkatakrishna Sástri was in possession. In the authenticated copy of the Poligars deed of gift, which forms Enclosure 4 to the Memorial it

Pálayagár

Pálayagár's

it is observed that the grant was made "to Venkatésa Sástri "son of Venkatakrishna Sástri."

7 It appears from the Collectors letter of 18th July 1860, № 109, "that the name "of the original grantee who "is stated to have died many "years ago," is entered in the accounts as Venkatakrishna Sástri, but that the name of his successor does not appear in his Register of claims, in 1857, when Mr Hall apparently alluded to Venkatésa Sástri as the original grantee who had died many years ago. R: Proc: 30th July 1860 № 3486.

8 Memorialist also alleges that the original deed of gift had been for 15 years prior to the enquiry, in the Collectors office, and that there is no reason to doubt its genuineness.

Such

9 Such are the particulars of the information before Govt., there are a few points on which further explanation is necessary. In the first place a difficulty appears as to the Petitioner's age. The gift of the land is alleged to have been originally made to Petitioners Father about 1772, and he is stated by Mr. Wall to have died "shortly after". Supposing him to have died within twelve years of that time, Petitioner must now be at least eighty years old; is he of such great age, or, if not, can

5

can he give any explanation as to the time of his Father's demise and of his own birth?

10. Secondly as to the succession to Venkiatachalam Sastri - he is stated by Mr. Wood to have died many years ago, and their statement agrees well with the other facts stated; for, as he had a son of some age in 1772, he may be supposed to have been at least 25 or 30 years of age at that time, and in either case, he would have been above 90 in 1838 when Petitioner states he obtained possession of the land.

If

It occurs therefore to ask whether there is reason to believe that he really did live so long, or whether any one succeeded him, intermediately, before the Petitioner; and if so, who, and by what right?

11 Thirdly, as to Petitioners actual possession of the land prior to the resumption in 1862. He states that he obtained possession in 1838, and retained it till 1842. If this was really the case, it does not appear why any question arose about the Indian at all, as the order of Govt.

× i.e. the Collector. Petitioner does not state what gave him possession. but merely that he succeeded his (real) father & held it till date of petition.

Government directed that those actually in possession should receive the money allowance in lieu. But nothing is said in Mr. Hall's Report in 1857, as to Petitioner having been in possession, or as to his claiming on that ground. Mr. Wood indeed in his recent letter (July 18, 1861) states that Petitioner got possession in 1838 and held it in 1842; but the statement is made very generally, without any facts to support it, or anything to show that its truth had been ascertained.

12 The Board will be requested to obtain, and

and submit more satisfactory information on the three points above stated.

GW

12 Copies
Board of Revenue
Circ. 12