M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

/——

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2039 Press ~~Mis.~~

52-53

Dated 3—11— 1869.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 3rd November 1860.

No. 52. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th September 1860, No. 4,280:—

Read the following letter from B. CUNLIFFE, Esq., Collector of Madras, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Saidapet, 20th August 1860, No. 336.

SIR,

1. Adverting to the Board's Orders of the 22nd March 1860, No. 1,463, communicating the Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 16th idem, No. 395, directing me to furnish the information called for by Government in the first part of paragraph 7 of their Proceedings in reference to the relationship of the present Petitioners, C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam, to the Pandárams of 1802, and with reference to the Board's Petitions noted in the margin,* I have the honor to report that the Petitioners, C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam, who are brothers, having been called upon to prove their relationship, the former appeared and stated that in 1802, the Inám in question was enjoyed by the descendants, from Nos. 8 to 18, of seven distinct families, as shown in the genealogical table A furnished by him, and which is enclosed. This table shows that, with the exception of Nos. 9 and 14, the other eighteen are dead, leaving heirs, and that the 1st Petitioners are the descendants of family No. 1.

* *No.* 1,363 *of* 1860, *from Srínivása Pillai, Gumáshta, to Sitárama Pandáram.*
No. 1,541 *of* 1860, *from Kandaswámi Gurukkal, Church-warden of Subramaniaswámi Pagoda in Andárkuppam.*
Nos. 1,549, 1,930 *and* 2,095 *of* 1860, *from Sónagiri Mudali and others of Andárkuppam.*

1. *Basava Pandáram of Andárkuppam*, 75 *years.*
2. *Krishna Dhikshtar of Sayanavaram*, 63 *do.*
3. *Venkatésa Pandáram of Kumwangalam*, 50 *do.*
4. *Subbaráya Pandáram of Ariattúr*, 73 *years.*

2. To ascertain the truth of the Petitioners' statement, four of the old and aged residents of that and adjoining villages were examined, whose names are given in the margin.

3. The 1st witness Basava Pandáram states that the Inám village was enjoyed by twenty-four persons of the Pandáram sect, from the time of the late Collector, Mr. Place, in 1796 for about 22 years, when it was resumed by the late Collector, Mr. Cooke, in 1819. If this statement can be relied on, the parties mentioned by him must have enjoyed the Inám in 1802.

4. To show more clearly the different members of the family who are stated to have enjoyed the Inám in twenty-four shares in the proportions he reunder given, a genealogical table B has been prepared with reference to the witness' statements, which is enclosed:

Nos. 1 to 4	enjoyed	1 share.
„ 5 to 7	„	1 do.
„ 8 to 10	„	1 do.
„ 11, 12 and 23 and another person No. 24, name unknown.	„	1 do., and
„ 13 and 14	„	19 shares.
„ 15 to 22		

That the descendants from Nos. 25 to 35 are now living, being the heirs of those in the first line. He states also that certain of these shares has since been sold, as shown below. No. 17 sold his share to one Chenchuráman not entered in this list; No. 18 to Subbu Pandáram and Ekámbra Pandáram, and Nos. 20, 21 and 22 sold their shares to 34 of this table, who is the 1st Petitioner, C. Sónagiri. There is, therefore, a great difference between the genealogical trees A and B, the former containing seven shares to the Inám, while the latter contains twenty-four shareholders.

5. Comparing the two tables, it would appear that only those of table A indicated in the margin† are to be found in table B. As regards the several others mentioned by the Petitioner C. Sónagiri in his table A, the 1st witness is silent.

† *Nos.* 1, 2, 3, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24 *and* 27.

6. From the statement of the 2nd witness, Krishna Dhikshtar, table C has been prepared which is also enclosed. He states that Nos. 1 to 5, as given in his table, and certain others with whose names he is not acquainted, enjoyed the twenty-four shares of the Inám from the time of the late Collector, Mr. Greenway, in 1802; that out of the family of those from Nos. 1 to 5 excepting Nos. 6 and 8, who are dead, the rest of their descendants are still living, as are also

the descendants of those who enjoyed the Inám in 1802, but with whose names he is not acquainted as stated above.

Nos. 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, *and* 29.

7. The names of the persons given in table C, will be found entered in the table A also, in the numbers given in the margin; but some names in the latter are omitted in the former.

8. The two other witnesses, Venkatésa Pandáram and Subbaráya Pandáram, deny all knowledge as to who enjoyed the Inám in 1802; but the former merely describes, with few exceptions, the families and their descendants as given in the table A furnished by the 1st Petitioner, C. Sónagiri, while the latter speaks only of one family, viz., that of Sítáráma Pandáram alone.

9. 2nd Petitioner, Sítáráma Pandáram who has petitioned the Board of Revenue on the 19th May 1860, claiming the restoration of the Inám to himself, having been called upon to prove his title, has produced the enclosed genealogical table D, and stated that his 5th grandfather, Pilebund Sítáráma Pandáram, No. 1, originally acquired the Inám with the Mirás rights from the late Nawáb, which was afterwards enjoyed by his heirs as given in his table, and that the Petitioners, C. Sónagiri Mudali and others, have no right whatever to it. The Petitioner has also produced certain documents which will hereafter be noticed in due order.

*1. *Kandaswámi Gurukkal*, 65 *years.*
2. *Subbaráya Pillai*, 77 *do.*
3. *Strínivása Aiyengár*, 72 *do.*
4. *Venkatáchella Mudali*, 65 *do.*

10. In support of his statement he has cited four witnesses marginally* named.

11. The 1st witness, Kandaswámi Gurukkal states that Kalástri Pandáram, No. 8, father of the Petitioner, No. 13, continued to enjoy the Inám with his cousins, Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12 and 22 in the table D, together with one Komara Pandáram not mentioned in the said table. He also states that Bangáru Pandáram, Vaidi Pandáram, Víra Pandáram and certain others, names unknown, also enjoyed the Inám with those above-mentioned; that the Petitioners C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam have no right to the Inám, as their uncle Korattúr Vírabaddra Mudali merely purchased 8¼ shares of the Mirás after the resumption of the Inám; that Kalástri Pandáram continued to pay to the Pagoda of the village 70 Rupees and 29 Kallums of paddy per annum before such resumption, and enjoyed all the honors in the Pagoda.

12. The 2nd witness, Curnum Subbaráya Pillai, states that as far as his experience goes for a period of 58 years, he knows that the village was held on Inám tenure from the year Kudurotkári (1804) to Iswara (1818) by the 2nd Petitioner's father, Kalástri Pandáram, and by his five cousins, Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12 and 22 mentioned in table D. He states that four other Pandárams, mentioned in the margin,† and certain others, names unknown, also enjoyed the said Inám with the permission of the aforesaid Kalástri Pandáram and his cousins in twenty-four shares; but that the Káni Mányam was enjoyed by the said six sharers alone. He moreover alleges that the two Petitioners, C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam are the nephews of Vírabaddra Pandáram, one of the four persons above-mentioned. He asserts also that he heard from his late father, and from the late father of the 2nd Petitioner, that the late Collector, Mr. Greenway, permitted the Inám and Mányam to be enjoyed by Kalástri Pandáram, and his four cousins given in the table D, when the Gurukkal of the Pagoda disputed the right to these Ináms and Mányams on behalf of the Pagoda.

† *Ponni Pandáram.*
Swámi Pandáram.
C. Virabaddra Pandáram.
Nallamuttu Pandáram.

13. The 3rd and 4th witnesses, Strínivása Aiyengár and Venkatáchella Mudali, confirm the statements of the two other witnesses in reference to the enjoyment of the Inám by Kalástri Pandáram and his four cousins, though these four witnesses differ slightly in regard to the names of the other parties, who are stated to have enjoyed the Inám with Kalástri Pandáram, No. 8, and his party.

14. Petitioner C. Sónagiri Mudali having been called upon to explain the validity of the claims of the other Petitioner, Sítáráma Pandáram admits his claims to the Inám in question, but states that through the instigations of the Pagoda Gurukkal, who is at variance with him, he is trying to deprive him, the Petitioner C. Sónagiri Mudali, of his share of the Inám. He also states that originally the other Petitioner Sítáráma Pandáram possessed six shares; but that he now possesses only three-quarters of one share. This three-quarters share must refer to the Mirás share of the village, and not the Inám shares which have long since been resumed.

15. He further states that the grandfather, Sítáráma Pandáram, No. 5, of the second Petitioner, also Sítáráma Pandáram, No. 13, in table D, had given a written statement to the eighteen

other shareholders of the Inám, of whom he is one, to the effect that he and his party inherit six shares out of the Inám, while the remaining eighteen shares are being enjoyed by other persons.

16. In support of his assertion, he has produced copy of the statement in question, exhibit E, a translate of which accompanies. From this it will be observed that Sítáráma Pandáram and his party, the forefathers of the 2nd Petitioner, having disputed with the remaining eighteen shareholders, Uddandi, Komari, &c., relative to the enjoyment of Káni Mányam of the village, they had recourse to the arbitrators mentioned in the margin,* who awarded a decision on the 15th Kartigai of the said year Bahudániya (A. D. 1759) and both parties have agreed to abide by that decision.

* *Tombu Mudali of Panjetti.*
Komarappa Mudali.
Agatiappa Mudali and others.

17. In this document it is provided that in the event of the Sirkár resuming the Inám and other Mányams, the six shareholders of the Inám are alone to defray the necessary expenses for their recovery, and if their efforts prove ineffectual in that case, the one Káni of Káni Mányam, awarded by the decision of the arbitrators to the six sharers alone, should be enjoyed by the whole of the twenty-four shareholders.

18. The 1st Petitioner, Sónagiri, has produced a copy of the arbitrators' decision, a transcript of which has also been produced by the 2nd Petitioner. This document bears date the 15th Kartigai of the year Bahudániya (A. D. 1759) the same date as that of the agreement. In fact, the agreement would appear to have been executed on the strength of the arbitrators' decision. This document, though quite unintelligible to any in this Office in some parts from the phraseology adopted, professes to show that the Ejamán or chief man Sítáráma Pandáram and his party who inherit six shares of the Inám, and Uddandi, Komari and others who enjoy the remaining eighteen shares, having disputed with each other relative to the enjoyment of the Káni Mányam, &c., the arbitrators decided that the chief man and his party should enjoy the Mányam, and also the first holy water, and other honors in the Pagoda, and that the rest of the land should be enjoyed in twenty-four equal shares. From this it is evident that Sítáráma Pandáram inherited the six shares of the Inám and the Káni Mányam, and was recognised as the chief party in the village.

19. The 1st Petitioner, Sónagiri Mudali, addressed two Petitions to this Office under dates the 26th and 28th July last, stating that the Village Curnum, Subbaráya Pillai, who on a former occasion spoke in favor of his claims to the Inám, had during the recent inquiry given a contrary statement. On referring to the deposition given by this Curnum on the 7th December 1858, when an inquiry was held under the instruction of the Board regarding this Inám which was disputed by the Petitioner, Sónagiri and others, and the Gurukkal of the Pagoda on its behalf, it appears that this Curnum had denied all knowledgeof the forefathers of the 1st Petitioner, Sónagiri, having founded the village, but that prior to Fasli 1227 (A. D. 1818) the village was for 20 years enjoyed by the parties marginally noted. His two statements, however, materially differ as to the particular shareholders prior to resumption. But on both occasions he stated that the 1st Petitioner and his brother were the sons of Ramalinga, brother to C. Vírabaddra Pandáram entered in statement A.

Former statement.
Kalástri Pandáram.
Nága Pandáram.
C. Muttu Pandáram.
Ponni Pandáram.
Swámi Pandáram.
Ella Pandáram.
C. Vírabaddra Pandáram.
Nalla Muttu Pandáram.
These and certain others, names unknown.
Present statement.
Kalástri Pandáram.
Peria Nága Pandáram.
Chinna Nága Pandáram.
Peria Ella Pandáram.
Chinna Ella Pandáram.
C. Muttu Pandáram.

20. The 2nd Petitioner, Sítáráma Pandáram, has not admitted that this Korattúr Vírabaddra Mudali, the uncle of the 2nd Petitioner, has any share in the Inám; but his first witness, the Curnum, has stated that he is one of the eighteen who are represented to have enjoyed the Inám conjointly with the principal six shareholders.

21. The 2nd Petitioner has filed copies of the documents marginally noted.*

* 1 *Decision of Panchâyet of* 15*th Kârtikai, Bahudâniya year.*

1 *Karârnâma executed to Company Sirkâr by Mirâsdârs of Subbramannyapuram, dated* 19*th December* 1826.
1 *Tâkid issued to Zilladar of Kannighappair by Tahsîldâr Vîrabaddra Mudali of Peddapolliem, dated* 23*rd August* 1830.
1 *Agreement executed by Uttukotta dancers Komari Pandâram, &c., to Pilebund Sîtâráma Pandâram, dated* 24*th A'vani of Angîrasa year.*

22. The first is an agreement given to the Sirkâr by the Ryots of Subbramannyapuram *alias* Andârkuppam on the 19th December 1826, agreeing to convey tappal and other things received at their village, with reference to their respective shares of the Mirás, under the instructions of the Ejamán, Kalástri Pandáram.

23. The second is copy of a Tákid issued to the Zilladar of Kannighappair (to which the village of Andárkuppam was attached) by the Tahsíldár Vírabaddra Mudali. The purport of the Tákid is, that Komara Pandáram having complained that certain of the Pandárams belonging to the eighteen shares of the Inám prevented the six shareholders from measuring the grain of the Káni Mányam; the grain should be restored to the six shareholders.

24. The third is a document given to Sítáráma Pandáram, grandfather of the 2nd Petitioner, by certain of the eighteen shareholders, under date the 24th Ávani of the year Angírasa (A. D. 1753), stating that they will conduct themselves consistently in every respect according to his instructions. If they fail to do so, they will forfeit the eighteen shares of the Inám given to them by the said Sítáráma Pandáram.

25. The Board were not, I dare say, prepared for this long explanation arising out of the Government query as to relationship. The necessary inquiry has given great trouble both in the Táluq and at the Húzur, and has resulted unsatisfactorily. I have laid the pretensions of the rival parties minutely before the Board that they may decide upon them.

26. They will observe, however, that the battle for the Inám has been fought by the 1st Petitioner alone, and that after victory gained, the 2nd Petitioner has stepped in to secure its fruits, and to exclude the 1st Petitioner from all participation in them. This being the case, I should be inclined myself to make the Srotriyam over to the 1st Petitioner and his party, leaving the 2nd to establish his claims in the Civil Courts, to any share above that to which the 1st Petitioner admits he is entitled.

27. In regard to the Petition No. 1,541 of 1860, from Kandaswámi Gurukkal, Church-warden of Andárkuppam, pointing out the inadmissibility of the claim of the present Petitioners, C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam, and claiming the village on behalf of the Pagoda on the strength of what he represents to be Bernard's Tarapadi Account, a copy of which he has in his possession, and on the strength of a decree of Mr. Greenway passed in January 1802, respecting a dispute between a former worshipper of the Pagoda and the Pandárams, I have the honor to report that Mr. Shubrick, my predecessor, having in his letter of the 27th April 1859, No. 130, reported fully on the merits of the whole case, it only remains for me to request the attention of the Board to the Proceedings of Government, dated 16th March 1860, No. 395, from which it will be clear that the Petitioner has not the slightest claim whatever to the Inám in question. It should also be observed that the Proceedings of Government above quoted, have been fully approved of by the Secretary of State for India, in his Despatch to this Government of the 29th June 1860, No. 42, communicated by the Board under date the 8th instant, No. 3,662.

28. In reference to Petitions Nos. 1,930 and 2,095 of 1860, from Sónagiri Mudali and others of Andárkuppam, praying for the transfer to them of the Pagoda of their village constructed by their ancestors, on the plea of the misappropriation of its funds by the Gurukkal of the Pagoda, I have the honor to state that from paragraph 13 of the Report of the late Collector, Mr. Cooke, dated 24th April 1819, it will be observed that when the Inám village was resumed by Government, the annual payment of 76 Rupees was ordered to be made for the support of the temple out of the proceeds of the Inám the payment meaning of course to be made to the Gurukkal to whom it has continued to be paid from that year, 1819, up to the present time.

29. Hence it would appear that the Gurukkal of the Pagoda had always the management of the temple, but whether as the rightful Church-warden of the Pagoda or its mere servant, there are no means of ascertaining after such a lapse of time. This arrangement having continued for a long time uninterruptedly, it should not perhaps be now disturbed.

---

1. In paragraph 7 of their Proceedings dated 16th March 1860, No. 395, Revenue Department, disposing of the Board's Proceedings dated 15th February 1860, on the claims advanced by C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam by Memorial for

In Cons. 17*th March* 1860, *No.* 1,236.

the restoration of the village of Andárkuppam, the Government while admitting the right of the descendants of the Pandárams who were ousted by Mr. Cooke from the Inám in 1819, directed that inquiry should be made as to the relationship of the Memorialists to those original Pandárams.

Nos. 1,363, ,, 1,541, ,, 1,549, ,, 1,930, ,, 2,095, ,, 2,265 } *of* 1860.

2. The Collector's present letter is a reply on this point, and to the endorsement of the Board on the Petitions noted in the margin, from the above-mentioned Memorialists, praying to be placed in possession of the village, and in the management of its Pagoda; from one Sítáráma Pandáram, asserting a preferential claim by descent to that of the Memorialists; and from the Gurukkal of the village Pagoda, re-asserting his claim on behalf of that institution. It is sufficient to say on this last person's claim that it has been already distinctly and finally rejected. Mr. Cunliffe in paragraph 27 of his above letter seems to have lost sight of the Board's Proceedings of 15th February last, on which the Government Proceedings of 16th March quoted by him were based, and to have misunderstood the object of the Board in forwarding the Petition in question to him, which was merely that as adverse claims to possession had been advanced and were then under his consideration, he might be in possession of all the claims that had reached the Board subsequently to the Government order.

No. 829.
In Cons. 17*th March* 1860, *No.* 1,236.

3. On the claims of Sónagiri Mudali and others to have the management of the village Pagoda, the Board consider it unnecessary to pass any decision, and resolve to refer them under Regulation VII of 1817, to the Civil Courts for the establishment of their rights relatively with those of the Gurukkal, who has certainly for many years past had the management of the temple and of the allowance assigned to it from the revenues of the village subsequently to the resumption of the Inám, though more probably as the descendant or successor of the individual originally inducted by the Pandárams, the founders of the village and temple, than by any inherent right of his own.

4. Had there been any present vacancy in the post of Gurukkal or Pujári, the Board would have admitted the Petitioners' claims to consideration, but the circumstances of the case are not such as in their opinion to call for the disturbance of the long incumbency of the present office-holder, who it is to be remembered will in future be dependant on the Inámdárs for the maintenance of the temple and its services, and is not likely under these circumstances to be too independent of their legtimate influence.

5. It remains to notice the adverse claims of Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam, the original Memorialists, and of Sítáráma Pandáram to the possession of the village.

6. Four genealogical tables are furnished by the Collector in elucidation of the various statements made by the claimants, and by the witnesses who have been examined; together with copy and translation of an agreement executed by Sítáráma Pandáram, grandfather of the Petitioner of the same name, and five others, to the eighteen other shareholders of the village, which document was produced by Sónagiri Mudali; and copy and free translation of the award made by certain arbitrators in a dispute which arose among the Pandárams of the village, transcript of which has been produced by both parties.

7. Both these documents are dated "15th Kártikai of the year Bahudánya" which in the latter document is said to correspond "with the year of Salivahana 1668," but according to Brown's Ephemeris Sal. 1668, corresponded with Xaya, the concluding year of the Cycle of which Bahudánya is the 12th Serial year, thus corresponding with the year Sal. 1680, but there is a variation of eleven years in the order of titles as used in Bengal and Madras at present, which would nearly remove the above discrepancy, and it may be that this variation was formerly of more extended incidence than it now is.

8. The year S. S. 1668 corresponded with A. D. 1746, but the correctness of the date of these documents is only of importance as evidencing their credibility or otherwise.

9. From them it would appear that that section of the shareholders which was headed by Sítáráma Pandáram, and included five others, was recognised as filling a somewhat superior position to that of the remaining eighteen sharers.

10. It is difficult to say what amount of credibility should be attached to the statements of the parties and witnesses which are embodied in the four genealogical tables supplied by the Collector, but it will be observed that all of them, except that of their immediate opponent Sítáráma, admit the right of the Memorialists C. Sónagiri Mudali and his brother or relative Sónáchellam to a share in the Inám. The Memorialists moreover admit the right of Sítáráma to a share.

11. Sítáráma on the other hand, denies all right on the part of Sónagiri and Sónáchellam to share in the Inám, but that they have such a right is admitted by some even of Sítáráma's own witnesses, and the witness who most strongly supports Sítáráma's claim as opposed to that of Sónagiri, &c., is the Gurukkal of the Pagoda, who for a long time previously was the strenuous advocate of the rights of the Pagoda to the Inám to the exclusion of all Pandárams, which claim was rejected by the Board and Government.

12. So far as the Board can discover the ancestors of Sónagiri and Sónáchellam, as well as those of Sítáráma, had both shares in the Inám. What their relative positions were it is not easy to judge, though that of Sítáráma's family may perhaps have been the superior or more influential one of the two.

13. It is, however, to be borne in mind that Sónagiri Mudali and his brother or relative Sónáchellam have long and stoutly fought the battle of the Inámdárs against Government, and have succeeded in obtaining the reversal of the sequestration, and that Sítáráma now steps in to reap all the fruits of their labors, denying them any right to a share, which even his own witnesses admit them to possess.

14. Under these circumstances, the Board consider that C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam should be put in possession of the Inám, the recovery of which from sequestration has been effected by their exertions, and that Sítáráma and any other sharers who may claim more than that share in the Inám to which Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam admit them to be entitled, should be referred to the Civil Courts for the establishment of their respective rights.

10. The Board resolve to recommend to Government that the Collector be authorized to carry out this arrangement, which is in accordance with his own opinion. The Petitions above-mentioned will be endorsed in accordance with these Proceedings.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 53. ORDER THEREON, 3rd November 1860, No. 2,039.

1. When making the inquiry to which these Proceedings and their enclosures are a reply, the Government did not intend that the claims of other than those on whose application the Inám had been restored, should be taken into consideration. Their object was merely to ascertain beyond a doubt whether the then Petitioners were bonâ fide descendants of the Pandárams of 1802. They will not enter therefore into a detailed consideration of Mr. Cunliffe's elaborate report, but will merely observe that as C. Sónagiri Mudali and Sónáchellam have tendered evidence which shows that they are, in all probability, descended from the Pandárams of 1802, it is proper that they should be put in possession of the Inám. This is in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and the Collector, though not founded on precisely the same grounds.

2. Whatever rights Sítáráma Pandáram may have, that is not a matter for the decision of Government, the parties must either come to an understanding among themselves, or Sítáráma may seek his remedy in the Civil Courts, to which the Governor in Council hereby permits him to resort, under Section 2 Regulation IV of 1831.

3. The claim of the Gurukkal has already been negatived and no further orders are necessary in his case.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

Revue Deptt.

No. 2039

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 3d Novr. 1860

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Sónagiri

Submitting a letter from the Collr. of Madras & recommending that C. Sonagherri Mudali & Sónáchellam be put in possession of the Inám, the recovery of which from sequestration has been effected by their exertions & that the Collr. be authorized to carry out this arrangement which is in accordance with his own opinion.

(Here enter 20 Sept. 1860 No. 1280)

1. When making the enquiry to which these Proceedings and their enclosures are a reply, the Government did not intend that the claims of other than those on whose application the Inám had been restored, should be taken into consideration. Their object was merely to ascertain beyond a doubt whether the then Petitioners were

were bonâfide descendants of the Pandáarams of 1802. They will not enter therefore into a detailed consideration of Mr. Cunliffe's elaborate report, but will merely observe that as b. Sonagherri Mudali & Sonachellam have tendered as evidence which shows that they are, in all probability, descended from the Pandáarams of 1802, it is proper that they should be put in possession of the Inam. This ~~judgment~~ is in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and the Collector, tho not grounded on precisely the same grounds.

2. Whatever rights Sitárama Pandáram may have, (~~and that Sitarama is entitled~~ that Sitarama is entitled) it is not a matter for the decision of Government, the parties must either come to an understanding among themselves, or Sitárama may seek his remedy in the Civil Courts, to which the Governor in Council hereby permits him to resort, under Section II. Regulation II. of 1831.

3. The claim of the Gurukal has already been negatived and no further orders are necessary in his case.

Will

Will

Will

12 Copies
To the Board of Revenue with 6 Enclosures
4-do Inam Comm. with Bd's Proc.

(3)

Regarding certain Inam
in the Madras Collectorate

Copy of a Letter to
Govt dated 16th March No 25 of
1863 -

Revenue 1860 Dept.
Pro. of Govt for Nov.
No 2039 -

Pro. of the Madras Govt
Dated Nov. 1863.

69.70
23.6.57
35
12.10.58
57.58
20.3.60
58.57
10-6-9 6.8.60

Copy of the Board of Rev. dated 24th July
1861 & No. 1858 -

Sonagiri Mudali
and Sonachellam to be
put in possession of their
Inam as recommended
by the Collector of Madras.

No 52 & 53 -