M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 34 Press ~~Mis.~~

69-70

Dated 5 — 1 — 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, for the month of January 1860.

No. 69. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th November 1859, No. 4639.

Read the following letter from W. KNOX, Esq., Collector of Masulipatam; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Kachahri, 1st November 1859, No. 195.

In reply to the Proceedings* of the Board of Revenue, No. 3185, I have the honor to report that I see no objection to granting the petitioner an order of Government under Regulation IV of 1831, to the effect that he may seek redress in the Courts of Adalut.

* *Dated 15th August* 1859.
Enclosures are herewith returned.

2. It appears, however, from the enquiry made by the Tahsildar, (the translation of whose urzee is herewith submitted,) that half a putti of rent-free Inam was granted to Venkatrama Sastrulu, petitioner's uncle, prior to Fasli 1212; that the donee and after his demise, his sons alone enjoyed it; and that neither the petitioner, nor his father ever had a share of the Inam. Both parties are absent and the Government have no claims against them.

Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their endorsement on petition No. 2034 of 1859, seeking leave to sue out in the Civil Courts a claim to certain Inam land.

2. The land appears to have been granted on *Sarvadumbala* tenure by the Mokassadar to petitioner's uncle, and to be still in the enjoyment of his sons.

3. There does not appear to be any objection to allowing petitioner to prosecute any claim he may think himself to possess in the established Courts.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Acting Secretary.*

No. 70. ORDER THEREON, 5th January 1860, No. 34.

Throughout these papers the Government fail to find the name of the táluq and of the village in which this Inám is situated; the Board will be requested to supply the omission to enable the Government to pass orders.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Translation of an Arjee addressed to the Collector of Masulipatam by P. Venkataranga Charlu Acting Tahasildar of Palanzi Taluq.—

Dated 28th September 1859

I received your Hookoom No 196 dated 2d Instant, wherein you were pleased to direct me to institute an inquiry into the circumstances connected with the Inam land belonging to Vedamvari and to report to your honor on the following points viz- what extent of Inam land, to whom, by what authority, when & in what manner it was formerly granted- from what to what time, and in the name of which of the descendants of the original grantee had the Inam land been entered and in what manner it has been enjoyed. To whom the ground is Vedam Annata Rama Murtu alias Buchea who is claiming the Inám land, heir- if he, or his ancestors had any title to the land in question, in what manner has it been continued to them, & has it ever been entered in their names or not—

In reply to the said order, I beg to state that I found it impracticable to summon the Inámdar named Vedam Syapha Sastulu with the documents in his possession, and to Examine him in the case, because he is said to be residing in a Village called Venkatarayapalem in the Tolaimanchili Taluq.

in

in the Nellore District, the documents being with him—

Sattiráj, Chinnamráj, and others being the late Karanams and Makhusadárs of the Village, and Désakávdias of the Pergana, have, on Examination declared that the forefathers of the family of the said Védamvár, was Arunta-néndyana Sástulu who had three Sons namely Silárama Sástulu, Venkatarama Sástulu and Aswadhanárayana Sástulu of whom the second Son Venkatarama Sastulu used to read the Puránam to their (Karanams) grandfather named Paramésem who, in Consideration of his learning, granted to him prior to Faslí 1212 ½ a Patti of Sarvadumbála Inám land in Charity, to be enjoyed from generation to generation; that ever since he, when he was alive, and after him, his Son Appia Sastulu enjoyed the land uninterruptedly, his name being entered in the accounts; that no obstructions whatever had ever been thrown in the way of his enjoying the land; that Venkatarama Sastulu during his life time, and after his demise, his second Son Venkatachellum used to come into the Village, grant Rauls to the Ryots and take the produce of the land; that neither the Claimant Anantana =ráyana Sastulu alias Buchia his

his father had enjoyed the produce of the Inám land at any time; that it should therefore be Continued to Syappa Sastulu &c. four individuals who are the Sons of the said Venkatarama Sastulu, who died about 22 years ago; that the year & date on which the Inam land was granted will be known from the Sanad in possession of the Inámdar; that the said Venkatarama Sastulu and his younger brother &c. lived for some time in their (Karanams) Village when they used to mess separately and that thereby it is clear that the said Anantoráyana Sastulu alias Buchia &c. have no title whatever to the land inquestion.

The Karanams and others also produced the genealogical table of the family of Védamvar together with an Extract from the accounts—

The Munsif and Pettamadars of the Village being Examined, gave in a Reiffy stating that the ancestors of Sattirajulu granted prior to Faslí 1212, ½ Patti of Sarvadumbála Inám land to the said Venkatarama Sástulu; that ever since the land had been enjoyed by him and his Sons and that the said Ananta Rama Sastulu alias Buchia &c. Rama enjoyed its produce—

Pedalu Vérárédi, China Virinadi and Dárlanka Gangulu being the Cultivators of the Inám land in question, have been Examined - They declared that they and their forefathers used to Cultivate the land from a long time; that its produce was carried away by Venkatarama Sastulu when he was alive, and after his death by his son Venkatachellum; that neither the said Anantarama sastulu alias Buchia nor his father &c. had enjoyed the land at any time; that when a suit was prosecuted in the Gudur Munsifs Court between the said Iyappa Sastulu and Anantaráma Sástulu alias Buchia they (Cultivators) were called as witnesses; and that at that time that is to say, 2 years ago they files the Rauls &c. in the Elur Munsif's Court—

From all the foregoing Statements, from the accounts in possession of the Inamdars; & from those lodged in the Sdig record and from the Ippiracs the following appears from the accounts, it would appear that when the Village was Continued as Mokhasa to Sattiraj Paramésem, the latter Granted in Charity ½ Putti of Sarvadumbálu Inam land to Venkatarama Sastulu Elder uncle of Anantanarayana

Otherwise Called Buchia; that it had been uninterruptedly enjoyed by the said Venkata rama sastulu and after his demise by his sons Appia sastulu &c. in being entered in the Sarkar accounts in their own names; that neither the said Anantaráma Sastulu nor his father &c. had any share in the Inam land. Nor had they ever enjoyed its produce; that before the grant of the said land was made, the father &c. Anantanarayana Sastulu lived separately; that no obstacles were thrown at any time in regard to the Continuance of the Inám land in question; that the Government have nothing to do with this land & that the claimant Anantanarayana Sastulu may be referred to Court to seek redress - They to submit these particulars for your information and forward herewith the Statement &c. given in during my inquiry as detailed below—

Papers produced by the late Inamdars—

1 Kaifeyat
1 Genealogical tree
1 Extract
1 Kaifeyat given in by the Munsifs & Pattamdar—
1 Ditto by the Cultivators

5

(True translation) /Signed/ P. Venkatarungia Chetty
Collector

Rev Depart.

No 34 No 34

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 5th January 1860.

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Submitting with the
Board's observations a letter
from the Collr of Masulipatam
reporting on Govt Re-
solution No 2034 of 1859 sanc-
tioning leave to the authorities in the Civil
Courts a claim to certain
Inam land.

(Here enter 12th Nov 1859
No 4639.)

Throughout these papers the Government fail to find the name of the Taluq and of the Village in which this Inam is situated; the Board will be requested to supply the omission

Both the Collector of Masulipatam and the Board of Revenue do not describe the Inam referred to in these proceedings with sufficient precision to enable the Govt to pass orders. ~~The Board of Revenue will therefore be pleased to state the name~~ on the case

1 Copies to the Bd of Rev Dis. No 6

1859 Dept
No 2 Letter from
Mr Collector of
Masulipatam
Resuming Inam
Dated 1st November
1859 - No 195

Letter from Collr
Masulipatam
No 2130 8/59

Transmitting Inam
Petn. addressed to the
Collector of Masulipatam
Claim, by the office
Tahsildar of Kollangi
Taluq -
Dated 28th September 1859

name of the village and Taluq in which the Inam is situated.

Revenue 1860 Sept 6.
Pro: of Govt 10 Jany:

No. 34.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 5th January 1860.
From Bd of Rev: 27 Jany 60
No 249.

On Petition No 2034
of 1859 for permission to
sue for certain premises
in Masulipatam.

No 69 + 70.