M.R.O, 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	395	Press / ~~Mis.~~
57-58		
Dated	16-3- 1860.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 57. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th February 1860, No. 829.

Read again letter from the Collector of Chingleput, dated 27th April 1859, No. 130, reporting on the claims of certain Pandárams to the restoration of the village of A'ndárkuppam.

(In Cons. 28th April 1859, No. 1879.)

Read also letters from the same Officer, dated 26th July, No. 277, and 6th August 1859, No. 291, and 6th February 1860, No. 37, on the same subject.

(In Cons. 3rd and 8th August 1859, and 7th February 1860, Nos. 3890, 3943 and 574.)

Resolved that the above letters be submitted to Government, with reference to paragraph 9 of their Proceedings, dated 9th October 1858, No. 1365, Revenue Department, communicating extract from a despatch received from the Home Government on the Pandárams' memorial.

In Consultation, 29th October 1858, *No.* 4953.

2. The petitioners assert that the land on which the village of A'ndárkuppam now stands, was, in its unreclaimed state, bestowed on their ancestors on Inám tenure by the former Gólkonda dynasty, that they erected thereon a Pagoda dedicated to Subbramanya, cleared the land, and built the hamlet which grew into the village now styled A'ndárkuppam; that the Inám remained in their possession through all the troublous times of Hider and Tippu, in which, however, the original Sanad was lost, and was not affected by the transfer of the Jágír to the British by the Nawáb of the Carnatic; that the person whom they had appointed to conduct the worship in the Pagoda maintained by them, laid false claims to the Inám as appertaining to the temple, but that Mr. Greenway, the then Collector of the district, enquired into the matter, and finding petitioners' claim supported by the entries in the "Tarapadi" accounts of the district, passed an order on 5th February 1802, to the Tahsíldár of the Tirupásúr táluq, directing him to register the Inám in the memorialist's names; that the false claim thus rejected, was subsequently revived by the son of the Priest who succeeded him as "Gurukkul" of the temple, and that Mr. Cooke, the then Collector, ordered the resumption of the Inám and payment of Rupees 70 annually out of the "Mélváram," or Government share of the produce for the benefit of the temple, leaving to petitioners only the "Kudiváram," or cultivator's share, on the ground that there were no documents to support their claim to the Inám; that petitioners then stated that the documents were in possession of an absent party, and that some months afterwards they produced Mr. Greenway's order to Mr. Cooke, but were informed that they were too late, and that final orders had been passed.

3. They protest against this resumption and seek restoration of the Inám and Pagoda, and in support of their claims, they produce copy of Mr. Greenway's order cited. Before the Collector they have produced, what Mr. Shabrick styles, "the original order issued by Mr. Greenway," but which the Board presume must be an attested copy, as the original was addressed to the táluq Tahsíldár, and this corresponds with the office copy in the Collector's records, and is, therefore, he has no doubt, genuine.

4. In this order it is directed that the Inám be confirmed to the Pandárams on the ground of their having been in possession at the time the Jágír was ceded and as the *Máyam* appeared in their names in the "Tarapadi" accounts. These particular Tarapadi accounts, however, are not now forthcoming, and the village cannot be traced in the accounts in the Board's office, which are designated "Place's Tarapadi Accounts," or "Barnard's Survey Accounts."

5. Mr. Cooke reported to the Board on 24th April 1819, that he had ordered the village, which he learned "had for many years been omitted

In Consultation, 3rd May 1819, *No.* 697.

from the accounts of the district, and had been in the occupation of some Pandárams," to be brought to account, as no *Sanad* of any one Collector was produced to substantiate what was asserted in regard to the grant. The present Collector remarks on the omission, on the part of the petitioners, to produce before Mr. Cooke the order by Mr. Greenway, on which they now rely; but the Board observe, that in the copy of this order, included among the papers before them,

giri

Memorialists

is a signature of one "M. Higginson, Attorney at Law, 26th June 1819. Translated. Signed T. Víráswámi Bramini, Interpreter Supreme Court of Judicature at Madras," which would seem to shew that about the time of Mr. Cooke's decision, this document was produced publicly, and possibly in consequence of that decision, or it may be that the fact of its being filed elsewhere, prevented those interested from producing it before that gentleman.

6. In the very brief correspondence that passed in 1819, in regard to the Inám, the claims of the individual Pandárams, as distinct from the claim preferred on behalf of the Pagoda, were not brought forward or taken into consideration.

7. Mr. Shubrick points out that the name itself of the village is evidence in favor of the Pandárams' claim as opposed to that of the Gurukkul of the Pagoda, the use of the word "A'ndár" being almost entirely confined to A'ndís or Pandárams, to whose tutelar deity "A'ndavan" the village might be said to be dedicated when denominated "A'ndárkuppam," and he remarks on the significance of the change of name to "Subbramanyapuram" by an order of Mr. Cooke's, dated 15th June 1819, for which change no reason is therein assigned, but which might have been the work of the office servants in league with the Gurukkul of the Subbramanya Pagoda, and done with the view of strengthening that party's claim. He also points out that Mr. Cooke's letter above quoted proves the fact of the Pandárams' occupancy, and remarks that if Mr. Greenway's order may be held to establish the circumstances stated in it, the restoration of the Inám would seem to follow as a matter of course, under the provisions of Regulation XXXI of 1802.

8. The evidence of the aged Karanam of the village goes to shew that the village was occupied by the Pandárams, who contributed 20 pagodas annually from its proceeds towards the support of the temple. He speaks to the state of things in 1817-18 and for 20 years previously. His grandfather's accounts are said to have shewn the village as enjoyed in three shares, of which two belonged to the Pandárams and one to the Pagoda.

9. As it appears from the correspondence submitted to Government, with the Board's letter of 24th July 1845, No. 469, that the average collections from the village were but Rupees 83-12-11, out of which Rupees 70 were allowed by Government to the Pagoda, in virtue of its vested interests, whatever they might be, in the village, it is evident that the temple party had no cause to complain of the results of the resumption, or of the effects of the intrigue on its behalf, if intrigue there were. The discontinuance of this allowance from Government will be a legitimate consequence of the admission of the Pandárams' claim, and the present Collector evidently considers that this last is most deserving of support.

Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 2nd January 1846, *Revenue Department, No.* 13, *in Consultation,* 16*th January* 1846, *No.* 104.

10. The average annual revenue demand against the village for the five years, from Fasli 1264 to 1268 inclusive, has been Rupees 92-7-9. The payments to the temple for the same period have continued to be Rupees 70 yearly.

11. The Gurukkul of the temple appears to have stated before the Collector that the lands included in A'ndárkuppam, were transferred to it from four villages, which he named, and the district "Tarapadi" accounts of one of these, viz. Trivalúr in the Náyer táluq, shew an alienation of 61¼ *kánís* to A'ndárkuppam.

12. Trivalúr cannot, however, be traced in either "Barnard's Survey Account," or "Place's Tarapadi Abstract Account" in the Board's office. On the other hand Barnard's accounts shews an alienation in "old free gift" of ¼ kání of land to A'ndárkuppam Komáraswámi, and certain fees in grain to the same person, in the entries regarding Perinjari, another of the villages named; in the village of Nelivéli in Ponnéri Parganá is entered a similar alienation of $\frac{56\frac{1}{4}}{100}$ kánís to Sidhamurti of A'ndárkuppam, and in Pupákam village in the adjoining Periapáleyam district the same extent of land is similarly alienated to the Siddha Pandáram of A'ndárkuppam, but these two last villages were not named by the Gurukkul. The fact that these are the only entries that have been traced in the Board's office, is no proof that others do not exist.

13. Mr. Cooke in his report of the resumption of the village, gave its "total *terum*," by which he meant cultivable area, as 95 kánís, and stated that the Gurukkul, in a subsequent

application for the customary aid to the temple, claimed 20 pagodas, and 6 kalams 8 markáls of grain, as the full extent of annual emolument derived from it, which corresponds nearly enough with the statement of the Pandárams and of the old Karanam.

14. The information which has been collected is imperfect, but it seems doubtful whether prolonged search will elicit anything further, and the Board think that sufficient data are forthcoming on which to base a judgment. They consider that it may be assumed as proved that certain lands were assigned in "old free gift" from several villages to the hamlet, which was styled A'ndárkuppam, such name affording internal evidence that the village was occupied by Pandárams, and that one assignment at least was in the name of the Siddha Pandáram; that at an early period after the cession of the Jágír to the British, the then Collector was satisfied, that at the date of that cession, the hamlet was in the possession of Pandárams free of taxation, and that the accounts, which were then produced, contained entries of it in their names as "Mányam;" that he confirmed their free tenure of it in preference to the claim set up on behalf of the temple by the Gurukkul, and that they accordingly continued to enjoy it until in 1819, Mr. Cooke resumed it on the ground that no former order of any Collector was forthcoming to support the grant; that the claim of the Gurukkul of the temple on its behalf, for but a portion of the estimated revenues of the village, which was denounced by Mr. Cooke as a false statement intended to mislead the Government Officers as to the resources of the village, is in truth collateral evidence in support of the Pandárams' claim inasmuch as the former claim corresponded with the amount assigned by the Pandárams in their narrative, to the Pagoda, and also by the old Karanam in his evidence.

15. The Board are of opinion that the foregoing data afford sufficient ground for admitting the claim of the memorialists to the benefit of Mr. Greenway's decision in their favor, and they beg to recommend that the Collector be instructed to restore the village of A'ndárkuppam on Inám tenure to the present representatives of the old Pandáram residents in the village, leaving the Pagoda Gurukkul to obtain from them any customary allowance, on behalf of the temple, to which, by prescription, he may be entitled.

16. The submission of this report has been delayed by the necessity of examining voluminous and detailed accounts of village lands, though with only partial success.

17. Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on petitions Nos. 1441, 1510 and 1938 of 1859;—

"Petitioners are informed that the Board's report on the subject of these petitions has been submitted to Government, whose decision they must await."

(A true Extract.)

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

No. 58. ORDER THEREON, 16th March 1860, No. 395.

The Government of Madras having forwarded* to the late Court of Directors a memorial from C. Sónagiri Mudali and Chónachellam, for the restoration of a hamlet in the District of Chingleput named A'ndárkuppam, with a recommendation unfavorable to memorialist's prayer; the Court in reply observed that the reasons given by this Government for rejecting the claims of memorialists, viz. that the decision arrived at in 1819 could not be disturbed, was insufficient, inasmuch as the memorialists had always remonstrated against that decision as unjust.

* *No.* 24 *of* 1857, *dated 3rd July.*

5th May 1858, *No.* 5, *paragraphs* 16, 17, 18, 19.

2. The memorialists, the Court continue, "assert that the lands in question, then lying "waste, were granted in Inám, to their ancestors about four "centuries and a half since: that their ancestors formed and "named the hamlet, and likewise built a Pagoda on it; that "their Sanads were lost in Hyder's invasion, but that they were in possession when the country "fell under the British dominion. They quote a decree of Mr. Greenway passed in January

Paragraph 17.

"1802, respecting a dispute between a worshipper in the Pagoda and themselves as Pandárams "in which that officer distinctly admitted that the Pandárams were in possession of this Estate "when the Jágír was ceded to the Company and that it was to be believed that they are the "proprietors of the said Inám. They also claim to be maintained in their right by Section "2, Regulation XXXI of 1802, passed in the July after the

Paragraph 15.

"Collector's decision. Mr. Cooke's decision in 1819 does not "touch these points and we are not supplied with any of the "reasons for the opinion, beyond the fact, that the memorialists could not produce Sanads to "support their claim."

Extract Minutes Consultation, 9th October 1858, *paragraph* 9.

3. The Government in consequence referred the matter for the full report of the Collector. This the Board of Revenue now furnish in their Proceedings above recorded.

4. It would be useless to recapitulate the case from the beginning. The whole matter is detailed clearly in the Board's present Proceedings; the principal points to be observed are that the memorialists have produced what is proved by the records to be a true copy of an order issued by Mr. Greenway in 1802, and in which it is directed that the Pandárams be confirmed in the enjoyment of the Inám, on the ground of their having been in possession at the time the Jágír was ceded, and as the Mányam appeared in their names in the Tarapadi accounts; that the name itself of the village is evidence in favor of the Pandáram's claim as opposed to that of the Gurukkul of the Pagoda, the use of the word "Anda" being almost entirely confined to A'ndís or Pandárams, to whose tutelar deity "A'ndavan" the village might be said to be dedicated when denominated "A'ndárkuppam" and that the subsequent change of name to "Subbramanyapuram" is significant, it being apparently done with a view of strengthening the Gurukkul's claim.

Paragraphs 3 *and* 4.

Paragraph 7.

5. The Board recommend that the village be restored on Inám tenure to the present representatives of the old Pandáram residents in the village "leaving the Pagoda Gurukkul to obtain from them any "customary allowance on behalf of the temple, to which by "prescription, he may be entitled." When Mr. Cooke resumed the village in 1819 under orders from the Board on the ground that the claimants to it had no Sanads, a payment of 70 Rupees per annum was authorized to be paid from the revenues of the village for the expense of the Pagoda, and this has continued up to the present day.

Paragraph 15.

6. On a consideration of the facts adduced by the Board the Government are pleased to accede to their recommendation as described in the previous paragraph.

7. It does not appear what relation the present petitioners hold to the Pandárams of 1802. This should be enquired. The Board of Revenue will communicate the present decision to the petitioners and issue the necessary orders to the Collector.

8. Copy of these Proceedings with those of the Board and the enclosures of the latter, will be communicated to the Home Authorities with reference to paragraphs 16, 17, 18 and 19 of the despatch of the late Honorable Court of Directors, dated 5th May 1858, No. 5.

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

Revenue Dept

6

3

In Con. 7th February 1860, No. 574.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Collector of CHINGLEPUT,
dated Saidapet, 6th February 1860, No. 37.

In reply to Mr. Hudleston's Official Memorandum of the 2nd instant, requesting me to specify the particular locality of the village of Audarkuppum therein alluded to, I have the honor to state for the information of the Board that the village in question is within a mile of Puduvoil, a post office station on the northern road, 21½ miles from Madras and that from the fact of the adjoining village of Paravalur entered in Bernard's Tarapadi as belonging to the Tripassur parganah having given 61¼ kanis of land to Audarkuppam, it is to be inferred that Audarkuppam must also have belonged to the same parganah.

2. The other villages adjoining Audarakuppam are,

Biravaukuppam.
Pereyenjari (Srotriam).
Madavaram (Juri).
Tuchur (Do.)
Chinnambedu and
Vadakanellur.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Memorial

giri

Revenue Dept

4

In Con. 3rd August 1859, No. 3890.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Collector of CHINGLEPUT,
dated Sydapet, 26th July 1859, No. 277.

In reply to your letter, No. 2274 of the 14th ultimo, I have the honor to inform the Board, that Aundar Cooppum and Aundar Muttum, are not one and the same village, the former being a Shrotriem and the latter a Turwary village.

2. Referring to paragraph 2, my records contain no further information of the village than I have already furnished to the Board. The Tarapady accounts of the villages noted in the margin have been examined to see if they contained any mention of some of these lands having been transferred to Aundar Cooppum, as stated by the Pagoda Goorookul, but none has been found.

Thatchoor.
Paravaloor.
Pareyenjary.
Madaveram.

3. Adverting to paragraph 3, the Board will perceive from Mr. Cooke's letter of the 24th April 1819, paragraph 8, that the village of Aundar Cooppum had been omitted from the accounts for many years, and I am therefore unable to say how it had been previously entered in the annual accounts.

	Beriz. Rs.	A.	P.
Fusly 1264	123	7	6
" 1265	110	10	5
" 1266	110	6	5
" 1267	23	7	2
" 1268	94	7	5

4. The beriz of the village for the last five years is given in the margin. The payment made to the Soobramanea Devastanum, under the instructions of the Board, dated 27th May 1819, is Rupees 70 per annum.

Enc. 1.—Petition.

Enclosure No 4 in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Collector of Chingleput dated 3rd August 1859 No 3890.

Letter from the Collector of Chingleput to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 6th February 1860 No 57. regarding Aundar Cooppum Village.

Dept
392/60

In Con. 8th August 1859, No. 3943.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Collector of CHINGLEPUT,
dated Sydapet, 6th August 1859, No. 291.

Referring to the 2nd paragraph of my letter to the Board, No. 277 of the 26th ultimo, I have the honor to state, that the statement therein made, that no portion of the lands of the villages entered in the margin, had been found to have been transferred to Aundar Cooppum in the Tarapady accounts, has since been found to be incorrect as regards the village of Peravaloor. The mistake arose out of the Record-keeper at Conjeeveram having forwarded the accounts of a village of the same name, in the Sydapet talook, instead of the proper village in the Nayer talook. The Tarapady accounts of the latter village having since been found and examined, shew an alienation of 61¼ cawnies to Aundar Cooppum, which I request the Board will be good enough to verify with the Tarapady accounts in their office.

Revenue Dept

No. 395

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 16th March, 1860

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board of

Revenue.

Submitting with remarks correspondence from the Collector of Chingleput reporting on the Memorial of certain Rundaviens claiming the restoration of the Village of Andarkuppam.

Here enter 15th February 1860 No 829

Can[illegible]
Andarkuppam

× No 24 of 1857 dated 5th July.

The Government of Madras having forwarded × to the late Court of Directors a Memorial from S. Sonaghorrie Mudali and Chinnachellum, for the restoration of a hamlet in the District of Chingleput named Andarkuppam, with a recommendation unfavorable to Memorialists

Sonagiri

Copy with Letter to Chingleput Collr. dated 16th March 1860. Para 5.

Enclosure No 3 in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Chief Secretary to Government dated 15th February 1860 No 829.

P 392/60

Letter from the Collector of Chingleput to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 5th August 1859 No 291 regarding Andarkuppam Village.

Page

Memorialists' prayer; the
Court in reply observed that
the reasons given by this Go-
vernment for rejecting the
claims of Memorialists, viz.
that the decision arrived at
in 1819 could not be disturbed,
was insufficient, inasmuch
as the Memorialists had
always remonstrated against
that decision as unjust.

5th May 1858
paras 16-17.

2 The Memorialists,
the Court continued, "assert
"that the lands in question,
"then lying waste, were granted
"in Inam, ~~to their ancestors~~,
"~~as appertaining to~~ to
"their ancestors about four
"centuries and a half since:
"that their ancestors formed
"and named the hamlet,
"and likewise built a Pa-
"goda on it; that their Sanads
"were lost in Hyder's invasion,
"but that they were in possession

Par.

when

"when the Country fell under
"the British dominion. They
"quote a decree of Mr
"Greenway passed in January
"1802, respecting a dispute
"between a worshipper in
"the Pagoda and themselves
"as Pundarums in which
"that Officer distinctly ad-
"-mitted that the Panda-
"-rums were in possession
"of this estate when the
"Jaghir was ceded to the
"Company and that it was
"to be believed that they
"are the proprietors of the
"said Inam. They also
"claim to be maintained
"in their right by Section
"2 Regulation ~~XXXI~~ of 1802,
"passed in the July after
"the Collectors decision. Mr
"Cooke's decision in 1819
"does not touch these
points

Para 15.

points and we are not supplied with any of the reasons for the opinion, beyond the fact, that the Memorialists could not produce Sanads to support their claim."

3. The Government in consequence referred the matter for the full report of the Collector. This the Board of Revenue now furnish in their Proceedings above recorded.

Ex Mad Cons 9 Octr 1858 para 9.

4 It would be useless to recapitulate the case from the beginning. The whole matter is detailed clearly in the Proceedings; the principal points to be observed are that the Memorialists have produced what is proved by the records to be a true Copy of an order issued by Mr. Greenway in 1802, and in which it is directed that the Pundarums be confirmed in the enjoyment of the inam, on the ground of their having been in possession at the time the Jaghir was ceded, and as the Maniyam appeared in their names in the Sarapadi accounts: that the name itself of the Village is evidence in favor of the Pundarums' claim as opposed to that of the Gurukul of the Pagoda, the use of the word "Andar" being almost entirely confined to Andis or Pundarums; to whose tutelar deity Andavan the Village might be said to be dedicated when denominated

Board's Proceedings para 3 & 4.

Maniyam para 7

Gurukkul

Andis

Andavan

denominated "Arulaviṣṇum"
and that the subsequent
change of name to "Subra-
-mániyapiram" is signi-
-ficant, it being appa-
-rently done with a view
of strengthening the Guru-
-kulá claim.

5. The Board recom-
-mend that the Village
be restored on triám te-
-nure to the present re-
-presentatives of the old
Pundaram residents in
the Village" leaving the
Pagoda Curukul to obtain
"from them any customary
allowance on behalf of
the temple, to which by
prescription, he may be
entitled." When Mr
Boke resumed the Village
in 1819 under orders from
the Board on the ground
that

Subramanyapuram

Sevva 15.

that the claimants to it
had no Sanads, a payment
of 70 Rupees per annum
was authorized to be
paid from the revenues
of the Village for the ex-
-pense of the Pagoda,
and this has continued
up to the present day.

6 On a consideration
of the facts adduced
by the Board, the Govern-
-ment are pleased to
accede to their recommen-
-dation as described in
the previous para.

7 It does not appear
what relation the present
petitioners hold to the
Pundarams of 1852. This
should be enquired. The
Board of Revenue will
communicate the present
decision to the Petitioners

and

and give the necessary orders
to the Collector.

8. Copy of these Proceedings with those of the Board and the enclosures of the latter, will be communicated to the Home authorities with reference to Paras 16. 17. 18 & 19 of the Despatch of the late Honorable Court of Directors dated 5th May 1858. No. 5.

Agw

JP

11 Copies. Board of Revenue.
1 " Accts. General's Disp. 17
3 " Civil Auditor's

Copy in a Letter to England
Dd 8th May /60 No. 40.

R 2d January /46 No. 1 to 6
1 23 June /57 — 69-70-
12th October /58 — 35

Revenue 1860 Departt.
Pro: of Govt 20th March.

No 395.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dd 16th March /60.

From Bo. 20th September /60
Ct. 2156 - 3 Nov. - 52/3.

Directing that the Village
of Tiúdár Kuppam in Chingleput be restored on Inam
tenure to the present - repre-
sentatives of the old Tandá-
ram residents in the Village.

No 57 & 58.

c 2 Dd Mundy No 12