

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 711

51-52

Press
~~Mis~~

Dated

4 — 8 — 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

No. 51. Read the following petition from SADASIVA Pillai, Nephew of the late MURUGA Pillai, Karanam Mirásdár of Sirukarumbúr and Velákam in Kávérípákam Taluq, North Arcot:—

Prays that the hereditary Office of Karanam, from which his late Uncle was unjustly dismissed, and to which a stranger has been appointed, may be conferred on him as the heir of the deceased.

(Here enter 22nd March 1860.)

No. 52. ORDER THEREON, 4th May 1860, No. 711.

1. Petitioner is Nephew to Muruga Pillai late Karanam of Sirukarumbúr and Velákam in North Arcot. This Karanam Muruga Pillai was charged in 1265 with embezzlement, &c.; was convicted by Mr. Pochin, the Head Assistant Collector, fined heavily, and dismissed from his appointment.

2. The exact date of this decision does not appear. An appeal was duly made to the Collector, who upheld his Head Assistant's order by an endorsement, dated 18th June 1859. Several months previous to this, however, the appellant had died.

3. The Petitioner on 8th August 1859, appealed to the Board of Revenue, endeavouring to show that the dismissal of his late Uncle was most unjust and contrary to evidence, and praying that his Uncle's character might be cleared, and that the hereditary office of Karanam, which had been bestowed upon a stranger, might revert to himself.

4. In their endorsement of the 6th September 1859, the Board declined to go into the question of the dismissal of Petitioner's Uncle, "as that person never appealed to them, and is no longer alive." As to his claim to succeed to the office of Karanam, Petitioner was referred to the Collector.

5. Petitioner on the 3rd October 1859, objected to this decision, on the ground that his Uncle had died *previously* to the date of the Collector's endorsement, and it was therefore impossible for him to have appealed to the Board against that endorsement.

6. The Board, however, on the 12th December, saw no reason for modifying their former order; and the Petitioner now appeals to Government.

7. The arguments adduced by Petitioner appear correct. The Board will, therefore, decide whether his late Uncle was or was not properly dismissed: with such a decision before them the Government will be more in a position to give a final endorsement to Petitioner.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,

Secretary to Government.

Dismissed

Rev. Dept.

No. 711.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 4th ~~April~~^{May} 1860

Read the following

Petition from Sadaiyasa

Pillay, nephew of the late

Muruga Pillay Karanam

Misaidar of Sirukarum

bur & Velakam in Canvey

Island Taluk North Arcot.

Kaneriya Kam

(Here enter 23rd March 1860.)

Petitioner is

nephew to Muragapillai

late Karanam of Sirukar

ambur and Velakam in

North Arcot. This Kara-

nam Muragapillai was

charged in 1855 with the

bezzlement of Rs. 100, was con-

victed by Mr. Pochin,

the Head Assistant Collec-

tor, fined heavily, and

dismissed

dismissed from his appointment.

2. The exact date of this decision does not appear. An appeal was duly made to the Collector, who upheld his Head Assistant's order by an endorsement dated 18th June 1839. Several months previous to this, however, the appellant had died.

3. The Petitioner on 8th August 1839 appealed to the Board of Revenue, endeavouring to shew that the dismissal of his late uncle was most unjust and contrary to evidence, and praying that his uncle's character might be cleared, and that the hereditary office of Karamam, which had

had been bestowed upon a stranger might revert to himself.

4. In their endorsement of the 6th September 1839 the Board declined to go into the question of the dismissal of Petitioner's uncle, "as that person never appeared to them and is no longer alive." As to his claim to succeed to the office of Karamam, Petitioner was referred to the Collector.

5. Petitioner on the 3rd October 1839 objected to this decision on the ground that his uncle had died previous to the date of the Collector's endorsement and it was therefore impossible for him to have appeared to the Board against that

that endorsement.
6. The Board however
ever on the 12th December,
saw no reason for re-
-versing their former
order; and the
Petitioner now
appeals to Government.

7. The arguments
advanced by Petitioner
appear correct. The Board
will therefore decide
whether his late uncle
was or was not proper-
ly dismissed; with
such a decision before
them the Government
will be more in a
position to give a final
endorsement to Petitioner.

Yours

J. H.

11 Copies to the Board of Admiralty
with High Secy & 3 Encls
Diff. 5

Lis. under order