M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-32.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 758 Press ~~Mis.~~

7-8

Dated 11-5-1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 7. Read the following Petition from CHENSU VENKATA RÁU:—

Appealing against the decisions of the Collector and Board of Revenue regarding his management of the Srotriyam Villages of Atharimangalam and Thaduporampákam in the Náyer Táluq of the Chingleput Zilá. } (Here enter Petition No. 1,119 of 1860, dated 27th March 1860.)

No. 8. ORDER THEREON, 11th May 1860, No. 758.

1. Petitioner is the only son of the late Venkata Subbayar, registered proprietor and manager of the Srotriyam Villages of Atharimangalam and Thaduporampákam in the Náyer Táluq of the Chingleput District; he appeals against the decision of the Collector, confirmed by the Board, refusing him permission to succeed his father in the management of the above Villages.

2. The late Venkata Subbayar had two brothers named Venkata Séshayar and Venkata Kámátchayar, both younger than himself, and by different mothers; in 1854 the deceased entered into an agreement, duly filed in the Collector's Office, promising to pay his two brothers annually each 400 Rupees, whether the Villages yielded produce or not. This payment was continued up to his death in October 1859. Shortly before that event, he addressed a Petition to the Collector requesting that the Villages might be registered in the name of his son (present Petitioner), and on an enquiry being made after he had actually died, the Tahsíldár on the 12th November 1859, reported in favor of the Petitioner's claim to manage the Villages in the same way in which his father had done.

3. Petitioner's two Uncles objected, however, to such an arrangement. They alleged that as the late Manager was the elder, he had the possession of the Villages, but that now one of themselves (Venkata Séshayar) being the eldest, the Villages should be placed in his charge, and the remaining Uncle and Petitioner should receive an annual allowance of 400 Rupees each.

4. Mr. Shubrick on the 6th December 1859, issued an Order in consonance with the wishes of the Petitioner's Uncles, as detailed in the preceding paragraph, and on Petitioner appealing to the Board, he was informed* that they saw no reason to interfere, and that if he was dissatisfied he should obtain permission to prosecute his claim in the established Courts.

* *9th February* 1860, *on Petition No.* 101 *of* 1860.

5. Petitioner now appeals against this decision, which he declares opposed to the Circular† Orders of the Board; and as the precedents cited by him are apparently in favor of his claim to succeed his father in preference to any one else, the Board will be good enough to report the grounds on which they thought their interference unnecessary, and to give their opinion on the merits of the case.

† *24th August* 1848.
Foot notes Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, *pages* 281-2.

6. The report should be submitted at an early date.

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

Pub: Dep
2

№ 758

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 11th May 1860

Read the following petition

from Chenna Venkata Ra

appealing against the decisions of the Collector and Board of Revenue regarding his management of the Pattiyan villages of Atharimangalam and Thadapparampákam in the Mayer Taluq of the Chingleput District

Here enter Pet. No 1119 of 1860 dated 27 March 1860

Petitioner is the only son of the late Venkata Subaya Registered proprietor and manager of the Pattiyan villages of Atharimangalam and Thadapparampákam in the Mayer Taluq of the Chingleput District, he appeals against the decision of the Collector, confirmed by the Board, refusing him permission to succeed his father in the management of the above villages.

Lutchmyer

Just

Ramatchayar

? Mr late Venkata Subaya had two brothers named Venkatrowshya and Venkata Ramatcha both younger than himself, and by different

2nd a depth. [illegible]

mothers; in 1854 the deceased entered into an agreement, duly filed in the Collectors Office, promising to pay his two brothers annually each 400 Rs. whether the villages yielded produce or not. This payment was continued up to his death in Oct 1859. Shortly before that event, he addressed a petition to the Collector requesting that the villages might be registered in the name of his son, (present Petitioner) and on an enquiry being made after he had actually died, the Tahsildar on the 12 Nov. 1859, reported in favor of the Petitioner's claim to manage the villages in the same way in which his father had done.

3. Petitioner's two uncles objected, however, to such an arrangement,

They alleged that as the late manager was the elder, he had the possession of the villages, but that now, one of them zebers (Venkatashelya being the eldest ought the villages should be placed in his charge, and the remaining uncle and petitioner sh^d receive an annual allowance of 400 Rs. each.

Seshayya

4 Mr Shubrick on the 6 Dec. 1859 issued an order in consonance with the wishes of the Petitioners uncles, as detailed in the preceding paragraph, and on Petitioner appealing to the Board, he was informed that they saw no reason to interfere, and that if he was dissatisfied he sh^d obtain permission to prosecute his claim in the Established Courts.

† 9 Febry 1860 on Pet. No 101 of 1860.

5. Petitioner now appeals against this ~~decision~~ decision, which he declares opposed to the Circular Orders of the Board; and as the precedents cited by him are apparently in favor of his claim to succeed his father in preference to any one else, the Board will be good enough to report the grounds on which they thought their interference unnecessary, and to give their opinion on the merits of the case.

6. The report should be submitted at an early date.

By Order

[illegible]

* 24 August 1848.
Foot notes Nos. 9. 10. 11. 12
Pages. 281. 282.

11 Copies to the Board of Rev: with Dispatch No 124
& 10 Encls.