M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 833	Press ~~Mis.~~
38-39	
Dated 23-5-1860.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 38. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st April 1860, No. 1,948:—

Read the following Endorsement of J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 12th April 1860, No. 138, on Board Petition No. 3,923 of 1859:—

Petitioner Rámachendra Aiyer, as Vakíl on behalf of Vengu Mudaliyár, proprietor of the villages named in the margin,* states that the Karanam of the said villages, who made the usual Triennial examination of the Palmirah trees belonging to his client, having charged excess Tírvai upon them, he preferred a complain at the Húzur, and the claim advanced by him for the remission of the excess Tírvai, was admitted in an Order sent to the Tahsíldár on the 18th December 1857, but that only Rupees 67-4 were remitted. Petitioner now solicits that the remaining amount, viz., Rupees 198-12, which the Acting Collector, Mr. Levinge, refused to refund, on the ground of its having been already credited in the accounts, may be ordered to be repaid to his client, and that the Karanam may be punished as recommended by the Tahsíldár.

* *Kutchanavelli and Puravur in the Strivaiguntam Táluq.*

2. According to the custom of the District, the Palmirahs belonging to the Petitioner's client in the villages abovenamed, were subjected to the Triennial examination in Fasli 1266. The Karanam made the examination himself, without taking the people of the proprietor with him as usual, and charged a rate of Tírvai on certain Palmirahs, higher than that to which they were liable. Petitioner complained against this, and a re-examination of the Palmirahs was then ordered to be made by the Péshkár when it was ascertained that the Tírvai† charged by the Karanam, was over and above what was due. Consequently with reference to the Péshkár's accounts, the demand to be paid by the Petitioner's client until the succeeding Triennial examination for the two villages, was fixed at Rupees 518-10-6, and Rupees 419-15-8, respectively, per annum, and an Order was sent to the Tahsíldár on the 18th December 1858, to collect the above sums for Fasli 1268. The Tírvai as fixed by the Karanam for Fasli 1266 having been already collected and brought to account; nothing was mentioned in the said Order about it; but the Tahsíldár was directed to remit such amount as might exceed that finally settled at the Húzur, and remain uncollected, out of the sum originally entered by the Karanam, as the demand for Fasli 1267. Accordingly Rupees 68-6 (out of the excess of Rupees 135-5-1) which were outstanding for that Fasli appear to have been remitted.

† *Kutchanavelli*.....	*Rs.* 608	13	2
Puravur.....	,, 465	2	1
Rupees...	1,073	15	3

3. On the 27th August 1859, Petitioner requested that the difference between the Tírvai originally fixed by the Karanam, and that subsequently settled at the Húzur, for the two Faslies 1266 and 1267, after deducting what had been remitted to his client in the last-mentioned Fasli, might be refunded. But as the excess amount had been already collected and credited in the accounts, his request was not complied with.

4. The excess Tírvai complained of by Petitioner amounts to Rupees 270-10-2. Of this, a sum of Rupees 68-6 has been remitted as already mentioned, and the Collector begs to recommend that the remainder, or Rupees 202-4-2, may be ordered to be returned to the claimant.

5. No punishment appears to been awarded to have the Karanam, who has been the cause of the above irrgularity, and the final Order sent to the Tahsíldár on the subject merely states, that his proposed transfer to another village will be subsequently considered.

Ordered, that the above Endorsement be submitted for the consideration and Orders of Government.

2. In Fasli 1266 at the Triennial examination of Petitioner's Palmirah trees for purposes of assessment, an amount was charged by the Karanam which was objected to by the

Petitioner and subsequently on appeal reduced by the Order of the Collector. Meanwhile, however, the sum assessed by the Karanam had been collected for Fasli 1266, and part of Fasli 1267, and carried to account, and Petitioner has thus paid Rupees 202-4-2 in excess of the amount for which he was properly liable under the Collector's decision.

3. He seeks to obtain a refund of this excess payment, and the Board request that the Collector may be authorized to make the necessary adjustment.

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

No. 39. ORDER THEREON, 23rd May 1860, No. 833.

1. The Governor in Council sanctions the refund to Vengu Mudaliyár, proprietor of the villages of Kutchanavelli, and Puravur in the Strívaiguntam Táluq, Tinnevelly District, of Rupees 202-4-2 being excess payment of tax on Palmyra trees in Faslies 1266-67.

2. The Board will instruct the Collector to take due notice of the improper conduct of the Karanam.

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

Rev. 1860 Depart.
Pro: of Oct. 31st May.
885

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 21st
Desp 27 } April 1860.
Rec 28
E. I. Petition
2 Encls. No 1948.

Submitting for consideration and orders an Endorsement from the Coll.r of Tinnevelly on a Petition No 3923 of 1859 and requesting that the Coll.r be authorized to refund to Petitioner the Sum of Rupees 202-3-2 paid by him in excess of the amount for which he was properly liable.

No 833. 23d May

With the accompanying orders

No 38 & 39.

4th May R II

No 833

The Governor in Council sanctions the refund to Vangee Mudeliar proprietor of the villages of Kulakaravilli, and Peravoor in the Shrivigunta Taluq, Tinnevelly District, of Rupees 202-4-2 being excess payment of tax on Palmyra trees in Fasleis 1266 & 67.

2. The Board will instruct the Collector to take due notice of the improper conduct of the Karanams.

Fort St. Geo.
23d May 1860.

11 Copies: Board of Revenue with 2 Encls. Desp 225
1 " Accountant Genl
3 " Civil Auditors