M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 83 Press ~~Mis.~~

50-51

Dated 17 — 1 — 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th and recorded in Proceedings of 26th July 1859, No. 1006.

No. 50. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th November 1859, No. 4904.

Read letter from the Collector of Chingleput, dated 18th August 1859, No. 305, observing that the *Grama manyam* falls under Regulation VI of 1831.

(In Con. 19th August 1859, No. 4158.)

In Consultation, 29th July 1859. Submitted to Government with reference to order, dated 26th July 1859, No. 1006.

2. The Collector is in error in thinking that the *manyams* in question fall under Regulation VI of 1831, which has reference solely to the *manyams* attached to the village offices, the "Bara Baloti."

3. The "*Grama manyam*" now in question is not of this nature, but is that portion of the privileges assigned to the Mirasidars or original founders of villages and their descendants, in some parts of the Tondei Mundalum, which, as explained by Mr. Ellis in his treatise on the subject of Mirasi, under the name of "*Cani manyam*" or "*Caniyatchi manyam*," formed as integral a part of the "Mirasi" where it existed, as do the "*Cani Mereis*" or "*Cuppatams.*"

4. Each Mirasidar enjoys a portion of this *manium* where it exists, in exact proportion to his share of the *mirasi* of the village lands, and without any reference to *office mirasi.*

5. The Collector is also in error in thinking that under no sense can these manyams fall under Regulation IV of 1831. The Court of Sadr Adálat have ruled that all Ináms which do not come under Regulation VII of 1817, or Regulation VI of 1831, must come under Rugulation IV of 1831, and it is, therefore, evident, that the "*Grama*," or "*Cani manyams*" are liable to the operation of this last enactment, and to no other.

6. The Board regret the delay that has occurred in the submission of this report.

(A true Extract.)

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

No. 51. ORDER THEREON, 17th January 1860, No. 83.

Paragraph 1. These papers relate to a certain Grama Manyam in the Chingleput district and raise a question too important to be decided on a single case. It belongs to a class of cases upon which it is desirable that Government should suspend action until they have been investigated by the Inám Commissioner.

2. The Governor in Council resolves therefore to transmit the papers recorded above to the Inám Commissioner, and to request that he will take the subject into consideration when his operations extend to the district of Chingleput.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 4904.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 30th November 1859.

Read letter from the Collector of Chingleput, dated 18th August 1859, No. 305, observing that the *Grama manium* falls under Regulation VI of 1831.

(In Con. 19th August 1859, No. 4158.)

In Con. 29th July 1859. Submitted to Government with reference to order, dated 26th July 1859, No. 1006.

2. The Collector is in error in thinking that the *maniums* in question fall under Regulation VI of 1831, which has reference solely to the *maniums* attached to the village offices, the "Bara Baloti."

3. The "*Grama manium*" now in question is not of this nature, but is that portion of the privileges assigned to the Mirasidars or original founders of villages and their descendants, in some parts of the Tondei Mundalum, which, as explained by Mr. Ellis in his treatise on the subject of Mirasi, under the name of "*Cani manium*" or "*Caniyatchi manium*," formed as integral a part of the "Mirasi" where it existed, as do the "*Cani Mereis*" or "*Cuppatams*."

4. Each Mirasidar enjoys a portion of this *manium* where it exists, in exact proportion to his share of the *mirasi* of the village lands, and without any reference to *office mirasi*.

5. The Collector is also in error in thinking that under no sense can these maniums fall under Regulation IV of 1831. The Court of Sudder Udalut have ruled that all Inaps which do not come under Regulation VII of 1817, or Regulation VI of 1831, must come under Regulation IV of 1831, and it is, therefore, evident, that the "*Grama*," or "*Cani maniums*" are liable to the operation of this last enactment, and to no other.

6. The Board regret the delay that has occurred in the submission of this report.

(A true Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To

J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to Collector of Chingleput.

Exd. J. Wright.

In Con. 19th August 1859, No. 4158.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Collector of CHINGLEPUT,
dated Sydapet, 18th August 1859, No. 305.

Adverting to the Board's order, No. 3004 of the 3rd instant, accompanying proceedings of Government, No. 1006 of the 26th ultimo, I have the honor to state that the gramamaniem therein referred to, as well as all gramamaniems in general, properly speaking, fall under Regulation VI of 1831, since they appear to have been originally conferred on the founders of the different villages, for the trouble taken by them in bringing the lands into cultivation.

2. Under the above view, these maniems have been entered like all other village service maniems, under the head of "Toropady Inams," instead of Sunned Inams or religious charitable, personal and hereditary grants.

3. It must, however, be remembered that these gramamaniems have been looked upon as the personal property of the Merassidars of the village, and that they enjoy a share of the gramamaniem in exact proportion to their share of the other lands in the village. They are not considered as necessitating the performance of service in return for their enjoyment, and in consequence both Moonsiffs and Puttah Managars are unremunerated as such. They have their shares of the maniem, whether they serve in either of those capacities or not, and they are not increased by serving.

4. The enclosed copy of the proceedings of the Civil Court, will shew that the gramamaniems have invariably been looked upon as private property, cognizable by the Courts, and justly so I think, when considered with reference to the universal practice and habits and opinions of the people. But I am not prepared to say that such was the original intention of Government, when permitting them to be set apart.

5. Under no sense can the gramamaniems fall under Regulation IV of 1831.

Extract from the proceedings of the Civil Court of Chingleput, under date the 1st August 1853.

Read again miscellaneous petition No. 80 of 1853, presented on the 7th March by M. Rungarow, Government Vakeel, stating on behalf of the Collector, that an arrear of revenue amounting to Rupees 58-4-8, is due on the lands of the defendant in suit No. 194 of 1851 on the file of the district Moonsiff of Conjeeveram now under attachment, and bringing to notice that $\frac{27}{64}$ cawny of the above lands is held as maniem granted for village services.

It does not appear that any maniem has been attached except the proportion of village maniem pertaining to the defendant's share of village merassee, and which it has been always the practice in this district to consider as part of the merassee share and to sell along with it. It does not appear from this motion whether the Collector considers the practice erroneous and wishes to object to it or not, but it is probable that such is not the case, or it would have been stated more distinctly.

Ordered that the lands be sold and circar balance be made good in the first instance from proceeds of sale.

Ordered, also, that a copy of these proceedings be furnished to the Government Vakeel, to be forwarded to the Head Assistant Collector in charge for his information.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. D. INGLIS,
Civil Judge.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. J. SHUBRICK,
Collector.

H. P.

№ 83

Proceedings of the Madras Govt
Under date the

Read again Proceedgs
of the Bd of Revenue dated
20th ult and recorded in Proc
of 26 July/59 № 1006

Read also the following
Rep: of the Bd of Rev:

Submitting with the Bds observations a communication from the Collr of Chingleput reporting in reference to the order of Govt dated 26 July/59 № 1006 that the Grama Mannyam falls under Regulation VII of 1831

(Here enter 30 Nov/59 № 4905)

H. These papers relate to a certain Grama Mannyam in the Chingleput District and raise a question too important to be decided on a single case. It belongs to a class of cases upon which it is desirable that Govt should suspend action until they have been investigated

Enclosed I have the honor to forward from the Secy to the Board of Revenue to the Secy to Govt Revenue Department dated 30th Nov 1859 with enclosures

Letter from the Collector of Chingleput to the Secy to the Board of Revenue dated 18th Augt 1859 with Reg and Grama mannyam

P. W. Powell Esq
Govt Secy
&c &c &c

vestigated by the
Inam Commissioner.
2 The Governor
in Council resolves there
fore to transmit the pa
pers recorded above to the
Inam Commissioner and
to request that he will
take the subject into
consideration when his
operations extend to the
District of Chengleput.

6 Copies to the,
Board of Revenue Dated 18th
5. Inam Commissioner.
with papers
5 - do - Dr. of Rev. Sett.
with do
2 - do - Asstt. Genl. of Prosecutions
Police - with do

Revenue 1860 Department

Pro: of Govt 20th January

No 83.

Pro: of the Madras Govt

Dated 19th January 1860.

From Inam Commissioner

29th April 61 No 1062.

Papers relating
to certain Grama Inams
in Chingleput,
transmitted to the Inam
Commissioner for con-
sideration when his
operations extend to
that District.