M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1181 Press ~~Mis.~~

40-14

Dated 11—6— 1861.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11*th June* 1861.

No. 110. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd January 1861, No. 3:—

Read again letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 9th August 1860, No. 304.
(In Cons., 14th August 1860, No. 3,979.)

Read also the following letter on the same subject from the same Officer, dated 16th November 1860, No. 450:—

(In Cons., 21st November 1860, No. 6,028.)

With reference to the concluding part of the Board's Proceedings, under date the 6th September 1860, No. 4,079, requesting to be informed on what ground the claim of the widow Alama Nachiar was preferred to that of her nephew Mannar Iyengar, to the Inâm originally granted to Kulanthai Mannar Iyengar, I have the honor to state that her claim is preferable because she is the widow of the eldest son of the original grantee, whilst the Petitioner Mannar Iyengar is only the son of the younger brother of her late husband.

---

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, with reference to their Endorsement on Petition No. 174 of 1860, seeking to have registered in Petitioner's name the Inâm now standing in the name of the widow of his father's elder brother.

2. The Inâm was originally granted to Petitioner's grandfather, after whose death it was held by his sons Ragunatha Iyengar and Sadagopa Iyengar, the latter of whom, who was Petitioner's father, died in Fasli 1268, and the Inâm was continued in the enjoyment of the elder brother and of Petitioner until Fasli 1262 (A. D. 1852-53), when Ragunatha Iyengar died leaving a widow, and Petitioner remained in possession.

In Cons. 7th September 1854.

3. In Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 19th August 1854, No. 972, Revenue Department, the continuance of the Inâms, among which that in question was included, for the lives of the then recipients was sanctioned, and in the statement of Inâmdârs which was then under consideration, the name of Ragunatha Iyengar who died in 1853, was still entered.

Dated 29th March 1856, in Cons. 3rd February 1857, No. 1,107.

4. In March 1856, the Collector submitted an amended list of the actual incumbents at the date of the Government order, and in this list Petitioner and his uncle's widow were entered as the heirs of the deceased Inâmdâr, and it was recommended that the widow should be recognised as Inâmdâr.

5. Eventually in their Proceedings of 11th May 1858, the Board recommended that the alterations in the list of recipients should be adopted as proposed by the Collector, which was sanctioned in Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 31st May 1858, No. 715, Revenue Department, and one of the results was that Petitioner was excluded in favor of his uncle's widow who now stands registered as Inâmdâr.

In Cons. 9th June 1858, No. 2,280.

6. Petitioner asserts a preferable claim to the Inâm, and the Board, on the information now supplied by the Collector, do not doubt his right to be recognised as heir to the last Inâmdâr and representative of the family, which was evidently an undivided one.

7. Petitioner's father and uncle jointly enjoyed the Inâm.

8. Subsequently Petitioner himself and his uncle held it together, and after the death of the latter, Petitioner retained possession till the claim of his uncle's widow was preferred to his own.

9. But, as under the Hindu law, a widow of a member of an undivided family is entitled only to maintenance, the Petitioner, as the direct descendant and eldest male representative of the original Inâmdâr (his grandfather), should certainly be recognised as the incumbent Inâmdâr. The Board, therefore, recommend that orders be issued to comply with his prayer.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Acting Secretary.*

First class

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11th June 1861.

No. 111. ORDER THEREON, 11th June 1861, No. 1,181.

The Government do not doubt that the view taken by the Board of Revenue of this case is correct; they therefore authorize the Board to issue the necessary orders for the transfer to Petitioner Mannar Iyengar of the Inám now registered in the name of his uncle's widow, Alama Nachiar.

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

No. 4,079.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 6th September 1860.

Read the following letter from J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George; dated Tencausy, 9th August 1860, No. 304 :—

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 103 (Government No. 174) of 1860, herewith returned, I have the honor to report as follows. The Petitioner Mannar Iyengar of Alwartirunagari in the Thenkarai Taluq, prays that the Inam to which he has hereditary right, but which was fraudulently made over to a female named Alama Nachiar, may be continued to him.

2. On a reference to the previous correspondence on the subject, it appears that grain and ready-money Inams to the amount of 6 grain cottahs and 6 pons, equal to Rupees 12-11-8 in the villages of Velúr and Kilpadagai respectively, were originally granted to one Kulanthai Mannar Iyengar, and were enjoyed by him until his death, and after him by his two sons Regunatha Iyengar and Sadagopa Iyengar. In Fasli 1248 Sadagopa Iyengar having died, his son the Petitioner, and Regunatha Iyengar continued to enjoy the Inams in question up to Fasli 1262. After Regunatha Iyengar's death the said Inams were zaried to the Petitioner.

3. In the statements of Inams paid by deduction from the Kistbundy Beriz which were submitted to the Board under date the 18th March 1854, with reference to their Proceedings of 15th November 1852, the name of Regunatha Iyengar deceased was erroneously entered as the holder of the Inams in question. The Board in their Proceedings of the 7th September 1854, having under instructions from Government ordered the disbursement of the Kistbundy Inams direct from the Huzur Treasury, the amount of the Inams now under dispute was disbursed for Fasli 1263 to the Petitioner. But as it was ascertained afterwards that Alama Nachiar, widow of Regunatha Iyengar, is entitled to hold the Inam as the head of the family, her name was entered in a revised List of Inamdars which was forwarded to the Board with a letter dated 29th March 1856.

4. The Board in their Proceedings dated 7th May 1857, desired to know what inquiry was made into the claims of the parties entered in column 8 of the revised statement. In reply a letter was sent to the Board under date the 27th May 1857, stating that the several Tahsildars were directed to make full inquiries as to who were the lawful heirs of the deceased Inamdars, and that from the reports received from them, the individuals entered in column 8 of the revised statement, were ascertained to be the legal heirs of the deceased Inamdars, and recommending that the Inams may be continued for their lives. Subsequently the Board having observed in their Proceedings dated 26th September 1857, that they think it desirable that the Collector should have the cases examined by his Assistant, prior to their being laid before Government, the heirs of the Inamdars were duly examined by myself and the Sub-Collector, and the result was reported to the Board on the 19th February 1858; and on the recommendation of the Board the Government in Extract from Minutes of Consultation under date the 31st May following, having accorded sanction for the continuance of the Inams to the heirs of the deceased Inamdars referred to in column 8 of the revised statement above-mentioned, the Inams under dispute were continued to Alama Nachiar, widow of the deceased Regunatha Iyengar, on a life Certificate, and she is accordingly in the enjoyment of the Inams in question.

---

1. The Inam in question is one of those the continuance of which for the lives of the then recipients was sanctioned by Government in Extract Minutes Consultation dated 19th August 1854, No. 972, Revenue Department, and had been enjoyed up to October 1853 by the original grantee and his two sons, the name of the latest survivor of whom (who died in 1853) was entered as the then recipient in the statement submitted to the Board on 18th March 1854.

In Cons., 7th Sept. 1854.

In Cons., 8th May 1854.

In Cons., 3rd Feb. 1857.

2. With the letter of 29th March 1856, the Collector submitted an amended List showing the names of the present recipients, the heirs of the deceased incumbents which should be substituted for those entered in the original List, and in the case now in question the son of one brother (present Petitioner), and the widow of the second and last surviving brother (present recipient) were entered as the heirs of the Inamdar deceased, and the widow was recommended for recognition as principal heir in whose name the life Inam should be registered.

3. Further scrutiny into the claims of the reputed heirs and merits of the recommendations of the Taluk Officers was directed to be made in the Board's Proceedings of 7th May and 26th September 1857, and eventually in their Proceedings of 11th May 1858, the Board recommended to Government the alterations in the List of recipients proposed by the Collector which were sanctioned in Extract Minutes Consultation dated 31st May 1858, No. 715, Revenue Department. One of those changes was as above-mentioned to substitute the widow of the last registered recipient for her deceased husband, and Petitioner now asserts a preferable claim as son of a brother of the deceased, who had also at one time enjoyed the Inam, on which claim the Government have called for a report. The Collector's letter above recorded does not state the grounds on which the claim of the widow was preferred to that of her nephew (Petitioner), the grandson of the original grantee, and on this point the Board request further information.

In Cons., 9th June 1858, No. 2,280.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Sub-Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly.

Exd. J. Wright.

C. 7

பகர்ப்பு. ஸ்ரீ கலெக்டர் [illegible]

யாதாஸ்து நெம்பர். 11

[illegible]

1859 [illegible]

(True Copy)

[illegible]
1859 [illegible]

[illegible signature]

Deputy Collector

days when certain claims may be drawn up in the usual manner and prays that the proceedings of the case may be ended for and further rendered

Ent. Collectorate 186
No 3019 of 1859
From Mannar Iyen-
gar of Alwartiroonag-
iri Streevigoontum
Taluk in the District
of Tinnevelly
Dated 22nd Septr
Read by Collr 1859
with 4 Encls
5
Ins No 174 of 1860
Appeals against
the enclosed order
of the Actg Collr
directing that Re-
ports of the Munsiff
and Dubash Peons

enter in the Book of the Said Collector made
in favor of me. If the Board should consider
that the Subordinate public servants of the
Collectors office, have misconducted themselves
and withheld my arguments by their unlawful
seizure of your authority, it would seem that
I could institute Summary proceedings and that
they won't be backward even irrespect of treason
When I presented the Acting Collector
the petition marked D to furnish a copy of the
order marked A and 5 other Documents to at
to prove forgefully all the foregoing points to the
Board, he had given the Endorsement that he
won't give copies of the five petitions. I have
submitted herewith 4 Documents to mean marked
A. B. C. D.

[illegible] by the Board to get all other proceedings for
your perusal and to give the Rs 150 that would
Amount to Fraudy 64 to 68 either to the Subordi-
=nate public Servants that committed forgery
or to Almanachiar who has received the Sachet
Amount by their efforts and order the Balance
to be charged in my name for Fraudy 69.

For such act of justice the
Petitioner as in Duty bound
shall ever pray.

Kyd 22.
1859.

To the Right Honorable the Governor in Council of
Fort St. George
Madras

The humble petition of Mannar Sangar of Alk
in the Steam Jamadar Palook
District of Tinnevelly
Humbly

1. In the Manaam Statement dated 18
March 20 forwarded up to the Government and
turned to the Collector's office; the Subordinate off
of the Collectors office, have by forgery entered t
Poca Manaam of Rs 30 per annum due thereby t
dittary right and the order of nomination, in the
of Almanachear a widow, who is in no way rela
in lieu of mine; while the forged statement
attempted by the Deputy Collector to investigate, the la
Collector ordered him not to do so, and her
charter for the receipt of manaam and the amount
balance from the income of the said village, ek contrac
Rs 60, the Board of Revenue have not awarded.
Therefore this petition has been forwarded by
to the Government of the State praying
in request to place the forged statement
investigation to find out the
2. Many of the Roda Manaam of this village have
also sold unto Manaam called Vaanty Manaam
Manaam pertaining to Livelihood and the statement
were formed in the Collector office for the year 1854
and with the order to the Shanbogue Tandiyan for the Vaanty
Manaam and the other to continue up to the date of
the copy. The latter containing those particulars

and Statements were sent to the Government there the Inspector Board and to the Government has furnished, there the Board in August 19. 1854 to do so —

3 — A letter prepared in the Collectors office [illegible] in confirmation of the statement dated 20 March 1856 was sent to the Board respecting the said statement which [illegible] among the persons [illegible] pertaining to livelihood found in the said Statement; the names of 18 deceased persons were [illegible] and therefore the petitioner the Manager of [illegible] who received the order of nomination and the Mansion of Tuly [illegible]

I the petitioner who received the order of nomination Apint 15. 1854 and the amount [illegible] Lady [illegible] having a right to the Roca Mansion of Ro[illegible] [illegible] the fact Collusion by [illegible] claim and [illegible] Government to the Labour Office from the [illegible] entertaining [illegible] entered [illegible] said [illegible] Mansion in the [illegible] [illegible] Mansion [illegible] 3 [illegible] said statement [illegible] my case and [illegible] reasons alleged in the heading of the said statement [illegible] whole of the letter in reference with [illegible] order of nomination and the Mansion of Tuly [illegible] letter were sent to the Collector for the Board dated [illegible] the enquiry report after [illegible] investigation [illegible] the [illegible] Mansion of Tuly [illegible] accordingly [illegible] summoned me and the [illegible] with [illegible] took [illegible] on 8th Nov. 1856; forwarded [illegible] dated December — 1856 to the Board [illegible] explaining that the 18 persons included [illegible] alive; the letter was approved by the Govt [illegible] [illegible] on May 20 — 1858 [illegible]

to the said persons. Moreover the said statement dated March 20 — 1856 which relates as if the said 18 persons were registered was returned to the Collector. The rest of the particulars respecting the matter would appear clearly to the Board petitioner.

5 — Only the reasons adduced in the heading of the said statement and not the letter written with it are quite sufficient to prove the name of Alimunachian as tampered by forgery in the statement dated March 20 — 1856. The letter dated December — 1857 confirming it. Those the late Acting Collector while considering, speaks as in order issued for this office to confirm Almanachian on the ground of the sign of the Government officer said Statement. In consequence of this only the Board did not enter on this point. The Government have signed on the supposition that would be written on the statement in accordance to the reasons alleged in the heading of the statement; the letter sent along with it and the letter dated December — 57 but no wise intended to establish the name of the [illegible] appears [illegible] the petitioner have received the order of nomination [illegible] appealed either to the Board or Government against such an order [illegible]

[illegible] petitioner most humbly beg [illegible] Honor in Council to [illegible] the report of the Board petition and to deliver my name [illegible] my charge, after having [illegible] the forgery of the subordinate officers of the Collectors office who have [illegible] the Public Proceedings of the matter.

For which act of justice and [illegible] the Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

[illegible] 1857

No. 3.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 3rd January 1861.

Read again letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 9th August 1860, No. 304.

(In Cons. 14th August 1860, No. 3,979.)

Read also the following letter on the same subject from the same Officer, dated 16th November 1860, No. 450:—

(In Cons. 21st November 1860, No. 6,028.)

With reference to the concluding part of the Board's Proceedings, under date the 6th September 1860, No. 4,079, requesting to be informed on what ground the claim of the widow Alama Nachiar was preferred to that of her nephew Mannar Iyengar, to the Inam originally granted to Kulanthai Mannar Iyengar, I have the honor to state that her claim is preferable because she is the widow of the eldest son of the original grantee, whilst the Petitioner Mannar Iyengar is only the son of the younger brother of her late husband.

---

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, with reference to their Endorsement on Petition No. 174 of 1860, seeking to have registered in Petitioner's name the Inam now standing in the name of the widow of his father's elder brother.

2. The Inam was originally granted to Petitioner's grandfather, after whose death it was held by his sons Ragunatha Iyengar and Sadagopa Iyengar, the latter of whom, who was Petitioner's father, died in Fasli 1268, and the Inam was continued in the enjoyment of the elder brother and of Petitioner until Fasli 1262 (A. D. 1852-53), when Ragunatha Iyengar died leaving a widow, and Petitioner remained in possession.

3. In Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 19th August 1854,

In Cons. 7th September 1854.

No. 972, Revenue Department, the continuance of the Inams, among which that in question was included, for the lives of the then recipients was sanctioned, and in the statement of Inamdars which was then under consideration, the name of Ragunatha Iyengar who died in 1853, was still entered.

4. In March 1856, the Collector submitted an amended

Dated 29th March 1856, in Cons. 3rd February 1857, No. 1,107.

list of the actual incumbents at the date of the Government order, and in this list Petitioner and his uncle's widow were entered as the heirs of the deceased Inamdar, and it was recommended that the widow should be recognised as Inamdar.

5. Eventually in their Proceedings of 11th May 1858, the Board recommended that the alterations in the list of recipients should be adopted as proposed by the Collector, which was sanctioned in Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 31st May

In Cons. 9th June 1858, No. 2,280.

1858, No. 715, Revenue Department, and one of the results was that Petitioner was excluded in favor of his uncle's widow who now stands registered as Inamdar.

6. Petitioner asserts a preferable claim to the Inam, and the Board, on the information now supplied by the Collector, do not doubt his right to be recognised as heir to the last Inamdar and representative of the family, which was evidently an undivided one.

7. Petitioner's father and uncle jointly enjoyed the Inam.

8. Subsequently Petitioner himself and his uncle held it together, and after the death of the latter Petitioner retained possession till the claim of his uncle's widow was preferred to his own.

9. But, as under the Hindu law, a widow of a member of an undivided family is entitled only to maintenance, the Petitioner, as the direct descendant and eldest male representative of the original Inamdar (his grandfather), should certainly be recognised as the incumbent Inamdar. The Board, therefore, recommend that orders be issued to comply with his prayer.

(A true Copy and Extract)

Acting Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly.

Exd. J. Wright.

5-6-62

Rev. 1861 Legal Cts
Pro: of Govt for Stamps
No. 1331
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 3rd
Decr. 5th } January 1861
received 4th June
Encl. 1 letter 1 or
7 Enclos.
No. 3
Rec. of Do. 24th Oct. 1861 No. 2588.

Submitting with the Boards recommendation Letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly reporting on Government O. No. 174 of 1860 seeking to have registered in his name the Inam now standing in the name of his father's elder brother

No. 1181. 11th June
Withdrawn order

No. 1181.

The Government do not doubt that the view taken by the Board of Revenue of this case is correct; they therefore authorize the Board to issue the necessary orders for the transfer to Petitioner's name of Thyagar of the Inam now registered in the name of his uncle's widow Alamaga Pachiar.

Lt Col. Geo:
11th June 1861

No. 1104 & 1111.

C. 6 June R 10th
C 27 May R 4th June

11 Copies to the Board of Revenue
21 " Inam Commissioner
1 Petition with Board's Proc. No. 13 Dated 13th