M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1571	Press Mis.
85-86	
Dated 6 . 8 . 1861.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 6th August 1861.

No. 85. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th May 1861, No. 2,705 :—

Read letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 9th March 1861, No. 119.

(In Cons. 15th March 1861, No. 1,649.)

1. Submitted for the orders of the Honorable the Governor in Council.

In Cons. 20th May 1847, No 1,078.

2. Under the views expressed in Extract Minutes Consultation of 1st May 1847, No. 539, regarding the permanent character of the allowance granted for the support of the family of Sinnananja Taver, the Board entertain no doubt that the portion now lapsed by the death of the widow Peramatál, should be continued in the name of her son Peria Swámi Sembuli Sinnananja Taver, the only surviving member of the family ; and accordingly recommend that this course be sanctioned.

3. It is to be regretted that the village of Coolianary formerly conferred on Sinnananja Taver was made over to the Zamíndár of Chokkampatti without any stipulation for the appropriation of its revenues in favor of that individual, but the Board fear that it is too late now to remedy that oversight.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 86. ORDER THEREON, 6th August 1861, No. 1,571.

1. The circumstances attending the original grant of this pension are detailed at length in the correspondence recorded in the letters from the Government to the Board of Revenue, under date 1st September 1818 and 21st February 1826, Nos. 576 and 121.

2. The original arrangement by which the village of Coolianary was granted for the support of Sinnananja Taver having been modified, with the concurrence of Government, and the grant of a monthly sum by the Chokkampatti Zamíndár accepted in lieu, the Zamíndár was enabled, after the lapse of some time, to repudiate the engagements into which he had entered, while the Government, through the village in question having been made over to the Zamíndár without any proviso, and no trace existing of any agreement made by him for the payment of the allowance, were unable to take legal steps to keep him to his promises, and felt themselves bound to take the responsibility and expense of supporting Sinnananja Taver.

3. The pension was, on the death of this last mentioned individual, reduced in 1826 from Rupees 105 to Rupees 95, which sum was subsequently directed to be equally divided among the four surviving members of the family, viz., the three widows and one son of the deceased, at the rate each of Rupees 23-12-0 per mensem.

4. The *third* widow having demised in 1847, the Government directed that her share should be equally divided among the remaining three ; by this arrangement the share of each must have been increased to Rupees 31-10-8.

5. When the *second* widow died in 1852, it was ordered that her share of 23-12-0 should be distributed equally between the first widow and the son of the late Poligar.

6. If this order was carried out literally, these two individuals should have received monthly, subsequent to that event their share each of Rupees 31-10-8+11-14-0 (or half of 23-12-0)=43-8-8.

7. But it is not unlikely that the *full* allowance of the deceased's second widow, or Rupees 31-10-8, was disbursed to the two survivors, who would, in that case, have drawn Rupees 31-10-8+15-13-4 (half of 31-10-8)=47-8-0.

8. The Board of Revenue will be requested to state what course was, in reality, followed.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 6th August 1861.

9. The death of the *first* widow is now reported, and the Board recommend that her *portion* (amount not stated) should be continued to her son, the only surviving member of the family. It should be specified whether this portion is simply her original share of Rupees 23-12-0 or either ofthe sums mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 7 *supra, i.e.*, whether it is intended that Peria Swámi Sembuli Sinnananja Taver is to receive the whole amount of the pension, viz., Rupees 95, or some smaller sum.

10. There is another point which needs notice. In their order of 1st May 1847, the Government assigned as one reason for continuing the allowance without reduction that in consequence of the Chokkampatti Zamíndári having become the property of Government, the revenues of the village of Coolinary were at its disposal. It appears, however, that on the restoration of the Zamíndári in 1859 after a lengthy correspondence, no measures were taken for making this village liable for the payment of the allowance assigned originally in lieu of it, and it has been made over to the Zamíndár without any proviso.

11. This oversight is much to be regretted and should not have occurred.

12. The Board should notice the delay by the Collector in reporting the death of the late Peramatál.

(Signed J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

3

In Cons. 15th March 1861, No. 1,649.

From J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of TINNEVELLY,

dated Tutacorin, 9th March 1861, No. 119.

I have the honor to report the death on the 20th December last, of Peramathal the first wife of the late Sinnananja Taver, the original Poligar of Chockumputty, who enjoyed a pension of Rupees 23-12-0 per mensem from the sum of Rupees 95, sanctioned by Government under date the 21st February 1826 for the whole family which consisted of four members, viz., three widows and the son of the late Poligar. The second and third widows died in the years 1852 and 1847 respectively, and their allowance of Rupees 23-12-0 each per mensem was distributed in equal shares among the surviving members of the family under the sanction of Government, dated 1st May 1847 and 11th June 1852.

2. The first widow having now died, the only surviving member of the family, the son of the late Poligar, requests that the pension of his deceased mother may be continued to him. In Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 1st May 1847, the Government in ordering the distribution among the surviving members in equal shares of the allowance enjoyed by Ponnachi Ammal, the third widow, observe that "the allowance was granted by Government for the support of Sinnananja Taver in lieu of the village of Coolianary formerly conferred on that individual, and which was by some unaccountable mistake made over to the Zemindar of Chockumputty without any stipulation whatever for the appropriation of the revenues in favor of the incumbent; that the Government were obliged to provide a separate maintenance for Sinnananja Taver as it had indirectly guaranteed the payment of a certain sum for his maintenance, on the village above-mentioned being included in the deed of permanent settlement granted to the Zemindar; and that the Zemindary of Chockumputty having become the property of Government and the revenues of the village of Coolianary being at its disposal, the Government were bound by considerations of justice to continue the allowance without reduction, and as a permanent grant for the support of the family of Sinnananja Taver." But as the Zemindary has now been restored to the present proprietor, I beg to be favored with the instructions of the Board, as to whether the share of the deceased widow can be continued to her son Periasawmy Sembooly Sinnananja Taver, the only surviving member, as requested by him.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

No. 2,705.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 29th May 1861.

Read letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 9th March 1861, No. 119.

(In Cons. 15th March 1861, No. 1,649.)

1. Submitted for the orders of the Honorable the Governor in Council.

In Cons. 20th May 1847, No. 1,078.

2. Under the views expressed in Extract Minutes Consultation of 1st May 1847, No. 539, regarding the permanent character of the allowance granted for the support of the family of Sinna Nanja Taver, the Board entertain no doubt that the portion now lapsed by the death of the widow Peramathal, should be continued in the name of her son Peria Sawmy Sembooly Sinna Nanja Taver, the only surviving member of the family ; and accordingly recommend that this course be sanctioned.

3. It is to be regretted that the village of Coolianary formerly conferred on Sinna Nanja Taver was made over to the Zemindar of Chockamputty without any stipulation for the appropriation of its revenues in favor of that individual, but the Board fear that it is too late now to remedy that oversight.

(A true Extract.)

Secretary.

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

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

Exd. J. Wright.

Exemption 1 5

Revenue Department

No. 1571

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 6th August 1861

Read the following
proceedings of the Board of
Revenue.

Submitting a letter
from the Collector of Tinne=
velly, and recommending that
the permanent character of the
allowance granted for the sup=
=port of the family of Sina
Nanja Taver should be
the name of Peria Sawmy &,
Taver.

Here enter 29th May 1861
No. 2705

The circumstances
attending the original grant
of this pension are detailed
at length in the correspondence
recorded in the letters from
the Govt. to the Board of
Revenue under date 1st Sep=
=tember 1818. and 21st February
1826 Nos. 576 and 121.

2. The original
arrangement by which the
village of Coolianary was
granted for the support of
Sinnanarja Taver having
been

P-4th May /47 No. 2342-43
P-11th June /52 — 63-64
2-2-53 37
19-6-56

Original

Revenue
Rec'd 29th May 1861 Department
Read 29th May 1861 No. 362.
Dated 29th May 1861.

Despatched.
Received.

No. 2,705.

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly, and recommending that the permanent character of the allowance granted for the support of the family of Sina Nanja Taver, continued in the name of Peria Sawmy &c, Taver.

1785.

No. 1571. 6th Aug.st

been modified, with the concur=
=rence of Govt., and the grant
of a monthly sum by the
Chockamputty Zamindar
accepted in lieu, the Zamin=
=dar was enabled, after the
lapse of some time, to repu=
=diate the engagements into
which he had entered, while
the Govt., through the village
in question having been
made over to the Zamindar
without any proviso, and
no trace existing of any agree=
=ment made by him for the
payment of the allowance,
were unable to take legal
steps to keep him to his pro=
=mises, and felt themselves
bound to take the reponsi=
=bility and expence of suppor=
=ting Sinnanja Tavar.

3 The pension was
on the death of this last
mentioned individual re=
=duced in 1826 from Rs. 105.
to 95 Rs. which sum was
subsequently

subsequently directed to be
equally divided among the
four surviving members of
the family. Viz. the three
widows and one son of the
deceased, at the rate each of
Rs. 23.12 -- per mensem.

4 The third widow ha=
=ving demised in 1847, the Govt.
directed that her share should
be equally divided among
the remaining three: by this
arrangement the share of
each must have been in=
=creased to Rs. 31-10-8.

5. When the second
widow died in 1852, it was
ordered that her share
of 23-12-- should be distri=
=buted equally between the
1st widow and the son of
the late Poligar.

6. If this order was
carried out literally, these
two individuals should
have received monthly,
subsequent to that event
their

their share each of 31-10-8 + 11-14-- (or half of 23-12--) = 43-8-8.

7. But it is not unlikely that the full allowance of the deceased second widow or Rs. 31-10-8, was disbursed to the two survivors, who would, in that case, have drawn 31-10-8 + 15-13-4 (half of 31-10-8) = 47-8-0

8. The Board of Revenue will be requested to state what course was, in reality, followed.

9. The death of the first widow is now reported, and the Board recommend that her portion (amount not stated) should be continued, to her son, the only surviving member of the family. It should be specified whether this portion is simply her original share of 23-12-- or either of the sums mentioned in paras

687 supra i.e. whether it is intended that Peria Swami Sembuli Sinnanaya Tayer is to receive the whole amount of the pension viz Rs. 95 or some smaller sum.

10 There is another point which needs notice. In their order of 1st May 1847, the Govt. assigned as one reason for continuing the allowance without reduction that in consequence of the Chockumpatty Zamindari having become the property of Govt., the revenues of the village of Coolianary were at its disposal. It appears however that on the restoration of the Zamindari in 1854 after a lengthy correspondence no measures were taken for making this village liable for the payment of the allowance assigned originally in lieu of it, and it has

has been made over to the Zamindar without any proviso.

11 This oversight is much to be regretted and should not have occurred. ~~Nor do I desire to be informed how it could have occurred and why the Collector did not bring the fact to notice before the permanent ~~award~~ was granted.~~

12. The Board should ~~do~~ notice the delay by the Collector in reporting the death of the late Peramathal.

C.W.

I. D. S.

14 Copies
For the Boards of Revenue.
Dist[illegible]

2-2-93

7-2-96

19-6-96

17-9-96.

20/10/96.

19-11-96.

9-10-05.

14-3-12

14-5-12

17-5-12

29-5-12

3-7-12

8-8-12

26-3-15

2-9-20

Respecting the allowce for the support of the family of Sina Nanjoo Tauer

Revenue 1861 Departt.
Pro: of Govt for August

No 1571.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dd 6th August 1861.

From B of Revd 1st Nov 1861 (No 2593
Submitting for the Orders

Board's Proceedings recommending to continue the Pension of Paramatal, deceased of the family of Sivinanaya Tauer to her Son Peria Swami Pensibuli Sivinanaya, with orders thereon -

No 85 & 86.