M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 575 — Press ~~Mis.~~

157-158

Dated 9. 3. 1861.

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

No. 157. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th February 1861, No. 765:—

Read the following letter from H. WOOD, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Cuddalore, 19th January 1861, No. 11:

SIR,

I have the honor to submit replies to the questions asked by the Government in their Proceedings, dated 8th September 1860 (forwarded by the Board on the 11th idem), relative to the claim made by one Kistnier residing in Chedambaram to a Datta Inám situated in the Táluq of that name.

*First.*— The Petitioner's age:—

1. Examined before Mr. Hall in 1857. Petitioner stated that he was 45, and that his father had been dead about 20 years.

2. Examined by myself in October last (1860). He gave his age as 48, and placed his father's demise at 46 years previously.

*Second.*—Succession to Venkatakistna Sástri.

1. Petitioner said before Mr. Hall that he succeeded to the Inám at his father's death, or in the year 1838.

2. He deposed before me that his father Venkatésa Sástri was 16 when the Inám was granted, and that he died at the age, as he had been told, of 58 years; that the decease of his grandfather Venkatakistna took place three years after his father's death, and that then he entered into possession of the Inám.

*Third.*—As to Petitioner's actual possession of the Inám.

1. The Jamábandi accounts for seven Faslis previous to 1234, taken from the records, show an entry of the Inám in the name of Venkatakistna Sástri.

2. The Curnum Gumáshta of the village where the Inám lies, when examined by me, stated that, except in the Jamábandi accounts for Prajotpattie (A. D. 1811-12), he could discover no entry of the Inám at all.

3. One Appávu Pillai alleged before me that he cultivated the Inám from 1830 to 1840 for the Petitioner Kistnier.

4. The Tahsíldár of Chedambaram in forwarding to this Office in 1844 Lists of Kávil Datta Ináms in the Táluq, put down the Inám under consideration as in the name of Venkatésa Sástri and as in possession of his grandson's Petitioner and his brother Kuppaiyar.

---

Submitted for the information of Government, in answer to the questions mooted in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of their Order, dated 8th September 1860, No. 1,551, relative to a memorial presented by one Kistna Aiyar, claiming a Datta Inám in South Arcot, resumed by Government in 1842.

*In Cons.* 10*th September* 1860.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

---

No. 158. ORDER THEREON, 9th March 1861, No. 545.

1. The Board submit the replies of the Collector of South Arcot to the questions contained in G. O. 8th September 1860, No. 1,551 Revenue Departmnet.

2. Referring to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, of that Order, it would appear from the information now received, that the Petitioner instead of being *eighty* years of age, as had been expected, is not *fifty*: that from his own account, his father's death seems to have occurred in 1814 instead

fifty: that from his
his account, his fa

of "shortly after" 1772: that his grand-father died three years subsequently to his father, or say in 1817, when he (Petitioner) entered, at the supposed age of five years, into possession of the Inám, which, in his Memorial he states was not enjoyed by him till 1838; and lastly, that the evidence of his actual possession is confined, (1.), to the statement of a solitary cultivator, who says that he occupied the land on Petitioner's behalf for ten years from 1830 to 1840, and (2.), to a List of Kávil Datta Ináms sent in by the Tahsíldár in 1844, or two years subsequently to the resumption of the Inám.

3. There is an apparent contradiction in the first and second paragraphs of the Collector's reply to the third question, but whichever statement regarding the entry of the Inám in the accounts, may be the correct one, the present inquiry has shown that no confidence can be placed in the assertions of the Petitioner; under these circumstances, there appears no reason for reversing the decision, which, in 1858, declared that he was not entitled to any allowance on account of the Inám which was resumed in 1842.

4. The Petitioner's Memorial will be transmitted to the Secretary of State with an intimation to the foregoing effect.

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

Revenue Depart.

No. 545.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 9th March 1861 –
Read the following Proceedings of the Bd of Rev.

Submitting for consideration a letter from the Collector of South Arcot furnishing replies to the questions asked by Govt relative to a memorial preferred by one Kistna Iyer, claiming a Datta Inám in S. Arcot resumed by Govt in 1842.

Received 11 Feby 1860.
No. 765.

1. The Board submit the replies of the Collector of South Arcot to the questions contained in G.O. 8 September 1860 – No. 1557. R.D.

2. Referring to paras 9, 10, & 11, of that order, it would appear from the information now received, that the Petitioner is alleged of being eighty years of age as had been expected, is now fifty: that from his own account, his fath

death seems to have occurred in 1814 instead of "shortly after" 1772: that his grandfather died three years subsequently to his father, or say in 1817 when he (Petitioner) entered, at the supposed age of five years, into possession of the Inám, which, in his Memorial he states was not enjoyed by him till 1838; and lastly that the evidence of his actual possession is confined (1) to the statement of a solitary cultivator who says that he occupied the land on Petitioner's behalf for ten years from 1830 to 1840. and (2) to a kabúl of Kázi Datta Inámy which in by the Collector in 1844, or two years subsequently to

the Inám.

3. There is an apparent contradiction in the first and second paragraphs of the Collector's reply to the third question, but whichever statement regarding the entry of the Inám in the accounts, may be the correct one, the present enquiry has shown that no confidence can be placed in the assertions of the Petitioner; under these circumstances, there appears no reason for reversing the decision, which, in 1838, declared that he was not entitled to any allowance on account of the Inám which was resumed in 1842.

4. The Petitioner's Memorial will be transmitted to the Secretary of State with an intimation to the fore-

Sovereign effect.

Resumed Inam in
South Arcot

18 Copies
To the Board of Revenue.
Dispt. 11

C. 26. Pub. Rds Read

12th June 1860 Nos 141-142
8th Sept. Nos 138-135

Copy in a letter to C
dy 9th March 61 No 34

Revenue 1861 Departt
Pro: of Govt for March.

No 545.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dy 9th March 61.

Relative to a Memorial
from one Kistna Iyer, claim-
ing a Datta Inam in South
Arcot resumed by Govt in 1842.

No 157 & 158.

C-26. Feb. Abstract