

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1621

Press
Mis.

392. 393

Dated

30 7 1862

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
30th July 1862.*

No. 392. Read the following Petition from MITTADODDI RAGHUNANDANA ROW,
Curum of Pedur and Chinnacherákúr Villages in the District of Nellore, to J. D.
SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated
16th July 1862 :—

SIR,

I beg to submit a Memorial in triplicate for transmission to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, and humbly request that you will with the permission of His Excellency the Governor in Council be pleased to forward the same to its destination.

No. 393. ORDER THEREON, 30th July 1862, No. 1,621.

1. The Petitioner is informed that his Memorial to the address of the Secretary of State for India will be forwarded at an early date.

2. In paragraph 3 of the Memorial Petitioner makes the assertion that "no portion of the amount declared to have been unjustly realized by him has been ordered to be refunded to the Ryots notwithstanding the latter's application for the same." The Board of Revenue will be so good as to ascertain the truth or otherwise of this statement, reporting the result for the information of Government.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Acting Chief Secretary.

19

To
The Right Honorable Sir Charles Wood Bart
Secretary of State for India.

The humble Memorialist of
Mittadoddi Raghunandana
Row Karnam of Bidur and
Chinnackerikur Villages in
the District of Bellary

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That having been unjustly dismissed
from the Merasi Karnamship enjoyed
by his family for the last two centuries,
and that, on grounds which have no
foundation in fact, the Memorialist pre-
sents this appeal to the patient and
merciful consideration of your Lordship
fully trusting that justice will be done
to him.

2 That the chief grounds on which
the Petitioner was dismissed, were, that he
realized from the Ryots a portion of the as-
sessment ordered to be remitted to them and
that he made an alteration in the accounts
appertaining

appertaining to this Collection with an ulterior object of profiting himself thereby.

3. That referring your Lordship for particulars to the enclosed Copy of the Petition *Dated 22 May 1842* presented to the Madras Government; the Memorialist here simply confines himself to submitting that it has been nowhere admitted by the Local Authorities that the Memorialist misappropriated any, the least portion of the Collections which he, in his ignorance, realized from the Ryots, or that he neglected to permit the same to the Government Treasury, and that the Memorialist collected the money under reference in perfect ignorance of its having been given remission, is evident from the blame attached to the Tahsildar in the Collector's Sakeed (accompanying) for not furnishing the Memorialist with a List of the Ryots ^{Besides} that had obtained remission. And it is a fact evident on the face of the Records in the Collector's batchery that no portion of the amount declared to have been unjustly realized by the Petitioner, was ordered to be refunded to the Ryots notwithstanding the latter's application for the same.

That

Marked A
vide paras 3 & 5

4. That with regard to the 2^d Charge of making false entries in the Account & appertaining to this Collection of over assessment, it is submitted that these were accounts (two) furnished to the Tahsildar on the occasion of remitting the Collection to the Saling Treasury. The so called alteration was, *Marked D* covered in only one of the Accounts rendered for the sum in question, while the correctness of the other was not questioned; so that, *Marked C* if any foul play had been intended by the Memorialist the alteration should have likewise been made in the other account to prevent detection, but such was not the case; so that the conclusion that any alteration was effected by the Petitioner in the Accounts to profit himself thereby, is altogether unfounded. Besides the so called alteration was discovered in the Accounts when they were sent for by the Tahsildar a second time from the Village.

5. That the Memorialist feels himself aggrieved that it was on a simple surmise as will be seen from the words of the Tahsildar quoted by the Collector in his Sakeed

I asked that the dismissal of the Memorialist *vide para 2*
was ordered, and that there were no actual
facts produced as proof of any culpability
on the part of the Petitioner.

6. That it is for your Lordship to consider whether any such supposed faults are to deprive the family of the Memorialist of any lenient Consideration to be Shewn to them for their long and faithful services, or that neither the respectability nor the previous good conduct of the Memorialist and of his ancestors is to have any weight for any indulgence to be Shewn to the Memorialist.

7. That the Memorialist strongly urges on the merciful Consideration of your Lordship that it is just possible that truth is made to appear a falsehood owing to the grudge of a petty local official having the confidence of the collector and it is magnified into dimensions of a great crime by the latter and accepted as such by the Local Authorities; - and the Memorialist sincerely assures your Lordship that it was in this manner his present ruin was effected; and that to enter into any details in the affair would be to

To, His Excellency Sir Charles Denison K.C. to
Governor in Council of
Fort Saint George.

The humble Petition of Milla Doddie
Rajinandana Row, Karnam of Piddis
and to himackerukis in the District
of Nellore.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

That your Petitioner was dismissed
from the Service for some supposed faults with
which he could have no concern and which have
no foundation in fact.

2 That the principal grounds stated
by the collector for the Petitioner's dismissal are:
1st That he realized from the Ryots a certain
sum of money which was ordered to be remitted
to them on account of lands submerged.

3 In explanation of this it is submitted
that no orders were furnished to the Petitioner
either from the Hoogoor or the Taluk Datchery
to enable him to know the names of the Ryots
that obtained, or not a permission of their assess-
ments (this is admitted in the collector's
Statement.) Such being the case, the Taluk Revenue
Inspector Venkiah brought a list of the Ryots
who

Marked A

4 who he stated were not entitled to remission. and so he realized from them the sum that forms the subject of the present complaint and remitted the same to the Salug Treasury. And thus in the absence of any orders as shown above the Petitioner was obliged to rely on the only paper furnished to him by the Inspector. The Salsildar himself is blamed by the collector in his Sakad for not furnishing the Petitioner with the particulars of the Ryots that obtained remission. an indirect admission that no blame could be attached to the Petitioner.

4 That altho there was an excess in the Collections it went to the Government coffers and the Petitioner could not be any gainer thereby. Besides the collector's assertion that the Petitioner collected the money cannot be maintained in the face of the document (letter) written to the Salsildar by the Revenue Inspector that he realized the amount under reference. Marked B

5 That the 2^d charge brought against the Petitioner was that he entered in the accounts, Collections that came to hand on one and the same day in two different items instead of one lump sum, and that this fact considered in connection with an alteration of a letter by the Petitioner in one of the above items and an omission on his part to enter in the balance account certain sum due by the Petitioner himself goes beyond a doubt to show that the Petitioner had some ulterior object of evading payment of a part of his own dues. In

6 In explanation it is submitted that the entry of the Collections in two separate items was unavoidable as only a portion of the assessment first came to hand and was entered in the accounts as one of the items under reference and shortly the other portion was received which rendered necessary the entry of a second item. As for the alteration the Petitioner is perfectly ignorant of the same and submits that this is only a construction placed by the Salsildar to injure the Petitioner. The accounts were at first examined in the Salug treasury and returned to the Petitioner, and it was only when they were sent for by the Salsildar a second time that the so-called alteration was discovered. And even admitting that there was any such alteration as stated, it could have been of no avail to the Petitioner as all the Ryots bear receipts attested by the signature of the Petitioner for the sum paid by them and the daily Khitta account kept by the Petitioner on papers bearing the collector's seal, discovers clearly the sum paid by each Ryot and no items could thereby be entered to the credit of the Petitioner.

Marked C

Marked D

7 That there are invariably two accounts furnished to the Salug treasury for the Collections namely the Eras alnama and the daily Chitta; and the present alteration was discovered only in the former account and not.

not in the *lo-hitta*. Then, of what avail could the alteration in only ^{one} of the accounts be to the Petitioner, while an examination of the other account would exhibit the truth. The Inspector's letter above alluded to also shows that no alterations could have been effected by the Petitioner in the accounts. The omission to enter the sum due by the Petitioner is accounted for as follows. This amount was due on account of certain withered crops raised on his fields by the Petitioner and for which Petitioner is not liable for payment, and so no entry of the sum was made in the account.

9 That from the Petitioner's ignorance of English he was not able to get his case clearly represented to the Board of Revenue who have therefore not been pleased to enter fully into the merits of the case which relates to a matter of accounts complicated in this appearance; but simply relying on the wording of the collector's *Takud* which in itself was a transcript almost of the *Taksildar's* *Urjee*, they have declined to interfere on the Petitioner's behalf.

10 That under all the foregoing circumstances the Petitioner humbly appeals to your Lordship for a reversal of the Board's decision, as also of the unjust order of Mr. Dykes removing the Petitioner from the *Karnamship* enjoyed by his family uninterruptedly for the last 200 years.

Humbly

Humbly begging pardon for this intrusion, your Petitioner as in duty bound,
Shall Ever Pray

Madras }
May 1862 }

I have the honor to be
Your Excellency's most obedient
and humble servant

(Signed) Raghunadana Rao

(True Copy)

Raghunadana Rao

Taken from J. W. B. Dykes Esq^r,
Collector of Nellore to Jellalammoodi Fannimanta
Row Tahsildar of Nellore Talug, is as follows:-

- 1 The urger No 441 written by you on the
30th January and enclosures, have reached me.
- 2 You state that in the urger presented to
your address by Gangapatnam Narraina Reddy
and others, Ryots of Chinnacherukin, attached
to the Talug they represented, that the fields na-
-med Golimellavāgi, Satagunta and Nūtalā-
-mitla situated in the bed of the Kottacheruvu
Tank of their Village, having become submerged,
were relinquished by them for Fusly 1270, that
the whole of the Revenue due on those fields was re-
-mitted for Fusly 1269, and that of this amount
the Village Karnam Rangunandana Row only
remitted the sum due on the Nūtalāmitla and
Satagunta fields, but collected fully the sums
due on account of Golimellavāgi and Chervillottu
Gegivapolam fields: and that on your examining
the Village Munsiff Gangapatnam Narraina
Reddy and others, and Karnam Rangunandana
Row, it was found that a sum of Rs 119 & odd
that had been remitted, was collected by the
Karnam in excess; and that the Karnam stated
that thro' oversight the excess was realized and
sent to the Talug Treasury; that either with the
object of taking credit for a portion of the sum
under

under his Patta and another portion at some future period, or with some other view, the Karnam remitted the sum to the Salug Treasury during September under the head of Fusly 1270; that on looking at the Shroff's ketta and the sealed Book for September, there was ^{an} entry of Rs 33 having been collected for Fusly 1270, and that in Corrobor-
 ration of which an entry in the Erasalmamah of a single item for Fusly 1269 and another item of Rs 33 for Fusly 1270, were first entered; but it appearing that the Telugu letter (3) "key" or the word "for" next to Fusly 1270 was newly altered into (or) "lo" or "in", Karnam Raghunandana Row was called upon for explanation when he stated that he did not put in the letter; that on consideration, as the first item in the Erasalmamah was entered as for Fusly 1269 the reason of the alteration of the letter (or) "lo" or "in" next to the item entered opposite Fusly 1270, seems (or is apt to be surmised) to be an intention to make the sum appear as if collected on account of Fusly 1269; that although a sum was due by the Karnam on account of his Patta, nothing of it was entered in the statement of arrears & outstanding ^{against} the Village sent up by the Revenue Head Inspector in September and written in the handwriting of the Karnam; that it may therefore be concluded that the Karnam credited the amount collected in excise under his own Patta; and that the case should in your opinion be dealt with under Regulation IX of 1822.

On a perusal of the whole of the above record sent up by you, and ^{on} an examination of the Karnam Raghunandana Row, it appears that the

the said Karnam realized to Rs 1198 odd in excise from the Complainant in September. Had you in your Sakad to the Karnam dated 25 July 1860 notified the names of the Ryots who obtained permission the Karnam would have distinctly known the Ryots who paid sum in excise of their dues but instead of this you mentioned only the names of those to whom no permission was granted. However the Lists furnished both to the Buzir and the one kept in the Salug butchery, of the Ryots who applied for permission, were written in the handwriting of Karnam Raghunandana Row. It was therefore an easy matter for him to have known the names of the Ryots to whom the remissions were granted. And even should there arise any doubt the Karnam could have proceeded to the Salug butchery and cleared himself of the same by a reference to the List there of the Ryots that obtained permission. If (shortly after the Sakad dated 25 July granting a remission of Rs 811 in his Village, was received) the Karnam did not know to whom the permission was granted, it was incumbent on him to enquire and ascertain the same. Moreover there is an item of Rs 33 entered in the Erasalmamah and the letter (3) "key" in the word "item" meaning ~~for~~ Fusly 1270 was altered into (or) "lo" or "in", and the Karnam failed to give any satisfactory explanation as to this correction.

Whether

Whether it is assumed to be (S) "key" for or (S) to "in" the reason for the entry here of this item has not^{at} all been explained by the Karnam. Also he has failed to account satisfactorily for the omission to enter the sum of Rs. 29, due by him, in the statement of arrears outstanding against the Village, which was prepared by the Karnam in his own hand-writing and given in September to the Inspector Venkiah. Therefore it is to be concluded that the Karnam did so with a deceitful intention of crediting part of the sum collected in excess, under his Patta. Wherefore, considering that it is not safe any longer to continue this Karnam Raghunandana Row in the duty of keeping the accounts of the Villages of Sedur and Chinnacherukur, he has been dismissed from the Karnamship of both those Villages. You are therefore to act according to the Rules in respect of this case.

4. Further it is to be understood that you are to select some other person competent for the Karnamship of the Villages to inform^{us} of the same thro' an Arjer.

5. Moreover as it is a duty incumbent upon you to cause entries to be made in the Ryot's Pattas, corresponding to the order & granting the remissions & to see our instructions are duly carried out, you are to understand that it is highly improper on your part to omit to do so and to evince extreme negligence.

Mellone 31 August 1861 (A True Translation)

[Signature]

To Jallalamudi Raminunta Row
Tahsildar of Killore Talug.

After the usual compliments, Akhara-
range Venkiah Inspector attached to the Talug,
begs to submit as follows:- There being a
balance of Rupees 188-9-9 outstanding against
the Village of Chinnacherukur for Fy 1269, I have
desired the Villagers to collect out of this sum
Rupees 209-14-6 and to remit the same to the
Talug Treasury. After deducting Rupees 58-15-5
(for which property was lately attached and
which is the balance^{left} uncollected owing to
certain objections raised) from the remainder, viz.
Rupees 273-11-3, there is left a balance of Rs. 214-11-
10, to be realized. Out of this sum Rupees 81-2-4
is due from one Annutaranga Subbanna an
inhabitant of this Village, but as he has not
paid the money due by him notwithstanding
it was often demanded of him, I have, with
the Villagers by me, attached such of his move-
able property as he has been found and also
the fields forming his immovable property on
account of the sum remaining to be made up,
and desired the Villagers to inform the Au-
thorities when any of his moveable property
is found. It does not appear that he has
any

any other property at present save house.

I have made arrangements for the early realization and remittance of Rupees 27-8-1, due by Nakkalapully Easturi Row and others and which should be collected by the end of the month. Besides those above stated, there is a sum of Rupees 106-1-6 to be realized ^{from} Mili. Kuduru Latchmia and others of Mellore, and altho' a peon was sent, they have neither sent the money nor made their appearance. I have therefore reported this for your information and forward to you the papers respecting the same which are as follows:-

1. Account shewing the Demand, Collection, and balance against each Dept.

1. List of the moveable property attached.
1. Do immovable Do Do

3. Syen.

1. Account shewing the Mokurpha due for July 1270.

4. These I have forwarded for your perusal.

24th September 1860.

(Signed) A. Venkiah.
(at the station),
[Signature]

No 10. Extract from an account, viz, Account No 14, shewing the daily receipts for July 1269 (A. D. 1859) relating to the Village of Chinnachur, attached to the Taluk of Mellore, District Mellore.

Month and date on which collected	Name	By whom paid	On which paid	Amount	So far paid on different dates
	Pogula Subbaraya	In person	Due on account July 1269	Land 27	105
	Mili Kuduru Latchmia	Do	5	15	12
	Goratapalli Latchminarasayya	Do	5	70	5
	Maganthi Peta Venkata Reddy	Do	5	1	1
	Venkat Reddy Venkata Reddy	Do	5	17	5
	Dasari Naraidu	Do	5	9	8
	Marum Reddy Venkama	Do	5	14	5
	Chelupadi Kondappa	Do	5	1	3
	Maganthi Chenna Venkata Reddy	Do	5	24	24
	Venkat Reddy Vengal Reddy	Do	5	3	3

24th September

Month & date on which collected	Name	By whom paid	On which Fusti ac. - Count paid	Mem Amount	Total of the sum paid on different dates
October 20	Vamadevdy Rapireddy	In person	Das on ac. - Count of Fusti 1269	16.33	16.33
	Pakala Pungada	Do	Do - Fusti 1270	9.129	9.129
				209.44	209.44

Of this Rupees and nine annas

9 189 4
209 14 4

Of this Paper, two hundred
and nine, amount to cotton
and pie., four, has been
sent to the Treasury of the
Allote Salug, ^{in the} Province of Kuma.
Sawmy under date 21st September
1860.

Remainder

(Signed) Larnam, Mr. Paplin and a Row
(A True Transcription)
Jesse G. Giddens, Clerk

Sadanama of the village of Chimachikur attached to the Taluk of Mellore. Just 270
 (A. D. 1860.)

Month and date to which the disbursements relate.	Relating to what Fund.	Land.	Moksha.	Regalia.	Bahra.	Collations.	Total.
From 17 th to 24 th September.	Relating to Fund 1269.	176 14 4	"	"	"	"	176 14 4
	Collected in Fund 1270.	33 "	"	"	"	"	33 "
		209 14 4	"	"	"	"	209 14 4
		As per					
			crim vuz				
			Papers				174 "
			Half Rs 26				13 "
			Quarters Rs 55				13 12 "
			Double annas 73				9 2 "
			Pice				" 4 "
			Total Papers				209 14 4
			Of this Papers				209 14 4
			Remainder				" "

The above Papers two hundred & nine
 pice four have been credited in the
 under date 24th September 1894
 (Signed) H. Venk
 (Signed) J.

The above Receipts two hundred & nine amount fourteen
& piece four. have been credited in the Shitta
under date 24th September 1860.
(Signed) E. Venkataramam
(Signed) J. A. S.

(Signed) *M. Raghunadana Ponn*
Village Shroff Ramaswamy
(A True Translation)
and Certified Notary

Copy in a. of the 1st copy sent
27/10/1862 No. 249/1862

Revenue Department.

No. 1621-21

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date No 30th July 1862

Read the following Petition
from Mittadoddi Raghu.
mandaria Rao Kammur of
Pedur and Chinnacherukun
Villages in the District of Nellore

Submitting for transmission to
His Government a Memorial in
triplicate, praying to be restored to the
Office of Kammurship in Nellore
District.

(Here enter 16th July 1862 No.)

WM
The Petitioner is
informed that his Memorial
to the address of the Secretary
of State for India will be
forwarded ^{at an early date} by the next steamer.

In Para 3 of the Memorial
Petitioner makes the
assertion

assertion that "no portion
 of the amount declared to
 have been unjustly realized
 by him has been ordered to be
 refunded to the Ryots ¹⁸⁸¹ not-
 withstanding the latter's
 "application for the same."

The Board of Revenue will
 be so good as to ascertain the
 truth or otherwise of this
 statement reporting
 the result for the information
 of Government.

MM

W M

14 Copies to the Bd of Rev. with Memorial Dec 31st

7/1/11

Respectfully the Memorial
to the Hon. Sec. of the
Interior

Copy to a letter to
Ex. Sec. of 1864
H. H. Rogers

Revenue 1862
and of Govt for 1864

1864

Ex. Sec. of 1864
H. H. Rogers

Ex. Sec. of 1864
H. H. Rogers

Ex. Sec. of 1864
H. H. Rogers

1864

Ex. Sec. of 1864
H. H. Rogers

Ex. Sec. of 1864