M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1830 Press ~~Mis.~~

386.387

Dated 28. 8. 1862

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 28th August 1862.

No. 386. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th August 1862, No. 5,139:—

Read the following letter from G. S. FORBES, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Chetterpore, 17th July 1862, No. 176.

SIR,

1. With reference to the endorsement on Petition No. 3,256 of 1861, I have the honor to report that the village of Bamoosaly is not entered as an Amavia or Pagoda grant in any of the accounts as stated by the Petitioner. The Zamíndár of Calicote has reported that the village is under the enjoyment of the parties whose names are down in the accounts.

2. With regard to the hamlet to which the Mahádavi also lays claim, it appears from the Zamíndár's Arzee and the Kyfeats given by Curnum and Carzee of Bamoosaly, and the Ryots of the hamlet, that it is not situated in the lands belonging to Bamoosaly; that some twenty years ago there was on this spot a village built by Khonds, &c., but owing to the ravages committed by tigers it was deserted, and that subsequently (some five or six years ago) the jungle was again reclaimed by others, who are now paying the Zamíndár his dues. It is besides improbable, as the Callicote Zamíndár justly observes, that a Zamíndár would make over a jungle to his wife for her maintenance, instead of villages and cultivated land. Under these circumstances, I have not issued any orders to alter the existing state of things.

3. With regard to the Mahádavi's representations to me, I have issued to her several Firwans desiring her to state whether or no she would draw the annual allowance of Rupees 5,000 made by Government for the subsistence of herself and the other members of the family, but she has not answered any of my letters. When in 1859, I sent her the allowance by a Daloyet, she refused to receive it without assigning any reason; I therefore told her that unless she answers my Firwans I could take no notice of her Arzees. Though she pretends not to know which of my Firwans were not answered, she must be well aware that she has replied to none of those relating to the allowance. The fact is, the Petitioner is a weak woman acting under the advice of the self-interested and ill-disposed persons about her.

Vide from Collector 18th July, in Cons. 2nd August 1862, My. No. 3,186.

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their endorsement on Petition 3,256 of 1861.

2. The Board are of opinion that the Collector was right in leaving the villages referred to as he found them.

(A true Copy and Extract.)
(Signed) C. G. MASTER, *Acting Sub-Secretary.*

No. 387. ORDER THEREON, 28th August 1862, No. 1,830.

1. The Collector reports that the village of Bamoosaly does not appear as a Pagoda grant in any of the accounts, but he does not say the same of the hamlet to which the Mahádevi of Hatghur lays claim, and which he expressly states is not situated in the lands belonging to Bamoosaly. It is indeed "improbable that a Zamíndár would make over a jungle to his wife for her maintenance, instead of villages and cultivated land," but the hamlet is not claimed by the Mahádevi as part of her maintenance, but as forming a portion of the endowments attached to the Pagoda which was ordered to be restored to her in the Proceedings of Government 11th March 1861, No. 554.

2. The Government cannot regard the Mahádevi's refusal, however obstinate, to answer the Collector's communications respecting her allowance, as sufficient grounds for withholding from her ordinary justice, and they therefore direct Mr. Forbes to entertain her complaint and to dispose of it under such rules as he may find applicable. The Petition will be returned in order that he may furnish the Mahádevi with an endorsement setting forth clearly the grounds of the decision at which he may arrive.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

R. D.

No. 1830.

1830

Proceedings of the Madras Government under date the 28th. augt. 1862.
Read the following
Pro: of the Board of Revenue

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Tanjore, reporting on Petition No. 3266 of 1861, regarding the village of Bamoosaly, with the Bd's remarks thereon.-

(Here enter 7th Augt. 62 No. 5,1397

The Collector reports that the village of Bamoosaly appears does not figure as a Pagoda grant in any of the accounts, but he does not say the same of the hamlet to which the Mahadevi of Hatghur lays claim, & which he expressly states is not situated in the lands belonging to Bamoosaly. It is

indeed "improbable that
"a Zamindar should
"make over a pinsle
"to his wife for her
"maintenance, instead
"of villages & cultivated
"land" but the hamlet
is not claimed by the
Mahadeo as part of
her maintenance, but
as forming a portion
of the endowments
attached to the pagoda
which was ordered to
be restored to her in
the Proceedings of Govt,
11th March 1864 No 554.

2. The Govt cannot
regard the Mahadevi's
refusal, however obstinate,
to answer the Collector's
communications respecting
her allowance, as sufficient
grounds for withholding
from her ordinary
justice, & they therefore
direct Mr Forbes to enter-

tain her complaint and
to dispose of it under
the ordinary rules that
he may find applicable.
The Petition will be
returned in order that
he may furnish the
Mahadevy with an
Endorsement setting
forth clearly the grounds
of the decision at wh
he may arrive.

WH

11 Copies to the Bd of Revl with Petition Dest 829

Revenue 1862 Deptt.
Pro: of Govt for Augt

No 1830.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dy 28 August 1862.

Pro. No. 175-176
11-3-61

Passing orders on
Board's Proceedings sub-
mitting Ganjam Collector's
report on Petition No 3256
of 1861 regarding the
Bamoosaly Village.

No 386 & 387.