

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1848	Press Mis.
409.23	
Dated 30.8.1862.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

Read the following papers:—

No. 419. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th March 1862, No. 1,531.

1. Read Government Petitions 206 and 386 of 1862, dated 13th January and 7th February 1862, the one from Venkatakristnah and other inhabitants residing at Tripaty, complaining of the embezzlement of the Tripaty Pagoda property by the Mahaut, of the Deputy Collector's partial enquiry into the case, and of the Collector's partial report, and praying that a Commissioner be appointed to investigate the matter under Regulation VII of 1817; the other from Streenevasa Row, late Peshcar of the Tripaty Pagoda, submitting a copy of his Petition to the Board of Revenue bringing to their notice the improper manner in which the Deputy Collector conducted the enquiry alluded to above.

2. The above Petitions have been referred to the Board for report, and they resolve to submit to Government a copy of their Proceedings, under date 20th February 1862, No. 1,224, in which they have already expressed their opinion that there was not sufficient foundation for the charges brought against the Mahaut alluded to in the Petitions under notice to induce them to investigate the matter further.

3. The second Petitioner has already been informed that his proper course in making charges against the Deputy Collector is in the first instance to bring the matter before the Collector of the District, who will then act in accordance with the provisions of Act VII of 1857.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 420. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th July 1862, No. 4,628.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Chittoor, 11th June 1862, No. 101.

1. I have the honor to forward for the information of Government copy of the explanation given by Deputy Collector M. Narasimma Panthulu in regard to the charges, brought against him by one Streenevasa Row, in the enclosed Petition No. 405 of 1862.

2. In my opinion the explanation is quite satisfactory, and I consider the charges unworthy of further notice.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From M. NARASIMMA PANTHULU, Deputy Collector of North Arcot, to J. FRASER, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, dated Naggeri, 28th May 1862, No. 15.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, which gave cover to a Petition* presented to the Board of Revenue by one Streenevasa Row, late Peshcar of Tripaty Devasthanam, containing certain accusations against me,

and beg to submit that they are made only from malice, and that both the character of the Petitioner and the nature of his complaints against the Mahaut were fully reported to the Collector, Mr. Robinson, in my letter of date the 9th November 1861, No. 52.

2. A formal trial on such important charges as those now preferred by the Petitioner, will, I trust, hold him responsible and relieve a public officer from vindictive accusations.

3. There are, however, some points on which I think I should explain, in order to show how the Petitioner has been coloring matters.

4. On my going up the Hill to worship, two shawls were presented to me in the Pagoda, as it was the practice observed on occasions of respectable Hindoos visiting the place, but having accepted, I returned the shawls instantly with a Takeed† to the Mahaut to receive and enter them in the accounts of the Pagoda. This was accordingly acknowledged by an Arzi,‡ copies of which are herewith forwarded, and I may

* Dated 30th August 1861, No. 128.

† Dated 10th September 1861.

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

also add that the Petitioner was well aware of this at the time, and I think a question to him to that effect will show that he has been hiding it.

5. Having had occasion to send money to Nellore, I obtained a Hoondie from the Tripaty Merchant Pangalur Veerasawmy Chetty, and in lieu of it, gave a cheque on the Agra Bank. This the Petitioner call as if a loan had been negotiated.

6. During my stay at Tripaty I halted in a public Chuttram like all other travellers and held my office there for a short time, as my tent could not admit of a considerable number of persons then in attendance before me. The Chuttram was I think built from the funds of the Pagoda, and it is only in such places that the offices of the Sub-Magistrate, District Moonsiff, and Mufassal Police are held at Tripaty.

7. I was never the guest of Mahaut or as alleged of his private Secretary Veerasawmy Chetty. It is, however, true that sacred food was sent to me from the Pagoda on one or two occasions, which was worth some 2 or 3 Annas, and which as a native I could not refuse, as you know the importance attached by natives to the food distributed at the Pagodas of Jagunath or Pooree, &c.

8. In short I request that you will be so good as to call upon the Petitioner to prove the several charges he has preferred against me.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. FRASER, *Acting Collector.*

1. Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government.

2. The Board agree with the Collector that further enquiry is unnecessary.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 421. To His Excellency the Honorable Sir W. T. DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 19th February 1862.

The respectful Memorial of Cochin Sashagerry Row, Chairman of the Association convened by the inhabitants of the Chendragherry Taluq, in the District of North Arcot, for the special purpose of representing to the Government the ruinous state of affairs of the Devasthanum (Pagodas) at Tripaty situated in the same District.

MOST HUMBLY SHEWETH,

1. That your Memorialist has been authorized by the Association to appeal to the proper authorities against the gross misconduct of Mahunthu Sheva Doss, who has been the Warden of the Pagodas at Tripaty since the year 1843, when he was nominated as such and placed in charge of the property there by the Government.

2. That your Memorialist begs to take this opportunity to bring to the notice of your Excellency that the Devasthanums at Tripaty possess extensive property, and command the reverence and worship of almost all the Hindoo population of India.

3. That your Memorialist begs to add that it is not only the inhabitants of Chendragherry Taluq (who form the Association) take interest in the amelioration of the present state of the Temples, but also the whole society of Hindoos, who would individually and collectively enlist their sympathy with the most neglected and miserable condition of their popular institutions.

4. That to the great grief of the members of the Association and to the utmost surprise and astonishment of the Hindoo public, was discovered the real shameful and unhappy state of affairs of the Devasthanums at the commencement of the authorized investigation partially conducted by the Deputy Collector, Narasimma Panthulu, upon the charges preferred against Mahunthu Sheva Doss in a Petition presented to the Board of Revenue by Streenevasa Row, late Peshcar of the Devasthanum.

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

5. That the very preliminary enquiry held on the spot by the Deputy Collector resulted almost in convicting the Warden of the Devasthanum of Criminal Breach of Trust in having dishonestly misappropriated the Devasthanum's funds entrusted to him by the Government as aforesaid and of gross mis-management and abuses of his authority over the Pagodas and their Estates, which are truly public property, notwithstanding the partial and illegal mode of the investigation into the charges by the Deputy Collector who was purchased in by Mahunthu and his friends whose interests have been at great jeopardy.

6. That your Memorialist requests your Excellency's permission to forward herewith a printed copy of the Petition presented to the Board on the subject, wherefrom your Excellency may be expected to learn the many serious charges against the Warden and the Deputy Collector who, as a public servant, ought to have delighted in bringing to justice the real conduct of Mahunthu and others who stand guilty in the eye of law.

7. That your Memorialist needs not expatiate much upon the misdemeanor of the Deputy Collector which the Government should know better.

8. That in conclusion your Memorialist humbly solicits your Excellency, on behalf of the Association of which he is Chairman, to appoint any two intelligent honest Native gentlemen as Commissioners to enquire into the state of affairs of the Devasthanums and to report upon it to the Government, also to remove the present Warden Mahunthu Sheva Doss from his office which he is quite unfit to hold any longer through his old age (85 years) and infirmity; and to nominate Wardens (not less than three) selected by the Association to the Devasthanums who should at all times be held responsible to the Association for their good and wise management of the institution entrusted to them.

Your Memorialist shall as in duty bound ever pray.

No. 422. From VENKATAPATI DIKSHATALU, Merasidár and Archakar of Terumala, Tripaty in Chendragherry Taluq, North Arcot, dated 25th June 1862.

Submitting his former Petition to Government and Board of Revenue, brings to notice the irregularities practised by Narasimma Panthulu, the Deputy Magistrate in the enquiry made by him into the charge of mis-appropriation of Pagoda Fund against Mahunthu, Churchwarden of Tripaty, and prays that as solicited in his former Petition of 6th January 1859, the accounts of the Pagoda which in the possession of Mahunthu may be ordered to be siezed and examined by Commissioners or by the Government themselves, and he, with certain other persons herein alluded to, may be appointed as joint Trustees of the Pagoda for the reasons hereinset forth.

No. 423. ORDER THEREON, 30th August 1862, No. 1,848.

1. With the first of the papers recorded above the Board of Revenue submit a copy of their Proceedings in which, after reading a full report from the Collector of North Arcot, they arrive at the conclusion that the charges of embezzlement and mis-management recently "brought against the Mahaut of the Tripaty Pagoda are the fruit of personal ill-will and feud, and judging from the report of the preliminary investigation already held, they do not consider that any benefit would result from continuing the inquiry."

2. With the second of these papers the Board forward an explanation from the Deputy Collector, Narasimma Panthulu, of certain charges preferred against him in connection with his investigation of the complaints against the Mahaut. These charges are repeated in the foregoing Petitions, and the Board consider that after the explanation furnished by Narasimma Panthulu there is no occasion to go into the matter further.

3. The Government concur in the opinion of the Board that further enquiry in either of the cases is unnecessary.

4. A copy of these Proceedings will be sent to the Petitioners.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,

Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

To The Honorable Governor in Council
Fort St. George.

The humble Mahajannah
presented by the undersigned
residing at Tripate in the
Taluk of Chendraghiri Zila
Chittur as follows.

Honorable Sir,

1. Savadoss Mahante, the warden
of the Tripate & Pagodas having, often committed
many irregular actions, such as, misapplying,
& embezzling the money of the Devasthanams
with a fancy that they were given for his
own use, as well as using their properties
himself, Theenappa Rowe, who was well
aware of these irregularities being, a Peshkar
under him for some time, & some others
complained to the Board of Revenue & brought
the accounts of the Devasthanams into disposal
in which this (Mahante's) irregularities for
the most part had been recognized.

2. We hear now that M. Narasimha Puntabharu, Deputy Collector of
North Arcot, appointed for the disposal
of this case, reported to the Head Collector
(without disposing of the case completely)
in favor of Mahante, that the latter
taking the advice of his chief Ministerial
Officer about the case, admitted the
Deputy Collector's Report & sent accordingly
a report to the Board of Revenue & that
both the Deputy Collector & the Chief

Ministerial Officer of the Head Collector had derived some interest from the Mahant.

We therefore pray that your honor will order the Board of Revenue to distrust the reports of the Head & the Deputy collectors; that your honor will appoint commissioners for the disposal of the accounts mentioned in the 3^d para. that your honor will punish the offender (Mahanta) with due regard to Section 16 Regulation III of 1817; & that your honor will cancel the Sanads given to the Mahanta which contain that "after his death his disciple should succeed him", as the right of appointment devolves to the Hindu Pagoda trustees upon the Hindu community as ruled in the Sud. Decisions-

Je remain

13th January 1862.

January 1862
Tropate - 1/2

၁၈၈၈ ခုနှစ်၊ ဇန်နဝါရီလ ၁ ရက်၊ နံနက် ၈ နာရီ၊
 မန္တလေးမြို့၊ ဝန်ကြီးရုံး၊ ဝန်ကြီးကြီးကြီး

[illegible]

ಪ್ರಿಯಾಂವು ಸುಖವಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾ
 ಸುಖವಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾ

ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ (ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ) ವಿಸ್ತರಣೆ
 ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಉಪಯೋಗ
 ತಿರುಪತಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ

சென்னை மாவட்டம்
தஞ்சை மாவட்டம்
கரையோரம்

சென்னை மாவட்டம்
தஞ்சை மாவட்டம்
கரையோரம்

[illegible][illegible]

I shall cover Pray.
~~Elizabeth~~
Steenwase Row

N^o. 386 of 1862.

Referred to the Board of Revenue

for report.

For Saint George

25th February 1862.

By Order

of the Master

Dy. Secy. to Govt.

No. 1,224.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th February 1862.

Read the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Wallajapet, 30th January 1862, No. 25:—

1. I have the honor to report the results of the Deputy Magistrate's inquiries into the charge against the present Trustee of the Tirumali Pagoda near Tirupati, set forth in the Petitions noted in the margin.

Nos. 126 of 1860.

670

1,932

1,933

1,998

2,733

2,783

2,841

3,084

3,631

85 of 1862.

2. The inquiry, as the Board will gather from these papers, is merely preliminary; but as the case is one, which, considered with reference to former orders, and the motives and antecedents of the litigant parties, should probably not have been entertained at all, I beg to lay it before the Board before proceeding further in it.

3. It will first be necessary to narrate as briefly as I can the circumstances under which the Mahaut was appointed sole trustee of the temple.

4. In Extract Proceedings of Board, dated 24th June 1841, No. 793, the Order of Government directing immediate withdrawal of all public officers from all interference with native temples and places of religious resort, runs thus:—

"It is the intention of Government that the interference of all public officers either with the internal arrangements of the religious institutions in question, or with the administration of their revenues and funds of every description should be altogether withdrawn, and be vested in those individuals, who, professing the same faith may be thought best qualified to conduct that administration with fidelity and regularity, such individuals together with their subordinates being held responsible to the Courts of Justice for any breach of the duties and trusts assumed by them; and this withdrawal His Lordship in Council desires may not be partial and uncertain, but final and complete."

5. On this, the Collector was required to report in detail the arrangements he would propose for each institution in his District, explaining the then extent of interference and control, and showing how far that is withdrawn by the operation of the method of administration that is to supersede the present management. The Collector was also called on to suggest in what manner vacancies should be supplied in the trusteeships, whether arising from death or resignation.

6. In his reply to the requisition, dated 29th September 1841, No. 132, the then Collector submitted a statement exhibiting the names, character, and profession of the individuals selected for the administration of the Pagoda revenues and general control of the temples in North Arcot; and in speaking of the arrangement so proposed for the Tirupati Pagoda, observes, that "it has altogether been objected to, and has been opposed in the most decided manner by every member of the institution."

7. After explaining the nature of those objections, and what he had done to combat them, Mr. Ogilve thus proceeds:—"The Jiyangars, Pujaris, and Priests, are the chief individuals connected with the internal management of the temple. They hold their respective places on Mirassy rights, and have the entire superintendence and control of all the various services of the institution. These individuals, seven in number, I would propose to be a Managing Committee; and a sufficient number of unexceptionable characters from the town could be selected as a general one. The two Zemindars of Kalastri and Karvetnaggar may be elected Patrons, or Honorary Members of the General Committee. The Kalastri Zemindar would be objected to by the Priests as a member of the Managing Committee, on account of his not being a follower of Vishnu; but the Zemindar himself is altogether careless of the matter, and indeed has expressed a desire to be relieved from all interference."

"If the measure is to be carried through, nothing short of at once withdrawing Government interference will tend to rouse into action the thinking properties of these sluggish bigoted Priests, who keep themselves immured within this temple, hid from all sight, and scarce to be traced out by inquiry. There they reside, and spend their existence in inert carelessness, enjoying the produce of their lands and villages, secure in the administration of their worship kept pure by a Government zealously recognizing all their rights, and careful of their religious feelings."

Prayer that as a Prabhakar -
Gurumath has been pre-
sented to the Board for
the removal of the Prabhakar
from the charge of the
temple - owing to his old
age - directions may
be given to them for post-
poning the decision of the
case.

30th Aug 1862
4/19

Prayer that as a Prabhakar -
Gurumath has been pre-
sented to the Board for
the removal of the Prabhakar
from the charge of the
temple - owing to his old
age - directions may
be given to them for post-
poning the decision of the
case.

"and prejudices. To such, the change must be anything but pleasing; and to keep things as they are consonant of course to their natural notions of ease and security." * * * "The exclusive privileges appertaining to the Priests and Jiyangars of the temple, constitute them the fittest, and indeed the only individuals who will be acceptable in the eyes of the Hindoos to form the Committee for the administration of its internal management. The only thing they have a right to look for, and to expect, is the protection of their persons and property, and for the preservation of the peace during the celebration of the great annual festival"

8. The details of the arrangement having been further discussed in the correspondence noted in the margin, Mr. Goldingham was asked to report, with reference to his proposition to appoint the Mahaut trustee under the general control of the Karvetnaggar Zemindar (a condition under which the former declined to accept the office), whether the trust should pass to the Mahaut's successors in place of being left in the Zemindar's patronage, and whether the succession to the position of Mahaut was hereditary or by appointment, and if the latter, with whom the appointment rested. These, and all other points are most fully answered in Mr. Goldingham's letter, dated 13th February 1843, No. 22, which is too long to transcribe *in extenso* here, but which is so material to a right appreciation of the then and present circumstances of the case, that I beg to solicit the Board's particular attention to it. On review of this letter, and of the objections urged against the Collector's proposition, the Government expressed their satisfaction that an arrangement had been made by which the State was relieved from all further charge of the temple at Tirpati; and that the trust was about to be consigned to the individual who was in all respects likely to fulfil the duty undertaken by him with good faith, and with satisfaction to the great body of the worshippers.

9. In the subsequent correspondence noted in the margin, the only point discussed which has a present interest, is, as to who should take charge in the event of the Mahaut's sudden death, when personage should exercise his privilege of nominating a successor as soon as possible. To this course the Mahaut objected; and the Board on that observed that it need not be further insisted on, as the nomination in such case would rest with the members of the Mhutt. The Board then add, with reference to a question from the Collector on the point, that they are of opinion that the accounts of the temple should be open to general though not indiscriminate inspection, but that they are not prepared to define the limit.

10. When the Muchilka, which it was proposed to take from the Mahaut, was submitted, the Board, in their letter dated 12th June 1843, No. 119, objected to it on the ground that it was drawn up as between the Mahaut on the one part, and the Government on the other; and observed that in the event of such contract being violated by the Mahaut, the Government would be the only, or at least the most natural party to sue him for the breach of his engagement; a step obviously inconsistent with that entire abandonment of all interference on the part of Government officers, which it was the object of the late arrangement to effect. All preliminaries having been at length finally arranged, the Collector reported on the 12th December 1843, that the Mahaut had been duly installed as sole trustee of the temple.

11. Having thus traced the history of the Mahaut's accession to the trusteeship of the temple, it will be proper to make some remarks on the position and antecedents of the parties who now charge him with an abuse of the trust.

12. The ostensible movers in this matter are two persons of the name of Srinivassa Rao and Venkatapathi Ditchitulu, who in reality are mere partizans and creatures of one Behar Doss, of whom I shall have more to say anon.

13. Srinivassa Rao was originally a peon on the establishment of the Pennamarri Taluk (now absorbed in that of Chittoor), but was employed, as was then the practice, as Kumaki or copyist in the Kacheri. Dismissed from that situation for insolence and insubordination, he contrived to get some minor post under the Mahaut, and gradually worked his way up to a Pesh-karship, until after 10 years' service he suddenly resigned under circumstances which shall be noticed hereafter.

14. Venkatapathi Ditchitulu was one of the Archakars (Pujaris) attached to the temple up to 1846, when he with two others, was committed at the instance of the Mahaut to the Session Court on a charge of plundering the temple treasury of jewels of the value of Rupees 380. All three were convicted and sentenced to seven years' imprisonment with hard labor in irons; but the sentence which was at first confirmed, was afterwards reversed on further appeal, by the Court of Foujdari Udalut. Thus acquitted, Venkatapathi Ditchitulu contrived to get himself re-attached to the temple as

Pujari; but some two years back having again fallen under suspicion of having reverted to his old tricks, and tampered with the ornaments, he anticipated the Mahaut's prosecution by bringing the counter-charges on which I have to comment a little further on.

15. Such are the antecedents of the two men, who have now constituted themselves the champion of justice and religious right. But, as I have already stated, these two men are the mere tools and mouth-pieces of their faction whose real chief and leader is Kotari Behar Dhoss.

16. The circumstances under which Behar Dhoss has become the secret enemy of the Mahaut are narrated in paragraph 14 of the Deputy Collector's letter,* and correspond in all respects with what I have myself heard on the matter.

17. It cannot be doubted that the Mahaut had the power to cancel his first nomination on the ground of his successor's suspected honesty, and in so deciding he would appear to have done only a tardy act of justice to his present nominee Dharma Dhoss, who is the senior disciple, but being a man of quiet and ascetic habits had allowed himself in the first instance to be passed over in favor of his more worldly minded and ambitious rival.

18. In the same paragraph of the Deputy's letter are described the circumstances under which Srinivassa Row seceded from the party of his benefactor, and the motives which influenced this desertion.

19. Having thus placed before the Board a brief sketch of the position of these rival factions, I shall now proceed to make some observations on the charges made against the Mahaut in his capacity of trustee. To facilitate review, I shall take these in the order in which they stand in the Deputy Collector's letter.

20. The evidence on this charge, so far as this inquiry goes, is given in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Deputy's letter. The Board will, I think, admit *ipse dixit* statements, which have not even the merit of being themselves self-consistent; and yet this is perhaps the sole charge in the long series in which there is reason to fear there may be some truth. The most careful comparison of the accounts of the Mhutt, of which the Mahaut is proprietor, with those of the temple of which he is trustee, would not, embracing as these do the transactions of many years, now probably establish the misapplication of the funds of the latter institution to the purposes of the former. But, there is no doubt a very general impression that the Mhutt buildings have benefited by being associated under the same management with the temple. What degree of truth there may be in this rumour, I am not prepared to say; but if such misapplication of funds have been made, it is just as probable as otherwise that it was done by the Mahaut's agents without his cognizance.

21. This charge likewise rests on no evidence whatsoever; and the location of the jewels and monies of the temple in the Mhutt was, it appears, authorized by the then Collector.

22. This is one of those vague charges that scarcely deserve notice. By his position, the trustee has, it may be presumed, an absolute discretion in such matters. The counter-charge alluded to in the latter part of paragraph 9 of the Deputy's letter was brought to my notice when at Chendraghiri in 1860, but I took no official action on it, and it was never pushed. Party feeling was then even running so high, that mere oral evidence on either side was little if at all to be trusted.

23. I now come to the charges preferred by Srinivassa Rao, of which the Deputy enumerates fourteen.

Charges 1st and 2nd.—Misappropriation of votive offerings by omitting to enter them in the account of the temple, and fraudulent entry of charges for provisions, which had never been incurred.

Charge 3rd.—Entering articles purchased for the uses of the temple at higher prices than they cost.

24. In substantiation of these charges, no accounts were produced, and oral evidence under the circumstances would be absolutely untrustworthy. The *onus probandi* again lies with the challenging party, as Government never could consent that the time of their servants should be frittered away in comparing the accounts of the temple with the monthly price lists of the last 18 years. From what I can learn of the rules and practice of the institution with respect to offerings in money and jewels, no abstraction would be practicable between the time they are presented and deposited in the place appointed for their reception, after being duly entered in two if not more sets of accounts.

4th.—Tampering with the jewellery.

5th.—Fictitious and exaggerated entries on account of repairs to buildings.

Deputy's remarks are quite conclusive as to the hopelessness of entering into any inquiry on this point.

6th Point.—Unnecessary employment of dependents as paid servants of the temple.

7th Point.—Present wealth of the trustee.

the Byragi order of which the Mahaut is the head. He may have placed too implicit confidence in Virasami Setti, the great Sowcar of Tirpati, and by giving him the monopoly as contractor of provisions and valuator of offerings been the means of building up his large fortune; but no one whom I have asked, and I have questioned many and most respectable persons on this point, ever admitted that there *might* be any truth in this allegation.

Charges 8 and 9.—Lending out and appropriating the interests on Temple funds and investment in his own name of Rupees 50,000 in Government Securities.

of time help his case much, unless supported by other substantial evidence.

10th Charge.—Embezzling the fines

11th Charge.—Embezzlement of Rupees 10,000.

12th Charge.—Increase of expenditure.

13th Charge—Paying 5,000 Rupees to Mr. Robinson.

welfare of the town and the temple is identical, and it is only to be regretted that such surplus funds are not oftener applied to such beneficial and legitimate purposes.

14th Charge.—The private use of the elephants and paraphernalia of the temple.

35. The Mahaut came by appointment to Chittoor in 1860 to meet Sir Charles Trevelyan with all the state and insignia pertaining to his office; but there was no whisper then of a profligate administration of the concerns of his trust; and all seemed to rejoice that their great religious institution should be so worthily represented.

36. Behar Dhoos as I have already stated is the real leader of this movement. Although his nomination as successor has been set aside in favor of Dharma Dhoos he is still the junior disciple, and the cashier of the Mhutt, and not daring to estrange all the sympathy of his sect and general feeling by openly avowing his hostility, he seeks under cover of the most absolute devotion and subordination to his chief, to undermine his reputation and influence through the instrumentality of such unscrupulous and despicable creatures as Venkatapathi Ditchitulu and Srinivassa Rao.

37. The Mahant, though still in full possession of all his faculties, when I last saw him, is a very aged man, and must in the ordinary course of things soon pay the debt of nature. The struggle of party is, therefore, only likely to grow the fiercer and more irreconcilable. The stake at issue is very large, being the control of some 6 or 7 lacs in cash and jewels, and of an annual revenue of from 30,000 to 50,000 Rupees.

38. The Mahaut's death may at any moment bring these two factions into angry collision, and from what I can learn of Dharma Dhoss, the present nominee's disposition and habits, it does not seem likely that he would be able to maintain his position against the rapacious horde which that event would let loose upon him.

39. Under such circumstances it becomes a serious question whether Government should leave matters to take their own course, or whether it would not be proper to make provision for a contingency which cannot be very remote, by associating with Dharma Doss in the trusteeship when he shall succeed to it, two other persons who should be resident on the spot, and be selected with reference to character, position, and religious creed. I have had frequent conversations with

25. The same remark holds good of this charge.

26. My observations on Venkatapathi Dichitulu's 1st charge apply to this. The uselessness of entering into any inquiry on this point.

27. Has already been noticed.

28. The acquisition of private property would be a breach of the very first principle of ad. He may have placed too implicit confidence and by giving him the monopoly as contractor of means of building up his large fortune; but no one and most respectable persons on this point, ever legislation.

29. These are heavy charges, but the *onus probandi* lies on the accuser; and the letter he lays so much stress by, would not at this distance offer substantial evidence.

30. Is altogether too paltry to deserve notice.

31. Is satisfactorily accounted for in the Deputy's letter, paragraph 11.

32. May be the natural result of the enormous rise in the prices of commodities.

The Government know all about this transaction, and at the time their marked approbation. The fact, and it is only to be regretted that such surplus was not used for legitimate purposes.

is and the next point are principally noticeable as the selfish and contemptible malevolence which these and probably all the other charges now made exhibit.

natives of all ranks and creeds on this subject, and all of them in bearing testimony to the high esteem in which the Mahaut is universally held, seemed to say that the affairs of this great temple could not on his demise, be safely or satisfactorily administered by a single trustee.

40. The Mahaut had no doubt singular qualifications for the office ; and I have every reason to believe that he has discharged its duties on the whole with rare fidelity and honesty. But the arguments which influenced his appointment as sole trustee are no longer applicable to his successor, and the present circumstances of the case, and the general opinion seems to be that provision should now be made that the management, as in the case of the Conjeveram Pagoda, should vest in three trustees on the Mahaut's demise, his successor and the chief Jeyangar being two of that quorum. Much was said at the time the Mahaut's appointment was under discussion in disfavor of making the Jeyangar a trustee ; but as I have reason to believe he will be very generally acceptable to the native community, as representing the numerous and influential Vaishnava sect, and will be associated with others in the office ; former objections should not now be urged against his election.

41. I am unable now to suggest who should be 3rd trustee; but if the Board entertain my proposition so far as it goes, my successor would probably not find it difficult to complete the quorum.

42. As regards the charges against the Mahaut, which have given occasion for these remarks, the Board will probably concur with me that they are neither in themselves, or considered with reference to the motives and antecedents of the parties who make them, a proper subject of magisterial inquiry. If Venkatapathi Ditchitulu and Srinivassa Rao chose to constitute themselves the Mahaut's accusers, it will I apprehend be for them to show first in the Civil Courts that they may be recognized as prosecutors in the general interests of the temple, and that done, to take such further action in the matter as they may think best under the circumstances.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of the Deputy Magistrate's report regarding the charges brought against the Trustee of the Tirpaty Pagoda.

1. The Board are of opinion that the charges brought against the Mahaut of the Tripatty Pagoda by Vencatapatty Ditchalah and Streenevassa Rau are the fruit of personal ill-will and feud, and judging from the report of the preliminary investigation already held, they do not consider that any benefit would result from continuing the inquiry.

2. The Board, therefore, resolve to reject the complaints, and decline to order any further investigation into the case.

3. As regards the appointment of a successor to the Mahaut in the event of his death, the Board think that it is most desirable that the Officers of Government should interfere as little as possible with such matters, and at present they see no good reason for altering the arrangements which were made at the time of the Mahaut's appointment, to meet the contingency in question.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To J. Fraser, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. J. Wright.

moner's depositions to the MAHUNTOO and desired him to forward his

RCr2661/62

Minisapa row who brought charge against the Mahant and accused the Depy Coll. who tried them. This second charge has been sent to the Rev. Board for inquiry & meanwhile these papers seem to me to require no orders.

Minisapa row calls himself, I believe, then addressing first Chairman of an Association of the inhabitants of Chandragerry concerned to protect the Pagoda &c. It should be ascertained what right he has to appear in this character & what kind of a meeting took place in Chandragerry.

12 March/62

The
I think the above is right
M. C.

I beg to submit that the individual who calls himself chairman of the association is Cochran

1862. Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 20th February 1862.

No. 1,224.

Passing orders on certain Petitions setting forth charges against the Trustee of the Tripat Pagoda.

Enclosure and Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Govt. No. 2. dated 7th March 1862. 1531.
21 April

1862 12
no. 1,224.

Letter from the Coll. of the District to the Depy of Revenue dated 30th Nov. January 1862. with 25 pages: viz. District Pagoda and Board's Proceedings thereon.

1862 12
no. 1,224.

Sashagiry Row, not
the Trinivasa Row

20/10/52

whose character is as was before
described by Mr. Robinson

in para 13. seg. of his letter

letter dated 30th January

MM

19 Aug 52.

No action seems to have
been taken on the ^{above} minute

by the Hon. Mr. Malhotra.

The Report of the Board
on the charges preferred
against the Deputy Coll^r

has now been received
& the papers are therefore
re-submitted for orders

- I enclose in the opinion of the
Board that further enquiry is
unnecessary

W. V. V.

cravst/2 R25

260
261
262

ced:

by

ced:

Petr is referred
to Reg VII of
1817.

JDS

For the over
for the present

Collected 1874/3

N^o 421.

c2101/12 R25

c2101/12 R25

Rev=1862 01/10/1862
Pro. of Govt for August

N^o 520.

From C. Chishaghery
Row of Trupetty on
Chendraghery Taluk
N. Arcot main road
at Madras -

Dated 19th Feb/62
Recd 22
Recd 24
With 1 enclosure

S.O N^o 1848-30 Aug

Submitting Me-
morial to His Ex^{ty} the
Gov^t representing the
ruinous state of af-
fairs of the Devasthan-
nam (Pagodas) at Chi-
patty, N. Arcot Dist.

Enter return

12
C. Chishaghery on Petitions Nos

38	126 of 1860
670	" of 1861
1933	" of 1861
100	116 of 1862

The Board having in their Proceed-
ings dated 20th February 1862 N^o 1224
rejected the Complaints preferred by
the Petitioner the petitions above record-
ed are returned to him.

North Arcot
Collector's Office
Puthalpat 14 April 1862.

By D. Hindman
Secy

J. Fraser
Ag. Collector

N 126 of 1860

13

To His Excellency Sir Charles
Edward Grey, Bart. &c. &c.

Governor in Council of
Fort Saint George

The humble Petition of Venkata-
pati Dikshitulu Archakia
Minister of the Temple of
Sri Venkateswara at
Tirupati in North Arcot

Respectfully Sheweth.

That among the Hindu Temples
of Southern India whose management
was abandoned by Government in 1843
that of Sri Venkateswara at Tirupati
commonly called Tripety was one of the
richest and most important. The concerns
of this Grand Temple together with the minor
ones attached thereto were transferred in
trust, for the Hindu community, to one
Siva dasa Mahant the head of a Gauragi
Muttam at that place. The selection of this
individual like that of the Trustees of all
other Hindu Temples, was made by the local
officers of Government and sanctioned by
the

ms. 1890 of 1860

3

the Board of Revenue in the exercise of the powers vested in them by Regulations VII of 1817. Prior to his call to this trust in 1843, he had possessed no vested rights, in the Temple, as was the case with the Trustees appointed to several other Devasthanams. He had been a Bouragi totally unconnected with the Temple of Perupatti, exercising no vocations and enjoying no honors prerogatives or privileges of any sort or kind in it. No section of the community interested in the Temple residing either at Perupatti or elsewhere had voted or desired his nomination. Yet he was called to this important Trust by Govt. and property of the value of several lacs was placed in his charge without any security or guarantee beyond the bare agreement or Muehelha which he executed to the Circar binding himself in the most general terms, to conduct the affairs of the Temple according to "Mamul".

2 That the said Sivadasa Mahant was, as stated above, the head of Mattam of Bouragis at Perupatti, where he was brought up from a long time. His attachment

attachment to this religious institutions grew with his growth and strengthened with his strength and matured with all the regard, devotion of the school to which he belongs. It would therefore be no exaggeration to say that he felt and evinced an interest ⁱⁿ its welfare and advancement ten times as great as that he has shown towards the Temple but recently placed under his management.

3 As has been the case with all other Dharma-kirtas, the Mahant has to this day rendered no accounts whatever of the incomes and expenditure of the Temple either to Govt or the Hindu Community. The details and result of his management a profound mystery to the Community interested in the Temple.

4 During the year preceding the transfer of the Temple to his charge being the last year (S-1252) of Circar management, the incomes of the Temple amounted to rupas 76,386-13-11 which being diminished by rupas 26,415-14-1 the total expenditure for that July left a

balance of Rs 49-970-14-11- which with
sundry other items of income amounting
to Rs 1047-14-4- aggregated to Rs 51018-13-3
whereof Rs 50500 were paid over to the Mahant
by Govt. Your Petitioner is informed and
believes it to be true that Rs 76386-13-14
below the average income and certainly the
revenues of the Temple during the period of
the Mahant's management cannot have
been less. Assuming therefore 50,000 Rs
as the average annual profits of the Devastanum
the accumulated surplus funds
after 16 years administration of its concerns
must be eight lacs. But your Petitioner doubts
whether any portion of these funds is to be
found in the coffers of the Temple. The conclusion
is irresistible that they must have been
misappropriated or embezzled by the
manager.

5. The jewelry gold and silver
ornaments and apparel of the Temples
entrusted to him in 1843 were then estimated
by the Circar officers at Rs 444973-1-8-
Your Petitioner has every reason to believe
that this was a very low estimate indeed;
it being notorious that the wealth of
Sri Venkatachellam

* See list N:1-

⊙ See list N:2

Sri Venkatachellam was upwards
of 40 lacs. Your Petitioner is quite satisfied
from his own experience that a correct
appraisal of the jewelry existing
at present would verify his belief.
Many of these jewels have been removed
by the Mahant out of the Temple ostensibly
from the purposes of repair. Some of
them have indeed been returned but greatly
deteriorated in their value; but a large
number has not been returned at all.
It is one of the immemorial rules of the
Temple that its jewelry should ever be
removed out of its walls and should
only require to be repaired or mended,
the same should be done inside it by
workmen employed for the purpose.
This rule has been systematically violated
by the Mahant and no one can control
him.

6. - - - Another of the rules of the
Temple and which was stringently
observed even during the days of Circar
management was that the Devastanum
Cutcherry and Treasury should always
be held in the Temple. In the case of
the Mahant this was the more necessary
and

and indeed absolutely essential, as
he was the head of another religious
institution viz. the Mattam aforesaid.
But being uncontrasted he has resided
both to the Mattam where he resides.
Thus as stated in an earlier part of this
petition, the Temple trust has been
studiously shown as being subordinate
to his favorite institution of the Mattam.

7 - - - During the days of Circar
management extra servants used to be
employed temporarily only during
the annual festivals called "Gramade-
=avani". But now in pretence of requiring
extra servants, he has employed a great
number of his own friends and dependants
in permanent situations thereby occasioning
serious waste of the Temple Funds. And
what is still more extraordinary, these
servants are employed in the Concessions of
the Mattam.

8 - - - On the 20 December 1821
certain rules were formed by the Circars
for the guidance of the servants of the
Temple. Rule No 12 provides that the
Tahsildar of the Temple (now represented
by the Mahant himself) in the presence
of

the Jee and other Devasthanam Inerassians
should inspect the Jewels and other
effects once in six months and see
that they are all right. But since the
transfer of the Temple to the present
Trustee, this rule has never been observed.
Neither are the regulations of rule
~~III~~ attended to which enjoins that all
ornaments presented to the Swamie
by the pilgrims should be sorted,
catalogued and sold by public
auction once a year.

9 - - - It is notorious fact that since
the case of the Mahant to their Trust,
he has with the aid of the Temple's
Funds improved the Mattam building
and added to the wealth thereof a
circumstance sufficiently proved by
the state in which the Mattam had
long previously remained.

10 - - - Several complaints of Mala-
=versation by the Dharmadanta of the
Tirupathi Temple have from time to
time been preferred to the local and
Controlling Revenue authorities by
individuals aggrieved at his mis-
management.

management. But they have all failed
of moving ^{the} authorities to enquire into
them; some of them have been dismissed
and in others the Complaints have been
referred to the Civil Courts for redress.

11 - Your Petitioner begs to submit
that apart from the uncertainty of the
result of proceedings of land, few indi-
viduals have the desire of public spirit
and fear still the means to undertake
the redress of this public grievance
by the long tedious and expensive course
of a Civil suit. It was with the view
of meeting this want of public spirit
among the people of India that Reg-
y. of 1817 was framed. But its provisions
have in practice been little attended to
by Gov^t as will shewn to Your Excellency
hereafter

12 - With regard to proceedings in
a Civil Court J. P. begs to state for your
excellency's information that in several
instances the Sudr or Idalat have in Cumbrg
Regl. VII of 1817 ruled that Civil Courts
had no jurisdiction in matters of Mal-
versation of Temple Funds a property
such jurisdiction having in their
opinion

a. n. 140 of 1857.
p. 39
58

opinion been exclusively vested in the
Board of Revenue. And altho on a
later occasion, the Sudr Idalat
differently Constituted placed a different
construction on the Regl. which they
then ruled only gave to the Revenue Board
Concurrent Jurisdiction with the Civil
Courts, still they are being granted to the
rights of parties resorting to the Courts;
for they add that any "parties" few may
bring the matter for subject of Course
to the Consequences of failing to proceed them
shall in a position to maintain such
action. Further in a number 49 of 1856
aforesaid, the S. D. ruled the paid
servants of a Temple could not sue
the Darma-kunta for malversation
of the trust Funds. And in appeal No.
133-56. also quoted above, there are ob-
servations which leave it doubtful
whether some members of the Community
interested in a Temple can maintain
an action agt its Trustees. Your Petitioner
refers to these facts and decisions simply
to show the uncertainty of legal provisions
for the adjudication of suits agt Darma-
kuntas of a Temple and the great
hesitation

hesitation. Your Petitioner and indeed
many members of the Hindu Community
must be in before they can venture to
bring an action in the Civil Court.

13 One point however is clear viz.
that as long as regulation VII of 1877 is
unrepealed the Board of Revenue then
Asst. the Collector are bound to administer
its provisions by carrying into compliance
of malversations brought agt Trustees
of Hindu Temples. Indeed such was
the view taken by the Govt in 1848. See P. 466 C
But adverting to the general disinclination
of the Rev. B. and Collector to entertain
such complaints and the treatment
of several petitioners agt the Trusty of
the Tirumala Temple in particular (see
Para of this order) Your Petitioner has
thought at the best Course to appeal at
once to your Excellency in Council in the
hope that the matter herein complained
may be taken notice of and due protection
afforded to the Temple property. One from
-dammuntal rules of the Temple itself
provides for the interference of Govt. See P. 203
in such matters

14 The Mahant is now aged
about 80 Years. He cannot be long
expected

expected to live or at all events to
manage efficiently the affairs of the
Temple. It is most deplorable that
the religious interest of the Hindu Community
involving the due preservation of the Temple
property and the administration of the
Temple Charities have been not only
left without the protection of the Govt
but placed in charge of rapacious &
irresponsible Trustees who are syste-
-matically misappropriating and
embezzling the Temple Funds with
impunity and unless Govt. take vigorous
which it has shown small public interest
since your Excellency's accession to the
Govt of this Presy, show an inclination
to put down the notorious wholesale
malversation of Church property, the
interest of the Community must seriously
suffer.

15 Your Petitioner prays in con-
-clusion.

16 That the said Srivadasa Mahant
the present Trustee of ^{these} Deputy Temples
may be suspended from office till the
result of these charges is known

25 That all the acts of the Temple
be kept

kept by him since his application
in 1843 may be sealed and sequestered

3^d That the accounts which the
Redda Jeer of the Temple is by its Reg-
quire to be kept may likewise be
sealed and secured

4 That the Collector of North Arcot
or such other Commissioner as to your
Excellency in Council may seem fit be
directed to enquire into these charges

5th That the Grounds from which money has
proved to have been misappropriated
or embezzled the Mahant may be
recovered from him and to^{ly} that the
said Mahant may be dismissed
from the Trusts and some wealthy in-
dependent members or Members of the Hindu
Community appointed to administer
the affairs of the Temple in furthering
proper and adequate security for the
preservation of the Temple property.

I shall ever pray
your Obedient
and devoted
servant

No 126 of 1860.

Referred to the Board of Revenue

for disposal under the provisions of Regulation

III of 1817.

For Main George,

10th February 1860.

By Order

Sequestered

of Temples: refers to Page
466 of the Board of Re-
venues Circular order
Book. Vol. I as bearing
out his views on this
last point. Lastly
prays that the present
Trustee may be sus-
pended; the accounts
seized ~~and~~ an enquiry
made; same em-
bezzled be restored
the said some respectable
member or members
of the Hindu Com-
munity appointed
in his place, on fur-
nishing adequate se-
curity.

as extra servants his own friends and dependants needlessly and to the waste of the Temple funds and acted contrary to the rules laid down for his guidance also affirms that though frequent complaints have been made to local, and controlling Revenue authorities, no good has resulted from them: complains that though Reg. VIII of 1817 was framed for the purpose of affording redress in such cases, its provisions have been but little attended to: quotes several instances to shew the uncertainty attending the prosecution of suits of this nature in the local Courts; points out that as long as Reg. VIII of 1817 is unrepealed, the Board of Revenue, through their Agents the Collector are bound to attend to complaints of malversation brought against Trustees of

N^o 126 of 1880

From Venkatapati
Dikshitar Archaka
Mirasidar of the Temple
of Sri Venkata-
challa Swami at
Tripetty in North
Arcot.

2
Imr 1890 of 1882
Reg. 3 Jan 1880
With 2 enclosures
states that the
present Trustee of the
above temple Srivadasa
Mahant being previous
to his appointment as such
totally unconnected with
the said temple has
during the last 16 years
embezzled much of its
revenues; tampered with
its jewellery; employed
as

Registered

TO

The Honorable the President and
Members of the Board of Revenue,
M A D R A S.

The Humble Urzee of
STREENEEVASA ROW, late Peish-
car of Davasthanum, Tripetty,
and residing at Tripetty in the
Chedragherry Talook, in the
Zillah of North Arcot.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That with sentiments of unbounded submission, your Petitioner begs to approach your Honorable Board, in the full confidence that he will obtain, from the exalted rank and unerring judgment of such eminent British functionaries, as the Honorable the President and Members of the Board of Revenue, that justice which English gentlemen only dispense, without favor or partiality, to those of their Hindoo subjects, who are aggrieved by the acts of subordinate Government Hindoo Officers.

That your Petitioner in an Urzee dated 2^d July 1880, preferred charges to the Board against SHAVADOSS MAHUNTOO, the Warden of the Tripetty Pagodas, of embezzlement and sundry other dishonest acts; that the said Urzee was referred to the Collector for report; that the Collector sent it to the Deputy Collector of North Arcot, M. NARASIMLOO PUNTALOO, to institute an enquiry; that your Petitioner was sent for by the said Deputy Collector, and his complaint heard; that thereupon the accounts, etc. were sent for from the Muttum of the said MAHUNTOO, and the corresponding accounts kept by the JEYANGAR; and that having examined all the documents and the witnesses produced by your Petitioner, and having satisfied himself of the truth of the charges preferred, and the guilt of the MAHUNTOO, the Deputy Collector issued a Takeed, informing the MAHUNTOO of the incorrectness of his accounts; a proceeding—your Petitioner most humbly and most respectfully submits—both irregular and partial; and though he took down the names of your Petitioner's witnesses, instead of immediately taking down their depositions, he delayed doing so, in order to ingratiate himself with the said MAHUNTOO; and he did not proceed further with the investigation, but returned the accounts from which the embezzlement and inaccuracies were proved.

That your Petitioner, under permission of your Honorable Board, begs to bring the following charges against M. NARASIMLOO PUNTALOO, the Deputy Collector of North Arcot:—

1. On the arrival of the Deputy Collector at Tripetty, he was the guest of the MAHUNTOO and his Private Secretary PUNGALLOOR VEERASAWMY CHETTY, and resided in a house built by them expressly for the accommodation of Brahmins. It is submitted most respectfully that a public Officer who had arrived expressly to enquire into charges preferred against the MAHUNTOO, ought not to have resided in his house or been his guest.

2. The Deputy Collector was at Tripetty about a fortnight, during which time his table was furnished by the MAHUNTOO, free of expense, besides sacred food offered to the Gods from the Pagodas.

3. The Deputy Collector went up the Hill to worship, and on coming down, two valuable Cashmere Shawls were presented to him, and Indian honors were paid him—such as the attendance of elephants, led horses, flags, music, dancing girls, &c.

N. B.—Your Petitioner also went up to worship, but was prevented from entering the Golden gate. Yet the Deputy Collector connived at his expulsion—though it was his duty as a Magistrate to have protected him from the tyranny of the Pagoda servants.

4. The Deputy Collector sent copies of your Petitioner's depositions to the MAHUNTOO and desired him to forward

172 116 of 1862 -
explanations thereon, which, as the investigating Officer, he ought not to have done.

5. The Deputy Collector during the investigation was in private correspondence with the MAHUNTOO. The former paid the latter private visits, which were returned—and all this while the enquiry was going on—when a loan was negotiated by the Deputy Collector with the MAHUNTOO and his Private Secretary PUNGALLOOR VEERASAWMY CHETTY. The loan was remitted by a Bank Cheque enclosed in a Takeed, to the Sub Magistrate of Tripetty, franked on the public Service, with a view to cheat the Post Office.

6. When it transpired that the embezzlement was proved, the inhabitants of Tripetty addressed a MAZZUR to the Deputy Collector, praying him to pass a righteous decision for the future security of the Pagodas. But the Deputy Collector issued a Takeed to the Sub Magistrate, enjoining him not to listen to any complaints made by the inhabitants against the MAHUNTOO or his colleagues; and he also issued an Eesthearnamah threatening the inhabitants with his displeasure, if they brought any cases against the MAHUNTOO, advising the Sub Magistrate not to interfere in the matter at all.

7. The Police having discovered a quantity of gunpowder and shot in the unlawful possession of the MAHUNTOO, it was brought to the notice of the Sub Magistrate; but the Deputy Collector, by a Takeed, got the case transferred to him, on the private solicitation of the MAHUNTOO, a proceeding highly irregular, partial, and opposed to the Regulations of Government.

8. The Deputy Collector proceeded to Nellore, on which occasion he received a TONJON from PUNGALLOOR VEERASAWMY CHETTY.

9. When the Deputy Collector left Tripetty for Naggery, his station, your Petitioner followed and was in daily attendance, begging him to pass a decision, but as there were no reasonable hopes of a decision ever being passed, your Petitioner left Naggery and returned to his village in disgust.

That your Petitioner most humbly and most respectfully begs to submit, that he has no doubt that the strong sense of justice inherent in the breasts of English gentlemen, and characteristic of the Ruling Powers, will give to the grave charges preferred against the Deputy Collector of North Arcot, that serious consideration, which they demand; and that the Mazzur of the inhabitants of Tripetty—including the names of all the wealthy and most respectable men—praying for the removal of the MAHUNTOO, in consequence of his extreme senility (aged eighty-five years) disqualifying him for the discharge of the duties of his high and sacred office, will receive the deepest attention from your Honorable Board, and lead to compliance with the unanimous and universal prayer of the inhabitants of Tripetty.

That finally your Petitioner most humbly and respectfully begs to solicit, on behalf of himself and the inhabitants of Tripetty, that your Honorable Board will be pleased to appoint a European gentleman—R. S. ELLIS, Esq. C. B., for instance—assisted by a Native, to enquire into this case; and further, that your Honorable Board will be pleased to call for a schedule or inventory of the jewels and other gold and silver property, which were delivered to the MAHUNTOO in the year 1843, when Government connection with the Pagodas ceased. This list made out in 1843 by the then Thasildar is in the archives of the Collector's Hoozzoor. It is humbly submitted that that list should be compared with the jewels and other gold and silver property bona fide forthcoming.

For which act of strict justice your Petitioner as in duty bound

SHALL EVER PRAY,

Sd/- Tripetty
21st October 1861

MADRAS,
1862.

N^o. 116 of 1862.

Referred to the Board of Revenue
with reference to the endorsement of Government dated 10th February
1860 on Petition 126 of that year.

For St. George,
18th February 1862.

By Order

C. Master

Dy. Secy. to Govt.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

పిలువనట్లు నాలుగంటి సేనాంబుజును
 ౩ ఐ నాలుగంటి సేనాంబుజును
 త మును నట్లు కౌముదియును కలువొక్కలైన నాలుగంటి సేనాంబుజును
 నాలుగంటి సేనాంబుజును
 నాలుగంటి సేనాంబుజును

[illegible]

2
 Jan 1890 of 1892
 No 116 of 1892.

From Woodstock
The collection of the
Archaeological Association
of the Cornwall Club
at St David's
in the County of Cornwall
- from South West.

for the Peruvianum
in the College of Charobar
you had best

Dec 23rd 1862
Dec 24th 1862.

Reynolds's

his former position dated

January 1859, Helms

the medicinal preparation of

June 10 1898

I am very much obliged to the Church
warden for the

recommenced, - was
deem proper to stop the

Collected to be examined
 and for the purpose,
 and having received many
 presents from the friends,
 and the matter
 was then brought a decision
 into the case.
 (Prayer that the case may
 be referred either to the
 District Court or to the
 Court of Appeals or that of the
 City or to the City Court
 and to the City Court for
 the purpose of the report.

[illegible]

[illegible]

may examine all the workings of the Deacons' fund -
-and since the appointment of the Deacons' fund -
the enlarged and increased
of the Deacons' fund and work
and accounts alone for
misconduct of the Deacons' fund
as ordered by the College

No 10089/1864
From Venkatahan
Sivakulu Shra-
ma Muradiah of
Simahil Devanama
in Chendassery
Delug no 1107
of 1864

Delug 30 June 1864
Delug 30 July 1864

Whence
the former between being
ing to us vice the
embellishment of the
Tasara stand by the
Museum of the ^{British} Society
place for early access

135

2

85

ಈ ಹತ್ತಿರದಿಂದಲೂ ದೂರದಿಂದಲೂ

Forwarded to the
Collector for early
report with reference
to the Board's order
on D.O. No. 38 of 1860.

By order
M. Sub. Secy.
Revenue Office
Chennai
22 March 1861
Recd 26-3-61
R

Registered

5
From Venkatapati
Dikthathulu. Archa
Kar & Mirasidarg
Lirupati Devastan
nam in Chenaghere
Telug in the District
Dated 1st March 61
Recd 13 March 61

Solicits early order
to the Collr to submit
his report as called
for on his Pet. to Govt
complaining of the
Mahanat depriving Pet.
of his Mirasid village
and encroaching the Godan
property.

Handwritten text in Telugu script, likely a petition or official communication. The text is dense and covers the majority of the right page.

Handwritten text in a South Indian script, likely Grantha or Tamil, covering the upper half of the page. The script is dense and cursive, with many ligatures. The text appears to be a continuous passage, possibly a philosophical or religious treatise.

Handwritten text in the same script, located at the bottom of the page. It continues the narrative or list from the upper section, maintaining the same cursive style.

Handwritten text at the top of the right page, possibly a title or a specific heading for the section that follows.

Main body of handwritten text on the right page. It consists of several lines of dense script, continuing the themes or lists found on the left page. The ink is dark, and the handwriting is consistent throughout the section.

A short line of handwritten text, possibly a sub-heading or a separator between sections.

Another short line of handwritten text, continuing the structural organization of the document.

The lower half of the right page, containing more handwritten text. This section appears to be a continuation of the main body of text, with similar density and script style as the upper half.

25/10/1900

7500

Dear Sir,
 I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the above named matter. I am sorry that I cannot give you a more satisfactory answer at present, but I am sure that you will understand the necessity of this delay. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Yours, &c.
 J. H. Thompson

Handwritten text in Kannada script, likely a historical document or manuscript. The text is dense and covers most of the page, with some lines appearing to be part of a list or a detailed account. The script is cursive and characteristic of older Kannada writing.

[The page contains approximately 20 lines of handwritten text in Devanagari script, which is mostly illegible due to extreme blurring.]

Handwritten text in Tamil script, likely a historical document or manuscript. The text is written in a cursive style and is mostly illegible due to the image quality and the angle of the writing. It appears to be a single page of text, possibly a letter or a record.

2
June 12 1860

3
June 18 1860
K. S.

34
The first of the season
has just commenced
and the weather is
very warm and
pleasant. The
crops are all
growing well
and the
stock is
in good
condition.
The
weather is
very
warm
and
pleasant.
The
crops
are
all
growing
well
and
the
stock
is
in
good
condition.

by him into the charge
of misappropriation
of Pagoda Fund against
Mahanthu Church-
warden of Terupati,
and prays that as solicited
in his former Petition
of 6th January 1859 the
accounts of the Pagoda
which in the possession
of Mahanthu may be
be ordered to be seized
by the Government
or by the Government
themselves & he with
certain other persons
herein alluded to
may be appointed as
joint Trustees of the
Pagoda for the seasons
herein set forth
C 21 Aug 62 No 22.

Rev^d 1862 Dep^y 2309.
No 1890 of 1862
Pro: of Govt for August.
From Venkatapati
Dikshatalu Meerasi-
dar & Archakar of
Terumala Terupati
in Chendrageri Taluq
North Arcot.
Dated 25th June 1862.
Recd 16 July 1862.
with 6 Enclosures.
Submitting his former
Petitions to Government
& Board of Revenue,
brings to notice the
irregularities practised
by Narasimmapanthulu
the Deputy Magistrate
in the inquiry made
S.O. No 1848. 30 Aug 62

Revenue Department 35

No 1848-1862

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 30th Aug. 1862.

Read the following papers

Pro: of the Board of Revenue
Submitting their Pro: dated 20th
February/62 No 1224 relative to certain
Petitions complaining of the embargo
of the Tripaky Pagoda property by the
Mahanth.

Here enter 7th March/62 No 1531.

Pro: of the Board of Revenue
Submitting a letter from the Acting
Collector of North Arcot forwarding
the explanation from the Deputy Collector
Narasimma Panthulu, of certain charges
preferred against him in Petition No 1405
of 1862, with the Board's remarks
thereon.

Here enter 17th July/62 No 4628.

Petition from K. Sashagheri Rao of
Tripaky, in Chendragheri Taluq North
Arcot now residing at Madras
Submitting Memorial to His Ex^{ty} the
Govt representing the ruinous state
of the Devasthanam (Pagoda)
at Tripaky, North Arcot District.

(Here enter 19th Feb/62.)

Petition from Venkatapati Dikshat-
alu Meerasidar and Archakar of Teru-
mala Tripaky in Chendrageri Taluq
North Arcot.
Submitting his former Petitions to
Government and Board of Revenue, brings
to notice the irregularities practised by
Narasimmapanthulu the Deputy
Magistrate in the inquiry made by him
into the charge of misappropriation of Pagoda
Fund against Mahanthu Churchwarden
of Tripaky.

(Here enter 25th June/62)

With the first of
the

the papers recorded above
 the Board of Revenue to
 Submit a copy of their
 Proceedings in which after
 reading a full report from
 the Collector of North Arcot
 they arrive at the conclusion
 that the charges ^{of mismanagement & mismanagement} brought
 against the Mahant of the
 Tripahy Pagoda are the fruit
 of personal ill-will and feud.
 And judging from the report
 of the preliminary investigation
 already held, they do not
 consider that any benefit
 would result from continuing
 the inquiry.

2 With the second of
 these papers the Board forwarded
 an Explanation from the
 Deputy Collector Narasimma
 Panthulu of certain charges
 preferred against him in connec-
 tion with his investigation
 of

20th Feb^r/62 N^o

36
 of the complaint against the
 Mahant. These charges are
 repeated in the foregoing
 petitions, and the Board
 consider that after the
 explanation furnished by
 Narasimma Panthulu there is
 no occasion to ^{go into} investigate the
 matter further.

3 The Government concur
 in the opinion of the Board
 that further enquiry in either of
 the cases is unnecessary.

4 A copy of these
 Proceedings will be sent to the
 Petitioners.

J.P.

M.M.

Agd. 4/10/62

2 Copies to the Board
 1 - C. Shakhheri Row
 1 - Venkataswami Dikshatulu
 1 - P. S. Desai
 at Dikshatulu

31/10
 5

17-9-55
77-7-69
30-10-91

Embezzlement of Triputy
Pagoda property by the
Mahant.

Revenue 1862 Departt.
Pro: of Govt. for August

N. 1848.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Df 30th August 1862.

Passing orders on
papers relating to the
charges of embezzlement
and mismanagement of
the Triputy Pagoda pro-
perty by the Mahant.

N. 419 @ 423.