

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 652	Press ~~Mis.~~
401-402	
Dated	28. 3. 1852.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th March 1862.*

No. 401. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st February 1862, No. 1,256 :—

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Vellum, 18th January 1862, No. 18.

SIR,

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 2,063 of 1861, I have the honor to report on the subject therein contained, as briefly as the nature of the case will admit.

2. The circumstances connected with Petitioner's claim are as follows :—In the year 1820 a large number of villages in this District, were sold by public auction for arrears of revenue, but it having afterwards been discovered that they were fraudulently purchased by the Native Revenue servants in the names of other parties, the sale was cancelled, the villages were re-

Board's Proceedings 19th June 1826, paragraph 68.
Proceedings of Government, 11th July in paragraph 15.

attached, and eventually made over to the original proprietors, and the purchase money paid by the public servants, was ordered to be refunded as will be seen from the orders of the Board and Government marginally noted.

3. This Petitioner is one of the grandsons of the then Head Sarishtadár Gundapandit, who purchased at the sale and in the manner above-mentioned, the two villages* noted in the margin, and the subject matter of his Petition is, that his share of the purchase money, as also of the usufruct of the villages for the period they were held under attachment, may be refunded to him.

* Ganapati Kottagam and Lakshmanam Kottagam.

4. This case has already been fully inquired into, and from the records it appears that the two villages above-mentioned were originally purchased in the names of two individuals, from whom they were afterwards taken possession of by Gundapandit, under formal deeds of sale.

	RS.	A.	P.
Purchase money.....	1,397	10	8
Mirasi Tanduvaram, the proceeds of the landlord's share realized during the period of attachment.....	1,016	0	10
	2,413	11	6

The amount as particularized in the margin is, therefore, due to this family, in consequence of the villages having been re-transferred to the original proprietors, and it has been ascertained, that among the several members of the family of the late Gundapandit this Petitioner and his paternal uncle one Srinivasa Row, are under the terms of the division bond subsequently made, the parties entitled

to receive the said amount in equal shares. It has further been ascertained, that the other members of the family have no objection to the same being paid to the Petitioner and his uncle above named.

5. The only objection then to the discharge of the claim in question is the length of time which has been allowed to elapse in bringing it forward. Although the final orders of Government cancelling the sale of the villages, and directing them to be made over to the original proprietors, were passed in 1826, they were carried into effect only in 1831; and the sanction of Government for refunding to the purchasers also the usufruct realized from the villages during the period they were held under attachment, was

† Board's Proceedings, 9th November 1846.

only received in 1846.† No limitation of period seems to have been fixed for the adjustment of these claims, but except in one case in which the same was subsequently discharged in 1859, on special sanction,‡ no refund of the purchase money appears to have taken place since 1840, and no payment of usufruct since 1852.

‡ Board's Proceedings, 14th June 1859, No. 2,259.

In the case under report the claim was for the first time brought forward in 1852, and was fully inquired into, but it was rejected by the then Collector Mr. Bishop, as too late, and it was in reference to the order thus passed by that gentleman, that I gave my Endorsement of the 10th May last, and from which the Petition under report is an appeal.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th March 1862.*

6. These are the facts of the case, and it is for the Board to decide, whether, under the circumstances above detailed, Petitioner's claim is one which at this distant date can be entertained or not.

7. It may not be out of place here to state that out of the total number of 33 villages, which were sold in public auction in 1820, and the sale of which was cancelled, the claims to the refund of the purchase money and usufruct yet remain unadjusted in the cases of eight entire villages, including the two now in question, as also of portions of four more villages, already partly adjusted, and the aggregate amount to be refunded, including both the items of purchase money and usufruct is Rupees 12,961-8-5. There are no traces on the records of this office, of any further claims to the said amount having ever been preferred, besides the one now under report, as also another lately preferred on behalf of the heirs of a former Sarishtadar of the Sub-Collector's office, one Vencatappa, and who was one of the purchasers at the sale above alluded to. In this latter case the parties interested have not yet appeared in person.

The Board resolve to submit the case to Government, with their recommendation that the Collector be authorized to disburse to the Petitioner and his uncle the sum of Rupees 2,413-11-6, to which amount the Board consider him to be entitled, and for the refund of which to his family sanction has been already accorded in Government Order, under date 11th July 1826, No. 438, and 27th October 1846, No. 1,967.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 402.

ORDER THEREON, 25th March 1862, No. 652.

Sanctioned.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

No. 2259.

EXTRACT from the PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 14th June 1859.
Read letter from the Collector of Tanjore, dated 9th April 1859, No. 82.

(In Con. 12th April 1859, No. 1631.)

As it appears from the above letter that repayment of the purchase money &c. in question to the parties entitled to receive it, has for the last ten years been delayed solely by the non-production by them of the original certificate granted by the Collector to the purchaser acknowledging the receipt of the purchase money, and declaring him entitled to the possession of the lands sold, which certificate the parties declare was delivered to a former Naib Serishtadar now deceased, though neither it, nor the records of the case can now be found, the Board authorize the Collector to disburse the money, on execution of such a Deed of acquittance as is described by him, and direct that a note of the cancelment of the certificate be at the same time made in all the public accounts in which any entry of the sale and transfer of the village may have been originally made.

2. Ordered that the following Endorsement be passed on Petitions Nos. 1904, 2779 and 4211 of 1857 and Nos. 144 and 1280 of 1859;—

"Petitioner is referred to the Collector who has received the Board's instructions in this matter."

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Sub Secretary.

To

W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore.
M. S. copy of Endorsement to Petitioner.

2. ~~Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a historical document or ledger entry. The text is written on aged, slightly stained paper. It begins with "2. 1844" and continues with several lines of text, including "1844" and "1845". The handwriting is dense and somewhat difficult to decipher due to the cursive style and fading.~~

~~Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a historical document or ledger entry. The text is written on aged, slightly stained paper. It begins with "1844" and continues with several lines of text, including "1845" and "1846". The handwriting is dense and somewhat difficult to decipher due to the cursive style and fading.~~

2045

not

2nd of June

4-10-60

[Faint handwritten text in Devanagari script, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through.]

7

[Faint handwritten text in English, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through.]

Most Honored Sir,

I respectfully beg to submit

that my Ranga Rao and my uncle Srimad

Rao presented a Petition to your honor's

office in April 1852 praying that the sum

of two thousand and odd Rupees due to them

on account of the sale of the Kherazi Land

of the village of Gunapatty Cotta

in the District of Chhurren Colla may

be paid to them. It appears that the

sum of two thousand and odd Rupees

is due to them.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Petition was referred for report addressed
an Arjee in September of the same year stating
that the my father and uncle's claim was
good but no final orders appear then to
have been passed on the subject nor the
money paid to them. My father died 2
years ago. Under these circumstances I
beg to request most respectfully that your
honor will be pleased to be so kind as
to order the payment of my share of the
said claim. I beg to remain
Your most obedient and very humble
servant

Enthoona the Power

I respectfully beg to submit that
my father Runga Rao & my uncle Sreeni
Rao presented a Petition to your Honor's Office
in the year 1852 praying that the sum of two thousand
800 Rupees due to them on account of the
sale of the Mirasi Zondoovarium of the village
of Ganihuty Cottagum & Lathurman Cottagum
might be paid to them. It appears
that the Collector of Coimbatore to whom
the Petition was referred for report addressed
an Arjee in September of the same year stating
that my father's & uncle's claim was good but
no final orders appear then to have been passed
on the subject nor the money paid to them.

my father died 2 years ago. Under these circumstances I beg to request most respectfully that your Honor will be pleased to be satisfied as to the payment of my share of the said amount.

I humbly beg leave to state that I addressed a Petition to your Honor in the month of June for the same subject and no order as yet passed on it.

Most Honored Sir

September 1800. Your most obedient servant

Mayavaram

Bartholomew P. P.

2
No 1063
17/6/61
J. P. Cullen

To the Honorable the President & members of the Board of Revenue

The humble Petition of
V. Yathunatha Row son of
Runga Row resident at
Mayavaram in the Tanjore
District respectfully

Sheweth,

That your petitioner's grand father bought certain villages in the District of Tanjore at a public auction held by revenue authorities which was subsequently cancelled by Govt that in consequence two thousand & odd rupees became due to the petitioner's family by Govt being the amount of sale money & the produce of the lands; I request That your petitioners father & himself have been demanding the said amount for

the last 10 years without obtaining any orders from the Collector who however has on 1881 favoured the petitioner with the endorsement ~~here enclosed~~.

3. That your petitioner is not aware of any other order than this endorsement, it is stated therein that his claims were dismissed as barred by the Law of Limit in 1853

That your petitioner begs to urge against this order that the law is inapplicable to revenue affairs & that Govt has on many occasions (even as late as in 1855 in case of Manellore Rengappa Naik) redressed complaints as old as 30 years

That the Collector does not & cannot state that your petitioner's claims are false & that your petitioner therefore prays you

Honored Board to reverse the Collectors order & pay to the petitioner the amount due to him & your petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

V. Lakshminath Rao

16th July 1861
Mayaveram.

[Faint handwritten notes and signatures in the bottom right corner, including dates like 1881 and 1882.]

1881

Subscribers

W. A. F. 4-20

Forwarded to the
Collector for duty report.

By Order

Public Auction

10030718
From J. Wetmore
Do you all
do nothing but
have you in
the last 20
days
See by 20 July 64
with 2000
See 2

stating that
 the said contribution re-
 ferred to in the enclosed
 No. 8 is not applicable
 to the premium rates, by
 reason of its being
 the surplus of the
 said money and the
 produce of the lands
 held by certain Revenue

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or name, on the left page.

Handwritten text at the top of the right page, including a date "22/2/53" and some illegible notes.

Handwritten text in the middle of the right page, starting with "The first..." and continuing with several lines of notes.

Handwritten text in the lower middle of the right page, starting with "The second..." and continuing with several lines of notes.

Handwritten text at the bottom of the right page, starting with "The third..." and continuing with several lines of notes.

Memorandum

The purchase by Public Servants under fictitious names of lands sold in Bangalore under Decrees of Court or for arrears of Revenue has been the subject of much correspondence since 1812. The Board of Revenue in 1813 directed that all the servants who had made such purchases be dismissed and that suits be instituted for annulling such of those sales as admitted of legal proof. Papers which subsequently came before the Board and were reviewed in their Proceedings of 19th June 1826 shew that not

Handwritten notes in a different script, possibly Kannada, covering the left page of the notebook. The text is dense and covers most of the page area.

notwithstanding this
order a considera-
ble portion of the
lands sold in Lau-
-jore for arrears of
Revenue were pur-
-chased by the Public
Servants. This was
particularly the case
during W. Cotton's
administration of the
District. While pre-
-vious to 1820, when
W. Cotton was appoint-
-ed no more than 34
valies consisting of
four lots were pur-
-chased by three public
servants, no less than
28 lots comprising
1230 valies were purchased
by

by them between 1820
and 1823 of that ad-
-ministration. The
Head Sheristadar
Jondopunt first set
the example by purchas-
-ing 30 valies and the
others soon followed it.
The chief of them was
Narakary Rao, Sahib-
-dar of Sivajy who
purchased 501 valies and
became a landholder
paying to Govt Rs. 17,479
per annum.

2. These purchases
were rendered much more
objectionable than they
would otherwise be, by
the very extensive sales
of lands during W.
Cotton's time, many of
which were for
absolute demands long
dormant

dormant, and a great
part of which was either
actually emitted by
Government or recom-
mended for recom-
mission, and that too
against a positive
prohibition of the
sale of land even
for recent arrears con-
firmed by orders from
England just before
Mr. Cotton took charge.
Another remarkable
feature in these trans-
actions was the near
relationship of the Head
Sheristadar to many of the
chief purchasers including
Karahary Rao and their
interest which he therefore
had in those sales. There
was also evidence that
while the other servants
paid about 44 Rs per day
Karahary Rao paid only 20 Rs.

Questions

13
3 Questions were
raised as to the com-
petency of Government
annulling the sales
without an order from
a Court of Justice.
The Board however
annulled the sales to
the public servants on
the grounds, that the
requirements of the
Law that the sanction
of the Board of Revenue
should be obtained from
them, and that the ad-
vertisement should
be published in the
office of the Board of
Revenue have not been
attended to and ordered
that the purchase mo-
ney amounting to Rs.
44,104-15-10 1/4 be re-
paid to the individuals
who

who bought the lands
which must revert
to their former proprie-
tors. The Head Seris-
kadar, Gondo Pant and
his Deputy, Nunga Rao
were ordered to be im-
mediately dismissed.

It was then that restric-
tion was placed on Public

Servants purchasing and
acquiring lands.

These orders were approved in paras 11 & 15 of the
letter to the Board of 11 July
1826.

were not carried into
effect until the close
of July 12th or 1830/31.

Certain sums ^{which} were col-
lected from the purchasers

on account of the Jom-
doorwami or Sacred

Lords' share in the
produce of these lands

amounted in 1846 to
Rupees 458. The Board
stated

Order of 27 Oct 1846 No 1067

stated that the pur-
chases from whom
those sums were col-
lected were properly
entitled to them and
recommended these
returns. Sanction was
accordingly granted.


20/3/62

Vide Board's letter of
21 Sept 1846

*Abstract of the papers
regarding the fraudulent
purchase of lands by public
servants in Tanjore in 1820
and the three following years -*

72/10/10

No. 1,256.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 21st February 1862.

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Vellum, 18th January 1862, No. 18:—

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 2,063 of 1861, I have the honor to report on the subject therein contained, as briefly as the nature of the case will admit.

2. The circumstances connected with Petitioner's claim are as follows:—In the year 1820 a large number of villages in this District, were sold by public auction for arrears of revenue, but it having afterwards been discovered that they were fraudulently purchased by the Native Revenue servants in the names of other parties, the sale was cancelled, the villages were re-attached, and eventually made over to the original proprietors, and the purchase money paid by the public servants, was ordered to be refunded as will be seen from the orders of the Board and Government marginally noted.

Board's Proceedings 19th June 1826, paragraph 68.
Proceedings of Government 11th July in paragraph 15.

3. This Petitioner is one of the grandsons of the then Head Serishtadar Gundapandit, who purchased at the sale and in the manner above-mentioned, the two villages* noted in the margin, and the subject matter of his Petition is, that his share of the purchase money, as also of the usufruct of the villages for the period they were held under attachment, may be refunded to him.

4. This case has already been fully inquired into, and from the records it appears that the two villages above-mentioned were originally purchased in the names of two individuals, from whom they were afterwards taken possession of by Gundapandit, under formal deeds of sale. The amount

	RS.	A.	P.
Purchase money.....	1,397	10	8
Mirasi Tunduvaram, the proceeds of the land-lord's share realized during the period of attachment.....	1,016	0	10
	2,413	11	6

as particularized in the margin is, therefore, due to this family, in consequence of the villages having been re-transferred to the original proprietors, and it has been ascertained, that among the several members of the family of the late Gundapandit this Petitioner and his paternal uncle one Srinivasa Row, are under the terms of the division bond subsequently made, the parties entitled to receive the said amount in equal shares. It has

further been ascertained, that the other members of the family have no objection to the same being paid to the Petitioner and his uncle above named.

5. The only objection then to the discharge of the claim in question is the length of time which has been allowed to elapse in bringing it forward. Although the final orders of Government cancelling the sale of the villages, and directing them to be made over to the original proprietors, were passed in 1826, they were carried into effect only in 1831; and the sanction of Government for refunding to the purchasers also the usufruct realized from the villages during the period they

were held under attachment, was only received in 1846.* No limitation of period seems to have been fixed for the adjustment of these claims, but except in one case in which the same was subsequently discharged in 1859, on special sanction,† no refund of the purchase money appears to have taken

place since 1840, and no payment of usufruct since 1852. In the case under report the claim was for the first time brought forward in 1852, and was fully inquired into, but it was rejected by the then Collector Mr. Bishop, as too late, and it was in reference to the order thus passed by that gentleman, that I gave my Endorsement of the 10th May last, and from which the Petition under report is an appeal.

6. These are the facts of the case, and it is for the Board to decide, whether, under the circumstances above detailed, Petitioner's claim is one which at this distant date can be entertained or not.

7. It may not be out of place here to state that out of the total number of 33 villages, which were sold in public auction in 1820, and the sale of which was cancelled, the claims to the refund of the purchase money and usufruct yet remain unadjusted in the cases of 8 entire villages, including the two now in question, as also of portions of four more villages, already partly adjusted, and the aggregate amount to be refunded, including both the items of purchase money and usufruct is Rupees 12,961-8-5. There are no traces on the records of this office, of any further claims to the said amount having ever been preferred, besides the one now under report, as also another lately preferred on behalf of the heirs of a former Serishtadar of the Sub-Collector's office, one Vencatappa, and who was one of the purchasers at the sale above alluded to. In this latter case the parties interested have not yet appeared in person.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

The Board resolve to submit the case to Government, with their recommendation that the Collector be authorized to disburse to the Petitioner and his uncle the sum of Rupees 2,413-11-6, to which amount the Board consider him to be entitled, and for the refund of which to his family sanction has been already accorded in Government Order, under date 11th July 1826, No. 438, and 27th October 1846, No. 1,067.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. D. Subell

Sub-Secretary.

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

Copy to W. M. Cadell, Esq., Collector of Tanjore.

Sanctioned - No. 652 -

Exd. J. Wright.

*The Govt decline to sanction pay-
ment of the sum claimed after such
lengthened delay. The parties must have
been well enough aware of their claims and
their application was rejected by the Collr
in 1852 as then too late.*

*In reply to the Bd of Rev. P. 11/10/52
3-4 Decr. 1852
Shorey, Esq. & J. Wright*

*The money
is already due & to
be paid by the
Collector of Tanjore.*

*Submitting a letter from the Collector of
Tanjore reporting on Petition No 2063, of
1861, and recommending that he be authorized
to disburse to Petitioner Rupees 2413-11-6, to
which he is entitled.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

No. 506.

Department

1862.

W. D. Subell

Dated 21st February 1863.

Despatched, 27/2/63.

Received, 27/2/63.

No. 4,219.

*On 11 July 1826 No. 438 to 19
12/10/1846 No. 1067.*

3

Key marked 960

*W. D. Subell
No. 652 - 25 March 1862*