13/8/41 RH
8330 12H C11

M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1536 Press ~~Mis.~~

826.317

Dated 27-10-~~19~~ 1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 316. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd September 1863, No. 6,030.

Read the following letters:—

From G. S. FORBES, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chetterpur, 27th August 1863, No. 163.

SIR,

1. With reference to the Endorsement on Petition No. 78 of 1863 (herewith returned), I have the honor to report for the information of Government, that the Inám claimed by the Petitioner Mosalakunti Buchamma is included in No. 56 in the Report on lapsed Ináms for the second quarter of 1852.

2. In their Order of the 30th August 1853, No. 988, the Government authorized the resumption of that portion of the Inám which had been transferred by the widow of the original grantee to one G. Teroomala Chailu, and bestowed by the latter for the endowment of the temple of Stri Jugganathsawmi of Itchapur. The other portion of Inám, which was in the enjoyment of the Petitioner's husband M. Ramana, who obtained possession of it in virtue of a will executed by the widow of the original grantee, was not ordered by Government to be resumed. But in an order issued by the then Collctor, Mr. Onslow, to the Tahsildar of Itchapur on the 4th October 1853, No. 56, I find that this portion of the Inám also was ordered by that Officer to be resumed on the death of the Petitioner's husband, and it was so resumed.

3. As no authority is extant for this resumption, it was probably a mistake, and the Order of Government will be required as to the course now to be taken.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

From the same Officer, dated 28th August 1863, No. 165.

SIR,

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 304 of 1863, I have the honor to report for the information of Government that the Inám land claimed by the Petitioner is included in item No. 61 in the Report on lapsed Ináms for the 2nd quarter of 1852. It having been represented to the Commissioner of Northern Circars by the then Collector Mr. Onslow, that the produce of the Inám had been divided in equal shares between Jaganadham, grandson of the original grantee and his nephews (brother's sons) Venkatachalum, Chellapilla Row, and Balaram Kristnamah. The Government, in their Order of the 22nd August 1853, No. 877, authorized the resumption of that portion of the Inám which should fall to the lot of G. Jaganadham, leaving the remaining portion to be enjoyed by his nephews. These orders were duly carried out. The Petitioners now claim 22½ Burnums or 4½ Acres of the entire Inám on the strength of a Deed of Sale executed to N. Buchamma, the 1st Petitioner, on the 26th December 1838 by G. Jaganadham, grandson of the original grantee, and state that one of them being a woman, and the other a minor they were unable to advance any claim in time. This plea is quite inadmissible, for the father of the second Petitioner and son-in-law of the first was and is still holding the post of District Munsiff of Berhampoor, and could not have been in ignorance of the resumption of this Inám.

2. It further appears that the order above quoted allows to the three nephews of Jaganadham lands to which they had no claim, for, from the Inám accounts of Fasli 1239, as well as the Paymash account it appears that the share of their father G. Govindaram, brother of Jaganadham had been already sold to one Caloor Sooba Row on the 27th April 1823, who is still in undisturbed enjoyment of it. Hence Venkatachalum, Chellapilla Row, and Balaram Kristnamah had no interest whatever in the remaining portion of the Inám which was in the enjoyment of their father's brother G. Jaganadham.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. Resolved that these letters be submitted to Government with reference to the Deputy Secretary's Endorsements dated respectively 20th March and 15th April 1863, on the Petitions to which the letters refer.

2. The Petitioner in Petition No. 78 of 1863, appears to have been hardly dealt with. The Inám which she claims was entered as No. 56 in the report of lapsed Ináms for the second quarter of 1852, and eventually it was ordered that 1 A. and 10 G. should be resumed, the remainder, which exceeded 12 Acres, being left in the possession of Petitioner's husband. On his death, however, this portion of the Inám was resumed without authority by the Collector, and the Board recommend that it be restored to Petitioner, subject to such quit-rent as she may be required to pay under the Inám rules.

3. The Petitioners in No. 304 of 1863 are not, it would appear, deserving of similar consideration. They claim a portion of Inám under an alleged deed of sale executed in 1838, so that at the time of resumption (1853) they had been in possession only 15 years, even supposing their assertions to be correct.

4. With reference to the statement made in the 2nd paragraph of the letter in which the Collector reports on this Petition, Mr. Forbes will be requested to report how the portion of the Inám to which he refers has been disposed of by the Inám Commissioner.

No. 317. ORDER THEREON, 27th October 1863, No. 1,936.

1. In the foregoing Proceedings the Board report upon Petitions 78 and 304 of 1863.

2. In Petition 78 one Mosalakunti Buchamma applied for the restoration of an Inám land in Belgaum, appertaining to the Talook of Itchapur, which was, she stated, bequeathed by Goomoodala Ramalakshmi in 1825 to her late husband Ramana Pantulu, and resumed under orders of the Commissioner Northern Circars passed in August 1853.

3. Petitioner based her claim on the fact that certain other Inám land which had at the same time been alienated by the abovementioned Goomoodala Ramalakshmi to Coravichendranna and resumed in 1855 had, on appeal, been restored to Coravi Ramasastri, heir of Coravichendranna.

4. In forwarding this Petition to the Collector for report, the Government noticed* that the Inám last referred to had been restored under their Order dated 22nd January 1861, No. 152, passed on paragraph 7 Board's Proceedings, dated 15th December 1860, No. 5,904.

* Endorsement dated 20th March 1863.

5. From the report† now furnished by the Collector it would appear that the resumption of the Inám claimed by M. Buchamma was a mistake, and it is not therefore necessary to compare her claim with that referred to in the preceding paragraph.

† 27th August 1863, No. 163.

6. In the Report on lapsed Ináms in Ganjam for the 2nd quarter of 1852, an entry was made (No. 56) of wet-land in extent 13 A. 18 C. 3 V. 2 C., situated in Cavetah Cundum, Belgaum, whereof 1 A. 10 C. had been until the date of his death, on 22nd May 1850, in the possession of Govindoo Teroomala Charlu, who had obtained it as a charitable gift forty years previously from Goomoodala Ramalakshmi, widow of the original grantee, and who shortly before his death bequeathed it to the temple of Stri Jugganathswami at Itchapur. The remainder of the Inám, amounting to 12 A. 8 C. 3 V. 2 C., was described as being in the enjoyment of Mosalakunti Ramana Pantulu, adopted son of the abovementioned widow.

Reviewed in Ex. Mins. Cons. 2nd August 1853, No. 577, Revenue Department.

7. This lapse report seems to have been made in reference to the portion above described as in possession of Teroomala Charlu, and the resumption of which was recommended by the Collector. The Commissioner Northern Circars, however, in calling for further information was evidently under the impression that the resumption of the *whole* Inám had been recommended. In his subsequent report‡

‡ Dated 4th August 1853, No. 79.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 27th October 1863.

to Government this mistake was rectified, and the order passed thereon (30th August 1853, No. 988,) clearly limited the resumption to the extent (1 A. 10 C.) "lately held by Teroomala Charlu."

8. Mr. Forbes now brings to notice that in an Order* issued by the then Collector on (apparently) the receipt of the Extract Minutes Consultation above referred to, the second and larger portion of the Inám was *also* directed to be resumed on the death of M. Ramana Pantulu, the present Petitioner's husband, and accordingly it was so resumed.

* Dated 4th October 1853, No. 56

9. The Government agree with the Board in considering this a very hard case. Petitioner, if really the person she represents herself to be, has been deprived of her late husband's land without any authority. It should immediately be restored to her, subject of course to investigation, &c., by the Inám Department, and the proceeds which have accrued since resumption should be made good together with interest.

10. Petitioner will be informed, through the Petition Department, that orders in her case have been communicated to the Collector to whom she should apply.

11. The Board will report the amount to be paid to her under this order.

12. With regard to the claim set up by Petitioners in No. 304, the Government agree with the Board that they are entitled to no consideration. The following endorsement will be passed on that Petition:—

"The Government have received a report from the Collector in this case and find that "Petitioners' claim is inadmissible."

13. The report called for in paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings should, when received, be submitted for the information of Government.

(True Extract.)

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ Collector of Ganjam.
Endorsement to Petitioner.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Rev Dept

No. 1936. 3

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 27th October 1863.

Read the following Proc^a

of the Board of Revenue

Submitting letter

from the Collector of Ganjam

re porting on Petition No 78 (Here enter 23 Sept^r/63 No 6030)

of 1863 regarding certain Inam

land claimed by the Petitioner

1 In the foregoing

Proceedings the Board report

upon Petitions 78 and 304 of 1863

2 In Petition 78

one Movalatinnle Buch-

-amma applied for the

restoration of an Inam

land in Belgaum, apper

-taining to the Taluq of Sh-

-chapur, which was, she

stated, bequeathed by Lin-

-mooda la Ramalakshmi

in 1825 to her late husband

Ramana

manda Pantuluvand
cumed under orders of
the Commissioner Northern
Circars passed in August
1853.

3 Petitioner based
her claim on the fact, that a
certain other Inam land which
had at the second time been
eliminated by the above men-
tioned Commordala Rama-
lakshmi to Coravichen-
drama and resumed in
1855 had on appeal been
restored to Coravi Rama-
lakshmi their of Coravichen-
drama.

4 In forwarding
the Petition to the Collector
for report the Government
noticed that the inam last
referred to had been
restored under their
order dt 22d January 1861
No 152 passed on appeal
by Board's

* 27 Aug 1863 No 163.

Received in Gt Mint Cons 2d
Aug 1853 No 577 Rd

* Endorsement dt 20 March
1863.

Board's Proceedings dated
15 December 1860 No 5904 -

5. From the report
now furnished by the
Collector it would appear
that the resumption of
the Inam claimed by
M Buchamma was a
mistake & it is not
therefore necessary to com-
pare her claim with that
referred to in the preceding
paragraph -

6 In the Report re-
specting Inams investigated
for the 2d Quarter of 1852
an entry was made of 1.36
of wet land in extent
C V C
13 - 18 - 3 - 2 situated in
Cavelatu Cumdum Tal
gaum whereof 1 - 12 - 0 had
been resumed by the date of
his death on 22d May
1850 in the possession
of Gowndoo Veroniata
Charlu

charities who had obtained
it as a charitable gift
40 years previously from
Koonoodala Ramalakshmi
widow of the original
grantee and who shortly
before her death bequeathed
it to the temple of Shri
Juggannathaswamy at Mocha
-pore - The remainder of
the Inam amounting to
A. C. V. C.
12 - 8 - 3 - 2 was described
as being in the enjoyment
of Mozala Kunti Ramana
Pantulu adopted son of the
above mentioned widow
7. ... This Lapse report
seems to have been made
in reference to the portion
above described as in po
-session of Teronala Charla
and the resumption of
which was recommended
by the Collector - The Com
-missioner Northern Circar
however

* d/ 8 Augt/53 No. 79.

* d/ 10 Oct/53 No 56.

however, in calling for further
information was evidently
under the impression that
the resumption of the
whole Inam had been
recommended. In the
subsequent report to Govt.
this mistake was rectified
and the order passed
thereon (30 August 1853
No 988) clearly limited the
resumption to the extent
(I- 10) "lately held by Tero
-nala Charlu."

8 ... Mr Forbes now
brings to notice that in an
order issued by the Assn
Collector on (apparently)
the receipt of the Dr Mem
-oir above referred to, the
second and larger portion
of the Inam was also di-
-rected to be resumed on
the death of M. Ramana
Pantulu the present Petitioner's
husband

husband, and accordingly it was so presumed.

7. The Government agree with the Board, in considering this a very hard case. Petitioner, of really the person she represents herself to be, has been deprived of her late husband's land without any authority. It should immediately be restored to her, subject of course to investigation &c. by the Inam Department, and the proceeds which have accrued since resumption should be made good to her together with interest.

10 Petitioner will be informed through the Petitioner's Department that orders in her case have been communicated to the Collector to whom she should apply.

6

9 The Board will report the amount to be paid to her under this order.

12 With regard to the claim set up by Petitioners in No. 304 the Government agree with the Board that they are entitled to no consideration. The following endorsement will be passed on that Petition.

"The Government have received a report from "the Collector in this case "and find that Petitioners "claim is inadmissible."

13 The report called for in para 4 of the Board's Proceedings should when received be submitted for the information of Govt.

CGM

55/6

14 Copies Letter Bd of Rev Sept 29 & 62
1 — Collr of Ganjam's
endorsement to Pr
1 — Petition Petr Sept 28 & Pr
in Mss Dept

Revenue 1863 Dehart.
Pro: of Govt for October
-V: 1936.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 2nd October 1863.

Pro: Bd of Revenue dt 15th Sept 1863
& No 1165 in Do:

Petition from Moorala,
Kanti Subbamma of Gunjam
for the registration of an
Inam land in Belgaum
dist dismissed.

Pro: No. order No. 877
2-8-53
588
30-8-53
15-
-1-

No 316 & 317.

22 Oct 1863 R 24