M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 338 Press ~~Mis.~~

234. 235

Dated 14 - 2 —1918 3

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 14th February 1863.

No. 234. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd December 1862:—

Read again letter from the Acting Inám Commissioner, dated 22nd August 1862, No. 9.
(In Cons. 23rd August 1862, No. 5,361.)

Read also the following letter from G. N. TAYLOR, Esq., Inám Commissioner, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Coimbatore, 16th October 1862, No. 12.

SIR,

1. In reply to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th ultimo, No. 5,965, I have the honor to state that no Kaúl appears to have been given for the two villages therein referred to which, under the orders of Government marginally* noted, were conferred on Shotriem tenure for three lives on Ramasawmy Mudaliar, the same individual who obtained the village of Sattigal as a permanent Jaghir.

Board to Government, 7th January 1828.
Extract Minutes of Consultation, 26th February 1828.
Government to Collector, 13th March 1827.
Mysore Resident to Collector, 16th May 1827.
Board to Collector, 6th March 1826.
Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 1st April 1828.

2. The two Shotriem villages above referred to, named Mooloor and Ooghana, are however included in the grant given for the permanent Jaghir, a copy of which has already been forwarded to the Board, and by which the right to the Moturpha has been conferred on the Jaghirdar. The correspondence which passed regarding the grant as above quoted will furnish any further information which the Board may require on the subject.

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, with reference to their Proceedings, dated 2nd August 1862, No. 1,644, Revenue Department.

2. The two grants referred to by the late Acting Inám Commissioner were made to Govindoo Row and his heirs, and to T. Ramasawmy Mudali, the builder of the Sevasamudram, bridge and his heirs. The Sanad issued in the first case is forthcoming. The draft proposed to be issued in the second case is identical in form, but was not actually issued, as a change in the form was at the time under contemplation, and eventually, it would seem from Mr. Taylor's letter, no Sanad was given. There can however be no doubt that the two grants were intended to be of precisely similar nature.

3. The Board from consideration of the terms of the Sanad and circumstances of these cases, entirely concur with Government in opinion that there is no reason to treat them differently from similar grants elsewhere or to consult the wishes of the Ryots as to the enfranchisement of the grants from liability to lapse. The provisions of the Sanad for securing the rights of existing occupants in the village lands, and limiting the Shrotriemdar's demands to the Government demand assessed on their lands, though more precise in terms than usual, are in no way different in spirit, for in no Inám grant did the grantee receive or indeed had the Government power to confer more than this in cases where the lands were already in the possession of Ryot proprietors. And similarly the power to reclaim the waste, saving all preferential rights, is identical with that conferred by other Inám grants.

4. The Board therefore see no reason for hesitating to deal with these two Shotriem grants under Section XV of the Inám Rules as usual.

5. The other parts of Mr. Blair's instructions under reference appear unobjectionable.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed.) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 235. ORDER THEREON, 14th February 1863, No. 338.

1. With his letter of the 21st June 1862, No. 38, the late Acting Inám Commissioner, Mr. Blair, submitted for the approval of Government a draft of instructions, which he proposed to issue for the guidance of the Deputy Collector deputed to investigate the Ináms of the Coimbatore District. In paragraph 5 Mr. Blair observed that in the case of certain entire Inám villages the grants so expressly convey a right only to the Government share of the

investigate the Inams
of the Coimbatore Dist.

revenue, that it would be desirable in any extension of the period of the grants by enfranchisement, to consult the wishes of the cultivating Ryots.

2. As the grants under which the above villages are held were not before Government, and there appeared no reason why the Ryots should be consulted regarding the disposal of these cases, inasmuch as their rights would remain the same whether the Mailweram or Government share is paid to Government or to the grantees, the papers connected with the subject were referred* to the Board of Revenue with a request that they would examine these grants and submit their opinion on this and the other portions of the draft Rules.

* G. O. No 1,644, 2nd August 1862.

3. From the reply of the Board of Revenue recorded above, it appears that the entire Inám villages in question were granted to one Govinda Rau and his heirs, and to T. Ramaswamy Mudelly, the builder of the Sevasamoodram bridge, and his heirs. The Sanad issued in the first mentioned case is forthcoming, but none appears to have been granted in the other, as a change in the form was at that time under contemplation. The draft Sanad proposed to be issued in this latter case is however in existence, and is reported by the Board to be identical in form. The Board further observe that the two grants were intended to be of precisely similar nature, and that "the provisions of the Sanads for securing the rights of existing occupants in the village "lands, and limiting the Shotriemdar's demands to the Government demand assessed on their "lands, though more precise in terms than usual, are in no way different in spirit."

4. On a consideration therefore of the terms of the Sanads and circumstances of these cases, the Board entirely agree with Government in opinion that there is no reason to treat them differently from similar grants elsewhere or to consult the wishes of the Ryots as suggested by the late Acting Inám Commissioner.

5. Under these circumstances the Governor in Council directs that the above Shotriem grants be dealt with under Section XV of the Inám Rules as usual, and that paragraph 5 of the draft Rules be modified accordingly.

6. The other portions of Mr. Blair's instructions, which the Board consider unobjectionable, are approved.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

No 338 Revenue Dept

Proceedings of the Madras Government 14th Feby 63

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue 23rd Dec 1862 No

with his letter of the 21st June 1862 No 38 the late Acting Inam Com Mr Blair submitted for the approval of Govt a Draft of instructions, which he proposed to issue for the guidance of the Dept Collector deputed to investigate the Inams of the Coimbatore Dist

In para 5 Mr Blair observed that in the case of certain Entire Inam Villages the grants do expressly convey a right only to the Govt share of the Revenue, that it would be desirable in any extension of the period of the grant by enfranchisement, to consult the wishes of the cultivating ryots.—

As the grants under which the Whole villages are held were not before Govt, and there appeared no reason why the ryots should

be consulted regarding the disposal of these cases, in so much as their rights would remain the same whether the Mairwaram or Govt share is held to Govt or to the proprietor

G.O. No 1644 2 nd Aug/62

the papers connected with the subject were referred to the Board of Revenue with a request that they would examine these grants and submit their opinion on this and the other questions of the draft

rules.—

From the reply of the Board of Revenue recorded above, it appears that the entire Guam villages in question were granted to one Govinda Rau and his heirs, and to T. Rama Swamy Mudelly the builder of the Levee: Samoodram Pillay and his heirs.— The Sanad issued in the first mentioned case is forthcoming, but none appears to have been granted in the other, as a

4

change in the form was at that time under contemplation. The draft Sanad proposed to be issued in the latter case is however in existence and is reported by the Board to be identical in form. The Board further observe that the two grants were intended to effect similar nature and that "the provisions of the canons for "securing the rights "of existing occupants

in the village lands,
and limiting the Sh.
Mirundar's demands
to the Govt demand
assessed on their
lands, tho' more
precise in terms
than usual, are in
no way different
in spirit".

On a considera-
tion therefore of
the terms of the Sanads
and circumstances
of these cases, the
Board entirely
agree with Govt in
opinion that there
is no reason to treat
them differently
from similar grants
elsewhere or to con-
sult the wishes of
the ryots as ~~about~~
suggested by the Coch
Acting Inam Com^r

Under these cir-
cumstances the Govt
in Council direct
that the above Sho-
lapur grants be
dealt with under
section XV of the
Inam rules as
usual and that para
of the draft rules be mo-
dified accordingly.

The other portion
of the Blain^s in-
structions, which

the Board cannot
deem unobjectionable, are appro-
able, are appro-

Revenue 1863 Dept.
Pro: of Govt. for February.

No. 338.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dt. 14 February 1863.

From the Act. Inam Commr. of
18 April 1864 ct. to Pro.

Revenue Letter to Collr. Dept. 15
Inam Commr. 5

Shrotrium Villages
of Ellooloor Doghang in
Coimbatore ordered to be
dealt with under Section
XV of the Inam Rules.

No. 234 & 236