

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1761	Press
		Mis.
	368. 361	
Dated	26 - 6 -	1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
26th September 1864.*

No. 360. Read the following letter from W. T. BLAIR, Esq., Acting Inám Commissioner, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Coimbatore, 18th August 1864, No. 65:—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to submit, for the orders of Government, the following circumstances connected with the Shrotriém village of Ayanellore, situated in the Ponnéri Talook of the Madras District.

* From Board to Collector, 22nd August 1822, conveying previous correspondence regarding grant of the village.
From Board to Collector, 13th December 1827, conveying sanction of Government, 7th December 1827, for the grant of Ayanellore Shrotriém.
" Collector to Board, 14th February 1828.
" Board to Collector, 25th February 1828.

2. This Shrotriém, it will be seen from the correspondence marginally* quoted, was granted by the Madras Government to one Barúr Venkatráyudu, Head Accountant of the Mint office, without any definite terms in regard to its dura-

tion. Subsequently, on the death of the grantee, the Government, in continuing the Shrotriém to his adopted son, Venkatnarasaiya, restricted it to his life. This last individual, aged 48 years, appeared during the investigation of the Deputy Collector in October 1833, and solicited the enfranchisement of the Shrotriém upon the terms applicable to life grants; but his request could not be then complied with in consequence of the prohibition to the enfranchisement of life tenures in the Madras District, contained in the Government Order of the 15th October 1831. This prohibition was afterwards removed upon the representation made in my letter of the 18th April 1864, No. 28. Meanwhile, the Shrotriémдар died, leaving a son and his adoptive mother, the widow of the original grantee, which circumstance precludes me from completing the enfranchisement without the special sanction of Government.

3. Independently of the consideration which is due to cases of this nature, in which the Inámдар, after having formally given his consent to the enfranchisement, has been prevented from completing it by causes beyond his control, there are in this case special circumstances which call for an indulgent treatment. The widow of the original grantee, who is entitled to maintenance from the Shrotriém, is alive, and it will be seen that the orders of Government of 1827 contemplated the continuance of the Shrotriém conjointly to her and her adopted son (now deceased), though these orders were not carried into effect owing to the objections of the adopted son, who claimed to be placed in exclusive possession of the Shrotriém. Now that he is dead, it will be hard under all the circumstances of the case if the widow of the original grantee, under whose protection the minor son of the deceased is placed, is not allowed the continuance of the Shrotriém for her life, in accordance with the general tenor of the orders of 1827, which seem to recognize her title to maintenance from the Shrotriém. If this indulgence is conceded, she will be entitled to enfranchise the Shrotriém upon one-half quit rent, in addition to the existing Jodi.

No. 361. ORDER THEREON, 26th September 1864, No. 1,761.

Miscellaneous.

The Officiating Inám Commissioner may, under the exceptional circumstances of the case, treat the Inám referred to as if it had been enfranchised on the late holder's application in 1863. The son of the deceased Shrotriémдар would in that event, it is presumed, be entitled to succeed.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

To the Officiating Inám Commissioner.

„ the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

AM 2216

Memo for orders.

1 In this letter the
Officiating Inam Com-
missioner asks for instruc-
tions in regard to the shro-
triem village of Ayavellore
in the Madras District.

2 This village, the
average gross collections of
which for ten years had

* From Board to Govt 18th
Decr 1820 No 618.

amounted to Rs 836-1-11-
was made over to Bd Ven-
katroylu, Head Accountant
at the Mint, on shrotriem
tenure, at a rent of 300 Rs,

From Govt 16th August
1822 No 756.

as a reward for his long
and meritorious services.

In 1823 the Board of
Revenue laid before Go.
vernment a letter from
the Collector of Chingleput
submitting a cowle for
this village which, it was
assumed, had been granted
for three generations to
Venkatroylu whose death
was at the same time re-
ported. The Board asked
whether the next heir of
the deceased should be put
in possession. Receiving
no answer they again 2½
years later (27th March 1826
No. 107), referred the question
for orders stating at the
same time that they had
no doubt of the intention
of Government to give in
the

* 10th Decr 1823 No. 460

* 14th April 1826 No. 210.

3
the shrotriem to the next
heir who, it appeared, was
the adopted son of the de-
ceased. In reply the Govern-
ment observed that the
grant took place before
the adoption of the rule
that all shrotriems should
be for three lives and that
it was intended merely
as a provision for the grantee
during the remainder of his
life. They consented, however,
to continue the shrotriem
to the heir on whose death
it must terminate.

3 The Board, however,
were under a misapprehen-
sion when they reported
that an heir had been
adopted by Venkatroylu.
It appeared that the
deceased

deceased left a will aie:
authorizing his widow to
adopt a son. She accordingly
did so, but subsequently
desired that the adoption
should be set aside on the
plea that the youth was
of a different Gotra than
to her deceased husband
and that the adoption had
been hurried through by the
boy's friends when she was
ill. The Board saw no
reason to admit this plea
but at the same time thought
that there was no necessity
for granting the village to
the boy, and they suggested
that the Government
should revoke their former
order continuing
the shrotri to the heir
of

From Board to Govt 22nd
November 1827 No. 485.

From Govt to Board 7th Decr
1827 No. 904.

of the late Venkatroylu and
should instead give his
widow a life pension of
Rs. 250 per annum.

4 The Government did
not see reason to recall the
orders formerly issued. They
directed however that the
village should be registered
in the names of the widow
and the adopted son con-
jointly, if they both agreed
to that arrangement, other-
wise it was to be registered
in that of the son alone.

5 The widow was wil-
ling that the former source
should be adopted. but
the guardian of the adopted
infant son objected to al-
lowing her to have any
property in the village,
saying

1 saving what might be
2 considered proper for her
3 maintenance. At the late

From Collector of Chingleput
14th February 1828.

4 Shrotriendav had bequeathed
5 the village by will to the youth
6 whom his wife might adopt,
7 the Collector was of opinion
8 that the registration should
9 be in the son's name only
10 and the Board concurred in
11 this view of the case.

25th February 1828.

12 b. Correspondence of
13 a later date shews that
14 the widow found a diffi-
15 culty in securing even a
16 maintenance, for in 1841 the
17 Board recommended that
18 in consequence of the Shro-
19 triendav (the same adopted
20 son) being unable to make
21 a satisfactory and final
22 arrangement for payment

25th March 1841 No. 126.

of

4th April 1841 No. 482.

1st 201
2 of the sum stipulated to
3 his adoptive mother the vil-
4 lage should be taken under
5 management with a view to
6 secure payment of the monthly
7 pension of Rs. 10 allotted from
8 the surplus proceeds to the
9 widows. Although the equity
10 of the measure was evident the
11 Govt. doubted the legality of the
12 proposed attachment and de-
13 clined to sanction it.

14 7. In 1860 the Inam Com-
15 missioner issued general instruc-
16 tions to the Deputy Collector
17 employed in the settlement of
18 inams in the Chingleput Dis-
19 trict, noticing the peculiar
20 position occupied by Inam-
21 dars with reference to the Inam-
22 dars he thought it a question
23 requiring consideration whether
24 in the case of entire villages
25 held

held for a limited number of
lives it would be desirable to
perpetuate the conflicting tenures
by enfranchisement. The Govt
when reviewing Mr Taylor's
proceedings remarked that
such life grants whether of
pieces of land or entire villages
should not, under the circum-
stances, be meddled with.

8. Accordingly when
the Ayanellore Shrotriengar
appeared during the investigation
which was carried out in 1863 into
the Enams of the Madras District
and applied for the enfran-
chisement of his shrotriengar upon
the terms applicable to life
grants he was told that
his request could not
be complied with.

9. The prohibition con-
tained in the order of
October 1861 was, on a subse-
quent representation of the
Acting Enam Commissioner,
removed

* G. O. 3^d June 1864.
N. 945. —

removed, and Mr Blair then
was authorized to settle
such life grants according
to the rules and instruc-
tion laid down for his
guidance.

10. The Ayanellore Shro-
triengar had in the
meantime died, leaving
a son and his adoptive
mother, the widow of
the original grantee -
His death makes it
impossible to enfranchise
the man at all.

11. Mr Blair points
out that the Inamdar
had formally given his
consent to the enfranchise-
ment and that through
no fault of his he was
prevented from obtaining
his

his wish. In addition
to this the widow of
the first Shrotriendur
is still alive, and
alluding to some of
the circumstances which
have already been
noticed in this
Memorandum he
finally recommends,
not that the son of
the deceased should
be permitted to en-
franchise the Shro-
triendur which in
the ordinary course
of things would be
the equitable course,
but that the widow
of the original grantee
under

under whose protection
the minor son of the
last holder is placed,
should be allowed
to hold the village for
her life which, if
conceded, would give
her the power of en-
franchising it under
the rule already
quoted.

12. This proposal
seems to be based
on the expressed inten-
tion of the Govern-
ment in former days
that the widow should
have a share in the
Shrotriendur. She certainly
is entitled to some
consideration.

consideration as she got
but little from her
adopted son - but
whether on this
account it is desirable
to interfere with
the ordinary inhe-
ritance of property
this for Government

to determine - If
the Shrotriya is to
be looked upon as
an enfranchised Indian
on the strength of the
last holder's application
in 1863 his son would
clearly be entitled
to succeed. -

Yes
I agree
I have no objection
on this point

The same Com^r
have been in the
habit, it seems, of
regarding such settle-
ments & enfranchise-
ment as binding - and it
is too late now, I apprehend,
to introduce
a different practice.
If you adopt this view
the son of the last holder
is the person to come -
- next - and the widow
must look to him for
maintenance.
A. D. L.

Letter regarding the
Shroton & Co. of Am.
military. H. H. H. H.

Letter regarding the
Shroton & Co. of Am.
military. H. H. H. H.

Jan 216

grantie under whose protection the minor son
of the deceased is placed, is not allowed the
continuance of the Shroton for her life, in
accordance with the general tenor of the order
of 1827, which seem to recognize her title to
maintenance from the Shroton. If this
indulgence is conceded, she will be entitled
to franchise the Shroton upon one half
quit rent in addition to the existing Jodi.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servt.

J. W. Main
Jr. Juan Comandante

68-444/6468

No 360 & 361.

No. 7 Dec 27 26-7-8
n-15 Feb 1861 - 190-191
a-3 Dec 1864 - 26-27

Recd 1804 Recd
No 3216.

From
The Ag. Superintendent

To: The Secretary of the
Revenue Dept.

Donald George

Dated 18th August 1864

Received 22nd 9

No. 65

Submits for favour
the consideration and
orders, the headman
and members of the
tribe's abolition in
the Pomei Valley, and
and District.

at 1901 26 Sept

Recd on 21st 9

(1) 50

John W. George
26- Sept 1864.

As per the Office of the Commissioner of the Revenue Dept. 26- Sept 1864.

1961-74

The Officiating Indian Com-
missioner may, under the special
circumstances of the case,
grant the grant referred to as
if it had been purchased in
1863. The son of the deceased
tribehead would in that event
it is presumed, be entitled to
succeed.