M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 331 Press ~~Mis.~~

336.337

Dated 24.2.~~19~~1864

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 24th February 1864.

No. 336. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th January 1864:—

Read the following letter from G. BANBURY, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidapet, 7th January 1864.

SIR,

1. In returning the Petitions which accompanied the Proceedings of Government, dated 25th November, I have the honor to report upon the subjects contained in these representations against the arrangements made with regard to the newly nominated Pagoda Committees.

Petitions Nos. 3,038, 3,350, 3,357, 3,403, 3,408 of 1863.

2. The Petitions marginally named contain protestations against the appointment of two separate Committees, one Vadagalay and one Tengalay, for the Devarajasawmy Pagoda at Conjeveram. The Board are doubtless aware that this is a most important Pagoda; that sectarian factions exist to a great extent; and that serious differences between these two parties are by no means uncommon. Mr. Ellis having considered all these points resolved to nominate two separate Committees, so that the respective Temples and their Institutions could be managed by their respective sects. At first it appeared to me that one Committee combining the hostile elements would be sufficient; but after consulting with several respectable natives likely to know more about the matter than any one else, I came round to Mr. Ellis's views and the separate Committees were nominated. I find that the general opinion is that this course is the correct one and likely to be attended with good results.

3. These Petitions also contain objections to the nomination of three individuals, Ramanja Iyengar, Rungasawmy Iyengar, and Kistnasawmy Moodelly, on the grounds that they are disciples of Tatachary, the present Dhurmakurtah; and that the first two are themselves virtually Dhurmakurtahs. As to the first of these allegations it appears that they are not disciples of Tatachary but of a relative of his, supposing they were his *Shishyahs* I see no harm in it; neither would it be sufficient ground for excluding such efficient and respectable men from the Committee. They must be the disciples of some Guru influential by virtue of his Office. The second objection, I am informed, is not a correct one, they are not virtually Dhurmakurtahs, neither have they any direct management in the affairs of the Pagoda. Moreover, it appears from the Decrees of the late Sudder Court that the Stri Devarajasawmy Pagoda at Conjeveram possesses an hereditary Dhurmakurtahship, so that most probably it will not come under the provisions of the Act. It must also be borne in mind that these nominees, to whom Petitioners object, have been selected to transact the duties throughout the whole Talook, and not for this particular Pagoda alone.

4. The remaining Petitions comprise two from private parties asking to be put upon the Committee for the Conjeveram Talook, as the members have been already nominated there does not appear any reason for retracing our steps.

5. Petition No. 2,826 requests that some residents of Madras may be nominated to the Trivellore Pagoda Committee, this body has already been formed, and I presume it is not the intention of Government to prefer Central to Local Committees.

6. The last representation is from the Dhurmakurtah's Agent at Trivellore, stating that this Churchwardenship is hereditary in the Ahobalahsawmy Pagoda, and consequently under Section 4 of Act XX of 1863 this Temple is not amenable to the Committee management. This point must be satisfactorily established by the Petitioners, and I have requested them to appear and do so. The continuance of certain ceremonies has prevented the appearance of the objecting parties; but as soon as they come forward their claims will be investigated.

---

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their Order quoted by the Acting Collector.

2. The Board concur with him in thinking that under the circumstances stated Petitioners have not shown cause for modifying the previous recommendation of the Collector.

ment concur in the remarks
contained

[illegible]

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" Petition Department.

Exd. R. H. Lee.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.

21th Feby

No 422

Mde 21st February 1861

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board

of Revenue.

Submitting the report from the Acting Collector of Madras on Petitions presented by certain parties, regarding the appointment of Pagoda Committees.

(Rece'd 15th January 1861)

With these Proceedings the Board submit a report from the Collector of Madras on the Petitions forwarded direct with G. O. 25th November last No. 2127.

2. Board Petitions 3350, 3357, 3403, 3408 will be returned to them for disposal with an intimation that Government concur in the remarks contained

contained in paras 2 and
of Mr. Danbury's letter. Gov:
Petition 3038 will be similarly
treated in the Petition Depart:

Government Petition
2793 and Board Petition 3313
which are referred to in para
1 of the Acting Collector's report
will be returned for disposal
with advertence to G.O. 12th
February 1864, No. 267.

The petition alluded
to in para 5 is apparently
Board No. 3314 and not 2826.
This with a further similar
address Board No. 4208 will
be disposed of by the Board
with reference to para 9 of
G.O. 12th February 1864, No. 267.

5 Board Petition 3649
will be returned for the further
enquiry promised in para 6

of Mr. Danbury's letter.

6. The eleventh enclosure
to the Proceedings under
review is Board Petition 387
from certain servants of Sri
vedanda Swastanum in
Chinglepet Tuluq. This is
not alluded to in the Collector's
report: the Government can
not therefore pass any order
on it.

Copies to the Bd of Rev & appl 25 Feby
Petition Depl with Original Enclosures

18/1/11 V

Revenue 8th Dept.
Proc: of Govt for Feby

No. 331.

Pro. of the Madras Govt
Dt 24th Feby 1864.

Pro. No. 393
14-6-63
~ 334-335
25-11-63
~ 206-208
12-2-64

Report of the Collr of Madras on the several petitions presented to Govt on the Pagoda Committees in his Distt disposed of.

No 330 to 331