

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 932

Press

~~Mis.~~

364.368

Dated

31-5-1918

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31st May 1864.*

No. 364. Read again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd October 1863, No. 6,237, and recorded in the Proceedings of Government, dated 12th February 1864, No. 267.

Read the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd February 1864.

Read again letter from the Collector of Madura, dated 17th December 1863, in Board's Proceedings, dated 7th January 1864, No. 75.

Read also the following letter from *Æ. R. McDONELL*, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, to *W. HUDLESTON*, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Madura, 6th February 1864, No. 28.

SIR,

• 18th December 1863, No. 8,014.
7th January 1864, „ 75.

1. In conformity with the orders contained in the Board's Proceedings marginally noted,* I do myself the honor to report on Board Petition No. 2,945 of 1863, herewith returned.

2. This is a Petition presented by certain parties who take exception to some of the names entered in Mr. Levinge's list of persons eligible for serving on the Devasthanum Committee of Melaterumanikem Pagoda.

3. Mr. Levinge in his letter No. 200, dated September 24th 1863, entered for this Committee the names of five persons, viz. :—

1. Dorasawmy Iyen.
2. Kalimuttu Pillai.
3. Subramonea Pillai.
4. Soundra Pandia Samiar.
5. Shunmoogum Pillai.

The last named party is one of the Petitioners.

4. Exception is now taken to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd names on the list.

5. It is alleged that the first name on the list should be struck out, as the party is a brother of the Nattamagar of an adjacent village, and that in the event of a boundary dispute occurring his influence might be misused; and further, that he is unfit for the office as he discontinued certain offerings which he had previously been in the habit of making.

6. The second and third names on the list are objected to, because the former is a "Karbar" or head official under the Zemindar of Yelumalai, who is one of the Pagoda Trustees, and the latter an intimate friend of the Zemindar.

7. I do not think the objections against the first person are worthy of any consideration; the party seems to be a respectable and influential man. The Zemindar being a Trustee, none of his servants should be allowed on the Committee, though it would be hard to exclude all his friends.

8. The Pagoda, I observe, enjoys an income of 2,500 Rupees a year; this is small, and I think a Committee of three would suffice. I would propose to associate the first named person with the fourth and fifth, excluding the names of the second and third persons mentioned in Mr. Levinge's list.

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, with reference to their Orders dated 25th November and 9th December 1863, Nos. 2,127 and 2,241, Revenue Department respectively.

2. The Board consider that Mr. Levinge shows good ground for maintaining his proposals in the cases referred to in the first letter.

3. They recommend that in the case reported on by Mr. McDonell, the course proposed by him be adopted, as it will remove the ground of objection, and still leave the Committee effective.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31st May 1864.*

No. 365. Proceeding of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd April 1864, No. 1,929.
Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Madura, dated 2nd March 1864, No. 53.

1. Having reference to the Orders of the Board dated 6th February on Petitions Nos. 3,434, 3,447, 3,870 of 1863, and 50 and 273 of 1864, I beg to report as follows.

2. Petitions Nos. 3,434 of 1863, and 50 and 273 of 1864 refer to the nomination by Mr. Levinge of the three individuals noted in the margin as Members of the Committee for the Meenatchee Soondaraswaral Devasthanam at Madura. The Petitioners repeat the same objections to these persons being appointed as are mentioned in Board Petition No. 2,594 of 1863, which formed the subject of paragraphs 2 to 7 of Mr. Levinge's communication to the Board dated 17th December 1863, No. 300, embodied in Board's Proceedings of the 7th January 1864, No. 75, from which the Board will observe that the objections of Petitioners have been fully met.

3. Petitioners in No. 50 produce two old Puttahs as further evidence in support of their allegation that the village therein named belongs to the above Pagoda. This point I find is satisfactorily explained by Mr. Levinge in paragraphs 3 and 4. The Pundaram is bound by the Muchilka taken from him when restoring the village to him, to distribute rice in his Madam.

4. Petition No. 3,870 of 1863 has emanated from the same individual, who presented Petition No. 3,054 of 1863, referred to in paragraphs 9 and 10 of Mr. Levinge's letter above mentioned. He reiterates the objections he there put forward to nominating Punnayana Mudali as a Member of the Committee proposed for the Kuruvithurai Pagoda. These call for no remark on my part, as Mr. Levinge has met them in paragraphs 9 and 10 of his letter, having first called on Peria Nambi Iyengar (the Petitioner) to adduce proof of his allegations which he was unable to do.

5. The object of Petitioners in No. 3,447 of 1863 is to get the same Committee which is recommended for the Madura Temple to superintend the affairs of their Pagoda at Teruparengundum in supercession of that nominated by Mr. Levinge in the List submitted by him to the Board under date the 24th September last, No. 290, but they at the same time wish to exclude from this Committee one of its members, viz., Tirugnana Samanda Pundaram.

6. The Petitioners who are Staneakauls in the Teruparengundum Pagoda take exception to the members of the Committee named by Mr. Levinge, on the grounds that they are ignorant, common Ryots, having no qualifications to administer the affairs of their Pagoda, and residing in a village three miles from the Pagoda; that theirs and the Madura Pagoda have so much in common which renders it absolutely necessary that the management of both should be under one Committee; that assistance is often rendered to them from the great Madura Temple, a want of which will put their institution to great inconvenience and expense; and that the members now selected to preside over them and the other Pagoda servants are not men of sufficient influence, being far inferior to them in social position.

7. The Temple in question is situated about four miles from Madura, and has hitherto been and is still under the management of the same authorities. The two institutions are Siva Pagodas.

8. The Petitioners in No. 3,447 of 1863 appeared before me for the express purpose of withdrawing all objections to the Pundaram being placed on the Committee. Translation of depositions taken before me are herewith submitted for the Board's information.

9. Mr. Levinge having already submitted his report, and recommended that distinct Committees for these two Pagodas should be appointed, I hesitate to offer an opinion on the matter; I have stated the circumstances of the case, and it remains for the Board to decide whether the two Committees shall stand, or whether in consideration of the great benefit it will be to the Teruparengundum institution, the Madura Committee be directed to manage the affairs of both Pagodas.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31st May 1864.*

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Translation of a deposition given before the Acting Collector of Madura by Sundra Battar, Stanikum of a Subramanya Coil at Teruparangundum.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Translation of a deposition given before the Acting Collector of Madura by Sundra Battar, Stanikum of a Subramanya Coil at Teruparangundum.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 3 to 7.—Petitions.

1. Submitted to Government in continuation of the Board's Proceedings under date 23rd February 1864, No. 1,184.

2. As explained by the Acting Collector, Mr. Levinge has disposed of the objections raised in most of the Petitions, but the Board consider that the request contained in the fifth (No. 3,447 of 1863) is reasonable one. They therefore recommend that both Pagodas be placed under the charge of the Madura Committee.

No. 366. From V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madura, 12th May 1864, No. 479.

SIR,

1. In forwarding the revised list showing the house names, &c., of the Members proposed for Committee called for in your Official Memorandum of 11th March last, No. 42, and those of the Deputy Secretary under dates the 8th April and 4th May, numbered 58 and 72 respectively, I regret to report that owing to the non-receipt of the necessary information from the Talooks and Sub-Collector, the despatch of the list was unavoidably delayed up to this time.

2. I beg further to bring to notice the individuals proposed for the Devasthanams noted in the margin* having declined to accept the trust, others were selected in their stead by the Sub-Collector whose names are marked A. B. C. and D.

- * 1 Ganapati Ayan for Kalastiswara Swami Covil.
- 2 Alagerisami Chetty of Komooty Caste for Soondraraja Perumal Covil.
- 3 Periatamby Gounden for do.
- 4 Balagunamoorthy Chetty for the Dundugadupani Swami Covil in Palany.

No. 367. Official Memorandum from the Secretary of the Board of Revenue, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 19th May 1864, No. 396.

The undersigned has the honor to return the original papers received with the Revenue Secretary's Memorandum dated 18th May 1864, No. 81, and to state that the Board are not aware of any objections to the changes proposed by the Collector of Madura in the Temple Committee nominations for that District.

(By Order.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, Secretary.

ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1864, No. 932.

No. 368.

1. These papers relate to the appointment of Committees for the Temples and Mosques in the Madura District under Act XX of 1863. The Government having given them and the several Petitions received from the inhabitants of the District their careful consideration agree with Mr. McDonell, the Acting Collector, and the Board of Revenue in the propriety of omitting the names of Kalimuttu Pillai and Subbramaniya Pillai from the Committee proposed by Mr. Levinge for Chokanada Sawmy Kovil in Melatérumanikam.

2. The Government also deem it necessary to omit the name of Terugiyana Pandaram from the Committee for Sri Minakshi Sundereswaral Pagoda in the town of Madura, because

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31st May 1864.*

from the first five paragraphs of the Collector's letter, dated 17th December 1863, No. 300, he appears to be the Trustee of the Pagoda, and is consequently disqualified to act on the Committee under Section XI of the Act. The Board will, therefore, request the Acting Collector to name some other competent individual to take his place, and as soon as this nomination is received the Committee for that Temple will be appointed. This Committee will also be entrusted with the supervision of the Temple at Terupurengundum agreeably to the recommendation made in paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings dated 2nd April 1864, No. 1,929.

3. The Government resolve to appoint at once the Committees for the other Temples with the alteration made in paragraph 1.

Nos. 2,566 }
" 8,054 }
" 8,057 } of 1863.
" 8,268 }
" 8,334 }
" 8,629 }

4. Ordered that the following endorsement be made on the Petitions noted in the margin:—

" The Government have considered the reports of the Collector and the Board on this and other Petitions on the subject and have issued the necessary orders."

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Collector of Madura.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

MEMORANDUM.

to return
Requested for reference the undermentioned papers on the subject of
Religious Committees in Madura

2 Original Enclosures submitted to Govt. with Board's Proceedings of 2 October 1863

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE,
6 March 1864

To The Registrar, *Govt. Office - Rev. Dept.*

Registrar.

3

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 7th January 1864.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Madura, dated 17th December 1863, No. 300:—

1. In conformity to the Order of Government dated 25th November 1863, No. 2,127, I have the honor to report on the Petitions which accompanied it as follows.

2. The Petitioners take exception to the appointment, to the Committee of the Madura Meenakshi Soondareswaral Pagoda, of Tirugunna Summanda Pundaram, Venkatachellam Chetti, Board Petition No. 2,594 of 1863.

and Kulliyanasoondra Mudali; the first, on the score of his misappropriating, for his own use, the income of two of the villages allotted to the Pagoda for the performance of certain "Araikattalai," and of having embezzled 40,000 Rupees on the pretence of executing repairs, &c.; the second, as being a non-resident; and the third, as being a relation of the first and an old man.

3. The villages alluded to have been in the possession and enjoyment of the Pundaram, and his predecessors, for many years and long before the Pundaram's appointment to the office of Trustee of the Pagoda, to which he was nominated with the almost unanimous consent of the great body of the people of Madura, after a long contest between two factions.

4. Mr. Hurd's report does not show the names of the villages alluded to, or that the income of the said villages is to be devoted to "Araikattalai" in the Pagoda, and the Muchilka taken from the Pundaram shows, the expenditure of the income of those villages was to be made in the Pundaram's Madam, and no mention is made of his making it in the Pagoda, this Muchilka was executed in 1820, so that the charge made against the Pundaram of not keeping up Araikattalai in the Pagoda won't stand.

5. The alleged defalcation is put forward to endeavour to exclude the Pundaram from the Committee. The people are very well satisfied with his management, the Petition has emanated from the Bramini section of the Pagoda servants, who are disaffected towards the Pundaram, because he looks sharply after them. Besides, his being a member of the Committee will not be a bar to Petitioner's bringing an action for any malpractices in the Civil Courts under Act XX of 1863.

6. The second man is a wealthy Nattukottai Chetti, an inhabitant of the District; he resides a great part of his time in Madura, and carries on an extensive trade in the town.

7. The third man is not a relative of the Pundaram, and is a respectable man, not too old to do work; he is under 60 years of age.

8. Petitioners are persons enjoying certain shares of the income of the mosque at Goripalliam. At one time they managed its affairs, but owing to disputes amongst them, and misappropriation, the mosque was several years ago placed under the superintendence of a respectable Mussalman. The object of Petitioners, is to procure the appointment of their own friends and dependants. The nomination I have made meets with the approval of the most respectable part of the Mussalman Community.

9. The appointment of Ponnavana Mudali as a member of the Committee for the Kurivithurai Pagoda is objected to in these Petitions on the ground that his deceased father had misappropriated the proceeds of the Inam of certain Pagoda servants and also Pagoda funds. Perianambi Aiyangar, Petitioner in No. 3,054, was called upon to explain; he is unable to adduce any evidence in the matter. All that he can show are disputes between him and Ponnavana Mudali's father regarding certain Inam lands. The latter was Manager of the Pagoda up to the time of his demise.

10. Ponnavana Mudali is of age and competent to be a member, is a wealthy Ryot and head of the village. Even if his father was as guilty as stated, this cannot disqualify his son.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 5.—Petitions.

The Board await the Collector's reply to their Proceedings dated 18th December 1863, No. 8,014, forwarding for report another Petition with Government Order dated 9th idem, No. 2,241, R. D.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. H. Nelson, Esq., Acting Head Assistant in charge of Madura.

Erd. J. Wright

Revenue Department

932
No. 932

Proceedings of the Madras Government
under date the 31st May 1864

Read again Pro.
of the Board of Revenue
dated 2^d October 1863,
No. 6237 and recorded in
the Bo. of Govt dated
12th February 1864, No. 267

Read also the following

Proceedings of the Bd of Rev. - of the Board of Revenue

Submitting letter
from the Acting Collector of
Madras reporting on Peti-
tion No. 2945 of 1863 presented
by certain parties who take
exception to some of the
names entered in Mr. Le-
vinger's List of persons eli-
gible for serving on the
Sevastian Committee of
Mela Sevaanikem Pagoda.
Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
from the Collector of Madras.
Memo. from the Secy to the Bd of Rev.

(Here enter 23rd Feb
1864, No. -)

(Here enter 2^d April 1864, No. 1929)
(Here enter 12th May 11-11-1864)
(Here enter 19th May 11-11-1864)
These papers

late to the appointment
of Committees for the Seva-
niam and Madamam

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

1864 Department

No.

Rev: 436/13

Dated 7th January 1864

Despatched

Received

No. 75

Awaiting his reply to Board's Proceedings,
dated 18th December 1863, forwarding for
report another Petition and Government
Order dated 9th December No. 2241, R. D.

Madura District under
 No. xx of 1863. The Govt
 having given them and
 the several petitions re-
 ceived from the inhabi-
 tants of the District their
 careful consideration
 agree with Mr. Macdonell,
 the Acting Collector, and
 the Board of Revenue in
 the propriety of omitting
 the names of Kali Muttu
 Pillai and Subbrahamya
 Pillay from the Committee
 proposed by Mr. Levinge
 for Chokanada swanu
 Kovil in Melakuruma-
 rikam.

2. The Govt also deem
 it necessary to omit the
 name of Serajiyam
 from the Committee
 for Sri Minakshi Su-
 =dereswaral Pagoda in
 the Town of Madura, be-
 cause from the first

This Committee will
 also be entrusted with
 the supervision of the
 temple at Serupareu-
 =gumam agreeably
 to the recommendation
 made in para 2 of the R.O.

No. of 2^d April 1864, No. 1929.

Nos. 2566.
 3054.
 3054.
 3268.
 3334.
 3629.

of 1863.

letter dated 17th Decem-
 =ber 1863, No. 300 he appears
 to be the Trustee of the Pa-
 =goda and is ^{consequently} ~~as such~~
 disqualified to act on
 the Committee under the
 =tion of the Act. The
 Board will therefore re-
 =quest the Acting Collector
 to name some other com-
 =petent individual to
 take his place, and as
 soon as this nomi-
 =nation is received the
 Committee for that tem-
 =ple will be appointed.

3. The Govt resolve
 to appoint at once the
 committees for the other
 temples with the altera-
 =tion made in para 1.

4. Ordered that the
 following endorsement
 be made on the Peti-
 =tions noted in the

"The Govt have
carefully considered
the reports of the collector
and the Board on this
and other petitions on
the subject ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{have} issued the
necessary orders."

25/10/11
JDS

14 Copies Letter P. & R. Govt.
1 copy with 7 copies of
of Govt. No. 486 sent to the P. & R.
1 in Col. Rajahmundry with enclosures

10/11

1-11-07

32 No. 334-335
25-11-63

155-156
9-12-63

12-1-11

Revenue 1864 Capital
No: of Govt for May

27.902.

No: of the Madras Govt
of 31st May 1864.

No: of Govt: of 17 June 1864
@ No: 1576.

Committee for the
management of
religious institutions
in Madras District,
appointed.

Ms. 364 @ 368.