M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1636 Press ~~Mis.~~

271.273

Dated 15-7-1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers:—

No. 271. Petition from STREENIVASA CHARRY, son of GOVINDAH CHARRY deceased, one-fourth sharer of the Inám lands at Madanapally village, in the Talook of Madanapalli, in Cuddapah District.

With reference to the Government endorsement dated the 24th January 1865, Petitioner submits a copy of the Inám Commissioner's decision, as well as other documents relating to his case.

States that, as the Inám Commissioner observes in his endorsement his (petitioner's) interest in the Inám is by no means confined to a life interest, but that the Inám is to be continued in perpetuity to his family as long as there is a male heir, prays that under the circumstances stated in the petition, and on the perusal of all the documents produced herewith, Government may be pleased to issue an order granting him justice by imposing a tax of 2 Annas in the Rupee on his one-fourth share of the Inám land, as has been imposed on the other three-fourths share of the Inám of the same description in the enjoyment of other sharers, all being the descendants of the same grantee.

(Here enter 29th May 1865.)

No. 272. From W. T. BLAIR, Esq., Officiating Inám Commissioner, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Coimbatore, 3rd July 1865, No. 32.

SIR,

1. In returning herewith the Petition No. 1,266 of 1865, presented by Inámdar Srinivásá Chári, I have the honor to report as follows with reference to the endorsement thereon of the Acting Under Secretary, dated the 20th ultimo.

2. From the Register of this Department, an authenticated copy of which is among the enclosures of the Petition, the Government will observe that portions of the same Inám, belonging to the same family, have been very differently dealt with, under the uncertain Rules which were in force from time to time in regard to succession to Ináms generally.

3. The Order of which Petitioner complains was passed in 1846, and the Order of the 6th August 1849, No. 745, passed on an analogous case was no doubt dictated by the more liberal terms prescribed by the Rules of 1848.

4. However hard the case of the Petitioner may be, this Department, acting under Rule XI. of the Rules sanctioned for its guidance, had no alternative but to charge the rate of half quit-rent prescribed for life grants, and when the Petitioner appealed, no other course was open than to confirm what had been done, for any relaxation of the rule in favor of one Inámdar would naturally lead to a host of similar applications from others equally entitled to consideration.

herewith, Govt may
be

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 15th July 1865.

No. 273. ORDER THEREON, 15th July 1865, No. 1,636.

Land Revenue.

1. From the report of the Inám Commissioner Government learn that the Inám alluded to in this petition, is a share of one of the Bhatavurthi Ináms of the Cuddapah District.

2. An order was issued in Extract Minutes of Consultation 7th July 1846, declaring that these Ináms should be held for life only, but it was superseded under directions from the Honorable Court of Directors by G. O. 6th August 1849, No. 745, which declared the Ináms to be hereditary.

3. In 1846, on the occurrence of a lapse, the share of one of these Ináms which devolved on petitioner's brother, Raja Charlu, was continued to him as a life grant only, and it does not appear that on application from that person, this order has been cancelled, but the shares which devolved on other members of the family after 1849 have been continued to them on hereditary tenure.

4. Under these circumstances, although it might be objected to the Petitioner's application that it is submitted in the absence of his brother Raja Charlu, and apparently without the knowledge or consent of that individual, the Government are of opinion that Raja Charlu's Inám must be considered hereditary, and resolve to direct the Inám Commissioner to fix the quit-rent in accordance with this Order.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Inám Commissioner.
,, D.S. Robertson Esq.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

15 Jan 1866 No. 65
29-55
1178/65

To His Excellency The Governor in Council Fort St. George

The humble petition of Yeenevasa Charry, son of the deceased Govinda Charry 1/4th Sharer of the Inam lands at Madanapullie village in the Taluq of Madanapullie of the Cuddapah District.

My Lord

Your petitioner had submitted to your Lordship's justice a petition of the No. 3220 of 1864 bearing the date 3rd December 1864, most humbly begging that, since the Inam Commissioners most unjustly imposed a tax of 1/2 Rupee in the Rupee on the 1/4th share of the Inam land in your petitioner's

⊗ I have herein enclosed the same petition which would explain the circumstances full at length

all documents herewith, Govt may

petitioner's enjoyment, a cess of two Annas in the Rupee was imposed on the other 3/4th share of the same description of the land, in the enjoyment of the other sharers, the descendants of one and the same grantee, the case should be taken in your kind and judicious consideration and that justice be given your petitioner by imposing a tax of two Annas in the Rupee on his 1/4th share of the Inam land as has been imposed on the other 3/4th share of the same description in the enjoyment of other sharers, all the descendants of the same grantee.

The petition was indorsed on the 24th January 1865, stating that a copy of the Inam Commissioner's decision in this case should be first

3

first produced.

Your petitioner now accordingly submits a copy of the Inam Commissioner's decision and with it the other documents that appeared serviceable to his cause.

The Inam Commissioner in his decision states that, since the Government issued orders as would appear by the Collector's order (No I) on the death of Govinda Chary, (which occured in 1845) my father, that my father, Govinda Chary's share of the Inam land should be continued to Rajah Chary, my elder brother, and that on his (my brother Rajah Chary's) death the land should

herewith, Govt may

should revert to the circar, therefore he (the Commissioner) was unable to treat my 1/4th share of the Inam land & place it on the same footing with the other 3/4th share.

Now your petitioner pleads that this land is by no means connected with life interest; I mean, it is to be continued in perpetuity to our family as long as there is a male heir or a lawful descendant to enjoy the property. I call in my defence a similar case (Nos. II & IV) where it would appear that, just as this present Inam land in question was stopped on my father Govinda

(Page 5)

Govinda Chary's death and afterwards the Government issued orders that my deceased father's portion of the Inam land should be continued to my elder brother Raja Chary, as would appear by (No. I) and that on his (my elder brother's) death the land should revert to the circar, in the same manner on the death of my Venkata Row a like order was issued by the Government to his land, as would appear by the Collector's order (No. II). But afterwards the order was recalled and fresh orders issued, as would appear

produced herewith, Govt may

appear by the Collector's orders (Nos IV) that the land may be continued on the names of the two brothers, Gooba Row and Thistna Row the sons of the deceased Venkata Row referred to.

In addition to this I call in my aid (Nos III & V) in each of which it would appear that on the deaths of the land-holders, their proper heirs or lawful descendants were ultimately put in possession of their respective lands with least reference whatever being made with regard to life interest.

By these and by a careful and

and impartial
careful examination of my papers (I fully believe) it would appear plain to the Government that the land in my enjoyment is not to revert to the Circar on my elder brother Raja Row's death, but is to be continued to our family till there is left a male heir or lawful descendant to enjoy the property. And thereby the ground (viz, the Inam land in my enjoyment would revert to the Circar on my elder brother Raja Row's death) on which the Inam Commissioner imposed a tax of 1/2 Rupee in the Rupee on that land alone, in my enjoyment,

produced herewith, Govt may

enjoyment, is at once refuted and consequently justice demands that two annas in the Rupee must be taxed on the 1/4th share of the Inam land in my enjoyment as has been imposed on the other 3/4th share of the same description of the land in the enjoyment of other sharers.

Having sketched an outline of my case, I most humbly beg that your Lordship will be take my cause in your kind consideration and grant me justice. For which act of kindness, justice and mercy your petitioner

petitioner shall, as in duty bound, continue to pray.

Madras
Triplicane
29th May 1865
Soonkoovar Street
Door No 3

Shall Ever Pray.

राजश्री विद्यासागर

Petition

From Seenevasa Chetty
Inam Land Holder of Mallee
respectfully in Mandamopulam Ta
Talaignan Chiddapah District

Dated 29th May 1865

Ill Enclosures Viz:

Original Covenant A & F

Certified Copies Nos 1 & V

Government Petition 1
Exhibit
Inam Commissioners Decision II

No. 1266 of 1865.

23/8/65.

Referred to the Inam Commissioner for report as to whether this Inam should be made hereditary under the terms of Gr. O. 6th August 1849 No. 745.

Fort Saint George
20th June 1865

By Order

J Wyle

Asst Under Secretary to Govt

Revenue Department.-

No. 1636.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
under date the 15th July 1865.-

Read the following
papers.-

Petition from Sreenivása-Charry, son of Govinda Charry, deceased 1/4 sharer of the Inám lands at Madanapally village in the Talook of Madanapalli in Cuddapah Dt.-

With reference to the Govt endorsement of the 24th Jany 1865, Petitioner submits a copy of the Inám Comrs decision as well as other documents relating to his case.-

States that as the Inám Comr observes in his endorsement his (petitioner's) interest in the Inám is by no means confined to a life interest; but that the Inám is to be continued in perpetuity to his family as long as there is a male heir.- Prays that under the circumstances stated in the petition, and on the perusal of all the documents produced herewith, Govt may be

(Here enter 29th May 1865.)-

W.R.

Regr No 384

Rev. 1865. Petn.
Dated [illegible] July
No. 1910.

From Sreenevasa Charry, son of Govinda Charry, deceased, 1/4 sharer of the Inam lands at Madanapally Village in the Taluq of Madanapalli in Cuddapah [illegible] [illegible] Madras.

29 May 1865.

27 Fifteen Enclosures. Octd for Ed. on
No. 1820/65

With reference to the Govt endorsement dated the 24th January 1865, Petitioner submits a Copy of the Inam Commissioner's decision as well as other documents relating to his case.

States that as the Inam Commissioner observes in his endorsement, his (petitioner's) interest in the Inam

No. 1636 - 15th July

7 July 1846 ... 34-35

is by no means confined to a life interest, but that the Inam is to be continued in perpetuity to his family as long as there is a male heir; Prays that under the circumstances stated in the petition, and on the perusal of all the documents produced herewith, Govt may be pleased to issue an order granting him justice by imposing a tax of two Annas in the Rupee on his 1/4 share of the Enam land as has been imposed on the other 3/4 share of the Enam of the same description in the enjoyment of other sharers, all being the descendants of the same grantee.

No. 271

[illegible] 5 July/65

be pleased to issue an order granting him justice by imposing a tax of 2 Annas in the Rupee on his 1/4 share of the Inám land as has been imposed on the other 3/4 share of the Inám of the same description in the enjoyment of other sharers all being the descendants of the same grantee.-

From the Off. Inám Commr.
Reports upon the Petition No. 1266 of 1865 forwarded by Inámdar Streenivásachári, with reference to the endorsement thereon of the Actg. Under Secy. of the 20th Ultimo.-

(Here enter 3d July 1865, No. 321.-

1 From the report of the Inám Commissioner Govt. learn that the Inám alluded to in this petition, is a share of one of the Bhatavar the Ináms of the Cuddapah district.-

2 An order was issued in Extract Minutes of

of Consultation 7th July 1846 declaring that the said Inams should be held for life only, but it was superseded under directions from the Honorable Court of Directors by G.O. 6th Augt. 1849 No. 745 which declares the Ináms to be hereditary.-

3 In 1846 on the occurrence of a lapse, the share of one of these Ináms which devolved on petitioner's brother Raja Charlu was continued to him as a life grant only and he has never got this ordered cancelled, but the shares which devolve on other members of the family after 1849 have been continued to them on hereditary tenure.-

4 Under these circumstances Govt. are of opinion

^ and it does not appear that on application from that person,

opinion that Raja Charchú Inám must be considered hereditary, and resolve to direct the Inám Commissioner to fix the quit-rent in accordance with this order—

J.F.

Fd. Forbes Board's Rec. dtd. 17 July
" Inám Commissioner's "
" Collector's Report "

Revenue 1865 Sept.
Pro: of Govt for July

No. 1636.

Pro: of the Madras Government

Dated 15th July 1865

Read

Ord No. 38-39
7-8-49

Directing the Inam Commissioner to fix the quit rent on Rajah Chanlee Inam in Cuddapah declared to be hereditary

Nos. 271 to 273.