

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1322

Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated

1-6-

1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

7

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st June 1866.*

No. 68. Read the following letter from the Collector of Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Sydapet, 17th May 1866, No. 78 :—

1. With reference to the Official Memorandum from Government of the 27th April, forwarding, for report, Petition from Dasarathy Naidoo and Sivaprasatha Naidoo, I have the honor to report that on the death of the late Lutchmepathy Naidoo, who was in receipt of a pension of 1,000 Rupees a month, the widow on the one side and the said Petitioners on the other, having set up claims to be his heirs and consequent successors to his pension, I caused, through the Tahsildar of Conjeverum, enquiries to be made; the widow alleged that shortly before her husband's death, he had expressed a wish to adopt one Narasimma Naidoo, son of Poonavalli Soobiah, and that this was done in the presence, amongst others, of the Tahsildar of Conjeverum. She, therefore, sent for the said Narasimma Naidoo, and adopted him in due form, and reported having done so in January last, stating that no further enquiry need be made, and begging that the pension might be continued to her and the adopted son.

2. The Government Petitioners, who, barring the truth of the alleged adoption, appear to be the true male heirs of the deceased's family, stated that the adoption was not true; that it had never been desired by the deceased, and that therefore they were his heirs, and that his pension should be continued to them.

3. On the enquiry it came out that the Tahsildar was not present when the deceased expressed, as alleged, his wish to adopt. The mother and daughter of deceased also stated, that though living in the same house with him, they never heard him express any such wish.

4. It also appears that the boy Narasimma, not being of the branch of the family of the deceased, could not, according to Hindoo custom, have been adopted.

5. The Government Petitioners have put in a printed petition, which I herewith forward, in it all the grounds of their claim are fully set forth, and it is for the Government therefore now to determine whether the pension shall be continued or not, and if continued, whether to the Government Petitioners or to the widow.

6. My own impression is that the widow has claim to no more than a maintenance allowance, such as appears to be given to the other female members of the Vassyreddy family.

7. As the Vassyreddy Estates resumed by Government were very large, and as it is to be presumed that the 1,000 Rupees a month pension, granted to the deceased, was given to him as head and representative of the Vassyreddy family, and in commutation of the Estates, I am of opinion that, if the Government Petitioners should now satisfy the Government that they are the successors to the deceased and to his dignities, they are, in fairness, entitled to have the pension continued to them.

8. If the Government do not see fit, however, to give them quite the same amount of pension as was given to the deceased, I think they ought to have continued to them the pension which was given to their late father Ramnada Baboo, and which was discontinued at his death, as the Petitioners, his sons, were then very young, and seem to have been unable to prefer their just claims to succeed their father.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st June 1866.*

9. The deceased also left an unmarried daughter named Camatchme Ammall. She lives separate from her step-mother, and she therefore claims a maintenance for herself, and a suitable dowry on her marriage.

No. 69.

ORDER THEREON, 1st June 1866, No. 1,322.

Miscellaneous.

To be recorded with reference to G. O. 25th May
1866, No. 1,255.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,

Under Secretary to Government.

2-10-19
15-1-20

Revenue 1866 Dept. to X
Lrs of Govt for June
From 11-1-1862

The Collector of Madras
To the Secretary to Govt
R. D.
Fort St. George.

Dated 17th May 1866.
Recd. 21st May 1866.
No. 78
W (2 Encls)

Submits his report
upon the Petition presented
by Dasaraj Rao
& Sivaprasad Rao of
the Vasireddy family.
No. 1322.

To be recorded
with ref to G.O. 25th May 1866
1st June 1866 J. G. L.

No. 68-69