

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1330

Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated

1-6-

1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1330

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

No. 84. Read the following letter from the Officiating Inám Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Coimbatore, 15th March 1866, No. 23 :—

1. The village of Pakkiri Pudukolum,* in the Zemindary of Ramnad, District of Madura, formed an ancient endowment of a Durga at Ramaswaram, known as "Habelkabel."

* Extent.	Assessment.
Acres	RS. A. P.
166-88	189 9 10

2. It came to the knowledge of the Deputy Collector, who conducted the Inám Settlement of the Zemindary, that the village in question had been alienated by mortgage, and that the services at the Durga had ceased to be rendered for fifteen years. That Officer, therefore, recommended either that the endowment should be resumed, or that it should be transferred to other hands capable of renewing the usual services.

3. Before, however, adopting either course, I requested the Deputy Collector to ascertain what the Hakdars, or the hereditary Managers of the Durga, had to say on the subject.

4. It was then reported that they promised to redeem the village from mortgage, to put the Durga into repair, and to revive the customary charities in four months. A Title Deed was accordingly issued and despatched to the Collector, with a request that it might be delivered to the Hakdars, after they had fulfilled their promises as stipulated.

5. The Collector subsequently reporting that the Hakdars were unable to fulfil their engagements, the Title Deed was revoked and cancelled, and the village directed† to be brought under resumption.

† 27th April 1865.

6. After this decision was known, certain residents of Ramaswaram appeared before me, and representing that a large Mussulman community was interested in the preservation of the Durga in question, which was one of great sanctity, complained that the resumption of the Inám village was a great hardship to them, inasmuch as the community was virtually punished for the fault of the persons in immediate charge of the institution.

7. I then referred the Petition to the Collector of the District for his opinion, whether the Durga was held in such great esteem among those professing the Mahomedan faith, as to make the case a special one, and whether, if so, it might not be desirable to overlook the default of those in immediate charge, and to make over the village afresh to such persons as should be deemed worthy of the trust.

8. The Collector, concurring in the justice of the petitioners' prayer, has recommended‡ that the management of the institution be entrusted to one Miralevy, a pious and respectable merchant,

‡ 3rd February 1866.

and that the Inám village be put into his possession.

9. The village, however, having been brought under *Ayan*, and included in the Jamabandy under the first decision, the sanction of Government for its restoration

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

becomes necessary, and I accordingly solicit it under the special circumstances of the case, as above detailed.

10. Since the date of the Collector's letter, quoted in paragraph 8, the original Hakdars have appeared at this office, and produced certain documents, including the deed of mortgage, wishing thereby to establish certain extenuating circumstances in their favor. Into these, it is not necessary for me to go, as the question of the management of the institution is a minor one, and can be well left for the reconsideration of the Collector, should he consider that what the Hakdars now urge rests on any good grounds.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for their observations.

21st March 1866. (Signed) J. GROSE,
Acting Under Secretary to Government.

Received, 22nd
Entered and returned, 23rd } March 1866.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

No. 85. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th May 1866, No. 3,643.
Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 24th March and 23rd April 1866, Nos. 2,099 and 2,830.

Read also the following letter from the Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th May 1866, No. 145.

1. Referring to the Proceedings of the Board, dated 23rd April last, No. 2,830, I have the honor to report, that the Kabelkabel Durga, at Ramaswaram, and the village forming its endowment, are in the Zemindary of Ramnad, and never were under the charge of the Board of Revenue and their local agent, under Regulation VII. of 1817. The Durga was under the management of the Inámdars, who enjoyed the endowed village of Pakkiri Pudukolum under the control of the Zemindar, the

Collector having been decided incompetent or unauthorized to interfere with the religious and charitable institutions in the Zemindary, as they were declared to be "appendages" of the Estate. Under these circumstances, no religious Committee was, under Act XX. of 1863, appointed to such institutions in the Zemindary.

2. The above village is an Inám, and its revenue was not taken into account, in calculating the assets of the Estate, to fix the Peishcush, and, consequently, the Government have a reversionary right in the village, which must revert to them, if the object of the Inám ceases to be carried out.

3. During the Inám Settlement of the District, it was found that the village in question had been alienated by mortgage, and that the services at the Durga had ceased to be rendered for fifteen years, and therefore the village was resumed and incorporated with the Government lands before Fusly 1274, and the facts mentioned in my Settlement Report for that year. The village has, therefore, become Govern-

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

ment property, and its former holder lost all claims to it. Thus the matter ended.

4. But, subsequently, the Mussulman community at Ramaswaram having complained against the resumption, the Inám Commissioner, as a special case, under the circumstances explained in his letter to the Board, dated 15th March 1866, No. 23, solicited the sanction of Government for the restoration of the village to its original purpose. The village is no longer an Inám, and it rests with Government to restore it or not.

5. I, therefore, see no objection to its transfer to Miralevy, as recommended by me, inasmuch as, I believe, he will carry out the object for which it is to be restored. The former holder, there is no reason to hope, will do the same, because he was unable to redeem the village from the mortgage within the time allowed by the Inám Commissioner, and even declared his inability to do so. Besides, in the commencement of the inquiry by the Inám Commission, he falsely stated that the services had been duly performed, and supported his statement by false evidence, and, consequently, the Inám was ordered to be confirmed; but it subsequently turned out, before the delivery of the Title Deed, that no services were rendered for fifteen years; the deed was thereupon cancelled, and the village resumed.

Submitted to Government with reference to the docket on the Inám Commissioner's letter, dated 15th March last, and with the Board's recommendation that the Collector's proposal be carried out, and the Inám, together with the management of the Durga, be entrusted to his nominee, the merchant Miralevy.

No. 85A. ORDER THEREON, 1st June 1866, No. 1,330.

Land Revenue.

The Collector will report whether the discontinuance of service for fifteen years has been satisfactorily proved, and whether any of the Mahomedan community reported the circumstance, and if so, what steps were taken to enforce performance of the conditions on which the Inám was held.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Officiating Inám Commissioner.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 2,830.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 23rd April 1866.

Read the following letter from V. H. LEVINGE, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 14th April 1866, No. 125:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 2,009, dated 24th March 1866, I have the honor to report that the persons who were in charge of the Mosque being hereditary Trustees falling within the scope of Section 4, no Committee has been appointed under the enactment.

1. If as stated the charge of the Durga is hereditary, the Board do not see how the Collector's proposal, as stated by the Inam Commissioner, that the management of the Durga and the possession of the Inam be transferred to "one Maralevay, a pious and respectable merchant," can be carried out.

2. The Collector will report further on this subject.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Madura.

Edw. J. Wright,

87-1330. 4

The Colr will report whether the discontinuance of service for 15 years has been satisfactorily proved & whether any of the Mahomedan community reported the circumstance & if so what steps were taken to enforce performance of the conditions on which the loan was held -

J. D. L.
1st June 1866

The Colr will report whether the discontinuance of service for 15 years has been satisfactorily proved & whether any of the Mahomedan community reported the circumstance & if so what steps were taken to enforce performance of the conditions on which the loan was held -

Enquire the No of the B of the Colr to the Board of Revenue
P.O. dated 28 Aug 1865
No. 3643.

Dec. 15 67/1865
1866. Department.

No. PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 23rd April 1866.

Shri. 1st June 1866

No. 2,830.

Requesting further report from Collector of Madura regarding management of Durga at Pamestaram known as Habelkabel, and possession of Inam forming its endowment.