M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1846 Press ~~Mis.~~

1857

Dated 9— 8— ~~1857~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 9th August 1867.

Read the following papers:—

No. 185. From AKELLA DIKSHITULU, of Siddhantam, Tanuku Talook, Godavery, dated 15th March 1866.

Referring to the Government Endorsement, No. 3,201, dated 3rd January 1866, passed on his petition, and submitting herewith a Memorial, in triplicate, addressed to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State, touching his claim to the Inam land held by his late grandfather, and which was converted into Jeroyetti land under the orders of Government, prays for the transmission of the same to the said authority.

No. 771 of 1866.

As the reasons why this Inam was resumed cannot be traced in the records of Government, a copy of the Memorial will be sent to the Collector, through the Board of Revenue for report.

By order,

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
6th July 1866.

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Under Secretary to Government.

Forwarded to the Collector, with reference to the Order of Government noted above.

By order,

CHEPAUK,
24th July 1866.

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

No. 186. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 10th July 1867, No. 4,306.

Read the following letter from the Collector of the Godavery District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 25th June 1867, No. 173:—

1. As directed in the Board's endorsement, dated 24th July 1866, accompanying the Order of Government of 6th idem on Government Petition No. 771 of 1866, together with a Memorial to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, and other accompaniments, presented by Akella Dikshitulu, of Siddhantam, in the Tanuku Talook, I have the honor to report as follows:—

2. Petitioner's complaint is that his grandmother's Inam land of the extent of A. 19, C. 77, has been resumed by Government after her death instead of its being continued to him, he being a daughter's son and legal heir.

3. The petitioner presented to Government petitions of numbers as per margin on the same subject. They having been referred to me with the Board's endorsements, dated 8th February and 16th June 1865, I have reported on them to the Board—*vide* their Proceedings of 22nd November 1865, No. 7,496. These Proceedings were forwarded to Government with reference to their Endorsement No. 3,201 of 1864, and the

Nos. 3,201 of 1864, and 1,642 of 1865.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th August 1867.

Government have passed their Order on the 3rd January 1866, stating that, as the Inam in question was assessed fully under orders of Government more than twelve years ago, the Governor in Council cannot allow the question to be re-opened.

4. As the Government have now directed, in their Order above quoted, that I should report on the Memorial, as the reasons why this Inam was resumed cannot be traced in the records of Government, I beg to state that I gather from the former correspondence, and statements of lapsed Inams, the following information:—

5. The Inam claimed by the Memorialist originally belonged to one Duggirala Mahalakshmy. She died on the 10th July 1849. She had no sons but three daughters named in the margin, and the Memorialist is the son of Rajamma, the third daughter. The Inam being situated in the sub-division, the then Sub-Collector inquired into the case under the lapsed Inam Rules,* and proposed that of this Inam, A. 11, C. 80, which are permanent Inam, should be continued to the Memorialist, he being a daughter's son of the last holder, and that the remaining A. 7, C. 97, which are subsequent Inam, should be resumed. The then Collector did not agree with the Sub-Collector in his proposal, but decided that the Government have a right to the whole land, as the Memorialist is a member of another family different from that of the original grantee. The Collector's recommendation having been upheld by the Commissioner of the Northern Circars, the Government have in their Proceedings, dated 9th March 1853, No. 271, paragraph 8, directed that the lands should be brought under full assessment, as there were not sufficient grounds for renewing it under the circumstances represented by the Commissioner.

1. P. Narasamma.
2. A. Eggamma.
3. A. Rajamma.

* *Vide* Board's Circular Order, dated 27th July 1848.

6. The petition and its enclosures under reply, and Petitions Board Nos. 64 (Government No. 983) and 963 subsequently presented by the petitioner, and referred to me, on the same subject, are herewith returned.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Petitions.

Ordered that the foregoing letter be submitted to Government, with reference to their endorsement on Petition No. 771 of 1866, dated 6th July 1866.

No. 187. ORDER THEREON, 9th August 1867, No. 1,846.

Miscellaneous.

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be despatched to Home Government, and that the Memorialist be informed of its despatch.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

Pattah / Donation bond / executed by Doogiraka Mahalakshmy
-iny to her daughter's son Ashtha Deekshit under
2d February 1843. on Monday the 13th Magha Bahoola
Year Soobacrōdhi.

2½ Rookies of Ac Nanja Inam land situated
in the village of Siddantum which belongs to
me, / limits omitted /, the house & backyard grounds
with trees thereon, and the house hold furnitures
which I possess, have this day been bequeathed
to your mother you to be my heir as per
directions of my husband. Therefore you with
enjoying the said property for posterity to forever
you are to protect me as long as I live -
Determining that either my Cousins or my
other Daughters or their husbands have no right
to my the said Property I have bequeathed
them to you & you with the right continue
to enjoy them yourself from generation
to Generation -

/ Marked / Mahalakshmy

Witnesses
× × × × ×
× × × ×

/ Signed / Cummum & village Pattamdars.

February

A

Suit (Damages Cond

27 Dec 1865

In No. 3206/66.

In No. 803 of 1865

the Petitioner's Son the 1st & 2d Daughters Minors
they would get some Shares if they were
accordingly so Decd to his Estate, have appeared
& pursuant their Answers - Copies of this
Petition the Pundit Lucy Ameen desires
the 1st Lieutenant Justice Commissioner, & this
is very unreasonable - & pray that the
said may be ordered to the Petitioner
on the file, & with order that a Decree
may be declared recognizing the Petitioner
as heir, under the Dooty Laxemee
& disallowing the Claims of the Respt
Defts -

23d October 1849 (Signed) Prabhakar Ramkrishna

Petition of Ramkrishna Ramchandra Chitnavis of Nagpore
Civil No 49 of 1850 -

Petitioner
Laxmana Father & Guardian
of Mathura & Devkabai
a Minor -

Defendants
1 Risaldarny Sugnumal
2 Abdulla Dungoomiah Khan
3 Adavala Bahamah

The Petitioner his Counsel states that
Laxmana & Mathura & Devkabai who was the
Daughters & Children of Ramchandra
Jagheer Minors had 3 Daughters besides
the 1st & 2d Defts & the Wife of the Petitioner
that since the death of his Father in Law
the Petitioner remained in his Mother in Law's
house & protected her, &c. (Mr Chitnavis Law)
had under his Guardianship order, he executed
all her Landed & other Property to Petitioner
on the 2d December 1843; that on his further
application Order to the Collector, having
the Custody of the Land in his own name
it was refused to the Guardian; that this
Guardian with some partiality has entered
the Land, 1/2 Rooty in each of the 1st 2d Daughters
& 1/4 Rooty only in the Minors name
and Caused a Petition from his Guardian
stating that the entry of the Land should
remain in her own name in the
Account until her Life time: that
for on Account of this irregularities
the Petitioner commenced a Civil Suit in the
Runjeeda Court for the whole
Land

Land, but to Purchase their Interest
that Land was to depend upon a
decision as to the effect that the Deed
in question should have in Law
Change the Title of the Parties
Land should be considered as
may be at the death of the
of the Mother in Law, the 1st 2d Defts
Catherine with the 3d Defts former the
payment to Pltff of the Mortgage of the
Land, and that a decree be passed under
that the 1st 2d Defts may not interfere
with the Land & House, & that Payment may
be made over to Pltff with Costs
Profits Pay - 10 -

The Defts answered that they too have
Female Daughters, that the Pltff & his wife
have never provided his Mother in law,
the Children their Wives are entitled to equal
shares in their Brothers property, the Pltff
had tendered a Requirement that he will
give them a 1/4 Portion each, that their
according to the Arrangement was only
meant to their Children share & not
otherwise, that they disagree to that
Purchase but they are not desirous
to part with the said portions - The 3d Deft
states that the Pltff Father in law Thomas
of him 160 Rs in Consideration that that debt
should be liquidated by the Annual
produce at 16 Rs, that he had the
income

the Mother in law during her life
of the 1st 2d Defts respectively,
for which purpose
The Pltff replied in support of his Bill
The Defts filed Rejoinder in support
of their Answers -

Decree -

Upon Considering the Records of the
Case, it appears that the Wives of the 1st 2d
& the Heirs of the Pltff are Daughters
to the deceased Doorpersaud Sukhanand
Deceased & the 3 Defendants are now with
their Husbands & live, and have issue
It is understood that the Pltff's wife has
a Claim over the Moiety of the 1st Defts
late Grandfather Respectively -
Thakurtolany, who was the Widow of the
deceased Mr Thomas Mc Leish & who was
the Mother of the 3 Wives of the Parties
died (enjoying the Lands until her decease
Remarke) in Calcutta Month May
Calendar. It further appears that the
Pltff brought a Suit No 125 Hd. against the 1st 2d Defts stating that the
said Mr Mc Leish by Will bequeathed her
Property to the sons of Pltff & that they
were entitled to a Claim Wives to include
the said Thakurtolany - The Pltff has
agreed to file their Suit against the 1st 2d
Defts after the Settlement of the

the land in question descended to Litchimy
nund, for, Litchimma Neelchyt- had no
legal heir at his death but if was
not acquired by her by any other means
this Motion being too narrow decide
the land cannot go to only the Daughters
son because all 3 daughters are entitled
heirs to her (Litchimy nund) —
& suppose her two daughters of the land
& made over it to her single
daughters son alone, she is not entitled
& in consideration of the friendship or
subsisting terms with which the Pffs
wife may have treated Litchimy nund
the land she had may the Whole property
to a single daughters son it cannot
be said had on her part subsequently
Litchimy nund entered into the Pffs
the Defendant to give 1/2 Rooth to each of
her two Daughters & 1/2 Rooth to the
last Daughters son & pretended assigned
to the land should be in her name
would her life estate — the Pffs now
requires to set over the 1/2 Rooth to the
3rd Defts heirs, and the 1st & 2nd Defts
want equal share in the aggregate.
The Pffs informs the Court that Litchimy
Litchimy gained a Petition to the Civil
Court of Mauritius that she devested
of her property to the Pffs son
& that he must engage to — All these
facts Litchimy nund entered before
the Court

Has

has no claim Litchimy nund being a Defendant
The Pffs with a view to see his own son
attain the Whole Estate has brought
actions twice —

Giving points & requiring both parties
to take witnesses are unnecessary trouble
for them. It appears just that the
3 Daughters shall or must enjoy the
land in equal shares & that if the
two Daughters should die without
male issue, it should revert to
the son of the 3rd Daughter —

Decree that the land should be equally
enjoyed by 3 Daughters, that if two
Daughters become issueless their share
shall revert to the 3rd Daughters son,
that the 3rd Defd shall pay to Pffs
Rs 23 3 4 (being 1/3 of the last profits)
& that if the 3 has any claim as to his
having sent money to Litchimy nund
he is to sue her heirs. The costs to be
borne by respective parties — The 1st &
2nd Defts heirs have no concern in the
personal property bequeathed to the
Pffs son by Litchimy nund —

/ Signed

Rundell Lord Comm

Godawary

Decree passed by
the Hon'ble Sudder
Court of Rajahmundry
in Suit No 49 of 1850
20th Nov 1850

Suit No 803 of 1865
Appeal No 320 of 1866

Endorsement

The Petitioner is to understand that in case he is desirous that the lands claimed by him should be enjoyed as Inam he should apply to the Inam Commissioner and obtain a Puttah for the same.

29th February 1864

/Signed/ R. Chase
Asst Collector

1201 1/16
5 Feb
5/12

TINO

To

His Excellency the Governor
In Council
Fort Saint George

The humble Petition of Akella
Dikshatulu, Ramidar of Sidhantam Taluq
Tamicka, Godavery District.

Most humbly sheweth

That with profound respect and
humble submission, your Petitioner begs to lay
the following lines of his distressed condition
before your excellency with a sincere belief that
justice will be rendered to them.

That your petitioner's maternal grand
father named Doggirala Lakshmana Dikshatulu
had been enjoying hereditarily an Inam of 2 : 10 : 8
in the villages of Sidhantam, Taluq Tamicka
Godavery District, and subsequently descended
bearing normally issued to succeed to his estate.
On his death his widow Mahalakshmamma

acknowledging your petitioner as her Daughter
and rightful & heir both hers to her husband and
bequeathed to him all her property with Slaves,
according a Deed gift thereof as stamped paper of
Rupees received and immediately informed the
same to the Sub Collector with a request
that her Slaves should be registered in your
petitioners name, as she was permitted by her
late husband to do so.

That your petitioners grand=
father had three daughters of whom one is his
mother and the two others enjoying the peculiar
attachment shewn to him by his late grandmother
put forth claims to the property thus made over
to your petitioner on the ground that they are
equally heirs to succeed to the property of the
said Devarchalakshmamma. She consequently
they sued him in the Court of Rajamundry
who decreed that the three daughters should
equally enjoy only the Slaves belonging to
the deceased during their lives, and that every thing

held moveable and immoveable property thereof
after their decease devolve to your petitioners
self-possession.

That upon your petitioners grand=
=mother bequeathed all her property to them, your
petitioner and her mother the two daughters had been
for sometime enjoying the proceeds of the aforesaid
Slaves in three equal shares, and that while
your petitioner himself enjoyed them without hauth
sharing them with the others on the strength
of the document executed to them by his grand=
mother and that there been no complaint on
the part of the other two daughters.

That your petitioners grandmother
died in 1846 and her funeral rights (as the
religious deeds were according to the conditions
of the Document performed by Pendalone

That your petitioner being unable
to earn his livelihood and be equally bound
obtaining education, had to perform a long journey
to Benares with the object of procuring both

and with this travellers life, he slaid there for some years and at last in 1863 returned to his native Country.

That no sooner he arrived than he inquired into the Inams mandower deed by his late grandmother but he was informed by the village Officers that they had, in accordance with the orders of Government in 1848 directing an enquiry into the lapsed tenures, reported in 1852 the fact of there being no mandoi issued to the original grantee and the Inams were ordered to be assessed fully to Government in 1854.

When immediately your petitioner complained of the grave injustice done to him to the late Collector who ordered on it that he (your petitioner) should prefer his claims before the Inam Commissioner.

Your petitioner fully believing that justice will be done him by the Commissioner presented himself before the Commissioner and informed all matters connected with his case.

TANC

He is sorry to represent it to your excellency that that officer was pleased to reply him that he is unable to reopen such cases as are finally presumed by Government without their orders. Hence your poor petitioner had to procure to your excellency merciful consideration.

That your petitioner begs to send for your excellency's perusal all the following documents in his possession in support of his petition to the Inams resumed by Government during his absence.

I Deed of gift on stamped paper executed by his grandmother and produced before the Court in 1848 showing the right to the moveable & immoveable property belonging to the original grantee.

I Deed of the Municipal Adalat Court dated in 1850 confirming the right of your petitioner to succeed to the property of the deceased.

I Attested copy of a motion presented

in 1846 by the deceased before the Civil Court
of Rajamundry acknowledging the bequest
of her property to your petitioner

I A petition presented to the Sub Collector
with his endorsement.

I Copy of a petition presented by the
father of your petitioner in 1854 claiming
his right to the presumed Inam and which
was not endorsed but to this day.

I By these your excellency will easily
perceive that the Inams above referred to were
bequeathed to your petitioner in accordance with
the provisions of Hindu Law before the Orders
of 1854 and that they had been resumed by
Government mostly on the misrepresentation
of the village authorities and that without
not a full consideration by the executive officers
who instituted an enquiry into the lapse Tenures
that he has every right to succeeded to the property
of the deceased, he being a Convert from the Country.

In conclusion your petitioner most
humbly and respectfully craves your excellency
that his case may be reopened and enquired into either
under your orders by the Inam Commissioner and
that justice done to him by regranting the Inams
above mentioned as they were unjustly resumed by the
then Revenue authorities of the District without
going deeply into the nature and merits of the
case and without proper grounds for presumption.

As the Government are mere
generally acknowledging the right of Daughters
to succeed to the Inams of their grandfather and
as your petitioner is a helpless creature left
without any means of livelihood, he fully trusts
that your excellency will take his helpless case
to your deep and generous consideration and
protect him and his helpless family by ordering
an inquiry to be instituted into his case.

For which act of generosity and charity
your petitioner will, as in duty bound,

1864
29th November

Ever Pray
Your most Obedient & humble
Servant
[illegible]

No. 3201 of 1864.

Referred through the Board of Revenue to the Collector of the Godavery for report.—

By order

C. G. Master

Under Secy. to Govt.

Fort St. George
4th Jany. 1865.

Rec'd 5th Jany. 1865.

Forwarded to the Collector for report with reference to the order of Government noted within.

By Order,

[illegible]
Asst. Secretary.

Rev. Board's Office,
Octacamund,
8th Feby. 1865.

by threatening the Ryot to sue him.

Convicted the Accused of the Embezzlement of the collections & the orders of the Courts with the other papers.

In No 320/66

in the meantime he proceeded to Benares & during his absence his Grandson was removed by the Civil Court under the lapse rules on the misrepresentation of the village officers that on his return he applied to the subordinate for the restoration of his Grant but that officer referred him to the Inam commissioner who granted him no redress.

Prays that under the circumstances herein stated his case may be ordered to be inquired into by the Inam commissioner & justice be done to him

Inc. 320/66

No 3201 of 1864.

From Mella Dikshatulu, Inamdar of Sidakattum Taluq Tanjore Collectorate

Dated 29 Decr 1864

Rec'd 5 Decr 1864

With 5 Enclosures

States that his late maternal grandmother who had no male issue became absolutely entitled to the immoveable property to him under the right of Dauhitra (grandson) & he enjoyed it after her death accordingly. that

VI

Rec'd 1-1-65
3 Encls
4/4

To
The Honble Edward Maltby Esqr
Collector of Tanjore

The humble Petition of Mella Dikshatulu, Inamdar of the Village of Sidakattum of the Taluq of Tanjore of the Godaveray Dist

Humbly Sheweth,

That reference to my Petition which was forwarded to Government on the 29th November 1864, I beg to submit herewith English translations of 3 Documents viz. Memorandum to the Petition, and Decree of the Munsiff's Court the authenticated Copies whereof were filed with the said Petition & I request that they may be perused, when this Petition may be taken into such consideration as ordered to be necessary.

The said Petition containing full particulars of the origin of my hereditary Title to the said Inam was made Exhibit of being referred to the Inam Commissioner, it is needless to burthen any more in this Petition than enclosing a brief Account of it as hereinafter stated.

1st. By the Puttah it would evidence that my Grand Mother bequeathed it to me, who was her last Daughter's son, on Inam Land & other property in 1843.

2nd. In confirmation of her allotment my Name

Shane the Son of the late Petition I'm
said Land which Land was sold to my
Grandfather.

3 - - To the Prayer of the Petition that
my Father Shane brought a Suit against
the Executors of Archibald Hamilton Rowan
(Deceased) for two Drawings of
the Land for Timber, that the Judicial Court
decided that [illegible] Drawings of the two Letters
should remain with the Shane Land
that Letters [illegible] after the Property settled
to Shane Land, and it could be taken out
said Drawings were made
thereon -

4 - - My Grandfather died in 1828 - Shane
was only pursued the Shane Land from 1843
to the Period of my Grandmother in 1848
but acts in to the end of 1851 - In 1851 I
left the Village for Binaries & returned
in 1853 - After my Father was
living the Shane Land, the Village offices
in a Close School in which they wrote
that the Land Law Courts did, it should
be, [illegible] - the new Authorities
Letter, [illegible] to the Post & C Shane
Petitioner Refering to the Land as Executors & Trustees
in 1854 -

5 - - My Petition in Part Amended a
Petition to the Court to treat my Shane
Land as not falling under the Last
Act but Petitioned to, & Continued

under the Donation Petition that was
recognized by the Award of the Civil Court
the Corbett declined to interfere with such
Reference as the Shane Commissioners,
Was upon my Application only said
that he cannot do any thing in Letters
on the ground that the Land Courts been
[illegible] by Order of Court in 1854 -

Petitioner Shane presented the said
Petition to Court in Pursuance of
Order said Documents
to Shane Castle that the Shane Land
Estate was Entered in 1854 was not Entered
to be Examined by the Barons Court

Because Land entitled to my Shane
Petitioner Estate Land Petitioned Pursuant
Law, [illegible]
2 Because the Grant of the Shane Estate
by the Judicial Decree, [illegible]
3 Because the Grant in the Shane Estate
Petitioner by the Judicial Decree [illegible]
Petitioner Land Estate to the Shane Estate

Where Petitioner Grant be Decree Pursuant
may be Continued, [illegible] Petitioner
What good Cause will there be for
the Grant of Petitioner to do
the Petitioner, that unfortunate
North there be for the Petitioner to

not to treat his [illegible] - This is therefore by the deed of the [illegible] decree [illegible] myself being as grand son a just description of his under [illegible]

1 April 1866 - [illegible]

No. 803 of /65.

As the Inam in question was assessed fully under orders of Government more than 12 years ago, the Governor in Council cannot allow the question to be reopened.

Fort St. George.
3rd January /66.

By Order.

[illegible]
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

—Petitioner must humbly entreats ~~your Honour~~ Your Honor will have pity on him and be graciously pleased to see the following few lines and take these circumstances into your Honor's Consideration.

1st. Collector had Jagtied the Lands under reference when the Petitioner was living at Benares and other places in 1853.

2nd Petitioner's father named Subbannah addressed a petition to the Collector in 22nd February 1854 for which he did not receive any reply.

3rd. In the year 1863 the Petitioner came from Benares and addressed a petition immediately and as he did not receive any order as he obliged to address another petition in the 19th February 1864 on which an order was given that the Petitioner should refer the circumstances to the Exam Commissioner and in accordance to the order of Collector the Petitioner addressed a petition to the Exam Commissioner in the 18th July 1864

4th. As the Exam Commissioner was given orders that the Petitioner showed inform Government of these circumstances, he addressed a Petition without loss of time on the 29th of November

5th. And when the Petitioner considers about the lapse of time he thinks that since the date on which the Collector Jagtied in 1853 to the time of his arrival to this Country in the year 1863 only 9 years elapsed and the Petitioner did not continue to recline wantonly

6th That from the time of his assessing the Collector in 1863 to the date on which the final decision was given 30 months have passed.

7th According to the above mentioned circumstances without taking into account the time nearly 21 years, which have passed in your Honor's Public Offices it seems quite unreasonable to reject the Petitioner's claim on the ground of its having been settled more than twelve years ago.

8th The Inadadoole estate was under the Jagt of your Honor's Government for 18 years but the Zemindary was restored afterwards to the legal Proprietor.

9th The allowance granted to the Malrajgoo Family (which was discontinued for upwards of 20 years) wa

No. 320 of 1866.

From Atluly Dutchi-
tulu, Inamdar of Se-
dantam, Tanuku Taluq,
Godavari District.

Dated 29 } Jany 1866.
Rec.d 29 }

12 Enclosures.

Recapitulating the circumstances of his former petition and expressing to the enclosed endorsement passed thereon, cites certain clauses in support of his claim & states the circumstances under which he was delayed from appearing before the Inam Comr. begs that an order may be issued for the restoration of his lands as was done to others.

Submits herewith certain papers with the Collrs. Endorsement for the consideration of Govt.

771
21 enclosures
15-3-66

To

The Right Honorable
The Secretary of State
for India in Council

The humble Memorial
of C. Kelly Detchitoolo Residing
in the Village of Siddhantam
attached to the Taloog of Tanoo Ka
Godavery District
Madras.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

That your Lordship's poor Petitioner humbly begs to submit this appeal against the decision of the Local Government Refusing to investigate into his claim to certain Inam land on the ground of its having been Resumed under the orders of Government more than 12 years ago.

2 That the facts of the case are briefly:- that the lands in question formed the personal Inam land of one D Inahalatchmy who bequeathed them in 1843 to her daughter's Son, the Petitioner, then a minor — Under Guardianship of his father (Son in law of Inahalatchmy) Inahalatchmy died in 1848, and the lands continued to be engaged by the Petitioner till 1852, in which he was obliged to go to Benares leaving his old father in the management of the lands. In 1853 owing to some misrepresentations of the Villagers of Siddhantam

Tedchantam who wanted to bring the lands under puttah for their own benefit, they were gifted and finally resumed by the Collector under the orders of Government passed, as would appear from the Endorsement granted by Government, 12 years ago.

3 That owing to the absence of the Petitioner, his father presented an Argee to the Collector in 1854 exclaiming against the above unjust proceedings to which no reply was favored. Subsequent Petitions presented by the Petitioners father shared the same fate. On the Petitioners return from Benares in 1863, another Argee was presented to the Collector by the Petitioner to which also no reply was given, but to a last Argee presented by the Petitioner in 1864, the Collector was pleased to refer him to the Enam Commissioner, and this latter Authority only said that the decision of the case rested with the Government. And to two Petitions presented by the Petitioner to Government, His Excellency the Governor in Council was only pleased to pass the following endorsement.

"As the Inam in question was assessed fully under orders of Government more than 12 years ago, the Governor in Council cannot allow the question to be reopened."

4 That the Petitioner is not aware of the grounds under which his Inam lands were resumed by the Local Authorities, but there is not the least doubt as to the right of

× 22 Feb 7

(8)

of the Petitioner to the lands for the following reasons.

I The lands were formally bequeathed to the Petitioner by means of a Will made by Mahalatchimy who possessed the right of disposing of them just like her other property.

II The Petitioner bequeathed the lands not only by reason of the above Will, but also by right of heirship to the deceased Mahalatchimy, as he is the son of her daughter - a right fully recognized by the Hindoo Law.

III The decisions of the Civil and the Pandita Sudar Ameen Courts are extant to the effect that the Petitioner has a right to the lands under reference.

IV The lands in question form no portion of any service Inam to justify their Resumption. They belong to the class of grants which have been treated under the Inam Rules just like private property only subject to a light assessment to the State.

V Had the Government any just right to the lands they would have been Resumed at once on the death of Mahalatchimy in 1848 and not have been allowed to be enjoyed by the Petitioner till 1853.

5 That the Petitioner is not Chargeable with any neglect or delay in prosecuting his claims as Petitions have been presented by him to the Local Authorities ever since the Resumption of the lands.

× No 215 of 1848
⊗ 20th November 1850
No 49

lands, as will be seen from para 3 of this Petition -

6 That under all the foregoing Circumstances and more especially as the lands were resumed without the least enquiry of the parties interested in them, and that during to the absence of the Petitioner from the Village and under the misrepresentations of the Villagers, Your noble Lordship's Petitioner humbly implores that your will be pleased to order the Restoration of the lands under the Inam Rules as has been done in thousands of Cases similar to that of the Petitioner.

That for this act of impartial Justice your poor Petitioner shall as in duty bound ever pray.

15th March 1866.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಗೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಂಟೋನ್ಮೆಂಟಿನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಜಡ್ಜಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವ ಜೆ. ಸಿ. ಮೆಕ್ಲಿನ್ ಎಂಬ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆಜ್ಞೆ

ಈ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ 20 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 1867

ಆಜ್ಞೆಯ ವಿಷಯ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಂಟೋನ್ಮೆಂಟಿನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಜಡ್ಜಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವ ಜೆ. ಸಿ. ಮೆಕ್ಲಿನ್ ಎಂಬ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆಜ್ಞೆ

ಈ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ 20 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 1867

ಆಜ್ಞೆಯ ವಿಷಯ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಂಟೋನ್ಮೆಂಟಿನ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಜಡ್ಜಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವ ಜೆ. ಸಿ. ಮೆಕ್ಲಿನ್ ಎಂಬ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯವರು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆಜ್ಞೆ

ಈ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ 20 ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 1867

ಆಜ್ಞೆಯ ವಿಷಯ

as yet taken
in the matter; and
that certain Lapse
Registers, and Reports
from the Collector
will rightly represent
his case.

Prays, that
they may be sent for,
and Inam restored
to him

Forwarded to the
Collector, for early report
with reference to the
Board's Endorsement
on Pet.r Bd.s No. 109 of
By Order

Revn. Bd.s Office, Lubbee
Chepauk
3rd May 67

that our Appeal
our this having been
made to the Secretary
of State for India,
information was
required by him
as to what had
transpired regarding
this case; that the
Govt and Board's
orders for his in-
formation were re-
by the Collector, but
no action has been

No 963 of 1867
From A Kellar
Dischatulu Inamdar
of Siddhantam in
Tanuku Taluq in the
Dt of Godary
Rec'd 20th
Read 22nd March 1867
Stated that
Inam Lands
which descended
to him were during
his absence in Benares
Kept up by Govt;
that

2 3 4 5
2 8 6 7

To
The Right Honorable
The Governor in Council
of Fort St George Madras
The humble Petition of
A Kellar Dischatulu
Inamdar of Siddhantam
Tanuku Taluq in the
Godavary District
Humbly Sheweth
That Your Petitioner begs
to state that he has presented to your honor
an Appeal to the Secretary of State dated
15th March 1866 regarding injustice he has
been subjected to in the case of his grand
mothers Inam, (Mothers mother) inherited
to him and which was in his enjoyment since

2 Being obliged to present supplemental
Petition on the above subject he did accordingly
accordingly on 13th December 1866 together with
an endorsement received from the Inam Com-
missioner on applying to him for Copies of
correspondence passed by the Commissioner
of Northern Circar in the said Lapse case,

3 An Endorsement is received on his subsequent Petition No. 3392 of 1866 to the effect that his case is under investigation, under your honor-

4 Your humble Petitioner although has waited for favourable orders in his Inam Commissioner's office at Coimbatore for 3 years he had not succeeded and therefore had recourse to your Lordships Just Judgement - He having received unjust decision in the Government also gave Appeal Petition to your Excellency in March 1866.

5. Your humble Petitioner after having been obliged to stop years together at Madras with family - he had the misfortune of suffering the losses of his wife and child and still remains now expecting Justice from Excellency's rightful decision

6 Your Petitioner therefore most humbly craves Your Excellency will be pleased to decide your long waiting Petitioners cause as soon as possible.

Madras
Dated 8th April 1867

I, The Right Honorable
The Governor in Council

Fort St. George

No 1846

Ordered that the Memorial
received with the foregoing letter
be despatched to Fort St George
and that the Memorialist be
informed of its despatch.

H Grant
9th August 67.

No 983 of 1867.
Rec'd 9th Aug 67 & Pets.

From Abella Dikshatalu, Inamdar of Siddhavallam in Tanuku Taluq, Godavary District.

Dated 8th
Rec'd 9th April 1867

Referring to his Memorial of 15th March 1866 addressed to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State in Council for his grand mothers Inam land inherited by him & to the supplemental petition of 13th Decr last & to the Endorsement passed thereon by this Govt. states that great

injustice alone to him in the case and prays for the speedy disposal of his case.

12/8/1407 Forwarded to the Collector for early report with reference to the Board's Endt on Petr B's No 109 of 1866.

By Order

M Carmichael
Subdr

Rev. B's Office, Chepauk
3rd May 67

Rev.

Reported to Bd/ 12th August.

Rev.

Petition

Revenue 1867. — Department.

Bd of Govt for August

No. 2094.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 10th *July* 1867.

~~£ 5 13 —~~

Rev

£ 3 0 —

No. 4,306.

Submitting report of Collector of Godavery district on Petition No 771 of 1866 claiming certain Inam in Tanuku taluq.

Ans 1866 9 Aug

With an order

185 / 13

£ 3 0 Aug 6/67