M.R.O. 14-5,450-22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1875 Press ~~Mis.~~

250.257

Dated 12-8-1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th August 1867.

No. 250. Read the following letter from NARASINGAMMA GAROO, of Cuddapah District, now in Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated 1st July 1867:—

1. I beg most respectfully to enclose triplicate copies of my Memorial for transmission to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India.

2. From a perusal of the Memorial your Honor cannot but perceive that a great and gross injustice is being done to me by the withholding of the arrears of pension due to my mother, and consequently to myself.

3. The circumstances are briefly these:—

The ancient Polliem of Chetwal, the most honorable of all the Polliems in the Ceded Districts, was assumed for certain political reasons in 1801, and an allowance in compensation was granted to my ancestors of one-tenth of the entire revenue of the Polliem, which originally consisted of Rupees 22,344-2-3 per annum, but which was subsequently reduced to Rupees 19,879-12-5, in consequence of the entire reduction of the assessment of the Cuddapah District.

4. On the reduction of the assessment, the pensions were apportioned as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
To Venkataragava Raz	13,253	3	0
,, Venkatarama Raz	3,314	4	9
,, Venkatapathi Raz	3,314	4	9

that is, two-thirds to the then Poligar, and one-sixth each to the other two brothers.

5. My grandfather was Venkataramah Raz, and one of his two wives, Venkatammah, was my grandmother. Agreeably to the terms on which the Polliem was assumed, and the respective apportionment of the pension was made, the pension of said Venkatammah should have been continued to her daughter, my mother, Ramakammah, but which from the inadvertence and misrepresentations of the Board of Revenue was not restored to her from the year 1831, the year in which my grandmother Venkatammah died, to the year 1846. Meanwhile, the arrears which was to have been duly paid to my mother was withheld, notwithstanding the repeated remonstrances of myself and my mother, to the Collector, Board of Revenue, and Government. Why should this be so? Was not the pension guaranteed by Government so long as there were lineal descendants of the ancient Poligars? Why was it not continued to my mother, except from the inadvertence and mis-statement of the Board of Revenue, who subsequently acknowledged their error, and the Local and Supreme Governments directed the allowance to be paid to my mother. Since such is the case, and since the claim of my mother was admitted by the Local and Supreme Governments, why should not the arrears be disbursed?

6. Honored Sir, the allowance is not a charitable one; it was given in compensation of the Polliem assumed by Government, and the amount given to my grandmother was wrongfully stopped through the inadvertence and misrepresentation of the Board of Revenue, though it was guaranteed originally by Government, and subsequently by Sir Thomas Munro, that it would be continued to my grandmother and mother.

7. This was not done, and my prayer in the Memorial is that the arrears of my deceased mother's pension, due to her from 1831 to 1846, may be now disbursed.

8. And I further humbly solicit your Honor that you will kindly intercede on my behalf, and procure a favorable recommendation from the Right Honorable the Governor in Council to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, that the said arrears may be paid to me.

No. 251. ORDER THEREON, 12th August 1867, No. 1,875.

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) J. GROSE,
Under Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Memorial 1875
Rev. & Genl. Dept.
Rec. 12th August 1875
No. of Memorialist
Pollam Chetwad

7,

The Right Honorable
The Secretary of State for India
East Indian Fund
London

The humble Memorial of Chinnammal granddaughter of Srimant Mudal Chandrasekara Muttu Venkatachalam Ammal Boya, late Poligar of Chittoor in the District of Cuddapah Presidency of Madras

Most Humbly Sheweth,

That the Pollam of Chittoor is a most ancient one, held and enjoyed from time immemorial by Memorialist's Ancestors, and Sanads and jaudeloiss of the state previous of Sanads were in use at the establishment Rule, and the Memorialist's Ancestors were first of Cuddapah, Chittoor and Kurnool Poligars and the other Poligars in the Ceded Districts.

2 After the Ceded Districts fell into the possession of the British, the Chittoor Pollam, from being Peishcush Circars which were ceded in 1801 was suspended and 10 per cent of the entire Income of the Pollam

amounting

amounting to Rupees 22,341 . 2 . 3 for which sum was granted to the said Lord by the Legislature on the estimate of the assessment hereinafter mentioned of which the said sum of Rupees 1231 . 12 . 8 for Arrears would be [illegible] the Collector [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] the 24th Rupees 3316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rs.

3 The application was then read, stating that the said Lord had at different times, and [illegible] Rupees to repair the [illegible]

4 [illegible] Rupees [illegible] Rupees [illegible] Tankhamen allowed to the [illegible]

5 The Petition of Catherine [illegible] the 11th of March 1822, was then read, stating that the said Lord had left to her daughter Elizabeth Tankhamen, otherwise called Elizabeth [illegible] another sum of [illegible] Rupees 1231 . 12 . 8 for Arrears of Land Revenue [illegible] Collector, which [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] the 24th Rupees 3316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rs.



The Petitioner [illegible] Rupees [illegible] Rupees [illegible] Tankhamen allowed to the [illegible]

Resolved that the Arrears of Land Revenue due [illegible] and be [illegible] by the Collector

Consent

6 Consent on the part of the Collector Resolved that the said sum of Rupees 1231 . 12 . 8 for Arrears of Land Revenue due [illegible] be [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rupees 3,316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] the 24th Rupees 3316 . 4 . 9 to be [illegible] Rs.

7 From the foregoing statement from Government it appears that it was [illegible] advantage of the Board of Revenue the Revenue which was guaranteed to Government to be given [illegible] and which was enjoyed by Elizabeth Tankhamen was not sufficient to her mother for a series of years that is from 1801 to 1805, notwithstanding the frequent application to the Authorities. That under this she was recommended to be justly entitled to the Revenue the Arrears were not paid to her. And that whose Elizabeth Tankhamen frequently submitted her claim to the Collector, Board of Revenue and Government to the said Arrears, Government were at last pleased to pass an Order

made

[illegible] Act 1871 of 1878 to the
[illegible] of the great [illegible] of time the
[illegible] Act 1878 [illegible]
[illegible]

8th The order in which the just & allowances
Brother or Sister & Children were entitled and time after
which [illegible] their claim to the arrears of pension
[illegible] was that the pensioner is to not
[illegible] the Elderly [illegible] & Memorialists
Grandmother which Memorialists Brother claimed
and which was subsequently, through [illegible] arbitrary
[illegible] by the Board and Supreme Government.
Early the was entitled to the pension from the date
[illegible] Memorialists Brothers demise and since
[illegible] the [illegible] to entitled to allowance both
[illegible] to the Brother & to the Memorialists
[illegible] Grandmother & to the Memorialists
[illegible] was [illegible] by Government
pensioned that the pensions were hereditary as declared
by Government in 1845 and were continued to both
[illegible] & female descendants of the pensioner
[illegible]

10th [illegible] Memorialists Brother [illegible]
[illegible] by the Temporary Commissioner
[illegible] & [illegible] pensioned [illegible]
[illegible] Memorialists Brother [illegible]
[illegible] & [illegible] of the family - the allowance
of each individual [illegible] being [illegible] in the
event of failure of [illegible] descendants.

11th [illegible] to the grounds on which his application was
rejected & [illegible] to be paid at once [illegible]

Memorialist

[illegible] to that [illegible] Brother and her self were
supported by their Uncle the late Rajah Gopee Mohun
that they were so protected for a days that deprive them
of their right to the arrears. It would violate the
[illegible] of the [illegible] allowance given in
lieu of the pension for [illegible] in the name
of [illegible] the [illegible] of the family [illegible] the
other members of the family were to look for [illegible]
So that case the pension would devise without any
[illegible] to one or other of the members of the family
and according to that principle the entire amount
would have been inherited by Memorialists Brother
as heir to her Uncle the late Rajah Gopee Mohun, such not
having been the case and in favour of the contrary
the pension was divided into three shares, one share
[illegible] of several [illegible] Memorialists Brother
just cause or reason why the arrears should not be
discussed. Memorialists Brother was either entitled
to succeed to the pension of her Uncle or to that of her
mother & if was to the pension of her brother that
she applied and which should have been continued
to her from her mothers death but which was
[illegible] Memorialist [illegible] Brother
[illegible] Government [illegible] to her brother
or decided [illegible] the pensions to the descendants
descendants or their [illegible] of the family to obtaining
not. The pensions of pensioners enjoyed by Memorialists
will prove to Government and by withholding the
arrears she is unable to make any provision for those
who are under her protection.

Memorialist

12 ...ference to the principle the grounds assigned by the late Judge Venkata Cappa Chetty and the tribunal the latest grants have accrued to Government and but a comparatively small amount, some three or four thousand rupees per annum is at present confined to the few surviving widows of the Vellanad family while all the rest of the guaranteed allowances has been escheated to Government. But the Court were the benevolent intentions of Government still in ...ward ...ance, departed from and that in the single instance of Memoriallist Brother Ramakrishnaiah, who, as stated above was the daughter of Venkata Cappa Chetty, Regulator of Venkatagiri, Memorialists ...

13 Further, the pension is not a hereditary allowance, it was granted in consideration of the Estates of Vellanad & Venkatagiri being resumed and guaranteed by Government and forfeited, as long as there were direct descendants of the family in the male or female line, hence the British Government might have ...ked the resumption of the Vellanad Zamindary when it would presume to prefer such an application, but it was ...ed that the ... Memorialist ... Venkatagiri ... that allowance ... to approach your Lordship and ...

14 The Petition were ordinarily rejected if Memorialists ...nected with the house of Government as ... their claim was ... of the ... as perfectly ... as the ... Brother Venkata ... Thomas Clarke, then Collector of Nellore ...

an

...ference of the Memorialists ... Venkatagiri ... account of the Zamindari ... that her pension would be continued to them ... to her daughter but not to the Memorialists ... to be ... the ... Memorialists ... to ... that ... the ... Memorialists ... the ... Memorialists ... the ... Memorialists

No 8875

Ordered that the Memorial received with the foregoing letter be dispatched to Rome Govt, and that the Memorialist be informed of its dispatch.

J. Rose

12th Augt.

Memorial in triplicate
to the address of the Secy of
State for India praying to
forward the same to
its proper destination -

Rejd. 11 Aug 1867

Rev. 1867. No 4

Postponed to Aug 1867

No. 1750.

From Narasingamma

Garu of Cuddapa Dist.

now in Madras.

Dated 1 July 1867

Rec'd 3 Encls.

1 & 4 Pet.

States that her Pollem was resumed by Govt for certain political reasons in 1801 & an allowance in consideration was granted to her ancestors at 1/10 of the Rent of the Pollem amounting to Rs 22,344-2-3 per annum but it was subsequently reduced to Rs 1987-12-5 owing to the entire reduction of the assessment of the Distt in 1875-12 Fasli

Prays to Enq. into the circumstances under which the three Poligars pay 1/6 & the other 2 brothers 2/3 to the Govt & the pensions were granted to her mother & also to the terms on which the Pollem was assessed but it was not continued from 1831 to 1846 on the misrepresentations of the Board of Revenue & that the arrears due to her mother was withheld though the Board of Revenue acknowledged their error & the petitioner addressed the Board repeatedly on the subject to the Local authorities & to Govt & the pension was continued on her mother with reference to the Local Govt & Supreme Govt. Submits that