

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1253	Press Mis.
Dated	7-5-18	1868

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

Extract of a letter from the Acting Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore,
dated 7th April 1868, No. 30.

- *
1. With reference to your letter of the 20th February, I regret the delay which has occurred, but the matter came under my notice for the first time to-day. I have called upon the Tahsildar of Oodumalapettai to explain that portion of the delay for which he is responsible, and will forward his explanation when received.
4. The record connected with the subject is enclosed, together with a Memorandum of the delay.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) P. GRANT,
Collector.

Memorandum.

Tahsildar's Report to Collector, December 16th, 1865.

Do. referred to Sub-Collector, January 6th, 1866.

Takced to Tahsildar calling for information, January 16th, 1866.

Tahsildar's reply, February 20th, 1866.

Takced for further information, February 26th, 1866.

Reply to the Sub-Collector, March 20th, 1866.

The Board do not know on what principle the Collector makes this recommendation. The person to whom he proposes to continue the pension has, apparently, no claim whatever upon Government, as the deceased received her allowance as a member of a totally different family. Further explanation is requested.

No. 145. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.
Read the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th May 1867, No. 111.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 3,939, of the 8th June 1866, I have the honor to submit copy of a letter from my Sub-Collector, No. 101, of the 2nd instant, which goes to supply the information called for in the above Proceedings.

From the Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 2nd May 1867, No. 101.

1. In reply to your letter of the 17th April, No. 163, I have the honor to state that I do not recommend the continuance of Ponnandy Ammal's pension to her husband's nephew.
2. Government in their Order, dated 22nd November 1866, No. 3,181, observe that these pensions are clearly not hereditary, and should be gradually reduced as circumstances permit. The present case is one in which the pension may be discontinued.
3. In my letter of the 7th April 1866, No. 40, I said, "There is no record in this office showing the terms upon which Ponnandy Ammal's pension was granted; but so far as the circumstances of the family are concerned the continuance of the pension may be recommended." This was in reply to your letter of the 6th January, No. 6, the Tahsildar having addressed you direct on the subject of this pension.

It is requested to state whether Ponnandy Ammal was a relative of the deceased, or whether she obtained her pension in virtue of her having been connected with the family by marriage.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

No. 146. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th April 1868, No. 2,590.
Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 8th June 1866, No. 3,939, and 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.

Read also the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 4th March 1868, No. 75.

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of a letter received from the Sub-Collector, dated 7th October last, No. 231, from which it will be seen that Ponnandy Ammal, referred to in the above Proceedings, obtained her pension more from her relationship with the Jelliputty Poligar's family than from her having become connected with the Chenchoovady Poligar's family by marriage.

From the Acting Sub-Collector, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Caroor, 7th October 1867, No. 231.

1. In reply to your letter, No. 327, dated the 11th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the deceased Ponnandy Ammal was the wife of a Poligar of Sunsuavady, Pollachy talook, who was hanged many years ago. She resided at her death with her grand nephew, the present pensioned Poligar of Jelliputty, in the same talook.

2. From the enclosed deposition of the present Poligar of Jelliputty, it appears that Ponnandy Ammal's pension came to her as the widow of her husband, and not in any way on account of her connection with the Jelliputty family. But as the deponent admits at the same time that its payment commenced when the Jelliputty Poligar was attached, and long subsequent to the execution of Ponnandy Ammal's husband, I venture to think that it is more probable that the pension accrued to her owing to relationship with the Jelliputty family rather than connection, by marriage, with the Sunsuavady Poligar. If this view be correct, the present claimant has no right to its continuance.

1. These papers will be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The deceased Ponnandy Ammal was in receipt of a Coimbatore Poligar pension, amounting to Rupees 64-6-3 per annum. From the statements alluded to in the letter from the Secretary to Government, dated 10th April 1827, No. 782, it appears that the allowance was granted to her as a member of the "Julliputty" family. Hence the Collector's recommendation that it should be continued to Saba Naick, her husband's nephew, and a member of a different family, is untenable, and the Board are of opinion that the pension should be declared to be lapsed.

3. The Collector will report whether the "Sunsuavady" Poligar, referred to in the Sub-Collector's letter, is the same as the "Chenchoovady" Poligar mentioned in the revised list of Poligar pensions submitted with letter from the Principal Collector of Coimbatore, dated 20th July 1826.

No. 147. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1868, No. 1,253.

Miscellaneous.

It is clear that the allowance enjoyed by the late Ponnandy Ammal was granted to her as a member of the Jelliputty family.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

Extract of a letter from the Acting Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 7th April 1866, No. 30.

1. With reference to your letter of the 20th February, I regret the delay which has occurred, but the matter came under my notice for the first time to-day. I have called upon the Tahsildar of Oodumalapettai to explain that portion of the delay for which he is responsible, and will forward his explanation when received.
4. The record connected with the subject is enclosed, together with a Memorandum of the delay.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) P. GRANT,
Collector.

Memorandum.

Tahsildar's Report to Collector, December 16th, 1865.

Do. referred to Sub-Collector, January 6th, 1866.

Takced to Tahsildar calling for information, January 16th, 1866.

Tahsildar's reply, February 20th, 1866.

Takced for further information, February 26th, 1866.

Reply to the Sub-Collector, March 20th, 1866.

The Board do not know on what principle the Collector makes this recommendation. The person to whom he proposes to continue the pension has, apparently, no claim whatever upon Government, as the deceased received her allowance as a member of a totally different family. Further explanation is requested.

No. 145. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.
Read the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th May 1867, No. 111.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 3,939, of the 8th June 1866, I have the honor to submit copy of a letter from my Sub-Collector, No. 101, of the 2nd instant, which goes to supply the information called for in the above Proceedings.

From the Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 2nd May 1867, No. 101.

1. In reply to your letter of the 17th April, No. 168, I have the honor to state that I do not recommend the continuance of Ponnandy Ammal's pension to her husband's nephew.
2. Government in their Order, dated 22nd November 1866, No. 3,184, observe that these pensions are clearly not hereditary, and should be gradually reduced as circumstances permit. The present case is one in which the pension may be discontinued.
3. In my letter of the 7th April 1866, No. 40, I said, "There is no record in this office showing the terms upon which Ponnandy Ammal's pension was granted; but so far as the circumstances of the family are concerned the continuance of the pension may be recommended." This was in reply to your letter of the 6th January, No. 6, the Tahsildar having addressed you on the subject of this pension.

It is requested to state whether Ponnandy Ammal was a relative of the family, or whether she obtained her pension in virtue of her having been connected with the family by marriage.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

No. 146. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th April 1868, No. 2,590.
Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 8th June 1866, No. 3,939, and 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.

Read also the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 4th March 1868, No. 75.

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of a letter received from the Sub-Collector, dated 7th October last, No. 231, from which it will be seen that Ponnandy Ammal, referred to in the above Proceedings, obtained her pension more from her relationship with the Jelliputty Poligar's family than from her having become connected with the Chenchoovady Poligar's family by marriage.

From the Acting Sub-Collector, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Caroor, 7th October 1867, No. 231.

1. In reply to your letter, No. 327, dated the 11th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the deceased Ponnandy Ammal was the wife of a Poligar of Sunsuavady, Pollachy talook, who was hanged many years ago. She resided at her death with her grand nephew, the present pensioned Poligar of Jelliputty, in the same talook.

2. From the enclosed deposition of the present Poligar of Jelliputty, it appears that Ponnandy Ammal's pension came to her as the widow of her husband, and not in any way on account of her connection with the Jelliputty family. But as the deponent admits at the same time that its payment commenced when the Jelliputty Pollicm was attached, and long subsequent to the execution of Ponnandy Ammal's husband, I venture to think that it is more probable that the pension accrued to her owing to relationship with the Jelliputty family rather than connection, by marriage, with the Sunsuavady Poligar. If this view be correct, the present claimant has no right to its continuance.

1. These papers will be submitted for the orders of Government.
2. The deceased Ponnandy Ammal was in receipt of a Coimbatore Poligar pension, amounting to Rupees 64-6-3 per annum. From the statements alluded to in the letter from the Secretary to Government, dated 10th April 1827, No. 782, it appears that the allowance was granted to her as a member of the "Julliputty" family. Hence the Collector's recommendation that it should be continued to Saba Naick, her husband's nephew, and a member of a different family, is untenable, and the Board are of opinion that the pension should be declared to be lapsed.
3. The Collector will report whether the "Sunsuavady" Poligar, referred to in the Sub-Collector's letter, is the same as the "Chenchoovady" Poligar mentioned in the revised list of Poligar pensions submitted with letter from the Principal Collector of Coimbatore, dated 20th July 1826.

No. 147. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1868, No. 1,253.

Miscellaneous.

It is clear that the allowance enjoyed by the late Ponnandy Ammal was granted to her as a member of the Jelliputty family.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

Extract of a letter from the Acting Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 7th April 1866, No. 30.

- *
1. With reference to your letter of the 20th February, I regret the delay which has occurred, but the matter came under my notice for the first time to-day. I have called upon the Tahsildar of Oodumalapettai to explain that portion of the delay for which he is responsible, and will forward his explanation when received.
4. The record connected with the subject is enclosed, together with a Memorandum of the delay.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) P. GRANT,
Collector.

Memorandum.

Tahsildar's Report to Collector, December 16th, 1865.
Do. referred to Sub-Collector, January 6th, 1866.
Takeed to Tahsildar calling for information, January 16th, 1866.
Tahsildar's reply, February 20th, 1866.
Takeed for further information, February 26th, 1866.
Reply to the Sub-Collector, March 20th, 1866.

The Board do not know on what principle the Collector makes this recommendation. The person to whom he proposes to continue the pension has, apparently, no claim whatever upon Government, as the deceased received her allowance as a member of a totally different family. Further explanation is requested.

No. 145. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.
Read the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th May 1867, No. 111.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 3,939, of the 8th June 1866, I have the honor to submit copy of a letter from my Sub-Collector, No. 101, of the 2nd instant, which goes to supply the information called for in the above Proceedings.

From the Sub-Collector of Coimbatore, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 2nd May 1867, No. 101.

1. In reply to your letter of the 17th April, No. 168, I have the honor to state that I do not recommend the continuance of Ponnandy Ammal's pension to her husband's nephew.
2. Government in their Order, dated 22nd November 1866, No. 3,181, observe that these pensions are clearly not hereditary, and should be gradually reduced as circumstances permit. The present case is one in which the pension may be discontinued.
3. In my letter of the 7th April 1866, No. 40, I said, "There is no record in this office showing the terms upon which Ponnandy Ammal's pension was granted; but so far as the circumstances of the family are concerned the continuance of the pension may be recommended." This was in reply to your letter of the 6th January, No. 6, the Tahsildar having addressed you on the subject of this pension.

It is requested to state whether Ponnandy Ammal was a relative of the deceased family, or whether she obtained her pension in virtue of her having been connected with the family by marriage.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1868.*

No. 146. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th April 1868, No. 2,590.
Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 8th June 1866, No. 3,939, and 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112.

Read also the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 4th March 1868, No. 75.

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1867, No. 4,112, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of a letter received from the Sub-Collector, dated 7th October last, No. 231, from which it will be seen that Ponnandy Ammal, referred to in the above Proceedings, obtained her pension more from her relationship with the Jelliputty Poligar's family than from her having become connected with the Chenchoo vady Poligar's family by marriage.

From the Acting Sub-Collector, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Caroor, 7th October 1867, No. 231.

1. In reply to your letter, No. 327, dated the 11th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the deceased Ponnandy Ammal was the wife of a Poligar of Sunsu vady, Pollachy talook, who was hanged many years ago. She resided at her death with her grand nephew, the present pensioned Poligar of Jelliputty, in the same talook.

2. From the enclosed deposition of the present Poligar of Jelliputty, it appears that Ponnandy Ammal's pension came to her as the widow of her husband, and not in any way on account of her connection with the Jelliputty family. But as the deponent admits at the same time that its payment commenced when the Jelliputty Poligar was attached, and long subsequent to the execution of Ponnandy Ammal's husband, I venture to think that it is more probable that the pension accrued to her owing to relationship with the Jelliputty family rather than connection, by marriage, with the Sunsu vady Poligar. If this view be correct, the present claimant has no right to its continuance.

1. These papers will be submitted for the orders of Government.
2. The deceased Ponnandy Ammal was in receipt of a Coimbatore Poligar pension, amounting to Rupees 64-6-3 per annum. From the statements alluded to in the letter from the Secretary to Government, dated 10th April 1867, No. 782, it appears that the allowance was granted to her as a member of the "Julliputty" family. Hence the Collector's recommendation that it should be continued to Saba Naick, her husband's nephew, and a member of a different family, is untenable, and the Board are of opinion that the pension should be declared to be lapsed.
3. The Collector will report whether the "Sunsu vady" Poligar, referred to in the Sub-Collector's letter, is the same as the "Chenchoo vady" Poligar mentioned in the revised list of Poligar pensions submitted with letter from the Principal Collector of Coimbatore, dated 20th July 1866.

No. 147. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1868, No. 1,253.

Miscellaneous.

It is clear that the allowance granted by the late Ponnandy Ammal was granted to her as a member of the Jelliputty family.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th May 1863.*

family; the Government, therefore, concur with the Board in considering that the allowance has lapsed.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
The Accountant General.

cp 1253

*It is clear that the allowance enjoyed
by the late Ponnandj Annal was
granted her as a member of the
Jelliputty family; the Government*

*Therefore concur with the Board in
considering that the allowance has
lapsed.*

*L.H.
7th May 63*

*11 Wm. B. of Rev. Secy
6 - acct General. n*

33-4

70

Ed. S. T. Aug 1863

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department
7th May 1863.

family; the Government, therefore, concur with the Board in considering allowance has lapsed.

To the
the

and S. T. Anglin.