

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	550.	Press Mis.
<u>72-73</u>		
Dated	3 rd March	1869.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Revenue Board Office,
Madras,
24th January 1869.

N^o.

From,

The Sub Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.

To,

The As Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to Official Memorandum
dated 15th January 1869 N^o 7, I am directed to report
that petition N^o 890 of 1850 from Narasingummal
was received in the Board's Office. An Extract
from the Register of Petitions relating to it is
subjoined -

2. No petition was received from Ramakrishna
in 1846 -

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

H. Gole
Sub Secretary

To The As Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

C. J. M. S. S.

Extract.

Extract from the Register of Petitions-

No	Name of the Petitioner-	Purpose of the Petition-	Board's Endorsement
890 of 1850	From Narasingamma daughter of Ramuakumma Chitwale Saman -stamm in Guddapah-	Praying that certain arrears due to her mother during a period of sixteen years may be paid up to her as she is hard pressed by her mother's creditors and she has no means of satisfying their demands-	Referred to the Collector for disposal by Endorsement- 1 st June 1850-

H. G. Gole
Sub Secretary

P. H.
C. P. Ramaswamy S. S.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd March 1869.*

Read the following papers :—

No. 72. Petition from MUTLA NARASINGUMMAH, grand daughter of STRIMON MAHA MUNDELESWARA MUTLA VENCATA RAMARAZ, late Poligar of Chitwail, in the District of Cuddapah, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 31st December 1868:—

1. In reference to the Order of Government, on her Supplementary Memorial No. 2,019 of 1867, to the Right Honorable, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, Petitioner solicits, with the utmost deference and respect, the attention of your Excellency in Council, to the following fresh facts bearing on her claim to the disbursement of the arrears of pension due to her:—

2. In that endorsement, it is stated, "that though it appears that a demand for the payment of arrears of her pension from 1831 to 1845 was presented by her to the Collector in 1857 or nine years earlier than the Government has supposed." Now, it is with respect to this statement, Petitioner would very respectfully submit, that Government have misapprehended the actual time when she first made an appeal and continuously thereafter applied to the authorities for the disbursement of the arrears.

3. Petitioner's mother, on the registration of the pension in her name in May 1846, consequent the rectification of the error committed by the Board of Revenue, that she was the daughter of the late Poligar, applied for the arrears in the same year, but having died within one short year, i. e., in June 1847, the arrears were not granted her.

4. In 1849, the pension registered in Petitioner's name, and she immediately thereupon addressed the Collector relative to her claim to the arrears in question, but finding that her applications were for some reason or other ineffectual, she presented her first *Petition on the subject to the Board of Revenue, No. 890, under date the 18th April 1850.*

5. This is the chief point, or fact as it is, to which Petitioner would elicit the particular attention of your Excellency in Council. It was not from 1857, which was only a reminder with reference to her petition, but from 1850, when she preferred her claim to the said arrears, or, in other language, just a year after the registry in her name. Hence it will be apparent that there was no delay whatever, either on the part of her mother or herself in preferring their claim to the arrears. From 1831 up to the time of her death in 1847, Petitioner's mother constantly applied for her pension and the arrears, and it was only through the unaccountable blunder of the Board of Revenue that she was kept out of the enjoyment thereof.

6. The truth of this statement can be easily ascertained, from the Petition Registers of the Board's Office. Did she or did she not present a Petition No. 890, 1850, dated 18th April 1850?

7. Such being the facts of the case, surely, it is not for Petitioner further to urge her claim by any stronger representation. There is no denial of her right and title to the arrears. That is a point which is beyond dispute, and were it not for the error originally committed by the Board of Revenue, these arrears would not have accrued. Now that she has proved that there was no delay on her part, that she did prefer her claim from 1850 and not from 1857, as is supposed by Go-

Refer to Secy 20/1/69

Rev. 1867 Copy

Secy. 11/7/77

She did not apply to the Board of Revenue.

By the Secy to Govt. of Madras Department.

*22/2/1869 January 1869
22/2/1869*

one

1-255

Petition - Lt. 890 of 1850 from Narasingumma - Govt. informed of receipt of it, & that no petition was received from her since. Hence in 1846.

22/2/69, 29/1/69

20/1/50. 3/1/69

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd March 1869.*

vernment, she leaves it to the just and candid consideration of your Excellency in Council, whether she is not entitled to receive the arrears.

8. Government, in their Endorsement on No. 1,071 of 1866, stated "that after "so great a lapse of time, the Government cannot take into consideration Petitioner's claim;" subsequently on Petitioner's first Memorial of the 1st July 1867, Government came to the conclusion that it was twenty-one years after she preferred her claim, and then on her Supplementary Memorial No. 2,019 of 1867, after reference to the Collector, Government passed an Endorsement that they found that *she did* set forth her claims "nine years earlier than they had supposed." But Petitioner has shewn that she did prefer her claim in 1850, within a year or so after the pension was registered in her name, and *not* in 1857. On what grounds then can the arrears be withheld from her?

9. It is further given in the Endorsement, that from the fact "of her request "having been finally negatived by the Secretary of State," the Government are "precluded from "again submitting her claim to the Secretary of State for India."

10. That august authority, it is true, negatived her claim; but that was from insufficient information, the real and whole facts of the case not having been submitted to him. Petitioner however, entertains the earnest belief that if her rights, as herein set forth, that she did present her claims to the arrears on the 18th April 1850, within a year after the pension was registered in her name, were brought forward to the notice of His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, it will be at once granted.

11. From this information not having been submitted to the Secretary of State, Section XIII of the Revised Memorial Rules is not at all applicable to her case. She submitted her Supplementary Memorial, *before* the Secretary of State passed his decision on her first Memorial, but *that* was not transmitted to him, it having been referred to the Collector for report, which he did not submit till several months later.

12. Petitioner therefore, with reference to the fresh facts herein contained, most humbly and respectfully solicits your Excellency in Council to be graciously pleased to take her just and rightful claim into mature deliberation, and pass an order directing the disbursement of the arrears to her.

13. Petitioner is in the most distressed circumstances; she has numerous individuals and dependants on her, and it will not only be an act of justice, but also an act of kind commiseration to order the disbursement of the arrears due to her. And Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

No. 72A. From the Sub-Secretary to the Board of Revenue, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Madras, 21st January 1869.

1. With reference to Official Memorandum dated 15th January 1869, No. 7, I am directed to report that, Petition No. 890 of 1850, from Narasingumamah was received in the Board's Office. An extract from the Register of Petitions relating to it, is subjoined.

2. No petition was received from Ramakamma in 1846.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd March 1869.*

Extract from the Register of Petitions.

No.	Name of the petitioner.	Purport of the petition.	Board's Endorsement.
890 of 1850	From Narasingumamah daughter of Ramakamma Chitwail Samastanum, in Cuddapah.	Praying that certain arrears due to her mother during a period of sixteen years may be paid up to her, as she is hard pressed by her mother's creditors, and she has no means of satisfying their demands.	Referred to the Collector for disposal, by Endorsement 1st June 1850.

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Sub-Secretary.

No. 73. ORDER THEREON, 3rd March 1869, No. 550.

Miscellaneous.

1. The claims put forward by the Petitioner formed the subject of a Memorial to the Secretary of State, which was forwarded by this Government on 12th August 1867. In his Despatch of 8th November 1867, the Secretary of State decided adversely to the Petitioner.

2. The Petitioner afterwards submitted a second Memorial, but the Government declined to forward it, on the ground that she had not shewn sufficient ground for a reconsideration of the question.

3. Since the petition now under consideration was filed, the Government have ascertained that in 1850 the Petitioner did address the Board of Revenue on the subject of the arrears claimed by her, and as is alleged, previously by her deceased mother, and that no final orders were passed.

4. Had this fact been established when the case came under consideration in 1866, the Government think that a more favorable view might have been taken, and as they are unwilling that Petitioner should suffer from a mistake, they resolve to transmit to the Secretary of State for India, a statement to the effect that the grounds upon which they based their former recommendation were opposed to the facts, and to express their opinion that the whole amount of the arrears which should have been paid to Ramakamma from 1830 to 1846 should now be disbursed to the Petitioner.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Erd. O. A. Turton.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
3rd March 1869.

No. 551.

No. 74.
To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Miscellaneous.

1. In reply to Mr. Under Secretary Batten's endorsement, dated 16th October 1868, on a Memorial addressed

to the Right Honorable the Viceroy, by Narasingamma, grand daughter of Venkatamaray, one of the brothers of the dispossessed Poligar of Chitwail, Cuddapah District, I am directed to state that the Memorialist's claim for the arrears of pension formed the subject of a memorial to the Secretary of State, which was forwarded by this Government on 12th August 1867, and in reference to which, the Secretary of State in his Despatch of 8th November 1867, confirmed the Order of the Madras Government, refusing to re-open a question which had been settled in 1845, and was not mooted again until 1866. A copy of that correspondence is herewith, forwarded, for the information of the Supreme Government.

2. Subsequently, the Memorialist presented a supplementary petition impugning the accuracy of the statement that her claim to the arrears had not been put forward between 1845 and 1866, and asserted that she had repeatedly presented petitions on the subject to the local authorities and the Board of Revenue. On inquiry, it was ascertained that the petitioner had filed a petition on the subject of these arrears in 1857, but the Government did not consider themselves justified in transmitting the second memorial to the Secretary of State on this ground only, considering that the same arguments adduced by them on the previous occasion would hold good, although the period during which she had failed to assert her claims was reduced from 21 to 12 years. The second memorial was therefore returned to the petitioner, under clause 2, Section XIII. of the revised Memorial Rules.

3. The Memorialist in the petition now under consideration, again asserts, that her mother Raunkumma did present a petition on the 26th May 1846, on the subject of the arrears claimed by her. With reference to this assertion, a careful search was again made in the Office of the Board of Revenue, and discovery has been made of a Petition numbered 890 of 1850, which was presented by the petitioner Narasingamma herself, though none from Raunkumma can be traced. Under these circumstances, and considering that the former memorial was rejected on what now seem to be insufficient grounds, this Government have resolved to represent the facts of the case, as recently ascertained, to the Secretary of State, and to recommend that the decision of the Secretary of State, dated 11th November 1867, be reconsidered and the arrears of pension claimed, be disbursed to the Memorialist.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Ed. G. A. Turton.

REVENUE.

1869 MARCH.

1869 March, 3rd.

G. O. 3rd March 1869, No. 551.

MARCH.

Nos. 72-73.

Memorial from Narasingamma a member of the deposed Poligar's family—
Favorable report made to be made to Her Government with reference to her claim to certain arrears of Pension.

2781
Sund
2/12/68

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
The Governor in Council
Fort Saint George
Madras

The humble Petition of Mulla
Nursinga-umma, grand-
daughter of Strimmo Maha
Mundaleswara Mulla Vencata
Ramaray, late Paligar of
Whitwab in the District of
Cuddapah

Respectfully Sheweth,

In reference to the order of Government
on her Supplementary Memorial No 2019 of 1867
to the Right Honorable Her Majesty's Secretary
of State for India, Petitioner solicits, with
the utmost deference and respect, the attention
of your Excellency in Council, to the following
fresh facts bearing on her claim to the
disbursement of the arrears of pension due to
her.

2 In that endorsement it is stated that
"though it appears that a demand for the
payment of arrears of her pension from
1831

Financial ISG9 Department.

[]

From Government of

Fort St. George.

Dated 3rd March.

3. } No. 531.
Enclosure.
6 spare copies.

2. No.

1. No. } Prog. } No.

RECEIVED

NO. 74.

Reporting on the Memorial from Narasim-
amma, Grand daughter of Vencataramany one of
the brothers of the deposed Poligar of Guntur,
claiming certain arrears of Pension.

1831 to 1845 was presented by her to the Collector in 1857 or some years earlier than the Government has supposed. Now, it is with respect to this statement, Petitioner would very respectfully submit that Government have misapprehended the actual time when she first made an appeal and continuously thereafter applied to the authorities for the disbursement of the arrears.

3. Petitioner's mother on the Registration of the pension in her name in May 1846, consequent the rectification of the error committed by the Board of Revenue that she was the daughter of the late Poligar, applied for the arrears in the same year, but having died within one short year, i.e. in June 1847, the arrears were not granted her.

4. In 1849 the pension registered in Petitioner's name, and she immediately thereupon addressed the collector relative to her claim to the arrears in question, but finding that her applications were for some reason or other ineffectual, she presented her first petition on the subject to the Board of Revenue, No 890, under date the 18th April 1850.

5. This is the chief point, or fact as it is, to which Petitioner would direct the particular

particular attention of your Excellency informant. It was not from 1857, which was only a reminder with reference to her Petition, but from 1850, when she preferred her claim to the said arrears, or, in other language, just a year after the registry in her name. Hence it will be apparent that there was no delay whatever, either on the part of her mother or herself in preferring their claim to the arrears. From 1831 up to the time of her death in 1847, Petitioner's mother constantly applied for her pension and the arrears, and it was only through the inexcusable blunder of the Board of Revenue that she was kept out of the enjoyment thereof.

The truth of this statement can be easily ascertained, from the Petition Registers of the Board's Office. Did she or did she not present a Petition No 890, of 1850 dated 18th April 1850?

Such being the facts of the case, surely, it is not for Petitioner further to urge to urge her claim by any stronger representation. There is no denial of her right and title to the arrears. That is a point which is beyond dispute, and were it not for the error originally committed by the Board

of Revenue these arrears would not have
accrued. Now that she has proved that there
was no delay on her part - that she did
prefer her claim from 1850 and not
from 1857, as is supposed by Government,
she leaves it to the just and candid con-
sideration of your Excellency in Council,
whether she is not entitled to receive the
arrears.

Government in their endorsement
on No 1071 of 1866, stated "that after so great
a lapse of time, the Government cannot
take into consideration Petitioner's claim."
Subsequently on Petitioner's Memorial of
the 10th July 1867, Government came to the
conclusion that it was 21 years after
she preferred her claim, and then on her
supplementary Memorial No 2019 of 1867,
after reference to the Collector, Government
passed an endorsement that they found
that she did set forth her claims 9 years
earlier than they had supposed. But
Petitioner has shown that she did prefer
her claim in 1850 within a year or so
after the pension was registered in her
name and not in 1857 - on what ground
then can the arrears be withheld from
her.

This further gives in the Endorse-
ment that from the fact of her request
having

having been finally negatived by the Secretary
of State the Government are precluded from
again submitting her claim to the Secretary
of State for India.

That august authority, it is true, negatived
her claim, but that was from insufficient
information, the real and whole facts of the
case not having been submitted to him. Petitioner,
however, entertains the earnest belief that
if her rights, as herein set forth, that she did
present her claims to the arrears on the 18th April 1850,
within a year after the pension was registered
in her name, were brought forward to the
list of His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State for India, it will be
at once granted.

From this information not having been
submitted to the Secretary of State, Section
xiii of the Revised Memorial Rules is not
at all applicable to her case. She submitted
her supplementary Memorial, before the
Secretary of State passed his decision, but
that was not transmitted to him, it
having been referred to the Collector for
report, which he did not submit till
several months later.

Petitioner therefore, with reference
to the fresh facts herein contained, begs
to be
Humbly

70
humbly and respectfully solicits your Excellency
in Council to be graciously pleased to take
her just and rightful claims into mature
deliberation and pass an order directing
the disbursement of the arrears to
her.

Petitioner is in the most distressing
circumstances; she has numerous individuals
& dependants on her and it will not
only be an act of Justice but also
an act of kind commiseration to
order the disbursement of the arrears due
to her.

And Petitioner as in duty bound

Shall Ever Pray

31st December 1868

Elizabeth B. M. P.

His Excellency the Right Honorable.
The Governor

May I please join Lordship,

The facts bearing on my case are briefly as follows: on the redemption of the Chitwood Pallium in 1801, a pension of Rs. 241 was allotted to Venkata Rama Rao, my grandfather, and that was guaranteed to him and his heirs in perpetuity.

To the misfortune of my mother and myself, the Board perpetrated an error in reporting to Government by stating that my grandmother had left no lineal descendants. After continued

Received 1869 \$440.
 202781.546. 88-526.
 Jan. 3. 1869 1869 1/2
 from estate of George Sumner
 grand daughter of Sumner
 estate of George Sumner, 111. 111.
 Sumner Sumner 1869 1/2 1/2
 of Christ. in the North
 of Andover.

(86) records with reference to the understanding of German in 1801; the fifth awarded by memorial of 1803; the 1807; that it was not in 1807; and the highest to obtain to the award of German in 1807. The award of German in 1807 was not in 1807.

application having been made to the
who addressed the Assembly of Ministers
in 1880 and confidently thought
it to be his bound duty. Those
that the treaty of 1842 for the
would not have suggested the
revival of the war and what
trade of the whole world had been
submitted to him; and also some
family he knew that if the
good goods were continued
he fairly at first before him.
That certainly would not
be that is what he expected
Drops that the good goods
rather contained may be taken
into another deliberation, and
that, as the is intended, and
must refuse and finally, and
order may be passed respecting
the Government of the article
to fair

Carroll County, Md.

Sto. 1. 550. 8th March 1861

146400607

and frequent representations and after the lapse of 14 years and on the acknowledgment of the Board in their Proceedings of the 3^d March 1845, under the recommendation of the Collector, the Supreme Government sanctioned the continuance of the pension which was bestowed on my mother in May 1846, but the arrears fairly due to her were not disbursed. My mother enjoyed the pension but for a single 12 months, she having died in the 10th June 1847 and then the allowance was continued to me in 1848.

Subsequent to the death of my mother, I repeatedly brought forward my claims to the notice of the authorities from April 1850 to the arrears of pension, and ultimately to Government when they were pleased to pass an endorsement to the effect that "after so great a lapse of time, Government cannot take into consideration Petitioner's claim". Thereupon she preferred a memorial to the Secretary of State under date 1st July 1867, but previous to its transmission to the Home Authorities I presented a supplementary one on the 15th August following, giving some of the numerous numbers and dates on which she had presented petitions. In that she specified Board's Petition No 890 of 18th April 1850 and the several other numbers she presented thereafter.

Now, I would humbly and respectfully presume to submit for your Excellency's judgment whether it was right and proper to transmit her first Memorial to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State and at the same time refer her supplementary one to the Collector for report.

Since a report was called for to verify the statement in the supplementary Memorial,

were

were it not just and equitable to have written to His Majesty's Secretary of State for India to suspend passing any decision on my case until the further information called for from the Collector was furnished and reported upon. This not having been done, that august authority confirmed the decision of Government.

Seven months after the presentation of my supplementary memorial and the reference was made to the Collector, that authority endeavored to send in a report whereby all my statements were fully substantiated.

Notwithstanding which Government were pleased to pass an endorsement on my supplementary memorial No 2019 of 1867 to the effect

This is incorrect. Petitioner did present a petition in the 18th April 1850 to the Board of Directors and subsequently to the Secretary of State. She also presented a petition in 1857.

that I had presented petitions from 1847 or 9 years earlier than the Government had undertaken to the Board of Directors but the fact of my prayer for the disbursement of arrears having been registered by the Secretary of State, Government are precluded from again submitting the same claim to the Home Authorities and that therefore "the memorial will be returned under section III clause 2, as given above, is utterly inapplicable to my case, and for these reasons, my first Memorial was forwarded without the further information contained in my supplementary one and the report of the Collector thereupon. If this information was submitted earlier, Her Majesty's Secretary of State would not have passed that decision adverse my claim.

In conclusion I would beg to

Submit

I

II That it should have been continued during
mother Annak. Lemmah, from the date
of my grandmother's demise, but it was
not done so thro the inadvertency of the
Board of Revenue and when, at last, the
Board admitted their error and the pension was
continued to her in 1866, the arrears due to
her for 15 1/2 years were withheld

From what I have stated it will be apparent to your Excellency that it was no fault of mine for not claiming the arrears of pension which I did from the 18th April 1850 up to the present period.

Had the full information obtained from the Collector been submitted to the Secretary of State no such answer would have been passed. It is just and proper then to decline forwarding any supplementary memorial under Section XIII clause 2 of the Revised Memorial Rules.

It will be no unprecedented case if the decision passed on it should be reversed, inasmuch as the late Honorable the Govt of Directors and the Secretary of State for India have frequently done it in numerous instances when full and true information was laid before them. Your Excellency yourself has in more than one instance caused the reversal of the decision of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India after being fully informed of the entire facts of the case. I therefore very humbly solicit your Excellency will kindly interest yourself on my humble behalf and cause the decision in my case reversed, which, without question, it will be confirmed by the same Authorities.

Leg. li. Roman.

May 1862 from Gendeh,
 from near Kahrizk Soudk Divand

[illegible]

Revenue Sept 1894

81-550

Proceedings of the Madras Court
under date the 3^d March 169

Read the follow.

—ing paper

petition from Mutha ex-
Korasingamunda grand-
daughter of the late Kaligar
of Sitawal in Buddabatt-

the circumstances stated,
that, an order may be passed
for disbursement of
amount of pension due to
her =

(K. 231 et 22 1858):-

Pol of Alulul -
 Informing receipt
 of petition No 870, of 1850 ex.
 from Karasinganmah & co.
 stating that no petition was
 received from Binakam-
 ma in 1846.

(H. 27th Jan 1861 =

The closure put
forward by the petitioners
forms the subject of a
Memorial to the Secretary
of State, which was for-
warded by this Govt on
12th August 1854. In his
despatch of 8th Novr 1854,
the

the Secretary of State
decided adversely to
the Petitioners -

2. The Petitioners af-
terwards submitted a
second Memorial, but
the Govt declines to re-
forward it on the en-
ground that she had
not shown sufficient
ground for a recon-
sideration of the question -

3. Since the Petition
now under consideration
was filed, the Govt have
ascertained that in 1855
the Petitioners (Mother)
did address the Board
of Revenue on the sub-
ject of ^{the} arrears claimed
by her, and that no final
order were passed -

Had this fact
been established when
the case came under
consideration in 1855
the Govt think that a
more favorable result
might

and, as is alleged,
previously by her
dismissed in 1855

might have been taken,
and as they are un-
willing that Petition-
ers should suffer from
a mistake, they resolve
to transmit to the Secy
of State for India, a re-
statement to the effect
that the grounds upon
which they based
their former recom-
mendation were op-
posed to the facts, &
to express their opinion
that the whole amount
of the arrears which
should have been paid
to Ramakamma from
1835 to 1845 should now
be disbursed to the
Petitioners -

HCO

S. P. Ball

12/10/69
Circular P.O. No. 1169
In receipt of
Circular P.O. No. 1169

Respectfully

3rd March/69.

P.D.

No. 551.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of India
Financial Department

Sir
In reply to Mr. Under
Secretary Batten's endorse-
ment, dated 16th October 1868,
in a Memorial addressed
to the Right Honorable
the Viceroy, by Narasingamma,
grand daughter of
Vencataramaya, one of
the brothers of the dispossessed
Rajah of Chitirach,
Buddapali District. I am
directed to state that the
Memorialist's claim
for the arrears of pension
formed the subject of a
Memorial to the Secretary
of State which was
forwarded by this Govt.
on

W.H.

M.A.

on 12th August 1867, and
in reference to which
the Secretary of State in
his Dispatch of 8th Nov^r 67
confirmed the order of the
Madras Govt. refusing
to re-open a question
which had been settled
in 1843, and was not
revived again until 1866.

A copy of that correspondence
is herewith forwarded
for the information of
the Supreme Government.

2. Subsequently, the
Memorialist presented
a Supplementary Petition
impeaching the accuracy
of the statement that ^{she} her claim to the annuity
had not ^{been} put forward
~~her claim to the annuity~~
between 1843 & 1866 and
asserted that she had
repeatedly presented pe-
titions on the subject

to the local authorities &
the Board of Revenue.
On inquiry it was as-
certained that the Pe-
titioner had filed a
Petition on the subject
of these annuities in 1857,
but the Government did
not consider themselves
justified in transmitting
the said Memorial
to the Secretary of State
on this ground only; con-
sidering that the same
arguments adduced by
them on the previous oc-
casion would hold good
although the period during
which she had failed
to assert her claims was
reduced from 21 to 12 years.
The second Memorial
was therefore returned
to the Petitioner under
clause 2, section VIII. of
the

the revised Memorial rules.
 2. The Memorialist
 in the Petition now
 under consideration
 again asserts that
 her mother Rana Kuma
 did present a petition
 on the 26 May 1846 on the
 subject of the arrears
 claimed by her. With
 reference to this assertion
 a careful search was
 again made in the Office
 of the Board of Revenue,
 and discovery has been
 made of a Petition num-
 bered 890 of 1850. Under
 these circumstances, and
 considering that the
 former memorial was
 rejected on insufficient
 grounds, the Govern-
 ment have resolved
 to represent the facts
 of the case as ^{recently} ascertained to the
 Secretary

It was presented by
 the Petitioner Nara
 Singhamma herself.
 though none from Rana
 Kuma can be traced.

What now seems to be

Copy of the
 Petition

Secretary of State, and
 to recommend that the
 decision of the Secretary
 of State dated 11 Nov/67
 be reconsidered and
 the arrears of pension
 claimed be disbursed
 to the Memorialist.

HW

Spence

1
To the
County of
of Chittenden
in the State of
Vermont

Myself & my
co-defendants