M.R.O. 1—30,000—16-10-23.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 549 Press ~~Mis.~~

689-690

Dated 19 May 1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,

31st May 1869.

No. 689. Read the following Petition from MARIA PILLAY and AROONACHELLUM PILLAY, Nattamy Mirassidars of Chinnamanur, Periacolum Talook, Madura, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 10th May 1869:—

WITH profoun[illegible]pect and submission your petitioners beg to take liberty of enclosing herein a Memorial, in triplicate, to the address of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, appealing against the orders of your Honorable Government respecting their claims to the Mirassi of Nattamy of the village of Chinnamanur.

2. The facts adduced in the Memorial are, in the humble opinion of your petitioners, such as are calculated to receive justice at the hands of your Honorable Government; and should your Government be still of opinion that their claims are untenable, your petitioners beg that their Memorials be forwarded to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India.

For which act of benevolence your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

No. 690. ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1869, No. 1,519.

Miscellaneous.

ORDERED that the Memorial, received with this paper, be despatched to the Home Government, and that intimation of the same be given to the Memorialists.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. WELLESLEY,
Acting Under-Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of 1869. Madras.

REVENUE.

To

Dated May, 31st.

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 31st May 1869, No. 1,519.

MAY.

Nos. 689-690.

Memorial from certain Hirassidars in Madura District.—Its despatch to the Home Government ordered, and intimation of the same given to Memorialists.

permitted once Annamalay Pillay (who was not connected at all either in the male or female line of the Tyauldar) to perform the duties of Nattanmy for Asher Sonnaratnam (Vide F) reserving to himself and his heirs the reversionary right to succeed to the Office and its emoluments on his demise. The last holder Annamalay Pillay having died here Commences the Contention which has given rise to this memorial.

2. The three Claimants to the Office in question were 1st Ramasamy Pillay the son of the deceased Annamalay Pillay 2d Your first memorialist who is descended from the daughter of the Tyauldar Thillanayagum Pillay. 3 Your second Memorialist who is the son and direct heir of the deceased Chockalingum Pillay

3. The Collector who made an enquiry into the respective claims of these parties, recognized the claims of the first by letter but passed an order No 512 dated 30th November 1866 appointing only (Your first Memorialist) to the office of Nattanmy for the Nimanarangam in succession to the said Annamalay Pillay, the 2d Memorialist being ill-fated and incompetent for the Office (Vide G) which admitted at the same time that Ramasamy Pillay the son of the last holder is not a descendant of the original holder in the male or female line).

4. Subsequent to the above Arrangement however your Memorialists opponent Ramasamy Pillay having presented a Petition to the Collector setting forth his claims for the Nimany attaining of to Nimanarangam by representing himself as descended from the male line of the original and unrecognized Tyauldar, the Collector without taking the trouble to enquire into the justness or otherwise of these claims and misled by the false information given him by interested men put the inquiry of the case before the Board and the Board likewise the strength of the Collectors report passed Proceedings dated 3rd October 1867 No 6305, Cancelling the Collectors previous order and appointing Ramasamy Pillay to the office in question.

5 Your Memorialist then remonstrated against the report of the Collector and requested him to Conduct a personal enquiry and Correct his report to the Board but he declined doing so stating that the order of the Board was a Summary one and that your Memorialist might appeal if aggrieved if they chose under regulation 12 of 1831 (Vide A)

6 Your Memorialist humbly begs to submit that it is highly unjust that they should be forced to an expensive litigation on account of the erroneous report of the Collector. A late Collector in his order No 574 dated 20th October 1857 admits that the said Annamalay Pillay was not entitled to succeed to the Office (Vide E) the next Collector admits in his order No 512 dated 30th November 1866 that the account of the Office to Annamalay Pillay in the first instance was Conditional (Vide G) Therefore a logical true herewith submitted is a true one and your memorialists opponent does not find a place in any grade of Caste even and yet by the intrigues of interested official the officers of Authority have been totally misled and gross injustice has been done to your memorialist

7 Your Memorialist therefore humbly solicit to obtain injured Crime for which they as in duty bound.

Shall Ever pray

Madras
10th May 1868

No. 1879.

Ordered that the Memorial, received with this paper, be despatched to the Home Government, and that intimation of the same be given to the Memorialists.

H. Merivale
Ag. Under Secy
to Govt
R.D.

31 March 69

3
Rec'd 1635/69
Trans. 31 May 69