Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th July 1871.

No. 355. Read the following letter from W. ROBINSON, Esq., C.S.I., Second Member of the Board of Revenue, in charge of the Inam Department, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 21st July 1871, No. 25 :—

[illegible] with an extract of [illegible] m the Inam Register of the village of Katakampundi in the talook of Tindivanam of the South Arcot District, together with the transcripts of correspondence* that passed between the Collector and myself on the subject, and request the sanction of Government for refunding Rs. 2,183 to the parties concerned under the following circumstances.

* To Collector, 7th January 1870, No. 22, and 11th November 1870, No. 1,515.
From Collector, 15th December 1870, No. 336.
To Collector, 26th January 1871, No. 76.
From Collector, 19th June 1871, No. 190.

2. The Inam comprises dry acres 14·85 and wet acres 19·80, assessed at Rs. 174-13-3. It is an old and valid grant conferred by a late Nabob and supported by proper documents.

3. In 1839 the Monegar of the village, probably through malice, impugned the succession and possession of the then holders, alleging that they were of different race from the original grantee, and that they were wrongfully appropriating the proceeds of an Inam which should lapse to Government. An inquiry was commenced by the Tahsildar under an order of the then Collector, and the Inam was sequestrated. Further inquiries took place from time to time, but no final order was issued.

4. This state of things continued until I took charge of the Inam Department in 1869, when, with the aid of my Native Assistant, I carefully went through the voluminous records of inquiries held at three different times before as many different authorities, and being fully satisfied that the attachment had been made on insufficient grounds, I brought the case on the Register of this Office, and a Title-deed was issued in recognition of the right of the Inamdars.

5. As regards the mesne profits which have accrued on the Inam, the Collector reported on the first reference that their exact amount could not be ascertained for the years prior to Fasli 1269, because the old accounts are no longer forthcoming. He was asked to give a fairly approximate estimate, and he now states that Rs. 2,183 is the nearest probable amount. For this sum, I request the sanction of Government.

No. 356. ORDER THEREON, 27th July 1871, No. 1,315.

Land Revenue.

REFUND sanctioned, Rs. 2,183.

2. It is presumed that the Monegar who was to blame is no longer in office.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. deC. SCOTT, Captain, R. E.,
Under-Secy. P.W.D.
for Secy. to Govt.

To the Inam Commissioner.
,, the Accountant-General.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No 76.

Revenue Board Office
Puránt Department
Madras 26th January 1871.

From,
G. Lee Morris Esquire,
Acting 2d Member in charge of the
Puránt Department.

To
The Collector of South Arcot.

Sir,

With reference to para 2 of your letter dated 15th December 1870 No 336, I have the honor to request that you will explain more fully how the accounts of the Collections of past proceeds on Puránt the Village of Kadakampúdi, Tindi-vanam Taluq, prior to Fasli 1269 have been not forthcoming. The Purándár actually claims past proceeds from the date of the original attachment, and I consider that he is entitled to consideration, and cannot be put off with the declaration that the accounts are not forthcoming. If the exact amount Collected cannot be ascertained, cannot an approximate statement be furnished?

I have &c
(signed) G. Lee Morris
Esq. 2d Member of the Board
of Revenue in charge
of the Puránt Department.

(True copy)
[illegible]

2d Member of the Board of Revenue
in charge of the Puránt Department

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

Extract from the Register of Deeds in the Village of Shadakanpur

Case No. 1. Personal Tax

	Rs A P	Rs A P
222	10-1	5-6-4
209	8-1	6-1-5
210	9-3	7-3-3
211	6	4-6-10
212	4-2	8-7-10
217	7	5-2-8
221	3-3	2-12-3
223	12-1	9
224	9-2	7-3
225	9-3	7-3-3
248	5-1	3-14
213	9-1	6-1-2
219	4-2	2-15-3
220	1-1	6-13-2
244	9-3	6-6-4
245	9-2	6-3-9
226	14-3	8-7-6
230	14	8
232	4	2-4-9
218	1-2-1	7-15-9
229	1-2-3	8-3-3
234	1-1-2	7-10-6
235	9-3	4-4-3
243	4-3	

*This includes 1/2 assessment for the 2 Deosh.

For the Personal benefit of the holder.

Fee of Rs 1 for tax.

Granted Documents Chuda=ca in Persian = ri khan Nabish Hasildar's Shirastadi Nawar receipt = 3 1 6 = di khan in Hijz = ri 1160.

15	16	17	18	19	20	21

Inám in the Taluq of Sindiánagar, in the District of South Arcot.

In Fasli 1232 Mórdin Sáhéb's share 2/4 = one half.	Minámúr	(1)	Not known.	(2)	
	1. Abdúl Khádar. Age 45.	Great grandson	(2, 11, 12, 14) Daughter's	(3)	Wife — 1 Son — ½
In Fasli 1236. Gulám Hussain, Mohiuddin Sáhéb's son, 26-4-0	2. Jáfar Sáhéb. Age 34.	Great grandsons.	(3, 6, 10) Daughter's	(4)	Brother's sons 3 Sister — 1 6
	3. Chundá Sáhéb. Age 50.	Daughter's grandsons.	(4)	None.	
In Fasli 1242 Mórdin Sáhéb's share 2/4 = one half. 26-4-0	4. Mahomed Hussain Age 18.	Daughter's grand daughter's grandson.	(5)	Sons — 2. Sister's sons — 2	4
	5. Sáránbi Age 48.	(5) Daughter's	(6)	Wife — 1 Son — 1	
	6. Bánuddin Sáhéb. Age 51.	Grand = daughter.	= Daughter — 1 Dot's son — 1		4
	7. Shamshoodin Age 60.	(7, 9) Daughter's daughter's	(7)	Wife — 1 Daughter — 1	
	8. Aghar Sáhéb. Age 45.	daughter's sons.	Brother's sons 4. Dot's daughter 1		
	9 Fakér Sáhéb. Age 48.	(8 13) Daughter's daughter's grandsons	Brother's daughter's sons — 2		
	10. Saidúnniyá Sáhéb. Age 48.	of the party	Brother's daughter-in-law — 1 Sister — 1 Sister's sons 2		
	11. Sábjan Sáhéb. Age 36.	in c" Column 13.	Dot's daughter 1		15
	12. Sépur Sáhéb. Age 30.		(8) Daughter — 1 Sister — 1		½
	13. Gajafar Sáhéb. Age 32.		(9) Brother 1		
	14. Saul		(9) Wife — 1		

See Collector's letter dated 16th December 1863 No. 840

This Inám has been under attachment from 1843. It was placed under attachment on the Complaint of the Manégar of the Village that Gulám Mohaddin who was then holding the Inám had no right to it.

From the record of enquiry held by the Tasildár in 1839, it is clear that Gulám Mohaddin succeeded to the Inám in about 1804 as the sister's son of the last holder of the Inám who was the son of the grantee. Gulám Mohaddin pleaded also that he was adopted by his maternal uncle, but this adoption was denied by the Complainant. I think it is immaterial whether he was really adopted or not, as adoptions, even if proved, are inadmissible under the Mahamedan Law. As a sister's son, however, Gulám Mohaddin was an heir at law to the last holder, he was the daughter's son of the grantee, and had nearly 40 years' possession before the Inám was placed under attachment. Under these

29/20-A

77	1-8-2		8-0-0	2-12-6	
77	0-7-2		2-15-0	1-12-2	
78	1-8-2		8-0-0	7-0-0	
143	4-11-2		24-12-4	15-0-0	
231	3-0-0		10-8-0	7-8-0	
	11-4-0	11.85	54-4-8	31-15-5	
	26-4-0	34.65	244-11-10	174-13-3	

Net	Assessment	Dry Acres	Wet Acres	Total	Total Assessment
15-0-0	142-13-10	11-4-0	31-15-5	26-4-0	174-13-3

Revenue Board Office
Irish Department
Madras 21st July 1871

(True Copy)

Secretary

Dt Member Discharge of the
Irrigation Department

Saheb. Age 32
M. Rangaia
Saheb. Age 34

Brother 1.

(10)
Wife — 1
Son — 1.
Brother — 1.
Dau's wife — 1
Dau's daughter 1
5

(11)
Wife — 1
Son — 1
Brother — 1
3

(12)
Sister — 1
Uncle's sons 3
Uncle's daughters in-Law 2
Uncle's wife — 1.
Uncle's grandson 1
= son — 31
8

(13)
Uncle's sons 2.

(14)
Aunt — 1

Grain was placed under att[illegible] C. under these circumstances, I consider that the title is perfectly good, and recommend that the Grains may be restored to the heirs and descendants of the parties in Column 16, with all the past proceeds.

The Complainant while adducing before the Tehsildar that he heard that Gulam Mohaddin was the sister's son of the last holder, tried after wards to throw suspicion on the relationship by putting forward the fact that Gulam Mohaddin was a Navayat whilst this alleged maternal uncle was a Mogal. But this circumstance cannot in the least disprove the relationship, as Mogals and Navayaties usually intermarry.

Quit-Rent Rs 18-22-0

(signed) P. Chentsal C Rau
Special Assistant to the Inam Commr.
21st December 1869.

Approved.

(signed) W. Robinson
2d Member of the Board of Revenue in charge of the Inam Department.
21st December 1869.

Collected Rs 595.

No 1515.

Official Memorandum.

Petition No 11 of 1870.

The above Petition is forwarded to the Collector of South Arcot, with request that he will make an early reply to the Memo from this Office dated 7th January 1870 No 22, respecting the past proceedings which occurred on the Siám at Tálaiyam-púndi Village, during the period it was under attachment.

× Tindivanam Tálug.

Revenue Board Office
Siám Department
Madras 11th November 1870

(signed) H. Robinson
2d Member in charge
of the Siám Department

(True copy)
H Maclean
2d Member of the Board of
Revenue in charge of the
Siám Department.

B5

Ap. 1871 — Dispatches

No 2357

From
Her Britannic Majesty's Minister
at Buenos Ayres
to Marquis Salisbury

Received 27th July 1871

No 23

Buenos Ayres 6th June 1871

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose herewith a Convention for the suppression of the Slave Trade signed between Brazil and the Argentine Republic on the 2nd instant.

I have &c

Edmund Monson

The Marquis of Salisbury &c &c &c

Ap. 1315

Enclosure in No 23

Convention between Brazil and the Argentine Republic for the suppression of the Slave Trade signed at Buenos Ayres June 2nd 1871

Ratifications exchanged at Buenos Ayres July 27th 1871

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty 1871

[illegible]