Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th June 1872.

No. 81. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th May 1872, No. 844:—

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 20th June 1871, No. 2,483.

Read also the following letter from J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 23rd February 1872, No. 73:—

I HAVE the honour, with reference to the Proceedings of the Board, dated 20th June last, No. 2,483, requiring further information regarding a religious service yeomiah enjoyed by the late Syed Kyrulla and recommended for renewal in the tabular statement submitted from this office under date the 3rd November 1870, to submit copy of a letter* from my Treasury Deputy giving all the information available in regard to the claim of the Superintendent of the Durgah in question to remove or continue the several Yeomiahdars connected with the Durgah and to appropriate the greater portion of the grants allowed for their services.

* Dated 21st February 1872, No. 100.

2. The three enclosures referred to in the Deputy-Collector's letter are likewise herewith forwarded with English translations. These do not support the Superintendent's claim to remove or continue the Yeomiahdars and to appropriate the greater portion of the grants allowed to them. The remark in the tabular statement above referred to "that the Superintendent had the power to remove or continue the Yeomiahdars" is therefore inaccurate.

3. From the Deputy-Collector's letter the Board will observe that with the exception of the documents now forwarded there are no other summuds forthcoming on the records of the Collector's office.

4. The origin of, and authority for, the remark in column 11 of the Yeomiah list in case No. 502 that the title depends on the nomination of the Superintendent of the Durgah is explained in paragraph 6 of the Deputy-Collector's letter.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. A. MARJORIBANKS, Esq., Deputy-Collector in charge of Treasury, to the Collector of North Arcot, dated Chittoor, 21st February 1872, No. 100.

ADVERTING to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th June last, No. 2,483, (herewith returned,) I have the honour to state, that I called upon the Tahsildar to send for the Superintendent of Durgah and ascertain whether there were any documents in his possession in support of his claim to remove or continue the Yeomiahdars in question, and to appropriate the greater portion of the grants allowed for their services, and if he should produce any such documents to forward them to me.

2. In his Arzi dated 29th November last, No. 147, the Tahsildar states that the Superintendent gave a deposition before him, alleging* that the former Collectors of the district had always nominated Yeomiahdars with the previous consent of his predecessors, and that the right to superintend the Durgah has remained with his family from time immemorial. The Tahsildar further states that the Superintendent produced copy of a document said to be an Inayatnamah issued under seal by the Nabob Wallajah to his Amildars, directing that, on the application of the Superintendent's great-grandfather, a certain sum of money should be paid to the servants *under his superintendence* on account of the expenses of the festival called "Oorcos" and a receipt taken from them.

* NOTE.—This is borne out by the notes appended to the enclosed Purwanah marked No. 3.

3. From the Superintendent's deposition above referred to, it would appear that by virtue of this Inayatnamah, he and his predecessors had been taking documents from successive Yeomiahdars binding themselves to perform services in the Durgah for certain *monthly wages* and draw and hand over to the Superintendents the entire allowance.

4. As the Superintendent also mentioned in his deposition that the original of the said Inayatnamah could be found amongst the records here, further search was made, but a copy (enclosure No. 4) only was found tallying in all respects with that produced by the Superintendent.

5. Another document (enclosure No. 2), dated 5th Rabbiulyeel, Hijeri 1180, was also found among the records headed "Extract Inayatnamah," sanctioning certain lands to the Superintendent on account of the Durgah and bearing the same seal as upon the copy of Inayatnamah produced by the Superintendent, viz., "Seal of Sernaseddeen Mahomed Mufid" in Persian. There is however no means of knowing who this individual was, and why those Inayatnamahs purporting to have been issued by the Nabob Wallajah bear his seal. This Extract Inayatnamah, like that produced by the Superintendent, only goes to affirm the right of the Superintendent's family to superintend the Durgah.

6. Besides these two documents, a Purwanah (enclosure No. 3) in Persian was found in the records signed by Mr. Grame, Collector, confirming the Yeomiah allowance to the ancestors of the present incumbents. In the notes entered below this document of the appointment of each succeeding Yeomiahdar, *it is stated* that the appointment has been made with the consent of the Superintendent, but under what authority *this* procedure was adopted by the then Collectors there is no means of knowing. I think the remark in column 11 of the Yeomiah list may have originated from these notes. It is to be found in the Collector's register, *and beyond this I have* not come across any information which would throw light upon the true origin of *this remark* which appears in the said letter in Case No. 615 also, but not in case No. 576, owing probably to the Superintendent being a minor at the Superintendent's *family*.

7. It will thus be seen that there is nothing in the old records which *expressly* declares the Superintendent's power to "*remove or continue*" the Yeomiahdars in question. In *the remark* column of the statement enclosed in the *Proceedings* under reply, it was mentioned through oversight that the Superintendent has such power. Both the Inayatnamahs above referred to merely *point to the right* of the family to *superintend* the Durgah. There is likewise no document in our records or in possession of the Superintendent in support of his claim to appropriate the greater portion of the *grants* allowed for the service of these Yeomiahdars. The claim thus appears to rest solely upon prescriptive right of many years standing.

8. Adverting to paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings under reply, I beg to state that the *muinahs* under which these grants appear to be held are not to be found in the records, and am therefore unable to submit them to you with a view to your sending translations thereof to the Board; but I beg to send the three Persian documents referred to in paragraphs 4, 6, and 7 for your inspection and for transmission to the Board if you consider it necessary.

9. I very much regret the delay that has occurred in making this report; it was *entirely* owing to my being obliged to wait a long time before I could get any competent and trustworthy person acquainted with Persian to decipher the old records of that language in the office.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. D. ROBINSON,
Collector.

From the 4th June report regarding the death of Syed Kyrulla, registered holder of a Yeomiah allowance of Rupees 177 per annum for service in a shrine (Durgah), it appeared that Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain, Superintendent of the Durgah, obtained from Syed Kyrulla's son from his father before him documents binding themselves to throw the allowance and pay the whole of it to the Superintendent and to receive a certain monthly salary for service in the Durgah. According to this arrangement Syed Kyrulla only got Rupees 54 per annum, the remainder, Rupees 123, being appropriated by the Superintendent. It was also stated that similar arrangements existed in regard to certain other service grants attached to the same institution, and that the Superintendent claimed the right to remove or continue the servants in whose names the allowances are registered.

2. In their Proceedings above recorded, the Board remarke that the allowance the lapse of which was reported and the others referred to, were religious service grants which are held to be *hereditary*, and that it moreover appeared from the records of the Board's office that they had been treated as such. The Collector was therefore required to report in detail the information available from the records of his office in support of the claims of the Superintendent to remove or continue the Yeomiahdars in question and to appropriate the greater portion of the grants allowed for their services. He was also requested to state the origin of and authority for the remark in column 11 of the Yeomiah list in case No. 502, that the title depended on the nomination of the Superintendent of the Durgah.

3. From the report of the Deputy-Collector it appears that it has been usual to nominate the servants with the consent of the Superintendent and to record the fact. This is probably the origin of the remark in the Yeomiah list above referred to. There is however no authority in support of this procedure, and the claim of the Superintendent to nominate the servants and to continue or remove them is manifestly inconsistent with the fact that the grants are hereditary.

4. *It also appears that it* has been *customary* for the Superintendent to *appropriate* the greater portion of the grants under documents executed by the incumbents, but there is nothing to show that he has a right to do so. The allowances having been granted as remuneration for service, can be claimed only by the registered holders who perform the service.

5. The Board therefore recommend the continuance of the allowance to Syed Noor, elder son of the late incumbent.

6. They would also suggest the propriety of intimating to the registered holders of the *grants* in question that the Superintendent is not entitled to receive any portion of them.

No. 82. ORDER THEREON, 8th June 1872, No. 897.

Miscellaneous.

THE Board's recommendations are approved and *sanctioned*. The arrears will be disbursed accordingly.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

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

Ext. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 2,483.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th June 1871.

Read the following paper from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 3rd November 1870:—

Statement of lapsed Service Yeomiah recommended for renewal in the District of North Arcot.

Number.	Taluk and village, extent and value of the entire Inam.	When and by whom granted, name of the original grantee; Sunnads or other documents in support of the grant.	Nature of the grant, Charity or Service; if Service, nature of the duty prescribed in which he stood to the grantee.	Name of the last holder, date of his decease, and the relationship	Shares enjoyed by the deceased and that held by the other members.	Family left by the deceased, name and age of the parties, their circumstances, and the means of subsistence possessed by them.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
502	For defraying the expenses of the Durgah of Syed Shah Ally Hussain at Aragunthumpundi in Vellore Taluk and for the subsistence of Kadim of the Durgah. Ready-money allowance at Rs. 177 per annum.	Fifth Bahee Sunee 1138 Hijri granted by Nabob Ensaut Khan to Hyder Sahba.	Ready-money allowance for the due performance of service in the Durgah of Syed Shah Ally Hussain in Aragunthumpundi of Vellore Taluk.	Syed Kyrulla, brothers, grandson to the original grantee died on the 10th December 1869.	Rs. Syed Kyrulla, the deceased... ... 54 Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain (Sujjatha) Superintendent of Durgah ... ... 123 Total... 177	*Heirs of the deceased.* Age. Rahmath Beebe, wife. Syed Noor, son ... 13 Syed Lathief, son ... 2 3 Daughters. Syed Patta Ally, brother ... ... 40 These have no other means of subsistence than this allowance.	Syed Kyrulla, who was drawing the allowance of Rs. 177 per annum under the sanction of Government, dated 30th October 1857, No. 2,552, died on the 10th December 1869, leaving two sons named Syed Noor and Syed Lathief, aged respectively thirteen and two years, and a younger brother, Syed Patta Ally aged forty years. Syed Patta Ally aforesaid claims the allowance and requests that it may be continued in his name, the sons of the deceased being minors. Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain who is the Sujjatha, Superintendent, of the Durgah in question, and under whose orders the deceased was performing the services of the Durgah, states that Syed Patta Ally is not a fit person to conduct the service, and prays that the allowance may be registered in the name of his son Syed Nasaruddin aged twenty-four years, appointed by him in the place of the deceased. From the records of inquiry before the Tahsildar of Vellore and the registers in the Huzoor, it appears that Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain aforesaid is the Sujjatha (Superintendent) of the Durgah for the services of which the four yeomiah allowances mentioned below are being paid to the individuals noted against them; that the Durgah and mauiom land attached thereto are in the possession of the said Superintendent who has power to remove or continue the yeomiah servants in whose names the allowances for the Durgah are now passed. This is borne out by the lists submitted annually to the Board and by the Yeomiah Register kept in the Collector's office.

No. in the account list sent to Board.	No. of Yeomiah.	Names of the Yeomiahdars to whom the allowances are passed.	Order of Government or Board sanctioning the allowance.	Annual amount of allowance drawn.	Monthly salary paid by the Sujjatha (Superintendent) to the Yeomiahdars out of the allowance.
				Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
105	502	Syed Kyrulla (deceased.)	30th October 1857 ...	177 0 0	4 8 0
107	502	Goolam Ahomed	15th November 1852.	177 0 0	5 0 0
99	615	Syed Kader.	18th May 1835	83 8 0	3 8 0
115	576	Syed Curreemudeen Hussain.	1st June 1802	83 8 0	... ...*

* No fixed pay is being disbursed to this man, he being a member of the Superintendent's family.

Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain produced before the Vellore Tahsildar two documents executed by the deceased Syed Kyrulla, and the other by his father, each binding himself to perform services in the Durgah for certain monthly wages and to draw for and hand over to the Superintendent the enam allowance. The validity of the documents is fully admitted by Syed Patta Ally who claims no more than the monthly allowance of Rupees 4-8-0 which was allowed to his deceased brother. Syed Shah Mahomed Hussain would not entertain Syed Patta Ally's claim, but requests that the allowance may be registered and continued in the name of his son Syed Nasaruddin Hussain who has been performing the services of the Durgah ever since the death of Syed Kyrulla. Under these circumstances, the Acting Collector begs to recommend that the yeomish be registered and continued in the name of Syed Nasaruddin Hussain and that the arrears of allowance from 1st July 1869 to 30th September 1870, amounting to Rupees 231-4-0, be disbursed to him. Syed Kyrullah having drawn the allowance up to 30th June 1869.

THE allowance the lapse of which is reported and the others referred to in the statement belong to the class of Religious Service grants which are held to be hereditary. Moreover it appears from the records of the Board's Office that they have been treated as such.

2. The late incumbent in No. 502 was the grand-nephew of the original grantee and as such succeeded to, and drew the *full* amount of the allowance as appears from the tabular statement recorded in Government Order, dated 11th July 1867, No. 1,549.

3. The Collector is therefore requested to report in detail the information available from the records of his office in support of the claim of the Superintendent of the Durgah "to remove or continue" the Yeomiahdars in question and to appropriate the greater portion of the grants allowed for their services.

4. As the grants appear* to be held under Sunnuds, the Collector should refer to them and submit with his report translations thereof.

* *Vide* column 3 of the revised list of money allowances.

5. He is also requested to state the origin of, and authority for the remark in column 11 of the Yeomiah list in case No. 502, that the title depends on the nomination of the Superintendent of the Durgah.

6. It is observed that according to the list the title in cases Nos. 576 and 615 is "*by descent*."

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) F. BRANDT,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of North Arcot.

Fort St. George Gazette, 16 Feb 1875, pp 193-94.
38 Cobbe's Collection, 1875-79.
1-1-09

Fee. 1872. Oct.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

Proceedings, 28th May 1872, No. 844.

Read 3 June 1872

Encl 2

Received 6th June

MAY.

No. 844.

Yearly allowance—of Rupees 177 per annum enjoyed by deceased Syed Kyralla of North Arcot District, for service in a Shrine (Durgah)—Continuance of —, to Syed Nasir, elder son of deceased, recommended to Government; and suggestion made that in cases like the present, where the Superintendent of a Durgah appropriates the greater portion of the allowance to himself on the authority of documents executed by the registered holders, it should be intimated to latter that Superintendent is not entitled to receive any portion of the allowance.

Letter to Govt
No. 599, 28 May 1872