Scott. 11-27—45,000—9-11-34

(193) Department.

Press SERIES.

G.O. No. 344

DATED 20-3-1923

[Despatch Abstract.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20*th March* 1873.

No. 206. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th February 1873, No. 227:—

Read the following letter from C. CUNDASAWMY MUDALIAR, Deputy Collector of Naidupett, to the Collector of Nellore, dated Kalvoy, 24th December 1872, No. 375:—

I HAVE the honour to submit, for your consideration, a claim advanced by one Mooloogoo Appiah and another Koomarasawmy of Chittetivaripalayem, in Gudur taluq, for certain resumed Palayagari fees, in the villages of Vemulachedu, Linganapalayem, Rajavolu, Yerragoontapalayam, and Accamambapuram, in Rapur taluq.

2. In the accounts prepared in 1864 by the late Deputy Collector Tolasinga Mudaliar, of the russums (fees) formerly enjoyed by the different Poligars in this district, and submitted with his letter No. 55 of the 31st December 1864, recorded in the Board's Proceedings No. 5,613 of the 11th September 1865, the following items were shown as the fees enjoyed by the Chitteti Poligar in the abovementioned villages:—

—	Cash.	Value of grain fees	Total.
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
Vemulachedu	12 0 0	22 3 4	34 3 4
Linganapalayam	1 12 0	2 1 0	3 13 0
Razalayeraguntapalayam ...	2 0 0	2 0 10	4 0 10
Accamambapuram	2 0 0	10 0 0	12 0 0
Total ...	17 12 0	36 5 2	54 1 2

These fees were accordingly resumed under the orders of Government and are now collected on behalf of Government.

3. In 1869, the abovementioned Mooloogoo Appiah and Koomarasawmy presented a petition on behalf of themselves and another Subbiah, stating that the above russums have been made over to their ancestors by a deed of gift, by a late Poligar Lakshmi Ragavappah Naidu, and that they had been enjoying them till they were resumed, and requesting that the fees might be continued to them.

4. This Arzi was immediately referred to the Tahsildar, and he has reported the result of his enquiry in his Arzi No. 63 of the 26th February last.

5. The witnesses enquired by the Tahsildar state that the petitioners and their ancestors were receiving these russums, but that they are not aware of the fact of these russums having been made over to petitioner's ancestors as a gift. Of the three persons in whose names the petition was given Appiah alone appeared during the enquiry before the Tahsildar. He states that the deed of gift granted by the Poligar perished by wear and tear some 40 years ago.

G.O.

6. With the record of enquiry the Tahsildar forwards the original statements filed by the Curnams in 1864. In these statements, the Curnams have entered a remark to the effect that Appiah has been collecting and enjoying the russums stating that the Poligar had transferred them over to him, but that they were not aware of the russums having been made over to him as a gift.

7. This mark does not seem to have been noticed by the taluq authorities when compiling the taluq return from the Curnam's statements, which was forwarded to this office, and hence they were resumed with the other fees in the actual enjoyment of the Poligar. Had the remark which appeared in the Curnam's statements been entered in the taluq return, the fees would have been continued to Appiah as a life grant, from the mere fact of his having enjoyed them, as in the case of the other grantees, without his being required to produce further proof of the alleged gift by the Poligar.

8. The record forwarded by the Tahsildar does not show what relation the other petitioners bear to Appiah, though they appear to belong to the same family, and are probably his cousins and brothers. But as Appiah's enjoyment alone is proved, I would recommend the continuance of the allowance to him alone as a life grant.

9. In his deposition before the Tahsildar, petitioner Appiah states he presented a petition to the Collector in 1867 about his claim, that it was referred to the Tahsildar for enquiry, but that when he appeared before the then Tahsildar Ragavacharry, the latter told him to come again, it being then the Jamabandy time, and that when he appeared again before the Tahsildar, he was informed that the petition was struck off the file for non-appearance of the petitioner. The record does not show that he presented any petition in 1867. The petition under reference having been presented in March 1869, the allowance may be continued from Fasli 1279 (1869-70).

10. The amount of fees according to the Curnam's statements is Rupees 55-3-11. But in commuting the value of the grain merahs according to the market value and taking the average, the late Deputy-Collector found it to be Rupees 54-1-2. This sum alone is now collected, and will have to be paid to Appiah if the claim is admitted and sanctioned.

11. I regret that there has been so much delay in the disposal of this petition. The petition was presented to me on the 16th March 1869, and it was immediately endorsed to the Tahsildar on the 17th idem. From the enclosures of the Tahsildar's Arzi it appears that the enquiry was closed in December 1869 by the late Tahsildar Narayana Row, but the Tahsildar's report was forwarded to me only on the 26th February 1872. No explanation of this delay is given in the Tahsildar's Arzi. This Arzi reached me on the 4th March last, when I was engaged in the Jamabundy, and soon after the close of the settlement I left the district for a few months. On my resuming charge of this office it did not attract my notice, as it was not entered in the list of unanswered references. I therefore beg that you will pass over this delay in my office.

12. The Tahsildar's Arzi and its enclosures are herewith forwarded for reference.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th March 1873.

No. 157.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue.

2. Under the circumstances stated by the Deputy-Collector, I beg to support his recommendation for the life grant.

CAMP CHINABALLY,
19th January 1873.

(Signed) A. NARAYANA ROW,
Deputy-Collector.
for Collector.

To the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

SUBMITTED for the sanction of Government.

2. The original omission of the claim, and the delay in the enquiry into it, appear not to have been due to the claimant, but to the taluq authorities. Due notice of the delay should be taken by the Collector.

No. 207. ORDER THEREON, 20th March 1873, No. 344.

Miscellaneous.

SANCTIONED.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary

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

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

G.O.

N 98-5.10
126.01-5

Precis with reference to Current № 539.

G.O. 28: June 1860 № 80 para 8. Jud. Dept.
—"— 10: July —"— № 1135 R.D.

In perusing Mr. Robinson's Estimates for introducing the Police into Nellore, Govt. order revision of the quit rent on the Poligars' Inaam Villages, and resumption of the fees collected on their account by the Village Police.

G.O. 26: Oct. 1860 № 1951 R.D.
—do— para 15

On report of the Inam Commissioner, Govt. dispose of the question of the revision of quit rent. In respect to fees alienated by the Poligars to individuals and Pagodas Govt. orders these alienations to be dealt with as had previously been done in South Arcot, viz individuals grantees to receive a life allowance equal to their past average receipts, and Pagodas to receive, in full satisfaction of their claims, a sum equal to five years income.

G.O. 7: April 1861 № 770 para 6.

Inam Commissioner proposes to assign Inam lands in place of the ready money payments sanctioned in the order above quoted. Govt. disapprove this proposal and direct the order referred to be carried into effect.

G.O.

G. O. 13. Oct. 1866 No. 2785

Govt consider Rev: Board's Proceedings submitting Coll'rs proposals for the Settlement of the Compensation to be to Individuals and Institutions on account of alienated fees, and grant the necessary Sanction

The present papers refers to a fresh claim in respect to certain fees to the total amount of Rs 54. 1. 2 which had been returned as enjoyed by the Chittety Poligar. The Claimants are Appiah and Koomarasawmy. The Dy Coll'r states that only Appiah's enjoyment of the fees is proved, and he recommends the payment to him of the sum of Rs 54. 1. 2 as a life grant, commencing from Fasli 1279 (1869-70). The Collector and the Board support the recommendation.

Precis

Resumed Poligar fees
in Nellore dist and treat-
ment of alienation
of these fees.

No. 227.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 18th February 1873.

Read the following letter from C. CUNDASAWMY MUDALIAR, Deputy Collector of Naidupett, to the Collector of Nellore, dated Kalvoy, 24th December 1872, No. 375:—

I HAVE the honour to submit, for your consideration, a claim advanced by one Mooloogoo Appiah and another Koomarasawmy of Chittetivaripalayem, in Gudur taluq, for certain resumed Palayagari fees, in the villages of Vemulachedu, Linganapalayem, Rajavolu, Yerragoontapalayam, and Accamambapuram, in Rapur taluq.

2. In the accounts prepared in 1864 by the late Deputy Collector Tolasinga Mudaliar, of the russums (fees) formerly enjoyed by the different Poligars in this district, and submitted with his letter No. 55 of the 31st December 1864, recorded in the Board's Proceedings No. 5,613 of the 11th September 1865, the following items were shown as the fees enjoyed by the Chitteti Poligar in the abovementioned villages:—

—	Cash.			Value of grain fees			Total.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
Vemulachedu	12	0	0	22	3	4	34	3	4
Linganapalayam	1	12	0	2	1	0	3	13	0
Razalayeraguntapalayam ...	2	0	0	2	0	10	4	0	10
Accamambapuram	2	0	0	10	0	0	12	0	0
Total ...	17	12	0	36	5	2	54	1	2

These fees were accordingly resumed under the orders of Government and are now collected on behalf of Government.

3. In 1869, the abovementioned Mooloogoo Appiah and Koomarasawmy presented a petition on behalf of themselves and another Subbiah, stating that the above russums have been made over to their ancestors by a deed of gift, by a late Poligar Lakshmi Ragavappah Naidu, and that they had been enjoying them till they were resumed, and requesting that the fees might be continued to them.

4. This Arzi was immediately referred to the Tahsildar, and he has reported the result of his enquiry in his Arzi No. 63 of the 26th February last.

5. The witnesses enquired by the Tahsildar state that the petitioners and their ancestors were receiving these russums, but that they are not aware of the fact of these russums having been made over to petitioner's ancestors as a gift. Of the three persons in whose names the petition was given Appiah alone appeared during the enquiry before the Tahsildar. He states that the deed of gift granted by the Poligar perished by wear and tear some 40 years ago.

6. With the record of enquiry the Tahsildar forwards the original statements filed by the Curnams in 1864. In these statements, the Curnams have entered a remark to the effect that Appiah has been collecting and enjoying the russums stating that the Poligar had transferred them over to him, but that they were not aware of the russums having been made over to him as a gift.

7. This mark does not seem to have been noticed by the taluq authorities when compiling the taluq return from the Curnam's statements, which was forwarded to this office, and hence they were resumed with the other fees in the actual enjoyment of the Poligar. Had the remark which appeared in the Curnam's statements been entered in the taluq return, the fees would have been continued to Appiah as a life grant, from the mere fact of his having enjoyed them, as in the case of the other grantees, without his being required to produce further proof of the alleged gift by the Poligar.

8. The record forwarded by the Tahsildar does not show what relation the other petitioners bear to Appiah, though they appear to belong to the same family, and are probably his cousins and brothers. But as Appiah's enjoyment alone is proved, I would recommend the continuance of the allowance to him alone as a life grant.

9. In his deposition before the Tahsildar, petitioner Appiah states he presented a petition to the Collector in 1867 about his claim, that it was referred to the Tahsildar for enquiry, but that when he appeared before the then Tahsildar Ragavacharry, the latter told him to come again, it being then the Jamabandy time, and that when he appeared again before the Tahsildar, he was informed that the petition was struck off the file for non-appearance of the petitioner. The record does not show that he presented any petition in 1867. The petition under reference having been presented in March 1869, the allowance may be continued from Fasli 1279 (1869-70).

10. The amount of fees according to the Curnam's statements is Rupees 55-3-11. But in commuting the value of the grain merahs according to the market value and taking the average, the late Deputy-Collector found it to be Rupees 54-1-2. This sum alone is now collected, and will have to be paid to Appiah if the claim is admitted and sanctioned.

11. I regret that there has been so much delay in the disposal of this petition. The petition was presented to me on the 16th March 1869, and it was immediately endorsed to the Tahsildar on the 17th idem. From the enclosures of the Tahsildar's Arzi it appears that the enquiry was closed in December 1869 by the late Tahsildar Narayana Row, but the Tahsildar's report was forwarded to me only on the 26th February 1872. No explanation of this delay is given in the Tahsildar's Arzi. This Arzi reached me on the 4th March last, when I was engaged in the Jamabundy, and soon after the close of the settlement I left the district for a few months. On my resuming charge of this office it did not attract my notice, as it was not entered in the list of unanswered references. I therefore beg that you will pass over this delay in my office.

12. The Tahsildar's Arzi and its enclosures are herewith forwarded for reference.

G.O. 13 Octob. 1866 No 348-9

Rev. 1873. Oct.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

No. 539.

PROCEEDINGS, 18TH FEBRUARY 1873, No. 227.

Dep. 21 Feb. 73

Encl.

Received 25th

FEBRUARY.

No. 227.

Resumed Palayagari fees—in certain villages of Rapur Taluq, Nellore District.—Sanction of Government requested for payment of—to M. Appiah and Koomarasawmy of Gudur Taluq.

No. 344.

Mer. Dec 21 Granted 73

1. Board's Proc.
6. Accts. Encls.

Nos. 206-207

C. 15 March 73 R 15 Do

20th March 73.