M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 18

(2) Date of repair 22-4-1966

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Rev. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	46	Press / Mis.
Dated	8th November 1873	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

46
1

No. 5,272.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 14th August 1867.

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 29th July 1867, No. 235:—

1. With reference to the endorsement of the Board on Petition* No. 1,934 of 1865, (638 of 1866,) presented to Government by Venkatakristna Mudali, Zemindar of the Anicut Muttah, in the Chingleput taluk, I have the honour to forward copy of a report† made on the subject of the petition by Mr. Burnell, the present Acting Sub-Collector.

* Received 13th September 1865 and 7th April 1866.
Returned 29th July 1867.
† 13th October 1866, No. 128.

2. Petitioner states that 8½ Cawnies of dry land, which strictly forms a part of the Porumboke, in the village of Paramesvara Mangalam, in the Anicut Muttah, have been treated by the Inam Commissioner as Inam, and a Title-deed issued by that Officer in the names of one Goolam Modeen and two others. He, therefore, begs that a reduction be made in the peishcush to the extent of Rupees 29, being the assessment of the land.

3. The Board will observe that the disputed 8½ Cawnies of Porumboke land are those referred to in paragraph 7 of the Acting Sub-Collector's letter, the whole of which has been enfranchised by the Inam Commissioner.

4. The original Tarapady accounts of Paramesvara Mangalam, are not forthcoming in this office; but, from an extract furnished by the Curnum from the accounts in his possession to the Deputy Collector of the Inam Commission during the Inam inquiry in Fusly 1269, and which is now on the record of this office, it appears that 8½ Cawnies were deducted under the head of Porumboke as "Syed Fatha Meah's Tope," but are not described as Inam. In the old Inam Register no mention whatever is made of the land in question being Inam.

5. The entries or extracts quoted by the Acting Sub-Collector from various old accounts in paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6, seem to have no reference whatever to the alleged 8½ Cawnies.

6. I beg to enclose copies* of correspondence which passed between this office and the Inam Commissioner, since the date of Mr. Burnell's report on the subject.

* Mr. Cockerell's letter, dated 4th December 1866, No. 571.
Commissioner's reply to the above, dated 5th Feb. 1867, No. 102.

7. The Board will observe, from this correspondence, that the Inam Commissioner is prepared to cancel the Title-deed, if there is nothing in the Tarapady accounts to show distinctly that the land differed in its nature from the ordinary Porumboke, and partook of the character of Inam; which latter it certainly does not, as far as I can see, from the records of this office.

8. Inquiries were also made as to the actual possession of the land, and the result, as reported by the Tahsildar of Chingleput, shows that four and odd Cawnies only have been, for the last 20 years, in the possession of Goolam Modeen, a descendant of Syed Futta Meeya, and the remainder has been in the possession of one Vedachella Chetty for some years on a cowle given him by the Muttahdar. Goolam Modeen denies the latter part of the story, and declares that he has had, and even now has, the exclusive possession of the whole 8½ Cawnies.

9. I find, however, from a decree filed by Goolam Modeen Saib during the late inquiries, that the District Munsiff of Carangooly decided in favour of Goolam Modeen Saib on a suit brought by the Muttahdar, and declared the whole 8½ Cawnies belonged to Goolam Modeen, and others, solely on the ground that a Title-deed had been issued by the Inam Commissioner for them, thus leaving the question exactly as it stood before, and not in any way settling the point now at issue; viz., the right or otherwise of the Inam Commissioner to issue the Title-deed.

10. So far as I can see, the Title-deed seems to have been issued on insufficient grounds, that is to say, as an old Inam, and appearing as such in the old accounts. I would, therefore, suggest that the Inam Commissioner be requested to reconsider his decision, and if, after due inquiry, the Inam Commissioner is satisfied that there are grounds for considering the lands as old Inam, the Muttahdar must be left to sue the Government for improperly alienating his land.

11. If, however, the Inam Commissioner should grant a new Title-deed under Section 16 of the Inam Rules, it may be right to grant the Muttahdar the reduction of peishcush which he demands.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. C. BURNELL, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of Madras district, to the Acting Collector of Madras district, dated Chingleput, 13th October 1866, No. 128.

1. I have the honour to report on Government Petition No. 1,934 of 1865, (Board's No. 169,) from C. Vencatachella Mudali, Muttahdar of Anicut, Chingleput taluk, complaining that Goolam Moodeen, and others, fraudulently obtained, from the Inam Commission, a putta for Cawnies 8½ of Punjah land, in the village of Paramasvara Mangalam, of the aforesaid Muttah.

2. Petitioner admits that there is a Maniem of 5 Cawnies of Nunjah land in the village, the endowment of a Mosque, but denies that there is any Punjah Maniem at all.

3. The Record-keeper of your office was directed to furnish extracts from the village accounts regarding the Mosque land. From these extracts I find that, besides 5 Cawnies of Nunjah, Mosque Maniem, regarding which there is no dispute, mention is also made of Punjah Mosque garden, but it is not described as Maniem.

4. In the Tarapady account of A. D. 1773, there is entered a "Mosque Garden" in the village, Nattam Coolies 60¾, (Cawnies 6-0-8,) deducted as Porumboke tope.

5. The Pymaish of Fusly 1250, shows that there is a Mosque garden in the village Nattam of Cawnies 5-12-12, Punjah.

6. The Dowle of the year "Roudri" also mentions the Mosque garden in the Nattam, and gives the extent under cultivation as Coolies 29, and says that there are also eleven trees; but the extent planted with trees is not given.

7. From the statement furnished by the Curnum Sabapathy Pillay, it appears that Cawnies 8½ are deducted as Porumboke, and described as "Syed Fatha Meah's Mango Tope," in the Tarapady account. This appears to be the land in dispute, and it is probable that the entries in the extracts above referred to have no reference to it.

8. To remove all doubt, I think it would be well to refer to the Tarapady account in your office under the head "Peramboke Topes."

9. From the enclosed extract from the Register of Enfranchised Inams, it will be seen that the Inam Commission has enfranchised Acres 6-30 (Cawnies 5) of Nunjah as Mosque endowment; also Acres 11-12 (Cawnies 8½) Punjah described as a "Personal Inam." The Title-deed for the latter has been issued to Goolam Modeen and Nasaroodeen.

10. It is to be presumed that the Inam Commission has disposed of the case according to rule and after due inquiry.

11. Petitioner's prayer is that the sum of Rupees 29, the Teerwa on the land in question, be deducted from his annual peishcush, or that he may be favoured with a certificate authorizing him to file a suit in the Civil Court against the "usurpers."

12. There is evidently no reason why any deduction should be made from his peishcush, and there is nothing to prevent his having recourse to a Civil Court, if so inclined, for he does not need a certificate from Government to enable him to do so.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to the Officiating Inam Commissioner, dated Sydapet, 4th December 1866, No. 571.

1. In the Inam Registry recently furnished me, there is an entry of 8½ Cawnies of land in the village of Parameswara Mangalam, in the Anicut Muttah, in the Chingleput taluk, as confirmed to Goolam Modeen and Nasarodeen, and enfranchised.

2. The land stands in the Tarapady accounts under the head Porumboke as "Syed Fatimah's Mango Tope." How it obtained a specific designation in these accounts is not discoverable from my records. The Anicut Muttadar now claims it, and has addressed Government on the subject, representing that if Porumboke, it could not at the date of the accounts have been Maniem.

3. In order that I may be in a position to report upon the petition, I have the honour to request you will forward me copy of your tabular report respecting the inquiry you instituted about the land, and of the decision you came to.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From W. T. BLAIR, Esq., Officiating Inam Commissioner, to the Acting Collector of Madras, dated 5th February 1867, No. 102.

With reference to Mr. Cockerell's letter, dated 4th December 1866, No. 571, I have the honour to forward an extract from the Register of the case. It will be observed that the Register does not show that the land was entered under the head of Porumboke in the earliest accounts. If there is nothing in the Tarapady accounts to show that this land differs from the ordinary Porumboke, and partakes of the character of an Inam, I must admit that its registration by this Department was an error, and shall be prepared to cancel the Title-deed on your recovering and sending the same to this office.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 and 5.—Petitions.

The Inam Commissioner will be requested to favour the Board with his remarks on this subject.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. R. COCKERELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Inam Commissioner,
with petitions.

Copy to the Acting Collector of Madras.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rd a letter from the Asst Commr to the Secretary to Govt Revenue Dated 21st Octr 1867.

Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 14th August 1867.

R L 3308/73

No. 5,272.

Requesting remarks of Inam Commissioner on claim advanced by Zemindar of Anicut Muttah in Chingleput taluk, Madras District Petitioner in Government No. 1934 of 1865, to certain land in his Muttah, treated as Inam by Inam Commission.

No. 6,326.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 4th October 1867.

Read the following letter from W. T. BLAIR, Esq., Officiating Inam Commissioner, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 9th September 1867, No. 21:—

* Enclosures herewith returned.

1. I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings* of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th August 1867, No. 5,272.

2. Under the circumstances stated by Mr. Thornhill, I am prepared to cancel the title-deed in question, and have requested him to forward it to this office for cancelment.

3. The Board will observe, from Mr. Thornhill's letter, that I have already informed him that I would cancel the title-deed if, on inspection of the accounts, he found the land to be Perambóke.

4. With reference to paragraph 11 of Mr. Thornhill's letter, I have to state that Section 16 of the Inam Rules does not apply to Inams in existing Zemindaries.

5. In conclusion, I beg to observe that the exclusion of the garden under notice from the Inam Settlement does not confer on the Zemindar the right to dispossess the holder of the tenure except by a suit in a Civil Court.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2.—Petitions.

1. Communicated to the Acting Collector, who will forward the title-deed to the Officiating Inam Commissioner to be cancelled.

2. The following endorsement will be passed on Petitions Nos. 1,934 of 1865, and 638 of 1866:—

"The title-deed complained of will be cancelled."

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of Madras.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with reference to endorsements, dated 31st August 1865, and 15th March 1866,
and with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 14th August 1867, No. 5,272.

,, to the Officiating Inam Commissioner.

MS. copy of endorsement to petitioner.

Exd. J. Wrigth.

Inám Commissioner's Office
Madras 14th November 1868

No 574.

From
The Offg Inám Commissioner

To
The Collector
of Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that I have cancelled the Title Deed No *766 received with your letter dated the 2d Instant, No 528.

2. I request that you will inform me of the amount of quitrent hitherto collected on the Inám, in view to my authorizing you to refund the same to the Inámdár.

I have &c
(Sd) W. T. Blair
Offg Inám Commissioner

(True Copy)
(Sd) Monteath
3rd Member, Rev: Board
for Inám Commissioner.

* Of the Chingleput Taluq.

E & E

Inám Letter from the Inám Commr to the Secretary to Govt Rev. Dept dt 21st Octr/73 No 528. 1867. Department.

No

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 4th October 1867.

R 2
3588/15

No 6,236.

Communicating to Collector of Madras letter from Officiating Inam Commissioner, and directing former to forward to latter for cancelment Title Deed of land, belonging to Zemindar of Anicut Muttah and forming subject of Petitions Nos 1034 of 1865 and 633 of 1866.

Chingleput District Collectors Office.

No 1440. Saidapet, 26th September 1873.

From

The Acting Collector of the Chingleput District.

To

The Board Commissioners -

Sir,

Referring to your Office letter dated 14th October 1868 No 574, cancelling title Deed No 756 granted in the name of one Gulam Rowden Sahib and of one Gulam Rowden Sahib of Parameswaramangalam, Chingleput Taluq, I have the honor to request your sanction for refunding Rs 11-14-9, being the amount collected between the date of the issue of title deed and the date of your order cancelling it.

2. The delay in refunding this amount was owing to a further Vizt Rs 9-- having been

3.

Re a letter from the Board Commissioner to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department, dated 21st October 1873, No 527.

R 3
3388/73

Copy of a letter from the Board Commissioner to the Collector of Madras, dated 14th November 1868 No 574.

been embezzled by a Talug Gumastha named Appoorow, who was criminally tried on the said charge, which included certain other items, and sentenced by the Sessions Judge. The Tahsildar now reports that the sum alluded to has been since made good from the balance of salary due to Appoorow, and is in deposit; and I request therefore your sanction for refunding this Rs 11-14-9.

I have &c

/Sig[d] R. H. Barlow

Ag Collector

/True Copy/

/Illegible/

3rd Member Rev: Board

for Inam Commissioner

Revenue Board Office

Inám Department

No. 527. Madras 21st October 1873.

From,

The Inám Commissioner

To,

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to request the sanction of Government for refunding Rupees 11-14-9. to the parties concerned, under the circumstances stated below.

2. It will be observed from the papers marginally submitted that an Inám Title deed bearing No. 766. was issued to one Gulám Mohaddin Sáhib and another, for a Dry Sice comprising an area of acres. 11.22 assessed at Rupees 24-7- as their Pramah Inám in the village of Parcimeswaramangalam attached to Anakat Mutta, in the District and Taluq of Chingleput.

3. The Muttadár subsequently objected

Board's Proceedings dated 14th August 1867 No. 5272

Do — Do. 4th October 1867 No. 6326.

To Collector dated 14th November 1868 No. 574.

From Do. dated 26th September 1873 No. 440.

4.

From a Letter from the Inám Commissioner to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 21st October 1873, No. 527.

R.C. 53 RB/73

Copy of a Letter from the Collector of the Chingleput District to the Inám Commissioner dated 26th September 1873 No. 440.

objected to the above settlement alleging that the extent specified in the Deeds Title deed formed part of his Perambóke land and urged the reduction of its assessment from the Pishkash of the Mutta.

4. From the Correspondence that has passed on the subject between the Board, the Collector and this Department, it having been discovered that the Title deed was not issued on a proper basis, it was recovered and cancelled, and the Collector was requested to report the amount of Quit Rent collected on the lands between the date of issue and its cancelment.

5. As he now reports that the amount collected was Rupees 11—14—9 I request the sanction of Government for refunding it to Gurulam Muhaddin Saheb.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

[signature]

3rd Member, Revenue Board &
for Inam Commissioner

Revd 1873 Dept-
No 3388.

1873 Siam Department.

From,
The Siam Commissioner
To,
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Calcutta.

Dated 21st October 1873.
Received 24 — —

No 527.
Enclosures 4.

Solicits the sanction of Government for refunding Rupees 11-14-9 to certain individuals in Chingleput District.

Siam Comm'r's Corr'd. Vol: 12 Letter

No 46
Sanctioned Rs 11-14-9
8th Nov 1873

C, 6th Nov/73 R8-