~~30n/93 RH/84~~

10018/RH/93

---

nes

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 44

(2) Date of repair 18. 6. 66

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No. 145

Press / Mis.

Dated 30. 1. 1904.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

X 1/145

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, *30th January 1874.*

No. 281. Read the following petition from A. DORASAWMY IYER, late Curnum of Kothavasal, in the Perumbaloor Taluq, Trichinopoly District, to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor of Madras, dated Arcalore, 31st October 1873 :—

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That the humble representator was unfortunately dismissed from Curnum office, and that it is his misfortune that he has lost his legality both in his petitions to the Honourable Board and Government, but, as he believes in good faith that he has good grounds, and has reasons to be relieved out of the charges and restored to his office, he begs to be allowed to ask for justice even the greater authority, and that has prepared the accompanying memorial (three copies) to be submitted to His Grace the Duke of Argyll, K.T., Secretary of State for India, with the hopes of being rendered justice to him.

2. The humble representator, therefore, with the greatest respect, prays that your Excellency will be pleased to have his memorial forwarded to His Grace the Duke of Argyll, K.T., Secretary of State for India, and to favour him with the order that will be passed on his memorial.

3. May it please your Excellency for which act of benevolence and charity the representator shall ever pray to the Almighty.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF ARGYLL, K.T.,
Secretary of State for India, London,
&c., &c., &c.

THE humble, etc., Memorial of A. DORASAWMY IYER, late Curnum of Kothavasal, in the Perumbaloor Taluq, Trichinopoly District, in the Presidency of Madras.

MOST HUMBLY SHEWETH,

First.—The humble memorialist was dismissed from his Curnum office by the Deputy-Collector in contradiction to the report of the Tahsildar, who, on due inquiry, had found the memorialist innocent of the charges laid against him. The decision of the Deputy-Collector (translated) and that of the Collector (translated), to whom your memorialist appealed, and the copies of Board's and Government's endorsement are appended to this memorial. The charges in these decisions against him are three, and are as follow :—

Second.—The first charge is that the memorialist received as bribe the sum of 5 Rs. from one Coolandavaloo Oodean for showing the limits of a piece of land of 34 square feet, paying a tax of 9 Annas belonging to him, and that the memorialist, receiving the said sum from him, failed to point out the limits of the land.

(*a.*)—The Tahsildar found that the land in question is always in the uninterrupted possession of the complainant, and the witnesses he brought forward were two individuals who owed the memorialist a grudge for having increased the rate of assessment on their lands, but the Deputy-Collector rejected these proofs, and has found the memorialist guilty, which is very unjust.

Third.—The second charge is that your Lordship's memorialist had wrongfully obtained a Rajenamah for the lands belonging to one Veerappa Oodean, and defrauded him of his lands.

(*a.*)—The memorialist begs to state that the lands relinquished by Veerappa Oodean is still in the possession of another individual as reported by the officer who inspected the spot, but not in the enjoyment of Veerappa Oodean, as observed by the Deputy-Collector and Tahsildar ; from which fact it clearly appears that the Rajenamah was tendered by Veerappa Oodean voluntarily of his own accord, and, moreover, no Veerappa Oodean complained in this case, as stated in the decision.

Fourth—The third charge is that one Soobooroya Oodean complained stating that the memorialist had taken certain lands from the villagers and appropriated them for his own use, and that he had employed threats to compel those villagers to do work for himself, and that he had exacted excess assessment from others to make up the deficiency of assessment due on his own lands.

(*a.*)—The Deputy-Collector observes that, although the other charges were not proved against the memorialist, the fact of there being a putta in his name is alone sufficient to prove his guilt; but the memorialist, on the other hand, begs to state that he possesses neither land nor a putta in his name.

Fifth.—The memorialist's uncle held this post for about sixty years under Regulation XXIX. of 1802 of Madras Code, who, on retiring from his service, was succeeded by his brother who, in his turn, was succeeded by the memorialist; thus his family has discharged the duties of this office for the last seventy years with the greatest diligence and utmost fidelity, but unfortunately at present is dismissed, and left destitute of the slightest means of procuring even the most ordinary aliments of life. Your memorialist begs to state that he would have taken an earlier opportunity of fighting for justice, but he was prevented from doing so because he was suffering for a long time from fever, and was in the village of Arealoor, and not till lately was he enabled to look after any of his affairs

Sixth.—The memorialist begs to state that the Madras Board of Revenue and the Government have merely overlooked his petitions, and have given him the empty endorsements that they declined to interfere.

Therefore, the memorialist, with the greatest respect and most humble submission, begs your Lordship will be pleased to take all these things seriously into kind consideration, and render justice to one destitute of every earthly assistance and comforts. Your Lordship's keen sense of justice and vast amount of generosity and grace of well-known and wide spread fame encourages your Lordship's memorialist with the hopes of justice being rendered to him, and feeds him with the ardent expectation of being pronounced innocent and restitution to his Curnum office.

May it please your Lordship for which act of charity and kindness the memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray to the Almighty.

No. 282. ORDER THEREON, 30th January 1874, No. 145.

Miscellaneous.

PETITIONER is informed that his memorial has been received, and will be forwarded to the Secretary of State as requested.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of 1874 Madras
REVENUE.

To

Dated January 30th.

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 30th January 1874, No. 145.

JANUARY.
Nos. 281-282.

Dorasawmy Iyer, late a Curnum in Trichinopoly District.—Informing — that his memorial will be transmitted to the Secretary of State.

A

3/145

From Mohummed Esuf Sahib Deputy Collector of Trichinopoly.

To Vencatasawmy Naidoo Thasildar of Perambalore Talugue.

The charges brought against Cathavasal Doorasawmy Iyer were observed: they are as follow

The 1st charge No 23 brought on the 11th January
- 2nd —— No 207 —— in the month of April
- 3rd —— No 208 —— on the 16th April

1st In the said charge No 23, it is said that Columdavaloo Odayan was merely paying the revenue for the land No 42C of his pattah without knowing the place; when he asked the Curnum of the village to acquaint him with it, the Curnum receiving Rs.5 to show him the land, deceived him with much unjustice; You wrote to me that the petitioner's having given the Curnum the sum of — Rs 5. for showing his land would not be true — and the witnesses differ from one another since the said land being an Amasha of the petitioner's pattah.

Dating the settlement of the 74th Fusli, many places were not knawn to the subjects

Incl. 2633 of 73. [illegible]

and it is usual for them to pay the revenue without knowing the place; while such is the case, why could not the petitioner have tried to know the place which is not under his cultivation. Therefore your writing me on the subject is thus very unsatisfactory and at the enquiry too the witnesses do not so much differ as you said and the conduct, of the Curanum when taken into notice, leads me to an amount of truth.

2nd In the petition No 207, One Verappa Odian when asked the Curanum to write out Rajeenama for No 46 I of his pattah land containing 6 acres 63 cents that it may be admitted in the following Fusli on account of Dawl excess revenue of the 78th Fusli; the Curanum setting that No. aside, entered into the Rajeenama two others No 46 and 49 dry land which also go by the same name and are numbers of his Amasha pattah and thus deceived him. Although the said lands are the Amasha of the petitioner, the Curanum says that they are not under his cultivation and therefore asked the Curanum to prepare Rajeenama for the same; but by a deep-look-out of the examiner, it is known that they are under his Amasha cultivation by his report. It is said in the

In N. 2633 of 70. ~~[illegible]~~ In Nr 2968 / Petition

5/145

petition that the Curnanum, to bring these lands into the pattah of one whom he likes, brought the two letters into the tillage accounts without marking the name of the person leaving space for the same; if the letters be examined instantly, the truth would be known. You wrote to me that the name was marked in the said account without giving a detail account of the person whose name goes in the pattah at the Fusli.

Considering these things, I understand that you did not examine deeply and merely wrote to me that the lands might be brought into the petitioner's pattah. Thinking over these states of things, I cannot help arriving at a conclusion that these deceipts were practised solely by the Curnanum and therefore want to know instantly whose name is marked in the tillage accounts and whose name in the pattah goes.

3rd In the petition No 208, it is said that the lands of the family of the petitioner Soobraya Odian were taken away by the Curnanum and were brought into his own pattah, and the subjects were used by the Curnanum to cultivate his ground for nothing and an higher revenue was demanded from them to substitute the excess for his own

Ru No. 2633 of 1772 Ind 968 [illegible] pattah

pattah. Leaving the said charges not evident, it is quite sufficient to judge since the Curanum did not pay even a pie for an amount of Rs 40-12-6 of his pattah that he actually collects an excess revenue from some and a less collection from some others and you have very often ordered him to do according to the account but he did not obey your orders.

Finally as his character is bad, he is dismissed from his service and another fit for duty ought to be recommended.

The No 207 Rajeenama was returned.

26 June 1871.

(Signed) Mohamed Esuf
Deputy-Collector.

Recd No. 2633 of/70.

Ind No. 2968 of/73

7/145

B

Extract from the decision of the Collector of Trichinopoly for the Appeal petition presented by Doorasawmy Iyen a late Curnum of Hothaval village in the Perambalore Taluque Trichinopoly District

Appeal No. 35 of 1871.

To the petitioner.

Your appeal petition was observed and its reference was, when taken into consideration I come to a very clear conclusion that you received Rs 5 from Colundanaloo Odyan for showing a number of pattah land, that when Peerappa Odian asked to prepare a Rajeenama for Dawl excess revenue of his pattah, you with a motive of deceipts, included in it a Rajeenama for two other numbers of his named pattah; and you being the owner for the pattah of your brother's Vagirahs detained the whole amount of revenue of the said land till this enquiry was made.

Therefore the decision of the Deputy Collector is quite just with regard to you and I could not interefere with and change the decision.

13th September 1871.

(Signed) W. S. Whiteside
Ag Collector.

Dy No. 2633 of 73
Int No. 2968 of 73

To

H. E. the Right

1872 C

Board of Revenue.

Madras.

Petition Department.

Petition No 653 of 1872.

The Board approve the petitioner's dismissal and reject this Appeal.

By Order
(Signed) H. E. Stokes.
Ag. Sub-secretary

Revenue
Board Office
Madras.
22nd May 72.

[illegible] No. 2633 of [illegible]

1873. D

9/145

Board of Revenue.
Madras.
Petition Department.
No. 955 of 1873

Petitioner is referred to the Board's Endorsement on his petition No 653 of 1872.

By order
(Signed) H. Goodrich
Acting Sub-secretary.

Revenue Board Office
Madras.
[illegible] 1873.
[illegible] No. 2633 of 73.

9

5
136/74

III E

Government of Madras. 10/145

Petition Department.

Docket
Endorsement } On No. 1491 of 1872.

The Government
decline to interfere

By order
(Signed) J. S. [illegible]
Under Secretary to Government

Fort St. George.
16th November 1872.

In No. 2968 [illegible] No. 2633 of [illegible]

2633
18 Ene
8/11/73

Lo P

11/145

His Excellency the Right
Honorable Lord Hobart the
Governor of Madras
&c. &c. &c.

My Lord

The humble representation
of Doorasamy Iyer late
Kurnam of Cottavoor in
the Perambalore Taluq
Trichinopoly District

Most respectfully Sheweth

That the humble Representator was unfortunately dismissed from Kurnam office and that it is his misfortune that he has lost his loyalty both in his petitions to the Honorable Board and Government but as he believes in good faith that he has good grounds and has reasons to be relieved out of the charges and restored to his office, he begs to be allowed to ask for justice from the greater Government authority

Int. 2968 of 73

12
144

Authority and that has prepared the accompanying memorial (3 copies) to be submitted to His Grace the Duke of Argyll K. T. Secretary of State for India with the hopes of being rendered justice to him.

The humble representator therefore with the greatest respect prays that Your Excellency ~~will~~ be pleased to have his memorial forwarded to His Grace the Duke of Argyll K. T. Secretary of State for India and to favor him with the order that will be passed on His memorial.

May it please Your Excellency

For which act of benevolence and charity the representator shall ever pray to the Almighty

31st October 1873
Arealore.

No. 524.

Ootacamund
4 ~~Nov.~~ 73

Transferred to the
Chief Secretary
to Government with
letter in
Triplicate to the
Secy of State for
India.

[illegible]

A. Awdry.
Private Secy

Regd No. 21.
136/74
Recd 5 Nov./73

Nave

21/
1

No. 145

Petitioner is informed that his
Memorial has been received
and will be forwarded to the
Secy of State as requested.

[illegible]

30 January 1874

13/145

To

His Grace the Duke of Argyll
K. T. Secretary of State for India
London
&c. &c. &c.

My Lord Duke

The humble, &c. memorial
of A Doraisamy Iyer, late
Kurnam of Pothoorwal,
in the Paramakudy Taluq,
in the Trichinopoly District, in the
Presidency of Madras

Most humbly sheweth

1st — The humble

Memorialist was dismissed from his
Kurnam office by the Dy Collector in
contradiction to the report of the
Tahsildar who on due enquiry had
found the Memorialist innocent of
the charges laid against him. The
decision of the Dy Collector (translated)
and that of the Collector (translated) to
whom your Memorialist appealed
and the copies of Board's and Government's
Endorsement
dated 2633 of 77. [illegible]

13

13

Endorsements are appended to this memorial. The charges in these decisions against him are three and are as follows.

2nd — The first charge is that the Memorialist ~~received as bribe the sum~~ of 6 rupees from one Coolandavaloo =Oodeyan for shewing the limits of a piece of land of 34 square feet paying a tax of 9 annas belonging to him & that the Memorialist receiving the said sum from him failed to point [illegible] limits of the land.

2d — The Tahsildar found that the land in question is always in the uninterrupted possession of the Complainant and the witnesses he brought forward were two individuals who owed the Memorialist a grudge for having increased the rate of assessment on their lands but Dy Collector rejected this proof & has found the Memorialist guilty which is very unjust.

14

3:

Ind No 2633 of [illegible]
Ind No 2968 11/73 [illegible]

3rd —— [illegible]

is that Your Lordship's Memorialist [illegible]
wrongfully obtained a Razinamah for
the lands belonging to one Veerappa oodean
and defrauded him of his lands.

[illegible] —— The Memorialist
begs to state that the lands relinquished by
Veerappa oodean is still in the possession
of another individual as reported by the
Officer who inspected the [illegible] but not
in the enjoyment of Veerappa oodean
as [illegible] by the Dy Collector and Teshil
[illegible] it clearly
appears that the O[illegible] oodean voluntarily
tendered by Veerappa oodean
of his own accord and moreover
no Veerappa oodean complained
ed in this case as stated in the
decision.

15

4th —— The [illegible] oodean
is that one Soobbo[illegible] complained stating that the Memorialist [illegible] taken certain lands
from the villagers and appropriated
them for his own use and that
he

Sub No 2633 of 1878

those villagers to do work for

and that he had exacted excess assess=
=ment from others to make up the
deficiency of assessment due on
his own lands.

4th — The Collector
observes that although the other charges
were not proved against the Memo=
=realist the fact of there being a 16
Pattah in his name is alone suf=
=ficient to prove his guilt but the
Memorialist on the other hand has bee[n]
to s[illegible] [illegible] his name:
nor a Pattah in his name 16

5th — The Memoria=
=list's uncle held this post for
about 60 years under regulation
29 of 1802 of Madras Code who on
retiring from his service was
succeeded by his brother who in his
turn was succeeded by the Memoria=
=list thus his family has discharged
the duties of this office for the last
70 years with the greatest diligence
and utmost fidelity but unfortunately at

: 2968 of 73 [illegible] No: 2633 of 73.

duly signed.

281-282.

C21st Jany/74. R26.

No. 136

Government of Madras,

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 2968 of 1873.

From Dorasawmy Iyer

Occupation. late curnum of

Village. Kothavasal

Talook. Perambaloor

District. Trichinopoly

Dated 11th } December 1873

Received 13th }

-do- 19th Jany/74.

Enclosures. 20

Send the Curnum

Abstract.

G.O. No. 145 - 30 Jany/74.

Submits for transmission the accompanying memorial to the Secretary of State with order