

(1) Number of Pages.....36
(2) Date of repair.....21. 7. 1966
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....Cllor

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	455	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	17-4-	1874 196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following Petitions :—

No. 104. From D. KAMA RAZ, late Zemindari Proprietor of the Mootahs of Vuppada and Yaluguvani Lunka, Godavery District to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor and President in Council, Fort St. George, dated Cocanada, 24th October 1873.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT it appears from your Honour's endorsement, dated 10th May 1873, that the Government have purchased the Vuppada Mootah in auction held by the Collector of this district, and that it is theirs to do as they deem proper. If the subordinates annex another's property to the Government, and while the owner of the said estate is continually claiming his right thereto, explaining his reasonable grounds to your Honour, the framer of laws which govern justice, still is it reasonable to forward him such dry and disappointing replies without deeply considering into the matter? He is a poor helpless wretch having lost all his property, and quite destitute. He has no alternative but to weep for justice.

2. The Board have issued an order, dated 20th February 1834, to annul the sale of Vuppada Mootah in auction, and to give it back to him; and the facts that the Collector had, contrary to the above, kept it under himself for some time and then put it in auction and he was not refunded with moturpha are continually represented to your Honour for justice, giving proofs of your record; and yet the endorsement to the effect that the Government do act as they deem proper is very striking. No one conceives that this sort of injustice ever existed nor provided by your law. He knew as much that it is in the hands of the rulers of a country to dispose of any case as they like, if have the intention of not being troubled by deep consideration to find out justice; and he has reason to be sorry that he is the only one precluded from justice. He is anxiously waiting for justice from the very talk that your Excellency is very fond of it. The mere inquiry of what took place subsequent to the Board's order to give back the Vuppada Mootah, annulling the sale thereof in auction, may, of course, to some length, lead the way to the right side. The taluq of Sree Naraya Appa Row, of Ellore, was put to auction by the Collector, and was in the possession of the Government for a space of twelve years. Even that was restored with its income for the said twelve years to the Zemindar on his prayers to find out justice. His (petitioner's) case presents more valid and justifiable arguments. The proprietors of Neelapilly and Kottam Mootahs also were refunded with moturpha collected by the Government. Some lands of a heirless family in Turingy, of Pittapur Taluq, were claimed by the Zemindar of Pittapur, but the then Collector, Mr. Purvis, denied his assuming the privilege and annexed to the Government; but your Excellency was pleased to return the said lands to the Zemindar after lapse of twelve years. Placing only a land-revenue of Rs. 1,000 under him, and collecting the moturpha for themselves, the Government have received from him a peishcush of Rs. 1,800, which was the amount payable when both the land-revenue and moturpha were under him. Thus the Government have occupied his Mootah and exchanged it to the Rajah of Pittapur, fixing thereon an annual peishcush of Rs. 673 only.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th April 1874.*

3. This fact is *prima facie* evidence of the injustice I am suffering from.
4. Considering the above, it appears that justice is freely open to the rich but quite shut against the poor.
5. He, therefore, most humbly begs of your Excellency will be good enough to get from the Collector of this district the report given by the Record-keepers to Mr. Purvis on 31st October 1855, which minutely treats of the particulars of his case, to bring it into your Honour's benevolent consideration, and to return him the moturpha and the Mootah of Vuppada, thus to enable him to protect his family, whose poor circumstances are not fit to commit into writing.
6. If your Excellency be not pleased to let him have justice, he humbly craves your Honour's apology to despatch the accompanying petition* to the Duke of Argyll, who ordered him to forward the same through the local Government. If this, too, cannot be granted, he begs of your Excellency to favour him with endorsement to that effect, which (endorsement) he shall forward to the Home Government.
7. Copies of the Proceedings of the Board above alluded to and of the Hookums of Collectors concerning the re-payment of moturpha collected by the Government are herewith sent for your Excellency's attentive perusal.
8. For which act of justice he shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From D. KAMA RAZ, late Zemindari Proprietor of the Mootahs of Vuppada and Yaluguvani Lunka, Godavery District, to His Grace the Duke of ARGYLL, M.P., Secretary of State for India in Council, dated Cocanada, 24th October 1873.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT may it please your Excellency's gracious will that your memorialist humbly solicits the liberty of representing that the Zemindari of Vuppada and the proprietorship of Yaluguvani Lunka have been held for many years by his father, and after his death by him successively, with the privilege of collecting both the land-revenue and moturpha; but the said estates being taken possession of by the Government owing to the misapprehension of the Collector for the time being, your memorialist petitioned the Madras Government on the subject, but no justice was done in his case, and his estates to which he had lawful right and the excise moturpha tax pertaining thereto, which should lawfully be paid to him, were not restored.

2. Placing only a land-revenue of Rs. 1,000 under him and collecting the moturpha for themselves, telling that they will re-pay him, the Government have received from him a peishcush of Rs. 1,800 from 1814 to 1834, which was the amount payable when both the land-revenue and moturpha were under him. Thus the Government have taken possession of his Mootah, and, being deaf to his solicitations, exchanged it to the Rajah of Pittapur, fixing thereon an annual peishcush of Rs. 673 only. This fact is *prima facie* evidence of the injustice he is suffering from.

3. That your memorialist presented several petitions both to the Board and to the Government, praying to call for the records and reports pertaining to his case, to investigate into the matter, and to do justice, but no notice was taken of his poor case.

4. But justice is freely given in several cases whose nature is very much similar to that of his. The taluq of Sree Naraya Appa Row, of Ellore, was put to auction by the Collector, and was in the possession of the Government for a space of twelve years. Even that was returned with its income for the said twelve years to the Zemindar on his prayers to find out justice. His (petitioner's)

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th April 1874.*

case presents more valid and justifiable arguments. The proprietors of Neelapilly and Kottam Mootahs were refunded with moturpha collected by the Government. Some lands of a heirless family in Turingy were claimed by the Zemindar of Pittapur, but the then Collector, Mr. Purvis, denied his assuming the privilege, and annexed to the Government; but the Government of the Madras Presidency were pleased to return the said lands to the Rajah of Pittapur after a lapse of twelve years.

5. The Board of Revenue in their Proceedings, dated 20th February 1834, resolved to annul the sale of Vuppada Mootah and to give it back to your humble memorialist; and the facts that the Collector had, contrary to the above, kept it under himself for some time and then put it to auction and that he was not refunded with moturpha are continually represented to the Government, but no notice is taken. He is a poor helpless wretch having lost all his property, and quite destitute. He has no alternative but to weep for justice.

6. That Her Majesty having graciously issued a circular, under date the 1st November 1858, that the injustice done to the Natives of India by the Government would be redressed, and that the proprietors and others would be re-endowed with their respective rights; and your memorialist addressed petitions both to the Parliament and to the Honourable the House of Commons on the 20th July 1865, but no reply has been obtained.

7. Your memorialist has applied a petition to the Right Honourable Lord Stanley on 28th February 1870, but the petition was returned ordering to despatch the same through the local Government. Accordingly, he sent it to the Government praying them to forward the same to His Highness, but they returned it to him with a disappointing endorsement giving no cause for the return, thus vexing him.

8. He, therefore, most humbly begs of your Highness's Grace will be good enough to let him have justice by the very proof of the record pertaining to his case.

9. Copies of the Proceedings of the Board above alluded to and of the Hookums of the Collectors concerning re-payment of the moturpha collected by the Government are herewith sent for your Highness's attentive perusal.

For which act of justice he shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Translation of a copy of decree executed by the Sadr Adalat Court of Rajahmundry showing that the proprietor of Vuppada has the right of collecting moturpha, and that it is included in the permanent beriz, is also included.

No. 104A. Petition from D. KAMA RAZ, late Zemindari Proprietor of the Mootahs of Vuppada and Yaluguvani Lunka, Godavery District, to His Excellency the Right Honourable the Governor and President in Council, Fort St. George, dated Cocanada, 16th January 1874.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT your endorsement, dated 18th November 1873, is to hand. The injustice I am suffering from placed me in such circumstances that I am unable to bear even the postage of the bearing letters giving cover to the endorsement.

2. If your Excellency be not pleased to confide in the enclosures or facts related, I beg of your Honour to call for the whole record relative to my case from the Collector of this district, and which (the record) I declare will convince your Honour of the justice I am entitled to.

3. Although I am informing the various troubles and injustice I have dealt with for a long time, yet they are quite unnoticed owing to your believing the false reports forwarded by the Collectors of this district.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th April 1874.*

4. I have, in pursuance of your endorsement noted above, appended an English translation of the Telugu Hookums enclosed in my last petition.
5. But to transmit my memorial in print it is quite beyond my power to conceive the means for so doing as far as my present ruined state of circumstances concerned.
6. The enclosures are—
 - (1.) My last petition, dated 24th October 1873, with a copy of endorsement thereon.
 - (2.) English translation of the Telugu Hookums regarding the re-payment of moturpha collected by the Government.
 - (3.) A copy of decree executed by the Sadr Adalat Court of Rajahmundry showing that the proprietor has the right of collecting moturpha and that it is included in the permanent beriz.
 - (4.) Proceedings of the Board referred to in my last copies of Telugu Hookums in Telugu.
7. For the act of justice and kindness I shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

No. 105.

ORDER THEREON, 17th April 1874, No. 455.

Miscellaneous.

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

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

252
21/4/74

His Excellency The Right Hon.

SP. 104

The Governor and President in Council

Fort Saint George, Madras

The humble petition of Devagupilapur
Hamaray, late Zemindary Proprietor of
Vuppada and Yaluguram Lunka moct.

Humbly Sheweth:

That your Endorsement dated 18th Nov
1873 is to hand. The injustice I am suffering from, placed
me in such circumstances that I am unable to bear even the
burden of a ~~small~~ ^{great} ~~giving~~ ^{giving} Court as the endorsement

If your Excellency be not pleased to confide in the en-
losures or facts related, I beg of your Honor to call for the whole
record relative to my case from the Collector of this District,
and which (the record) I declare, will convince your Honor
of the justice I am entitled to.

Although I am informing the various troubles and injustice
I have dealt with, for a long time, yet they are quite unnoticed
owing to your believing the false reports forwarded by the
Collectors of this District.

Govt. of 1874

REVENUE.

To

Dated April 17th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 17th April 1874, No. 455.

APRIL.

Nov. 104-105.

Devagupilapur Kama Rao of Godavari Dis-
trict. — Informs — that his memorial has been
received, and will be forwarded to the Secretary
of State.

I have, in pursuance of your Endorsement noted above,
prepared an English Translation of the Telugu Hukums
enclosed in my last petition.

But to transmit my Memorial in print, it is quite beyond
my power to conceive the means for so doing, as far as my
present ruined state of circumstances concerned.

The enclosed are,

My last petition dated 26th October 1773 with a copy of
Endorsement thereon

A Translation of the Telugu Hukums regarding the repayment
of Molinfa collected by the Govt

A copy of decree executed by the Sudder Udalut Court of
Rajahmundry shewing that the Proprietor has
the right of collecting Molinfa and that it is
included in the Permanent Bazar.

Proceedings of the Board referred to in my last.
Copies of Telugu Hukums in Telugu.

For the act of justice and kindness

I shall be in debt, I am Sir,

prayer.

Belovables
16th January 1774

Your Excellency's most obedient Servant
అంజనాధుని

*L.P. No 2565 of 73. M.R.
Eudh. of 10/5/73 No 264.*

Rev. $\frac{1}{929/74}$.

November 1873, states that he is unable to pay the postage of the bearing letters giving cover to the endorsements; that if the records relating to his case be called for, justice will be done; that his statements are quite incorrect owing to the false reports forwarded by the collector

Submits translation of the Tehgu Hukums enclosed in his former petition & also a lucid note addressed to the Secretary of State.

C25 March 1874 - R30

Revenue 1874 Septo

Government of Madras

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 267 of 1874.

From Devaguptapu Kama-
raz

Occupation. late Zemindary
Proprietor of Trooppada

Village. and Yalugurani

Talook. Lanka Mootas

District. residing at Coconada

Dated 16th } January 1874
Received 21st }

Enclosures 7

Abstract.

Acknowledging the receipt of the Govt Endorsement dated 18th

GO-17 April 1874 No 455

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated the 20th February 1834.

Trooppada }
Yalugurani Lanka } 7 Trooppada and Yalugurani Lanka
the permanent Bariz on which is 1800 and 8540 Rupees
respectively were sold. the former for 1825 Rupees to Volabey
Ramanah and the latter for Rupees 6,300 to Government.
The total amount of arrears due by the owner at the date of sale
was Rupees 6,159-5-5. The Trooppada Estate, the Collector
reports, was sold for its full value and he did not therefore
purchase it on account of Government.

No 985 of 1833
+ 1031 of " "
10 Devaguptapu Kama-raz the Proprietor subsequent to
the sale represented to the Board in the Petitions noted in the margin
that on the evening of the day of sale he tendered payment of arrears
due by him, and complained of the hardship imposed upon him
by the Collector in first putting up Trooppada the Estate of the
least value and afterwards the other, whereas if he had sold
Yalugurani Lanka first, a sufficient sum would have been realized
to discharge the amount of balance, and the sale of Trooppada thus
rendered unnecessary. These petitions having been referred to the
Collector for explanation - he stated that the money for payment of
balance was not brought before him, that he believed that it had
not been brought to the Gulcherry and that his Cash-keeper affirmed
that no such money was brought to the Treasury. He also stated,
had Devaguptapu Kama-raz expressed a wish that either of the
Estates should be first sold, he would not have objected. In a

No 1113 of 1833 Subsequent petition Devaguptapu Kama-raz besides recapitulating
in No 2565 of 1833

former statements announced that he was prepared to pay the balance of Peshtunk to the Collector 4th November 1833. The Board in consequence authorized the Collector of Raja-
Mundry to afford him a limited time to do so, at the expiration of the period allowed, the Collector reported that Devaguptapur being a considerable defaulter as security to the renters of several villages in the Pittapur Zamindari, he had made a demand against him for the balance due on this account, at the same time that he called on him to pay the arrears of Peshtunk due on his Estates, that up to the date of his letter he had received no communication from him, and that he thought that he never seriously intended to pay the balance but petitioned to gain time during which he could exercise an influence in the Estates.

11. On an attentive consideration of the Petitions received from the Proprietor and of all circumstances relative to the sale of the Wooppada Estate and specially with reference to the fact of the price for his other Estate was sold being more than sufficient to liquidate the balance due upon both, the Board resolve to annul the sale of Wooppada Estate and to recommend to Govt the Confirmation of the purchase of the Estate of Galugur and Lunkur on account of Government for 6300 Rupees.

(Sd) W. Bauman

Secretary

Godavery District Collector's Office

16th May 1872

(True Extract)

(Sd) K. Jagannatha

Deputy Collector

(True copy of an Extract)

84 8 4 31 20 07 20 00 20 00 20 00



Lillah of Rajahmundry.

No 593

Decree executed by the Sudder Adalat Court of the District of Rajahmundry, regarding the prosecution between the Plaintiffs Perumalla Chinniah, P. Jagganna, Rasamsetti Pakir, Majasudhi Malliah and Bahiah vs.

Defendant Ragunpudi Venkannah.

The result from the Court's trial on the Petition, reply and Rejoinders marked 1/1 and the depositions marked 1/1 from Gumbala Jaggappa, Gorrara, Nookanna, Meruvu Chinniah, Challapatti Saraju, Padala Mattu and Basina Rajulu the witnesses of the Plaintiff - is that they are living by fishing in the sea near Wooppada, and by cooly labourings, and that a tax upon all of them was annually levied and that having understood that the Government have resolved that the Proprietors had no authority to collect the personal, the professional and other kinds of taxes under Section 4 of Regulation 25 of 1802, the Defendant, the employee on behalf of the Proprietor has collected the Tax from them from the year Rakhtakshi, pretending that it is usual; that there is no authority to others except to the Government to collect the Tax and that the Proprietors are not at all authorized by the Regulations and by permanent bowles to receive the tax for the fishes caught in the sea so that they request to refund the tax hitherto collected from them as follows:-

	Pagodas
For the year Rakhtakshi	82 - 10
" " " " " " " "	82 - 10
" " " " " " " "	82 - 10

Total Poorly Pagodas into Rs 953 - 5 - 0 and they further complain that such Tax would never be imposed in future.

To which (the above) the Defendant answers as follows:-

The tax which the plaintiffs are paying is not a personal one, but on a condition which they have among themselves arranged. That for the above tax which the

plaintiffs are paying and that of Chayroot Tase, Mr. Brown
 14 years ago granted a permanent bowle and that
 are usually collecting the tax in question uninterruptedly
 the last 14 years; that it would be plain by the Accounts
 years in the Collector's Office, that it is not contrary to
 Regulation 25. Section 4 and that this Tax was included
 the fishing net tax as a permanent free hold, to his (Def's)
 Master. That with reference to the above grounds, he requests
 that he has no any concern in this respect.

Upon the Enquiry of the entire case, the Court must first
 consider whether the Proprietor is authorized to collect this tax
 from the Plaintiffs under Section 4 of Regulation 25.

Considering in the depositions of the witnesses on the subject
 and the accounts marked 1/1 which were prepared by the
 Gurus of Trooppada and Ameenbada and the accounts
 in the Collector's Office by which the Permanent System of the
 Mootah had been formed, it is clear that the Tax of fishers
 is levied from them from a long period and that the Tax of
 fishing included in permanent accounts was separately
 written under one head. The tax levied on fishers is meant
 to be one of such items of provisions as included in the Revenue
 which is due to be collected by the Proprietor but does not
 mean to be leviable upon the profession and therefore it is
 not reasonable to fail to the Plaintiffs in conformity to
 Section 4 of Regulation referred to and moreover it appears
 from the village accounts and from the depositions of all
 witnesses that the Proprietor is levying tax upon the profession
 of the fishermen at Rs 2 for each married man and at one
 Rupee for each unmarried man while they are living by
 labour. It is a custom in this Country that the Proprietor is to
 inform the head of their (fishermen) Cast that the tax due
 is in any pagoda and that the Head used to collect
 the same from his Cast men making arrangements among
 them at his discretion. The plaintiffs, instead of making

an arrangement upon their fishing nets, having made it upon
 their families at their discretion, are continued to pay it and are
 now pretending as it means to be imposed upon the persons; so
 that the plaintiffs cannot say that the proprietor is not
 authorized to collect such fishing tax on nets. The Proprietor
 should impose the Tax upon those who catch fishes in the
 Sea, but not upon those who are labouring as coolies and women
 living in the houses. The Proprietor should give Cowles to
 those who catch fish in the Sea. The Court now determine a
 new rule that the Proprietor should grant Cowles to those
 who catch fish in the Sea and at the same time receive
 Cudpas from them and that he should receive such Tax
 from them alone. Moreover, the Plaintiffs claim in their
 plaint that besides Rs 308 as mentioned in the permanent
 accounts, the defendant has increased the collection since
 the year Raklakshi. On considering this, the Plaintiffs
 only proved that the nets which they had in their use of
 fishing since five or six years were a dozen and although
 most part of the persons of their village were gone to labour as
 bearers to Seringapatam and Madras &c, yet from two years
 the present fishing nets are 14. As the tax is to be levied upon
 the nets and as the number of these nets is now augmented than
 before, a little more might have been collected from them.

The Plaintiffs Complaint is dismissed as it is a groundless
 one and it is decreed that the Plaintiffs should pay Rs 96-0-0
 for the Expenses incurred to the Defendants' fee &c.

Fee for the Pleader Vangala Silaya	Rs	as	P
on behalf of the Plaintiff	47	10	0
Fee to Pleader Gandikoli-kousingam	47	10	0
on behalf of the Defendant	0	4	0
Batta to the Court's Peon	0	8	0
Court Disbursements	96	0	0

22nd January 1808.
 (See Translation)
 60 21 21 0 12 13 22 22 22 22 22

Total Rs 96-0-0
 (sd) S. Skinner, Judge
 (sd) N. Bulikank Seisladan

included in the average Peshkush of the Villages of
Upada and Ameenbada, that the said Tax being
added to the amount of Rs 325 in the year in which the
Villages came into your possession, that the then Collector
inhibited the collection by the Proprietors of any other Tax but
Land Revenue; that when the payment of the said Tax
was demanded from the fishermen pursuant to the order of
Saeel the Collector, they refused to pay and complained
to Long the Judge, who notwithstanding a previous decree
808 of Mr Skinner empowering you to collect the said Tax,
decided in favour of them, and that a copy of the decree of
Long against that of Mr Skinner was enclosed in your
petition. You have written that you petitioned the Collector
about the Motinfa Tax.

We hereby inform you that permanent average accounts
do the proceedings of Special Commissioners about them
have been sent to us; and we are enabled to pass on decision
one way depending on the said accounts but are not
inclined to trouble the Board of Revenue with the several
times you sent to us, therefore order you to furnish us
to the purport of all your petitions, so that when we lay
matter before the Board, they may very readily make
themselves acquainted with the nature and truth of the same
and giving cause to us unnecessary explanation.

To Support your Statement that Mr Long decreed
that there is no occasion for the fishermen to pay the Tax
you had better send any documentary evidence to
that effect or else it could not be attended to.

Coenadas
14th April /21

(Ed) J. W. Robertson

Collector

To

Kalliny Steelachellum

Daroga of Sayer

From the petition of Devaguplapu
Zaminidar of Uppada and Ameenbada, it
that you prevented him from collecting the Vala
from the tenants of the said two Villages under y
jurisdiction, which is customary and which is inc
in the permanent Poiriz.

You are hereby informed or directed not to inter
the matter if he do so and inform the same to the
Coenadas }
13th December /16 } (Ed) H. Saeel
ag Collector

5
Zubthul Yakaran Devaguplapu Mursiah. Prop
Uppada Yakugurani Lanka Moolahs &c. Rafiah

We are in receipt of your petition dated 31
stating that the late ag collector had given to the
a piece of land situated in Madaroyapatam of
Vani Lanka Moolah, which yields a Revenue of
that you should be remunerated for this loss, and
we did not listen to your several petitions about the
to you the Valakatta Tax included in the perman
Accounts of Uppada &c.

We have no time for the present to settle the
but we will think about it when we have time
Rajahmundry Zillah } J. W. Robertson
26th June 1819. } Collector

to your Honor for justice giving proofs of your deeds; and yet, the Endorsement to the effect that the Govt do act as they deem proper is very striking. No one conceives that this sort of injustice ever existed nor provided by your Law. He knew as much that it is in the hands of the rulers of a country to dispose of any case as they like, if have the intention of not being troubled by deep consideration to find out justice; and he has reason to be sorry that he is the only one precluded from justice. He is anxiously waiting for justice from the very talk that your Excellency is very fond of it. The more enquiry of what took place subsequent to the Board's order to give back the Vuppada Mootah annulling the sale thereof in auction, may, of course, to some length lead the way to the right side. The Taluk of Sree Naraya Appa Row of Ellore, was put to auction by the Collector and was in the possession of the Govt for a space of 12 years. Even that was restored with its income for the said 12 years to the Zemindar on his prayers to find out justice. His (Petitioner's) case presents a most valid and justifiable argument. The Proprietors of Keelapilly and Nottam Mootahs also were refunded with Moturfa collected by the Govt. Some lands of a heirless family in Tiringy of Pittapur Taluk were claimed by the Zemindar of Pittapur, but the then Collector Mr Purvis denied his assuming the privilege and annexed to the Govt; but your Excellency was pleased to return the said lands to the Zemindar after a lapse of 12 years. Placing only a land Revenue of Rs 1000 under him and collecting the Moturfa for themselves, the Government have received from him a Peshkash of Rs 1300 which was the amount payable when both the land Revenue and Moturfa were under him. Thus, the Govt have occupied his Mootah and exchanged it to the Rajah of Pittapur fixing thereon an annual Peshkash of Rs 673 only. This fact is *prima facie* evidence of the injustice I am suffering from.

Considering the above, it appears that justice is freely open to the rich, but quite shut against the poor.

He therefore most humbly begs of your Excellency will be good enough to get, from the Collector of this District, the report given by the Record keepers to Mr Purvis on 31st octo/55 which minutely treats of the particulars of his case, to bring it into your Honor's benevolent consideration and to return him the Moturfa, and the Moolah of Vuppada, thus to enable him to protect his family, whose poor circumstances are not fit to commit into writing.

If your Excellency be not pleased to let him have justice he humbly craves your Honor's apology to despatch the accompanying petition to the Duke of Argyll, who ordered him to forward the same thro' the Local Govt. If this, too, cannot be granted, he begs of your Excellency to favor him with Endorsement to that effect, which (Endorsement) he shall forward to the Home Government.

Copies of the Proceedings of the Board above alluded to and of the Hockums of Collectors concerning the repayment of Moturfa collected by the Govt are herewith sent for your Excellency's attentive perusal.

For which act of justice, he shall as in duty bound

Ever pray

சென்னை

Cocainadap
24th October/73

The Petitioner forwarded a Memorial to the Right Hon^{ble} L. Stanley on 28th February/70 but it was returned ordering him to forward the same thro' the L. G. Hence the request.

Record keepers to Mr. Harris
on 31st October 1855, and
prays that the Mosturpha
may be refunded to him
and the Mostah put
in his possession.

Further requests
that in the event of
Govt being unwilling
to render justice, the
accompanying Memorial
to the Duke of Argyll
may be forwarded.

Encl. of 10/5/72 A-241

~~453~~
14

reasonable to give him
such dry and disappoint-
ing replies without deeply
considering his case;
that the Board have
issued an order dated
20th Feby/34 to cancel
the sale of Vuppada moot
ah and to give it back
to him; but that the
Collector kept it under
his own management
and sold it at auction

Citing cases similar
to his own and observing
that justice is spent
the rich, requests that
the Govt may call for
the report given by the
1074

Revenue 1874 Sept
Government of Madras,

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

N^o 1208

Petition No. 2565 of 1873.

From D. Rama Ragu

Occupation. Late zemindary
Proprietor of the Mootahs

Village. of Vuppada and

Talook. Yaligurani
District. Chynka residing
at Coconada

Dated 24th } October 1873.

Received 30th } April 14 Dec. 1873

Enclosed 17th } April 14 Dec. 1873
N. H. 12 } Enclosures. 3

Abstract.

Dissatisfied with the
Govt endorsement dated
10th May 1873, brings to
notice that it is not
40-17 April/74 No 455

No 2565 of 1873

Returned the Memorialist
with reference to Rule No. 18 below

Extract from Rules for Memorials
addressed to Her Majesty's Govt
Rule 18. Memorials may be
transmitted either in manu-
script or in print, but must
be properly authenticated by the
signature of the Memorialist
on each sheet.

(Sd)

Ag under Secy to Govt

Fort Saint George
18th Nov. 1873

(True Copy)

சென்னை 24 ஆகஸ்ட் 1873

(Sd) D. Ramaswamy

Letter 257 of 1874

No 2565 of 187.

Preliminary to the Memorials
with reference to Rule No 2 below.

LESS
Extract from Rules for Memorials
addressed to Her Majesty's Govt.
Rule 2. Memorials, together with
their accompanying documents,
should be in English. If the accom-
panying documents must necessarily
be forwarded in the Vernacular,
an English Translation should
be appended, which should be
certified as genuine by the Si-
gnature of the Memorialist.

(Sd)

ag under Secy. to Govt.

Fort Saint George?

18th Nov/73

(True Copy)

சென்னை அரசாங்கத்தின்
புதுச்சேரி

(Sd) Devaguplaee Ramaswamy
Dec 1st 257 M/74

No. 455

Revenue Department.

455
17

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 17th April 1874.

READ the following Petition from Deva.

Suptam Kamaraz, late Proprietor of
Wodpada and Teluguram, Lanka in
Gottaray District

Submitting Memorial for trans-
mission to the Secretary of State for
India

H. E. 24: Oct/73 and 16: Jan'y 1874

Petitioner is
informed that his Memorial
has been received, and will be
forwarded to the Secretary of
State.

9/11/74

1074-1055

9-0

Memorial of Devagupta in Ramay.
Godavery to Secretary of State.

Dis