18

M.R.O. 1—20,002[c]—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 36

(2) Date of repair 21. 7. 1966

(3) Initials of the Referencer CWV

d

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.O. No. / B.P. No. | 453 | Press / Mis. |
| Dated | 17-4- | 1874 / 196 . |

*Not to be folded or roughly handled*

455
1

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

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 Governmont 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.

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.

* The petitioner forwarded a Memorial to the Right Honourable Lord Stanley on 28th February 1870, but it was returned, ordering him to forward the same through the local Government; hence the request.

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)



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.

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.*

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 1874 Dated 17th April 1874

To His Excellency The Right Hon'ble
Lord Napier & Ettrick G.C.S.I.
&c. &c. &c.

The Governor and President in Council.

Fort Saint George, Madras.

The humble petition of Devaguptapu Ramadas, late Zemindary Peishcar of Vuyyaleru in the Godavery District.

Sheweth:

That your Endorsement dated 18th Aug. 1873 is to hand. The injustice I am suffering from, placed me in such circumstances that I am unable to bear even the [illegible] unless your Excellency be not pleased to comply in this behalf.

If your Excellency be not pleased to comply in this behalf, the relatives of Farbs 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 bodies and my petition about dealt with, for a long time, yet they are quite unwilling to give relieving the false reports forwarded by the Collectors of this District.

Govt. of Madras 1874

## REVENUE.

To

*Dated April 17th.*

*Recd.* *Encl.*

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

APRIL.

Nos. 104—105.

*Devaguptapu Kuma Raz of Godavery District.*—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, appended an English Translation of the Telugu Hookums inclosed in my last petition.

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

The enclosures are,

My last petition dated 24th October 73 with a copy of Endorsement thereon

Translation of the Telugu Hookums regarding the repayment of Inolinfa Collected by the Govt

A Copy of decree executed by the Sudder Adalut Court of Rajahmundry Shewing that the Proprietor has the right of Collecting Inolinfa and that it is included in the Permanent Sanz.

Proceedings of the Board referred to in my last

Copies of Telugu Hookums in Telugu

For the act of Justice and Kindness

I ... humbly beg ... pray.

I remain

16th January 74

Your Excellency's most obedient Servant

[illegible]

A.P.O. No 2561 Mil. P.
Censor St. 10/5/43 No 2641

Rec: 1/929/74.

Revenue 1874 Depto

Government of Madras

No 929

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. ~~261~~ of 1874.

From Devaguptapu Ramaraz

Occupation. late Zemindary Proprietor of Vuppada

Village. and Yalugurvani

Taloo's. Lanka Moolas

District. residing at Coconada

Dated 16th } January 1874

Received 21st }

Enclosures 7

Abstract.

Acknowledging the receipt of the Govt Endorsement dated 8th Ult. GO-17 April 1874 No 455

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 unnoticed owing to the false reports forwarded by the Collector

Submits, translation of the Telugu Statements enclosed in his former petition Vide G.O. 1874 and requesting address to the Secretary

C 25 March 74 - K 30. 104 A.

Revenue department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated the 20th February 1834. 455

Vuppada } Vuppada and Yalugurvani Lanka

Yalugurvani Lanka } the permanent Bariz on which in 1806 and 8540 Rupees respectively have sold the former for 1825 Rupees to Volala 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 Vuppada 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 } 10. Devaguptapu Ramaraz the Proprietor subsequent to
No 1031 of " } 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 Vuppada the Estate of the least value and afterwards the others whereas if he had sold Yalugurvani Lanka first a sufficient sum would have been realized to discharge the Amount of balance and the sale of Vuppada 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 Cutcherry and that his Cash-keeper affirmed that no such money was brought to the Treasury. He also stated, had Devaguptapu Ramaraz 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 Ramaraz besides accepting

Vide 2565 of 1833

former statements announced that he was prepared to pay the balance of Peshkush to the Collector 4th November 1833.

The Board in consequence authorized the Collector of Rajahmundry to afford him a limited time to do so, at the expiration of the period allowed, the Collector reported that Devagupta pursuant to the Board's order being a considerable defaulter as security to the renters of seven villages in the Pittapur Zamindary, 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 Peshkush and 8th Sept 33

the same time that he called on him to pay the arrears of Peshkush and 8th Sept 33

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 pretended to gain time during which he could exercise an influence on the Estates

11. On an attentive Consideration of the Petitions received from the Proprietor and of all circumstances relative to the sale of Wooppada Estate and especially 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 Gaby avaram Lanka on account of Government for 6300 Rupees.

5793-4-1

(Sd) V. Bannerman
Secretary

Godavery District Collector's Office
16th May 1822
(True Extract)
(Sd) K. Jagannadhams
Deputy Collector
(True copy of an Extract)

(Sd) A. Pereira
Asst. Actg

(Sd) V. Venkatasubbarow
Translator

Seal of Coll

Zillah of Rajahmundry. No 59

Decree executed by the Sudder Adalut Court of the Zillah of Rajahmundry, regarding the prosecution between the Plaintiffs Penumalla Chinnaih, P. Jaggamma, Rasadesetti Pakir, Venkatasudu, Mallaih and Baliah &c.

Defendant Rajumpudi Venkamah.

The result from the Court's trial on the Petition, reply and Rejoinders marked 1 1 and the depositions marked 1 1 from Cumbala Jaggappa, Goorara, Sookanna, Meruvu Kanu, Challapalli Sarraju, Padala Mallu and Casina Rajulu the witnesses of the Plaintiff - is that they are living by fishing in the sea near Vooppada, and by Coolly 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 profession and other kinds of taxes under Section 6 of Regulation 25 of 1802, the Defendant, the employe on behalf of the Proprietor has collected the Tax from them from the year Rakhakshi 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 Cowle 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 Rakhakshi | 82 - 10 |
| Krodhana | 82 - 10 |
| Aekshaya | 82 - 10 |

Total Pooly 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 praying is not a personal one, but on a condition which they have among themselves arranged. That for the above tax which the

inliffs are paying and that of Chayroot Tax, Mr Brown not 14 years ago granted a permanent Cowle and that are usually collecting the tax in question uninterruptedly ed the last 14 years; that it would be plain by the Accounts years in the Collectin'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 (Defts) Master. That with reference to the above grounds, he requests that he has no any concern in this respect.

Upon the Enquiry of the Suits 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 / / which were prepared by the Peruns of Moospada and Ameenbada and the accounts in the Collectin'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 know 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) caste that the tax due is to any pagodas and that the Head used to collect the same from his caste men making an 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 is 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 Rakhakshi. 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 headers to Seringapatam and Madras &c. yet from two years the present fishing nets are 14. As the tax is to be levied upon the net 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 agreeable to rule and it is decreed that the Plaintiffs should pay Rs 96-0-0 for the Expences incurred to the Defendants' fee &c.

| | Rs as P |
|---|---|
| Fee for the Pleader Vangala Silaya on behalf of the Plaintiff | 47-10-0 |
| Fee to Pleader Gandikota Narsingarow on behalf of the Defendant | 47-10-0 |
| Batta to the Court's Peon | 0-4-6 |
| Court Disbursements | 0-8-0 |
| Total Rs | 96-0-0 |

22nd January 1808.

(Sd). S. Skinner. Judge

(Sd) K. Bulchaik Seristas

included in the average Peshkush of the Villages of
Vuppada and Ameenbadas, that the said Tax being
decided to the amount of Rs 325 in the Year in which the
Lease came into your possession that the then Collector
prohibited 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
Mr Sael the Collector, they refused to pay and Complained to
Mr Long the Judge, who notwithstanding a previous decree
of 808 of Mr Skinner Empowering you to Collect the said Tax,
decided in favour of them, and that a Copy of the decree of
Mr Long against that of Mr Skinner was Enclosed in your
petition. You have written that you petitioned the Collector
about the Inolinga Tax.

We hereby inform you that permanent average Accounts
& the proceedings of Special Commissioners about them
have been sent to us; and we are enabled to pass no decision
one way depending on the said accounts but are not
confined to trouble the Board of Revenue with the several
petitions You sent to us: therefore order you to furnish us
with the purport of all your petitions so that when we lay
the matter before the Board, they may very readily make
themselves acquainted with the Nature and truth of the case
& giving Cause to no 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.

Rajahmundry Cutcherry
the 21st April 1821.

(Sd) J. W. Robertson
Collector

To

Kalliny Seelachellum

Daroga of Sayer

From the petition of Devaguptapu Ta
Zamindar of Vuppadas and Ameenbadas, it a
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 in
in the permanent Bandz

You are hereby informed or directed not to inter
the Matter if he do so and inform the same to the
Rajahmundry Cutcherry
the 13th December 1820.

(Sd) H. Sael
ag Collector

Subbul Yatavaru Devaguptapu Annaiah. Prop
Vuppada Gahingmani Lanka Mootahs &c. Rajah

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 Madavoy a talem of
Vani Lanka Moolah, which yields a Revenue of
that you should be remunerated for this Case, an
we did not listen to your several petitions about the
to you the Valakatta Tax included in the perma
Accounts of Vuppada &c.

We have no time for the present to settle the
but we will think about it when we have time

Rajahmundry Zillah Cutcherry
the 4 January 1819.

J. W. Robertson
Collector

To

His Excellency The Right Hon'ble

The Governor and President in Council

Fort Saint George. Madras.

The humble petition of Devaguptapu Ramaraz, talz Zemindary Proprietor of Vuppada and Yalugurani Lanka Moolahs

Humbly Sheweth.

That it appears from your Honor's Endorsement dated 10th May 173, that the Government have purchased the Vuppada Moolah 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 property to the Govt and while the owner of the said Estate is continually claiming his right thereto explaining his reasonable grounds to your Honor, 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 a quite destitute. He has no alternative but to weep for justice.

The Board have issued an order dated 20th Febry 34 to annul the sale of Vuppada Moolah in Auction and to give it back to him; and the facts that the Collector had, in Contrary to the above, kept it under himself for some time and then put it in auction, and he was not refunded with Molinfa, are Continually represented

Lr No 281 of 14

to

Zemindar Yakaraw Davagupliapu Ammiah, Proprietor of Yaluguvanidunka, Vuppada Moolahs, Bapiathu, Bashaud.

Your petition presented on the 6th instant states that you have paid the Machili and Molinfa Jasti of Vuppada Moolah, included in the average for 8 years from Fasli 1229 to the amount of Rs 16,000, and requesting us to send the accounts relative to the matter and to refund the said sum.

You are hereby requested to inform that have you at any time Collected Molinfa after the said Villages have come under you, if so, the respective sums Collected from Each village then by whom presented; but if you never Collect the said Molinfa, when, why, and by whom the Collection was objected to, before the Moolah came under you.

Further, to let us have a copy of the decree of Mr S. Skinner the Judge Empowering You to Collect the Machily Molinfa as stated in your petition, informing us at the same time of the Causes which led you not to bring the said decree into force.

6 o-caurada
4th January 21

(Sd) F. B. Robertson.
Collector

(True translation)

Rec 2/239/14

to yorr Honor for justice giving proofs of yorr Record: and yet, the Endorsement to the effect that the Govt do act as they deem proper is very shocking. No one Conceives that this sort of injustice can exist did no provided by yorr 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 trembled 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 yorr Excellency is very fond of it. The inner enquiry of what took place subsequent to the Board's order to give back the Vuppada Moolah annulling the sale thereof in auction, may, of Course, to some length lead the way to the right side. The Jaluq of Sreeharaya 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 present a basis valid and justifiable arguments. The Proprietors of Neelapilly and Kottam Mootahs also were refunded with Motunfa Collected by the Govt. Some lands of a heirless family in Turingy of Pittapur Jaluq were claimed by the Zemindar of Pittapur, but the then Collector Mr Purris denied his assuming the privilege and annexed to the Govt; but yorr 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 Motunfa for themselves, the Government have received from him a Peishkush of Rs 1800 which was the amount payable when both the land Revenue and Motunfa were under him. Thus, the Govt have occupied his Moolah and exchanged it to the Rajah of Pittapur fixing thereon an annual Peishkush 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 yorr Excellency will be good enough to get from the Collector of this District, the Report given by the Record keepers to Mr Purris on 31st Octr/55 which minutely treats of the particulars of his case, to bring it into yorr Honor's benevolent Consideration and to return him the Motunfa and the Moolah of Vuppada, thus to enable him to protect his family, whose poor circumstances are not fit to Commit into writing.

If yorr Excellency be not pleased to let him have justice he humbly craves yorr Honor's apology to despatch the accompanying petition to the Duke of Argyle, who ordered him to forward the same thro' the Local Govt. If this, too, Cannot be granted, he begs of yorr 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 Hookums of Collectors Concerning the repayment of Motunfa Collected by the Govt are here with Sent for yorr Excellency's attentive perusal

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

Ever pray

Cocanada
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.

Encl. of 10/5/72 ct 24

455
14

Record keepers to Mr Burns
on 31st October 1855, and
prays that the Instruments
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.

reasonable to give him such dry and disappointing replies without deeply considering his case; that the Board ~~have~~ issued an order dated 20th Febry/34 to cancel the sale of Vuppadamoodi 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 to the rich, requests that the Govt may call for the report given by the

1024

Revenue 1874 Sept.

Government of Madras,

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

No 1208

Petition ~~No. 2505~~ of 1873.

From D. Rama Razu

Occupation. late Zemindary Proprietor of the Mootahs

Village. of Vuppada and

Talook. Yalleswaram

District. Vizagapatam residing at Cocanada

Dated 24th October 1873

Received 30th April 1874

Enclosures. 3

Abstract.

Dissatisfied with the Govt endorsement dated 10th May 1873, brings to notice that it is not-

GO-17 April/74 No 455

No 2565 of 1873

Returned the Memorialist with reference to Rule No IX below

45/15

Extract from Rules for Memorials addressed to Her Majesty's Govt

Rule IX. Memorials may be transmitted either in Manuscript or in print, but must with all accompanying documents be properly authenticated by the signature of the Memorialist on each sheet.

(Sd)

Sg under Secy. to Govt

Fort Saint George

18th Novr 1873

(True Copy)

(Illegible)

(Sd) D. Ramas Razu

Dm No 251 1874

No 2565 of 187

Relimed to the Memoriabist
with reference to Rule 1 & X below.

455
16

Extract from Rules for Memoriats
addressed to Her Majesty's Govt

Rule X. Memoriats, 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 Memoriabist

(Sd)
ag under Secy to Govt

Fort Saint George
18th Nov/73

(True Copy)
[illegible]

(Sd) Devagoplapen Mamaroy
Inst. 257 1874

455
17

*Revenue Department.*

No. 455

***PROCEEDINGS** of the **MADRAS GOVERNMENT.***

Under date the 17th April 1874.

READ the following Petitions from Deva. Sapthapu Kamarazy, late Proprietor of Wooppada and Gelagamany Lanka in Gotamy District

Subng memorial for transmission to the Secretary of State for India

H. E. 26: Oct/73 and 16: Jany 1874

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

C. M. C.