

(1) Number of Pages..... 22
(2) Date of repair..... 23. 3. 68
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... 27. 4. 68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

1729

B.P. No.

Press

Mis.

Dated

2. 12. 1875 196.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
2nd December 1875.*

No. 21. Read the following Petition from RAYA SOOREDDY VENKET RAM NURSAYA, late Zemindar of Murrigudem, in Rekapally Taluq, now annexed to the Government of Madras, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Nursapoor, 28th May 1875:—

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH, •

That he submitted his memorial to the Government of India at Calcutta through the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, for the restoration of the estate of Murrigudem, which was taken away from the hands of your petitioner and made over to the Bhadrachellum Zemindari on a misapprehension and on grounds not at all just and proper.

2. The memorial of your humble petitioner was, he is informed, rejected by the Right Honorable the Governor-General of India on receiving a certain report or reports from the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, under whose administration the estate first remained before its annexation to the Madras Government.

3. Your petitioner submits herewith a memorial to the Home Government with the copies of his representations, &c., and prays that your Lordship will be moved to forward the same to the Secretary of State with such favorable recommendations as you may deem proper under the circumstances, for which your petitioner and his humble family shall ever pray.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Memorial from RAYA SOOREDDY VENKET RAM NURSAYA, late Zemindar of Murrigudem in the Upper Godavery District, in the Central Provinces, and lately annexed to the District of Rajahmundry, in the Madras Presidency, to the Secretary of State for India, London, dated Nursapoor, 28th May 1875.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That he was convicted of dacoity in the year 1862 by the Deputy Commissioner of Upper Godavery District, and his estate of Murrigudem was also confiscated at the instance of the Deputy Commissioner, who got it transferred to the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum on the plea that your memorialist was simply a trustee under the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum and had no proprietary rights in the said estate of Murrigudem.

2. Your memorialist was too young, being about 18 years old, when these orders were passed. He considered at the time, as also the other residents of the place did, that the Deputy Commissioner was the highest authority, and that unless his favor was obtained, and he was moved, your memorialist's representation to the British Government would be of no avail. Under this impression, your memorialist took all the pains possible to please the Deputy Commissioner, and also to show to him that your memorialist was treated very unjustly and harshly. The Deputy Commissioner being afterwards convinced of the injustice done to your memorialist, referred his humble case to the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, for his kind, just, and merciful consideration. The Chief Commissioner, without ordering the restoration of the estate to your memorialist, as it was first transferred to the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum without any interference on the part of the latter, asked the Deputy Commissioner to consult the Zemindari as to whether she would allow the estate to be transferred to your memorialist. She, of course, denied to part with the estate, as by so doing she would lose a handsome and good fertile estate which she had got for nothing.

3. When the Deputy Commissioner, Upper Godavery District, failed in all his efforts in repairing the loss which he rashly caused to your unfortunate memorialist, he referred your humble memorialist to the Chief Commissioner and other superior British authorities for redress.

The Home Govt, with the copies of ^{his} representations &c

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
2nd December 1875.*

On this your humble memorialist went to Nagpoor and submitted his humble and most wretched case to the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, in his representations (copies of which are herewith enclosed for information, marked A B.) The Chief Commissioner declined to re-open the case.

4. On this your humble memorialist submitted his memorial to the Governor-General of India in Council, who, on the report of the Chief Commissioner, dismissed the prayers of your memorialist, thus disappointing him entirely in the fervent hopes that he cherished of obtaining redress from the Supreme Government.

5. Now your memorialist has no other recourse left in this earthly world, except submitting his humble prayers for your Lordship's most benevolent and merciful consideration, fully trusting that God the Almighty God will inspire your Lordship to give your kind and gracious attention to his prayers.

6. Though your memorialist was convicted by the Deputy Commissioner of dacoity, the Commissioner and the Judicial Commissioner found that your memorialist was not guilty of dacoity but of extortion, and this finding of the Commissioner and Judicial Commissioner based upon the statements of witnesses which were taken down, while your memorialist, who was accused of the offence, was not present. The accused had nobody to speak for him. His cousin who bore enmity with your petitioner also wished your memorialist's ruin. No opportunity was given to your humble memorialist for getting the aid of a Counsel. The Deputy Commissioner was so much prejudiced against your memorialist that he himself acted as a complainant rather than as a Judge. It was he who prevailed upon the higher authorities to deprive your memorialist of his estate as shall appear from the official communications in the Deputy Commissioner's Office.

7. The Chief Commissioner recommended to the Government of India that your humble memorialist's case be dismissed evidently on the following grounds, viz:—

(1) That your memorialist was merely a trustee and not the independent owner of Murrigudem estate;

(2) That your memorialist's case was decided long ago, and by re-opening the question now the settlement made in the name of the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum would be disturbed;

(3) That by restoring the estate to your memorialist it would not be improved;

(4) That your memorialist was deprived of his estate as a warning to others, &c.; and,

(5) That the procedure of the Original Courts was correct according to the law then in force, and that your memorialist was not dealt with any injustice.

8. In respect to the first ground your humble memorialist submits that the Sanads, &c., filed in the Chief Commissioner's Office show that the estate of Murrigudem is the hereditary and private property of your memorialist, and that, though the estate of Bhadrachellum was often taken possession of and kept in "Khas" management by the Nizam's Government for arrears due by the Zemindar of Bhadrachellum, yet the estate of Murrigudem, forming a portion of the Rekapally Taluq, was never touched by the Nizam's Government. This single fact is sufficient to show that Murrigudem estate does not belong to the Bhadrachellum Zemindar, and that it was never so considered. When the Chief Commissioner ordered an inquiry into the rights of your memorialist's family, and your memorialist was in imprisonment, your memorialist's cousin was obliged to give a statement suited to the cause of the Deputy Commissioner for fear that he also would come to grief if he stated anything contrary to the wishes of the Deputy Commissioner. The statement of your memorialist's cousin is no proof of the estate being not the private property of your memorialist. An inquiry,—a due inquiry,—will prove that Rekapally Taluq, in which the estate of Murrigudem is included, forms the private and ancestral property of your memorialist's family, and that it was so when the estate was transferred by the order of the Central Provinces Government to the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum, who had never claimed for its possession, and your memorialist humbly prays that a judicial investigation be ordered to sift the truth as to whether the pretensions of the Zemindari of Bhadrachellum

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
2nd December 1875.*

now set up are valid. There have been several alienations, transfers, &c., made by your petitioner's family of the estate which on the face would show that your memorialist was not a trustee but a proprietor of the estate in question.

9. With regard to the second ground your memorialist trusts that his age, ignorance, and desire to be loyal to British Officers, will plead as an ample apology for his not having gone up to Nagpoor for submitting his case personally to the Chief Commissioner. Length of time does not become a bar for the administration of justice, and it is not inequitable and unlawful for rectifying a mistake. The settlement wrongly made with the Zemindari can be corrected without much difficulty and without any wrongful loss to any of the parties.

10. In regard to the third ground your memorialist humbly submits that your memorialist's fertile and well-populated estate has been ruined since it was transferred to the Zemindari. Your memorialist fully hopes to improve his estate if it be restored to him. He is willing to furnish such security as the Government may require for securing the improvement of the estate.

11. In regard to the fourth ground your memorialist has only to say that the Deputy Commissioner himself was satisfied that your memorialist fell an innocent victim, and that he tried his best subsequently to repair the loss, but it was too late for him to rectify his own doings. Your memorialist was then a lad of eighteen years old, and the sentence and punishment inflicted upon him were too severe and unjust. The Deputy Commissioner for having his awe spread in the country punished an innocent person most unmercifully.

12. In regard to the fifth ground your memorialist submits that he was not allowed any advantage that law provides for the public. When your memorialist was arrested he was not allowed to say a single word. From the time of his arrest up to the time of his release he was a prisoner half-dead, nobody to speak to nor to give him any courage. The Deputy Commissioner was wholly biased against your memorialist, and, in fact, he was both the prosecutor and the Magistrate. It may then be surmised as to the position in which your memorialist was placed, and whether he had any chance of obtaining justice.

13. To submit any further details about the troubles and grievances of your memorialist and his humble family while in jail, and even now as he has nothing in the world left for his sustenance, would be teasing your Lordship and occupying your Lordship's precious and valuable time. Your memorialist earnestly prays that your Lordship will be moved for the sake of God, who has given existence to both the rich and poor, powerful and weak, and the ruling and the ruled, to do justice to your humble memorialist's family, and confer upon it its property wrested from its possession unlawfully without any just and reasonable grounds, for which act of grace, justice, benevolence, and charity, your memorialist's family shall ever pray for the long reign and prosperity of Her Majesty the Gracious Queen Victoria in the whole world.

(True Copy.)

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

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

REVENUE DEPT.
FORT ST. GEORGE
2nd December

No. 22.

No. 1,729.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
AGRICULTURE, AND C

Miscellaneous.

SIR,—I am directed to
the orders of the Government
the accompanying memorial

the Secretary of State by Raya Soorreddy Venkat Ram Narasaya, ex-Zemindar
Murrigoodem, in the taluq of Rekapally, lately transferred to this Presidency from
the Central Provinces.

2. It has been ascertained that no papers relating to the case of the memorial-
list have been received by this Government, and it would appear that the orders
passed by the authorities in the Central Provinces were ratified by the Government
of India.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

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

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

The Home Govt, with the copies of representations to

Agriculture (1875) Department.

Government of Fort St. George.

Dated 2nd December 1875. No. 1,729.
Received } Enclosures.
5 spare copies.

D. No. Progs.

L. No. No.

H-21-22

Forwarding, for orders, memorial addressed to the Secretary of State by Raya Sooraddy Venket Ram Narasaya, ex-Zemindar of Murrigoodem, in the taluk of Bekapally, lately transferred to this Presidency, praying for the restoration of his Zemindari.

13
15
2/11/75

13
15
2/11/75

The Secretary to the Government of

Madras

Madras

Date

The humble petition of Raya Sooraddy Venket Ram Narasaya, late Zemindar of Murrigoodem in Bekapally Taluq now annexed to the Government of Madras, residing at Mursapoor

Most respectfully sheweth

That he submitted his memorial to the Government of India at Calcutta the Chief Commissioner C. P. for the restoration of the estate of Murrigoodem, which was taken away from the hands of your petitioner and made over to the Bhudrachellum Zemindar on a misapprehension, and on grounds not at all just and proper.

The memorial of your humble petitioner was, as informed, rejected by the Right Honorable the Governor General of India on receiving a certain report or report from the Chief Commissioner C. P. under whose administration the estate first remained, before its annexation to the Madras Government.

Your petitioner submits herewith a memorial to the Home Govt, with the copies of his representations to

and pray that your Lordship will be moved to forward the same to the Secretary of State with such favorable recommendations as you may deem proper under the circumstances for which your petitioner and his humble family shall beseech.

28th May 1875. { Signature of Raja Looreddy Venkata Ram Narsaya.
 ముద్రా ముద్రా ముద్రా ముద్రా ముద్రా
 చిహ్నములు

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text at the top of the right page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]

The humble memorial of Raja Looreddy Venkata Ram Narsaya late zemindar of Mungudi in the upper Godavari District in the Central Provinces and lately annexed to the District of Rajahmundry in the Madras Presidency now residing at Amrapoor in the Madras Presidency.

Most respectfully Sheweth.

That he was convicted of dacoity in the year 1862 by the Deputy Commissioner of Upper Godavari District and his estate of Mungudi was also confiscated at the instance of the Deputy Commissioner who got it transferred to the zemindar of Bhudrachellam on the plea that your memorialist was simply a trespasser under the zemindar of Bhudrachellam and had no proprietary rights in the said estate of Mungudi. Your memorialist was too young being about 18 years old, when these orders were passed. He considered at the time as also the other residents of the place did, that the Deputy Commissioner was the highest authority and that unless his favor was obtained and he was moved your memorialist's representation to the British Government would be of no avail. Under this impression your memorialist took all the pains possible to please the Deputy Commissioner and also to show to him that your memorialist was treated very unjustly and harshly. The Deputy Commissioner

In N^o 1337 of 75

being afterwards convinced of the injustice done to your memorialist, referred his humble case to the Chief Commissioner Central Provinces for his kind just and merciful consideration. The Chief Commissioner without ordering the restoration of the Estate to your memorialist as it was first transferred to the Zemindar of Bhudrachallum, without any interference on the part of the latter, asked the Deputy Commissioner to consult the Zemindar as to whether he would allow the Estate to be transferred to your memorialist. He of course denied to part with the Estate, as by so doing he would lose a handsome and good fertile estate, which he had got for nothing.

3 When the Deputy Commissioner Upper Godavery District failed in all his efforts in repairing the loss which he rashly caused to your unfortunate memorialist he referred your humble memorialist to the Chief Commissioner and other Superior British Authorities for redress. On this your humble memorialist went to Nagpore and submitted his humble and most wretched case to the Chief Commissioner Central Provinces in his representations (copies of which are herewith enclosed for information marked A.B. The Chief Commissioner decided to refer the case.

4 On this your humble memorialist submitted his case to the Governor General of India in Council, who on the report of Chief Commissioner dismissed the prayers of your memorialist thus disappointing him entirely in the fervent hopes that he cherished of obtaining redress from the Supreme Government.

5 Now your memorialist has no other recourse left in this earthly world, except submitting his humble prayers for your Lordship's most benevolent and merciful consideration, fully trusting that God the Almighty God will inspire your Lordship to give your kind and gracious

attention to his prayers.

6 Though your memorialist was convicted by the Deputy Commissioner of dacoity the Commissioner and the Judicial Commissioner found that your memorialist was not guilty of dacoity but of extortion and this finding of the Commissioner and Judicial Commissioner based upon the statements of witnesses which were taken down, while your memorialist who was accused of the offence, was not present. The accused had no body to speak for him. His Cousin who bore enmity with your petitioner ^{also} wished your memorialist ruin. No opportunity was given to your humble memorialist for getting the aid of a Counsel. The Deputy Commissioner was so much prejudiced against your memorialist that he himself acted as a Complainant rather than as a Judge. It was he who prevailed upon the higher authorities to deprive your memorialist of his Estate as shall appear from the official communications in the Dy. Commissioner's office. The Chief Commissioner recommended to the Government of India that your

humble memorialist's case be dismissed on the following grounds V.D.

- (1) That your memorialist was merely a trustee and not the independent owner of Munnigudem estate
- (2) That your memorialist's case was decided long ago and by reopening the question now, the Settlement made in the name of Zemindar of Bhudrachallum would be disturbed.
- (3) That by restoring the estate to your memorialist it would not be improved.

(2) That your memorialist was deprived of his estate as a warning to others & and that the Procedure of the Criminal Courts was correct according to the law then in force, and that your memorialist was not dealt with any injustice.

8 In respect to the 1st ground your humble memorialist submits that the Summons filed in the Commissioner's office show that the estate of Murrigudium is the hereditary and private property of your memorialist, and that the estate of Bhudrachellum was often taken possession of and kept in "Khas" management by the Peshwa government for arrears due by the zemindar of Bhudrachellum yet the estate of Murrigudium forming a portion of the Dekapelly Taluk was never touched by the Peshwa government. This single fact is sufficient to show that Murrigudium estate does not belong to the Bhudrachellum zemindar and that it was never so considered. When the Chief Commissioner ordered an enquiry into the rights of your memorialist's family and your memorialist was in imprisonment your memorialist's cousin was obliged to give a statement suited to the cause of the Deputy Commissioner for fear that he also would come to grief, if he stated anything contrary to the wishes of the Deputy Commissioner. The statement of your memorialist is no proof of the estate being not the private property of your memorialist. An enquiry and due inquiry will prove that Dekapelly Taluk in which the estate of Murrigudium is included.

forms the private and ancestral property of your memorialist's family and that it was so when the estate was transferred by the order of the Central Provinces government to the zemindar of Bhudrachellum, who had never claimed for its possession, and your memorialist humbly prays that a Judicial investigation be ordered to sift the truth as to whether the pretensions of the zemindar of Bhudrachellum now set up are valid. There have been several alienations transfers &c made by your petitioner's family of the estate which on the face, would show that your memorialist was not a trustee, but a proprietor of the estate in question.

With regard to the 2d ground your memorialist trusts that his age, ignorance, & desire to be loyal to British officers, will plead as an ample apology for his not having gone up to Nagpur, for submitting his case personally to the Chief Commissioner. Length of time does not become a bar for the administration of justice and it is not inequitable and unlawful for rectifying a mistake. The settlement wrongly made with the zemindar can be corrected without much difficulty and without any wrongful loss to any of the parties.

In regard to the 3d ground your memorialist humbly submits that your memorialist's fertile and well populated estate has been ruined since it was transferred to the zemindar your memorialist fully hopes to improve his estate if it be restored. He is willing to furnish evidence as to the improvements

may require for securing the improvement of the estate. In regard to the 4th ground your memorialist has only to say that the Deputy Commissioner himself was satisfied that your memorialist fell an innocent victim and that he tried his best subsequently to repair the loss but it was too late for him to rectify his own doings your memorialist was then a lad of 18 years old and the sentence and punishment

inflicted upon him were too severe and unjust. The Deputy Commissioner for having his awe spread in the Country punished an innocent person most unmercifully.

In regard to the 5th ground your memorialist submits that he was not allowed any advantage that law provides for the public when your memorialist was arrested he was not allowed to say a single word. From the time of his arrest up to the time of his release he was a prisoner half dead, no body to speak to nor to give him any courage. The Deputy Commissioner was wholly biased against your memorialist and in fact he was both the Prosecutor and the magistrate. It may then be surmised as to the position in which your memorialist was placed and whether he had any chance of obtaining justice.

To submit any further details about the troubles and grievances of your memorialist and his humble family, while in jail and even now as he has nothing in the world left for his maintenance would be teasing your Lordships and occupying your Lordships' precious and valuable time. Your memorialist earnestly prays that your Lordships will be moved for the sake of God who has given existence to both the rich and poor, powerful and weak and the ruling and the ruled, to do justice to your humble memorialist's family and confer upon it its property wrested from its possession unlawfully without any just and reasonable grounds, for which act of fraud and, justice, benevolence, and charity, your memorialist's family shall ever pray for the long reign and prosperity of Her Majesty the Princess Queen Victoria in the whole

world.

Signature of Raja Somoddy Venket Rao
Date of 26th May 1875
Muvaya late Zaminar of Marigaden
in Rekaperly taluk.

Madras Presidency
S. Somoddy Venket Rao
303
C. 172-10-18

Phil. Soc. 2. 17. June 1944
No. 74

9

Rev 1/2509/75

Presdy

R.D.
 N^o 1729
 To The Secretary to the
 Government of India
 Secy of the R.H.

Sir, I am directed
 to forward for the
 orders of the Govt.
 of India, the ac-
 companying Memo-
 rial addressed to
 the Secretary of State
 by Raja Sooruddy
 Venkat Rao & Kara-
 sayi & Zaminदार
 of Murrigoodem
 in the taluk of
 Rekapally, lately
 transferred to this
 Presy.

LB

enclosing herewith
 requesting the recti-
 tude of both Zamindars
 of Murrigoodem, which
 has been carried to the
 Revenue Presidency.

Govt. : 1875: 244
 M. 2509.
 Government of Madras.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 1337 of 1875.
 From Raja Sooruddy Venkat
 Ravi Naraya late
 Occupation Zamindar of Murrigoodem
 Village, Taluk, Rekapally
 District, Tanjore
 Dated 28th May 1875
 Received 2nd June 1875
 And 1st July 1875
 Enclosures, 15.

ABSTRACT. 21407

Raja for the same
 Murrigoodem, & the late
 taluk of Rekapally, of the
 Revenue

118 May 1874
 121 1875 1875 1875

Presidency from the
Central Provinces

2. It has been
ascertained that no
papers relating to the
case of the Nema
rialist have been
received by this
Govt., and it would
appear that the
orders passed by
the authorities in the
Central Provinces
were ratified by
the Govt. of India.

2^d Dec^r 1875

[Signature]

