

(1) Number of Pages 18(2) Date of repair 30.10.1967(3) Initials of the Reference 19.2.68**MADRAS RECORD OFFICE****GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS***Revenue***DEPARTMENT**

G.O. No.

880

Press

B.P. No.

Mis.

Dated

7.6.1875

196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 43. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th May 1875, No. 1,275:—

Read again—

Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 775, dated 5th February 1874, and No. 3,948, dated 12th June 1874.

Board's Proceedings, dated 26th October 1874, No. 3,098.

Read also the following letter from W. H. COMYN, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Pudukudi, 13th March 1875, No. 127:—

With reference to Board's Official Memorandum,* No. 211, dated 17th February 1875, calling for a reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 3,098, dated 26th October 1874, I have the honor to inform you

* Enclosure (petition No. 2,805 of 1873) returned.
that a further inquiry regarding the inams therein referred to has been made, from which it seems clear that the inams in question were held for service and not for subsistence.

2. It appears from an extract from the inam chitta prepared in Fasli 1254 (A.D. 1844-45) that these inams were entered as subsistence money inams. How they came to be so entered is not known, but it seems clear from an older document that this was a mistake.

3. The document I refer to is an original takid from the then Collector to the Tahsildar, No. 104, dated 21st November 1825. In this takid a list of the holders of these inams is given, and it is clearly stated that the grants were for the performance of certain services* in the temple

* விருத்தி.
and the order was to continue the inams to the Inamdars named in the list in perpetuity (சாகுவிதமாய் ஜாரிசெய்ய).

4. It further appears from the reports of the Temple Committee that the inams were for service, and that the service is duly kept up.

5. It does not appear that any other cases, besides the four mentioned in this office letter, No. 436, dated 4th September 1874, have been wrongly dealt with.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

THE above correspondence relates to claims preferred by the individuals marginally noted to certain maniyams alleged to have been originally granted for service in a certain pagoda in the district of Tinnevely. The Inam Commissioner declined to deal with the claims on the ground that they refer to ready-money allowances, the settlement of which does not fall within his jurisdiction.

Attaraiyengar.
Patchirajiyengar.

the Madras Government Revenue Department

1st May 1875.

Inamdar's Name

Attarayengar 5
Appanaiyengar 30
Krishnaiyengar 22
Patchirajengar 70

Total 127

granted, of which one was held in 1865, two are in the funds, and four are life-grants, an arrangement with the holders did not consent. The service consists in watching the jewel-box of the pagoda by turn, and is reported to be duly maintained. The four inams in question were treated as life-grants in

1854, because they were entered by the Collector in the list of inams held for subsistence whilst the Inam of a similar nature, which was confirmed, was entered in the list of service inams. It now appears that this classification was incorrect, and that the inams, being held for service, should have been treated as permanent under G.O., 19th August 1854, No. 972.

3. The Board are of opinion that the inams in question should be confirmed to the holders, or their heirs in case the original holders have deceased, and that the arrears, which have been improperly withheld, should be paid. The sanction of Government is requested to this course.

4. Payment of the allowances in question appears to have been discontinued in 1854, in which case arrears for twenty-one years, amounting to Rupees 3,717, are due. The Collector will report whether this is the correct amount.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 49.

ORDER THEREON, 7th June 1875, No. 880.

Miscellaneous.

THE proposals of the Board of Revenue in paragraph 3 are sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

Certain Maniyams originally granted for service in a pagoda in Tinnevely District, and entered by mistake as life-grants.—Sanctioning Board's proposals that—should be confirmed to the holders, or their heirs in case the original holders have deceased, and that the arrears, which have been improperly withheld, should be paid.

JUNE
Nos. 48-49.

G. O., 7th June 1875, No. 880.

Recd.

Encl.

to
cc,
cc,
cc.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

REVENUE.

Obdt. of 1875. *Madras.*

No. 1,275

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE date 14th May 1875.

Read again—
Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 7, dated 5th February 1874, and
No. 3,948, dated 12th June 1874,
Board's Proceedings, dated 26th October 1874, No. 3,998.

Read also the following letter from W. H. COMYN, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Pudukudi, 13th March 1875, No. 127:—

With reference to Board's Official Memorandum,* No. 211, dated 17th February 1875, calling for a reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 3,098, dated 26th October 1874, I have the honor to inform you

* Enclosure (petition No. 2,800 of 1873) re- turned.

that a further inquiry regarding the inams therein referred to has been made, from which it seems clear that the inams in question were held for service and not for subsistence.

2. It appears from an extract from the Inam Chitta prepared in Fasli 1254 (A.D. 1844-45) that these inams were entered as subsistence money Inams. How they came to be so entered is not known, but it seems clear from an older document that this was a mistake.

3. The document I refer to is an original takid from the then Collector to the Tahsildar, No. 104, dated 21st November 1825. In this takid a list of the holders of these Inams is given, and it is clearly stated that the grants were for the performance of certain services† in the temple,

† வித்தி.

and the order was to continue the Inams

to the Inamdars named in the list in perpetuity (சாகவிதமாய் ஜாரிசெய்ய).

4. It further appears from the reports of the Temple Committee that the inams were for service, and that the service is duly kept up.

5. It does not appear that any other cases, besides the four mentioned in this office letter, No. 433, dated 4th September 1874, have been wrongly dealt with.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition

The above correspondence relates to claims preferred by the individuals marginally noted to certain Maniyams alleged to have been originally granted for service

Attaraiyengar.
Patchiraiyengar.

in a certain pagoda in the district of Tinne-

velly. The Inam Commissioner declined to deal with the claims on the ground that they refer to ready-money allowances, the settlement of which does not fall within his jurisdiction.

Miscellaneous Affairs
PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated 12th May 1874

Read the following

From
R. A. Puckley Esq.,
Collector
The Inam Commissioner
Madras

Sir, In reply to your Memo No 246 dated 6th May last, I have the honor to inform you that 7 "Stalattan Nirvagam" Maniyams were originally granted for service in the Alwarthirunagari Pagoda. These Maniyams were in the form of ready money allowances.

2. In 1854, a list of all such allowances was furnished to the Board of Revenue, and 4 of these 7 Maniyams were continued as service Inams.

All

Enclosures 11
returned together
with a Petition
received with
Memo No 535
dated 24th October
1873.

19 Aug 1874 No 13-14
19 Mar 1873 - 140-99
16 July - 509-510

Ord: 1875: 214
12059

1875.
BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS 14TH MAY 1875, No. 1,275.

Done 25th May 1875

Encls 5
2000

Received 31st May

MAY.
No. 1,275.

Maniyams' Name	Value Rs.
Attarayengar	55
Appanaiyengar	30
Ashnaiyengar	22
Panirajayengar	70
Total	177

1854, because they were entered by the Collector in the list of inams held for subsistence, whilst the Inam of similar nature, which was confirmed, was entered in the list of Service Inams. It now appears that this classification was incorrect, and that the Inams, being held for service, should have been treated as permanent under G. O., 19th August 1854, No. 972.

3. The Board are of opinion that the Inams in question should be confirmed to the holders, or their heirs in case the original holders have deceased, and that the arrears, which have been improperly withheld, should be paid. The sanction of Government is requested to this course.

4. Payment of the allowances in question appears to have been discontinued in 1854, in which case arrears for seven years, amounting to Rupees 1,275, are due. The Collector will report whether this is the correct amount.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. C. S.
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with copies of Board's Proceedings, dated 5th February 1874, Miscellaneous No. 535; 12th June 1874, Miscellaneous No. 3,948; and 26th October 1874, No. 3,098; and Petition No. 2,805 of 1873 to be returned.

the Acting Collector of Tinnevely.
Copy to the Inam Commissioner.
Exd. J. W. Fischer.

1. To the Board of Revenue 14th June
1. To the Revenue Board General

Maniyams—originally granted for service in a certain pagoda in Tinnevely District, four of which were entered by mistake as life-grants—Opinion expressed that these four Inams should be confirmed to the holders, or their heirs in case the original holders have deceased, and that the arrears, which have been improperly withheld, should be paid, and Government requested to sanction this course. Report called for regarding the arrears of allowances due to the holders. The holders of the Inams are in possession of the same.

All were however precisely similar both in original grant, mode of payment and nature of service, and the Trustee of the Pagoda reports that the Service Geneists in watching the Jewel box in turn.

3. The reason why the Inam has not been continued to 3 of the 7 Inamdars is that they objected to its being considered a life grant in 1854 and claimed it in perpetuity.

4. There is nothing on record to show why any distinction was made between the 4 Inamdars to whom the grant was confirmed and the 3 to whom it was refused. Perhaps 4 were thought to be enough for the Office which is a Sinecure - the amount of Inam claimed

claimed is Rupees 70, and the offer to grant it for life might be made again before the case is disposed of.

I have &c
Sd/- (Signed) R. R. Puckle
8th Nov 1873. Collector.

(True Copy)

(Signed) G. Thornhill

3^d Member, Revenue Board
for Inam Commissioner

N^o 579
Forwarded to the Board of Revenue for disposal. This appears to be a ready money Inam, and its settlement does not therefore fall within the jurisdiction of the Inam Commissioner.

Board Office,
Department
Madras,
December 1873. } (Signed) G. Thornhill
3^d Member, Revenue Board
for Inam Commissioner

The

The Board require further information before they can dispose of this matter.

The Collector will indicate in what parts of the lists submitted in 1854 the 7 maniyams assigned to the Alwarthirunagari pagoda are entered, the lists have been examined without finding any such entries.

He will report whether the three Inamdars to whom the Inams were continued agreed to take them as life grants. He will state whether the Board ordered an inquiry into the petitioners' case (as he asserts) and whether he has any claim to arrears.

With regard to the need to the Pagoda of petitioners' services the Collector will ascertain whether

880/6
The Pagoda Committee think they are wanted -

(True Copy & Extract)

(Signed) J. G. G. Secretary

To The Collector of Tinnevely

(True Copy)

W. H. C. Sub Secretary

C. H. C.

Enclosure in Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue
to the Secretary to Government
dated 14th May 1875,
No. 1276.

Copy of Board's Pro-
ceedings, dated 5th
May 1874, closed.
Enclosure No. 773.

Rev. 1/2059/95

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 26th October 1874.

Read the following letter from R. P. POKKLE Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to J. GROSE Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Courtalam, 4th September 1874 No. 4.

In reply to Board's Proceedings, Nos. 773* and 3,943 dated 26th February and 22nd June 1874, and Enclosures and the petition are herewith. Board's petition* No. 683 of 1874, I have the honor to inform you that the names of five of the seven Maniyamdars are found in the list of 1854, as under:—

Name.	Number in list of 1854.	Remarks.
Alwairaiyengar	76 in Statement Nos. 1 and 2.	Inam confirmed in 1865.
Attanaiyengar	13 in Do. " 3 and 4.	} Not confirmed.
Appanaiyengar	19 in Do. " do.	
Krishnaiyengar	20 in Do. " do.	
Patchiraiyengar	28 in Do. " do.	

the names of the remaining two, Tiruvengadaiyengar and Venkatanaranaiyengar are not found in the list, as the allowance is said, to be payable from Pagoda funds and not by Government; there thus remain four men to consider, viz., Attanaiyengar, Appanaiyengar, Krishnaiyengar, and Patchiraiyengar.

2. The one to whom the Inam was confirmed, viz., No. 76 of the list and the two paid from Pagoda funds did not agree to take it as a life-grant, and the Vishnu Committee reports that they require the services of the petitioners. The Board did not order an inquiry, as asserted by petitioners beyond issuing a general Circular No. 237, dated 15th November 1852.

3. If petitioners should have the Inam, I conclude that they should have arrears, but their office, as mentioned before, is a sinecure, and if three men are insufficient to watch a Jewel box, it is doubtful whether five will afford the security needed.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

It appears that the Inams claimed by Attanaiyengar and Patchiraiyengar were treated as life-grants, because they were entered by the then Collector in the list of "Inams held for subsistence," whilst the Inam referred to as having been confirmed was entered in the list of Service Inams—vide Mr. Bird's letter of 18th March 1854, No. 80, and Board's Proceedings, No. 189, dated 8th May 1854.

2. The disposal of the present claims depends entirely upon the question whether the Inams were held for service or for subsistence. If held for service, the Inams must be treated as permanent, if for subsistence, they are clearly life-grants. From the Collector's last letter it would appear that the former is the case, but before admitting the claims, the Board desire to be informed, after a further

inquiry has been made, whether as personal in 1854 was incor-
 tioned in the Collector's letter re-
 Mr. Bird's letter already quoted
 pronounced to be Service Inams
 transferred to the head of personal
 in the registers of former Collectors
 were originally "personal" grants and
 brought gradually to assume the name of "Service" grants. Mr. Bird also mentions
 the transfer of certain grants formerly considered to be personal to the head of
 Service, after inquiry and examination of the records. As further investigation
 may throw some light on the matter, the Board desire that the nature of the
 grants under notice may be fully inquired into.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
 Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Tinnevely, with two petitions:

Copy to the Inam Commissioner.

Exd. G. A. Turtoll.

Alwarthimaganari Pagoda—in Tinnevely
 District.—Further information requested from
 Collector regarding certain Inams granted for
 service in—

OCTOBER.
 No. 3,098.

Rev 24/15
 20/15

PROCEEDINGS, 26TH OCTOBER 1874, No. 3,098.

1874.
 BOARD of REVENUE
 MADRAS.

Encl.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, PART OF REVENUE.

1874.

Read the following

Official Memorandum

Letter from the Collector of Tinnevely
 dated 14th February 1874, No. 102.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue
 for disposal. Petitioner is one of the
 three referred to in Para III of the Collector's
 letter dated 8th November 1873 No. 620
 which accompanied the Proceedings
 of the Inam Commissioner dated 1st
 December 1873 No. 579.

Revenue Board Office,
 Inam Department
 Madras, 29th May 1874

(Signed) R. A. Dalrymple
 Inam Commissioner

To The Secretary to the
 Board of Revenue

Enclosure

Enclosure

N^o 102

From R. H. Puckle Esq,
Collector

To, The Insam Commissioners
Madras

Sir, In reply to your Memo. N^o 619
dated 20th December 1873, I have the
honor to inform you that the petitioner
is one of the 3 alluded to in my letter
N^o 620 dated 8th November 1873 and
he is reported to keep up the service.

Tinnevely Collectors
Circuit. Gatcheri
Taticorin, 14th February
1874

I have &c
(Signed) R. H. Puckle

Collector

The Collector of Tinnevely
will be requested to expedite his
reply

880/a
reply to Board's Proceedings 5th February
1874 N^o 773

(True Copies & Extract)
(Signed) J. G. G.
Secretary

To, The Collector of Tinnevely &c
(True Copy)

W. G. G.
Sub Secretary

C. M. G.
C. M. G.

Enclosure in Board-
-ing of the Board of
Revenue to the Secretary
to Home Affairs, D.C.
dated 14th May 1875,
N^o 1275.

Copy of Board's Pro-
-ceedings, dated 12th June
1874, No: N^o 3948.

Rev 246/75
Rev 2nd 2059/75