

(1) Number of Pages 18(2) Date of repair 30/10/1967(3) Initials of the Reference 19258

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

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.

* விநாயகம்
and the order was to continue the inams to the Inamdars named in the list in perpetuity (சாக்விதமாய் 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.
Patchiraiyengar

of the Madras Government, Revenue Department
No. 1975.

Inamdar's Name

Attarayengar	30
Appanayengar	22
Krishnayengar	70
Patchirajengar	

Total

of which one was
in 1865, two are
in funds, and four
life-grants, an arrangement
holders did not consent. The service
consists in watching the jewel-box of the
pagoda by the, 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.

No. 1,275

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

Read again—
Board's Miscellaneous Proceedings, No. 77, 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

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, and the order was to continue the Inams

† வித்தி

to the Inamdars named in the list in perpetuity (சாகஸிதமாய 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 the 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 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.

Col. of 1875

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

to

Dec 1st 1875

Recd

G O, 7th June 1875, No 830.

JUNE
Nos 48-49.

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

Maniyams were granted, of which one was confirmed to the holder in 1865, two were payable to the pagoda fund, and four were treated as life-grants in arrangement in which holders did not consent. The sanction consists in watching the box of the pagoda by turns, and the four inams were reported to be duly maintained. The four inams in question were treated as life-grants	Value Rs.
Attarayengar	55
Appanayengar	30
Ashnayengar	22
P. Virayengar	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 ~~several~~ years, amounting to Rupees ~~1,500~~ are due. The Collector will report whether this is the correct amount.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. C. C.
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with copies of Board's Proceedings, dated 5th February 1874, Miscellaneous No. 522, 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 on 14 June
1. The Revenue Board General

BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.
1875.

PROCEEDINGS 14th MAY 1875, No. 1,275

June 25 1875

Received 31st June

MAY,
No 1,275

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 Inamholders. The Inamholders of the Inams are sanctioned.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated 5th May 1874

R. H. Pichler 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 "Stalattan" Nirragam Maniyams were originally granted for service in the Alu-artur-nagari 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 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 Aug 1873 - 140-94
16 July - 509-510

Oct 1875: 214
Jan 2059

All were ~~forwarded~~ ^{proceeds} ~~proceeds~~ ^{simultaneously}
both in original grant made of
payment and nature of service and
the Trustee of the Puzadur reports
that the service consists 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 as Rupees 70 and the offer
to grant it for life might be made
again before the case is disposed of.

By Hand
with Butchery. } (Signed) R. R. Puckle
18 Nov 1873 } Collector -

(True Copy)

(Signed) G. Thornhill

32 Member Revenue Board
for Inam Commissioner

N^o 577

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, (Signed) G. Thornhill
Department, } 32 Member Revenue Board
Adras, } for Inam Commissioner
December 1873 }

The

The Board requires 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 petitioner's 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

85/6
The Pagoda Committee think they are wanted -

(True Copy & Extract)

(Signed) J. G. Rose
Secretary

The Collector of Tinnevely
(True Copy)

J. G. Rose
Sub-Secretary

C. H. R.

C1 1/2 (1/2) 1/2

1858

1858

*Enclosure in Proceeding
of the Board of Revenue
to the Secretary to Govern-
ment of Revenue Department
dated 14th May 1875,
No 1295.*

*Copy of Board's Order
- ending, dated 5th
February 1874, enclosed.
- Enclosure No 773.*

Rev 1/2059/75

3,095.
PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 26th October 1874.
Read the following letter from R. P. POKKLE, Esq., Collector, Tinnevely, to
J. GROSSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated C. urtalam,
4th September 1874 No. 4.
In reply to Board's Proceedings, Nos. 773* and 3,943 dated 26th
February and 23rd June 1874, and
* Enclosures and the petition are herewith. Board's petition* No. 683 of 1874, I have
retained. the honor to inform you that the names
of five of the seven Miniyamdars 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., Attanai-
yengar, Appanaiyengar, Krishnaiyengar, and Patchiraiyengar.

- 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.
- 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. Mr. Bird's letter already quoted pronounced to be Service Inams transferred to the head of personal in the registers of former Collectors. It was thought probable that what was of influential parties here 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. A 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.

Exl. G. A. Turtell.

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

OCTOBER.
 No. 3,008.

Rev 20/5/75

PROCEEDINGS, 26TH OCTOBER 1874, No. 3,008.

1874.
 BOARD OF REVENUE
 MADRAS.

Encl.

PROCEED. BOARD OF REVENUE, TIRUNELVELLY, 12th Nov. 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. Dalzell
 Inam Commissioner

To The Secretary to the
 Board of Revenue

Enclosure

Enclosure

N^o 102

From: R. H. Puckle Esq.
Collector

To: The Tamil Commissioner
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 Collector
Circuit Cutchery
Tatcorin, 14th February
1874

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

The Collector of Tinnevely
will be requested to expedite his
reply

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

(True Copy & Extract)
(Signed) J. G. Brown
Secretary

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

(Signed) J. G. Brown
Sub Secretary

(Signed) J. G. Brown
copy

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

Copy of Board's Pro-
ceedings dated 12th June
1874, No: 23948.

Recd 245/75-11
Riv 2/75
2059/75