

(1) Number of Page 16(2) Date of repair 31.10.67(3) Initials of the Referencer 15.2.68**MADRAS RECORD OFFICE****GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS**Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

B.P. No.

834

Press

Mis.

Dated

Ru 6.18.72 196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 75. From RAJAH VASSEREDDI VENCATA LUTCHMI AMMAH GAURU,
mother and guardian of RAJAH VASSEREDDI VENCATA LUTCHMI NARASIMHA
NAIDOO, Bahadoor, Munna Sultan of Kistna District, to His Excellency the
Governor in Council of Fort St. George, dated Madras, 8th May 1875.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

THE petitioner prays your Excellency to forward the enclosed petition and its
enclosures to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Viceroy and Governor-General
of India.

For which act of kindness your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

THE humble Petition of RAJAH VASSEREDDI VENCATA LUTCHMI GAURU,
mother and guardian of RAJAH VASSEREDDI VENCATA LUTCHMI NARASIMHA NAIDOO,
Bahadoor, Munna Sultan of Kistna District, to His Excellency the Right Honorable
THOMAS GEORGE BARING, BARON NORTHBROOK OF STRATTON, Viceroy
and Governor-General in Council of Fort William, Calcutta, dated Madras, 8th May 1875.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

THAT when the petitioner's family estate, styled "The Vassereddi Estate," in the Kistna
District was resumed by Government, certain amount of allowances was granted on behalf of
Government in lieu of the same to be distributed among the members of the family.

That there were both male and female members of the family at the time who enjoyed the
grant; that, on account of the demise of the male members, their personal representatives enjoyed
the respective allowances without any stoppage or deduction, and that of the original recipients,
two widowed ladies, Rungammah Gauru and Parwathammah Gauru, the mother and paternal
grandmother, respectively, of the petitioner's husband, died in 1873 and 1874, and that the
petitioner applied for the continuation of both the allowances.

That it appears that the Board of Revenue, on the recommendation of the Collector of the
district, has reported to the Madras Government for the continuation of one of the same to your
petitioner's minor son, and the other to a third party; but the said Government only recom-
mended the claim of the other party for Rs. 150, but nothing to your petitioner and her son.

That your Excellency's petitioner begs to bring the following, among other circumstances,
to your Lordship's merciful consideration in disposing of this matter:—

(1.) It is admitted by the authorities that the sons of Ramanatha Baboo have no right to
inherit any allowance on the ground that your petitioner's minor son was in receipt of a liberal
allowance, namely, what was allowed to his father, the petitioner's husband, during his lifetime.
But the other party not being in receipt of any allowance out of what was allowed to their
father, except Rs. 150, which was allowed to their mother, the Madras Government resolved to
recommend Rs. 150 for the sons, which, it appears, is now pending before your Excellency in
Council.

(2.) The allowance granted to Ramanatha Baboo not being in lieu of any property resumed,
was, in nature, a mere compassionate allowance and not inheritable, and the Government continued
a portion to the widow without conferring anything on the sons.

(3.) The lapse in question being what was allowed to the immediate members of the peti-
tioner's family, but the petitioner's family is entitled to compassionate consideration.

(4.) While the petitioner's husband was alive, he, as well as his mother, was in receipt of
separate allowances. Now the petitioner's son is in receipt of the allowance granted to her
husband, and the petitioner is without any, the mother's being one of the lapses now under report.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th June 1875.*

(5.) Ramanatha Baboo, whose sons the claimants are, was repeatedly pronounced to be the usurper, whose frauds and malpractices ruined petitioner's family and its resources, the ill savings of which his sons still are in possession for their livelihood. The petitioner begs to enclose a printed copy of the Proceedings of the Madras Board of Revenue, in which the claims of the petitioner's family are detailed, and to the extent which they suffered by the fraud of the usurper Ramanatha Baboo.

These Proceedings formed the basis of your Excellency's recommendation to the Secretary of State for India for the continuance of the allowance to the petitioner's son in 1873, which was accordingly granted.

(6.) The allowances in question are in nature of hereditary grants, being what made in lieu of landed property resumed by Government. It is, therefore, wrong to treat as personal, and unnecessary now to create them hereditary.

(7.) These grants formed parts of the amount originally set apart in return by Government to be allowed for the members of the Vasserreddi family in lieu of the resumption, and on the principle of the recent ruling on the subject they became at once hereditary. This is further evidenced from the circumstance that the allowance of the male members being to this day enjoyed by their heirs are personal representatives.

(8.) The petitioner and her minor son is admitted by the authorities to be the chief and the sole heir or legal representative of the deceased ladies, and therefore it is undisputed that no third party can inherit anything belonging to them or their family.

(9.) It is admitted by the authorities, including the Board of Revenue, that Ramanatha Baboo and his son (for one of whom one out of the two allowances in question is recommended) do not legally belong to the Vasserreddi family. It appears that the Board of Revenue even now consider that the adoption of Ramanatha Baboo being declared invalid by the highest judicial authorities, his sons have no legal claims to the allowance of Parwathamamah Gauri.

(10.) The compassionate personal grant allowed to Ramanatha Baboo by Government in 1848 after the decree of the Privy Council, which disinherited him of all his title to the Vasserreddi Estate, was of a separate and independent creation, and which only lasted to the period of his life, and in half alone continued to his widow, but ignoring the title of his two sons to any portion, though they are superior legal representatives under the Hindu Law. This allowance is enjoyed by the widow in preference to the sons up to this day, now nearly seventeen years.

(11.) The questions for the sons of Ramanatha Baboo to inherit any portion of his allowance or those belonging to the members of the Vasserreddi family was several times mooted before the authorities, but was always negatived; it is, therefore, wrong to suppose now to the contrary.

(12.) It is highly improbable to suppose now that any portion of the estate resumed by Government was formed of any that for which Ramanatha Baboo was entitled. In such a case, it is not likely for so many years Ramanatha Baboo and his heirs would have remained quiet without asking for any compensation, while they were otherwise pursuing their claims before the authorities for even a continuance of the compassionate allowance.

(13.) The truth is that the only estate which was resumed by the Government was that well-known one distinguished as the "Vasserreddi Estate" in the Northern Circars, the ancestral property of the noble family of the same name. There could be no self-acquisition of the Zemindar Venkatadri Naidu, and even if such a thing existed, it being sufficiently clear that it did not survive the long and protracted litigation which ensued on his death as to be resumed by Government. The only property resumed by Government was the estate of the "Vasserreddi family, of which the petitioner's husband was declared to be the sole heir by the decree of Her Majesty in Council.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th June 1875.*

(14.) The petitioner encloses a copy of each of the petitions she addressed to the lower authorities in the matter, that it might meet your Excellency's kind perusal.

That it is, therefore, humbly prayed that your Lordship will kindly take all the circumstances into your kind consideration, and give her justice in mercy, being a poor widow encumbered with the education and bringing up of a minor son to be received and recognised by the intelligent public as the head of her once-renowned but now fallen family.

(True Copy.)

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

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,

OOTCAMUND,

8th June 1875.

No. 76.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Miscellaneous

SIR,—I am directed to forward the accompanying memorial presented by Venkata Lakshmi Anna, mother of

Venkata Lakshmi Narasimha Naidoo, the present head of the Vasireddi family.

2. This memorial has reference to the case brought to the notice of the Government of India in the letter marginally noted, and the writer's object appears to

11th March 1875, No. 404.

be rather to prejudice that case than to gain any substantial advantage for herself or her adopted son.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council, I am to state, considered that sufficient had been done for memorialist in the continuance to her adopted son of the full pension enjoyed by her late husband, and, therefore, made no recommendation on her or her adopted son's behalf.

Secretary of State's despatch, No. 13, dated 26th June 1873.

See G. O., 11th March 1875, No. 403.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,

Acting Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Financial (1875) Department.

Government of Fort St. George.

Dated 8th June 1876.

No. 894.

Received

Enclosures.
8 spare copies

D. No.

Progs.

L. No.

No.

h-75-76

FORWARDING a memorial from Venkata Lakshmi Amma, mother of Venkata Lakshmi Narasimha Naidoo, the present head of the Vasserreddi family, Kistna District, requesting the continuance of the allowance of her deceased mother-in-law to her or to her minor son; and intimating that no recommendation was made on her or her adopted son's behalf, because it was considered by this Government that sufficient had been done for the memorialist in the continuance to her adopted son of the full pension enjoyed by her late husband.

1254
12/5/76
To
His Excellency the Governor
in Council of Fort Saint
George.

The humble Petition of Rajah
Vasserreddi Venkata Lakshmi Amma
Jauroo, mother and guardian
of Rajah Vasserreddi Venkata
Lakshmi Narasimha Naidoo
Bahadur Nanna Sultan of
Kistna District

Most respectfully sheweth

The Petitioner prays Your
Excellency to forward the enclosed
Petition and its enclosures to His Excellency
The Right Honorable The Viceroy and Governor
General of India.

Madras. Royapettah
High Road Door
No 54
8th May 1876

For which act of kindness
Your Petitioner as in duty
bound shall ever pray
ರಾಜಾ ವಾಸರೇದಿ ವೆಂಕಟಾ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ
ಅಮ್ಮಾ
Rajah Vasserreddi Venkata Lakshmi
Amma

To

H. E. THE RIGHT HON'BLE THOMAS GEORGE BARING,
BARON NORTHBROOK OF STRATTON,
Viceroy and Governor General
in Council of Fort William,
CALCUTTA.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF RAJAH VASSEREDDI
VENCATA LUTCHMAH GAUROO, MOTHER
AND GUARDIAN OF RAJAH VASSEREDDI
VENCATA LUTCHMI NARASIMMAH NAIDOO
BAHADOOR, MUNNA SULTAN OF KISTNA
DISTRICT,

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That when the Petitioner's family estate, styled "The Vassereddi Estate," in the Kistna District, was resumed by Government, certain amount of allowances was granted on behalf of Government in lieu of the same to be distributed among the members of the family.

That there were both male and female members of the family at the time who enjoyed the grant; that on account of the demise of the male members their personal representatives enjoyed the respective allowances without any stoppage or deduction, and that of the original recipients two widowed ladies, Rungammah Gauroo and Parwathammah Gauroo, the mother and paternal grandmother respectively of the Petitioner's husband, died in 1873 and 1874, and that the Petitioner applied for the continuation of both the allowances.

That it appears that the Board of Revenue, on the recommendation of the Collector of the District, has reported to the Madras Government for the continuation of one of the same to your Petitioner's minor son and the other to a third party, but the said Government only recommended the claim of the other party for Rs. 150, but nothing to your Petitioner and her son.

That your Excellency's Petitioner begs to bring the following, among other circumstances, to your Lordship's merciful consideration in disposing of this matter.

I. It is admitted by the authorities that the sons of Ramanatha Baboo have no right to inherit any allowance on the ground that your Petitioner's minor son was in receipt of a liberal allowance, namely, what was allowed to his father, the Petitioner's husband, during his lifetime. But the other party not being in receipt of any allowance out of what was allowed to their father, except Rs. 150, which was allowed to their mother, the Madras Government resolved to recommend Rs. 150 for the sons, which appears is now pending before your Excellency in Council.

Autr 1204 of 175

Rw 2160/75

II. The allowance granted to Ramanatha Baboo not being in lieu of any property resumed, was in nature a mere compassionate allowance and not inheritable, and the Government continued a portion to the widow without conferring anything on the sons.

III. The lapse in question being what was allowed to the immediate members of the Petitioner's family, but the Petitioner's family is entitled to compassionate consideration.

IV. While the Petitioner's husband was alive, he as well as his mother was in receipt of separate allowances. Now the Petitioner's son is in receipt of the allowance granted to her husband, and the Petitioner is without any, the mother's being one of the lapses now under report.

V. Ramanatha Baboo, whose sons the claimants are, was repeatedly pronounced to be the usurper, whose frauds and mal-practices ruined Petitioner's family and its resources, the ill savings of which his sons still are in possession for their livelihood. The Petitioner begs to enclose a printed copy of the Proceedings of the Madras Board of Revenue, in which the claims of the Petitioner's family are detailed, and to the extent which they suffered by the fraud of the usurper Ramanatha Baboo.

These Proceedings formed the basis of your Excellency's recommendation to the Secretary of State for India for the continuance of the allowance to the Petitioner's son in 1873, which was accordingly granted.

VI. The allowances in question are in nature of hereditary grants, being what made in lieu of landed property resumed by Government. It is therefore wrong to treat as personal, and unnecessary now to create them hereditary.

VII. These Grants formed parts of the amount originally set apart in return by Government to be allowed for the members of the Vassireddi family in lieu of the resumption, and on the principle of the recent ruling on the subject they became at once hereditary. This is further evidenced from the circumstance that the allowance of the male members being to this day enjoyed by their heirs are personal representatives.

VIII. The Petitioner and her minor son is admitted by the authorities to be the chief and the sole heir or legal representative of the deceased Ladies, and therefore it is undisputed that no third party can inherit any thing belonging to them or their family.

IX. It is admitted by the authorities, including the Board of Revenue, that Ramanatha Baboo and his son (for one of whom one out of the two allowances in question is recommended) do not legally belong to the Vassireddi family. It appears that the Board of Revenue even now consider that the adoption of Ramanatha Baboo being declared invalid by the highest judicial authorities, his sons have no legal claims to the allowance of Parwathamah Gauroo.

X. The compassionate personal grant allowed to Ramanatha Baboo by Government in 1848 after the decree of the Privy Council which disinherited him of all his title to the Vassireddi Estate, was of a separate and independent creation, and which only lasted to the period of his life, and in half alone continued to his widow, but ignoring the title of his two sons to any portion, though they are superior legal representa-

tives under the Hindu Law. This allowance is enjoyed by the widow in preference to the sons up to this day, now nearly 17 years.

XI. The questions for the sons of Ramanatha Baboo to inherit any portion of his allowance or those belonging to the members of the Vassireddi family was several times mooted before the authorities but was always negatived; it is therefore wrong to suppose now to the contrary.

XII. It is highly improbable to suppose now that any portion of the estate resumed by Government was formed of any that for which Ramanatha Baboo was entitled. In such a case it is not likely for so many years Ramanatha Baboo and his heirs would have remained quiet without asking for any compensation, while they were otherwise pursuing their claims before the authorities for even a continuance of the compassionate allowance.

XIII. The truth is that the only estate which was resumed by the Government was that well known one distinguished as the "Vassireddi Estate" in the Northern Circars, the ancestral property of the noble family of the same name. There could be no self acquisition of the Zemindar Venkatadri Naidoo, and even if such a thing existed, it being sufficiently clear that it did not survive the long and protracted litigation which ensued on his death as to be resumed by Government. The only property resumed by Government was the estate of the "Vassireddi" family, of which the Petitioner's husband was declared to be the sole heir by the decree of Her Majesty in Council.

XIV. The Petitioner encloses a copy of each of the Petitions she addressed to the lower authorities in the matter, that it might meet your Excellency's kind perusal.

That it is therefore humbly prayed that your Lordship will kindly take all the circumstances into your kind consideration, and give her justice in mercy, being a poor widow encumbered with the education and bringing up of a minor son to be received and recognized by the intelligent public as the head of her once renowned, but now fallen family.

ROYAPETTAH,

High Road, Door No. 54,
Madras.

राजा वसिरेड्डी वेंकट लुत्तमा उम्माह गौरो

(Signed) RAJAH VASSIREDDI, VENCATA LUTCHMA
UMMAH GAUROO.

Recd Dec. 7. 11th Mar 1752
149, 150 & 151

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. Some words like "received" and "Mar 1752" are visible.]

Memorial praying
the continuance of the
allowance of her deceased
mother-in-law to her
or her minor son.

Recd: 1875: 8th June
No 2168
Government of Madras.

Rev. DEPARTMENT,

Petition No. 1204 of 1875.

From Rajah Vaseeroodi

Venkata Lutchma
Amma, the
Occupation mother and guardian

of Rajah Vaseeroodi Thimma
Lutchmi Narasimha
Village, Raidoo Bahadur

Talook. Marana Sultan

District. Krishna, andhra Pradesh.

Dated 8th May 1875.

Received 12th June 1875.

Recd 8th June 1875. Enclosures. 4
J.L.D. No 894. 8th June 1875
ABSTRACT.

Prays to forward to
the Govt of India,
the enclosed Memo-
rial

No 75

Revenue Department.
No 894

8 June/75

The Secretary to the Govt of India,
Financial Dept

Sir,

I am directed to
forward the accompanying
Memorial presented by
Venkata Lakshmi Amma,
mother of Venkata Lakshmi
Narasimha Raidoo, the present
head of the Vaseeroodi family.

2. This Memorial has
reference to the case brought
to the notice of the Govt
of India in the letter margin-
ally noted and the writer's
object appears to be rather
to prejudice that case
than to gain any substantial
advantage for himself or her
adopted son.

3. H.E. the Governor in Council.

11th March 1875, at 404.

I am to state, considered
that sufficient had been
done for her in the
continuance of ^{her} adopted son
of the full pension enjoyed
by her late husband and
therefore made no recom^{me}nda-
tion on her behalf.

Y^{rs} L^g

Secy. of State Despatch

N^o 13 of 26 June 1773.

See G.O. 11th March 1775

N. 403.

P.

Govt of India
Field Office

Bombay

Col