1062

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 48

(2) Date of repair 15.5.69

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1062
~~B.P. No.~~

Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated 8/8/1876 ~~196~~.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(24) 1/1062

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th August 1876.

Read the following papers :—

No. 45.

No. 64. OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

In Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 25th November 1851, No. 1,162.

Referring to paragraph 3 of letter, No. 73, dated 13th October 1851, from Mr. Prendergast, Collector of Rajahmundry, to the Commissioner, Northern Circars—information is requested as to the disposal by the ex-Zamindar of Velampalem of the "Seri" lands, estimated to yield him 760 Rs. a-year; the ex-Zamindar in a petition to Government having pleaded extreme indigence.

2. The Collector is also requested to state what allowances are granted to ex-Zamindars (ancient) or their descendants in the Godavari District; thus :—

Name of Estate.	Peishcush at permanent Settlement.	Date of Estate becoming Property of Government.	Allowance and Date of Estate becoming Property of Government.

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

20*th March* 1876.

To the Collector of the Godavari District.

No. 64a. From J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to the Hon. D. F. CARMICHAEL, Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Cocanada, 30th June 1876, No. 13 :—

With reference to your Official Memorandum of the 20th March 1876, No. 45, I have the honor to inform you that the "Seri" (home-farm) lands estimated to yield the ex-Zamindar of Velampalam Rs. 760 a-year were not left to him, but were sold with the rest of the Estate. They were included in the advertisement of sale, and there would be no reason for their exclusion, for they were just as much part of the Zamindari as other lands. As a matter of fact, they were sold with the rest of the Estate.

2. The Sub-Collector reports that acres 99-65 of Inam land, assessed at Rs. 289-1-0, and charged with a quit-rent of Rs. 94, was all that remained to the Zamindar, and that all of this has been mortgaged and sold subsequently, the Zamindar being now entirely dependent on charity (*vide* Government Order, 10th December 1874, No. 1,532.)

3. I beg to enclose a statement giving the information asked for in paragraph 2 of the memorandum under reply.

STATEMENT showing the Allowances granted to ex-Zamindars in the Godavery District.

Name of the Estate.	Peishcush at the permanent Settlement.	Date of becoming Property of Government.	ALLOWANCE AND DATE OF GOVERNMENT ORDER.		
			To whom paid.	Amount per Mensem.	Date of Order.
				RS.	
Ramachendrapuram ...	35,599 Star Pagodas or Rs. 1,24,596.	9th December 1846, Fasli 1256.	Kakarlapudi Narsarazu Gar.	700	Order of the Government of India, 8th January 1848, No. 57, communicated with the Order of Madras Government, dated 25th January 1848, No. 98.
			Kakarlapudi Appala Narasimharazu Gar, son of Jagannatham Gar.	400	Order of Government, dated 10th November 1846, No. 1,156, paragraph 2, and do. 12th April 1847, No. 469, communicating the Order of Government of India, dated 20th March 1847, No. 208, and order of the Government of India, dated 30th November 1868, No. 3,154, and Madras Government, dated 7th January 1869, No. 38.
Mogultur, 6,54,495. The Zamindar of this Estate died in the year 1792, or long before the permanent assessment was fixed. The permanent Settlement was made at the Kabuliat taken from Poosapaty Narayana Jagapatirazu, Zamindar, in 1803.	.... Star Pagodas. From Fasli 1213 to 1215... ... 9,535 From Fasli 1216 to 1218 ... ... 10,272 From Fasli 1219 to 1220 ... ... 11,937 From Fasli 1221. 14,237 From Fasli 1222. 14,595	January 1792, but was restored to the Zamindar in 1803 when it was permanently settled.	Kalidirdi Kumara Lakshminarasimharazu Gar.	455	Order of Board of Revenue, dated 4th June 1810, and of Government, 3rd May 1822, No. 332, and also Extract Minutes of Consultation, dated 3rd November 1846, No. 1,099, paragraph 1.
Peddapuram, Star Pagodas 1,90,805.	6,67,817-8-0	5th July 1847, Fasli 1256.	Vatsavay Suryanarayana Jagapathirazu Gar.	600	Government of India, dated 16th October 1847, No. 990, communicated with the order of Madras Government, dated 9th November 1847, No. 1,223.

COCANADA, 30*th June* 1876.

(Signed) J. HOPE, *Acting Collector.*

MINUTE BY THE HON. SIR W. ROBINSON, K.C.S.I.

IN the first place the petitioner is an adoption into the ancient family—and, indeed, so was the last Zamindar under "doubtful" conditions—a circumstance which certainly mitigates personal considerations. If he be in indigent circumstances, and a burden on his relatives, it is because he has not applied himself to gain a livelihood. He is a hale, hearty man of 35 or 40 years of age, and should be well able to support himself. I doubt the plea of indigence.

2. This matter was carefully discussed in Council—at the instance of the late Lord Hobart—before the Government Order now brought on for reconsideration was passed, and no reasonable grounds for special recommendation to the Government of India and to the Secretary of State could be advanced.

3. The Estate was an unimportant one, and probably not really an ancient Zamindari at all, though it was at length admitted to those privileges. It was more highly assessed than some others, but no doubt this was done after careful inquiry as to its condition. The real cause of bankruptcy is that the estate was badly managed, and was always in a chronic state of difficulty—the fault of the extravagant and weak family. Adoption maintained it.

4. As regards Government action; in the main much consideration was shown to the family for years and years, and every opportunity given to keep it up but in vain.

5. When the final crisis came, the family and Estate were bankrupt, in every direction. The family property was deeply mortgaged, and the arrears of peishcush were heavy. The Government simply applied the principle of the encumbered Estate legislation, which was at the time the policy—and not an unwise one—both at Home and (partially too) in India. The Velampalem Estate was one of a large number of encumbered Estates in the North which were similarly treated; and in few cases, was the action of Government more reasonable and the bankruptcy more complete.

6. The public debt at the time of the sale was some Rupees 8,000, one-fourth of the value of the Estate. And one mortgage alone—then under the management of the Court of Wards and for the prosecution of which the State was responsible—covered half the Estate, and could not be met (if it had not been already foreclosed) without the sale of the property. In fact, the debt known to Government alone amounted to Rs. 30,000 to 31,000, and there were doubtless other debts. The family jewels were gone. No other course was open.

7. The Estate was brought to the hammer when the worst had passed in respect to encumbered Estates, and no doubt fetched a fair price for the time—though the Collector thought it might fetch Rs. 50,000. The circumstances presented no claim for special consideration in respect to this unimportant Estate, and there was no such balance to credit after the discharge of the debts as would have justified special provision by the State.

8. The Estate has naturally improved since the sale, and would now fetch more under present conditions, but this is attributable to the force of circumstances and to State expenditure,—as distinctly stated by the Tahsildar—and not to considerations which need be weighed here.

9. I am unable to join in any impugnment of the equitable action of the Government at the time the Estate was sold in this matter—and am unwilling to re-open the question after a lapse of quarter of a century, on the *ad misericordiam* plea now put forward; the case was, I think, well considered in 1874, and I adhere to that decision.

10. I look on the point raised about the sale of the home-farm, &c., in the same light as the local officers appear to do—the Board of Revenue have not had an opportunity of stating their opinion on the point raised by Secretary's Memorandum—*viz.*, that it is not pertinent or worthy of consideration. The Seri lands or home-farm were security for the public debt as well as for our ward's claims. The action of the Government was, therefore, equitable and usual, and the charges against the Estate could not have been cleared without their realisation. Be this as it may, the argument is out of date and place in the matter before us. There is little in common with the Hatgudda case, and will carry a doubtful precedent inconveniently further. Concession here will encourage other similar claims that are already inconveniently numerous.

(Signed) W. ROBINSON.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 8th August 1876.

No. 66. ORDER THEREON, 8th August 1876, No. 1,062.

Miscellaneous.

WHAT was rightly attached and sold was the defaulter's Zamindari tenure; but the sale of his "Seri" lands was clearly illegal. Except that in that case, the lands were Inam not Seri, the transaction is on all fours with the mistake made in the sale of the Hautghur Estate in Ganjam, where compensation was subsequently awarded with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

2. A recommendation will be made to Her Majesty's Government for the grant of a compensation pension to the ex-Zamindar, of the amount proposed† by the Board of Revenue.

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

---

* G.O., No. 1,478, dated 30th August 1860.

† G.O., 10th December 1874, No. 1,532.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

In a letter

From

The Ag Collector

Godavery District

To

The Secretary to

Government

R 27/6/76 Revenue Department

Fort Saint George

Dated 30th June 1876

Received

No. 13

Statement shewing

the allowances granted

to Ex-Zamindars in

the Godavery District

Govt. of {1876} Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated August, 8th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 8th August 1876, No. 1,062.

Further from G of [illegible] Dated /76 No. 5738.

AUGUST.

Nos. 64—66.

"Seri" (home-farm) lands of the ex-Zamindar of Velampalam, in the Godavery District.—Passing remarks on papers regarding the —; and promising to make a recommendation to Her Majesty's Government for the grant of a compensation pension to the ex-Zamindar, of the amount proposed by the Board of Revenue.

Statement showing the allowances granted to Ex-Zemindars in the Godavery District.

Name of the Estate.	Peishcush at the Permanent Settlement.	Date of becoming property of Government.	Allowance and date of Government Order.		
			To whom paid.	Amount per mensem.	Date of order.
				Rs	
Ramachendrapuram ——	35,599 star Pagodas or Rs 1,24,596 ——	9th. December 1846 Fasli 1256 ——	Venkatapaidi Narsaraju Garu.	700	Order of the Government of India 8th January 1848 No. 57 communicated with the order of Madras Government dated 25th January 1848 No. 98.
			Do. Appala Narasimharaju Garu, son of Jagannatham Garu	400.	Order of Government dated 10th Novembe 1846 No. 1156, Para 2 and Do. 12th April 184 No. 469, communicating the order of Government of India dated 20th Mar 1847 No. 208, and order of the Governmen of India dated 30th November 1868 No. 315 and Madras Government dated 7th Janu -ary 1869 No. 38.
Mogultur —— 65,495. The Zemindar of this Estate died in the year 1792 or long before the permanent assessment was fixed	. . . . .	January 1792 but was restored to the Zemindar in 1803 when it was permanently settled.	Kalidindi Hemmara Lakkhmi Narasimharaju Garu.	458.	Order of Board of Revenue, dated 4th June 1810 and of Government 3rd May 18 and also Extract M. of Consultati dated 3rd November 1846 No. 1099, Para
The Permanent Settlement was made at the Cabuliat taken from Poosapaty Narayana Jagapatiraz (Zemindar, in 1803.	Star Pagodas. From F. 1213 to 1215 = 9,538 From F. 1216 to 1218 10,272 From F. 1219 to 1220. 11,937 From F. 1221 —— 14,237 From F. 1222 —— 14,598				
Peddapuram, Star Pagodas 1,92,808	6,67,817-8-0.	5th July 1847, F. 1256	Vatsavai Suryanarayana Jagapathi-Razu Garu	600.	Government of India, dated 16th Oc 1847 No. 990 communicated with t order of Madras Government date 9th November 1847 No. 1223.

Godavery District
Collector's Office
Cocanada
30th June 1876

L. Hope
Acting Collector

Comp. B.G.

In a Letter

From

The Ag Collector
Godavery District

To

The Secretary to
Government

R 27/6/76 Revenue Department
Fort Saint George

Dated 30th June 1876
Received

No. 13

Statement shewing
the allowances granted
to Ex-Zamindars in
the Godavery District

G.O. 8 Aug/76 No 1662

Proof [illegible] R –

Proposed order:–

~~The Government see no reason to modify their order of 10th December 1874 No 1532~~

Minute

In the first place the Petitioner is an adoption into the ancient family – and indeed so was the last Zemindar under doubtful conditions – a circumstance which certainly mitigates in personal consideration, If he be in indigent circumstances, and a burden on his relatives, it

RK. 20/7/76.

I should not have been a party to the order of 1874 but should have accepted the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and endeavoured to obtain sanction to the allowance of 250 Rs.

It is impossible to deny that this family was dealt with harshly if not illegally

The confiscations in the Northern Circars may have benefitted the country by bringing fresh capital but it severely injured our reputation as a Govt

We have precedents for dealing liberally with the Rv. [illegible] I reconsider in this sense the order [illegible] 1874. –

it is because he has
not applied himself
to gain a livelihood. He
is a hale hearty man of
35 or 40 years of age and
should be well able
to support himself

This matter was
carefully discussed in
Council. – at the instance
of the late Lord Hobart –
before the G. O. now brought
on for reconsideration
was passed – and no
reasonable grounds
for special recommendation
to the Government of India
& to the Secretary of State
could be advanced.

The Estate was an
unimportant one and
probably

probably not really an
ancient Zamindari at all
though it was at length
admitted to those privileges
~~and~~ It was more
highly assessed than
some others by no doubt
this was done after
careful inquiry as to its
conditions. ~~Well~~ The real cause of bankruptcy was badly
the estate
managed, and was
always in a chronic
state of difficulty – the
fault of the extravagant
and weak family a adoption
maintained it

As regards Government
action; in the main
much consideration
was shown & every opportunity
given to keep it up ~~[illegible]~~
~~no doubt it little to the advantage~~
of
others

to the family for years &
years

~~of the Country~~. Return Pani

When the final crisis came, it was a bankrupt ~~Estate~~ in every direction and ~~we~~ simply applied the principle of the Encumbered Estate Legislation, which was at the time the policy — and not an unwise one — both at Home and (partially) too in India. It was one of a large number of encumbered Estates in the North which were similarly treated. ~~The prosperity of the Northern Circars has not lost by sweeping away a number of the bankrupt landed gentry that kept that Country probably~~

family Estate were

the family property was deeply mortgaged & the arrears of Peshkash were heavy — the Govt

Vellampalem Estate

& in few cases was the action of Govt more reason-able & the bankruptcy more complete

---

worth of the value [illegible]

Country back.

The public debt at the time of the sale was ~~[illegible]~~ some Rs: 8000 — to one mortgage alone — then under the management of the Court of Wards and for the prosecution of which the State was responsible — covered half the Estate, and could not be met (if it had not been foreclosed) without the sale of the property. In fact the debt known to Government alone amounted to Rs: 30000 to 31000, and there were doubtless others

others debts :: the family funds all gone. No other course was open

The Estate was brought to the hammer when the worst had passed in respect to Encumbered Estates and no doubt fetched a fair price for the time — though the Collector thought it ~~worth~~ might fetch Rs. 50000. The circumstances present no claim for special consideration in respect to this ~~unfor~~ unimportant Estate and there was no such balance to credit after discharge of debts, as would have justified special provision. The Estate of the State has naturally improved under present conditions

Since the sale it wd. now fetch more

but this is attributable to

to the force of circumstances and to State expenditure — as distinctly stated by the Tahsildar, and not to considerations which need be weighed here.

I am unable to join in any impugnment of the Equitable action of the Government at the time the estate was sold in this matter and am unwilling to reopen the question ~~of this kind~~ after a lapse of quarter of a century, on the ad misericordiam plea now put forward.

the case was I think well considered in 1874

I look on the point raised about the sale of the Home farm, in the same light as the local officers appear to do — the

Boar

opinion
Board have not had an opportunity of stating their opinion
~~Consulted~~. ~~They~~ were on the point raised by
secured by the ~~if not~~ public Secretary's memo to
as well as the Collector — viz that it is
debt (1) for our Wards' not pertinent — the Service
claims. The action of lands or home farm, —
the Government was
therefore Equitable
and usual; and
against the State
the Charges could not
have been cleared
without their realization
Be this as it may, the
argument is out of date
and place in the
matter before us

9/7 [illegible]

R G O 8th August 1876 No 1062

There is little in common with the Halgudda case and will carry precedent still further

Beyond that the [illegible]
may be [illegible] in far [illegible]
[illegible]

R. D

1062

Petition No 372 of 1876
from the Ex Zamindar of
Valempâlem, Godavari district

1. The circumstances of this man's case will be found in the Bd's Report printed with G.O. 10th Dec/74 No 1336. The Bd strongly recommended that a compassionate allowance shd be made to him, but as the alleged hardship occurred 3/4 of a century ago, the Govt declined.

ubmitted for favble considern

2. There is one point however on wh the Colr was asked to report, viz, whether his predecessor sold up the man's tenure as "Zamindar" only, or his "Seri" lands also. He replies 'both' & seems to think it is an irrational question to put.

3. But the point is material enough. A Zamindar, besides being a 'farmer' of the revenue, often has tenant rights in some lands within the Zamindary.

Under the Mahometans, a leading Ryot often became the Zamindar, & of course retained his own lands, accounting to the Govt for the public revenue assessed on such lands as for all others — viz — paying it into the fisc

This is called an "Ancient Zamindari" and there is no indication whatever of the old ancestors' family having been "farmers" of the Revenue. — The creation is as one ancient proprietary estate & the estate was not so large that the relation of the people should be other than that of landlord & tenantry — the estate was sold for both public & private debts ~~and~~ naturally any portion which the owner may have been pleased to keep in his own hands came likewise to the hammer — there is no distinction — there was a share of the public debt — on the Home farm.

subject to his ordinary Commission – A Zamindar may also, of course, acquire tenant rights by purchase or in fifty different ways –

4. The case therefore stands thus:–

Rs 8000 was due by the young Zamindar, for which his whole Zamindary tenure was attached & sold – the Govt. becoming purchasers for 35,000 Rs –

So far, though harsh, the proceeding was legal – It wd not be so now, the new law not allowing us to sell more than is likely to extinguish the debt –

But over & above this, we sold the lands he held, not as Zamindar but, as Ryot. This we certainly had no right to do; and though, from effluxion of time, any claim wd be statute-run, we are bound, I submit, to compensate him – The occupants of the land paid him 760 Rs a year; but there wd be some deduction for management expenses.

July 17/76.

Of this there is no indication

Public Debt 8000
Private – 22500
Rs – 30,500 which was liquidated –

The price realized – 1857 was no doubt the full value of the Estate at the time Demand for land had revived – the Collectors guess of Rs 50,000 notwithstanding –

There was nothing harsh in the matter – for had foreclosure sold what wd liquidate the Public debt – the whole of the rest probably must have gone to meet the (foreclosed?) mortgage debt of Pittapur

I can see no hardship – the Sale of these lands under the circumst. more than occurs under any bankruptcy Sale

much in Madras for the last four Months –

Prays, therefore, that Govt. may take into their consideration the matter stated therein and grant the petitioner the same indulgence which has been shown to the heirs of other mindaries.:–

Petition (Rev) Dep

Rev-
Vide G. O. 8 August 1876.
No 1062

Re.
These petitions (Nos 372 + 1300 of 1876) were disposed of by [illegible] G.O. of 8 Sept 1876 Nos 64 + 66.

18 July/76 R 24 July

[illegible] 1062

Ex Zamindar
of Velampolium
Godavery Dist

Cons

G.O. 8 August 1876 No 1062

C. 18th July 1876 R 240 July

Petition

13

No 372 of 1876 of 5th February 1876
Recd 10th " "

From Angara Kristna Bramhajee Pentooloo, late Zemindar of Valempolium, Godavery Distt.

(With report from the Ag. Collector of the Godavery Distt dated 30th June 1876, No 13)

Adverting to the order of Government, dated 10th December 1874, No 1532, declining to sanction a monthly allowance of Rs 250 to petitioner as recommended by the Board of Revenue represents that the heirs of all the ancient Zemindars of the Northern Circar, whose estates were sold for heavy arrears of Peishcush, have been granted liberal allowances by the generous British Government; that his father's estate was sold for the small arrears of Rs 7889 during his

(petitr)

372 + 1300

For orders

W

Note

This seems a very hard case - The Ptnr had not the benefit of the estate being placed under the Court of Wards - The present [illegible] yearly - ~~would~~ is nearly equal to the total debt for which the estate was sold - It is submitted that the order of 10 Dec 74 might be reconsidered and a small allowance made - W (petr's) minority & purchased by the Govt. themselves for Rs 35,000; that during the last 16 years, the Government have derived a revenue at Rs 8000 a year; that petr. is quite destitute; that he has no property whatever —

Prays, therefore, that on a reconsideration of his hard case, the Govt. may mercifully sanction the grant to petitioner of the allowances, which was recommended by the Board of Revenue, on a reference to the reports & the correspondence in the matter —

No. 1300 of 1876 of 29th May 1876

Recd 16th June — —

From Do. —— Do. —— Do. ——

Submitting a copy of his petition, dated 5th Febry 1876, which is said not to have been received in the Govt. Office, states that he has been suffering

much

3/7/76
16/7/76

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham & Chandos
The Governor in Council
Fort St George

The humble Petition of Angara
Cristna Bramhajee Puntooloo
Late Zemindar of Ancient Estate
of Vatempoliem in the District
of Godavery

My Lord,

1 Petitioner respectfully presents this Petition to your Lordships Government praying reconsideration of his claim to the allowance lately recommended, & not sanctioned by the late Governor Lord Hobart having declined to accede to the rate proposed by the Board of Revenue, for the following reasons-

2 Petitioner was a minor of 14 years when his father died in 1857, & his Estate was placed under the management of the Court of Wards. There having been a small arrears of Rs 7589 the then Commissioner of the Northern Circar having upon Government order directed the Collector to sell the Estate, it was accordingly sold in 1857, & purchased by Government [illegible] for Rs 35000. Petitioner was ready to discharge the arrears & made known to the Collector of it and the Collector saying that Petitioner shall bring the Amount tomorrow morning, has unjustly completed the sale on the evening of the preceding on which he told so, knocking down the Estate in favor of Government for Rs 35000. Petitioner appealed to the Board of Revenue & to the then Governor objecting to the illegality of the sale, but those tribunals never [illegible] that appeal, nor done justice the Petitioner. By this very reason itself Petitioner became utterly destitute of means for his livelihood, & has therefore [illegible] carry on his livelihood by the generosity [illegible] who were acquainted with the name [illegible] 34th year of age. The [illegible]

assist him any longer he has therefore applied to the Sub Collector to favor him with some allowance from Government as was generally granted to the heirs of the other Zemindars - that authority mercifully referred Petitioner's claim for the favorable consideration of the Collector, who knowing the indigent state under which Petitioner labours has mercifully submitted his report to the Board of Revenue to grant him an allowance, and the Board of Revenue considering the respectability of Petitioner's father & the indigent state of the Petitioner have graciously submitted their report to Government that an allowance of Rs 250 should be sanctioned per mensem to be granted to Petitioner.

3-- The late Governor (Lord Hobart) declined to sanction the allowance, upon some reasons, unknown; as unnecessary.

4 It is therefore now requested your Lordship will be graciously pleased to refer to the proceedings of the late Governor (Lord Hobart) the reports submitted by the Board of Revenue & Collector, & if necessary other records, reconsider Petitioner's claim, and order the grant of the allowance recommended by the Board of Revenue, to Petitioner at the same rate recommended by the Board of Revenue or any other rate as it may seem just and equitable for the following among other reasons.

10th Decr 1874 No 1532

I Because number of the descendants of the ancient Zemindars of the Northern Circar, whose Estates were sold for heavy arrears as would be seen by the Collector's letter para 5 were provided with the monthly allowance by Rs 600 per mensem although they possessed of Houses & other property, Petitioner would here submit that your Lordship will in consideration of his possessing no Property whatever, have clemency upon him & sanction [illegible] the allowance as proposed by the Board for Petitioner's Estate [illegible] is the [illegible] as would be seen by the report of Revenue & for Petitioner possesses no house whatever whereby he to carry on his livelihood. And it

[illegible] earth of their [illegible] no friends [illegible] ness to assist

it is therefore full incumbent on your Lordship's Government themselves to relieve Petitioner from his indigent circumstance he labors under.

II Because it is not a burden thing for the charitable British rulers to place the Petitioner in the row of the heirs of other Zemindars of the Northern Circar to whom allowances are granted, for, the Government, who purchased the Petitioner's Estate are deriving the revenue there of i.e. Rs 80,000 per annum from this 16 years

III Because the Petitioner is adopted son of the late Zemindar, he is lawfully entitled to the bounty of Government as they had shown to the heirs of the Ancient Zemindar's descendants referred to in the preceding clause

5-- It is needless for Petitioner to lengthen any more than what are shown above, & if your Lordship's Government go through the correspondences referred to in the reports of the Board of Revenue & Collector they will no doubt regret for the late Governor (Lord Hobart) having declined to grant the allowance to Petitioner as proposed by the Board of Revenue, and be now disposed to reconsider Petitioner's case & order the continuance to him of the same allowance

Shall Ever Pray

5th February 1876 -

[illegible]

From Arusa Oristus
Braenkaie Puntoolo
late Zemindar of the Esta
of Valempoliem in th
District of Godavery

Dated 5th February 1776

Enclosures
11

1300
Ans Encl
15/6/76.

To

His Grace the Duke of
Buckingham & Chandos
The Governour of
Fort St George

The humble Petition of Angara
Krishna Brahmaje Puntuloo
the zemindar of Velewplium in the
District of Godavary

My Lord

In obdience to the Endorsement made by the Private Secretary on my Petition dated 25th Instant, informing me that the one which I have "presented to your Lordship on the 5th February "last, has not been received in this Office, and "that I would transmit the same petition "again" - I have Accordingly transmitted herewith a true Copy of the same Petition, dated 5th February 1876, Affixing my name in English and Vernacular as directed.

It is now upwards of 4 months that I have

present
the Govt
in Mad
tion Las,

ships G
Case Co
ing praye
of the heir
District

29th
May

Petitione

---

d the above Petition and put it in the box of
House at Madras, and suffer for food
s; but I came now to know that that Peti-
t been received in the Govt. Office

Gt is therefore requested that your Lord
ace will be pleased to consider my
tained in the same Petition and grant
as was heitherto done in the matter
of the other Ancient Zemindars of the

Shall ever Pray
అంగర కృష్ణబ్రహ్మజీపంతులు

(Angara Krishna Brahmajee Puntulu)

lives at
Mane
Madras

From Angara Krishna
Bramhajee Puntulu of
Godavery District

Dated 29th May 1876

Transmitting copy of his
Petition dated 5th Feb 76
for the same Petition
said that it is not received
in the Office when it
was presented at Madras

To

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham & Chandos
The Governor in Council
Fort St. George

The h the Petition of Angara Cristna
Bramhajee Puntoolo the late Zemindar
of the ancient Estate of Vadapolliem in
the District of Godavery

My Lord,

1 - - - Petitioner respectfully presents this Petition praying
your Lordship's Government to reconsider his Claim to an
allo the late Governor Lord Hobart had merci
to sanction the rate of the allowance
recommended by the Board of Revenue to whom the
Collector submitted a favorable report on that subject.

2 - - - - Petitioner was a minor of 14 years when his
father died in 1851, and his Estate was taken under
the Management of the Court of Wards - There having been
arrears Rs 7889 on the same Estate the then Commiss-
-ioner of Northern Circar having upon Govt orders
directed the Estate to be sold accordingly sold
by the then Collector without es which
Petitioner was ready to pay - the Collector, ordered the
Petitioner to bring the money tomorrow morning he irregularly
knocked down the sale in favor of the Government who
purchased it for Rs 35000 - As regards the irregular
procedure of the Collector Petitioner appealed to the

Board and the then Governor, but those tribunals never as
attended to the Same appeal, nor made Justice to Petitioner
As there was some private debts Contracted by Petitioner's
father the Government Confiscated Petitioner's house and other
real and personal property, and sold them and paid
the sale proceeds to the Creditors. By this reason
Petitioner in his [illegible]
means of his livelihood [illegible] by resorting to the
generosity of certain native gentlemen who were ac
acquainted with the name and respectability of Petitioner's
father until 34th year of his age.

3 - - Those native friends having by degrees shown
their unwillingness to show their generosity to Petitioner
subjected to alternate fastings or passing his nights
by drinking fresh water [illegible]

[illegible] personally ascertaining
Government. The Same Aumany
the awful Condition of Petitioner has mercifully submitted
Petitioner's application to the Collector of the District for
his favorable Consideration and the Collector Mr. Fowler
knowing Petitioner's indigent state has mercifully been
pleased to submit a report to the Board of Revenue as
Recommending that Petitioner's prayer for allowance
may be Considered and needful orders obtained from
Government. The Board of Revenue Referring to their old
rec[illegible] them states that the Estate was
an[illegible] that Petitioner is the Son of the deceased Zemindar,
and [illegible] that an allowance is reasonably to be granted to
[illegible] done by Government in the matter of the
[illegible] of several Zemindars whose Estates were
sold for arrears in the same manner as Petitioner's Estate
was

was, They (Board of Revenue) had mercifully reco[mmended] Recommended may be granted
to Govt. that a monthly allowance of Rs 2 [illegible]
to Petitioner - the Board of

4 - - - The late Governor Lord Hobart [illegible]s Grace
declined to Sanction the allowance proposed [illegible] said and
Revenue it is most incumbent on your Lord[ship] the rate of
to reconsider the report submitted by the [illegible] i.e. Rs 2
District Revenue Authorities and order [illegible] may seem
the allowance proposed by the Board of R[evenue] other reasons
or any other rate as to your Lordship's [illegible] the Ancient
Just, may be Sanctioned for the following [illegible] hoor) [illegible]

I - - Because number of the heirs [illegible] arrears
Zemindars (such as Pitt[illegible] poor and [illegible] month
Northern Circar whose Estates were sold [illegible]
well as your Petitioner's were [illegible]
[illegible] Rs 60 or more as would [illegible] have
Collector's letter para 5, whilst those [illegible] personal
possessed houses and other property, [illegible] waiting for
whereby they could subsist without [illegible] that
alone pension, Petitioner would subm[illegible] and
Lordship will have clemency upon [illegible]
the rate of the allowance proposed [illegible]
Revenue or any rate that it may deem pr[oper]
his Estate too is ancient one as would be [illegible]
the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue [illegible]
possesses no house to live in nor propert[y]
he could Carry on his livelihood

II Because Petitioner suff[ered]
fastings and pass his nights by drinking
water, it is not a great thing for the [illegible]
British rulers to place the Petitioner in [illegible]
heirs of [illegible] other Zemindars [illegible] ded to
clause as a matter of liberality tho [illegible]
of right, for the Govt. who purchased

presi
the Go
in tha
tion L

ship's
Case
ing p
of the
Dist

29th

Pet

---

ue now Rs 8000 annually.

la . . Because the Petitioner is the adopted son of the
te Zemindar he is lawfully entitled to the bounty of
nt and to obtain the indulgence under the Hindee law
o they had shown in the matter of the descendants of
al other Zemindars mentioned in the first Clause

are less for Petitioner to lengthen any more herein
t are stated above. If your Lordship refers to the Corres
d between the Board and Government it will appe
ar Governor Lord Hobart having declined to sanction
ance recommended by the Board of Revenue, and
fully disposed to reconsider Petitioner's claim and
structions that the allowance either as proposed by
d or any other rate which Could relieve him from
ent Condition he now labors under may
be Continued to Pet

this Act of benevolence Petitioner as in duty

Shall Ever Pray

Triplacane
Conductor
to the Board of

Rungara Cristna Bunhajie Puntor

pres
the G
in he
tion
ship
Case
by
of the
Dist
29
pen
5th Februar

Government of Madras,
Rev Pro- 8th Augt 1876
No 1062

Rev DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 1300 of 1876.

From Angara Kristna Brahamajee Puntooloo

Occupation the Zamindar of

Village Velempoliem

Talook

District Godavery now at Triplicane

Dated 29th May } 1876.
Received 15th June }

372 Enclosure. One

ABSTRACT.

Submitting a copy of his petition d/5th Feb. 1876, which is said not to have been received in the Govt Office, states that he has been suffering much [illegible] in Madras for the last four months.

Prays, therefore, that Govt may take into their consideration the matter stated therein and grant the petitioner the same indulgence, which has been shown to the heirs of other Zamindaries.

Petition.

20/
106

No. 372 of 1876 D/5th Feby 1876
R. 10 — " — "

From Angara Christna Bramhajee Raontoolo late Zemindar of Valempolem Godavery—

Adverting to the order of Govt. D/10th Decer. 1874, No. 1532 declining to sanction a monthly allowance of Rs. 25 0 to petitioner as recommended by the Board of Revenue; represents that the heirs of all the ancient Zemindars of the Northern Cirkars, whose estates were sold for heavy arrears of Peishcush, have been granted liberal allowances by generous British Government; that his fathers estate was sold for the small arrears of

Order
The Govt. decline to reconsider their order 10th Dec. 1874. No 1532

Note
the Ptnr urges nothing fresh
14.3.76

of Rupees 7889 during his (petrs) minority and purchased by the Government themselves for Rs 35000; that during the last 16 years the Govern:ment have derived a revenue at Rs 80000 a year that petr is quite destitute; that he has no property whatever.

Prays, therefore, that on a reconsideration of his hard case the Government may mercifully sanction the grant to petitioner of the allowance, which was recommended by the Board of Revenue, on a reference to the reports and the correspondce in the matter.

Petition of Rev. D.

Rev. Doc. Off. Inw. No. 45
G. 20 Mar. 1876

… o. 13 Godavery District

that he has no property whatever.

Prays, therefore, that on a reconsideration of his hard case, the Govt. may mercifully sanction the grant to petr. of the allowance, which was recommended by the Board of Revenue, on a reference to the reports & the correspondence in the matter.

Bm. f.O. G. 10 Decr./74: 1532.

Bd. G. 27-1-1860 No. 4890/59
E. M. C. 6-1-52: 39 @ 40
—"— 25-11-51: 14-15
—"— 15-8-51: 5-7

½ margin

Government of Madras.

Pro: 8th Augt /76
No 1062

Rev DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 372 of 1876. -

From Angara Christna Braimhajee Puntooloo

Occupation "late Zamindar of

Village Valempoliem

Talook

District Godaverya

Dated 5th } February 1876.
Received 10th }

GO 8 August /76 Enclosures. No 1062

ABSTRACT.

Adverting to the order of Govt d/10 Decr 1874, No 1532, declining to sanction a monthy allowance of Rs 250 to petr as recommended by the Board of Revenue; represents that the heirs of all the ancient Zamindars of the Northern Cirkars, whose estates were sold for heavy arrears of Peishcush, have been granted liberal allowances by the generous British Govt; that his father's estate was sold for the small arrears of Rs 7889 during his (petr's) minority & purchased by the Govt themselves for Rs 35000; that during the last 16 years, the Govt have derived a revenue at Rs 80000 a year; that petr is quite destitute; that

Vide G.O. 8 August 1876 Sanction No 1062

No 13

Godavery District
Collector's Office
Cocanada
30th June 1876

From
James Hope Esquire
Acting Collector

To
The Honorable D. F. Carmichael
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort Saint George

Sir,

1 With reference to your Official Memorandum of the 20th March 1876 No 45, I have the honor to inform you, that the "Seri" (Home farm) lands estimated to yield the Ex-Zamindar of Velampalam Rs 760 a year were not left to him but were sold with the rest of the Estate. They were included in the advertisement of sale and there would be no reason for their exclusion, for they were just as much part of the Zamindari as other lands. As a matter of fact they were sold with

14 To the Board of Rev. Dr. 17 Aug
1 To the Collector of Godavery Dr. 5

No. 2726.
Revenue 1876 Department

From the Acting Collector
of the Godavery
District.

To The Secretary
to Government
in the Revenue
Dept.

No. 1062 8 August 1876

Dated 30th June /76.
Enc: 18 No. 63
Recd. 6 July /76

~~Stating in the reference to the Offg. Memo 20th March last, that the~~ Seri lands in the Velampalem Estate were sold with the rest of the Estate, and submitting a statement giving information asked for in Para 2 of the above Memo.

No. 1062 d/8 August 1876

Read Memo No. 45. d/2-/3/76 – Read also [illegible] d/29/4/76.
Read also Minute [illegible]

What was rightly attached & sold was the defaulter's Zamindary tenure; ~~but~~ the sale of his "Seri" lands was clearly illegal. Except that, in that case, the lands were Inam not Seri, the transaction is on all fours with the mistake made in the sale of the Haubpur Estate in Ganjam, where compensation was subsequently awarded with the concurrence of the Secy of State.

G.O. No 1078 d/30 Aug '60

vide G.O. 10/12/74 No 1532.

2. A recommendation will be made to H. M. Govt. for the grant of a compensation pension to the Ex-Zamindar, of the amount proposed by the Bd. of Rev. [illegible]

August 8/76