

- (1) Number of pages _____
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES
GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU
Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2890	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	24th Sept	1877
		197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

24th September 1877, No. 2,890.

Read the following paper :—

No. 582. Memorial from SOOBRAMANIA DURAI, son of COMPANY SELVA DURAI, late Zemindar of Panchalamcoorichy, in the District of Tinnevely, to His Excellency the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated 1st June 1877.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That his Excellency the Madras Government will be so pleased as to transmit the petition addressed to Her Majesty, and enclosed herein, to Her Gracious Majesty.

2. For which act of charity, the humble petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Petition from SOOBRAMANIA DURAI, son of COMPANY SELVA DURAI, late Zemindar of Panchalamcoorichy, in the District of Tinnevely, Presidency of Madras, to Her Majesty the Most Gracious Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Empress of India, &c., &c., dated 1st June 1877.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That the Honorable Company having confiscated the ancestral properties, both Aiyas and Zamindari, supported the petitioner's father monthly allowance of Rs. 52-8-0. After his death the present petitioner and his elder brother are now supporting themselves with the same monthly allowance of Rs. 52-8-0.

2. That his (petitioner's) elder brother petitioned to the Madras Government to sanction for his and the present petitioner's marriage expenses Rs. 10,000.

3. They sanctioned for his marriage expenses and not for the present petitioner's, Rs. 350, which they found, upon referring to the records, to have been sanctioned for his great uncle for his marriage. When the present petitioner petitioned directly, directly to the Madras Government to the same effect, they endorsed to the petitioner that such sanctions will be allowed only to the head of a family and not to its other members. The present petitioner, as his marriage expenses were not sanctioned, appealed to the Indian Government to direct to the Madras Government to sanction him an allowance for his marriage like that sanctioned for his brother's. They endorsed the appeal petition No. 985-G, that they decline to interfere with the orders of the Madras Government as contained in the endorsement No. 400, dated 3rd April 1876.

4. The petitioner sent the endorsement No. 400 of the Madras Government, the endorsement No. 985 of the Indian Government, and the appeal petition written to Her Majesty on 15th June 1876, to the Madras Government with a petition requesting the Government to transmit them to Her Majesty. The Madras Government sent them to the Indian Government on the 18th October 1876. The Madras Government has sent Proceedings No. 2,197 to the petitioner, returning with it only the petition written to Her Majesty, and stating that the Indian Government says in letter No. 2,596 that they finding the petition to be not in accordance with Section 9 of Order No. 3,743 of 1867, has therefore returned the petition. But the Government has not returned the two endorsements.

5. Of the two sons of a father's, the marriage expense of one being sanctioned and that of the other refused, what other support has the latter. If the Honorable Government that is more just and kind than the former rulers of India decline to grant the marriage of the petitioner that wholly depends upon its patronage, who else would undertake to supply his wants? As long as the Government maintain the petitioner's family as their own children, why should they not be so merciful as to provide the necessary wants of their children. Is the petitioner to remain unmarried. If his zemini remain in his possession, he could perform his marriage from the included sum.

6. The petitioner, therefore, most humbly prays that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to peruse the petitions, and to order the Madras Government to sanction him for his marriage expenses a sum like that sanctioned for his elder brother's, and order it to be paid from the Huzar Treasury, Trichinopoly.

For which act most charitable, most benignant, and most gracious, the most humble petitioner hall as in duty bound ever pray.

No. 383.

ORDER THEREON, 24th September 1877, No. 2,890.

Miscellaneous.

The memorial will be forwarded to its address with the remark that this Government have no recommendation to make in petitioner's behalf.


(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

To the Petition Department.

2
28 77

222A
6/8/77
H.C.



His Excellency the Governor
in Council

Fort St. George
Madras

The humble Petition of
Sobramonia Durai son of
Company Selva Durai late
Groomer of Panchallamkuram
in the District of Tirunelveli

Wm. H. H. H.

That the Petitioner encloses herewith the
petition No. 400 of 1876 which has been returned
by the Madras Government under an order dated
14th Decr to the Indian Government and that of the
Madras Government dated 14th July 1877 duly
authenticated by the Petitioner as required by
para 9 of Municipal Rules.

2. That the Petitioner in conclusion begs
that the application to the Madras Government
for forwarding the petition dated 1st June 1877
and two other documents to Her Majesty
be complied with.

In which Act of Charity the humbled
Petitioner shall ever as in duty bound
pray.

Ed. Durai
18/77

I am Your Most Obedient and humble
Servant
Sobramonia Durai

Child

1020
4/6/77

The following is a list of the names of the
 persons who have been admitted to the
 membership of the Society since the
 last meeting of the Executive Committee.
 The names are given in alphabetical order.
 The names of the persons who have been
 admitted to the membership of the Society
 since the last meeting of the Executive Committee
 are given in alphabetical order.

I have not been able to find
 the original of the letter. I have been unable to find the original
 of the letter. I have been unable to find the original
 of the letter.

... and ... the ...

1st June
1879

Toobramania Durai

For Majesty the most gracious
Queen of Great Britain and Ireland
and the Emperor of India, &c. &c.

The most humble petition of Subramania Das
son of Company Selva Dasai late Zemindar of
Panchalamcorriy in the District of Tinnevely
Presidency of Madras

Sheweth,

1. That the Honourable Company having im-
puted the ancestral properties both to his father and
Zemindary supported the petitioner's father
with a monthly allowance of Rs 50. 0. After
his death the present petitioner and his elder
brother are now supporting themselves with the
same monthly allowance of Rs 50. 0.
2. That his (petitioner's) elder brother petitioned
to the Madras Government to sanction for his
and the present petitioner's marriage expenses
Rs 10,000.
3. They sanctioned for his marriage expenses and
not for the present petitioner's Rs 300, which they
found upon referring to the records to have been
sanctioned for his great uncle for his marriage.
When the present petitioner petitioned directly
directly to the Madras Government to the same
effect, they endorsed the petitioner that such

Sanctions will be allowed only to the head of family and not to its other members. The petitioner, as his marriage expenses were not sanctioned by the Indian Government to direct the Madras Government to sanction him an allowance for his marriage like that sanctioned for his brothers. They endorsed the appeal petition of Rs 955 p. that they decline to interfere with the orders of the Madras Government contained in the endorsement of Rs 400 dated 3rd April 1876.

4. The petitioner sent the endorsement of Rs 400 of the Madras Government, the endorsement of Rs 9 of the Indian Government, and the appeal petition written to His Majesty in 1876, to the Madras Government with a petition requesting the Government to transmit them to Her Majesty. The Madras Government sent them to the Indian Government on 18th Dec 1876. The Madras Government has sent on proceedings of Rs 2197 to the petitioner, returning with it only the petition written to Her Majesty. It stating that the Indian Government says in letter of Rs 2596, that they guiding the petition to not in accordance with section 9 of order of 1867, has therefore returned the petition. But the Government has not returned the two endorsements.

5. Of the two sons of a father, the marriage expenses of one being sanctioned and that of the other, says what other support has the latter. If the Honorable Government that is more just and fair.

G. S. Ramana Dutt

that the same rules of India, declare to grant the
marriage of the petitioner that wholly depends
upon his fortune, who else would undertake
to supply his wants? as long as the government
maintain the petitioner's family as their own
children, why should they not be so merciful
as to provide the necessary wants of their children.
If the petitioner to remain unmarried. If his
family remain in his possession he could
perform his marriage from the included sum.
6. The petitioner therefore most humbly prays that
your Majesty will be graciously pleased to
peruse the petition and to order the Madras
Government to sanction him for his marriage
expenses a sum like that sanctioned for
his elder brother's and order it to be paid
from the Nagpur Treasury Treasurership.

For which most charitable
most benevolent and most gracious
The most humble petitioner shall
as in duty bound ever pray

1st June
1877

Tobraman Dura

sheet No 3

24-9-77 W. 2890.

Small to medium