(1) Number of pages 5 Sheets

(2) Date of repair 7.2.84

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No: 1370	Press. / Mis.
Dated 28.8.1878.	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives I—5,806—24-2-78.

1320/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

28th August 1878, No. 1,370.

Read the following paper:—

No. 319. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th July 1878, No. 2,090.

Read the following letter from W. LOGAN, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to G. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 3rd July 1878, No. 190:—

I HAVE the honor to bring to the notice of the Board that there are great dissensions in the Narangoli Chirakal Nambiar family which is entitled to a malikhana of Rupees 1,671-14-0 per annum. The family has split into three branches, viz., (1) Ramath, (2) Puthalath, and (3) Mulleri; so that in reality it is a single family no longer but a collection of families hanging together by their interest in what remains of the common property of which the Government malikhana allowance forms the most [illegible] present, and are never likely in future, to live quietly in subjection to the eldest male member who is nominally karnavan of the family, or tarawad, to use the proper Malayalum expression. They cannot, therefore, be brought to agree to the arrangement that has hitherto existed whereby the nominal karnavan received the whole of the malikhana and disbursed it among the members.

Under such circumstances I beg to recommend that the principle which was adopted in the case of the Karangothtadathil Nayar family (Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 4,735, dated 8th July 1872) be applied to the Narangoli tarawad, viz.:—

(*a*.) That half of the malikhana be allotted to the eldest male member of the tarawad who is Kunhi Sankaran Nambiar; and

(*b*.) That the other half be distributed equally among the three branches into which the tarawad has split and be paid to the representative members of those branches, viz.:—

1. Kunhappa Nambiar for Ramath branch.
2. Kunhi Raman *alias* Kunhappa Nambiar for Puthalath branch, and
3. Kunhi Lekshmi Amma for Mulleri branch.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board are of opinion that the malikhana should be paid to the head of the family, and that it is inexpedient for the State to recognize these domestic dissensions by splitting up the Government allowance into infinitesimal shares whereby the original object of the grant, viz., the decent maintenance of the family, is defeated. The Government apparently had this principle in view when disposing of the Parupanad case—*vide* G.O., dated 26th June 1878, No. 966.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. STURROCK,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 320. ORDER THEREON, 28th August 1878, No. 1,370.

Miscellaneous.

THE information before Government is insufficient to enable them to sanction the arrangement suggested by the Collector who will report fully as to the past history and present condition of the family and its property.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. C. Howarth and F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of [1878] 30th
—, REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated August 28th.

Printed September 4th.

Read.

Q.O., 28th August 1878, No. 1310

AUGUST.
Nos. 310-320.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 3577

From Board of Revenue

Dated 29th July 1878

FOR ORDERS.

I think that the remission is most important. As it must involve the head of the family & Karnavan—manifestly the proper person to apply for the first-Profits for the benefit of the family & not for individual purposes the ancient custom has passed away.

that the property of
which the Irish Land
-20% of the Collections —
was the recognition
has been despised
and that the old family
are more or less in
the position of mere
pensioners. The three
branches have become
-come entirely distinct —
In this case a forced
alliance is really as
maintenance of an
ancient Joint family
a Forward and the
Collectors suggestion

may be raised not at
variance with Govt
policy — but enumer-
cate the general un-
willingness of Govt to
interfere and require
more information as
to the conditions of
the family property
before deciding.

I observe that
the question arises
between Hamilton
& Co in most cases
the Condition as
respects Rent is
rather that of a
Class of Joint Pro-
-prietors — Some that

1320/5

No. 2,090.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 29th July 1878.

Read the following letter from W. LOGAN, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 3rd July 1878, No. 190 :—

I HAVE the honor to bring to the notice of the Board that there are great dissensions in the Narangoli Chirakal Nambiar family which is entitled to a malikhana of Rupees 1,671-14-0 per annum. The family has split into three branches, viz., (1) Ramath, (2) Puthalath, and (3) Mulleri; so that in reality it is a single family no longer but a collection of families hanging together by their interest in what remains of the common property of which the Government malikhana allowance forms the most important portion. The members of the three branches do not at present, and are never likely in future, to live quietly in subjection to the eldest male member who is nominally karnavan of the family, or tarawad, to use the proper Malayalum expression. They cannot, therefore, be brought to agree to the arrangement that has hitherto existed whereby the nominal karnavan received the whole of the malikhana and disbursed it among the members.

Under such circumstances I beg to recommend that the principle which was adopted in the case of the Karangothtadathil Nayar family (Board's Proceedings, Miscellaneous No. 4,735, dated 8th July 1872) be applied to the Narangoli tarawad, viz. :—

(*a*.) That half of the malikhana be allotted to the eldest male member of the tarawad who is Kunhi Sankaran Nambiar; and

(*b*.) That the other half be distributed equally among the three branches into which the tarawad has split and be paid to the representative members of those branches, viz. :—

1. Kunhappa Nambiar for Ramath branch.
2. Kunhi Raman *alias* Kunhappa Nambiar for Puthalath branch, and
3. Kunhi Lekshimi Amma for Mulleri branch.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board are of opinion that the malikhana should be paid to the head of the family, and that it is inexpedient for the State to recognize these domestic dissensions by splitting up the Government allowance into infinitesimal shares whereby the original object of the grant, viz., the decent maintenance of the family, is defeated. The Government apparently had this principle in view when disposing of the Parapanad case—*vide* G.O., dated 26th June 1878, No. 966.

(A true Copy and Extract.) A Howarth

Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

Exd. C. Howarth.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated July 29th.

Printed August 7th

Received — — 12

PROCEEDINGS, 29TH JULY 1878, No. 2,090.

JULY.

No. 2,090.

Malikhana — enjoyed by the Narangoli Chirakal Nambiar family of Malabar District. —Submitting to Government Collector's suggestion for the apportionment of the — to its several branches, and stating Board's views on the subject.