

(1) Number of pages 1

(2) Date of repair 20-4-78

(3) Initials of the Referencer 720/4

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1672 <i>Revenue</i>	Press Mis.
Dated	16th October	1878.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

16th October 1878, No. 1,672.

Read the following paper :—

No. 162. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th July 1878, No. 1,861.

Read the following letter from J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 14th June 1878, No. 1,222 :—

In renewing the allowance enjoyed by the late Vasireddi Naidamma on the name of his minor son Padmanabha Ramanna, it was stated in G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867, that the allowance should be paid to the minor's mother Venkata Lakshamma until he attained his majority. The allowance was accordingly paid to her up to June 1877, and from July it was stopped at the request* of the minor's

* In arzi of 9th July 1877.

mother owing to a quarrel between herself and her first son.

2. The latter petitioned† the Collector that his mother abused the trust reposed in her, contracted debts and became very extravagant, so that the allowance

† Dated 18th April 1877.

Rupees 385 became insufficient even for their maintenance; that she left their usual residence at Chintapalli and went to Masulipatam, leaving him alone in the former place; and that he might be removed from her guardianship and be allowed to draw his allowance himself.

3. The minor's mother petitioned‡ to the effect that she has neither abused her trust nor contracted any debts; that her son's petition was presented by the

‡ 9th July 1877.

instigation of her brother, who is also the minor's father-in-law with the intention of his assuming the management of the household affairs; that she left Chintapalli as she was ill-treated by her brother; that there is no reason to remove her son from her guardianship and to pay the allowance to him, and that if the allowance be paid to her son it should be split up equally between her two sons Padmanabha Ramanna, the petitioner, and her second son Chandramavali Naidu, who was born after her husband's death, she being pregnant at that time. She further requested that until the matter was settled the allowance might be kept in deposit.

4. The petition was referred to the Sub-Collector. A copy of his letter and of the memorandum which accompanied it are enclosed. It will be observed therefrom that the statement of the minor is correct; that his mother has abused her trust and is unfit for the post of guardian; that the allowance may be paid direct to the minor who is able to manage his household affairs; that there is no chance of reconciliation between the members of the family, and that Government are to determine who are entitled to share in the allowance in question.

5. The minor and his mother were then called upon to report on the last point.

The minor states that his late father's family consists of six members including himself as per margin; that out of them his two sisters have no right whatever to receive any allowance as they were given in marriage to wealthy persons possessing landed property; that the remaining three are to be protected by himself; and if they do not like it, he may be allowed to pay them as follows :—

	Monthly. RS.
To mother and brother	50
Step-mother who has been drawing for a long time 25 Rupees per month notwithstanding the Kararnama to pay her Rupees 90 monthly	25

6. The mother states that beside herself and her two sons there are three members who are entitled to receive a share in the pension, viz., the 1st wife of her late husband Durgamma, and her two daughters, who, though married, have been in the habit of receiving allowances as shown in the margin.

	Monthly. RS.
Durgamma under registered Karar-nama	90
1st daughter besides giving food ...	15
2nd daughter besides giving food ...	10

7. I do not think that any provision is needed for the sisters who have married into other families, and would recommend that the allowance be made payable to the minor on the understanding that the suitable provision is made for the other members of the family, viz., mother, step-mother and brother. He proposes to provide only Rupees 75 for these, but I think that this may reasonably be doubled.

8. The minor claims to be now 18 years of age, but our accounts show that he is only 16. I would recommend that his father-in-law Chirumamilla Seshadri be empowered to receive the pension on his behalf during the remaining two years of his minority.

9. The usual application for payment of arrears of pension is herewith forwarded for the Board's sanction.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

STATEMENT showing the Amount of Arrears of Allowance due to the undermentioned individual in the Kistna District.

Number of Certificate.	Name of Pensioner.	Amount of Pension per Annum.	Date of Government Authority.	Nature of the Grant.	Period for which amount of arrears due.	Total amount of arrears.	Explanation of cause of Suspension.	Remarks of the Board of Revenue.	Government sanction.
	Vasireddi Padmanabha Ramanna.	RS. 4,620	G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867.	Compensation in lieu of resumed lands.	From July 1877 to May 1878.	RS. 4,235	In G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867, the pension enjoyed by the late V. Naidamma was renewed in the name of his eldest son Padmanabha Ramanna, and it was ordered that the pension should be paid to his mother Venkata Lakshamma during his minority. Disputes having subsequently arisen between the minor and his mother, the payment of pension has been stopped from July 1877 at the request of the mother. After inquiry, Report No. 1,222, dated 14th June 1878, has been sent to the Board. I therefore request that you will be good enough to obtain their sanction for payment to Chirumamilla Seshadri Naidu whom the minor has nominated to receive his pension on his behalf during the remainder of his minority, the arrears due to the minor from 1st July 1877 to 31st May 1878 amounting to Rupees 4,235.		

MASULIPATAM,
14th June 1878.

(Signed) J. G. HORSFALL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From B. HORSBRUGH, Esq., Sub-Collector, to the Collector of the Kistna District, dated Gunttoor, 8th August 1877, No. 434.

With reference to your endorsements, Nos. 918 and 1,106, dated 18th April and 1st June 1877, on the petitions from the minor pensioner of Chintapalli, I have the honor now to submit the result of the inquiries as embodied in the Tahsildar's report* and its enclosures herewith sent; a rough translation of the arzi is also put up with it.

* Dated 21st July 1877, No. 1,550.

2. From this inquiry and from all that I have heard I think there is no doubt that the mother, who was ordered to be entrusted with the pension by G.O., No. 1,471, dated 2nd July 1867, has abused her trust and gone to the bad.

3. I saw Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna three months ago. I think he might now be allowed to draw the pension himself. I do not think there is any chance of a reconciliation between the members of the family, and therefore I would suggest that Government should determine who are entitled to share in the pension, and then that each sharer should draw his share separately from the treasury.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collector.

MEMORANDUM.

RAJAH Vasireddi Padmanabha Ramanna, minor pensioner of Chintapalli in the Sattannepalli Taluq, submitted petition to the Collector under date 18th April 1877, stating that on the death of his father, the late Rajah Vasireddi Naidammagar in 1867, the Government in their Order, dated 2nd July 1867, had sanctioned the continuance of his allowance to him (petitioner) to be paid on the receipt of his mother who had been made his guardian; that his mother Venkata Lakshamma had entered into extravagance, by which the monthly allowance having proved insufficient for the domestic and other expenses, she raised money by loans to a considerable amount; that the money-lenders were troubling him very much for the same; that he was unable to describe the difficulties he was undergoing by the extravagant habits of his mother; that he had advised his mother to give up those bad habits, but in vain; that she was consequently living separately from him and had conceived hatred towards him, by which he was afraid of his own life.

That orders to remove him from the support of his mother as guardian and to pay the monthly allowance on his own receipt might be therefore passed, and that if this could not be done, another guardian according to his selection might be appointed.

This petition and another on the subject were referred to the Sub-Collector for report.

The Sattannepalli Tahsildar by his arzi, dated 21st July 1877, No. 1,550, reports that he made inquiry on the subject, in which Babbellapati Narisingarayudu for the petitioner and Chintapalli Timmaraz for his mother were examined, as well as some others for the former.

B. Narasingarayudu, Vakil for the petitioner, states that amongst the servants of the Rajah (petitioner) there is one Tungala Kotaya, who, being a drunkard, supplies the petitioner's mother with liquor, &c., for drinking; that by this most part of the allowance money is being squandered away; that the minor Rajah (petitioner) once dismissed the said Tungala Kotaya from his service, ordering him not to come into the fort; that consequently his mother had left the fort during his absence and again taken Kotaya into her service; that should he (Kotaya) remain with her, many troubles are apprehended to the Rajah (petitioner); that as the Rajah is able to carry on the management for himself, the monthly allowance may be ordered to be paid on his receipt.

Chintapalli Timmaraz, Vakil for Venkata Lakshamma, mother of the Rajah, stated that the petitioner is now 17 years old; that unless he is 18 years old, he could not be entrusted with the allowance money; that the elder brother of the petitioner's mother, named Chirumamilla Seshadri Naidu, had given his daughter in marriage to the petitioner, and therefore with the view of having in his own hand the entire management (of his house) had instigated the petitioner and caused the allowance money for November and December 1876 to be sent for and expended by him (petitioner); that in order to deprive his mother and his younger brother Chendramavuli Naidu of any share in the estate had caused such petitions to be submitted by his son-in-law; and that petitioner's mother Venkata Lakshamma had not made any undue expenses from the allowance money.

Mulagu Chendramavuli of Chintapalli stated that the petitioner Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna and his mother Venkatalakshamma are not in good terms with each other; that Venkata Dakshamma had left the fort and is now living in another house; that Tungala Kotaya was

from former times employed in the fort and is not under her in common with some other servants; that he heard that the petitioner had ordered Kotaya not to come into the fort, which is the cause for her leaving the fort; that the (deponent) had never used to go into the fort, and therefore he does not know what passes there.

Chintapalli Bhavanisenkarudu, Curnam of Chintapalli, stated that seven months ago Rajah Venkata Lakshamma had left the fort for Taduvayi village without remaining with her son; that she returned to the village and put up in a Brahmin's house where she still resides owing to the removal by her son of Tungala Kotaya from his service; that Venkata Lakshamma again received Tungala Kotaya into her service; that Tungala Kotaya used to bring liquor and supply it to Venkata Lakshamma; that he heard that this Kotaya had been convicted of the offence of having clandestinely brought liquor and been punished with heavy fine which Venkata Lakshamma had paid for him; that Kotaya being a drunkard persuaded Venkata Lakshamma to make extravagant expenses; that the petitioner requested his mother while at Taduvayi to return and live with him in the fort at Chintapalli, but she did not do so; that with frugality of expenditure the allowance money would be sufficient for their charges.

Sivalanka Mallayya, Munsif of the village, corroborated the above in every particular point. He also added that Venkata Lakshamma used to make the expenditure extravagantly, and also contracted loans to a large amount.

Pesapati Ramayya of Chintapalli stated that Cherumamilla Chinna Seshadri Naidu, son-in-law of Rajah Venkata Lakshamma, and Tungala Kotaya, both had executed to him a bond for Rupees 64, which they had received from him in cash on account of the abkari kist; that he had lent the money at the request of Venkata Lakshamma; that the money had been returned to him one month afterwards; that there subsisted enmity between Venkata Lakshamma and her son Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna for the last six months, because the former had spent the entire amount of the allowance money for undue purposes, putting him (petitioner) to inconvenience for domestic expenses and had contracted loans, for the repayment whereof the money-lenders were greatly troubling him; that this Tungala Kotaya was fed in the fort in addition to batta paid to other servants, and then he was also given clothes.

Kokkireni Butchayya of Chintapalli stated that he used at different times to procure loans of money amounting to about Rupees 300 and pay the money to Venkata Lakshamma and Kotaya at the request of the former when money was required for purchasing liquor and other such things; that he also paid some money to the abkari shopkeepers; that some of the above money was borrowed on the mortgage of her jewels; that after Kotaya was sent away from the fort, Venkata Lakshamma left the fort and went to Taduvayi; that she returned again and put up in another house in the village; and that Kotaya is still in the service of Venkata Lakshamma.

The Tahsildar further states that from the foregoing it is clear that Venkata Lakshamma used to send for liquor, &c., by Tungala Kotaya, who was employed in the fort, for her own use, inasmuch as the said Kotaya is exceedingly addicted to drinking; that on account of this large portion of the allowance money has been squandered away; that the Rajah (petitioner) having turned out the said Kotaya from his service in the fort, Venkata Lakshamma left the fort during her son's absence and is living separately.

That no witnesses were called by the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma to prove the contrary.

That it is nine years since he came to this taluq (as Tahsildar); that from years past, he came to understand that Venkata Lakshamma used to get liquor by Tungala Kotaya and indulge herself in excesses; that therefore she was obliged to mortgage her jewels to procure loans of money, the allowance money not being sufficient for her expenditure; and that she has been making extravagant expenses according to the advice of the said Kotaya; that she had the abkari lease undertaken on her behalf which shows that she became a drunkard.

That her eldest son having removed Kotaya from service, Venkata Lakshamma by favor towards the latter fell out with her son and left the fort with her second son and widowed daughter and others, the said Kotaya being re-employed in her service; that Venkata Lakshamma tells that she will remove Kotaya from her service, but it would not appear probable that she would do so, and that enmity would be restored between her and her son.

That the Vakil of Padmanabha Ramanna Garu filed a list which shows that out of the monthly allowance, Rupees 290-8-3, as detailed below, will be required for expenses, leaving a balance of Rupees 94-7-9 :-

	RS.	A.	P.
On account of wages and batta to the servants	105	8	3
For subsistence charges	50	0	0
Payment to Durgamma Garu, step-mother of the petitioner	90	0	0
Do. to Ramanamma, a sharer	45	0	0
Total	290	8	3

It also appears from an entry in the above list that the monthly payment of Rupees 45 to Ramanamma has not been made from 1873, so that the balance on surplus amount to Rupees 139-7-9, that this balance may conveniently be applied towards the liquidation of the debts, and that it seems unnecessary to contract the debts.

That the Rajah's (petitioner) Vakil filed also a list of debts due by his master as below :-

	RS.
Amount of debts contracted by the father of the Rajah	2,900
Amount of debts contracted by Venkata Lakshamma since the death of her husband	7,050
Total	9,950

To the existence of these debts, the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma also admits.

That of the above amount of debts, Rupees 3,000 due to Ketaraz Jagannadham Pantulu were taken for the performance of marriages of the Rajah (petitioner) and his sister as admitted by the both parties; that why the remaining debts were contracted, it would not appear; that on questioning the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma if there are any accounts relating to these debts, he stated that the accounts, &c., are in the fort, while Babbellapati Narasingarayudu stated that no accounts were kept from some years under the orders of Venkata Lakshamma; that in the absence of account, it is not possible to know for what purpose the amount of the debts was spent, and that from Venkata Lakshamma involving herself in debts to a larger amount than her husband did, it is presumed that she indulged herself in much extravagance.

The minor Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna was present before the Tahsildar at the inquiry.

He is now 17 years old. From what he said, he seemed able to manage his household affairs, as he also said he would do so. He did not pass his 18th year of age; the law provides that until the expiry of 18 years, minors cannot be allowed to manage for themselves, but the petitioner holds no Zemindari except his household affairs. Tahsildar does not consider that the petitioner should be precluded from transacting his household business before the end of his 18th year of age.

Under all the above circumstances, Tahsildar sees no objection to Rajah Padmanabha Ramanagar (petitioner) being removed from the charge of his mother Venkata Lakshamma as guardian and the monthly allowance paid on the receipt of the petitioner. He also proposes that from the amount of the monthly allowance, a sum of Rupees 30 to his mother and Rupees 50 on account of her second son Chendramavuli Naidu may be allowed for their maintenance. He also states that Venkata Lakshamma would not remove Kotaya from her service as she is not willing to do so.

(Signed) B. HORSBRUGH,
Sub-Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with the recommendation that payment of the pension and arrears be made on behalf of the minor to his father-in-law until the minor comes of age, on the condition that a suitable allowance is made to those entitled to it, with regard to which the Collector may be authorized to come to an arrangement with Chirumamilla Seshadri.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

No. 163. Telegram from RAJAH VASIREDDI VENCATA LAKSHMAMMA GARU, Masulipatam, to Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 15th July 1878.

PRAY not decide my case pending arrival petition posted.

No. 164. Petition from RAJAH VASIREDDI VENCATA LAKSHMAMMA GARU, widow of the late RAJAH VASIREDDI NAIDAMMA BAHADOOR MANNE SULTAN, residing at Chintapalli Village, Sattanapalle Taluk, now at Masulipatam District, dated 14th July 1878.

ABSTRACT.—Adverting to the enclosed endorsement of the Board of Revenue, to the effect that “the matter referred to has been submitted for the orders of Government,” states that she is not aware whether the Board referred her case to Government after considering all the grounds of her petition to them (the Board).

Submits, therefore, the same petition to Government for their perusal, and prays that, on a merciful consideration of the whole case, justice may be rendered to petitioner, who is a helpless and ruined widow.

No. 165. ORDER THEREON, 16th October 1878, No. 1,672.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government observe that the pension already stands in the name of the minor, Padmanabha Ramanna, who is the senior male representative of this branch of the Vasireddi family.

They are convinced that the policy of recognising a single head in these cases is essential for the purpose of continuing the families in a position of respectability, and would therefore allow no change in this respect in the present case, though the Board's recommendation will be adopted to the extent of recognising the receipt of the uncle and father-in-law of the minor on his behalf for the pension, in lieu of that of the mother, as formerly sanctioned.

2. The Collector will report, through the Board, what arrangements are made for the maintenance of the other members of the family.

3. The Government are of opinion that the minor, or his representative, should recognise the debt incurred by his mother for the marriage of his sister, which appears moderate, but that he is not bound to recognise his mother's dissipated extravagance.

4. The petitioner Vencata Lakshamma will be referred to the Collector.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Petition Department.

18695
 31-1-22
 14.10.26 ✓
 21.12.33 ✓
 3-4-39 ✓

Pension enjoyed by the late Vasireddi Naidamma in the Kistna District.—Observing that the — already stands in the name of the minor, Padmanabha Ramanna, the senior male representative of this branch of the Vasireddi family; desiring, for reason stated, to allow in the present case any change in the policy of recognizing a single head for the purpose of continuing the families in a position of respectability; directing the Collector to report, through the Board, the arrangements made for the maintenance of the children of the family; and considering that the minor, or his representative, should recognize the debt incurred by his mother for the marriage of his sister, referring petitioner to Collector.

OCTOBER
 Nos. 162-165.

G.O. 16th October 1878, No. 1,672.

Recd.
 Dated October 16th.
 Printed 23rd.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

REVENUE.

G.O. of 1878

Original

Vice. no. 1143/79. 413
 3035/81.

No. 163-164 117

Slam 9

No. 1,861.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th July 1878.

Read the following letter from J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 14th June 1878, No. 1,222 :—

In renewing the allowance enjoyed by the late Vasireddi Naidamma on the name of his minor son Padmanabha Ramanna, it was stated in G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867, that the allowance should be paid to the minor's mother Venkata Lakshamma until he attained his majority. The allowance was accordingly paid to her up to June 1877, and from July it was stopped at the request* of the minor's

* In arzi of 9th July 1877.

mother owing to a quarrel between herself and her first son.

2. The latter petitioned† the Collector that his mother abused the trust reposed in her, contracted debts and became very extravagant, so that the allowance

Rupees 385 became insufficient even for their maintenance; that she left their usual residence at Chintapalli and went to Masulipatam, leaving him alone in the former place; and that he might be removed from her guardianship and be allowed to draw his allowance himself.

3. The minor's mother petitioned‡ to the effect that she has neither abused her trust nor contracted any debts; that her son's petition was presented by the

instigation of her brother, who is also the minor's father-in-law with the intention of his assuming the management of the household affairs; that she left Chintapalli as she was ill-treated by her brother; that there is no reason to remove her son from her guardianship and to pay the allowance to him, and that if the allowance be paid to her son it should be split up equally between her two sons Padmanabha Ramanna, the petitioner, and her second son Chandramavuli Naidu, who was born after her husband's death, she being pregnant at that time. She further requested that until the matter was settled the allowance might be kept in deposit.

4. The petition was referred to the Sub-Collector. A copy of his letter and of the memorandum which accompanied it are enclosed. It will be observed therefrom that the statement of the minor is correct; that his mother has abused her trust and is unfit for the post of guardian; that the allowance may be paid direct to the minor who is able to manage his household affairs; that there is no chance of reconciliation between the members of the family, and that Government are to determine who are entitled to share in the allowance in question.

5. The minor and his mother were then called upon to report on the last point.

1 Himself.	1 His step-mother.	The minor states that his late father's family consists of six members including himself as per margin; that out of them his two sisters have no right whatever to
1 His brother (minor).	2 His two sisters.	
1 His mother.		

receive any allowance as they were given in marriage to wealthy persons possessing landed property; that the remaining three are to be protected by himself; and if they do not like it, he may be allowed to pay them as follows :—

	Monthly. rs.
To mother and brother	50
Step-mother who has been drawing for a long time 25 Rupees per month notwithstanding the Kararnama to pay her Rupees 90 monthly	25

6. The mother states that beside herself and her two sons there are three members who are entitled to receive a share in the pension, viz., the 1st wife of her late husband Durgamma, and her two daughters, who, though married, have been in the habit of receiving allowances as shown in the margin.

	Monthly. rs.
Durgamma under registered Karar-nama	90
1st daughter besides giving food	15
2nd daughter besides giving food	10

7. I do not think that any provision is needed for the sisters who have married into other families, and would recommend that the allowance be made payable to the minor on the understanding that the suitable provision is made for the other members of the family, viz., mother, step-mother and brother. He proposes to provide only Rupees 75 for these, but I think that this may reasonably be doubled.

8. The minor claims to be now 18 years of age, but our accounts show that he is only 16. I would recommend that his father-in-law Chirumamilla Seshadri be empowered to receive the pension on his behalf during the remaining two years of his minority.

9. The usual application for payment of arrears of pension is herewith forwarded for the Board's sanction.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

STATEMENT showing the Amount of Arrears of Allowance due to the undermentioned individual in the Kistna District.

Number of Certificate.	Name of Pensioner.	Amount of Pension per Annum.	Date of Government Authority.	Nature of the Grant.	Period for which amount of arrears due.	Total amount of arrears.	Explanation of cause of Suspension.	Remarks of the Board of Revenue.	Government sanction.
	Vasireddi Padmanabha Ramanna.	rs. 4,620	G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867.	Compensation in lieu of resumed lands.	From July 1877 to May 1878.	rs. 4,235	In G.O., No. 1,471, of 2nd July 1867, the pension enjoyed by the late V. Naidamma was renewed in the name of his eldest son Padmanabha Ramanna, and it was ordered that the pension should be paid to his mother Venkata Lakshammamma during his minority. Disputes having subsequently arisen between the minor and his mother, the payment of pension has been stopped from July 1877 at the request of the mother. After inquiry, Report No. 1,222, dated 14th June 1878, has been sent to the Board. I therefore request that you will be good enough to obtain their sanction for payment to Chirumamilla Seshadri Naidu whom the minor has nominated to receive his pension on his behalf during the remainder of his minority, the arrears due to the minor from 1st July 1877 to 31st May 1878 amounting to Rupees 4,235.		

MASULIPATAM,
14th June 1878.

(Signed) J. G. HORSFALL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From B. HORSBRUGH, Esq., Sub-Collector, to the Collector of the Kistna District, dated Guntur, 8th August 1877, No. 434.

With reference to your endorsements, Nos. 918 and 1,106, dated 18th April and 1st June 1877, on the petitions from the minor pensioner of Chintapalli, I have the honor now to submit the result of the inquiries as embodied in the Tahsildar's report* and its enclosures herewith

* Dated 21st July 1877, No. 1,550.

sent; a rough translation* of the arzi is also put up with it.

2. From this inquiry and from all that I have heard I think there is no doubt that the mother, who was ordered to be entrusted with the pension by G.O., No. 1,471, dated 2nd July 1867, has abused her trust and gone to the bad.

3. I saw Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna three months ago. I think he might now be allowed to draw the pension himself. I do not think there is any chance of a reconciliation between the members of the family, and therefore I would suggest that Government should determine who are entitled to share in the pension, and then that each sharer should draw his share separately from the treasury.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collector.

MEMORANDUM.

RAJAH Vasireddi Padmanabha Ramanna, minor pensioner of Chintapalli in the Sattannepalli Taluq, submitted petition to the Collector under date 18th April 1877, stating that on the death of his father, the late Rajah Vasireddi Naidammagar in 1867, the Government in their Order, dated 2nd July 1867, had sanctioned the continuance of his allowance to him (petitioner) to be paid on the receipt of his mother who had been made his guardian; that his mother Venkata Lakshammamma had entered into extravagance, by which the monthly allowance having proved insufficient for the domestic and other expenses, she raised money by loans to a considerable amount; that the money-lenders were troubling him very much for the same; that he was unable to describe the difficulties he was undergoing by the extravagant habits of his mother; that he had advised his mother to give up those bad habits, but in vain, that she was consequently living separately from him and had conceived hatred towards him, by which he was afraid of his own life.

That orders to remove him from the support of his mother as guardian and to pay the monthly allowance on his own receipt might be therefore passed, and that if this could not be done, another guardian according to his selection might be appointed.

This petition and another on the subject were referred to the Sub-Collector for report.

The Sattannepalli Tahsildar by his arzi, dated 21st July 1877, No. 1,550, reports that he made inquiry on the subject, in which Babbellapati Narisingarayudu for the petitioner and Chintapalli Timmaraz for his mother were examined, as well as some others for the former.

B. Narasingarayudu, Vakil for the petitioner, states that amongst the servants of the Rajah (petitioner) there is one Tungala Kotaya, who, being a drunkard, supplies the petitioner's mother with liquor, &c., for drinking; that by this most part of the allowance money is being squandered away; that the minor Rajah (petitioner) once dismissed the said Tungala Kotaya from his service, ordering him not to come into the fort; that consequently his mother had left the fort during his absence and again taken Kotaya into her service; that should he (Kotaya) remain with her, many troubles are apprehended to the Rajah (petitioner); that as the Rajah is able to carry on the management for himself, the monthly allowance may be ordered to be paid on his receipt.

Chintapalli Timmaraz, Vakil for Venkata Lakshammamma, mother of the Rajah, stated that the petitioner is now 17 years old; that unless he is 18 years old, he could not be entrusted with the allowance money; that the elder brother of the petitioner's mother, named Chirumamilla Seshadri Naidu, had given his daughter in marriage to the petitioner, and therefore with the view of having in his own hand the entire management (of his house) had instigated the petitioner and caused the allowance money for November and December 1876 to be sent for and expended by him (petitioner); that in order to deprive his mother and his younger brother Chendramavuli Naidu of any share in the estate had caused such petitions to be submitted by his son-in-law; and that petitioner's mother Venkata Lakshammamma had not made any undue expenses from the allowance money.

Mulugu Chendramavuli of Chintapalli stated that the petitioner Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna and his mother Venkata Lakshammamma are not in good terms with each other; that Venkata Lakshammamma had left the fort and is now living in another house; that Tungala Kotaya was from former times employed in the fort and is not under her in common with some other servants;

that he heard that the petitioner had ordered Kotaya not to come into the fort, which is the cause for her leaving the fort; that the (deponent) had never used to go into the fort, and therefore he does not know what passes there.

Chintapalli Bhavanisenkarudu, Curnam of Chintapalli, stated that seven months ago Rajah Venkata Lakshamma had left the fort for Taduvayi village without remaining with her son; that she returned to the village and put up in a Brahmin's house where she still resides owing to the removal by her son of Tungala Kotaya from his service; that Venkata Lakshamma again received Tungala Kotaya into her service; that Tungala Kotaya used to bring liquor and supply it to Venkata Lakshamma; that he heard that this Kotaya had been convicted of the offence of having clandestinely brought liquor and been punished with heavy fine which Venkata Lakshamma had paid for him; that Kotaya being a drunkard persuaded Venkata Lakshamma to make extravagant expenses; that the petitioner requested his mother while at Taduvayi to return and live with him in the fort at Chintapalli, but she did not do so; that with frugality of expenditure the allowance money would be sufficient for their charges.

Sivalanka Mallayya, Munsif of the village, corroborated the above in every particular point. He also added that Venkata Lakshamma used to make the expenditure extravagantly, and also contracted loans to a large amount.

Pesapati Ramayya of Chintapalli stated that Cherumamilla Chinna Seshadri Naidu, son-in-law of Rajah Venkata Lakshamma, and Tungala Kotaya, both had executed to him a bond for Rupees 64, which they had received from him in cash on account of the abkari kist; that he had lent the money at the request of Venkata Lakshamma; that the money had been returned to him one month afterwards; that there subsisted enmity between Venkata Lakshamma and her son Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna for the last six months, because the former had spent the entire amount of the allowance money for undue purposes, putting him (petitioner) to inconvenience for domestic expenses and had contracted loans, for the repayment whereof the money-lenders were greatly troubling him; that this Tungala Kotaya was fed in the fort in addition to batta paid to other servants, and then he was also given clothes.

Kokkireni Butchayya of Chintapalli stated that he used at different times to procure loans of money amounting to about Rupees 300 and pay the money to Venkata Lakshamma and Kotaya at the request of the former when money was required for purchasing liquor and other such things; that he also paid some money to the abkari shopkeepers; that some of the above money was borrowed on the mortgage of her jewels; that after Kotaya was sent away from the fort, Venkata Lakshamma left the fort and went to Taduvayi; that she returned again and put up in another house in the village; and that Kotaya is still in the service of Venkata Lakshamma.

The Tahsildar further states that from the foregoing it is clear that Venkata Lakshamma used to send for liquor, &c., by Tungala Kotaya, who was employed in the fort, for her own use, inasmuch as the said Kotaya is exceedingly addicted to drinking; that on account of this large portion of the allowance money has been squandered away; that the Rajah (petitioner) having turned out the said Kotaya from his service in the fort, Venkata Lakshamma left the fort during her son's absence and is living separately.

That no witnesses were called by the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma to prove the contrary.

That it is nine years since he came to this taluq (as Tahsildar); that from years past, he came to understand that Venkata Lakshamma used to get liquor by Tungala Kotaya and indulge herself in excesses; that therefore she was obliged to mortgage her jewels to procure loans of money, the allowance money not being sufficient for her expenditure; and that she has been making extravagant expenses according to the advice of the said Kotaya; that she had the abkari lease undertaken on her behalf which shows that she became a drunkard.

That her eldest son having removed Kotaya from service, Venkata Lakshamma by favor towards the latter fell out with her son and left the fort with her second son and widowed daughter and others, the said Kotaya being re-employed in her service; that Venkata Lakshamma tells that she will remove Kotaya from her service, but it would not appear probable that she would do so, and that enmity would be restored between her and her son.

That the Vakil of Padmanabha Ramanna Garu filed a list which shows that out of the monthly allowance, Rupees 290-8-3, as detailed below, will be required for expenses, leaving a balance of Rupees 94-7-9 :-

	RS.	A.	P.
On account of wages and batta to the servants	105	8	3
For subsistence charges	50	0	0
Payment to Durgamma Garu, step-mother of the petitioner	90	0	0
Do. to Ramanamma, a sharer	45	0	0
Total	290	8	3

It also appears from an entry in the above list that the monthly payment of Rupees 45 to Ramanamma has not been made from 1873, so that the balance on surplus amount to Rupees 139-7-9, that this balance may conveniently be applied towards the liquidation of the debts, and that it seems unnecessary to contract the debts.

That the Rajah's (petitioner) Vakil filed also a list of debts due by his master as below :-

	RS.
Amount of debts contracted by the father of the Rajah	2,900
Amount of debts contracted by Venkata Lakshamma since the death of her husband	7,050
Total	9,950

To the existence of these debts, the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma also admits.

That of the above amount of debts, Rupees 3,000 due to Ketaraz Jagannadham Pantulu were taken for the performance of marriages of the Rajah (petitioner) and his sister as admitted by the both parties; that why the remaining debts were contracted, it would not appear; that on questioning the Vakil of Venkata Lakshamma if there are any accounts relating to these debts, he stated that the accounts, &c., are in the fort, while Babbellapati Narasingarayudu stated that no accounts were kept from some years under the orders of Venkata Lakshamma; that in the absence of account, it is not possible to know for what purpose the amount of the debts was spent, and that from Venkata Lakshamma involving herself in debts to a larger amount than her husband did, it is presumed that she indulged herself in much extravagance.

The minor Rajah Padmanabha Ramanna was present before the Tahsildar at the inquiry.

He is now 17 years old. From what he said, he seemed able to manage his household affairs, as he also said he would do so. He did not pass his 18th year of age; the law provides that until the expiry of 18 years, minors cannot be allowed to manage for themselves, but the petitioner holds no Zemindari except his household affairs. Tahsildar does not consider that the petitioner should be precluded from transacting his household business before the end of his 18th year of age.

Under all the above circumstances, Tahsildar sees no objection to Rajah Padmanabha Ramannagar (petitioner) being removed from the charge of his mother Venkata Lakshamma as guardian and the monthly allowance paid on the receipt of the petitioner. He also proposes that from the amount of the monthly allowance, a sum of Rupees 30 to his mother and Rupees 50 on account of her second son Chendramavuli Naidu may be allowed for their maintenance. He also states that Venkata Lakshamma would not remove Kotaya from her service as she is not willing to do so.

(Signed) B. HORSBRUGH,
Sub-Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with the recommendation that payment of the pension and arrears be made on behalf of the minor to his father-in-law until the minor comes of age on the condition that a suitable allowance is made to those entitled to it, with regard to which the Collector may be authorized to come to an arrangement with Chirumamilla Seshadri.

(True Copies and Extract.)

J. S. Seshadri
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of the Kistna District.

Erd. A. Grubert.

Person—enjoyed by the late Vasireddi Naik, anna, in Krishna District and returned to his minor son Padmanabha Rammanna.—Recommendment that payment of the — and arrears be made on behalf of the minor to his father-in-law until the minor comes of age on condition that a suitable allowance is made to those entitled to it.

[illegible]

1 These papers relate to a pension of Rs 385 per mensem enjoyed by the late Vasireddi Haidz - annua - Krishna District, and renewed to his minor son Pudmanabha Ram - annua.

2. Vasireddi Naid.
- anna died in March
1864, leaving the under-
- mentioned family. -

I do as the B^o
 recommend - and
 make an allow^t of
 the Brother² - of P^y
 150 - reimbursing the
 balance of 235 & the
 father - law of the
 Elder Son 150

2 Widows (1) Durgamma and
(2) Venkata Laksh-
-amma.

2 Daughters
1 Son, Padma-
nabha Ram-
-amma, aged
5 years — } Children of
Venkata
Lakshman-
-ma.

Mother. Ramamma

It was also stated that
Venkata Lakshmanamma
was pregnant.

3. The Govt then
sanctioned the contin-
-uance of the allowance
in the name of Pad-
manabha Ramamma
and its payment on
his mother's receipt
during his minority.

4 The collector of the
Mistna District now
reports.

G.O. 2^d July 1867.
No 1471.

Cameat No. 3194

reports
that the allowance
was accordingly paid
to the minor's mother.
Venkata Lakshmanamma
up to June 1877, and
that from July it
was stopped at her
request owing to a
quarrel between
herself and her son
Padmanabha
Ramamma.

5 The latter
petitioned the Collector
that his mother
abused her trust,
Contracted

2 ~~and~~ contracted debts and became
very extravagant,
1 and that he might
be removed from her
guardianship and
be allowed to draw
his allowance him-
self.

6. The minor's mother
also petitioned to the
effect that she neither
abused her trust
nor contracted any
debts, and that her
sons' petition was
presented

presented
by the instigation of
her brother, who is
also the minor's
father-in-law, with
the intention of his
assuming the
management of the
household affairs.

She asked that
if the allowance
be paid to her son,
it should be split
up equally between
her two sons —

Radmanatha

Padmanabha is
Ramanna, and
her second son
Chandramamli
Aidu, who was
born after her
husband's death,
she being pregnant
at that time.

After enquiring,
the Sub-Collector
thinks there is
no doubt that the
mother

21
mother has abused her trust and
gone to the bad, and that there
is no chance of any reconcilia-
tion between the members of
the family.

3. The Collector recommends
that the allowance be made
payable to the minor, on the
understanding that suitable
provision is made for the
mother, step-mother and bro-
ther, the sisters being excluded,
as they have married into
other families. For the three
former, the minor proposes
Rs 75. but the Collector
thinks that this may reasona-
bly be doubled.

* To mother and brother Rs 60.
Step-mother --- 25

75

385-56h
150 Hone
235 Rate

4. As the minor, though
claiming to be 18 years, is
only 16, as shown by the
accounts, the Collector
further

Further recommends that his father-in-law Cherumamilla Seshadri be empowered to receive the pension on his behalf during the remaining two years of his minority.

10 The Board's recommendation is "that payment of the pension and arrears be made on behalf of the Minor to his father-in-law until the Minor comes of age, on the condition that a suitable allowance is made to those entitled to it"; and that on this point the Collector "be authorized to come to an arrangement with Cherumamilla Seshadri".

11 Venkata Lakshmana has also addressed a Petition

Petition No 1537 of 1878

27
Petition in which she submits that the brothers should share equally in the allowance "after deducting other charges or maintenance of the widows". She asks, 1st That an equal allotment of the allowance may be made between the brothers after deducting the charges. 2nd That if the eldest son's share be handed over to his father-in-law on his behalf, the other share may be paid directly to her from the Treasury on behalf of her other son.

gll

1878

Memorandum

Relates to a pension enjoyed
by the late Vasireddi Sairam-
damma in Krishna Dist and
renewed to her minor son
Padmanatha Ramanna

Revenue Department.

No 1672

Proceedings of the Madras Government.
Under date the 16 October 1878

Read the following:-

Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue recommending that
payment of the pension enjoyed
by the late Vasireddi Sairamma
in Krishna District and renewed
to his minor son Padmanatha
Ramanna and arrears be made
on behalf of the minor to his father
in law until the minor comes
of age on condition that a suit-
able allowance is made to those
entitled to it

A.E. 5 July 1878 No 1861.

Petition from Raja Vasireddi
Vengata Lakshmanamma
Garu

A.E. 15 July 1878 Petition
No 1505

Petition from Raja Vasireddi
Vengata Lakshmanamma
Garu

A.E. 14 July 1878 Petition
No 1537.

1. The Govt observe that
the pension already stands

in the name of the minor,
Padmanabha Ramanna
who is the senior male
representative of this
branch of the Vairavdi
family.

They are convinced
that the policy of recognising
a single head in these
cases is essential for the
purpose of continuing the
families in a position
of respectability and would
therefore allow no change
in this respect in the pre-
sent case though the
Board's recommendation will
be adopted to the extent
of recognising the receipt
of the Uncle & father-in-law
of the minor on his behalf
for the pension, in lieu of
that of the mother, as formerly
sanctioned

sanctioned.

2. The collector will
report, through the Board,
what arrangements are
made for the maintenance
of the other members of the
family.

3. The Government are
of opinion that the minor,
or his representative, should
recognise the debt incurred
by his mother for the marriage
of his sister which appears
moderate, but that he is
not bound to recognise his
mother's dissipated extravagance.

4. The Petitioner Venkata
Lakshmananna will be
referred to the collector.

List from Orders

14 To the Board of Revenue 25-2-25
1 To the Collector 25-2-25

40/3

Y
JCC

Respecting Concern of Ch...
natha Ramanna, minor son
of Vasireddi Naidanna
Kistna District