

680/6

M.R.O. 1-20,002-12-3-65.

(1) Number of Pages.....12.....
(2) Date of repair.....19.11.66.....
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....*h*.....

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

SPARE COPY

G.O. No.	680	Press
~~B.P. No.~~		Mis.
Dated	8. 8. 1889	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 11th February 1887, Mis. No. 907, Revenue :—

Read—petition from N. C. SRINIVASA CHARIAR, Manager of the Hindu devasthanam of Sankaramanallur, on behalf of the temple committee of Udamalpet taluk, Coimbatore, dated 4th February 1887.

ABSTRACT.—Praying that certain village be declared an inam village, &c.

Order—dated 11th February 1887, Mis. No. 907, Revenue.

The petitioner should forward an authenticated copy of the Inam Commissioner's order on the subject.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secy. to Government.

To the petitioner.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 23rd August 1887, Mis. No. 4972, Revenue :—

Read—endorsement from the Private Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, dated 2nd May 1887.

ABSTRACT.—Transfers a petition from N. C. Srinivasa Chari, Manager, Sankaramanallur devasthanam, Coimbatore district, praying for a declaration that Sankaramanallur is an entire devasthanam inam village and order for the cancellation of the title-deeds granted to the village service inams.

Read—petition from ANANTHA RAMIER and others, Udamalpet taluk, Coimbatore district.

ABSTRACT.—Praying to be relieved of their trouble in regard to water-supply.

Read—letter from the Inam Commissioner, dated 16th June 1887, No. 201.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting copies of correspondence that passed between his office and the Collector of Coimbatore showing that the village of Sankaramanallur is an aggregation of minor inams and that it is a Government village.

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 19th July 1887, No. 1311, Routine.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting to Government certain papers connected with the petition from Anantha Ramier and others of Kolumum in Udamalpet taluk, Coimbatore district, regarding levy of water-rate.

Order—dated 23rd August 1887, Mis. No. 4972, Revenue.

The two petitions and their accompaniments will be referred to the Collector of Coimbatore for a full and careful report after such further inquiry as he may deem necessary. The allegations made in the petition, dated 4th February 1887, should in particular be carefully examined with reference to the records relied upon by the petitioner. It should also be stated why the inam lands were not separately surveyed and settled.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secy. to Government.

To the Collector of Coimbatore with two petitions and their
seven enclosures to be returned.

Copy to the petitioner.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 22nd September 1887, Mis. No. 5704,
Revenue:—

Read—petition from ANANTHIER, Landholder, Udamalpet taluk, Coimbatore
district, dated 10th September 1887.

ABSTRACT.—Laying claim to the free and exclusive use of the Sankaramanallur channel.

Order—dated 22nd September 1887, Mis. No. 5704, Revenue.

The Government will not receive a petition on any matter, unless it shall appear that the petitioner has first applied to the local authority, and also to the Board or other controlling authority, where such exists. The petitions addressed to such local and controlling authorities, or copies of them, and the answers or orders of those authorities, respectively, if any shall have been passed, must be annexed to the petition addressed to Government.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secy. to Government.

To the petitioner.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 22nd October 1887, Mis. No. 6385, Revenue:—

Read—again G.O., dated 22nd September 1887, Mis. No. 5704, Revenue.

Read—also petition from ANANTHA RAMIER, Coimbatore district, dated 13th
October 1887.

ABSTRACT.—Praying for justice in the matter of the Sankaramanallur channel case.

Order—dated 22nd October 1887, Mis. No. 6385, Revenue.

Referred to the Collector of Coimbatore for report in continuation of G.O.,
Mis. No. 4972, dated 23rd August 1887.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secy. to Government.

To the Collector of Coimbatore with three petitions
and seven enclosures to be returned.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 8th April 1889, Mis. No. 2244, Revenue:—
Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated
19th March 1889, Mis. No. 1659:—

THE HON. J. GROSE, M.A.

Read—the following letter from J. STURROCK, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore,
to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department (through the Board of
Revenue), dated Coimbatore, 11th January 1889, No. 21:—

I have the honor to submit the report called for in G.O., dated 23rd August
1887, No. 4972 (enclosure returned).

2. In this district there were six villages known as "devasthanam villages."

Karur	...	...	...	} Karur taluk.
Achimangalam	...	...	...	
Yellavanur	...	...	...	
Velambudi	...	...	...	
Perur	...	...	...	} Coimbatore taluk.
Sankaramanallur	...	...	...	
				Udamalpet "

3. At the settlement by the Inam Commissioner the four former were treated as
entire inam villages and the latter were not. I can find nothing on record to indicate
the grounds for the diversity of treatment, but it may be worth noting that those
treated as entire inams were investigated by one officer, and the remaining two by
another.

4. When the enfranchisement of the village service inams was in progress in
the district, it was decided by the Inam
* Letter, dated 27th Sept. 1883, No. 307. Commissioner * that the service inams in
the entire inam villages should not be enfranchised, but that enfranchisement might
proceed in Sankaramanallur which was an aggregation of separate inams.

5. After the service inams had been enfranchised, a series of petitions commenced,
and on that presented to Government, on the 29th April 1887, a full report has been
called for.

6. With these introductory remarks I now proceed as directed to examine the
allegations made in the petition, dated 4th February 1887.

7. Paragraph 4 of the petition of the 4th February.—I can find nothing in any
inscriptions which throws any light on the matter.

8. Paragraphs 5 to 28 are narrative. In paragraph 29 is given a list of the
documents on which the petitioners base their claim, and the relevant allegations in
the narrative can be most conveniently dealt with by an examination of the documents
cited in paragraph 29, and of those subsequently produced or brought to notice by
the petitioners.

9. The order referred to in (i) does not, as alleged, declare that the village in
question is a whole inam village, but the inam lands assigned by the order and enu-
merated in (ii) are partly in the devasthanam village of Sankaramanallur and partly in
Government villages. In the case of the Government villages the measurements of
the assessed lands are alone given, while with regard to the devasthanam village the
whole ayacut is entered and the extent of the inam calculated by deducting minor inams
and poramboke. This is the same form as that adopted in the Inam Commissioner's
settlement of whole inam villages, with regard to which the Inam Commissioner

explained in a letter, dated 4th October 1865, that the exclusion of poramboke was in no way intended to bar the right of the inamdars to enjoy the same as part of their village.*

10. In the list of villages (iii) of the Udamalpet taluk prepared in fasli 1211, the taluk is said to contain 18 Government villages and 52 hamlets and one devasthanam village with five hamlets.

11. Document (iv) is the jamabandi account of fasli 1211. The boundaries of the devasthanam village are given, and the irrigation works, &c., are particularized as stated, but it cannot be said that this proves anything more than that the whole village was styled a "devasthanam" village which has been throughout admitted. A similar remark applies to document (v).

12. The inam settlement account of fasli 1214 (document vi) seems to assign as devasthanam tasdik for two temples the whole of the ayacut less minor inams (including resumed inams), though poramboke is deducted in the same way as in document (ii). It is to be noted in connection with the inam settlement that the painash numbers of the fields shown as resumed inams in the account are the same as those of the only lands which were treated as Sirkar lands at the time of settlement and survey.

13. The kamnijasti accounts of fasli 1223 (document vii) show that the Government area remained throughout the same as that resumed, while there were additions from poramboke to cultivated inam lands and *vice versa*.

14. Documents (viii) and (ix) prove nothing more than (vii).

15. Nothing can be inferred, so far as I can see, in favor of the petitioners' claim from the hukumnama of 1847 (x), which is in general terms based on Board's Proceedings, dated 22nd March 1847. On the 2nd February 1847 a statement was submitted by the Collector to the Board, in which entire and minor inams were separately entered. A copy of the statement is not now forthcoming here, but it will probably be found in the Board's office.

16. With reference to (xi) I am directed to state why the inam lands were not separately surveyed and settled. I can find no explanation of this.

17. Amongst the documents put in by the appellants after the commencement of this inquiry, there is a transcript of cadjan accounts (marked o) which was drawn up and filed before Mr. Cole in 1885. This document shows the amounts spent by the devasthanam on the different irrigation works in the village between the years 1849 and 1862. There is also a memorandum (marked v) drawn up by the karnam in fasli 1235, describing the state of the "devasthanam irrigation works." From this memorandum it appears that the works were then being repaired from devasthanam funds. I have not been able to find any account of monies spent by Government on the irrigation works of the village, and no water-rate seems ever to have been charged by Government on dry inam fields irrigated from them until after the decision of the Inam Commissioner now under appeal.

18. The documents above noted seem to me to tend to support the devasthanam claims; against this I can only point to the fact that all the six devasthanam villages in the district were at one time regarded as Government villages. In the lists drawn up showing the lands made over to the management of the temple committees in 1847 occupied fields and assessed waste were alone shown. The sources of irrigation were entered in the annual lists of Government irrigation works and darkhasts were freely granted from poramboke in all but this one village of Sankaramanallur. The fact that no darkhasts were granted in Sankaramanallur was no doubt due to its remote situation and laxity of administration rather than to any distinction intentionally drawn between it and the other villages.

19. In conclusion I am distinctly of opinion that Sankaramanallur is as much entitled to be regarded as an entire inam as any other inam village in the district.

* Paragraph 2.—The exclusion of poramboke from the extent of land entered in the title-deeds issued for whole villages of whatever description is simply on account of the generally uncultivable character of such lands; but the exclusion is in no way intended to bar the right of the inamdars to cultivate such lands when practicable and enjoy the same as part and parcel of their village.

Resolution—dated 19th March 1889, Mis. No. 1659.

Submitted to Government.

2. The Board agree with the Collector in thinking that there has been no good cause for treating Sankaramanallur differently from the other villages referred to which have been settled as entire inam villages.

3. In the list mentioned in paragraph 15 of the letter read above, the inam in question is entered as sarva inam, and, of the other villages settled as entire inams, some are entered as entire villages and some as sarva inams like Sankaramanallur.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with nine enclosures returned and with petition
No. 180 of 1889 to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated
19th March 1889, Mis. No. 1666:—

THE HON. J. GROSE, M.A.

Read—the following letter from J. STURROCK, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department (through the Commissioners of Land Revenue), dated Coimbatore, 11th January 1889, No. 20:—

In reply to G.O., dated 23rd October 1887, No. 6385 (enclosures returned), I have the honor to state that, in my letter, No. 21 of this day's date, I have reported that in my opinion the Sankaramanallur village is as much entitled to be treated as an entire inam village as any other inam village in this district.

2. If this view be accepted, the claim to treat the channel as a Government source of irrigation falls to the ground.

3. It may be mentioned that, since Mr. Leman's letter recorded with Board's Proceedings, dated 25th March 1887, Mis. No. 2200, was written, it has been found that wet assessment on lands irrigated by this channel in the Sankaramanallur village was paid up to fasli 1257, in which year the management of temple affairs was given up by Government, and as the examination of records in connection with the inquiry about the Sankaramanallur village shows that there never was at any time more Government wet land in the village than acres 2.1 of resumed inam land, it is clear that the assessment on the wet land under the channel must have been credited to the devasthanam and the channel treated as a devasthanam channel.

4. If it be now decided that the Sankaramanallur village is an entire inam, the claim to the channel as a Government source of irrigation must be abandoned and the claim of the Kolumum ryots to take water from it, put forward in their petition to the Board, dated 13th October 1887, must be left for settlement with the devasthanam and Ananthier. Our settlement and irrigation registers show that the fields in question are within the ayacut of the Kolumum tank, but in some pattes of fasli 1274 the letter "va" for channel is entered against some of the fields, and as these lie on the other side of the channel from the tank, it is clear that water must either come from the channel or be brought across it. The precise meaning of the entry in the patta must be determined by the civil courts if the Government abandon their claim to the channel. The obligation of Government to the ryots is fulfilled by allowing them to take water from the tank.

ENCLOSURE.

From G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Coimbatore, 1st March 1887, Ref. on No. 901-Bd.

With reference to Board's Proceedings, Reference on Petition Register No. 718 of 31st May 1886 (enclosures returned), I have the honor to report as follows:—

2. The old records show that the affairs of the anicut are somewhat complicated.
3. In 1830, when the devasthanam inams were still under the Collector, the Tahsildar reports in reply to a takid that, by giving over the repairs to Mariappa Asari and Karuppan Asari, the anicut and channel may be put in order and 98½ cawnies made up of 3½ cawnies patta dry, 31½ cawnies of grass patta, 29 cawnies assessed waste, 23½ poramboké, and 11½ devasthanam service inam be irrigated, that the benefit to Sirkar would be Rs. 435 against the present assessment of Rs. 9-2-0.
4. After some correspondence in regard to the darkhastdars' solvency, the Collector in November 1830 told the Tahsildar to accept the darkhast, but the irrigable area was in 1834 reduced to 25 cawnies only. The Tahsildar was ordered to give every assistance in repairing the anicut and channel to Mariappa Asari as he agreed to pay 5 rupees wet assessment per cawny and that the names of the pattadars were to remain in the patta lands and the darkhastdars' names to be entered in waste irrigated.
5. This man seems to have done very little, and one Pushpa Reddi came to the front, and, with the Tahsildar's permission, paid the Asari the cost of what he had done (Rs. 140) to get the privilege given to him of repairing the anicut.
6. This did not meet the Collector's approval and he fined the Tahsildar, and takid, dated 27th February 1834, was sent ordering the Tahsildar to inform Mariappa Asari that, as he had not acted up to the terms of his agreement to irrigate 25 cawnies, the anicut would be made over to others to repair.
7. Mariappa Asari and Karuppan Asari objected that there were not 25 cawnies available, but their objection was overruled, and they were told to produce sureties (for the fulfilment of their contract).
8. In 1835, the Tahsildar reported that they were unable to fulfil their contract and that they wanted to make it over to Assan Sahib and Venkatapathi Naidu, which, after a statement by the Collector that Pushpa Reddi must be first consulted and a reply by the Tahsildar that he had refused to take it up, the Collector allowed.
9. The Tahsildar's arzi of 5th August 1833 forwards the darkhast of Assan Sahib and Venkatapathi Naidu. It is recited that Karuppan Asari and Mariappa Asari not being able to repair the anicut and pay assessment as agreed, it is sold to Assan Sahib and Venkatapathi Naidu and they agree to put the anicut in repair and irrigate 25 cawnies at ½ assessment for 43 and 44 faslis and full assessment of Rs. 5 a cawny in 45, i.e., Rs. 125, which assessment is to be paid whether cultivation is made or not. They gave security for this, and this was accepted by the Collector and a note on the arzi says "no answer."
10. From 1835 the records are silent. In 1864 the petitioner Ananthier purchased from Venkatapathi Naidu by a deed of sale the ruined anicut and channel in question, showing that though the agreement to repair and to irrigate 25 cawnies may have been once carried out, the anicut had been again washed away and irrigation stopped.
11. Since that there is nothing to show that his possession in the channel, &c., was questioned until Anantha Ramier brought it to notice that the channel was a Government channel on which the Collector's order, dated 16th November 1885, was passed to the effect that the channel was a Government source of irrigation.
12. At the time of paimaish this village was almost entirely inam, but it has now been settled as a Government village. The earliest Collector's order does not speak of the anicut as belonging to the devasthanam but as a Sirkar anicut, and the question asked is what profit may occur to Sirkar.
13. It is said that the Collector, who was at that time agent for the Board in the management of temple funds, may have meant to say devasthanam and not Sirkar, but no sufficient reason for such inference is shown, and, I think, as the doubt is raised, that the word Sirkar must be taken in its strict meaning "Government."
14. It is then to me quite clear that the Collector acting for Government and for the benefit of Government in 1835 gave Assan Sahib and Venkatapathi Naidu the permission to repair the anicut on condition of irrigating 25 cawnies and paying yearly, after fashi 45, Rs. 125 to Government; whether such conditions were or were not fulfilled is not material. It is

certain that in 1864 the anicut was again in disrepair and that without any reference to Government and without any condition of watering any land or paying any water-rate the anicut was sold by the son of Venkatapathi Naidu to the present claimant.

15. The wording seems to show that the anicut was washed away as soon as built, and though I cannot from the records show that the 125 rupees promised was ever collected, it is not possible to say it was never done, for the first two years were cowle.

16. It is manifest that Ananthier is not justified in saying that Venkatapathi Naidu ever had such right in the anicut that he could sell it without the original condition of paying Rs. 125 a year for irrigation holding good.

17. It also seems to me that the right that Assan Sahib and Venkatapathi Naidu had was to repair the anicut and so keep it—not to let it be destroyed again and then without reference to Government to sell it to others to repair.

18. The Collector *ab initio* interfered to regulate the arrangements made, and I think the re-making of it by Ananthier was an act he could not do without permission and as a further consequence without permission to irrigate and use Government water.

19. As regards the irrigation of the Kolumum lands they are said to be irrigated by the tank, but the river channel lies between them and the tank and cuts them off from it. Water can only get to them if carried over the channel or into it and then out of it again.

20. There is no evidence of the existence of any such aqueduct, except that of witnesses I do not believe.

21. But the lands were irrigated before 1864 when the channel was in disrepair, and it may safely be said that when this was the case there were no aqueducts but that the water passed into and out of the old line of the channel as convenient.

22. When therefore Ananthier renewed the old channel, the Kolumum people, who had been in the habit of taking their water through it, continued to do so, and as, I believe, they have done so to this day and cannot be interfered with by him.

23. The condition that 25 cawnies were to be irrigated and paid for every year has never been observed by Ananthier, and it should be enforced from this time and could be enforced in arrears.

24. As we cannot tell what extra land has been irrigated and if any has it would not by the present ruined tank rules be charged water-rate; there is no liability on account of this for lands watered in Sankaramanallur, but that the Kolumum lands now watered may continue to be watered without trouble and expense to the ryots, I would make a stipulation that if the Government does not claim the Rs. 125 due by Ananthier year by year since 1864, he should now agree that he will make no further resistance to their taking water from the channel for what land is now irrigated as long as the channel is open.

25. The Board's questions in the above reference may be thus answered:—

No. 1.—There is no evidence that the channel was constructed solely to irrigate devasthanam lands, for there is no evidence of its origin. When repaired in 1830 the Collector stipulated for a payment of Rs. 125 for water to be taken to the then supposed irrigable area (cawnies 25).

No. 2.—The owners, as they call themselves, have not paid anything to Government, because the conditions under which the repair of the anicut and channel were allowed have been always neglected.

No. 3.—The channel has only been in use since 1864 for any length of time together, and the Kolumum lands have always been watered. Petitioner was, by the conditions that bound the person from whom he purchased the anicut, bound to pay Rs. 125 a year which he has never done.

No. 4.—This so far as I know is untrue. Government once interfered, and the devasthanam people have records of clearance as well as Ananthier. The point becomes immaterial.

No. 5.—The matter is treated of already. I do not find the entry to be trustworthy, and I cannot say what channel is meant or whether the entry "channel" is trustworthy and should or should not be "tank."

No. 6.—Is answered in No. 4.

26. I therefore find that the channel and anicut are Government and not private property; that Ananthier must pay Government Rs. 125 a year for the use of it and the channel; that he may not interfere with the usual supply of water to the Kolumum ryots and that if he agrees to these terms, Government should forego the collection of the Rs. 125 which they can claim of him for the use of the anicut, channel and water since 1864.

Resolution—dated 19th March 1889, Mis. No. 1666.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 1659, dated 19th March 1889.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with ten enclosures returned and with petition No. 181 of
1889 and petition No. 882 of 1887, in original,
Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore. to be returned.

Read—also petition from N. C. SRINIVASA CHARIAR, Manager, Sankaramanallur devasthanam, Udamalpet taluk, Coimbatore district, dated 18th March 1889.

ABSTRACT.—Prays that, on the strength of the documents referred to within, Sankaramanallur be declared an entire devasthanam inam village and the title-deeds granted to village service inams be cancelled.

Order—dated 8th April 1889, Mis. No. 2244, Revenue.

Referred to the Inam Commissioner for early report.

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Inam Commissioner with current Nos. 2156, 2157 and 2233
and their enclosures, in original, to be returned.

Read—also petition from ANANTHA RAMIER, Coimbatore, dated 27th October 1887.

ABSTRACT.—Praying that Government may confirm their right to the Sankaramanallur channel, &c.

Read—also letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 18th March 1889, No. 234.

ABSTRACT.—Reporting that the report called for by Government in G.O., No. 6385, dated 22nd October 1887, regarding the Sankaramanallur channel has already been submitted by Mr. Sturrock in his letters, Nos. 20 and 21, dated 11th January 1889, through the Board of Revenue, Madras.

Read—also letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 26th March 1889, Ref. on No. 85-Govt.

ABSTRACT.—Reporting that the enclosures called for in Assistant Secretary's memorandum of 23rd March 1889 will be submitted on their receipt from C. A. Venkatakrishnaiah who has been called upon to send them.

Read—also letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 8th April 1889, Ref. on No. 1075-Petn.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding copies of two of the documents called for in memorandum, dated 23rd March 1889, and stating that Venkatakrishnaiah wants one month's time to produce the other three documents.

Read—also the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Inam Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Madras, 14th June 1889, No. 216:—

With reference to G.O., dated 8th April 1889, Mis. No. 2244 (enclosures herewith returned), I have the honor to report as follows:—

2. Petitioner, who is the manager of the pagodas of Thandayesvara Swami and Kalyana Varadarajuswami, claims that the village of Sankaramanallur attached to the said pagodas may be treated as an entire inam village and that the enfranchisement of service inams in it already carried out by the Inam Deputy Collector may be cancelled.

3. The six villages noted in the margin are attached to different devasthanams in the district. They were settled originally in the year 1862 by the Inam Deputy Collectors, T. Kristna Rao and Tholasinga Mudaliar, the villages 1 to 4 by the former, and 5 and 6 by the latter. In the four villages settled by the former, he, with reference to the entries in the old accounts, recognized them as entire inam villages and entered them in the registers as such, but the latter in settling the other two villages omitted to mention that they were entire inam villages and hence this lengthy correspondence. During the settlement of service inams in the Coimbatore district in 1881, the Deputy Collector brought to the notice of the Collector that the devasthanam villages above referred to with the exception of Sankaramanallur (in which only a small portion was surveyed) had been surveyed and settled and requested to be informed whether the service inams in the villages should not be enfranchised. The Collector in recommending the enfranchisement of the service inams in these villages observed that there was nothing on record to show that they were ever exclusively assigned to the devasthanam. Mr. Horsley, the then Inam Commissioner, asked the Collector to ascertain and report the opinion of the trustees on the matter. In his letter, dated 20th September 1883, No. 488, the Collector reported that the trustees insisted that the villages were entire inams and objected to the enfranchisement of the service inams therein. Mr. Wilson, who had succeeded Mr. Horsley, after perusing the correspondence connected with the case and the entries in the inam register, decided that the first 4 villages were entire inams, while the fifth was for the most part merely an aggregation of separate inams, and that therefore the service inams in the former should not, and those in the latter should, be enfranchised. I perused the inam registers of all the devasthanam villages and find them all to be aggregations of minor inams, as in the case of Sankaramanallur. They appear to have at first been granted as entire inam villages but subsequently the then trustees for the sake of convenience parcelled out the various service inams out of the entire inam and assigned them to the several office-bearers in the devasthanam to remunerate them for their services in lieu of ready money payment. During the inam inquiry, the Deputy Collector settled these minor inams and those reserved for the upkeep of devasthanams according to actual enjoyment and hence each village, instead of having one title-deed in the name of the pagoda to which it is attached, had several title-deeds issued to the several office-bearers, all of them rendering service to the devasthanam. It will thus be seen that Sankaramanallur differs in no way from the other villages, all of them being aggregation of minor inams.

4. The village of Sankaramanallur includes 44 acres of ayan which have been surveyed and settled by the Settlement Department. These 44 acres appear from the Collector's letter to have been assigned originally for service in the devasthanam, but owing to cessation of service by the holders thereof they have been resumed by Government and treated as ayan when the devasthanam was under their management. If these 44 acres be assumed to be inams as they were once, the village becomes an entire inam. From a perusal of the statement referred to in paragraph 15 of the Collector's letter, dated 11th January 1889, No. 21, which I consider to be a genuine document, it appears that Sankaramanallur is classed as sarva inam which is tantamount to saying that it is entire inam. I have perused the several documents appended to the petition now under report, and they all go to establish the petitioner's contention that the village is an entire inam. From the Collector's letter above referred to it also

appears that during the period that the village was under the management of Government, no water-rate was ever collected for lands irrigated by means of irrigation works in the village and credited to ayan, that the repairs to those works were executed solely at the cost of the devasthanam, and that no money appears to have been spent by Government on that account.

5. In these circumstances, I agree with the Collector in his conclusion that the village of Sankaramanallur is an entire inam like the 4 villages referred to above and that the enfranchisement of the service inams in it should be cancelled as requested by the petitioner.

ORDER—dated 8th August 1889, No. 680, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

Upon a careful consideration of the arguments adduced by the petitioner Srinivasa Chari and of the full and

exhaustive reports submitted by the Collector and the Inam Commissioner, the Government is of opinion that the village of Sankaramanallur should have been treated as an entire inam village. The enfranchisement of the service inams therein should accordingly be cancelled and a single title-deed issued for the village as a whole. The lands which have been resumed will of course remain Government lands.

2. As regards the channel, it appears from the Collector's report of the 11th January last that there are no good grounds for treating it as a Government work of irrigation. The Government accordingly abandons its claim to it and further directs that any water-rate, which may have been levied in pursuance of the Board's order of the 25th March 1887, be refunded.

3. The channel having been declared a private one, the petitioner Ananthier is free to establish his claim to rights over it by means of a suit in the civil courts.

4. The Government observes from the papers that the village of Perur in the Coimbatore taluk is in exactly the same position as Sankaramanallur, and although no claim has been put forward as yet in respect of it, it is probable that, as soon as the decision in this case is known, a similar claim will be preferred. The Inam Commissioner should, therefore, inquire and report on it at an early date.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

„ the Inam Commissioner.
„ the Accountant-General.
„ N. C. Srinivasa Chariar.
„ Ananthier.
„ the Kolumun ryots.

Exd. A. D. Xavier.

50 Copies.

Govt. of (1889) Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 8th August 1889, No. C80.

AUGUST.

Inam, Coimbatore.

Considering that the village of Sankarama-
nallur attached to certain pagodas in Udumalpet
taluk should have been treated as an entire inam
village and ordering the issue of a single title-
deed for it; declaring the Sankaramanallur
channel to be private property; and directing
the Inam Commissioner to submit a report with
regard to Perur village which is in the same
position as the former.