M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages—18

(2) Date of repair—7-12-48

(3) Initials of the Referencer—P 7.10.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 763 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 23-9- 1890.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. STURROCK, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Inam Commissioner, Madras, dated Coimbatore, 22nd July 1890, Reference on No. 1632, Mis.:—

I have the honor to reply to paragraph 1 of your endorsement, dated 14th September 1889, No. 450, on G.O., dated 8th August 1889, No. 680, Revenue Department.

2. I am clearly of opinion that the village of Perúr, with its hamlet Mavuthampadi or Ikkarai Walaiyar, is as much entitled to be treated as a whole inam village as Sangramanallur or any other village in the district.

3. As my reasons for doing so are mainly the same as those given with regard to Sangramanallur in my letter recorded with the Government Order above quoted, I presume, I need not repeat them here in detail, but the abstract of the history of the village given as a heading to the Inam settlement account of fasli 1214 is worth quoting: "The entire village "was Sarwamaniyam to the temple long "before the reign of Madura Tirumal "Nayudu Garu. It continued to be so till "the year Sobakrithu (1783). Between "Krodi (1784) to Soumya (1789) Tippu Sultan kept the village under attachment and "was paying half of the revenue to the temple. In the years Sadarana and Virodikrithu "(1790 and 1791), the British Government kept the village under attachment and "appropriated the whole revenue to the temple. Again between Paritapi (1792) and "Kalayukti (1798) Tippu Sultan kept the village under attachment and paid half of the "revenue to the temple. In the year Siddarti (1799), fasli 1209, the British Govern-"ment granted the village to the temple as inam and issued a jaripatta to that effect."

NOTE.—This is a translation from a Tamil version of the Mahratta certified copy given in 1878 to the committee.

4. When the management of the Perúr temple was made over to a trustee in fasli 1257 (1847-48), the total extent of Government land shown in the village accounts was acres 5·90, made up of resumed minor inams. It was only after this that the practice arose of treating as Government land poramboke brought under cultivation.

5. The village contains one channel and two tanks which have always been repaired from the temple funds. There are also some lands under the Kuniyamuthur tank and channel to which they claim to have contributed, but the only contributions for which records are available are two small sums in 1858 and 1879.

6. The hamlet of Mavuthampadi, called in the Revenue settlement Ikkarai Walaiyar, though not included in a takid of 1802 assigning lands to the temple, was settled as temple inam in fasli 1214. It was resumed in 1851 on the ground of its omission from the takid of 1802, but it was restored in 1871 by an order of Government * on a Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, in which it was stated that there was no reason to doubt that the entire village of Perúr with its hamlets was an ancient endowment of the Perúr pagoda.

* G.O., dated 27th July 1871, No. 1308, communicated with Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 2641, dated 8th August 1871.

7. In the statement of 1847 referred to in paragraph 4 of your letter recorded with the Government Order above quoted, Perúr, unlike Sangramanallur, was not entered as an entire inam, but the omission of the hamlet of Mavuthampadi from the takid of 1802 would be sufficient to account for this, and after the decision of Government referred to in the preceding paragraph, it would seem that no inference adverse to the claims of the pagoda can now be drawn from it. I have not, however, a copy of the statement in my office but only a note which shows that Perúr was not entered in it as an entire inam.

8. The following abstract shows particulars of the ayacut of Perúr and Mavuthampadi :—

Particulars.	Perur.		Mavuthampadi.	
	Extent.	Assessment.	Extent.	Assessment.
	ACRES.	RS. A. P.	ACRES.	RS. A. P.
Poramboke	560·78	..	191·36	..
Inam	986·88	7,505 1 0	1,944·82	1,260 15 7
Unoccupied waste	34·29	190 9 0	..	..
Government lands	25·55	163 5 0	869·59	539 4 0
Total Ayacut ..	1,607·50	7,858 15 0	3,005·77	1,791 3 7

9. Of the poramboke, acres 114·61 are Nóyil river poramboke added to Perúr at settlement. To this of course the temple has no claim.

10. The Government lands in Perúr are made up of acres 6·4 (5·90 before settlement) of resumed inams, to which the temple has now no right, and acres 19·51 given on darkhast after the Government had given over the management of the temple lands in 1847 and which would have been added to the inam lands if the darkhasts had been received before that date. The Government land in Mavuthampadi is forest to which the temple waived all claim when the hamlet was restored in 1871.

11. I therefore recommend that Government waive all claim to land in Perúr village and its hamlet Mavuthampadi or Ikkarai Walaiyar with the following exceptions :—

	ACS.
Perúr—resumed inams	6·4
Nóyil river poramboke	114·61
Mavuthampadi—forest land	869·59

No. 838.

Submitted to Government in reply to G.O., dated 8th August 1889, No. 680, Revenue, paragraph 4. With the exceptions noted in paragraph 11 of the above letter, the village of Perúr and its hamlet Mavuthampadi may be treated as an entire inam village as recommended by the Collector.

MADRAS,
22nd August 1890.

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Inam Commissioner.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—dated 23rd September 1890, No. 763, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Collector's recommendation, supported by the Inam Commissioner, is approved and sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Inam Commissioner.
,, the Commissioners of Land Revenue.

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.

45 Copies.

Original C

Govt. of {1890} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 23rd September 1890, No. 763.

SEPTEMBER.

Inam, Coimbatore.

The treatment of the village of Perúr, together with its hamlet Mavuthampadi, as an entire inam village with certain exceptions recommended by the Collector and supported by the Inam Commissioner, approved and sanctioned.

20.6.79

24.11.05

9-2-17.

4/3/20

5-10-68 II

Form No. 123.
4,000—10-7-08.

Post Box No. 79,
Madras, B.P.

0781

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE. MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

No. 7043 Misc dated - 4.11.1890

Read Government order, Revenue Department No. 763 dated 23rd September 1890.

Resolution

Communicated to the Collector of Coimbatore

(signed) H. A. Sim
Ag. Secretary

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

(True Copy)

M Ramachandrapa
14/7/09
For Secretary

12-7-09.
13-7-09.

1890
Board of Rev.
L.H.

Free copy of Bd's Engs
dt 4 11-1890
No. 7043 Revs.

Keep with
Go 760 Rev
dt. 23 · 9 · 90

NOTE FOR THE ~~UNDER SECRETARY~~ Registrar.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT. 9

I dont understand the statement in para 10 of the Collectors letter regarding the 19.51 acres given on Durkhast after the Govt. had given over the management of the Temple lands in 1847. The Collector states that they would have been added to the Mam lands if the Durkhasts had been recd. before that date. I dont understand what he means or what claim Govt. has to the land. Can you explain?

C.L.
8/9

Please see ~~pa~~ the second sentence of para 4 of the Collr's letter. The Govt.

appears at one time to have claimed the right of disposing of poramboke lands in Shrotriems, at least some officers ~~after 1847 when~~ appear to have been of this opinion. after 1847 when the village was handed over to the temple authorities, acres 19.51 of the poramboke lands were applied for cultivation. The application was granted and the lands were treated as Govt. lands.

2. The Govt. has now ~~given~~ renounced this right and the Shrotriemdar may dispose of the poramboke as he pleases. (vide G.O dated 7 Nov 1887 No 1042).

3. If the darkhast had been made before the ~~temple~~ lands were handed over to the temple authorities, it was likely that the acres 19.51 might have been ~~a~~ transferred at the same time. I suppose this is what the colls. means.

WR
11/9

REVENUE DEPARTMENT. 9

Current No 6115.

From

Dated 188

FOR ORDERS.

I agree, but in para 11 does not the Colr recommend that all claim shall be waived wall this darkhast land? In paras 8 & 10 he is describing the present condition of things.

JG
16/9.

Yes. I think he does. I was misled by para 10 when he says "added to the Inam lands". He means added to the Temple lands not to the Minor Inams as I thought he meant.

CL
23/9

The Village of Peru together with its hamlet of Ikkarai Welanjee may be treated as an Entire Inam Village but in my opinion, the Govt has no claim to the 19.51 acres of Poramboke which has been given up for cultivation. The Village ought to have been treated as a whole Inam Village all along & Poramboke in such villages belongs to the Inamdar vide G.O 9. 7 Nov 87 No 1042. I don't understand what the Collector means by the remarks in para 10 that these lands would have been added to the Inam lands of the [illegible]

G.C. 23-9-90

had been received before the management of the Temple lands was made over in 1847. In para 4, on the other hand, he says it was only after this (1847) that the practice arose of treating as Govt. land Poramboke brought under cultivation. The two statements are conflicting: whatever the practice, if the whole Inam tenure of the village is recognised, the Inam due is entitled to the Poramboke brought under cultivation 19.57 acres.

Cl
13/9

FOR ORDERS.

Re tenure of the Inam Village of Peru in Coimbatore.

The Honble Mr Grose
The Honble Mr Earstin
C.S.

Reference on No 1632 mis.

Coimbatore Collector's Office
22nd July 1890.

From

J. Sturrock Esquire,
Collector of Coimbatore.

To

The Inam Commissioner,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to reply to para 1 of your endorsement, dated 14 September 1889, No 450, on G.C. dated 8 August 1889 No 680 R.D.

2 I am clearly of opinion that the village of Pérúr with its hamlet Mavuttampadi or Ikkarai Walaiyar is as much entitled to be treated as a whole Inam village, as Sangramanallur or any other village in the District.

3 As my reasons for doing so are mainly the same as those given with regard

regarde to Sangramanallur in my letter recorded with the G. O. above quoted, I presume, I need not repeat them here in detail, but the abstract of the history of the village given as a heading to the Inam settlement account of Faslie 1214 is worth quoting.

"The entire village was Sarwamaniyam to the temple long before the reign of Madura Tirumal Naidugaru. It continueth to be so till the year Dhakrithu (1783) Between Krodi (1784) to Soumya (1789) Tippu Sultan kept the village under attachment and was paying half of the revenue to the temple. In the years Sadarana and Virodikrithu (1790 & 1791) the British Government kept the village under attachments and appropriated the whole revenue to the temple. Again between Parita pi (1792) and Kalayukti (1798) Tippu Sultan kept the village under attachment and paid half of the revenue to the temple. In the year Siddarti (1799) Fasli 1209 the British Government granted the village to the temple as Inam and issued a jaripatta to that effect".

Note

This is a translation from a Tamil version of the Mahratta certified copy given in 1878 to the Committee.

4. When the management of the Periur temple was made over to a trustee in Fasli 1257 (1847-48) the total extent of Government land shown in the village accounts was acres 5.90 made up of resumed minor Inams. It was only after this that the practice arose of treating as Government land Porambokes brought under cultivation.

5. The village contains one channel and two tanks which have always been repaired from the temple funds. There are also some lands under the Kuniyamuthur tank and channel to which they claim to have contributed, but the only contributions for which records are available are two small sums in 1858 and 1879.

6 The hamlet of Mavuthampadi called in the Revenue Settlement Ikkarai Walayar, though not included in a

Taluk

takid of 1802 assigning lands to the temple, was settled as temple Inam in Fasli 1214.

It was resumed in 1851 on the ground of its omission from the takid of 1802, but it was restored in 1871 by an order of Government on a Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, in which it was stated that there was no reason to doubt that the entire village of Perur with its hamlets was an ancient endowment of the Perur Pagoda.

× G.O. dated 27 July 1871 No 1316 Communicated with Board's Proceedings Mis: No 2641 dated 8 August 1871

7. In the statement of 1847 referred to in para 4 of your letter provided with the G.O. above quoted, Perur, unlike Sangramallur, was not entered as an entire Inam, but the omission of the hamlet of Mavuthampadi from the takid of 1802 would be sufficient to account for this, and after the decision of Government referred to in the preceding para it would seem that no inference adverse to the claims of the Pagoda can now be drawn from it. I have not however a copy of the statement in my office but only a note which shows that Perur was not entered in it as an entire Inam

8 The following abstract shows particulars of the ayacut of Perur and Mavuthampadi.

Particulars	Perur				Mavuthampadi			
	Extent		Assessment		Extent		Assessment	
	acres	cents	Rs.	A. P.	acres	cents	Rs.	A. P.
Puramboke	560	78	.	. .	191	36	.	. .
Inam	986	88	750	5 1	194	82	126	0 15
Unoccupied waste	34	29	19	0 9	.	.	.	. .
Government lands	25	55	16	3 5	8	69	5	3 0 4
Total ayacut	1,607	50	785	8 15	390	77	179	3 3

9 Of the Puramboke, acres 114·61 are royal rivers Puramboke added to Perur at settlement. To this of course the Temple has no claim.

10 The Government lands in Perur are made up of acres 6·14 (5·90 before settlement) of resumed Inams to which the Temple has now no right and acres 19·51 given on Darkast after the Government had given over the management of the Temple lands

in

in 1847 and which would have been added to the Inam lands if the Darkasts had been received before that date. The Government land in Mavuthampadi is Forest to which the Temple waived all claim when the hamlet was restored in 1871.

11 I therefore recommend that Government waive all claim to land in Perur village and its hamlet Mavuthampadi or Ikkarai Walaiyar with the following exceptions.

Perur — Resumed Inams acres 6.4
Noyil river Purambok acres. 114.61
Mavuthampadi — Forest land acres 869.59

I have &c.
(Signed) D. Ananthayya
for Collector

No 838. (True Copy)

Submitted to Government in reply to G. O dated 8 August 1889 No 680, Revenue, para 4. With the exceptions noted in para 11 of the above letter the village of Perur and its hamlet, Mavuthampadi, may be treated as an entire Inam village as recommended by the Collector.

Inam Commissioner's Office
Madras, 22nd August 1890.

W. L. Whitehead
Inam Commissioner

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department.

JMO

Revenue Department 680 / 8-8-89 / 27771

No. 6145

1890 Depto

From The Inam Commissioner

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Dated 22d
Despd 28d } August 1890
Received 24

No. 828

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
24 AUG 90
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Submitting in reply to para 4 of G.O. No. 680/8-8-89 Rev., letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, reporting that the village of Perur in Coimbatore Taluk, may be treated as an entire Inam village, with certain exceptions.

with an order

Order

Sy 23 Sept 1890 no. 763

HS 20/9/90

The Collr's recommendation supported by the Inam Comrs. is approved and sanctioned.

22/9

3 To the Inam Comrs.
16 " Comrs of Land Revenue } Des. 21-10

note

In para 4 of G.O. dated 8 August 1889 no 680 Revenue, the Govt. remarked that the village of Perur was in the same position as Sankramanallur (i.e. it was an entire inam village) and called for a report, which is submitted in the current under disposal. Both the Collr and the Inam Comrs. recommend that the village with its hamlet may be declared to be an inam village — minus a portion which is Govt. ~~[illegible]~~ property. The recommendation may be approved.