1401

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultations

from 30th March 1858.

Bach No 39 to 40

Order No 401 to 27th March 1858

புரதசுற்பு பிரிவு=1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் கு. ஸ்ரீரங்கையா.

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 16-5-08

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் -11-08.

28/11/08
சரிபார்க்கும்
முதல் மு. நி. பா. உ.

16/11/08
கொடுக்கும்.
நி. நி. பா. எ.
கையொப்பம்,

ஆராய்ச்சி
உத்தியோகர்
கையொப்பம்

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 30th March 1858.

No. 39. Read the following letter from G. S. FORBES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department; date Fort St. George 18th February 1858, No. 649.

SIR,

1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation dated 26th September 1857* No. 987, R. D. in which the Government proceed to pass orders on a despatch from the Court of Directors under date 5th August 1857, No. 7.

**In Cons. 10th October 1857.*

2. The despatch has reference to a Memorial from one C. Valungapooly Taver, son of the Ex-Zemindar of Chocumputty, an Estate sold for arrears of Revenue in 1834, and purchased on account of Government. The petitioner prays for restoration to his father's Zemindary, accompanying his petition with an address purporting to express the wish of the bulk of the tenantry for his restoration. The Court refer the petition for the decision of the Government of Madras, empowering them to restore the Petitioner to his father's estate, provided they are of opinion that such is the wish of the tenantry, that the Petitioner is fit for the charge of such an estate, and that no injurious precedent is established by such a step.

3. On these points the Board are instructed to pass an opinion, after communicating with the Collector. In the event of it being finally decided to refuse the prayer of the Petitioner the adequacy or otherwise of his present allowance is to be liberally considered.

4. The Government have requested the Board to review the correspondence which has taken place regarding this estate since its sale for arrears in 1834, but in effect on reviewing all that has been written since that period, they find that it amounts simply to the facts recapitulated in the Honorable Court's letter now under reference, and that a still more succinct resume of the earlier stages of the affair is to be found in the Honorable Court's former despatch dated 9th May 1838 No. 5, they have not thought it necessary therefore to accompany these remarks with a fresh history of the case.

In from Govt. 9th in Con. 22d October 1838, No. 1384. R. D.

5. The correspondence has in fact turned entirely on the expedience of restoring the estate to the Petitioner, and latterly on the amount which it was proper to allow him for his support. The proposal to restore the estate of Chocumputty to the Petitioner proceeded in the first instance from Mr. Eden then Collector of Tinnevelly, it was favorably received both by the Board of Revenue and by the Court of Directors as will be observed from para. 3 of their present letter; subsequently however Mr. Eden was led to change his opinion, and both he and the Acting Collector Mr. Thompson strongly pressed upon the Board the inexpediency of carrying out the liberal views expressed by the Court.

6. Zemindary management is admitted on all hands to expose the ryot to exactions and oppressions unknown to him under the rule of Government; after a few years of comparatively just and liberal management the condition of the tenantry on the Chocumputty estate had improved in so signal a manner that the local officers naturally shrunk from exposing men who as the tenants of Government, had used their utmost exertions to improve their lands, to a relapse into their former state of bondage, the estate itself had become the property of Government in return for the enormous losses occasioned by the long continued failure of the Ex-Zemindar to pay his Peshcush. This man had made himself every where feared and hated as a lawless tyrant, dangerous to the public peace, and an obstructer of the administration of justice; he had even gone so far as to plunder a Government treasury.

From Acting Collector Tinnevelly 3rd in Con. 25th July 1839.

From Acting Collector Tinnevelly 3rd in Con. 25th July 1839.

7. While these events were still fresh in the recollection of the people, the change of rule was hailed as a blessing, and there seemed little to urge in favor of the Petitioner's claim to be placed in possession of an estate which had been acquired by the Government by legal purchase, and the incorporation of which was justified by considerations of humanity and good policy.

8. The expression of these views by Messrs. Thompson and Eden, supported by the entire concurrence of the Board and the Government, induced the Court of Directors to acquiesce in the resumption of the estate, and their approval of the measure was conveyed in their despatch of the 15th July 1840, No. 6.

In from Government 21st October in Con. 19th November 1840, No. 1164, R. D.

9. It remained only to provide in a suitable manner for the maintenance of the Petitioner as son of the Ex-Zemindar, not indeed as a matter of right, but as a call on the liberality of the Government; after some consideration it was decided to devote to this object one-fifth of the proceeds of the estate calculated on an average nearly doubling the amount which had been ordinarily collected by the former proprietor.

10. The sum thus set-apart amounts as the Court observes to 8,000 and odd Rupees, and appears to the Board under the circumstances of the case to be quite a sufficient donation on the part of Government.

11. With the receipt of the Court's despatch dated 15th July 1840, this case had received, in the opinion of the Board, as full a measure of enquiry and consideration as could fairly be claimed for it. The Board are not aware of the circumstances which have influenced the Government in re-opening this question as they have expressed themselves in the Extract Minutes of Consultation now under acknowledgment as indisposed to attach much weight to the address purporting to express the wishes of the tenantry.

Dated 23d January in Cons. 18th February 1858, No. 453.

12. A reference has been made to the present Collector of the District as directed by Government and his reply is now forwarded.

13. Mr. Silver appears to think that the ryots really desire the restoration of the Zemindary, but the Board cannot feel satisfied that such is their genuine wish, the reasons assigned for it in their address are quite unworthy of notice, such as the alleged deficiency of produce under Government management, and the alleged substitution of money rents for payments in kind. No change of assessment has taken place, and when the grain which forms the Government portion has been ascertained, an arrangement is made annually with the ryots, by which they retain the grain and pay for it in money at the current price instead. The enquiry instituted by Mr. Silver with a view to ascertain the sentiments of the people was conducted not by a European officer, but by the Tahsildar, whose report cannot in a case of this kind be regarded with equal confidence. It is to be observed moreover that a report of the intended restoration of the estate had been extensively circulated and believed among the people, and it would necessarily follow that in the face of such expectations the tenantry of the estate would hesitate to incur the ill-will of their future superior by withholding their signatures to the address in his favor.

14. Nor can the Board regard the inoffensive habits ascribed to the petitioner as affording any security for the future well-being of the estate or for the interests of Government, the petitioner is evidently devoid of experience in the management of business, he proposes to commence his rule burdened with a debt of 30,000 Rupees, and judging from Mr. Thompson's report of the influence under which he was likely to fall, it is probable that his first step would be to pledge the revenues of the Zemindary to his creditors. Apart however from the objections which the above remarks suggest, the Board would view the restoration of the Chocumputty estate to the heir of its late possessor as affording a precedent open to serious objections.

From Tinnevelly, 3rd in Con. 25th July 1839.

15. There are many persons in this Presidency similarly circumstanced with the petitioner, and who might with equal shew of justice claim to be put in possession of estates which formerly belonged to their ancestors, for, as the Board have shewn, the petitioner has absolutely no claim at all, and the selection of particular individuals to be the objects of the liberality of Government is obviously impossible. Some very just and forcible remarks on this point will be found in Mr. Thompson's letter already referred to. The estate in question became the property of Government by a bonâ fide purchase at outcry, and on the strength of the change of ownership many interests have grown up which would be less secure under any other conditions; to annul such a transaction would tend the Board fear to destroy the feeling of certainty and security now belonging to such sales as take place on similar occasions under the authority of Government.

16. Mr. Silver has not noticed the question of the Petitioners allowance, but the Board think it unnecessary to refer to him again on this point until informed of the views of Government on the more important consideration involved in this case.

No. 40. ORDER THEREON, No. 401; dated 27th March 1858.

Resolved that a copy of the foregoing letter, and of its enclosures, be forwarded to the Honorable the Court of Directors, with reference to their despatch in this Department dated 5th August 1857 No. 7, and with an intimation that the Government, entirely concurring in the objections urged by the Board, are strongly of opinion that the Chocumputty Estate in Tinnevelly should not be restored to the Memorialist C. Valungapooly Taver. The Board will be pleased to inform the Memorialist accordingly, with reference to para. 8 of the despatch from the Honorable Court above adverted to.

2. The Collector of Tinnevelly has not noticed the question of the Memorialist's allowance; and the Board consider it unnecessary to refer to him again on the subject, until informed of the views of Government regarding the more important question of the restoration of the Estate. It appears however from para. 10 of their Proceedings, that they consider the allowance now enjoyed by the Memorialist to be quite sufficient, under all the circumstances of the case; and in this opinion the Government concur.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

5

No. 649.

4/401

From

G. S. FORBES, Esq.,

Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

To

H. FORBES, Esq.,

Acting Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation dated 26th September 1857, No. 987 R. D. in which the Government proceed to pass orders on a despatch from the Court of Directors under date 5th August 1857 No. 7.

In Con. 16th Oct. 1857.

2. The despatch has reference to a memorial from one U. Valungapooly Taver, son of the Ex-zemindar of Chocumputty, an estate sold for arrears of revenue in 1813, and purchased on account of Government. The Petitioner prays for restoration to his father's Zemindary, accompanying his petition with an address purporting to express the wish of the bulk of the tenantry for his restoration. The Court refer the petition for the decision of the Government of Madras, empowering them to restore the Petitioner to his father's estate, provided they are of opinion that such is the wish of the tenantry, that the Petitioner is fit for the charge of such an estate, and that no injurious precedent is established by such a step.

3. On these points the Board are instructed to pass an opinion, after communicating with the Collector. In the event of it being finally decided to refuse the prayer of the Petitioner the adequacy or otherwise of his present allowance is to be liberally considered.

4. The Government have requested the Board to review the correspondence which has taken place regarding this estate since its sale for arrears in 1834, but in effect on reviewing all that has been written since that period, they find that it amounts simply to the facts recapitulated in the Honorable Court's letter now under reference, and that a still more succinct resume of the earlier stages of the affair is to be found in the Honorable Court's former despatch dated 9th May 1838 No. 5, they have not thought it necessary therefore to accompany these remarks with a fresh history of the case.

In from Govt. 9th in Con. 22d Oct. 1838 No. 1384 R. D.

5. The correspondence has in fact turned entirely on the expediency of restoring the estate to the Petitioner, and latterly on the amount which it was proper to allow him for his support. The proposal to restore the estate of Chocumputty to the Petitoner proceeded in the first instance from Mr. Eden then Collector of Tinnevelly, it was favorably received both by the Board of Revenue and by the Court of Directors as will be observed from para 3 of their present letter; subsequently however Mr. Eden was led to change his opinion, and both he and the Acting Collector Mr. Thompson strongly pressed upon the Board the inexpediency of carrying out the liberal views expressed by the Court.

6. Zemindary management is admitted on all hands to expose the ryot to exactions and oppressions unknown to him under the rule of Government; after a few years of comparatively just and liberal management the condition of the tenantry on the Chocumputty estate had improved in so signal a manner that the local officers naturally shrunk from exposing men who as the tenants of Government, had used their utmost exertions to improve their lands, to a relapse into their former state of bondage, the estate itself had become the property of Government in return for the enormous losses occasioned by the long continued failure of the Ex-zemindar to pay his Peshcush. This man had made himself every where feared and hated as a lawless tyrant, dangerous to the public peace, and an obstructer of the administration of justice; he had even gone so far as to plunder a Government treasury.

From Acting Collector Tinnevelly 3rd in Con. 25th July 1839.

From Acting Collector Tinnevelly 3rd in Con. 25th July 1839.

No

7. While these events were still fresh in the recollection of the people, the change of rule wa hailed as a blessing, and there seemed little to urge in favor of the Petitioner's claim to be placed i possession of an estate which had been acquired by the Government by legal purchase, and the incorpo ration of which was justified by considerations of humanity and good policy.

8. The expression of these views by Messrs. Thompson and Eden, supported by the entire con currence of the Board and the Government, induced the Court of Director to acquiesce in the resumption of the estate, and their approval of the measur was conveyed in their despatch of the 15th July 1840 No. 6.

In from Government, 21st Oct. in Con. 19th Nov. 1840, No. 1164 R. D.

9. It remained only to provide in a suitable manner for the maintenance of the Petitioner as son of the Ex-zemindar, not indeed as a matter of right, but as a call on the liberality of the Government; afte some consideration it was decided to devote to this object one fifth of the proceeds of the estate calculate on an average nearly doubling the amount which had been ordinarily collected by the former proprietor

10. The sum thus set apart amounts as the Court observes to 8,000 and odd rupees, and appear to the Board under the circumstances of the case to be quite a sufficient donation on the part of Govern ment.

11. With the receipt of the Court's despatch dated 15th July 1840, this case had received, in th opinion of the Board, as full a measure of enquiry and consideration as could fairly be claimed for it The Board are not aware of the circumstances which have influenced the Government in re-opening thi question as they have expressed themselves in the Extract Minutes Consultation now under acknowledg ment as indisposed to attach much weight to the address purporting to express the wishes of the tenantry

12. A reference has been made to the present Collector of the District a directed by Government and his reply is now forwarded.

Dated 23d Janv. in Con. 18th Feby, 1858 No. 453.

13. Mr. Silver appears to think that the ryots really desire the restoration of the Zemindary, bu the Board cannot feel satisfied that such is their genuine wish, the reasons assigned for it in their addres are quite unworthy of notice, such as the alleged deficiency of produce under Government management and the alleged substitution of money rents for payments in kind. No change of assessment has taker place, and when the grain which forms the Government portion has been ascertained, an arrangemen is made annually with the ryots by which they retain the grain and pay for it in money at the cu rent price instead. The enquiry instituted by Mr. Silver with a view to ascertain the sentiments of the p ople was conducted not by a European officer, but by the Talsildar, whose report cannot in a case of this kind be regarded with equal confidence. It is to be observed moreover that a report of the intended restoration of the estate had been extensively circulated and believed among the people, and it would necessarily follow that in the face of such expectations the tenantry of the estate would hesitate to incur the ill-will of their future superior by withholding their signatures to the address in his favor.

14. Nor can the Board regard the inoffensive habits ascribed to the petitioner as affording any security for the future well-being of the estate or for the interests of Government, the petitioner is evidently devoid of experience in the management of business, he proposes to commence his rule burdened with a debt of 30,000 Rupees, and judging from Mr. Thompson's report of the influence under which he was likely to fall, it is probable that his first step would be to pledge the revenues of the Zemindary to his creditors. Apart however from the objections which the above remarks suggest, the Board would view the restoration of the Chocumputty estate to the heir of its late possessor as affording a precedent open to serious objections.

From Timmerelly, 3d in Con. 25th July 1839.

15. There are many persons in this Presidency similarly circumstanced with the petitioner, and no might with equal shew of justice claim to be put in possession of estates which formerly belonged to their ancestors, for, as the Board have shewn, the petitioner has absolutely no claim at all, and the selection of particular individuals to be the objects of the liberality of Government is obviously impossible. Some very just and forcible remarks on this point will be found in Mr. Thompson's letter already referred to. The estate in question became the property of Government by a bonâ fide purchase at outcry, and on the strength of the change of ownership many interests have grown up which would be less secure under any other conditions; to annul such a transaction would lead the Board fear to destroy the feeling of certainty and security now belonging to such sales as take place on similar occasions under the authority of Government.

7 5/401

F A

16. Mr. Silver has not noticed the question of the petitioners allowance, but the Board think it unnecessary to refer to him again on this point until informed of the views of Government on the more important consideration involved in this case.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S. D. Forbes
Secretary.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE,
Fort St. George,
18th *February* 1858.

To
H. FORBES, ESQ.,
Acting Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Mad Cons. 29 September 57 N.
" 27 October 48 "
" 29 " 138 "

Revenue 1858 Depr.
2nd to Cons: 30th March

N: 243

Copy in a Letter to C.
dy 19th April 1858 N: 15

From
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

To
The Ag Secretary to
Government
Revenue Department

Dated 15th
Rec'd 29th February 1858.

5 Encls.

S. No. 401. 27th March 1858

Submitting the views of the
Board, with reference to the Memorial
of C. Valunga Pooly Tavier, son of the
late Zemindar of Chocumpully in
meerally praying for restoration to
his father's Zemindary.

No. 89

Copy Sent by Dy Cl. 12th March

To
The Honble the Governor in Council
Fort St. George

Collectorate of Tinnevelly

The humble Petition of Arumbeby Sinnamuttu
Thaiver Son of Sinnamuttu Thaiver the late
Zemindar of Sochumbully a Native of
Sinnamelly in the Carnatic Payen talum

Humbly Sheweth

That the Zemindary of Sochumbully was
enjoyed by my Ancestors for 15 Generations, during the space
of 399 Years upto the days of my Grandfather who died in
1790; after which Mr Doriau who came for the purpose
of Collecting the Polayapat Kistis on behalf of my father
Sinnamuttiar Thaiver who was a minor as the Guardian
of the said Estate according to the Order of the Government
appointed his younger Uncle as Surveyor and the Kistis
duly paid without any Balance to the Collector Mr Doriau
and after arrived to Tellore [illegible]
and left Mr Doriau

Mr Doriau in 1779 [illegible] father the
Zemindar and Thaiver by the [illegible]
to the Provincial Court has [illegible]
that period [illegible]
Office, Mr Doriau [illegible]
Valunga pooly Thaiver who is [illegible]
who is one of the Petitioners [illegible]

that 66 Pagodas & 2 Pr Pialays should be paid monthly to
my father until he attaining his age of discretion & obtained
a Moochilicka from the said Vellia thaver to the effect
that he will make over the Zemundary of Sockumbutty
to my father when he attains his proper age recorded
in the Diary & directed my father to reside at Ramanad.
3 Inclosure. "Whilst the said Vellia thaver was continuing
to pay my fathers expence according to the Moochilicka,
Inilcoyed sunneds were ordered to be given for all Zemindars
in 1803, when the said Vellia thaver spent much money
and got a Wool Knit Sunned issued in his name for
the Zemindary of Sockumbutty & giving over public
servant made away with the Moochilicka which he
had formerly executed from the public records, & upon the
strength thereof he paid only a portion of my fathers
Monthly allowance & continued to decrease it,
My father who was at Ramnad came to
know the frauds practiced by the said Vellia thaver and
addressed many petitions to Collector & Government
stating forth his legal claims, whereupon an Order was issued
the Collector of this Zillah calling for the above said
Moochilicka when the said Document was searched
for in 1816, but as it was not forthcoming the Collector
reported to the Government & had issuing an Order
was there upon rendered by the Collector to the effect that
as the Moochilicka could not be known from the Public
Records my father Vellia thaver should be paid
monthly from the Company's Treasury
the Sum which my father Continued to receive
the Sum Monthly by order dated 22 July upon which the

22 July 1827 Cal. Board

the Board Some how or other drew no Rt and passed
new Order directing Rt 93 to be paid to my father monthly which
I continue to receive up to the present date.
5 7 The above said Valiaveetil thaver who is
referred to in the 2d para committed himself in many ways
and was consequently imprisoned & the Zemindary which
was in his possession was attached in 1834 when I
advanced my legal claims through many petitions
which do I am now informed that the Zemindary is to
be made over to Karreonalaya thaver but should the
Zemin which here detarily belongs to my tribe be made
over to the said Karreonalaya thaver who is in no way
entitled to it & who is a great debtor & a extravagant
Character it will be ruined, I pray that your honor
who imparts Justice to the inhabitants of this Country
will be merciful & based to maintain to my legal
rights and in mercy towards me submit a letter to
the Board, upholding my just claim & preventing
the transfer of my Zemindary to strangers,
6 My Ancestors who enjoyed the Zemindary
from Generation to Generation laid out immense
sums of money & built the Ilama thava Sathiram at
Coottalum, the affairs of which are now Conducted
by the Circar, the Thirumaiyu bridge and the Chithra
Sabay and many other Stone buildings & these Circum-
stances will be clearly manifest from the work
called "Coottala cooravungy" which is published and
printed at Madras & from the Diaries passed by the
Circar prior to 1796 If your honor will condescendingly
institute enquiries my legal rights to the said Zemin-
dary will be manifest,

7

The manifestation for determination in this case is as to whether it is just to make over to me who am the heir to the Zemindary which was hereditarily enjoyed up to the days of my father for 404 Years until 1796 or whether it is just to make it over to the son of the individual who was a mere manager of my father who subsequently enjoyed it through fraudulent means for so short a time as 39 Years from 1796 to 1835 from whom it was subsequently taken and retained under Circar management during the last 23 years.

I therefore humbly solicit that your honors will mercifully pass an Order so as to prevent the Zemindary from passing to other hands during my existence.

For which act of Justice and humanity your duty bound shall ever pray.

5th January

Tinnevelly

To

The Chairman and Directors of the Honorable united East India Company London

4/01 | 13

The Humble Maharajanamah or address of the undersigned Nattamagars and all the other Inhabitants of the Zemindary of Chockumpatty in the Zillah of Tinnevelly under the Presidency of Madras—

Humbly and respectfully Sheweth—

That the above Zemindary is of high antiquity and our Ancestors and ourselves had always cultivated lands to a great extent under the protection of the Zemindars and after appropriating the Coodewarum or Tenants Share of the produce of the Punjah or wet lands, paid to the Zemindars the Melwarum or Landlord Share,

9

15

1801

The Examination for determination the
Question as to whether I am just to make over to me who
am the heir to Zemindary which was hereditarily enjoyed
up to the days of my father for 40+ years until 1796 or
whether it is just to make it over to the son of the
individual who was a mere Manager of my father &
who subsequently enjoyed it through fraudulent means
for so short a time as 3 or 4 years from 1796 to 1833 from
whom it was subsequently taken and retained under
Circar Management during the last 33 years.

I therefore humbly solicit that your
honour will exercise the power in order to prevent the
Zemindary from passing to other hands during my existence,

In which act of Justice and
humanity I am sure your honour will pray.

I am &c.

Sunnyasy

12/12/27

23rd July 1827 Calcutta Mail

Oakdale

28

10/01

The Township Committee
of the
Township of Oakdale
in the
County of Passaic

Gentlemen:

I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Township Committee of the Township of Oakdale, to take effect immediately.

Respectfully yours,

Oakdale, N.J.
January 10th, 1901.

a just and lawful claim to it, and had repeatedly shown a jealous attachment to the Company. Mr Thompson charged Petitioner's father with having plundered the Public Treasury. The report to which Mr Thompson referred charged him that 20 years previously, the Petitioner's father had been tried for the offence and acquitted.

11
401

6 Mr Thompson charged the Ex Zemindar with having wilfully withheld his Peshcush where as "a famine unexampled of late years for severity" in the words of the Revenue letter of 30th October 1834 was the cause of the Estate falling into arrears. The Revenue of the District of Trinchelly in 1830 was 1,404,481 Rupees in 1831. 1,039,656 Rupees, a deficiency in the latter year of Rupees 364,825, in this year the Estate was attached

10 A
401

as 74040, Rupees where as 8000, Rupees was the amount for which the Estate was attached. The larger arrears having arisen while the Estate was under Government management for which Petitioner's father could not be responsible. Since in 1829, two years before the attachment, Mr Drury the Collector speaks of the Estate as having improved in resources. Mr Thompson spoke of the necessity that existed for the deportation and exile of the Petitioner's father, where as the Government of India and the Honorable Court declared the former unwarrantable, and the latter as a fiction.

8 Mr Thompson spoke of the injury inflicted on the tenants under Petitioner's father, but specified no facts in his letter. He speaks of one Zamindar being committed on a Criminal Charge

the Honorable Court, the condition which has given an opportunity for such an objection would not have occurred. The Petitioner humbly submits that the wrong of the officers of Government, should not be made a plea against justice to him.

12/401

10 That Mr Thompson represents the tenants as greatly rejoiced at the removal of the Zemindar. The annexed Petition from 1500 tenants shows that they prefer the restoration of the Petitioner.

11 Mr Thompson repeats the libel of the Petitioner's father being a notoriously bad character. The circumstance of the Judge's hunting with him and dealing with him contradicts such a conclusion.

12 That Mr Thompson to support his view imputed duplicity to Mr Eden in his correspondence with Government. Mr Eden having expressed an opinion that it was but just to the son that he

charge and another bound down to keep the Peace.
shewing that the Law is ample for punishment
where offences are committed. The absence of charges
of injury to the Ryots, must therefore imply the absence
of offences. Mr Thompson contrasts the Revenue
of 1830 with that of 1837 and concludes that it had
doubled under Government management, drawing
the inference that the prosperity of the District had
proportionally increased - but he neglected to shew
that in 1837 the Zemindars proportion of the total pro-
duce of the Estate is added, in 1830 it is deducted -
Mr Eden in his letter of 6th October 1836 speaks of
the rent up to 1829 having been regularly paid -
The subsequent years of 1831-32 were years of
notorious scarcity so that the Revenue of Madras
sunk from 30,266,127 Rupees in 1830 to 24,888,877 Rupees

impoverished it is not possible immediately to obtain
the same Revenue in continuous years of plenty
Mr Thompson ought in fairness to have noticed that
the largest deficiency commenced under Government
management, and it is the case that the total Revenue
of 1837 referred to by Mr Thompson as evincing an Era
of prosperity, is not equal to that accruing under Pe-
tioners father. The Zemindars rule on this principle
was more propitious than that of Government.

9 That an objection is raised by
Mr Thompson to the restitution of the Estate on the ground
of the injustice which will be done to tenants, who
have occupied as tenants to Government - if there
be any force in this objection Petitioner humbly
submits that the Government may compensate
those tenants - for if the Officers of the Honorable

Lands Lr to Supt of Police N° 762
of 1858

Para 58-

D 7-46
19-9-86

Pl 246/58.

~~Pl 1858~~
~~in 1889~~

J 1858
In N° 1663

Ln No 3814/9
In 10 Ach.

In N° 1530 of 1858
In Encls 18 Feb.

13
10 Ach
E1

Ln No 1663 of 1858
In Encls 20 Dec

Pl 246/58

Pl 1858
In 1889

J 1858
In N° 1663

Ln No 3814/9
In 10 Ach.

In N° 1530 of 1858
In Encls 18 Feb.

13
10 Ach
E1

Whereas the Estate of Petitioners
Intestate consisted of a Leasehold
Messuage and Premises situate
at Number 20 Queen Street
Cheapside in the City of London
held for the residue of a term
of 21 years from the 25th day
of March 1848 at the yearly
Rent of £70 and subject to
the Covenants and Conditions
in the Lease thereof reserved
and contained and on the part
of the Lessee to be observed
and performed and which
Premises are now in the
occupation of Messrs Hanmer
Gaunt & Co as Tenants
thereof at the yearly Rent
of £70 and which Premises
are of the value of £1,000
and upwards

And whereas the Petitioners
Thomas Hanmer Gaunt
and Frederick Gaunt
have applied to the
Commissioners for
Administering the
Property of Persons
dying Intestate
for Letters of
Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
and the
Commissioners
have required
the Petitioners
to produce
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the Prerogative
Court of the Archbishop
of Canterbury
that Letters of
Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
have been
granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners

And whereas
the Petitioners
have produced
to the Commissioners
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the said
Court dated
the 25th
day of
September
1848
whereby
it appears
that Letters
of Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
were granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners
on the
23rd
day of
September
1848

And whereas
the Petitioners
have applied
to the
Commissioners
for
Administering
the
Property of
Persons
dying
Intestate
for
Letters of
Administration
to the
Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
and the
Commissioners
have required
the Petitioners
to produce
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the Prerogative
Court of the Archbishop
of Canterbury
that Letters of
Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
have been
granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners

And whereas
the Petitioners
have produced
to the Commissioners
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the said
Court dated
the 25th
day of
September
1848
whereby
it appears
that Letters
of Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
were granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners
on the
23rd
day of
September
1848

And whereas
the Petitioners
have applied
to the
Commissioners
for
Administering
the
Property of
Persons
dying
Intestate
for
Letters of
Administration
to the
Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
and the
Commissioners
have required
the Petitioners
to produce
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the Prerogative
Court of the Archbishop
of Canterbury
that Letters of
Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
have been
granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners

And whereas
the Petitioners
have produced
to the Commissioners
a Certificate
of the Registrar
of the said
Court dated
the 25th
day of
September
1848
whereby
it appears
that Letters
of Administration
to the Estate
and Effects
of the said
Intestate
were granted
by the
said Court
to the
Petitioners
on the
23rd
day of
September
1848

1858 Department

Enclosure in a letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly to the Actg Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St Geo. dated 23 January 1858 No 37. R 245/58.

In Ltr 1530 of 1858
In Revs 18 Feby
Statement shewing the amount of Demand, Collection, & Balance of the Chockumpetty Zemindary from Fasly 1245 to 1266 both inclusive.

14/101

and tenantry and hopes to raise the Chockumpetty Estate to a Modul for neighbouring Zemindars.-

[illegible]

Tinnevelly
19th July 1858

13/101

2/10/1

13/401 24

Tinnevelly
Dist
Rept 55-6

Statement shewing the Amount of Demand, Collection, and Balance of the Cheekumpully Zemendary in the District of Tinnevelly from July 1245 to 1266 both inclusive

12/401

12/401 A

Faslies	Total amount of Demand exclusive of Malikhana Vacancies	Deduct amount on account of Chuttrum	Nt amount	Amount actually collected	Amount remitted	Total of columns 5 & 6	Balance	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	C. Rupees a p	C. Rs a p	C. Rs a p	C. Rs a p	C. Rs a p	C. Rs a p	C. Rs a p	
1245	33884 12 2	" " "	33884 12 2	32754 9 2	130 3 "	33884 12 2	" " "	Former Pricurch on the Zemendary Rupees 255 50-
1246	29670 5 9	" " "	29670 5 9	29406 6 10	263 14 11	29670 5 9	" " "	
1247	49869 3 4	" " "	49869 3 4	49478 7 7	390 11 9	49869 3 4	" " "	
1248	50116 15 4	" " "	50116 15 4	49017 10 6	1099 5 "	50116 15 4	" " "	
1249	47209 14 11	" " "	47209 14 11	46572 9 10	637 5 1	47209 14 11	" " "	
1250	48635 12 10	" " "	48635 12 10	48016 7 10	619 5 "	48635 12 10	" " "	
1251	42555 10 2	" " "	42555 10 2	42437 11 10	117 14 4	42555 10 2	" " "	
1252	45185 10 2	3130 " "	39318 1 7	39250 12 6	67 5 1	39318 1 7	" " "	
1253	42448 1 7	3130 " "	39447 11 5	39441 1 6	6 9 11	39447 11 5	" " "	
1254	42577 11 5	3130 " "	47882 7 11	47882 7 11	" " "	47882 7 11	" " "	
1255	51011 7 11	3130 " "	60467 " 11	60465 7 9	1 7 2	60467 " 11	" " "	
1256	63597 " 11	3130 " "	39063 15 3	39063 15 3	" " "	39063 15 3	" " "	
1257	42193 15 3	3130 " "	66579 2 2	66579 2 2	" " "	66579 2 2	" " "	
1258	69709 2 2	3130 " "	30912 6 8	30904 1 12	8 5 6	30912 6 8	" " "	
1259	34042 6 8	3130 " "	48803 13 7	46801 15 1	1 14 6	48803 13 7	" " "	
1260	49933 13 7	3130 " "	30768 7 8	30768 7 8	" " "	30768 7 8	" " "	
1261	33898 7 8	3130 " "	34212 3 5	34212 3 5	" " "	34212 3 5	" " "	
1262	37342 3 5	3130 " "	48606 7 7	48606 7 7	" " "	48606 7 7	" " "	
1263	51736 7 7	3130 " "	41961 14 11	41961 14 11	" " "	41961 14 11	" " "	
1264	45091 14 11	3130 " "	43079 9 1	43079 9 1	" " "	43079 9 1	" " "	
1265	46209 9 1	3130 " "	31729 3 10	31727 2 4	" " "	31727 2 4	2 7 6	× Of these Rupees 7916-15-4 have been realized up to December-
1266	34859 9 10	3130 " "	38519 6 11	28327 8 4	" " "	28327 8 4	8191 14 7	
Total.	989375 1 5	50080 " "	939295 1 5	927756 6 1	3344 5 3	931100 11 4	8194 6 1	

Tinnevelly
23d January 1858.

Collector

Asst

Dist

10/11
E1

26

16

No. 37. 27

15
401

From

J. Silver Esqre

Collector

To

J. D. Sim Esqre

Acting Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort Saint George

Sir,

In conformity to the in-
structions of the Board of Revenue
as conveyed in an Extract from their
Proceedings with reference to the Minutes
of Consultation under date the 26th Septem-
ber 1857, I have the honor to report on the
question of the restoration of the Chockum-
putty Estate to C Valangapooly Taver
son of the Ex Zemindar, with reference to
the points adverted to by the Honorable
the Court of Directors in their letter in the
Revenue Department dated the 5th Au-
=gust 1857.

J

2. I have received along with the instructions above referred to, a duplicate copy of the Petition to the Honorable Court, and a paper signed by the Son of the Ex-Zemindar, which purported to be a Copy of the address said to have been signed by fifteen hundred Inhabitants of the Zemindary praying for its restoration to the Petitioner.

3. The circumstances relating to the deportation of the Ex-Zemindar, and the subsequent Sale of the Estate for arrears of Revenue, are already known to the Board from the correspondence that has taken place with former Collectors of this District, and I need not here recapitulate them. The propriety of these Proceedings was early questioned by the Honorable Court, and the questions to which I shall here confine myself, are whether to place Curnalliah Calangapooly Thaver in possession of the Estate would be acceptable to the larger body of the Ryots, and whether this person is capable of discharging properly the duties of a Zemindar. A third question, as to whether such a step would establish an injurious precedent, will be answered by the Board and Government on broad and general grounds. So far as regards Tinnevelly, and the peculiar circumstances attending the deportation of the Ex-Zemindar, I do not apprehend any injurious precedent being established as respects this District.

4. One of the principal grounds urged by a former Collector Mr. E. P. Thompson, against the restoration of the Zemindary to the present Petitioner, was, that after the Inhabitants of Chockumputty had enjoyed the privileges of being under the direct administration of the Government Officers, it would be an act of extreme hardship to place

place them again under the immediate
control of the Zemindar. Every Officer
acquainted with the Zemindary System
will say, that the Ryots living under
the control and protection of even the
best Zemindars, are exposed to petty
extortions from which the Government Ryots
are free. In the present instance how-
ever I have to state, that not only
a large majority, but nearly all the Ryots
in the Chockumputty Villages, have ex-
prefsed their willingneſs that the son
of the Ex Zemindar should be reinstated.
I deputed the Tahsildar of Tencausey
to proceed to Chockumputty, for the
expreſs purpose of making enquiries
on the subject. That the question of the
restoration of the Estate was under con-
sideration, was widely known all over
the District. The son of the Ex Zemin-
dar was powerleſs to injure, and I
should think, even to intimidate those,
who

17/401

who might be opposed to him, and yet not
one single individual appeared before me,
to protest against the restoration of the
Estate, and only two anonymous Peti-
tions declaring the unwillingneſs of the
people to be again placed under the
son of the Ex Zemindar, were forwarded
to me, through the Post.

5. The Tahsildar's report shewed
that out of the 18 Chockumpatty Villages,
a population of 3,528 persons, represent-
ing a revenue of 37,545 Rupees, were in
favor of the restoration of the Petitioner,
while a population of 175 persons repre-
senting a revenue of 2,099 Rupees did
not appear. It is impoſsible to sup-
pose, that the Petitioner could influence
by undue means so large a majori-
ty, and as no one appeared personally
before me, to protest against the
measure, I must conclude that the
restoration

restoration of the Estate would be acceptable to the majority of the tenants, and that they do not dread oppression at the Petitioner's hands.

6 As regards the fitness of the Petitioner to discharge the duties of a Zemindar, I have had several interviews with him in the course of the last two years. The Petitioner never had any participation in the evil courses of his father. He has generally borne the reputation of a quiet and inoffensive man. His abilities I should reckon as inferior, but not more so than those of other Zemindars in this Province. He has for a considerable time given himself principally up to religious ceremonies and observances, and he told me at an interview I had with him about a month ago, that he had been

18/401

been attending so closely to these ceremonies, in order to get back the Estate, in which if he succeeded, he would attend to the interests of the Ryots. He informed me also, that he was in debt to the extent of about 30,000 Rupees, but that he was ready to give good and sufficient security for the regular payment of the Peshcush. As regards Petitioner's general character, he is as regards qualifications, about the average of the other Zemindars, and as regards his conduct, it has hitherto been inoffensive. If therefore it should be decided that the Zemindary is to be restored to him, I would propose that this measure be carried out, from the commencement of the next Fusly year. I do not enter here upon any of the arrangements necessarily connected with this step, till the general question has been

decided

decided. I beg to forward for the information of the Board a Tabular Statement shewing the Fusly war Jgen Bariz, exclusive of the Bariz assigned for the support of the Chattrum at Courtallum, with the yearly actual collections from Fusly 1245 being the Fusly subsequent to that in which the Estate was purchased by Government.

Along with this letter I beg to forward an address sent to me through the Post by one Somboly Sinnanunja Thaven, a Pensioner receiving 95 Rupees a month, and a Descendant of the old deposed Zemindar of Chockumpully, setting up a claim to the Estate. The history of this man's progenitors is fully given in the correspondence of

of the Board with Government in February 1826, and his Petition does not call for any notice. The duplicate Petition from C. Valangapooly Thaver, together with the Copy of the address of the people of the Zemindary, are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obed.t Servant

J. Pilcher
Collector

Tinnevelly
23.d January
1858.

Encl.s &c

No 404. 37 2Q 401 H.P.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation

Under date the 27th March 1858.

Read the following

Letter from the Board of Rev...

Here enter 18th Febuary 1858, N 649

Resolved that a

copy of the foregoing letter and

of its enclosures be forwarded

to the Honorable the Court of

Directors with reference to their

Despatch in this Department

dated 5th August 1857 N 4 and

with an intimation that the

Government entirely concurring

in the objections urged by the

Board, are strongly of opinion

that the Cheerumpully Estate

in Tinnevelly should not be

restored to the Memorialist,

C. Valumgapooly Tavee. The

Board will be pleased to

inform

1858 Dept. No.

From

The Collector of

Tinnevelly

To

The Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St George

Dated 28th January 1858

Rec'd 1st

No 345 58.

Ans. 4th

Subject Cheerumpully Estate 1858.

Reporting on the question

of the restoration of the Cheerumpully Estate

to the Petitioner C. Valumgapooly Tavee

and forwarding the Petitioner's

memorial addressed to the Honorable

the Court of Directors

Refer to Govt 10 Feb 58

inform the memorialist accordingly, with reference to para 8 of the Despatch from the Honorable Court above adverted to.

The Collector of Tinnevelly has not noticed the question of the Memorialists' allowance; and the Board consider it unnecessary to refer to him again on the subject, until informed of the views of Government regarding the more important question of the restoration of the Estate. It appears however from para 10 of their Proceedings, that they consider the allowance now enjoyed by the Memorialist to be quite sufficient under all the circumstances of the case; and in this opinion the Government concur.

(Signed)

H. Pigot to the Bd of Rev. Dep. 30 Sep.

No 27
A01

For Orders.
No 21
A101

Revenue Department No 245.

From the Board of Revenue 18th Feby 1858.

I do not see how further the
matter can proceed. The Collector
declines to restore the Estate.
but I quite agree with the
views expressed by the Board
of Revenue.

I should express a strong opinion
against the restoration of the estate for
which I can see no good reason either
in law

2 7
A 01

inform the memorialist
accordingly, with reference
to para 8 of the Despatch
from the Honorable

above adver

Tinnevelly
the question
allowance; a
consider it
to him again
until infor
of Governmen
more impurta
the restoratio
It appears
to of their Pr
consider the
enjoyed by t
to be quite
all the circumstances of the
case; and in this opinion the
Government concur.

(Signed)

H. Pigot to the Bd of Rev
Dup 30.99

or repair or the Palace

Really Private to the Estate should be
restored - Portico" inquiry is invited =
factory, and the reason given that
Palace to be kept in thorough
when said out, future repairs
repairs to be done
the 1640 now exist to
restoration of the estate

Roll
26

Revenue 1858 Dept.

Dft. to Com.rs 30th March

No 401

Extract Mins. of Com.rs

Dated 27th March 58

Intimating that the Govt.
entirely concur with the Bd.
are strongly of opinion that
the Chaumpathy Estate
ought to be sold by Auction
& not portioned to the Tenants
at a Valuation & requesting
the Bd. of Rev. to inform the Tenants
accordingly.

No 39 & 40

No Com.n 29 Sept.r 57 No 38
Copy do. do. Lt. Col. Ct.
dt. 19 April 1858 No 315

2-7-98
19-9-96

26-8-15