G1

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultation

22nd June 1855

Back Nos. 60 & 61

Order No. 5582 21st June 1855

(21 Cloth)

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் :

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக்-
கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள்.

19/4/58
சரிபார்க்கும்
முதல் முறியாள
கையொப்பம்

19/4/58
சரிபார்க்கும்
2ம் முறியாள
கையொப்பம்

21/4/58
ஆராய்ச்சி
உதவியாளர்
கையொப்பம்

G 2

8

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 22d June 1858.

No. 60. Read the following Petition.

To His Excellency the LORD HARRIS, G. C. B. Governor in Council.

The humble Petition of Baboo Row, Enamdar of Neelacuntapoor in the Cholungur Talook in the Northern Division of Arcot; dated Madras June 1858.

My Lord,

Dissatisfied with the orders passed by your Lordship on Petitions Nos. 687 and 1216 of 1858 presented to Government by your Lordship's Petitioner, your Petitioner submits herewith an Appeal against those orders to the address of the Honorable Court of Directors with 6 enclosures together with 3 copies of each paper, which, it is requested, to be despatched to the Honorable Court of Directors. Shall ever pray.

No. 61. Order thereon, No. 858; dated 21st June 1858.

Ordered that the Memorial of Baboo Row do lie on the table for the prescribed period of 20 days, and that it be afterwards transmitted to the Honorable Court, intimation of its dispatch being made to the Memorialist.

(Signed) W. H. BAYLEY,
Acting Secretary to Government.

G3

To His Excellency the Lord Harris, G.C.B.

Governor in Council

The humble Petition of Baboo Ram
Surnder of Nuttamalapoor in the
Chelingapoor Taluk in the Northern
Division of Arcot District

My Lord,

Dissatisfied with the order passed by your Lordship
on Petition No 687 of 12th May 1858 forwarded to
Government by your Lordship's Petition, your
Petitioner submits herewith an Appeal against
those Orders to the Directors of the Honble
Court of Directors with Duplicates together
with 3 Copies of each paper, which it is requested
that they be despatched to the Honorable Court of
Directors -

Madras
June 1858

I shall ever pray

G 4

To The Honorable Court of Directors

The humble Petition of Vaboo row
Errandur of Vootacondapoor in
the Talook of Chokiagoor in the
Northern Division of Arcot under
the Madras Presidency

Sheweth,

This is an Appeal against the Orders passed by the Governor in Council of Fort Saint George under dates the 27th April & 15th May 1858 upon Petitions Nos 687 & 1216 of 1858 presented by the Petitioner.

The same decisions are herewith submitted to your Honorable Court together with some other Documents marked A-B-J A A-J B B connected with the matter referred to in the above Petitions, your Honorable Courts Petitioner being highly aggrieved by these decisions he, therefore in the firm hope that your Honorable Court will do him justice, falls upon their mercy for redress on the following among other Grounds

1st The the Petitions Nos 687 & 1216 adverted to, above contains the Origin of the Agreement of the Enam Village therein referred to, of the uninterrupted possession & enjoyment thereof by the Petitioners father & by himself & of the recent deprivation thereof by order of the Governor in Council. Yet your Honorable Courts Petitioner begs

to

[illegible]

to state them here as succinctly as possible for the full information & deliberate consideration, & orders of your Honorable Court.

1. That one Arcot Goondabah hearing at the early part of the introduction of the British power in the territories of the Nabob of the Carnatic, afforded plenty of assistance to the British Government the Lord William Cavendish Bentinck Governor of Fort St. George granted to him a Village free of all Assessment on the 22 October 1803. Vide Purwanah A.

2. That the Grantee Arcot Goondabah had an entire brother named Vencobah Rau. The Grantee exclusively held & enjoyed the Village until the year 1814 in which he died. But the Original grantee having two sons & his brother having had two sons namely Kistnarow & Seneevasarow, he (the Grantee) adopted his brothers son named Seneevasarow.

3. That on the death of the Original Grantee in 1814, the then Collector of the Northern Division of Arcot obtaining the sanction of the Board of Revenue & Government regularly registered the Village in the name of the adopted Son Seneevasarow (Father of your Honorable Courts Petr.) The adopted son of the Original Grantee (Petitioners father) exclusively held & enjoyed the Village for 36 years Viz. from 1814 to 1850 in which the said adopted having died, the Collector registered the Village in the name of your Honorable Courts

Courts Petitioner rejecting the claim of his natural Uncle Kistnarow which he attempted to lay to share the Village as Alienee & Brother to the adopted. Vide Document B being the Mamiem Register of the Collectors Office dated 1851.

4. That your Honorable Courts Petr. enjoyed & continued to hold & enjoy the Village exclusively without any interference whatever of his Natural Uncle Kistnarow.

5. That this Kistnarow having died in 1852, his widow Banoobayee renewed her husbands illegal attempt & so appealed to the Board of Revenue praying that she should be allowed to enjoy the Village along with the Petr. on a plea that your Petrs. father (whom, the Original Grantee adopted) & her husband being the nephews to the Original Grantee they are equally entitled to his (Original Grantees) Village granted by Govt. The Revenue Board rejected her claim, but were of opinion that the Petitioner however heir to the Original Grantee has only life interest in the Village. On Petitioners appealing to the Board they cancelled their own Orders, & declared that he should be allowed to hold the Village as permanently as his father Seneevasarow did, without the interference of the Natural Uncle Kistnarow's Widow.

6. That the said Widow presented a Petr. to the Governor in Council who called for all papers connected with the Case & finally disposed the matter that your Honorable Courts Petr. & the said Widow should, as heirs of the Original Grantee, hold & enjoy the Village into halves,

halves, & that one half should revert to the State on the demise of each. This decision would appear in the Minutes of Consultation No. 427 dated 9th May 1857 of which the Petr has no Copy to produce.

7. That your Honorable Court's Petr presented appeal Petns Nos. 687 & 1216 to the Governor in Council against his Minutes adverted to above, clearly setting forth that the order sanctioned therein is purely opposed to the Original intention of the Purwanah A, & to the provisions of the Hindoo law, & that any orders passed discretionarily without consulting with the Law Officers of the Court of Sudder Adawlut is to be construed as evidently violated the Purwanah & Hindoo law, & finally prayed that if he is unwilling to reverse his own Orders, an Endorsement may be granted to the Petr at least in order to enable him to go to the Civil Law in the Judicial Court; which he hoped will decide whether his natural Uncle's widow to whom the Governor allotted ½ Share in the Village, is lawfully entitled to it, and whether the Petrs title & right to the Village is superior in preference to that of the Widow under the Hindoo Law in consideration of the adoption of the Petitioner's father by the Original Grantee.

8. It would appear from the Orders passed by Government on Petition Nos. 687 & 1216 that they decline to reverse their former order & to permit your Honorable Court's Petitioner to go to Civil Law.

9. In appealing to your Honorable Court against the above orders, your Honorable Courts' Petitioner would respectfully submit that the order passed by the Government in their Minutes No. 427 dated 9th May 1857 & the orders passed on his Petition No. 687 dated 15th May 1858 are opposed to the intention of the Purwanah to the Hindoo Sastre, and to the Regn. IV of 1831, & that therefore it is wholly incumbent on your Honorable Court to take into their Consideration the whole matters stated in the Petns Nos. 687 & 1216, and pass such decision as the title & right of your Petr may be deemed to him under law after deliberately considering each of the law points stated hereunder.

1st Whether the Village should be in the [illegible] of the Original Grantee's heir (the Petitioner (the son of the adopted Seenevasarow.)

2nd Whether the Widow of Rishnarow the uterine brother of the adopted is entitled to share the Village under Hindoo law as at present decided by the Governor in Council.

3rd Whether the Governor in Council is justified to declare the life interest in the premises under the wordings used in the Purwanah A.

4th Whether the Governor in Council is justified to decline the grant of Indorsement in order to the Petitioner under Regn. IV of 1831 - as appears on the back of the Petn No. 1216.

For

10 For the 1st point. Your Honorable Court's Petr. would observe that, altho' it is true that your Petrs. father Seenevasarow & the widow's husband Kistnarow are brothers to each other, & Seenevasarow having been adopted as son by the Original Grantee Goondapah, it is under the provisions of Hindoo law that Kistnarow has lost all right which he would have had in the absence of Seenevasarow's adoption. This is the law point which the former authorities observed and continued the Village to the Petitioners father, & to the Petr. but the Governor in Council acted the reverse path by not attending to the Hindoo law & by dividing the Village into shares between your Petr. & the widow & Kistna-
Had but Hindoo law Officers as requested in the Petrs. No. 687 the law would no doubt have assisted your Petr. by declaring that, from the reason of his father's adoption by the Original Grantee, he (Petitioner) has exclusive right to inherit the entire Village, & that his Natural Uncle Kistnarow's widow has nothing to do with that Village. Now it is therefore just & proper that your Honorable Court would among other reasons ascertain the law & place the Petr. in the exclusive possession of the Village as lawful heir to the Original Grantee.

For 2d point. From the reasons mentioned in the preceding para it is clear that had the Original

Original Grantee Goondapah died without adopting his uncle's son Seenevasarow, the Village is common to both the adopted & his brother Kistnarow by their connections as Nephews to the Original Grantee, & will descend to both in shares. This is not the Case in the present delegation for the Petitioner's father became Son to the Original Grantee by adoption & the Kistnarow only a Natural Uncle to the Petitioner - Hence it is to be decided under Hindoo law that Kistnarow's widow has lost all her right to the Village, & that the Governor's allotting to her ½ of the Village is purely unwarranted, this point to your Honorable Court should, it is requested, be kindly pressed to consider.

For the 3d point. Your Petitioner would observes that the Original intention of the Purwanah was in no way intended to deprive the heir of the Original Grantee nor to view his right as subject to life interest. But the Arrangement was made in the Order of Govert. that the Village should be continued to life &, your Honorable Court's Petr. humbly infers, the idea or the plan spring from the rules which the Government observes in India since May 1846 which reserves to itself the power of continuing or discontinuing the Grant of lands or allowance to the adopted sons - If this were the Case with the Governor in Council to found his orders (your Honorable Court's Petitioner would respectfully venture) to state that his Case does not fall within

without the scope of these Rules, because his father Seneva-
-rayer who was adopted by the Original Grantee in 1814,
had inherited the Village for 36 Years viz. upto 1850,
& because the Village has regularly descended to him in
1851, & continued to him by order of the Board of Revenue.
Your Honorable Court are well aware that several heirs
of the Native Princes Jaghirdars Polygars &c. who have
entered the family of their forefathers by adoption before
the date of these Rules of 1846 are to this moment in the
possession & enjoyment of their lands or allowance granted
to their adoptive forefathers by Government antecedent
to that Year (1846). as your Petitioners Case too is the one
that had reference to the adoption effected in 1814 being
32 Years before the date of the said Rules, any arrange-
ment which the Governor in Council may have founded
his decision placing your Petitioner out of the line of
the indulgence shown towards them by British Government
are not consistent with law. Under these reasons your
Honorable Courts Petr. trusts that your Honorable Court
will view him & place in the same line of indulgence
setting aside the Orders under Appeal.

For 4th point. It is the invariable precedent
or observance in India that under the existing Regns of
Madras Government. the parties aggrieved by any orders
passed by the Collectors, Board of Revenue & Government
as regards the Land or allowance which may have been

granted to them - by Government on any occasion whatever,
are to go to the Judicial Courts to have their Litigations ad-
judicated under the laws & Regns. To pursue this course
at least your Honorable Courts Petr. requested the Governor
in Council to grant him with endorsement under Regn. IV
of 1831 in order that he may seek redress in the Civil
Courts. But which request was not complied with, as
would Appear from the orders passed on Petition No. 216.

Thus, as your Honorable Courts Petitioner
has been deprived of his exclusive right & title to the
Village in question, & as the Governor in Council has divided
that right into halves between him & his Natural Nieces
widow in Opposition to the Hindoo laws, as the Governor
has moreover ruled that the share of each shall revert
to the State on demise in opposition to the Strict letter
of the Purwanah - 1, as the door through which your
Petitioner attempted to go to the Judicial Courts was
shut up, your Honorable Courts Petr. lastly implores
that your Honorable Court will, for the ends of justice,
& under the existing rules & Regns be graciously pleased
to reverse the decision appealed against & order that the
Village may be continued to him as heir of the Original

Granted
Madras
14th June 1858

Shall Ever Pray.

To His Excellency the Lord Harris G.C.B.

Governor in Council

The humble Petition of Balaa Law
Gnanidai of Neelacanta poor with
Chokanganar Palaok in the Northern
Division of Arcot.

Sheweth,

That your Petitioner having perused the Order made by Govt on Petitions Nos 687 & 760 of 1858 together with their enclosures, your Lordships Petitioner takes this opportunity of bringing to the notice of your Lordship that he did no where state in his Petitions that he is desirous of filing a suit against the Party in whose favor the Orders of Govern.t were passed; It is the intention of the Petitioner that he will bring an Action against the Govern.t itself, for it Overrules the Orders of the Collector & Board of Revenue. The Board Orders of the General Regulations clearly declare that the parties aggrieved by the Orders of the Collector, Board of Revenue and

Received to the
Board of the Court
of Directors from
Board of Revenue.
with G.O. Collectors
Dated 15th

Examined & Compared

and Govert should seek redress in the established Judicial Courts. Besides this, the Land which has reference to Your Lordship's decision being the subject matter, the Court should not decline to grant permission to the Petitioner for such permission authorized by Regn IX of 1831, & for the aggrieved cannot go to the Civil Court with such permission under the Circular order of Sudr Adawlut, dated 12th July 1855. If your Lordship is unwilling to reverse its former order, the Petitioner begs to state that it is legal for it to favor him the Endorsement that the Civil Court may receive & try his suit. His legal Course is now shut for Petitioner by the Endorsement of the Court alluded to above.

Therefore Your Petitioner prays that your Lordship will be kindly pleased to favor him with an endorsement in order that he may go to Civil Court-

Madras
May 1859

shall ever Pray

№ 1216 of 1858

Petitioner's request is inadmissible. The Government will receive no more addresses on this subject.

Fort St. George 15th May 1858.

By order

W. Morman

Dy Sec. to Govt.

To His Excellency the Lord Harris G.C.B.

Governor in Council

Madras

№ 1216 of 1858

From Babu Ramanadar of Nellam[illegible] Upper in Kholinga[illegible] putnam Taluk Chittoor

Dated 4th May

Rec'd 14th May 1858

With 6 enclosures

4-5-58 G/O

R 891/58

urges permission of the Govt. to sue [illegible] in the Civil Court for recovery of the Nilakantapuram Choultry.

has, & had to this day invariably observed as to the right of succession Native Princes other Natives which are Analogous to that of the Petitioner; and that the decision passed on appeal contains a mistake & therefore solicits to be reconsidered as a decision denovo, passed by the following among other grounds.

The Original Grantee, Arot Gradobah to whom the Enam Village was allotted, & Seneviratna were both Sons of the same Parents, the former was Senior to the latter, he had two Sons, namely Kistna row & Seneviratna. The Original Grantee adopted his brothers younger Son Seneviratna who was the most appropriate object for such application. On the event of the Original Grantee having died without adopting Seneviratna, then this Seneviratna & his exterior brother Kistna row are under Law equally entitled to inherit their Uncles (Orig. Grantee) Estate, & Especially when he adopted his Nephew. Seneviratna row, but Seneviratna row is, under Kindoo Law, the Sole heir to the original Grantee. With reference to this Lawful course the Enam Village was duly registered in the adopted's name in 1224 or 1814 in which his adoptive father (Original Grantee) died, without any Claims or lien whatever being Represented at the time by Kistna row his natural brother. From 1814 to 1850 being a period of 36 years, Seneviratna row, the adopted

G12

adopted son of the Original Grantee, Father of the Petitioner, exclusively held & enjoyed the Village without any claim of his natural brother Kistnarow.

On the death of the Petitioners father Seneviratna row in 1850 the Village was regularly registered in the Petitioners name alone rejecting the said Kistnarows claim which he newly made before the Collector to have his name also jointly registered with that of the Petitioners, as would be seen by the accompanying Register of the Collection officer for 1851.

The said Kistnarow appealed to the Board of Revenue but having since died, his Widow Banoohamy placed herself in her husbands place, & commenced to contend that the Petitioner & herself are, from the reason of their being heirs to the Original Grantee equally entitled to share the Enam Village. The Board of Revenue on the 13th November 1852 rejected their Proceedings objecting the said widows claim as untenable, but were of opinion that the Petitioner, however heir to the Original Grantee, has only life interest in the Village, & that it should therefore revert to the State on his decease.

On the Petitioners appealing against the above Proceedings the Board of Revenue have since cancelled their former ones on the 12th June 1854 declaring that their former orders which limited

the

the Petitioners right as the interest in the Enam Village were owing to their not having had before them the Government Purwanah at the time, & that therefore the Petitioner should be allowed to hold the Village as permanently as his father Seenevasarao was, without the interference of his natural brother Krishna Rao.

The said Bamachayee the Widow of the said Krishnarao, who, under Hindoo Castre, has no right to demand share in the Enam Village, renewed her former attempt & presented a Memorial to your Lordship who called for all papers connected with the Case & passed the minutes of Consultation Go 427 dated 7th May 1867 that the Petitioner and the said Widow should, as heirs of the original grantee, hold & enjoy the Enam Village with its rights & that one half should revert to the State on the demise of each.

By this the decision as passed by your Lordship deprived the Petitioner of his hereditary right & title, & allotted three and one half to the Widow, who whose husband had never had since the death of the original grantee, & altered the intent & purpose for which the Village was originally granted.

On a future consideration of the Case & with Convenience your Lordship that the arrangement sanctioned in the above minutes of Consultation is purely opposed to the original intention of the General Purwanah & to the provisions of Hindoo Castre, & that any other hereditary arrangement contrary to the Hindoo Law & expenditure of money connecting with the Case ought to be avoided in the Case of other Hereditary Village, it is humbly submitted

that the Petitioner's right as the heir of the original grantee, should be confirmed & established upon obtaining, if necessary, the opinion of the Hindoo Law officers of the Sudder Adawlut Court & in the same manner as the general case, on numerous occasions, done in cases of Inheritance & Hindoo Widows Petitioners defended in family disputes and not with ordinary Causes as in the case with the generality of Petitioners.

The Adoption of the Petitioner's father Seenevasarao by the original holder of the Purwanah before his death in 1844 had not only been officially recognized but also is lawful under Hindoo Law. Vide Page 100 of Stranges Manual of Hindoo Law, wherein the adoption of a brother's son (as in the case of the Petitioner's father) to the most appropriate object by a childless brother under that law.

Petitioner

Petitioner's father became legal heir to the original grantee & his uterine brother Pethuraw has no right to demand share in the Petitioner's father Enam Village nor his widow Banoobayee whatever has any thing in the Allotment which was exclusively held by the Petitioner's father for 26 years, by the Petitioner himself from 1807.

Before the said Minutes of Consultation was passed, had the Petitioner had presented a Counter Memorial to your Lordship with all the explanation & documents afforded, he trusts that your Lordship would have deputed to obtain the opinion of the Law officers of the Sudder Adawlut Court, & decided the matter existing at once the Claims of the Widow as opposed to the Law & affirming the right & title of the Petitioner.

With reference to the Rules of Govt dated May 1826, obtain the Govt. reserves to itself the power of rejecting or confirming the adoptions effected by individuals who are in the receipt of Allowances & grants by British Govt," the Petitioner begs to observe that these Rules apply only to those Cases which may have occurred subsequent to May 1826; but they cannot be strained nor applied to the similar Cases occurred antecedent to that year: The adoption of the Petitioner's father's antecedent to that year is recognized as such by your Lordship's predecessors in whose administration the said Rules were introduced. If these were to be applied

614

to the adoption of the Petitioner's father, then the Petitioner would respectfully remind your Lordship that numerous native Princes, Zemindars & Enamdars whose heirs & the adopted sons are to this day in the possession & receipt of the lands & allowances granted in consequent on this part of the Grants consent. Hence the Petitioner would be reckoned as entitled to share the universal indulgence.

The Petitioner further begs to bring to your Lordship's notice that had the Widow, to whom share is now granted in the Village in question gone to the Civil Court to have the joint right for judicial Sanction or Limits would not have passed upon the provisions of the Hindoo Law & precedents & courts have declared that the Petitioner has a legal & exclusive right to the original granted Enam Village & that the Widow has no right to it at all or Share of Land the Petitioner is desirous of having his rights & actions, but whereas he cannot do unless an amendment is passed to rule by Govt.

Under the foregoing Reasons the Petitioner hath humbly Prayed your Lordship will have Clemency upon him, & reconsider his Minutes of Consultation dated 7 May 1867 No 27, & if necessary obtain the Law opinion of the Law officers of the Sudder Court, & if not inconsistent with Rules that the Enam Village in question may be restored to him as specially granted to his father & grandfather & confirm the Grant of your Lordship & Council & dispose of the Village in favour of the Petitioner & favour him with an Order to

G15 13

Purwana granted by the Right Honorable Lord William Cavendish Bentinck Governor in Council of Fort St. George and its dependencies on the part of the Honorable the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies to Arcot Gundaba Pramenjy of the Village of Veelgumtapoor.

Be it known to all officer of the Courts of Justice and of Revenue and to all proprietors of land that the Right Honorable the Governor in Council has been pleased to grant to Arcot Gundaba Pramenjy and his heirs the Village of Veelgumtapoor in the Northern Division of Arcot province at the annual value of Star Pagodas 301.10.15 free of all assessment.

Which said Village of Veelgumtapoor the said Arcot Gundaba Pramenjy and his heirs shall continue to hold and to receive and enjoy the revenues derivable from the lands belonging to the said Village so long as the said Arcot Gundaba Pramenjy

and his heirs shall continue faithful to us and their allegiance to the British Government and obedient to the Regulations which have been or may be established by the authority for the internal Government of the Country for the administration of justice and for securing to its subjects the enjoyment of their just rights and privileges.

In the event of the said Arad Gundaba Braming or his heirs failing to perform the above duties the village of Nalgundapoor shall be forfeited and escheat to the Company and his Sunnud shall become null and void. Otherwise it shall continue in full force and effect. Provided however that if the family of the said Arad Gundaba Braming shall at any time fail and become extinct the Village of Nalgundapoor shall then revert to the Honorable Company free from all demands on account of Sirkt.

Given under the seal of the Honorable Company and signature of the Governor in Council at Fort Saint George this twenty second

616 19

second day of October in the year one thousand eight hundred and three.

By order of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council

Edwd Granary
Sec: to Govt.

Signed H Pontinck
" J. Stuart
" Hon Petrie
" John Cranmer

(True Copy)
(signed) H A Britt
Acting Collector

(a true Copy)

A (3rd Copy)

This Copy of the Summons
is returned to the Petitioners
Vakeel Seabrama Sastry on
the 25th November 1854.

(Signed)
A. D. Mathias
Civil Judge

R 891/55

Extract from the Register of Successions in the Northern Division of Steel for 1851

Case	Talook and Village	Extent and value of the entire Enam or Goomiah	When and by whom granted	Summuds or other documents in support of the grant	Nature of the grant charity or service of service nature of the duty if any reserved by the grant	Name of the original grantee	Name of the last holder & the relation in which he stood to the grantee at date of his decease	Share enjoyed by the deceased & that held by the other Sharers	Family left by the deceased and name and age of the parties	Their circumstances & the means of subsistence possessed by the family	Recommendation & grounds thereof
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Shalungur Talook Puttamun-tapanam	C. A. Rupees a. p. Total Assessment of Pannum-pahe and Enam Jaury Enam Toongal 181-12 200 9 11. Chunjah 10 - 200 9 11. 291-12 500 8 - Payment jointly to the Circar	On the 22d October 1803 by Governor the Right Honble Lord William Cavendish Bentinck Bahadoor	1 Purwanah dated 22d October 1803 granted by Governor the Right Honble Lord William Cavendish Bentinck Bahadoor to Goondabah. 1 Decree of the late Zillah Court of the Year 18.17. 1 Do of the late Provincial Court Centre Division of the Year 1819 Nr. 19.	Granted through favour	Steene Goondabah	Steene. Same as above	The whole enjoyed by the deceased	1 Vascobaya widow of the deceased aged 35 Years. Baboo Row son of Do aged 20 Years. 1/2 Kistna Row brother but by adoption & consent to Do age 52 Years	Entirely dependent	The Registration is taken in the name of Baboo Row son of Steenevasa Row Steena Rows name need not be mentioned Steenevasa Row was the adopted son of Goondabah brother both being sons of Vencobah Goondabah brother Kistna Row adduces as proof of his right to joint registration with Baboo Row & that he and Steenevasa Row owed their paternal uncle Goondabah jointly in the Civil Courts. but this right will be as Kistnarow would represent his father and Steenevasa Row his father by adoption in any dispute that might arise about family matters and yet not show that Kistna Rao had any claim to the Shrotriem. December 17/1851.

Delivered to the party on the 26 January 1853

Signed/ S. N. Ward
Acting Collector

(A true Copy)

(True Copy)
Signed/ H. A. Bett
Acting Collector

G 19

17

To

The President and Members

of the Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

The humble Petition of Vaboo Row

Grandson of Goondabah late Examiner

of the Village of Neelakuntapooram

in the Talook of Cholingeerapooram

in the District of Chittoore.

Most humbly Sheweth.

That in the year 1802. Lord Pentenah the then Governor of the Madras Presidency, granted the said Neelakuntapooram Village, which yielded an annual Peiz of 201-10-15 as known to your Petitioners Grand Father Goondabah, free from assessment to be enjoyed by generations - which your Petitioners Grand Father enjoyed till his death, when your Petitioners father named Streenevasa Row; who was the son of Goondabah's brother and whom he had adopted, succeeded & continued the management of the Village affairs till the year 1832. at this period your Petitioners father having been appointed Tahsildar in the District of Vellore, he desired his brother Krishna Row to superintend the business of the

Village

the Civil Court also dismissed the action, brought by your Petitioners opponent, to be quite false and unfounded, and confirmed, under date the 10 February 1854, the decree passed by the Moonsiff of Chalungeeraroor in your Petitioners favor declaring him to be the sole proprietor of the said Village: the attested Copy of the same marked D your Petitioner has enclosed herein. On the 3d April 1854, the Moonsiff of Chalungeeraroor delivered possession of the said Village with a deposited amount of 500 Rs 1022, to your Petitioner as per instructions received by him from the Civil Court, for which your Petitioner has duly given a receipt.

It having been determined by the Collector, the Acting Collector, your Honorable Board, the Moonsiff, and the Civil Court, that your Petitioner is the only heir to & the sole proprietor of the said Village, your Petitioner presented a Petition, on the 9th January 1854 to J. D. Brandillon Esqr requesting that Gentlemen to deliver over the Village to him. on this, he was pleased to indorse on the Petition, under date the 21st of the same month, stating that "your Honorable "Board have not distinctly expressed, in the following words, that Baboo Rao the Son of "Sreenevasa Rao is the sole proprietor of the said Inam Village and that he should above "enjoy the Village." this would appear to your Honorable Board to be vague and diametrically opposed to the meaning which is very plain and clear. this last Indorsement of the Collector marked B is also put in.

Under the circumstances above alluded to, your Petitioner most humbly hope your Honorable Board will be pleased to get the inclosed documents, marked from A to E, translated, to peruse; and, with reference to your Honorable Boards proceedings dated the 10th Nov. 1853 on the subject, to issue necessary instructions to the Collector by rescinding his Order which he had unreasonably granted, and also to favor your Petitioner with an Indorsement on this Petition plainly stating that your Petitioner Baboo Rao, Son of Sreenevasa Rao & Grandson of Gopalacharlu, is the sole proprietor and is entitled to enjoy the said Inam Village.

By doing this Act of justice your Petitioner as in duty bound.

Shall Ever Pray

Madras
13th May 1854

No. 1062 of 1854.

From Baboo Row Grand Son of the late Enamdar of Neelakuntapooram in Sholunghypuram Talook in the Zillah of Chittoor. Dated 23rd (AA 3rd Copy) Recd. 23rd May 1854. With 4 Encls. R891/55

To the Board 12 June 1854.

Praying with reference to the Bd. Proceedings of the 10th November 1853 & the Collector's Endt. herewith submitted that an order may be passed declaring him Baboo Row Son of Streenevassa Row, and Grandson of Goondaboo to be the sole proprietor of the Enam Village of Neelakuntapooram, & entitled to enjoy it.

Petitioner is referred to the Collector to whom instructions will be forwarded regarding the subject of this Petition.

Revd. Bd. Office. Fort St. George 9th June 1854.

By order
B. Cunliffe
Sub Secy.

(A true Copy)

G 22

2013 of 1853.

This Petitioner was registered in December 1851 by Mr. Ward the late Acting Collector, for the Enam Village of Neelakuntapooram in Sholunghur Talook. On the 26th August 1853 Mr. Dell who succeeded as Acting Collector reversed that order & directed that Kristna Row (uncle of the Petitioner) should have half the Village. Petitioner now prays that he may be confirmed as sole proprietor of the Village.

On the 10th November 1853, the Board of Revenue passed an order rejecting the claims of the widow & adopted son of Kristna Row (as urged in Board's Petition 624 of 1852) and directing that Baboo Row should hold the Village for his life, and that on the occurrence of a lapse the case should be reported for orders. No further order is now necessary.

North Arcot
Collr. Cutchery
Chittoor 31st December 1853.

(Signed) J. G. De Boudillon
Collector

No 2063 of 1853
From Bahadrau

Petition being in Tamil is omitted but the Collectors is copied.

B B

(2d Copy)

a true Copy

R 891/58

Cons 12th May/57 - N: 10@12

Copy in a L to C
D 30th June/58 N 32

From Saya Row-Cayetsreevar
Chetty & Caleg of Rev.
Pedda D/ 18th Oct/61
C N° 24 31

N° 60 & 61.

11th June 21st

Revenue 1858 Report
D to Cons 22d June.

N° 891

From Baboo Boor
Chundur & Neelacunta
Poor in the Talook of
Chelengoor in South Arcot

Dated
Rec'd 5th } 2 June 1858
21 Feb.

Submitting the Report with
the Orders of the Collector
&c &c &c of Chelengoor regarding
the Encroachment of the Pond
(Oopil) Petition in Original to the
Honorable Court to be laid with its
Enclosures before the Right Honble
the Sole Proprietor of the Revenue
Village of Pedda Nellacunta Superam
on the Land of Chundur Poor and
Neelacunta Poor &c &c &c Inhabitants
Talook Chelengoor &c &c &c

N° 858 Sheriff says Order issued 18th June 1858.

F

N° 858.

Ordered that the
Memorial of Baboo Row
do lie on the table for
the prescribed period of
20 days; and that it be
afterwards transmitted
to the Honorable Court,
intimation of its dispatch
being made to the Me-
morialist.—

For Sir Geo.
21st June 1858.

W. H. D.

11