M.R.O. 1—38,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1094 Press Nis.

465-67
Dated 22-6-1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following:—

No. 465. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th April 1868, No. 3,018. Read the following letter from the Collector of Tanjore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th April 1868, No. 91.

I HAVE the honor to report, for the information of the Board, that Insagiri Gosayi, the ex-Manager of the Mattam, in the village of Nadiam, in the Pattukottai Talook, has instituted a suit* against me, *in forma pauperis*, in the Civil Court at Tanjore, for the recovery of the landed property belonging to the said institution, together with mesne profits, assumed to be Rupees 19,146-8-0, for the period during which the same has been under Government management.

* No. 10 of 1867.

2. This institution, with its endowment, was taken under Government management in the year 1856, under the authority conveyed in the Board's Proceedings marginally noted, in consequence of the plaintiff having misappropriated the proceeds, and illegally alienated parts of the endowment, and is accordingly now under my charge; the two appeals, successively preferred by him to Government, having been rejected,† because the Government saw no reason to interfere with the Board's decision.

Of the 23rd February 1856, No. 551.

† Order on Government Petition, No. 3,299 of 1860, communicated in Board's Order, No. 1,296, dated 7th March 1861.
Do. on do., No. 1,036 of 1865, communicated in Board's Order, dated 13th October 1865.

3. From the enclosed translation of the plaint, it will be seen that plaintiff rests his suit on the assumed ground that the object of the endowment was to provide for pujah and other religious services, and not for the use of, or for the distribution of food to, the "public".

4. As I have stated in my letter‡ of the 14th July 1865, No. 210, the Sunnud in support of the endowment of the Mattam, and of which a translation has been submitted to the Board with my letter of the 18th December 1865, No. 8,099, does not contain an express condition that food is to be distributed to travellers, though Mr. Forbes, in his letter§ recommending its resumption, says such to be the terms of the grant. Neither, however, on the other hand, is there a word of pujah or any other religious services in the Sunnud, and the natural inference to be drawn from the fact of the Mattam being specifically mentioned therein to be situated on the road to Rameswaram is, as I have already said, that the institution was intended for the benefit of travellers.

‡ *Vide* Board's Proceedings, 2nd August 1865.

§ 19th January 1856, No. 10.

5. It is thus on the ostensible character of the institution as a charitable one, and on the undoubted fact of the plaintiff having grossly abused his trust, that the defence on behalf of Government now rests; and this I have accordingly set forth in the enclosed draft of the written statement which I propose to put in, and to which I solicit the sanction of the Board. All the evidence available on the records to prove the misapplication and improper alienation of the property of the institution by the plaintiff, will be produced at the hearing of the suit, which has been posted for the 31st July next.

6. The cost of the defence will, of course, be defrayed from the funds of the institution.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

To the Civil Court of Tanjore.

Plaintiff in formâ pauperis.	*versus*	*Defendant.*
Insagiri Gosayi Swamiyar, Inamdar of Sarwamaniam lands, attached to the Mattam at Nadiam, in Pattukottai Talook.		G. L. Morris, Esq., Collector of Tanjore.

Petition of Plaint.

I AM the Trustee of the Mattam at Nadiam in Pattukottai Talook. I was, according to custom, appointed as Madathipathi by my predecessor. I was in enjoyment of the undermentioned villages attached to the said institution.

2. In 1744 the said villages were granted, as Sarwamaniam, by Pretap Sing, Rajah of Tanjore, for the use of the institution. In support of this, there is a Sikka Sunnud in the name of the then Insagiri Gosayi.

3. While in enjoyment of these villages, with all rights and titles thereto attached, they were, in February 1856, attached by the order of the Board of Revenue upon the Collector's report. Since then the Collector has been enjoying the villages together with mesne profits.

4. The said villages were originally intended for meeting charges connected with pujah or worship, etc., of the Mattam, and not for the distribution of food to the public.

5. Till February 1856, the villages were under my management ; the pujah and other matters connected with the institution were conducted by me regularly and according to usage. They (the villages) were then unjustly attached under a mistaken notion that they were intended for the distribution of food to the public, and this suit is brought for the recovery of these villages together with mesne profits.

6. As I am unable to pay for the stamps required for instituting the suit, I file this *in formâ pauperis* under Sections 299 and 300 of the Civil Procedure Code.

7. The aforesaid Sikka Sunnud was pledged, in 1865, to one Valoo Mudaliar, of Royal Hotel at Madras. I will cite him as a witness, and cause the said document to be produced at the hearing.

8. I, Insagiri Gosayi, the plaintiff *in formâ pauperis* in the above plaint, do declare that all that is stated therein is true to the best of my belief and information.

(Here enter the Schedule of lands.)

	V.	M.	G.
Extent of Nunjah and Punjah lands in the seven villages ...	245	11	0
	RS.	A.	P.
Estimated value of the gross produce, after deducting Porakudi Varam, etc.	113,280	10	0
Do. of mesne profits of the said lands, as per annual accounts of the Circar from 1856 to 1866...	19,146	2	0
Total value of the claim ...	1,32,427	2	0

INSAGIRI GOSAMIYAR, (Signed in Guzaratti.)

Filed on the 12th December 1867.

Original Suit No. 10 of 1867.

(Signed) E. W. BIRD,
Civil Judge.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) G. L. MORRIS,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Draft of the proposed written Statement.

THE plaintiff's assertion that the grant was made for Pujah and Aradhanai, etc., is untrue, there being not a word regarding these or of any other religious services whatsoever in the Sunnud.

2. It is true that neither is it mentioned in the grant that it was made for the use of, or the distribution of food to, the public ; but from the fact of the Mattam being specifically mentioned therein to be situated on the road to Rameswaram, it is to be naturally inferred that the endowment was intended for the benefit of travellers, and is, as such, of a charitable character.

3. The Mattam, with its endowment, was taken under the management of the Board of Revenue under the provision of Regulation VII. of 1817, because the plaintiff was abusing his trust by misappropriating the proceeds and illegally alienating parts of the endowments—a fact which the defendant is prepared abundantly to prove.

4. Under these circumstances, the defendant begs to state that this charitable establishment, with its endowment, cannot be safely entrusted to the management of the plaintiff, and prays that the suit brought by him may be dismissed with costs.

(Signed) G. L. MORRIS,
Collector.

TANJORE,
10*th April* 1868.

THE Board sanction the defence of the suit on the usual terms, and approve of the proposed written statement.

No. 466. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd April 1869, No. 2,165.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tanjore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th February 1869, No. 20:—

WITH reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated the 24th April 1868, No. 3,018, I have the honor to report that the Civil Court at Tanjore has dismissed the suit therein referred to, with costs.

2. I enclose herewith copies of the Judgment and Decree passed by the Court.

3. The cost incurred by me on account of the defence has, as the Board will observe, been adjudged to be paid by the plaintiff; but as he is destitute of means, and has instituted this suit *in formâ pauperis*, I apprehend that it will have to be borne by the funds of the Nadiam Mattam under Government management, and to which the suit referred, and from which funds it has been paid at present. I have, however, ordered inquiries to be made as to whether there is any possibility of recovering the cost from the plaintiff.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

In the Civil Court of Tanjore.

Present:—W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Acting Civil Judge.

Original Suit No. 10 *of* 1867.

Insaghiri Ghosi Swamiyar ... ... Plaintiff (Pauper.)
G. L. Morris, Esq., ... Defendant.

THIS suit coming up for final hearing, the Court, after examining the witnesses adduced on both sides, perusing the various documents filed by the plaintiff and defendant, and hearing the arguments of Subramonia Aiyar, Vakeel on behalf of the plaintiff, and of the Government Vakeel on behalf of the defendant, the Court delivered the following:—

JUDGMENT.— In this suit plaintiff, alleging himself to be the Madathipathi or proprietor of the Ghosavi Mattam, situated in the village of Nadiam, in the Pattukottai Talook of this district,

sues *in formâ pauperis* to set aside the order of attachment issued by Mr. Forbes, the former Collector of Tanjore, who in the year 1856, acting under the instructions of the Board of Revenue, ousted the plaintiff from the possession and enjoyment of the lands and Mattam abovenamed, and to recover once more possession of the said lands and Mattam, and also the mesne profits derived therefrom during the years they have been under the management of the defendant.

2. The plaintiff states in his plaint that the lands specified in the list filed by him were granted in the year 1744 upon a Sicca Sunnud issued by Pretap Singh, a former Rajah of Tanjore, only for the maintenance of the religious rites, ceremonies, and observances to be performed in the temple of the Nadiam Mattam and not for the distribution of food to travellers, or for general purposes of charity; that plaintiff having succeeded to the post of Madathipathi, continued to perform the duties of his office, properly and with regularity, up to the year 1856, when Mr. Forbes, who was then Collector of Tanjore, ousted him improperly from his possession of the endowment lands of the Mattam, and the Collector has ever since administered them himself, and the plaintiff therefore now sues to recover the lands and the mesne profits derived by defendant from the land, the value of the claim being Rupees 1,32,427-2-0 together with subsequent profits and costs.

3. The defendant in his written statement denied the plaintiff's allegation that the grant of the lands by the Rajah of Tanjore was solely for the purposes of Pujah and Aradhanai (anniversary ceremonies) inasmuch as no mention whatsoever was made in the Sunnud, under which the lands were held, of any religious services, and that although, on the other hand, no mention was made in that Sunnud that the lands were granted for the benefit of the public, or for the regular distribution of food to travellers, still from the fact that the Mattam is situated on the road to Rameswaram it may naturally be inferred that the endowment was really intended for the comfort and relief of travellers, and as such of a charitable character. Further, that as the plaintiff, when in charge of the Mattam, was abusing his trust by misappropriating the proceeds, alienating parts of the endowment, and generally misconducting himself, the late Collector, as Agent of the Board of Revenue, acting under the provisions of Regulation VII. of 1817, took charge of the Mattam, with its endowments, and has since then continued to retain them in his custody.

4. The following issues were framed:—

I.—Whether the grant of lands by the former Rajah of Tanjore, as specified in the plaint, was intended to be applied to the performance of religious services only, or to the charitable object of feeding, and the benefit of travellers only.

II.—Whether the pauper plaintiff, when in charge of the said Mattam, was guilty of malversation of the endowments or income of the Mattam or not.

5. The plaintiff filed the following documents:—

A.—Yadast sent by Kondal Row, late Tahsildar of Pattukottai Talook, to plaintiff, dated 4th March 1856.

B.—Copy of a list made by the public authorities when plaintiff's Mattam property was sold in auction by Government, dated 10th November 1865.

C.—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd August 1865.

D.—Sicca Sunnud, (in the Mahratta language) about the village in question, dated in 1744.

E.—Memorandum (in do.) about the same village, dated 26th Jilakada in 1185.

F.—Order issued to the Custom Officer of Darasaram from the Tanjore Palace, regarding certain Mattam charity.

G.—Pension Certificate of cash allowance issued by the Collector of Tanjore to Venghoba Ghosami, dated 22nd September 1853.

H.—Sicca Sunnud granted by the Tanjore Rajah to Atmaram Ghosami, dated 5th June 1809, regarding certain Inam.

I.—Order relating to Inam granted to Sedubavaswamy by the Tanjore Rajah in the year Sursan Seba Arbayanmaya Alaf.

J.— Do. do. to do. by do. in 1716.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd April 1869.

K.—Title-deed granted by the Inam Commissioner to the villagers of Karukavayal, in the Pattukottai Talook, dated 20th June 1865.

L.— Do. do. do. to Aiyavaiyen and others of Nadiam in the talook of Pattukottai, dated 28th January 1865.

M.— Do. do. do. to Kuppaiyen of Nadiam in the said talook, dated 19th June 1865.

6. The defendant filed only one document,—

I.—Memorandum sent by the Special Assistant Collector to the Collector on 17th January 1856.

7. At the final hearing the plaintiff examined twelve witnesses, of whom the first witness, the confidential Agent of Velu Moodelly, the keeper of the Royal Hotel in Madras, produced the two Sicca Sunnuds, exhibits D. and E, whereby the lands in dispute were granted by the former Rajah of Tanjore for the maintenance of the Nadiam Mattam, and proved that those documents had been mortgaged by plaintiff, about four years ago, to Velu Moodelly, as security for money then lent to him by Velu Moodelly, who had delivered them to witness for the purpose of filing them in this suit.

8. Second witness, a Ghosami in charge of a Mattam at Combaconum, produced Exhibits E. and G., two Sicca Sunnuds granted by a former Rajah of Tanjore, whereby his Mattam was endowed with lands producing Rupees 22 a-month, which grant was subsequently reduced to the monthly income of Rupees 11 which is still continued. The grant being only designed for the purpose of performing Pujah and certain festive ceremonies and the maintenance of the Ghosami in charge of the Mattam, and not for the distribution of food to travellers or other charity.

9. Third witness, a Ghosami in charge of a Mattam in the Town of Tanjore, repeated the same evidence in regard to his own Mattam, and produced the Sicca Sunnud, exhibit H. and admitted that, as Ghosami in charge, he is not at liberty to alienate or make away with any of the lands assigned for the maintenance of the Mattam.

10. Fourth witness, a Ghosami in charge of a Mattam in the Town of Mannargudi, makes the same statement as third witness.

11. Fifth witness, the Manager of Setu Bava's Choultry, which is situated on the road to Rameswaram, half a mile from the Nadiam Mattam, also produced two Sicca Sunnuds, Exhibits I. and J., granted by a former Rajah of Tanjore, assigning, for the support of the Setu Bava's Choultry, lands producing an income of Rupees 6,000 per annum, and Rupees 2,000 for the maintenance of a choultry in Mannargudi, the whole of which is expended in charity to travellers; and stated that for ten years he managed the Dhurmapuram Mattam in the Mayaveram Talook which possesses an annual income of Rupees 20,000, no part of which is expended in charity, but simply in the support of the thirty disciples living in the Mattam, and in the expenses of religious ceremonies, but for no bad purposes; and that while he so managed that Mattam, none of the lands to his knowledge were alienated or made away with, and that though such alienations would lower the income and so be injurious to the Mattam, he was aware that they were occasionally made. (This witness's evidence was given in a very evasive and unsatisfactory manner.)

12. Sixth witness was for fourteen years the Agent of one of plaintiff's predecessors for the conduct of the affairs of the Nadiam Mattam, and he deposes that there is a Temple in the Mattam where Pujah was daily performed; and that charity and food to Brahmins was only given on certain festive occasions. He declares that plaintiff conducted his duties as Ghosami properly—namely, performing Pujah daily and teaching and eating with his disciples. He speaks to two alienations of portions of the endowment lands of the Mattam by plaintiff's predecessor: one Veli of land on one occasion as a gift to an Astrologer on the occasion of an eclipse; and subsequently two Mahs to a Prohit Brahmin. He acknowledged that while plaintiff was Ghosami he only occasionally visited the Mattam, as he was not then Agent.

13. Seventh, eighth, and tenth witnesses, inhabitants of Nadiam, state that from time to time they visited the Mattam in their village, and plaintiff always behaved properly.

14. Eleventh witness produces two documents, Exhibits K. and L., to prove that plaintiff's predecessors in the post of Ghosami, established an Agraharam and granted for its support lands out of the endowment of the Mattam.

15. Twelfth witness proves that plaintiff let to his (witness's) elder brother five Velis of the Mattam endowment lands on the nominal rent of Rupees 7-15-6 per annum.

16. Thirteenth witness (common to both parties) admits that he has received as gift four Mahs of the Mattam endowment lands from plaintiff's predecessor, and three from plaintiff which he now holds.

17. Fourteenth witness (also a common witness) proves that he and his brother have got possession from plaintiff and the preceding Ghosami of eight Mahs of the Mattam endowment lands, of which three were given by plaintiff on the occasion of a new moon.

18. Fifteenth witness, also a common witness, admits that he has eight Mahs of the Mattam lands, which he says was given him by plaintiff's predecessor on the occasion of an eclipse.

19. Sixteenth witness, a servant in the Tanjore Palace, proves that his father obtained for him seven Mahs of the Mattam endowment lands which he now holds.

20. The defendant examined six witnesses, of whom, first, the Village Moonsiff of a village adjacent to Nadiam proves that thirteen years ago plaintiff made a present to him of four Mahs of the Mattam endowment lands which he still holds.

21. Second witness, an inhabitant of Nadiam, proves that fifteen years ago plaintiff owed his (witness) elder brother Rupees 50, and he gave witness one Veli of the Mattam endowment lands, with orders to pay the kist thereon, (namely, Rupees 7-12-6,) to his brother in liquidation of plaintiff's debt of Rupees 50. Witness has kept the land ever since.

22. Third witness speaks to plaintiff's bad and immoral character when in charge of the Mattam; he used to drink, saw him drunk four times, and also saw him frequently going at night to the houses of prostitutes in the town of Pattukottai; states also that he has seen a dancing girl and a woman of bad character of the Gentoo caste going to the plaintiff's Mattam, which was improper, he being a Sanniyasi.

23. Fourth witness's evidence is unimportant.

24. Fifth witness deposes to having seen plaintiff on divers occasions smoking gunja.

25. Sixth witness, who was Police Peshkar for the town of Pattukottai from 1849 to 1861, proves his having gone one night in 1851 to a dancing girl's house, where there was a disturbance; and finding plaintiff in company with three men and two women gambling with cards—plaintiff was undressed, and said he had come to the prostitute's house on business of his own,—witness kept him and the others on the pial of a house all night, and in the morning produced the party before the Tahsildar, who rebuked plaintiff for his misconduct, and let him go home.

26. This was the evidence in the case, and it shows very clearly, in the opinion of the Court, that the lands granted many years ago by the former Rajah of Tanjore for the support of the Mattam have been most recklessly dealt with both by plaintiff and his predecessors; so that a very considerable portion of the endowment lands have been permanently alienated, and the income of the institution thereby seriously diminished; while plaintiff himself, it is proved, while professing to lead the life of an Ascetic, or (as his title of Ghosami denotes) a man who has conquered his passions, was in the habit of frequenting prostitutes' houses, of allowing women of bad character to visit his Mattam, of gambling, drinking intoxicating liquor, and of smoking gunja.

27. The point upon which the plaintiff chiefly relies is, that the Nadiem Mattam, from the management of which he was removed by the Collector, was not one of those institutions whereat a charitable distribution of food is made regularly to travellers, but that it is solely the abode of a Sanniyasi who was to perform regularly certain pious ceremonies and observances in the temple inside the Mattam, and that the endowment lands were merely granted for the support of the Ghosami and his disciples, and for defraying the expenses of the religious ceremonies in the Mattam.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 22nd April 1869.

The Court is of opinion that this is a good argument of the plaintiff's, and that the evidence which has been adduced does not prove that the Mattam was ever regarded as a halting place for travellers, or where a charitable distribution of food was made.

28. The Setu Bava's Choultry, where food is daily provided for all comers of every caste, and for which charity it possesses an annual income of about Rupees 6,000 per annum, is situated about one mile from the Nadiam Mattam, from which Mattam some of the lands originally granted by the Tanjore Rajah were taken away by the Rajah and transferred for the support of the Setu Bava's Choultry. If the Nadiam Mattam had been a place where travellers were regularly fed, the Rajah would have hardly transferred from it its endowment lands to another institution of a precisely similar nature close by. In the opinion of the Court it may be fairly inferred that the Rajah ordered that transfer of lands to the Setu Bava's Choultry, where the income would be applied in general charity in preference to continuing the extravagant grant originally made for the support of a so-called Ascetic and his disciples.

29. That the Mattam stands on the road to Rameswaram is no doubt the case, but so does the Setu Bava's Choultry close to the Mattam, and at it every traveller who asks for food is given it day by day, and the fact of the Mattam being so situated cannot be considered as a proof that the endowment was only designed for charitable purposes. Moreover, the Sunnud granted to the Setu Bava's Choultry by the Rajah of Tanjore, Exhibit I, makes special mention of the charity to be maintained there; whereas, in that granted to the Nadiam Mattam, it is merely stated that the holder of the Mattam should enjoy the lands rent-free for ever. Had it been intended by the Rajah, when assigning the endowment lands to the Mattam, that the income derivable therefrom should be applied in charity, the Court considers that some special mention of such intention would have been entered in the Sunnud, and as nothing of the kind appears, the Court finds that the lands of the Nadiam were granted not in view to the distribution of food, etc., to travellers, but for the maintenance of the religious ceremonies and pious observances to be performed regularly in the institution.

30. This finding of the Court on the first issue does not, however, remove the Nadiam Mattam from the jurisdiction of the Court, and involve a decree against the defendant.

31. Regulation VII. of 1817 was especially enacted to provide for the due appropriation of the rents and produce of the lands granted for the endowment and maintenance of Mosques, Hindu Temples, Colleges, Choultries, or other pious and beneficial purposes. Now the plaintiff has strenuously contended that the grant of the lands in his case were designed solely for the support and regular continuance of the religious ceremonies and services which were to be performed in the temple situated in the Nadiam Mattam, and for the support of the Ghosami in charge thereof and of the disciples under his tuition.

32. This is a clear admission that the endowment lands were designed "for pious and beneficial purposes," within the meaning of Regulation VII. of 1817, and consequently the Collector, as local Agent of the Revenue Board, had undoubted right to interfere under the provisions of that Regulation if it were shown that the lands or the income derivable therefrom was not being appropriated in the manner, or to the purpose for which it was intended by the individual who made the grant originally.

33. The inquiry that was conducted by Mr. Norman in the year 1855, and whose report to the Collector embodying the result of his inquiries has been filed by the defendant in this Suit (Exhibit I), shows clearly that at that time the plaintiff was personally misconducting himself grossly, while the buildings of the Mattam were dilapidated, and the income derived from the endowment squandered by the plaintiff in debauchery.

34. The evidence that has now been adduced both by the plaintiff and by defendant shows conclusively that for some time prior to the interposition of the Collector the lands forming the endowment of the Mattam had been dealt with both by plaintiff and his predecessors in the Office of Ghosami in the most reckless manner. Instead of regarding these lands as property, in the usufruct of which they had merely a life interest, the Ghosamis of the Nadiam Mattam evidently

regarded and treated them as if they were their absolute private property to be alienated as they pleased.

35. The plaintiff did not hesitate to assign away portions of the endowment in payment of a private debt of his own in one instance, the land so given being of infinitely greater value than the debt on account of which the alienation was made. It is no justification for the plaintiff to urge, as he does, that he only did as his predecessors had done before him. There can be no doubt but that, managed as the Nadiam Mattam was in 1855, the endowment of the institution was being seriously impaired and diminished, and the evidence of plaintiff's first witness shows that even during the last few years the plaintiff borrowing money from an Hotel-keeper in Madras has given him a lien on the lands of the Mattam, and as security for that debt has deposited with him the original Sunnuds granted by the Rajah of Tanjore; so that if this Court were now to give a decree in plaintiff's favor, it is clear the income, instead of being expended for the pious purposes intended by the original granter, would go to pay the private debts of plaintiff contracted while he was not in charge of the building.

36. Moreover, the evidence of the credible and respectable witnesses who have been examined, prove that plaintiff, while managing Ghosami, was in the habit of keeping company with prostitutes, of visiting their houses, of gambling, of drinking, and of smoking gunja; all which dissolute practices necessarily entailed the misappropriation of the funds of the Mattam which plaintiff, as a holy Ascetic, had been selected to manage. The Court, therefore, upon the second issue is decidedly of opinion that the plaintiff, when in charge of the Nadiam Mattam, was guilty of malversation of the endowment and income of the Mattam, and that the Collector had good and sufficient cause for enforcing against him the provisions of Regulation VII. of 1817.

37. The Court, therefore, dismisses this suit with costs.

Dated this 23rd November 1868.

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Acting Civil Judge.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Decree.

SUBMITTED, together with a copy of the Board's Proceedings, dated 24th April 1868, No. 3,018, for the information of Government.

2. This suit was brought by the ex-Manager of a Mattam in the village of Nadiam, for the recovery of the landed property of the institution, together with the mesne profits during the time that the Mattam has been under Government management.

3. The institution was, together with its endowment, taken under Government management in 1856, under authority conveyed in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd February 1856, No. 551, in consequence of the plaintiff having misappropriated the proceeds and illegally alienated portions of the endowment.

4. It will be seen that the suit has been dismissed; but as it was brought "*in forma pauperis*," the Collector is of opinion that the costs incurred by him will have to be paid out of the funds of the Mattam.

5. He intends, however, to endeavour to obtain them from the plaintiff.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 22nd April 1869.

No. 467. ORDER THEREON 22nd April 1869, No. 1,094.

Miscellaneous.

RECORDED.

2. The Board will be good enough to report on the course adopted with reference to the payment of the costs incurred in the case.

(True Extract.)

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of Madras
GENERAL
REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 22nd April 1869.

Read.

G.O., 22nd April 1869, No. 1681.

Sent.

Suit No. 10 of 1867 against Collector of Tanjore, for recovery of a Tattikai en Inaam—Report of the Board, recommending Board of Revenue to report on the course adopted with reference to the payment of the costs.

Rev. Department

R-1094

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 22nd April 1869.

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Sub. letter from Coll. of Tanjore forwarding copies of Judgment & Decree in Original Suit No. 10 of 1867 filed in Tanjore Civil Court for recovery of land forming endowment of a Inattam in Puttukottai

(R.P.C. 22nd April 69 No. 2165)

1 Recorded.

2. The Board will be good enough to report on the course to be adopted

adopted with reference to
the payment of the costs
incurred in the case.

Ath.

12 Copies to the B of Do Sept 29