

- (1) Number of pages: 6
(2) Date of repair: 6.12.76
(3) Initials of the Referencer: _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

521

Press
Mis.

Dated

5. 2. 1877

197.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

523
Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th February 1877.

No. 114. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th January 1877, No. 341:—

Read the following letter from J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chengam, 1st December 1876, No. 560:—

I HAVE the honor to request the sanction of the Board under Original Suit No. 347 for the payment of a reward of Rupees 100 to one Ramasami Moodelly of Agaram Alambadi who gave information which led to the saving of upwards of 1,000 Rupees' worth of bamboos, the property of Government, from being misappropriated.

2. The circumstances connected with the case are detailed below.

3. In December 1872, one Komarasami Pillay, the Monagar of a pagoda at Nallur, in the Virdachellam Taluq, presented a durkhast on behalf of the pagoda for certain lands adjoining the rivers Manimuttanuddy, Mayuranuddy, and Gomukhanuddy, and situated close to the pagoda. The Village Officers in the Khetwar Memorandum submitted by them stated that the fields applied for were river poramboke and contained fifty-five clusters of bamboos planted and reared at the cost of the pagoda for the benefit of the swami. It was apparent on the face of the durkhast that the land adjoined the rivers, and the memorandum furnished by the Village Officers clearly set forth that the lands were river poramboke and contained a large number of grown up bamboos. In the face of these facts, the Tahsildar assigned the land in January 1873 without reference to the Sub-Collector and without collecting the value of the bamboos from the applicant. These facts were brought to notice by Ramasami Moodelly by means of a petition addressed to the Sub-Collector in June 1875.

4. The explanation afforded by the Tahsildar in justification of his conduct was unsatisfactory. He taxed the Durkhastdar with improper conduct in having applied for the land with a full knowledge of its condition and charged the Village Officers with having prepared the Khetwar Memorandum in such a vague manner as to mislead the taluq officials, whereas the Village Officers had in reality described the land with sufficient clearness. He even at first suggested that the entry about the bamboos in the memorandum had been fraudulently inserted after the assignment had been made, but withdrew the suggestion on finding that the entry had existed all along. He then charged his own Gumasta with having so read the memorandum to him as to convey the impression that the bamboos on the land were of no value.

5. The Tahsildar afterwards inspected the land personally and reported that there were on it sixty clusters containing 8,347 bamboos, valued at Rupees 800. The Acting Sub-Collector, Mr. Irvine, however considered that the bamboos were worth about Rupees 1,040.

6. The assignee of the land was then asked if he would either relinquish the land or pay the value of the bamboos, but declined to do either.

7. Mr. Irvine referred the matter to me with a recommendation that the assignment should be cancelled, the putta not having been duly and deliberately issued, and the assignment ratified by superior authority (*vide* Board's Proceedings of 12 July 1871, No. 2,886). The land being river poramboke, the durkhast rules did not apply to it, and the durkhast should not have been accepted nor assignment made by the Tahsildar without a reference to the Divisional Officer, which he never made.

8. I accordingly cancelled the assignment in question, and directed that the Tahsildar should make good the value of any bamboos that might have been removed.

9. The Acting Sub-Collector has recommended a reward of Rupees 150 to the informer, but I consider that Rupees 100 is a sufficient sum.

SUBMITTED to Government with the Board's recommendation that the proposed reward be sanctioned.

10. The Collector will report what notice has been taken of the conduct of the Tahsildar further than being made to pay the value of any bamboos which may have been removed. His gross carelessness and disingenuous excuses merited special punishment.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 115.

ORDER THEREON, 5th February 1877, No. 521.

Miscellaneous.

Reward sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant General.

Erd. F. R. Bantleman.

Reward for information regarding mis-
appropriation of Bamboos in South Arcot. — Sanc-
tioning the grant of Rupees 100 as a — to one
Ramasami Moodelly.

FEBRUARY.
Nos. 114-115.

No. 518 February 1877, No. 191.

Recd.

10th February, 5th.

Encl.

Sc.

Sc.

Sc.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

REVENUE.

Govt. of 1877

No. 341.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 29th January 1877.
Read the following letter from J. H. GARSTIN, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to
H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated
Chengam, 1st December 1876, No. 560:—

I HAVE the honor to request the sanction of the Board under Original Suit
No. 347 for the payment of a reward of Rupees 100 to one Ramasami Moodelly of Agaram
Alambadi who gave information which led to the saving of upwards of 1,000 Rupees
worth of Bamboos, the property of Government, from being misappropriated.

2. The circumstances connected with the case are detailed below.

3. In December 1872, one Komarasami Pillay, the Monigar of a pagoda at
Nallur, in the Virdachellam Taluq, presented a durkhast on behalf of the pagoda for
certain lands adjoining the rivers Manimuttanuddy, Mayuranuddy, and Gomukhanuddy,
and situated close to the pagoda. The Village Officers in the Khetwar Memorandum
submitted by them stated that the fields applied for were river poramboke and con-
tained fifty-five clusters of bamboos planted and reared at the cost of the pagoda for
the benefit of the swami. It was apparent on the face of the durkhast that the land
adjoined the rivers, and the memorandum furnished by the Village Officers clearly set
forth that the lands were river poramboke and contained a large number of grown up
bamboos. In the face of these facts, the Tahsildar assigned the land in January 1873
without reference to the Sub-Collector and without collecting the value of the bam-
boos from the applicant. These facts were brought to notice by Ramasami Moodelly
by means of a petition addressed to the Sub-Collector in June 1875.

4. The explanation afforded by the Tahsildar in justification of his conduct was
unsatisfactory. He taxed the Durkhastdar with improper conduct in having applied
for the land with a full knowledge of its condition and charged the Village Officers
with having prepared the Khetwar Memorandum in such a vague manner as to mislead
the taluq officials, whereas the Village Officers had in reality described the land with
sufficient clearness. He even, at first suggested that the entry about the bamboos in
the memorandum had been fraudulently inserted after the assignment had been made,
but withdrew the suggestion on finding that the entry had existed all along. He
then charged his own Gumasta with having so read the memorandum to him as to
convey the impression that the bamboos on the land were of no value.

5. The Tahsildar afterwards inspected the land personally and reported that
there were on it sixty clusters containing 8,347 bamboos, valued at Rupees 800. The
Acting Sub-Collector, Mr. Irvine, however considered that the bamboos were worth
about Rupees 1,040.

6. The assignee of the land was then asked if he would either relinquish the
land or pay the value of the bamboos, but declined to do either.

7. Mr. Irvine referred the matter to me with a recommendation that the assign-
ment should be cancelled, the putta not having been duly and deliberately issued,
and the assignment ratified by superior authority (vide Board's Proceedings of 12th
July 1871, No. 2,886). The land being river poramboke, the durkhast rules did not
apply to it, and the durkhast should not have been accepted nor assignment made by
the Tahsildar without a reference to the Divisional Officer, which he never made.

8. I accordingly cancelled the assignment in question, and directed that the Tahsildar should make good the value of any bamboos that might have been removed.

9. The Acting Sub-Collector has recommended a reward of Rupees 150 to the informer, but I consider that Rupees 100 is a sufficient sum.

SUBMITTED to Government with the Board's recommendation that the proposed reward be sanctioned.

2. The Collector will report what notice has been taken of the conduct of the Tahsildar further than being made to pay the value of any bamboos which may have been removed. His gross carelessness and disingenuous excuses merited special punishment.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

H. J. Lewis
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
„ the Collector of South Arcot.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

PROCEEDINGS, 29TH JANUARY 1877, No. 341.

BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

1877.

Revenue 1877/1050

22/2/1877 Exd.

Received 3/2/1877

JANUARY.
No. 341.

Report of Rupees 100 to one Ramasami Moodally of South Arcot District who gave information which led to the saving of 1,000 Rupees' worth of bamboos from being misappropriated.—Recommending Government to sanction grant of —, and requesting Collector to report what notice has been taken of the conduct of Tahsildar of Virudachellum in the matter.

C. S. 1877. 185-2-77

116-115

15/10

147 The Board/Revenue 11-2-77

52-74-77