M.R.O. 1—99,000—16-10-99.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 550. Press ~~Mis.~~

72-73

Dated 3rd March 1969.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

550-51

Revenue Board Office,
Madras,
21st January 1869.

No

From,

The Sub Secretary to the
Board of Revenue -

To,

The Actg Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to Official Memorandum dated 15th January 1869 No 7, I am directed to report that petition No 890 of 1850 from Naraingunnah was received in the Board's Office. An Extract from the Register of Petitions relating to it is subjoined -

2. No petition was received from Ramachunnah in 1846 -

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

H Grole
Sub Secretary

To, The Actg Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Extract

Extract from the Register of Petitions-

№	Name of the Petitioner-	Purport of the Petition-	Board's Endorsement
890 of 1850	From Narasingummah daughter of Ramuckummah Chitrale Samastanum in Cuddapah-	Praying that certain arrears due to her Mother during a period of sixteen years may be paid up to her as she is hard pressed by her Mother's Creditors and she has no means of satisfying their demands-	Referred to the Collector for disposal by Endorsement- 1st June 1850-

J Gale
Sub Secretary

P L
Capt Ramsay Esqr

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 3rd March 1869.

Read the following papers :—

No. 72. Petition from MUTLA NARASINGUMMAH, grand daughter of STRIMON MAHA MUNDELESWARA MUTLA VENCATA RAMARAZ, late Poligar of Chitwail, in the District of Cuddapah, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 31st December 1868:—

1. In reference to the Order of Government, on her Supplementary Memorial No. 2,019 of 1867, to the Right Honorable, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, Petitioner solicits, with the utmost deference and respect, the attention of your Excellency in Council, to the following fresh facts bearing on her claim to the disbursement of the arrears of pension due to her.

2. In that endorsement, it is stated, "that though it appears that a demand for "the payment of arrears of her pension from 1831 to 1845 was presented by her to "the Collector in 1857 or nine years earlier than the Government has supposed." Now, it is with respect to this statement, Petitioner would very respectfully submit, that Government have misapprehended the actual time when she first made an appeal and continuously thereafter applied to the authorities for the disbursement of the arrears.

3. Petitioner's mother, on the registration of the pension in her name in May 1846, consequent the rectification of the error committed by the Board of Revenue, that she was the daughter of the late Poligar, applied for the arrears in the same year, but having died within one short year, *i. e.*, in June 1847, the arrears were not granted her.

4. In 1849, the pension registered in Petitioner's name, and she immediately thereupon addressed the Collector relative to her claim to the arrears in question, but finding that her applications were for some reason or other ineffectual, she presented her *first Petition on the subject to the Board of Revenue, No.* 890, *under date the* 18*th April* 1850.

5. This is the chief point, or fact as it is, to which Petitioner would elicit the particular attention of your Excellency in Council. It was not from 1857, which was only a reminder with reference to her petition, but from 1850, when she preferred her claim to the said arrears, or, in other language, just a year after the registry in her name. Hence it will be apparent that there was no delay whatever, either on the part of her mother or herself in preferring their claim to the arrears. From 1831 up to the time of her death in 1847, Petitioner's mother constantly applied for her pension and the arrears, and it was only through the unaccountable blunder of the Board of Revenue that she was kept out of the enjoyment thereof.

6. The truth of this statement can be easily ascertained, from the Petition Registers of the Board's Office. Did she or did she not present a Petition No. 890, of 1850, dated 18th April 1850?

7. Such being the facts of the case, surely, it is not for Petitioner further to urge her claim by any stronger representation. There is no denial of her right and title to the arrears. That is a point which is beyond dispute, and were it not for the error originally committed by the Board of Revenue, these arrears would not have accrued. Now that she has proved that there was no delay on her part, that she did prefer her claim *from* 1850 and *not from* 1857, as is supposed by Go-

vernment, she leaves it to the just and candid consideration of your Excellency in Council, whether she is not entitled to receive the arrears.

8. Government, in their Endorsement on No. 1,071 of 1866, stated "that after "so great a lapse of time, the Government cannot take into consideration Peti- "tioner's claim;" subsequently on Petitioner's first Memorial of the 1st July 1867, Government came to the conclusion that it was twenty-one years after she preferred her claim, and then on her Supplementary Memorial No. 2,019 of 1867, after reference to the Collector, Government passed an Endorsement that they found that *she had* set forth her claims "nine years earlier than they had supposed." But Petitioner has shewn that she did prefer her claim in 1850, within a year or so after the pension was registered in her name, and *not in* 1857. On what grounds then can the arrears be withheld from her?

9. It is further given in the Endorsement, that from the fact "of her request "having been finally negatived by the Secretary of State," the Government are "precluded from "again submitting her claim to the Secretary of State for India."

10. That august authority, it is true, negatived her claim; but that was from insufficient information, the real and whole facts of the case not having been submitted to him. Petitioner however, entertains the earnest belief that if her rights, as herein set forth, that she did present her claims to the arrears on the 18th April 1850, within a year after the pension was registered in her name, were brought forward to the notice of His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, it will be at once granted.

11. From this information not having been submitted to the Secretary of State, Section XIII of the Revised Memorial Rules is not at all applicable to her case. She submitted her Supplementary Memorial, *before* the Secretary of State passed his decision on her first Memorial, but *that* was not transmitted to him, it having been referred to the Collector for report, which he did not submit till several months later.

12. Petitioner therefore, with reference to the fresh facts herein contained, most humbly and respectfully solicits your Excellency in Council to be graciously pleased to take her just and rightful claim into mature deliberation, and pass an order directing the disbursement of the arrears to her.

13. Petitioner is in the most distressed circumstances; she has numerous individuals and dependants on her, and it will not only be an act of justice, but also an act of kind commiseration to order the disbursement of the arrears due to her.

And Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

No. 72 A. From the Sub-Secretary to the Board of Revenue, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Madras, 21st January 1869.

1. With reference to Official Memorandum dated 15th January 1869, No. 7, I am directed to report that, Petition No. 890 of 1850, from Narasingummah was received in the Board's Office. An extract from the Register of Petitions relating to it, is subjoined.

2. No petition was received from Ramakamma in 1846.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 3rd March 1869.

Extract from the Register of Petitions.

No.	Name of the petitioner.	Purport of the petition.	Board's Endorsement.
890 of 1850	From Narasingummah daughter of Ramakamma Chitwail Samastanum, in Cuddapah.	Praying that certain arrears due to her mother during a period of sixteen years may be paid up to her, as she is hard pressed by her mother's creditors, and she has no means of satisfying their demands.	Referred to the Collector for disposal, by Endorsement 1st June 1850.

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Sub-Secretary.

No. 73. ORDER THEREON, 3rd March 1869, No. 550.

Miscellaneous.

1. The claims put forward by the Petitioner formed the subject of a Memorial to the Secretary of State, which was forwarded by this Government on 12th August 1867. In his Despatch of 8th November 1867, the Secretary of State decided adversely to the Petitioner.

2. The Petitioner afterwards submitted a second Memorial, but the Government declined to forward it, on the ground that she had not shewn sufficient ground for a reconsideration of the question.

3. Since the petition now under consideration was filed, the Government have ascertained that in 1850 the Petitioner did address the Board of Revenue on the subject of the arrears claimed by her, and as is alleged, previously by her deceased mother, and that no final orders were passed.

4. Had this fact been established when the case came under consideration in 1866, the Government think that a more favorable view might have been taken, and as they are unwilling that Petitioner should suffer from a mistake, they resolve to transmit to the Secretary of State for India, a statement to the effect that the grounds upon which they based their former recommendation were opposed to the facts, and to express their opinion that the whole amount of the arrears which should have been paid to Ramakamma from 1830 to 1846 should now be disbursed to the Petitioner.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Exd. C. A. Turton.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
3rd March 1869.

No. 551.

No. 74.
To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Miscellaneous.

1. In reply to Mr. Under Secretary Batten's endorsement, dated 16th October 1868, on a Memorial addressed to the Right Honorable the Viceroy, by Narasingamma, grand daughter of Venkataramaray, one of the brothers of the dispossessed Poligar of Chitwail, Cuddapah District, I am directed to state that the Memorialist's claim for the arrears of pension formed the subject of a memorial to the Secretary of State, which was forwarded by this Government on 12th August 1867, and in reference to which, the Secretary of State in his Despatch of 8th November 1867, confirmed the Order of the Madras Government, refusing to re-open a question which had been settled in 1845, and was not mooted again until 1866. A copy of that correspondence is herewith, forwarded, for the information of the Supreme Government.

2. Subsequently, the Memorialist presented a supplementary petition impugning the accuracy of the statement that her claim to the arrears had not been put forward between 1845 and 1866, and asserted that she had repeatedly presented petitions on the subject to the local authorities and the Board of Revenue. On inquiry, it was ascertained that the petitioner had filed a petition on the subject of these arrears in 1857, but the Government did not consider themselves justified in transmitting the second memorial to the Secretary of State on this ground only, considering that the same arguments adduced by them on the previous occasion would hold good, although the period during which she had failed to assert her claims was reduced from 21 to 12 years. The second memorial was therefore returned to the petitioner, under clause 2, Section XIII. of the revised Memorial Rules.

3. The Memorialist in the petition now under consideration, again asserts, that her mother Raunkumma did present a petition on the 26th May 1846, on the subject of the arrears claimed by her. With reference to this assertion, a careful search was again made in the Office of the Board of Revenue, and discovery has been made of a Petition numbered 890 of 1850, which was presented by the petitioner Narasingamma herself, though none from Raunkumma can be traced. Under these circumstances, and considering that the former memorial was rejected on what now seem to be insufficient grounds, this Government have resolved to represent the facts of the case, as recently ascertained, to the Secretary of State, and to recommend that the decision of the Secretary of State, dated 11th November 1867, be reconsidered and the arrears of pension claimed, be disbursed to the Memorialist.

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

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Rad. G. A. Turton.

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

Public Memorials, Vol.

Read

G. O. 3rd March 1869, No. 550.

MARCH
Nos. 72-73.

Memorial from Narasingamah a member of the deposed Chitwail Poligar's family — Favorable report submitted to be made to Home Government with reference to her claim to certain arrears of Pension.

Financial 1869 Department.

[ ]

From Government of Fort St. George.

Dated 3rd March. } No. 551. Enclosures. 6 spare copies.

2. No. } Progs. D.

L. No. } No.

MARCH
No. 74.

Reporting on the Memorial from Narasimmana, grand daughter of Venkatamanaray one of the brothers of the deposed Poligar of Chitwail, claiming certain arrears of Pension.

2381
1 Encl
2/12/68

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
The Governor in Council
Fort Saint George
Madras

The humble Petition of Mutla Narsinga-ummah, granddaughter of Shimmo-Maha Mundeleswara Mutla Vencata-Ramaraj, late Poligar of Chitwaik in the District of Cuddapah

Respectfully Sheweth,

In reference to the order of Government on her Supplementary Memorial No. 2019 of 1867 to the Right Honorable her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, Petitioner solicits, with the utmost deference and respect the attention of your Excellency in Council, to the following fresh facts bearing on her claim to the disbursement of the arrears of pension due to her.

2 In that endorsement it is stated "that "though it appears that a demand for the "payment of arrears of her pension from

1831

1831 to 1845 was presented by her to the Collector in 1857 or eleven years earlier than the Government has supposed. Now, it is with respect to this statement, Petitioner would very respectfully submit that Government have misapprehended the actual time when she first made an appeal and continuously thereafter applied to the authorities for the disbursement of the arrears

3. Petitioners mother on the Registration of the pension in her name in May 1846, consequent the rectification of the error committed by the Board of Revenue that she was the daughter of the late Poligar, applied for the arrears in the same year, but having died within one short year, ie: on June 1847, the arrears were not granted her

4 In 1849 the pension registered on Petitioners name, and she immediately thereupon addressed the collector relative to her claim to the arrears in question, but finding that her applications were for some reason or other ineffectual, she presented her first petition on the subject to the Board of Revenue, No 890, under date the 18th April 1850.

5. This is the chief ground, or fact as it is, to which Petitioner would claim the particular

particular attention of your Excellency in Council. It was not from 1857, which was only a reminder with reference to her Petition, but from 1850, when she preferred her claim to the said arrears, or, in other language, just a year after the registry in her name. Hence it will be apparent that there was no delay whatever, either on the part of her mother or herself in preferring their claim to the arrears. From 1831 up to the time of her death in 1847, Petitioner's mother constantly applied for her pension and the arrears, and it was only through the unaccountable blunder of the Board of Revenue that she was kept out of the enjoyment thereof.

The truth of this statement can be easily ascertained, from the Petition Registers of the Board's Office. Did she or did she not present a Petition No 890, of 1850 dated 18th April 1850?

Such being the facts of the case, surely, it is not for Petitioner further to urge to urge her claim by any stronger representation. There is no denial of her right and title to the arrears. That is a point which is beyond dispute, and were it not for the error originally committed by the Board

of Revenue these arrears would not have accrued. Now that she has proved that there was no delay on her part - that she did prefer her claim from 1850 and not from 1857, as is supposed by Government she leaves it to the just and considerate consideration of your Excellency in Council whether she is not entitled to receive the arrears.

Government in their endorsement on Petition No 1191 of 1866, stated "that after so great a lapse of time, the Government cannot take into consideration Petitioners' claim." Subsequently on Petitioner's Memorial of the 1st July 1867, Government came to the conclusion that it was 21 years after she preferred her claim, and then on her supplementary Memorial No 2019 of 1867, after reference to the Collector, Government passed an endorsement that they learnt that she did not forth her claims 9 years earlier than they had supposed. Each Petitioner has shown that she did prefer her claims in 1850 within a year or so after the pension was registered in her names and not in 1857 - On what grounds then can the arrears be withheld from her.

This further grew on the Endorsement that from the facts of her approach having been finally negatived by the Secretary of State the Government are precluded from again submitting her claim to the Secretary of State for India.

That august authority, it is true, negatived her claim, but that was from insufficient information, the real and whole facts of the case not having been submitted to him. Petitioner, however, entertains the earnest belief that if her rights, as herein set forth, that she did present her claims to the arrears on the 18th April 1850, within a year after the pension was registered in her name, were brought forward to the notice of His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, it will be at once granted.

From this information not having been submitted to the Secretary of State, Section XIII of the Revised Memorial Rules is not at all applicable to her case. She submitted her supplementary Memorial, before the Secretary of State passed his decision on her 1st Memorial but that was not transmitted to him, it having been referred to the Collector for report, which he did not submit till several months later.

Petitioner therefore, with reference to the fresh facts herein contained, most humbly

humbly and respectfully solicits your Excellency in Council to be graciously pleased to take her just & rightful Claim into mature deliberation and pass an order directing the disbursement of the arrears to her.

Petitioner is in the most distress circumstances, she has numerous individuals dependants on her and it will not only be an act of Justice but also an act of kind commiseration to order the disbursement of the arrears due to her

And Petitioner as in duty bound

Shall Ever Pray

31st December 1868

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
The Governor
Fort Saint George
Madras

May it please your Lordship,

I am an unfortunate female and have no other protection under Providence than your honor and it is therefore that I beg most humbly and respectfully to submit my case for your Excellency's just and kind consideration and to solicit that your Excellency will be graciously pleased to take my unfortunate case into consideration.

The facts bearing on my case are briefly as follow: On the resumption of the Chitteval Pollium in 1801, a pension of Rupees 271 was allotted to Venkata Rama Raz, my grandfather and that was guaranteed to him and his heirs in perpetuity.

Accordingly, on his demise the pension was continued, first to his senior widow and next to his senior widow, Venkata Ummah, my grandmother, who died on the 11th November 1830, which circumstance was reported to the Board of Revenue by the Collector on the 18th March 1831 and in which he stated that the deceased had left a daughter named Ramah-Ummah (my mother).

To the misfortune of my mother and myself, the Board perpetrated an error in reporting to Government by stating that my grandmother had left no lineal descendants. After continued

and

and frequent representations and after the elapse of 14 years and on the acknowledgment of the Board in their Proceedings of the 3d March 1845, under the recommendation of the Collector, the supreme Government sanctioned the continuance of the pension which was restored on my mother in may 1846, but the arrears fairly due to her were not disbursed. My mother enjoyed the pension but for a single 12 months, she having died on the 10th June 1847 and since the allowance was continued to me viz 1848.

Subsequent to the death of my mother, I repeatedly brought forward my claims to the notice of the authorities from April 1850 to the arrears of pension, and ultimately to Government when they were pleased to pass an endorsement to the effect that "after so great a lapse of time Government cannot take into consideration Petitioner's claim" Thereupon she preferred a memorial to the Secretary of State under date 1st July 1867, but previous to its transmission to the Home Authorities I presented a supplementary one on the 15th August following, giving some of the numerous occasions and dates on which she had presented petitions in that she specified, Baird's Petition No 890 of 18th April 1850 and the several other occasions she presented thereafter.

Now, I would humbly and respectfully presume to submit for your Excellency's judgment whether it was right and proper to transmit her first Memorial to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Secretary of State and at the same time refer her supplementary one to the Collector for report.

Since a report was called for to verify the statements in the supplementary Memorial,

were

were it not just and equitable to have written to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India to suspend passing any decision on my case until the further information called for from the Collector was furnished and reported upon. This not having been done, that August authority confirmed the decision of Government.

Seven months after the presentation of my supplementary memorial and the reference was made to the Collector, that authority condescended to send in a report whereby all my statements were fully substantiated.

Notwithstanding which Government were pleased to pass an endorsement on my Supplementary Memorial No 2019 of 1867 to the effect that I had preferred Petitions from 1847 or 7 years later than the period when Government had undertaken to pay the back pension for the disbursement of arrears having been negatived by the Secretary of State, Government are precluded from again entertaining the same claim to the Home Authorities and that therefore "the memorial will be returned under section XLIII clause 2, as given above, is utterly inapplicable to my case, and for these reasons, my first memorial was forwarded without the further information contained in my supplementary one and the report of the Collector thereupon. If this information was submitted earlier, Her Majesty's Secretary of State would not have passed that decision adverse to my claim.

In conclusion I would beg to

I

Submit:

* This memorial is dated the 15th August 1850 and not as stated in the letter of transmission and subsequently to the date of the Collector's report which is dated the 18th April 1850 and that other preferred a petition only in 1857.

I That the pension was guaranteed in perpetuity by Government to Petitioner's family.

II That it should have been continued from my mother Ramah Ummah, from the date of my grandmother's demise, but it was not done so this the inadvertency of the Board of Revenue and when, at last, the Board admitted their error and the pension was continued to her in 1866, the arrears due to her for 15½ years were withheld

From what I have stated it will be apparent to your Excellency that it was no fault of mine for not claiming the arrears of pension which I did from the 18th April 1850 up to the present period.

IV Had the full information obtained from the Collector been submitted to the Secretary of State no such reference would have been necessary. So it is just and proper that to declining forwarding my supplementary memorial under Section XIII Clause 2 of the Revised Memorial Rules.

It will be no unprecedented case if the decision passed on it should be reversed, inasmuch as the late Honorable the Court of Directors and the Secretary of State for India have frequently done it in numerous instances when full and true information was laid before them. Your Excellency yourself has in more than one instance caused the reversal of the decisions of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India after being fully informed of the entire facts of the case. I therefore very humbly solicit your Excellency will kindly interest yourself on my humble behalf and cause the decision in my case reversed which, in truth question, it will be confirmed by the Home Authorities.

I beg to remain
Madam, Your most obedient humble Servant
[illegible]

Revenue Department

No 550

Recd from the Madras Govt under date the 3rd March 69

Read the following

Petition from Mutha ex Ponnacinnamma granddaughter of the late Poligar of Chittoor in Cuddapah

(Requesting, under the circumstances stated, that an order may be passed for disbursement of arrears of pension due to her.) (No 281 of 1868)

Rd of Revenue Informing delay of Petition No 870 of 1868 ex from Ponnacinnamah & ex stating that no petition was received from Ponnakanna and in 1866. (No 21 of 1869)

The Memorialist forwarded by the Petitioner formed the subject of a Memorial to the Secretary of State, which was forwarded by this Govt on the 12th August 1867 - In his despatch of 8th Nov 1867, the

the Secretary of State decides adversely to the Petitioners.

2. The Petitioners afterwards submitted a second Memorial, but the Govt declined to forward it on the ground that she had not shewn sufficient ground for a reconsideration of the question.

3 Since the Petition now under consideration was filed, the Govt have ascertained that in 1860 the Petitioner's mother did address the Board of Revenue on the subject of the arrears claimed by her, and that no final orders were passed.

Had this fact been ascertained when the case came under consideration in 1865 the Govt think that a more favourable view might

1547

and, as is alleged, previously by her husband and other

might have been taken, and, as they are unwilling that Petitioner should suffer from a mistake, they resolve to transmit to the Secy of State for India, a statement to the effect that the grounds upon which they based their former recommendation were opposed to the facts, & to express their opinion that the whole amount of the arrears which should have been paid to Ramakumma from 1830 to 1840 should now be disbursed to the Petitioner.

11*

40

S. Ethall

3d March 69.

P D

No. 551.

To The Secretary to the Govt of India
Financial Department

Sir

In reply to Mr. Under Secretary Batten's indorsement, dated 16th October 1868, on a Memorial addressed to the Right Honorable the Viceroy, by Narasimgamma, grand daughter of Venkatasamaraya one of the brothers of the dispossessed Poligar of Chitoor ack, Cuddapah District. I am directed to state that the Memorialist's claim for the arrear of pension formed the subject of a Memorial to the Secretary of State which was forwarded by this Govt.

on

on 12th August 1867, and in reference to which the Secretary of State in his Despatch of 8th Nov. 67 confirmed the order of the Madras Govt. refusing to re-open a question which had been settled in 1863, and was not moved again until 1866. A copy of that correspondence is herewith forwarded for the information of the Supreme Government.

2. Subsequently, the Memorialist presented a supplementary Petition impeaching the accuracy of the statement that her claim had not been put forward between 1863 & 1866 and asserted that she had repeatedly presented petitions on the subject to the local authorities & the Board of Revenue. On inquiry it was ascertained that the Petitioner had filed a Petition in the subject of these arrears in 1863-7, but the Government did not consider themselves justified in transmitting the 2nd Memorial to the Secretary of State on this ground only; considering that the same arguments adduced by them on the previous occasion would hold good although the period during which she had failed to assert her claims was reduced from 21 to 12 years. The second Memorial was therefore returned to the Petitioner under clause 2, section XIII of the

her claim to the arrears

the revised Memorial rules.

3. The Memorialist in the Petition now under consideration again asserts that her mother Ramkumma did present a petition on the 26 May 1846 on the subject of the arrears claimed by her. With reference to this assertion a careful search was again made in the Office of the Board of Revenue, and diligent discovery has been made of a Petition numbered 890 of 1850. Under these circumstances, and considering that the former memorial was rejected on insufficient grounds, this Government have resolved to represent the facts of the case as recently ascertained to the Secretary of State, and to recommend that the decision of the Secretary of State dated 11 Nov. 1857 be reconsidered and the arrears of pension claimed be distributed to the Memorialist.

HW

^ It was presented by the Petitioner Naraingham herself though none from Rama kummal can be traced.

° What now seem to be

S. Hobhouse

Richard & Eliz. Lloyd
Cha. Plan