M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 68

(2) Date of repair 15·11·68

(3) Initials of the Referencer 4/12

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. ~~B.P. No.~~ 9

Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 5-1-1876 ~~196~~.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th January 1876.

Read the following Petitions:—

No. 18. From A. SREENIVASSA RAO SAHIB, Jághírdár of Arnee.

[illegible]STRACT.—A[illegible]ating against the [illegible] of the D[illegible] C[illegible]ector, dated 17th May 1875, No. [illegible]ring the peti[illegible] the orders of [illegible] Collector, to G.O., dated 1st Oct[illegible] 1858, No. 1,360, Judicial Consultation, an[illegible] that, under the said or[illegible] power of nominating and dismissing vil[illegible]gars in the Arnee Jágír is solely vested in the Collector and his divisional officers and not in the Jághírdár.

No. 19. From A. SREENIVASSA RAO SAHIB, Jágírdár of Arnee, dated 1st July 1875.

ABSTRACT.—Referring to his former petition which was returned under paragraph 2, submits the copies of his letters to the Deputy Collector and of his replies thereto.

2. Prays that Government may reconsider their order, dated 1st October 1858, No. 1,360, Judicial Department.

No. 20. ORDER THEREON, 5th January 1876, No. 9.

Miscellaneous.

Regulation VI., 31.

THE law is quite clear; that, in the case of all ancient village offices (except Accountants in Zamindaries) the authority and control of the Collector are complete, subject to the limitation contained in Section 3 of Regulation IV. of 1816, and to the usual appeal. These village officers, however, have two sets of duties, one in relation to the proprietor of the estate, where there is a proprietor distinct from the Government; and one in relation to the Magistrate and Collector who is the guardian of the public peace as Chief Magistrate of the district. This being so, it is the undoubted duty of the Collector to punish the incumbents for misconduct or neglect in both their capacities. A man may be a very fair head of a village, from a Police point of view, and yet so signally fail in his duties as a revenue official, as to be justly amenable to exemplary punishment; and *vice versâ*. Any complaint from the Jágírdár against a village servant should be carefully looked into by the Collector in the same manner as he would inquire into a case of misconduct were he himself managing the village on behalf of Government; and should be dealt with as he would deal with it in a Government village.

2. This course will practically give the Jágírdár all the relief he requires. The Government are unable to give him the direct power of dismissal.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Petition Department.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Govt. of 1876: Madras.

REVENUE.

THE PETITION DEPARTMENT,
&c., &c., &c.

ed January, 5th.

ed. Encl.

G. O., 5th January 1876, No. 9.

JANUARY.
Nos. 18—20.

Village Officials in Arnee Jagír.—Intimating that the Government are unable to give the rdár the direct power of dismissing the —'s, directing that any complaint from the Jágírdar against a village servant should be carefully into by the Collector.

9

Audley House
29th May 1875

Honorable & Dear Sir

I am encouraged by the kind interest which Your Excellency has at all times taken in my personal affairs to hope that the petition to the Madras Government (Copy of which I have the honor to enclose) may receive favorable consideration at Your Excellency's hands and at those of the other members of the Government.

My object, as I am sure

Your Excellency is aware, is to
do my duty honorably to my
estate and to my ryots. I have
not the slightest wish to curtail
any of the customary payments
to village officers or in any way
to act oppressively to the people:
but the difficulty which I experience
is one which Your
Excellency will readily appreciate
(viz) the difficulty of dealing with
and controlling officers over
whose appointment and dismissal
I am supposed to have no
power.

power. There are several hundreds
of these petty officials in my Jaghire,
they are really my servants for
the purpose of collecting my revenue
the whole of which with the exception
of a Nuzzer of Rs 6000 and the
Road Cess is mine absolutely.
Upon their regularity, diligence
and honesty my income largely
depends. How is it reconcileable
with common sense that men
who are responsible to me in
such important particulars
should be made independent
of me in matters of discipline
and

& be enabled to defy my authority.

What I would venture to ask, is if it be held ~~by law~~ that the law at present ~~vests~~ vests the Appointment & dismissal of Monegars in the hands of the Collector, if that a dismissal by the Collector of a village Moonsiff or by myself of a Monegar should have the like effect. If the Collector dismisses a Moonsiff, let that dismissal be good for the Monegar. If I dismiss a Monegar for misconduct, let

My dismissal hold good as to the village Moonsiff. Every thing will then work harmoniously, otherwise I really despair of conducting my estate in a satisfactory and honorable manner.

I trust your Excellency will appreciate the motives which have induced me move in the matter. I have no wish to ~~a~~ set up my authority against that of the Collector, although the the Collector's authority is

sometimes

sometimes made to conflict disagreeably with my own; but I do want to exercise a reasonable and necessary authority over the officials employed to collect my revenues and I trust that your Excellency will enable me to do so.

I respectfully beg to remai

My dear Sir

Ever Your Obedient Serv

A. Srinivasa Row

Sahib

Jaghiredar of Ar

17

Govt. House
Ootacamund
4th June 1875

Transferred to the
Chief Secretary to
Government
for orders

Berkle Hobart
a tem-
pry: Secretary
for
Private Secretary

Under 1466 of 75.

Petition

9/6

No. 1397 of 1875 D/
Recd 18th June 1875

From A. Sreenivasa Rao Saheb,
Jagheerdar of Arnee.

Appealing against the letter of the Dy Collector D/ 17th May 1875, No. 15 referring the Petitioner under the orders of the Collector to G. O. dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360, Judicial Consultation & stating that under the said order the power of nominating and dismissing village Manragars in the Arnee Jagheer is solely vested in the Collector & his divisional officers and not in the Jagheerdar.

No. 1466 of 1875 D/ 29th May 1875.
Recd 24th June "

From Do — Do — Do

Submitting a copy of his former petition prays that he may be allowed to exercise due and reasonable authority over the officials who are entrusted with the Collections of of the revenue of his Jaghere.

No. 1582 of 1875 D/ 1st July 1875

Recd 7th July

From Do — Do — Do

Referring to his former petn which was returned under para 2 submits the copies of his letters to the Dy Collector and of his replies thereto.

Prays that Govt. may re-consider their order dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360 Judl. Deptt.

No. 1612 of 1875 D/ 7th July 1875

Recd 12th " "

From Do — Do — Do

In Continuation of his petition on the Subject of the appointment and dismissal of Maneagars in Arnee Jaghee, submits for the Consideration of Govt. a letter addressed to the late Jagheedar of Arnee by R W Barlow Esqre, the then Sub Collector of North Arcot.

1466
24/6/75
Cat

9/7

To

The Hon'ble D. F. CARMICHAEL,

Chief Secretary to Government.

HONORED SIR,

I have the honor to request your kind attention to the following remarks on the subject of the nomination and dismissal of Monegars or Head-men in the villages comprised in my Jaghire.

2. One Arimuthoo Gounden, the Monegar of the Village of Kiliyur, in my Jaghire, died on the 8th of August 1874, and I appointed in his stead his son Kistna Gounden, who had been recommended by my Tahsildar, and of whose qualifications for the post I had satisfied myself by a personal interview.

3. I reported this nomination to the Deputy Collector, Iyooloo Naidoogauroo, who is in charge of my North Arcot division, in a khat, dated 6th November 1874, No. 364, and requested him to issue the sunnad of appointment as Village Munsiff in the name of my nominee.

4. The Deputy Collector, however, in his reply, dated 19th November 1874, No. 8, intimated that the power of nominating and dismissing Village Monegars had all along been solely exercised by the Collector and his divisional Officers, and requested me to state under what authority I made the nomination reported to him.

5. I sent him a reply on the 9th December 1874, No. 429, in which I succintly noted the several [illegible]ink that I could nominate my own Monegars.

[illegible]ver, has since written me a letter, dated 17th March 1875, No. 15, in which, under orders of the Collector, he refers me to G. O., dated 1st October 1858, No. 1360, Judicial Consultation, and states that under that order the power of nomination and dismissal is solely vested in the Collector and his Divisional Officers, and that I can only recommend eligible persons for the office.

7. On a perusal of the G. O. in question I am not convinced that the question, as it regards myself, is finally concluded by it, and I venture to think that the question still admits of some discussion.

8. The law on the subject of Village Officers is contained in Regulation VI of 1831. It has been held that this Regulation applies to Village Officers wherever situated, *i.e.*, whether in Zemindaris or Government Villages, provided emoluments have been annexed to those offices by the State.

9. As regards the Arnee Jaghire however, it appears to me questionable whether it can with any degree of propriety be asserted that emoluments have been *annexed by the State* to the Village Offices in the Jaghire.

10. The case is otherwise in regard to Zemindaris. They are all of them permanently settled estates, and at the time of the original settlement a portion of the assets were by mutual agreement *set apart* as remuneration for village servants. It is therefore consistent with the duty of Government that they should be anxious to guard the emoluments so set apart from retrenchment or resumption, and should reserve to themselves the requisite powers to maintain an immediate control over them under Regulation VI of 1831.

11. But the Jaghire of Arnee is not, in the same sense, a permanently settled estate, inasmuch as there never was any settlement between Government and the Jaghirdars of the assets, as in the case of Zemindaris. The tenure on which it is held, is in my humble opinion, different from that of the Zemindaris settled under Regulation XXV of 1802; and the kist of Rs.6,000, which the Jaghire pays, has no reference to its assets, and is simply termed a "*Nazzar.*" The sunnad also is differently worded, and makes no allusion to unresumable Inams, &c., as in the

sunnads of settled estates. The Jaghire is one of those exceptional cases of property, of political origin, assigned by some former power, under treaty, to the original holder, and continued by the British Government on like terms to the descendents of the first grantee.

Vide copy of Treaty.

12. It can scarcely with correctness, therefore, be stated that any emoluments have been annexed by the State to the Village Offices in the Jaghire, and the village dues now existing would be more properly regarded as having been assigned by the Jaghirdars out of their own income.

13. This view of the case appears to receive confirmation from past incidents in the history of the Jaghire. In Fusli 1215, when the Jaghire was under the management of the Court of Wards, a *fieldwar Pymaish* of the Jaghire was made by Mr. Ravenshaw, then Collector of North Arcot. In this Pymaish the Inams enjoyed by the several Village Officers were noted. But only two years later, that is in Fusli 1217, the then Jaghirdar reduced all the Inams by one-fourth. The reduction then made still stands good, and supports the view that the Inams were all of his own or his ancestors' bestowal, and that it was in his discretion to curtail or increase them.

14. This reduction, as also some changes made by some succeeding Jaghirdars in the *Mera* of Monegars, attracted the notice of Mr. Whiteside, during one of the recent Jamabundi settlements which he made under the orders of the Court of Wards during my minority; and not feeling competent to rescind old arrangements, he wrote to the Court to know if he might quash the resumption. They however declined to interfere, and desired that the matter might be left to be decided by me when I should come of age, thus again impliedly sanctioning the view that it was with me and not with the Collector that the matter rested.

15. There are, moreover, several villages in the Jaghire where the only remuneration allowed to Village Officers consists of money payments, which evidently come out of the Jaghirdar's funds.

16. Under these circumstances, therefore, I would submit that Regulation VI of 1831, which applies in regard to Village Offices for which emoluments have been assigned by the State, does not apply to my Jaghire, and that it is within my competence to deal with the Village Officers employed on the Jaghire.

17. I do not claim the privilege to curtail present emoluments, or to bestow the offices on families and persons who are not strictly in the hereditary line, but with these limitations I claim the privilege to nominate, or to suspend, fine or remove Village Officers, on sufficient cause being shown.

18. The right so claimed is not without parallel. If I have been correctly informed, like powers are exercised by the Mootadars in Salem, and at least by one Inamdar in the North Arcot District, viz., the Inamdar of Royalcharavoo Village, in the Karveti Naggar Zamindari. This Inamdar dismissed his Monegar of his own authority, and the dismissal was upheld by the Collector, and ultimately by the Board. The date and number of the decision on the file of the Collector of North Arcot is noted in the margin for reference.

Dated 14th March 1870, No. 240.

19. The above decision distinctly enunciates the position that a Monegar is a private agent of the proprietor appointed for the collection of Revenue, and that the proprietor should be at liberty to make his own arrangements as to his nomination and dismissal. The decision further states that as the Monegar is virtually the head of a village the Collector should issue the sunnad of Village Munsiff to the person appointed Monegar by the proprietor.

20. Moreover, when discussing the scope and applicability of Regulation VI of 1831, the Government, in their orders marginally noted, say it extends to *Zamindaris* generally, and in North Arcot in particular to Kalastri, Karvati Naggar, Kangundi and Punganur; but no allusion is made to the Jaghire of Arnee, which is held on a different tenure to that of Zamindaris.

Government Order, dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360 Judicial Consultation; 29th July 1858, No. 937, Judicial Consultation.

21. If this view of the case does not commend itself to your approval, and you still hold that Regulation VI of 1831 is applicable to my Jaghire, I beg your attention to the following considerations.

22. The question as regards Village Officers involves two points, (1) their nomination, and (2) their removal, fine or suspension. I shall deal with these two aspects of the question separately.

23. You will observe, from the khat of the Deputy Collector, referred to in para 6 *supra*, that he says it is not competent to me to nominate my own Monegar. But reading through the whole of the Regulation VI of 1831 I fail to see that there is any provision in it which prevents me from making my own nomination, provided it does not involve any alienation of the emoluments or disrespect to hereditary claims.

24. If any alienation or disrespect to hereditary claims occurred the immediate remedy is a summary suit to the Collector; and I believe that the object of Regulation VI of 1831 is to afford such relief only.

25. Even in Zemindaris the privilege of appointment to the more important office of Curnam rests with the Zemindars (vide Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802), and I submit that I am entitled to similar powers in regard to nomination of Monegars, even under the supposition that Regulation VI of 1831 does apply to my Jaghire.

26. The next point I come to is the suspension, removal or fining of village officers. If Regulation VI of 1831 is held to apply to my Jaghire, of course the powers for removal are exclusively vested in the Collector and his divisional Officers. Sec. VII.

27. But I submit that with a view to the importance of the interests at stake of the person who employs the village officers, the powers may also be vested in the Jaghirdar, subject to appeal to the Collector.

28. When the Government in their orders marginally noted, and already referred to in para 20 *supra*, laid down that the Collector alone had the power to dismiss Monegars, the immediate object they had in view was the enforcement of better police discipline and arrangement. To this end it is doubtless essential that a condemned Village Munsiff should be dismissed by the Collector, and that such dismissal should also carry with it the loss of emoluments and the loss of the office of Monegar. But this need not prevent the Jaghirdar from dismissing the Monegar if he was guilty of any fraud in his revenue duties, and such dismissal, if approved on appeal by the Collector, might also be made to involve the loss of the office of Munsiff and the emoluments. Police considerations would in no way suffer by such an arrangement, and both the Collector and the Jaghirdar would be in a position to protect respectively their Police and Revenue interests. In fact this is the very point settled in the Royalcharavoo case already referred to in para 19 above.

29. In conclusion I beg to observe that if these powers are not conceded, my power to effect improvements in the Revenue administration of my Jaghire will be little or nothing, and that my authority will be set at naught by my own servants. I can cite at present several cases of malversation by Monegars, in which I am altogether powerless to punish them, except by the tedious process of criminal prosecution. I believe it is the well-considered opinion of the best Revenue Officers in the Presidency, in communication with the proposed revision of Regulation XXV of 1802 about *Zemindari Curnams*, that the power to dismiss them should also be allowed to Zemindars, an opinion which goes a great way to support my request.

I respectfully beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,

Jaghirdar of Arnee.

F. O. No. 1397 of 1871: 9.2

2/9

Revenue 1875 Septr

Government of Madras.

No 4857

Rev. DEPARTMENT.

S.O. No 9/76 5th Jany

Petition No. 466 of 1875.

From ... Sreenevasa Rao Sahib

Occupation Jaghirdar of

Village.

Talook. Arnee

District. North Arcot.

Dated 29th May } 1875.
Received 24th June } 1875.

Enclosure. One

ABSTRACT.

Submitting a copy of his former petition prays that he may be allowed to exercise due & reasonable authority over the officials who are entrusted with the collection of the revenue of his Jaghire.

No 18

Revenue 1875 Septr 1397
No 4857 18/6/75.
Encl one.

9/10

To

The Hon'ble D. F. CARMICHAEL,

Chief Secretary to Government.

HONORED SIR,

I have the honor to request your kind attention to the following remarks on the subject of the nomination and dismissal of Monegars or Head-men in the villages comprised in my Jaghire.

2. One Arimuthoo Gounden, the Monegar of the Village of Kiliyur, in my Jaghire, died on the 8th of August 1874, and I appointed in his stead his son Kistna Gounden, who had been recommended by my Tahsildar, and of whose qualifications for the post I had satisfied myself by a personal interview.

3. I reported this nomination to the Deputy Collector, Iyooloo Naidoogauroo, who is in charge of my North Arcot division, in a khat, dated 6th November 1874, No. 364, and requested him to issue the sunnad of appointment as Village Munsiff in the name of my nominee.

4. The Deputy Collector, however, in his reply, dated 19th November 1874, No. 8, intimated that the power of nominating and dismissing Village Monegars had all along been solely exercised by the Collector and his divisional Officers, and requested me to state under what authority I made the nomination reported to him.

5. I sent him a reply on the 9th December 1874, No. 429, in which I succintly noted the several grounds which induced me to think that I could nominate my own Monegars.

6. The Deputy Collector, however, has since written me a letter, dated 17th March 1875, No. 15, in which, under orders of the Collector, he refers me to G. O., dated 1st October 1858, No. 1360, Judicial Consultation, and states that under that order the power of nomination and dismissal is solely vested in the Collector and his Divisional Officers, and that I can only recommend eligible persons for the office.

7. On a perusal of the G. O. in question I am not convinced that the question, as it regards myself, is finally concluded by it, and I venture to think that the question still admits of some discussion.

8. The law on the subject of Village Officers is contained in Regulation VI of 1831. It has been held that this Regulation applies to Village Officers wherever situated, *i.e.*, whether in Zemindaris or Government Villages, provided emoluments have been annexed to those offices by the State.

9. As regards the Arnee Jaghire however, it appears to me questionable whether it can with any degree of propriety be asserted that emoluments have been *annexed by the State* to the Village Offices in the Jaghire.

10. The case is otherwise in regard to Zemindaris. They are all of them permanently settled estates, and at the time of the original settlement a portion of the assets were by mutual agreement *set apart* as remuneration for village servants. It is therefore consistent with the duty of Government that they should be anxious to guard the emoluments so set apart from retrenchment or resumption, and should reserve to themselves the requisite powers to maintain an immediate control over them under Regulation VI of 1831.

11. But the Jaghire of Arnee is not, in the same sense, a permanently settled estate, inasmuch as there never was any settlement between Government and the Jaghirdars of the assets, as in the case of Zemindaris. The tenure on which it is held, is in my humble opinion, different from that of the Zemindaris settled under Regulation XXV of 1802; and the kist of Rs.6,000, which the Jaghire pays, has no reference to its assets, and is simply termed a "*Nazzar.*" The sunnad also is differently worded, and makes no allusion to unresumable Inams, &c., as in the

sunnads of settled estates. The Jaghire is one of those exceptional cases of property, of political origin, assigned by some former power, under treaty, to the original holder, and continued by the British Government on like terms to the descendents of the first grantee.

Vide copy of Treaty.

12. It can scarcely with correctness, therefore, be stated that any emoluments have been annexed by the State to the Village Offices in the Jaghire, and the village dues now existing would be more properly regarded as having been assigned by the Jaghirdars out of their own income.

13. This view of the case appears to receive confirmation from past incidents in the history of the Jaghire. In Fusli 1215, when the Jaghire was under the management of the Court of Wards, a *fieldwar Pymaish* of the Jaghire was made by Mr. Ravenshaw, then Collector of North Arcot. In this Pymaish the Inams enjoyed by the several Village Officers were noted. But only two years later, that is in Fusli 1217, the then Jaghirdar reduced all the Inams by one-fourth. The reduction then made still stands good, and supports the view that the Inams were all of his own or his ancestors' bestowal, and that it was in his discretion to curtail or increase them.

14. This reduction, as also some changes made by some succeeding Jaghirdars in the *Mera* of Monegars, attracted the notice of Mr. Whiteside, during one of the recent Jamabundi settlements which he made under the orders of the Court of Wards during my minority; and not feeling competent to rescind old arrangements, he wrote to the Court to know if he might quash the resumption. They however declined to interfere, and desired that the matter might be left to be decided by me when I should come of age, thus again impliedly sanctioning the view that it was with me and not with the Collector that the matter rested.

15. There are, moreover, several villages in the Jaghire where the only remuneration allowed to Village Officers consists of money payments, which evidently come out of the Jaghirdar's funds.

16. Under these circumstances, therefore, I would submit that Regulation VI of 1831, which applies in regard to Village Offices for which emoluments have been assigned by the State, does not apply to my Jaghire, and that it is within my competence to deal with the Village Officers employed on the Jaghire.

17. I do not claim the privilege to curtail present emoluments, or to bestow the offices on families and persons who are not strictly in the hereditary line, but with these limitations I claim the privilege to nominate, or to suspend, fine or remove Village Officers, on sufficient cause being shown.

18. The right so claimed is not without parallel. If I have been correctly informed, like powers are exercised by the Mootadars in Salem, and at least by one Inamdar in the North Arcot District, viz., the Inamdar of Royalcharavoo Village, in the Karveti Naggar Zamindari. This Inamdar dismissed his Monegar of his own authority, and the dismissal was upheld by the Collector, and ultimately by the Board. The date and number of the decision on the file of the Collector of North Arcot is noted in the margin for reference.

Dated 14th March 1870, No. 240.

19. The above decision distinctly enunciates the position that a Monegar is a private agent of the proprietor appointed for the collection of Revenue, and that the proprietor should be at liberty to make his own arrangements as to his nomination and dismissal. The decision further states that as the Monegar is virtually the head of a village the Collector should issue the sunnad of Village Munsiff to the person appointed Monegar by the proprietor.

20. Moreover, when discussing the scope and applicability of Regulation VI of 1831, the Government, in their orders marginally noted, say it extends to *Zamindaris* generally, and in North Arcot in particular to Kalastri, Karvati Naggar, Kangundi and Punganur; but no allusion is made to the Jaghire of Arnee, which is held on a different tenure to that of Zamindaris.

Government Order, dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360 Judicial Consultation; 29th July 1858, No. 937, Judicial Consultation.

21. If this view of the case does not commend itself to your approval, and you still hold that Regulation VI of 1831 is applicable to my Jaghire, I beg your attention to the following considerations.

22. The question as regards Village Officers involves two points, (1) their nomination, and (2) their removal, fine or suspension. I shall deal with these two aspects of the question separately.

23. You will observe, from the khat of the Deputy Collector, referred to in para 6 *supra*, that he says it is not competent to me to nominate my own Monegar. But reading through the whole of the Regulation VI of 1831 I fail to see that there is any provision in it which prevents me from making my own nomination, provided it does not involve any alienation of the emoluments or disrespect to hereditary claims.

24. If any alienation or disrespect to hereditary claims occurred the immediate remedy is a summary suit to the Collector; and I believe that the object of Regulation VI of 1831 is to afford such relief only.

25. Even in Zemindaris the privilege of appointment to the more important office of Curnam rests with the Zemindars (vide Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802), and I submit that I am entitled to similar powers in regard to nomination of Monegars, even under the supposition that Regulation VI of 1831 does apply to my Jaghire.

26. The next point I come to is the suspension, removal or fining of village officers. If Regulation VI of 1831 is held to apply to my Jaghire, of course the powers for removal are exclusively vested in the Collector and his divisional Officers. Sec. VII.

27. But I submit that with a view to the importance of the interests at stake of the person who employs the village officers, the powers may also be vested in the Jaghirdar, subject to appeal to the Collector.

28. When the Government in their orders marginally noted, and already referred to in para 20 *supra*, laid down that the Collector alone had the power to dismiss Monegars, the immediate object they had in view was the enforcement of better police discipline and arrangement. To this end it is doubtless essential that a condemned Village Munsiff should be dismissed by the Collector, and that such dismissal should also carry with it the loss of emoluments and the loss of the office of Monegar. But this need not prevent the Jaghirdar from dismissing the Monegar if he was guilty of any fraud in his revenue duties, and such dismissal, if approved on appeal by the Collector, might also be made to involve the loss of the office of Munsiff and the emoluments. Police considerations would in no way suffer by such an arrangement, and both the Collector and the Jaghirdar would be in a position to protect respectively their Police and Revenue interests. In fact this is the very point settled in the Royalcharavoo case already referred to in para 19 above.

29. In conclusion I beg to observe that if these powers are not conceded, my power to effect improvements in the Revenue administration of my Jaghire will be little or nothing, and that my authority will be set at naught by my own servants. I can cite at present several cases of malversation by Monegars, in which I am altogether powerless to punish them, except by the tedious process of criminal prosecution. I believe it is the well-considered opinion of the best Revenue Officers in the Presidency, in communication with the proposed revision of Regulation XXV of 1802 about *Zemindari Curnams*, that the power to dismiss them should also be allowed to Zemindars, an opinion which goes a great way to support my request.

I respectfully beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,

A. Treenasta Row
Sahib
Jaghirdar of Arnee.

9/12

Government of Madras.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement on No. 1397 of 1875.

"The Government will not receive a petition on any matter, unless it shall appear that the Petitioner has first applied to the local authority, and all so to the Board or other controlling authority, where such exists. The petitions addressed to such local and controlling authorities, or copies of them, and the answers or orders of those authorities respectively, if any shall have been passed, must be annexed to the petition addressed to Government." (Revised Petitions Rules, para 2.)

(By Order.)

Fort Saint George,
21st June 1875.

Under-Secretary to Government.

In No 1582 of 75.

A.

Extract of Fort Saint George Military Consultations, 20th September, 1762.

A Treaty and Agreement made and concluded between Woomdatool Moollock, Serajah Dowlah, Anaverdy Cawn, Behauder, Munsoor Jung, Nabob of the Carnatic, Pyen Gaut, and Pertaupa Sing, Rajah of Tanjore, in manner following.

* * * * * *

5th. The said Nabob Anaverdy Cawn, Behauder, having expended immence sums during the late troubles in defence of the province under his Government, found it necessary, after the expulsion of the common enemy, to call upon the several Jemmidars, Poligars, and Jagiredars, to contribute each a moderate sum towards reimbursing the monies so expended in procuring the blessings of the peace, of which they became partakers, and amongst others did demand of Tremaul Row, Killidar of Arnee, his reasonable quota; but the said Tremaul Row having obstinately refused to comply therewith, and having also in other respects behaved himself disobediently, the said Nabob found himself obliged to compel him to a compliance with his demand; and did accordingly subdue and take the Forts of Arnee and Doby-Guddy, with all the Jaghire thereunto belonging, as also the person of the said Tremaul Row, with his family and others. The said Nabob having thus convinced the said Tremaul Row, and all the world that he can and will enforce due obedience in all who are subject to his Government, is now equally desirous of shewing to all mankind that compassion is stronger in him than resentment. From these motives as well as in condescension to the request of the said Rajah Pertaupah Sing, the said Nabob doth hereby promise, that as soon as the said Rajah shall have signed this agreement, he, the said Nabob, will cause the said Tremaul Row, with his family, attendants, and all other persons who were taken and made prisoners at Arnee to be released and set at full liberty; and further, that on the day the sum of three Lacks of Rupees, mentioned in the first article hereof, shall be paid, he will cause the said Tremaul Row to be put in full possession of the whole Jaghire he possessed and enjoyed before the capture of Arnee (excepting however the said Fort and Doby-Guddy, which the said Nabob will retain in his own possession); and provided that the said Tremaul Row shall not at any time hereafter erect, or cause to be erected, any fortress, walled Pagoda, or other strong-hold, and that he shall not even erect or build any wall round his dwelling house exceeding eight feet high and two feet thick, and further, that the said Tremaul Row shall in all things behave himself with due obedience to the Government, and pay yearly, in the month of July, unto the said Nabob, or his successors, the sum of ten thousand Rupees; and the said Rajah Pertaupah Sing doth promise for the said Tremaul Row, that he shall in all things demean and behave himself accordingly, and pay yearly the stipulated sum.

We George Pigot, Esquire, Covernor of Fort Saint George, and all the forts and factories and places subordinate thereto, President of the Council for all the affairs of the English East India Company on the Coast of Coromandel, and also the said Council, whose names are hereunto signed, having greatly at heart the peace and tranquillity of the countries where the Company hold possessions, and to which they trade, see with great satisfaction the conclusion of the treaty of friendship between Nabob Woomdatooll Moollock, Serajah Dowlah, Anaverdy Cawn, Behauder, Munsoor Jung, Nabob of the Carnatic Pyen Gaut, and Pertaupah Sing, Rajah of Tanjore, of which the foregoing is a translation; and being willing and desirous, as much as in us lies, to establish the friendship between them upon a lasting foundation, do hereby promise to guaranty the performance of the said treaty, being thereunto invited by both parties. And accordingly we do hereby promise, as far as in us lies, that in case either party shall fail in the performance of the articles he hath hereby undertaken to perform, or any part thereof, we will, to the utmost of our power, assist the other party to compell him who shall fail to fulfil his agreement, and to render due satisfaction for his failure therein. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and caused the seal of the said Company to be affixed hereto, in Fort Saint George, the 12th October, 1762.

(Signed) GEORGE PIGOT, &c.

Ju No 1397 of 75

Ju No 1582 of 75

[illegible]
364

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1874 [illegible]

Jaghirdar of Arnee

True Copy

Sreenivasa Row
Jaghirdar of Arnee

C.A.
Compd.
W.R.

20-11-74

vide Ahlah No 429

dated 27 [illegible]

ASRS

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 364 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] No 1582 [illegible]

16

429

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1874 [illegible]

ASRS

Jaghirdar of Arnee

| True Copy |

A. [illegible] Rao

Jaghirdar of Arnee

Compd

Received 3-75

ASRA

15

[illegible]

[illegible]

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 1st October 1858

+ 1858 [illegible] 1360

Sr. No 1582 7/75

6-

Sr. No 1582 7/75

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
3 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1875 [illegible] 17 [illegible]

P. Kalichandra
[illegible]

Allo

[illegible]
[illegible]

Ju. No 1582 7/75

To

The Deputy Collector
General Duties
Arcot

Sir

1 I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 19th Novembe 1874 No 8 enquiring to know under what authori the appointm[illegible] of the Maniagar of Keelay village was conferred by me on Kistna Goundu son of Arimoothoo Goundoo.

2 In reply I beg to state that the nominatio was made under the circumstances detailed below.

3 The only Regulation now in force whic confers on Government or its officers the powe of interference in the nomination or dismissa of village servants is Regulation VI of 1831 and it applies only to Government Talug

In No 1582 7/7/75

and may perhaps, with much straining, be made to apply to Permanently settled Estates only in case of unauthorized resumptions. The reason that Government reserved such right in regard to those estates is that at the original settlement a portion of the assets of the estates were by mutual agreement set apart as remuneration for village servants and it behoves Government to guard such assigned assets from retrenchment or resumption.

4 The Jaghire of Arnee is not in the same sense a Permanently settled Estate. There never was any settlement between Government and the Jaghiredars of the assets of the Estate. The tenure on which it is held is entirely different from that of the Zamindaries settled under Regulation XXV of 1802 and the Kist of 6000 — which the Jaghire pays has no reference to its assets as in other estates but is termed a Nuzzur. The Sunnad also is differently worded and makes no allusion to unresumable Inams &c. as in the Sunnads of settled estates. The Jaghire is one of those exceptional cases of property politically recognized and assigned under Treaties with the State.

5 It may also be observed that even in the case of Permanently settled Estates, the only interference Government can claim is in [illegible] dismissal of the village officer, not in his nomination which entirely rests in the Zamindar vide Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802 in which it is stated that the appointment to the more important office of Curnum vests in him.

the exception proves the rule

6 But under the circumstances explained in para 4, the power to nominate as well as to dismiss belong

to the Jaghiredar in the Arnee Jaghire in which all allowances and Inams made to village servants are at the discretion of the Jaghiredars and there is no scope for Government interference.

7 This view of the case appears to receive confirmation from past incidents in the history of the Jaghire. In Fasly 1215 when the Jaghire was under the management of the Court of Wards a Kethwar Pymash of the Jaghire was made by Mr Ravenshaw then Collector of North Arcot. In this Pymash, the Inams enjoyed by the several village officers were noted. But only two years later (ie.) in Fasly 1217 the then Jaghiredar reduced all the Inams by one-fourth. The reduction then made still stands good and can have only one meaning viz that it was in the discretion of the Jaghiredar to interfere as he did with the Inams.

1804-5

I suppose the escap was made up of encroachments

[illegible]

2

21

8 This reduction, as also some changes made by the Jaghiredars in the Merah of Manigars attracted the notice of the Collr during the late jamabundy, and not feeling competent to rescind old arrangements, he wrote to the Court of Wards to know if the resumption could now be quashed. The Court of Wards wrote back to say that they decline to [illegible] that they should be left to be decided by the Minor Jaghiredar at his own discretion when he came of age.

9 I have further to add that there are several villages where the only remuneration allowed to village officers consists of money payments periodically made without any landed Inams annexed to them and vice versa.

In No 1882 of 75

10 All these things indisputably point that the Jaghirdar has the power to make his own arrangements as to nomination and dismissal of village servants. And the exercise of such powers is not inconsistent with the practice now obtaining elsewhere. In the case of Royelcherrie, an Inam village in the Karvetnuggur Zamindary, the Inamdar dismissed the Manigar of his own authority. This dismissal was upheld on the ground of the Inamdar's own right by the Collector and ultimately by the Board also. The date and No. of the decision on the file of the Collector of North Arcot is noted in the margin for reference.

It must have been a grant made by the Inamdar himself & not an old grant.

Dated 11th March 1870 No. 240.

11 The above decision distinctly enunciates the position that a Manigar is a private agent of the proprietor appointed for the Collection of the revenue, that the proprietor should be at liberty to make his own arrangements as to his nomination and dismissal and that as the Manigar of a village is virtually the head of the village, the Collector should issue the Sunnud of village Moonsiff to the person appointed Manigar on the proprietor's application. This practice is followed now in regard to the Royelcherrie village and it is consistent with sections 1 to 3 of Reg. IV of 1816. These powers are also exercised by the Moottadars in the Salem District.

12 After this it cannot be argued that because the power of constituting a village Moonsiff rests with the Collector, he should also have

the power of nominating the village Manigar.

13 In conclusion it must be added that it does not stand to reason that the Jaghiredar should not have power of appointing persons for the Collection of his own revenue and deal with them as he thinks proper. And further that as it was not the State but the Jaghiredars out of their own free will and revenues that fixed the remuneration either in Service Inam lands or money to village offices, it is but fair that they should be allowed to exercise the powers in question. If this should not be so, the Jaghiredar's power in effect

23

improvements in the Revenue System will be very limited and his authority set at naught by his own Servants. Hundreds of cases of malversation by Manigars may be cited and I am altogether powerless to punish them unless by the tedious process of criminal prosecutions.

Arnee Sathyavijia }
nagarum 5th Decr }
1874 }

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your obedient Servant
(Signed) A. Streenivasa Rao Sahib
Jagheridar of
Arnee.

(True Copy)

A. Sreenivasa Rao
Sahib

In No 1582 of 75

In 51582 5/7/75

1582
8 Lee
7/7/75

Arnee
1st July 1875 25

To

The Honorable D. F. Carmichael
Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras

Honored Sir

My petition to your address [illegible] dismissal of village Monegars in my Jaghire 25 has been returned to me with an endorsement dated 24th June 1875 under para 2 of the Revised Petitions Rules.

The endorsement intimates that no petition will be received by Government unless it appears that the petitioner has first applied to the local authority and to the

the Board of Revenue or other controlling authority as the case may be. The endorsement further states that all petitions addressed to the local authorities and their orders should be forwarded.

The subject of my petition refers to certain orders of Govt. passed in the Judicial Department and communicated to the District Magistrate of North Arcot.

I wrote some letters to the Dy. Collector & Magistrate of North Arcot on this subject and I have also received replies from him, which he says are in accordance with instructions received by him from the Collector and Magistrate of

of the District. All these letters are herewith submitted in original and the dates and numbers thereof are entered in the margin for reference.

A. Letter to the Dy. Collector dated 6th Nov. 74 No: 364.
B. Reply from the Dy. Collr. dated 19th Nov. 74 No: 8.
C. Tamil Chit enclosing an English letter in Eng & dated December 9th 1874 No 429.
D. Reply from the Dy. Collr. under orders from the Collector dated March 1st 1875.

There is no other controlling authority except Government in magisterial matters and the object of the present petition is to induce Government to reconsider the orders passed by them in Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360 with a view to their bearing upon my peculiar position. I hope therefore that the papers now submitted will be found to be sufficient and

and that Government may be pleased to take them and my petition into their considera-tion

I respectfully beg to remain
Honored Sir
Your most Obedient Servant

A. Sreenevaso Row
Sahib
Jaghiredar of Arnee

Ref. Dep.
Get all papers
referred to & abstract 1/2 margin
both petitions placing
the earlier first
L

Recd. P.O. 9/11/58 2093
9/8/58 : 1979
1/10/58 : 1380

A. Sreenevaso Row Sahib
Jaghiredar of Arnee

Revenue 1875 Dept
Government of Madras.
No. 4857
Rev DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 1582 of 1875.
From A. Sreenevasa Rao Sahib
Occupation Jaghiredar of S O No. 9. 5th January 1876
Village. Arnee
Talook.
District. North Arcot.

Dated 1st } July 1875.
Received 7th } July 1875.
Enclosures. 8

ABSTRACT.

Referring to his former petition, which was returned under para 2, submits the copies of his letters to the Dy Collector and of his replies thereto.

Prays that Govt may re-consider their order dated 1st October 1858 No. 1360 Judl Dept.

No. 19

1612
15
12/7/75

28

7th July 1875
Arnee

To

The Hon'ble D. F. Carmichael
Chief Secretary
to Government

Honored Sir

In continuation of my letter to your honor's address on the subject of the appointment and dismissal of Managers in the Arnee Jaghire, I beg respectfully to submit for the considera-tion of Government an important Tamil Khat in original, dated 5th June 1863, addressed to the late Jaghiredar by R. W. Barlow Esquire, the then Sub Collector of North Arcot.

I respectfully beg to remain
Honored Sir
Your most obt. & humble Servant
A. Sreenevasa Rao Sahib
Jaghiredar of Arnee

N: 4

[illegible] 1863 [illegible] - 6 - [illegible]

30

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1850 [illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

In No. 16/2 of 75.

Petition

Recd 4/7/75

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1863 [illegible] 5 [illegible]

R. W. Barlow

Ag. Sub Collector

y. S. B.

Recd 4/7/75

Petition No. 1612 of 75

31

To

Tiroomal Rao Saib &c

Jaghiredar of Arnee.

Your letter of the 5th Instant was received.

Although the right of appointing Monegars and other village Servants rest with you, yet as stated in the letter of Mr Bourdillon, the late Collector to your address dated 23rd May 1850 No. 91 you should report to us from time to time such appointments made by you, and they should be approved by us. You shall, therefore, hereafter inform ~~to~~ us in due time, the appointment or dismissal of Village Officials.

Sir

It is stated in the aforesaid letter that Koopathai Cowden and others illegally enjoy the ~~[illegible]~~ Maniem Inam lands, which should go to Ramaswamy Moodelly and others, whom you have appointed as Moniagars of Mamundoor village. You shall make proper arrangements to have the said Inam lands left to Ramaswamy Moodelly and others, who are doing the service.

Dated 5th June 1863
Camp Palmanair } (signed) R. W. Barlow
Ag Sub-Collector.

Rec. D

G O 5 January/76 № 9

Rec 4/7/75

Revenue 1875 Depatt
Government of Madras.
No. 4857
Rev. DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 1612 of 1875.
From A. Sreenevasa Rao Sahib
Occupation Jaghiredar
S.O. No. 9 - 5th January 1876
Village. Arnee
Talook.
District. North Arcot

Dated 7th } July 1875.
Received 12th }
Enclosures One

ABSTRACT.

In continuation of his petition on the subject of the appointment and dismissal of Moneagars in Arnee Jaghire, submits for the consideration of Govt. a letter addressed to the late Jaghiredar of Arnee by R. W. Barlow Esquire, the then Sub-Collector of North Arcot.

Former Petition No. 1382 of [illegible] sent to Coll on 13th July with the abstract

---

No. 9

Rev. Dept

33

Rep. VI/31.

Read the following Petitions from the Jágírdár of Arni.

1 Nos. 1397 & 1582 of 1875.

Also Limitation contained in Sect. 3 of Reg IV of 1816 &

The law is quite clear; that, in the case of all ancient village officers (except Accountants in Zamindaries) the authority & control of the Collector are complete, subject to the usual appeal. These Village Officers however have two sets of duties, one in relation to the Proprietor of the Estate, where there is a proprietor distinct from the Govt.; and one in relation to the Collector who is the guardian of the public peace as Chief Magistrate of the district. This being so, it is the undoubted duty of the Collector to punish the incumbents for misconduct or neglect in both their capacities. A man may be a very fair Head of a Village, from a Police point of view, and yet so signally fail in his duties as a revenue official, as to be justly amenable to exemplary punishment; and vice versâ. Any complaint from the Jágírdár against ~~a~~ Village servant shd. be carefully looked into by the Collr. in the same manner as he wd. enquire into a case of misconduct were he himself managing the village on behalf of Govt.; & shd. be dealt with as he wd. deal with it in a Govt. village.

2. This course will practically give the Jágírdár all the relief he requires. The Govt. are unable to give him the direct power of dismissal. D.S. 1/12-5.

1 To the Petitioner Despd. 6 Jany 7
14 the Board of Rev 5

5th Jany 1876

Village Officers

Petn from the
Jagirdar of Arni

[illegible]

C. 2/12
R. 18/12