Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 1764

DATED 23 Sept 3

[Despatch Abstract.]

duplicate copy of a
Receiving Petition from Sunbiechurnia
Kidaroo, the Thimmapoor anchom, Kummham
Tq., Nellore Dt., regr: the Office of Archakam.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O	No.	Department.	Date

0/18 4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 8088

From A. P. Subbiahiyan Kidavoo Malabar Dt.

Order R no 1764 d/23 Septr 97 Recorded.

No.

1/13/9/97.

Dated 9th Septr 1897

Received 16-9-97

Registered 17-9-97

Enclosures

Spare copies.

List

Note

This is only copy of a petition stated to have been sent through the Collecta.

CA.
20 Sep 97

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be reinstated in the office of Adhikari of Thiruvangur Amshom, Kharasambrand Taluk, Malabar Dt.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Dismissed

PETITION

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 13 SEP 1897

10 SEP REVENUE DEPT 1743

To

His Excellency,

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

Fort St. George,

MADRAS.

The humble appeal petition of AVIKARA PULIYERI IMBICHUNNI KIDAVOO, residing in Thiruvangur Amshom, Kurumbranad Taluk, Malabar District.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That Petitioner humbly appeals to your Excellency in Council against the proceedings (Enclosure A) of the Board of Revenue, No. 2736, Mis. dated 21st July 1897, dismissing his review petition against Board's order (Enclosure B) No. 1446, Mis. dated 21st April 1897.

That by virtue of the proceedings No. $\frac{2346}{R.96}$ dated 20th October 1896, of the Sub-Collector of Malabar (Enclosure C) Petitioner had been appointed Adikhari of Thiruvangur Amshom in succession to his Karnaven, Ryrukutti Kidavoo, who had resigned owing to ill-health.


That the Honorable Board in its Proceedings (B) cancelled the Sub-Collector's order and directed the appointment of Petitioner's anandervan, Avikara Puliyeri Pydel, *alias* Chandu Kidavoo, on the ground that the latter is a nearer relation to the late Adikhari than Petitioner.

That when the Sub-Collector, who was best in a position to decide as to the respective merits and claims of the contending applicants, appointed Petitioner, Pydel appealed to the Collector who, it is significant, declined to interfere with the Sub-Collector's appointment (Enclosure D).

That the Honorable Board before upsetting the Sub-Collector's proceedings did not, unhappily, afford Petitioner a hearing.

That from the Board's statement that Pydel is admittedly a nearer relation of the late Adikhari it is to be assumed that Pydel, by deliberate misstatement of facts, has been misleading the Board. The inference is strengthened by the circumstance that in Pydel's petition to the Collector, dated 20th November 1896, he states that "the said Imbichunni Kidavoo" (Petitioner) "is admittedly only a cousin of the late Adikhari, while Petitioner is a brother of his."

That the following genealogical table correctly describes the relationship in which Pydel and Petitioner respectively stand to the late Adikhari:—



That from the above table, the absolute accuracy of which could be established by enquiry on the spot and by reference to the late Adikhari, it will be seen, in the first place, that the late Adikhari has no brother living, and in the second place, that whereas, Petitioner and Pydel are both sons of two sisters (Madhu Amma and Theyi Amma) of the late adikhari's mother (Madhavi Amma), Petitioner's mother is the senior of those two sisters. The nearness of Petitioner's relationship to the late Adikhari is therefore greater than Pydel can claim.

That in the third place, Petitioner was the senior anandervan of the late Adikhari and has succeeded him in the karnavanship. This circumstance by itself quite knocks the bottom out of Pydel's claim.

That in the fourth place, Petitioner has previously acted twice for the late Adikhari, whose special request it moreover was that Petitioner should succeed him in office. This can be proved by reference to the Tahsildar's office.

That a strict enquiry into the question of relationship will elucidate the fact that Pydel has been guilty of grave perversion of the truth for purposes of self-aggrandisement, and this moral delinquency unfits him to hold the important post of Adikhari.

That the Hon'ble Board has evidently cancelled Petitioner's appointment in the belief that Pydel was the better claimant. It has been seen from the above circustances that (1) Pydel is not so near a connection of the late Adikhari as Petitioner is; (2) that Petitioner acted twice for the late Adikhari, (3) that Pydel has been guilty of deliberately misleading the Hon'ble Board, (4) that Petitioner is karnavan of his house now, and (5) that the Sub-Collector and Collector both supported Petitioner's claim. That under such circumstances, Petitioner most humbly prays that Your Excellency in Council will be most graciously pleased to cancel the Hon'ble Board's proceedings No. 1447 Mis. dated 21st April 1897 and direct Petitioner's reinstatement in the office of Adikhari of Thiruvangur Amshom.

For which gracious justice Petitioner shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY

Calicut.
9th September 1897

ചെറിയമ്മമ്മ

Copy of petition submitted through the Collector of Malabar on 9th September 1897, with four enclosures.

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined ——
When signed ——
} 189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only