

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2062

DATED 10.11.97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere on behalf
of A. P. Imbichurni Kidavoo, Malabar
et., praying that he may be reinstated
in the office of Adikshari of Thiruvangur
Amshom, Kumbharamald Taluk.

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. 9519.

Order R. 2062 d/10.11.97
The Govt declines
to interfere.

From
Anikara Puliyeri Imblichunni
Thiruvangur Anshom,
Thurumharanad Saluk,
Malabar Dt.
No.

Dated 27-10-97.
Received 3-11-97.
Registered 5-11-97
Enclosures one.
Spare copies.

Int. Pet. }
with 1 Encl. }
60/13-11-97

note

Village offices in
Malabar are not here-
ditary and the above
endorsement is put up
in accordance with the
decision arrived at in
G.O. No. 561 d. 8-2-96

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be rein-
stated in the office of Addikhar
of Thiruvangur Anshom.

8 Nov 97

Regis clerk
S/P

6/11/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.


FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0850

REVENUE DEPT.



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. ²³⁴⁶_{K.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 circumstances 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

27 October 97
Calicut.

[Handwritten signature]

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

A A A A A A A

N.B.—

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