

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2267

DATED 7th Decr

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt has no reason
to interfere on behalf of the pet^r, Narasimha
Iyer, Curman. Salem Dt in the matter of relaxing
the order of ^{the} Sub. coll^r directing him to reside within
the limits of his daraff.

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. 10422.

From

Narasimha Ayyer
Curnam Pennahalli Toraff
Dharmapuri Taluk
Salem Dist.
No.

Dated 28th Nov.

Received 2nd Dec.

Registered 3rd Dec.

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Praying that the Sub. Collyer
dismissing the order to reside within the limits of his estate of the Government's execution group of villages may be relaxed and that he may allowed to reside at Pennagaram.

1897
3/12/97

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CHIEF SECRETARY
30. NOV. 1897
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

His Excellency the Governor of Madras Presidency
Through the Chief Secretary
Madras

His Excellency

The humble petition of a maina
of the village of Channapuri taluk
and Curram of the district of
Talam district
Most humbly & respectfully sheweth
That this is an appeal against the order of
the Board of Revenue No 2465 dated 21 August 1897
The petition was suspended by the Sub-
Collector for not residing within the limits
of the Taluk of which he was the maina
This order was confirmed by the collector
Whereupon the petitioner appeal to the Board

of Revenue who decided that the orders of the Collector were correct. Now the petitioner does not appeal against the order of suspension but, submits that the enforcement of the Sub Collector's order that he should reside within the limits of his Taraff may be relaxed in his favour as was done by the Sub Collector Mr Broadfoot who, after ascertaining from the petitioner the utter difficulty to get a site in the village, and in consideration of close proximity of his Taraff to his place of residence at Punnagaram allowed him to remain where he was and do his duty.

In pursuance of the above order, the petitioner was doing his duty to the satisfaction of his superiors until August 1896. when he was suspended for no other cause but for his omission to reside within the limits of his Taraff. The petitioner begs to state that the order of the Sub Collector permitting him to remain at Punnagaram and do his duty was passed after due deliberation of the difficulties represented by him and approved of by his superiors to get a house site in any of the villages included in the Taraff.

(3) The petitioner submits that his Taraff consists of four villages all clubbed up together, the nearest being a furlong, and the furthest within two miles distant from Punnagaram. The area of his Taraff is short of one and a half square miles.

(4) Under the above circumstances, the petitioner humbly requests that the order of the Sub Collector to reside within the limits of his Taraff may be relaxed in his favour and he be permitted to reside at Punnagaram and do his duty as he had been doing for some series of years until the order of suspension dated August 1896.

(5) For this act of charity & kindness the petitioner shall as in duty bound, ever pray.

28th Nov 1897 } The petitioner humbly begs to remain
Punnagaram }

His excellency's humble servant
C. K. Munnayy

The following papers are submitted for reference

- (1) Extract from the Proceedings of the Sub Collector dated 26th September 1897
- (2) Sub Collector's order No 2230 dated 28-7-96.
- (3) Collector's Proceedings No 1355 dated 13-3-97
- (4) Proceedings of the Board of Revenue No 2465 dated 21-8-97

C. K. Munnayy

C No. 10422 of 97.

From Narasimha aiyar, Salem dt

Dated 28 — " — 1897.

FOR ORDERS.

This is a petition from a karnam in the Salem district requesting that the orders of the local authorities directing him to reside within the limits of his tanaff may be relaxed. Village offices in the Salem district are not hereditary and the Govt has decided not to interfere in connection with these appointments. (G.O. No. 561 D.S.-2-96). Moreover, the question whether or not a village officer should be required to live within the limits of his charge

put up with an other account

is a point on which
the local officers
are the best judges.

The petr was suspended
till he complied
with the subcoll's
order directing him
to reside within the
limits of his tariff
and his appeals to
the colls and the
Board appear to have
been against such
suspension only.

What the petitioner
now requests is not that
the order of suspension
should be cancelled,
but that the rule requiring
him to reside within
his charge may be
relaxed.

There are clearly no
grounds for interference.
A draft is accordingly
submitted.

Wm. H. [Signature]

FOR ORDERS.

Issue
7/12/97

/Read C.N. 10422/97

G.O. R. 2267 d/7 Dec '97.

The petitioner is
informed that the
Govt. sees no reason
to interfere on his
behalf.

8/12
7/11/97

To the petitioner.
with encls.

(A.)
7 Dec 97

Dec. 9-12-97