

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2364

DATED 11th May

[Despatch Abstract.]

Requesting the Collector of Tinnevely
to report on certain allegations contained
in the petition presented by one A. Varisa
Dohidem Markaraga, Dharmakanta
of the mosque of Karamkulam, Tinnevely,
re. the allowance paid in connection
with that mosque.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
CNo 6112/97	13/4						
CNo 7308/97	13/4						

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 26

From

A. Varasai Mohideen Merakay,
a Durnakartha of the mosque
of Karangalam, Trivikuntham
Zahak,
Tinnevely Dt.
Residing at Chinna Lubhai Str.
No. Vellore

Recy

Order mis

Para 5(3) of C. P. Rules

Dated 18th March 1897

Received 23rd

Registered 24th

Enclosures 4.

Spare copies

To The Petitioner with receipt
-18-17-5-97

SUBJECT.

Note Pleassee 40 no 27838/97 July 1994 claiming the difference of an
and the colln letter therein with stated allowances enjoyed by the
petitioner to defray the expense
of the mosque of Karangalam.

C.R.P.
The 5/8 does not seem to
att'y to the Petri. request
for the amount of the difference between
Rs 11.24 + Rs 9.80. The previous
file was only related to the difference
between the two amounts.
file was corrected
30-5-97
Pleassee 40 no 27838/97
and the amount of Rs 21.04
10/11/97
Asst
26/3/97

Asst
26/3/97

Amer. Dept.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Copy of petri's petn. to the Sub.
Colr. of Tuticorin 13.6.92.
The petri states that originally a
money allowance of Rs 11-8-4 per
annum was granted for the
maintenance of the mosque in his village, that this was
subsequently to settlement converted
into a grant of a mangam which
yielded only Rs 2-4-8. The difference
Rs 2-4-8, he petri prays, may
be made good to him (either by
payment in ~~money~~ cash or) by the
grant of more land yielding an
assessment equal to this amount.

C.O.
2.11.92

Please see next page
for the Sub Colr's Encl.

C.No 2605 of 97

For orders.

It appears that a
money allowance of Rs 11-8-4 was
granted by former Native Govts
from the collections made on account
of Maturpha Tax for the support
of the mosque at Karungulam
in the Tenkairai (now Sivakuntam)
Taluk, Trimmalest and the
allowance was continued by the
British Govt so long as the Maturpha
tax was collected. On the abolition
of the tax, it was proposed to
discontinue the allowances made
to religious institutions but the Govt
was of opinion that as the abolition
of the tax had been the spontaneous
act of Govt, the state could not
with good faith discontinue the
assignments out of the proceeds
of the tax enjoyed for half a century
and directed that the allowance
be continued and commuted into
land (G.O no 2087 of 20th Nov/1863)

Flashed at

2244/97

The colls accordingly substituted in 1865 for the Cash allowance an assignment of land revenue equal to the allowance. This was assessed on 61 cents of irrigated land in 3 survey numbers in the village. These lands were held on patta in the name of a chattram managed by the villagers in common. At the time of the settlement which was introduced in 1878, the assessment was reduced to Rs 9-8.

Now the petitioner, one of the trustees of the mosque prays that the difference between the amount originally granted and that fixed at the settlement should be paid to him. This is in fact a complaint against the reduction of assessment effected at settlement in 1878.

The petitioner slept over the matter till 1892 when he petitioned the sub colls who declined to reopen the question which had been settled 15 years ago and the colls to whom an appeal was made in 1896 was of opinion that the petitioner himself was to blame for

1892
1878
14

1896
1892
4

I don't understand how he could have collected it after his answer had been rendered

Flagged B

not having collected the amount from the cultivating tenants - (vide Sub's Encl- No 146 13-2-96) The petitioner has taken more than a year to come up to govt. This long delay should it is submitted, put the petitioner out of his rights and he has no valid ground of complaint against govt.

Petitioner has two complaints. First a statement above that the allowance originally fixed at 11-8-4 was reduced at settlement in 1878 to 9-8-0 + second that the village munsif or mowjan paid him only 7 Rs out of the 9-8-0. This second complaint was fully reported on by the Collector of Timmavely & disposed of in G.O. 3283 17 July 94. With regard to the first matter - petitioner or whoever represented him at the time accepted a land revenue assignment in 1863. It is presumed he took it with the full knowledge

Yes. The V. M. did not object for the time being + for the time being.

Flagged C

Flagged D

Flag A. The G.O. commits the presentation of the mowjan into a grant of land.

14/11/17

It that the settlement
might change it. From
as the Census report (Flagged C)
it appears that the allowance
of 9-8-0 has since
1873 been converted into
a heavy deduction at
petitioner's own request.

Ulle
14.4.97

21/4/97

No doubt he did; but it was his
own matter as for him to suppose
that more land might be
granted Jg

So far as I can see the petitioner
ought to have been anticipated
to make up the difference. The
delay is against him, but the
rights of his case seem clear.

Jg
28/4/97

D 1,000-20-2-96.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 2605-797

From

Dated

189 .

Humble Mr. G. W. C. E.

FOR ORDERS.

With reference to the
order on the 20th for order
overleaf viz that petitioner
should have more land
assigned to make up
the difference, orders
are solicited as to the
acres from 1878.

* Flag D

Further petitioner states
that under Govt order ²⁷⁸³⁺
17.7.94 he has ^{since} been receiving
^{the} full allowance of Rs 11.8.0.
The Govt order gives him
no such allowance. The
Collector in para 7 of his
report Flagged C distinctly
states that the allowance
of 9.8.0 has been converted
into a heavy allowance deduction
& Govt in the order quotes,
with reference to petitioner's
complaint that the village

n.e. 4/5/97
R 6/5/97

himself paid him only
 Rs 7. States that as the
 allowance had been
 converted into a being
 deduction the proper
 payment was ensured
 for the future.

+ It was also then
 reported that FOR ORDERS.
 pete had since
 received the difference
 between 9.8.0 + 7.0.0
 and given a full acquittance
 vide please para 5 of letter letter Hage
 ad finem Wille
 3.5.97

is. 09.8.0

It is possible that
 under some misapprehension of the G.O.
 the local authorities
 have increased the
 allowance.

It is submitted then
 for that before ordering
 the increase in the allowance
 the Collector might ask
 to report on the point.

I regret that this
 last matter was not
 made clear in the
 original note for orders.

Wille
 3.5.97

Govt has abandoned the plan
 of assigning the revenue on land
 and leaving the assesse to collect
 it and has introduced the system
 of being deductions. Some land can
 be given but it does not appear
 why this original assignment should not be restored.

Right

Wille

Secy
 D/W/S

No 2633/97
 10.11.97
 by the Secretary.

June - 11.9.97

88
 6/5/97

Cmo 2605 of 1897

Order Misc no 2364 of 10th May 97.

The Collector of
 Tinnevely is requested to re-
 port whether the pete's state-
 ment that he has been
 receiving the increased al-
 lowance of Rs 11-8-4 from
 1893 is correct and if so
 to state under what authority
 it is being paid to him.

(from orders)

Wille
 8.5.97
 8/5/97

To the Collector of Tinnevely
 with petition and encls. to be
 returned.

M
 7/5

26.5.97

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

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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