

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 243

DATED 3^d Feb'y

[Despatch Abstract.]

Disposing under para 2 of C Rules, the petⁿ of
Siddhis & Lakshmi Sibs. Vellayoor Vattam, S. M. M.
requesting that they may be appointed to the
Honorary Office of the Vattam.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	192 2/97						

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 768.

No revision of the subject matter of the order was made in 1892. No records have been submitted.

Sp 2/97

From Subbaraya Nizar & Peshagiri Nizar to Virigoor Vattam in the Kallakurichi Taluk P. Arcot Dt.

Order R. No. 243 d/3rd Feb 1897

Para 2 of C Rules.

No.

Myself

Dated 15-12-96

Received 12-1-97

Registered 28-1-97

Enclosures

Spare copies

List
(A)
1 Feb 97

To the petitioners des. 8.2.97

SUBJECT.

Requesting that ^{they} be ^{to} appointed for the monism office of the said watham.

25/1/97

PACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

25 December

Kallakurichi

0040

REVENUE DEPT.



The Right Honorable
the Government in Council
Fort St. George
Madras

The humble petition of Subbaraya-
Aiyar and Beshagura Aiyar (known as
Mirassidars) of Viriyoor Vattam in the
Kallakurichi Taluk South Arcot District,
against the Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue No. 1370 dated 18 May 1896, respecting
his appeal under the Madras Hereditary
Village Officers Act III of 1895, now in
force, more than one appeal is in-
admissible in cases of appointments
made at a revision most respectfully
Sheweth.

I. The petitioners' forefathers were
holding the Moniem Mirass right
of fashies 1217 & 1231 for the village
of Viriyoor Vattam which is clubbed into
3 villages (A) Viriyur (B) Arasarampattur
& (C) Kidaragudayampattur.

The petitioners' father was also

holding the moniem office for upwards of 25 years & lastly to his bad time he was convicted in the year 1875 on account of an embezzlement case charged against him. The petitioners' eldest brother, one Subbaroya Aiyar has put in a suit before the Deputy Collector who has ordered that his claims will be considered after he attains his majority. Accordingly he was appointed as Assam

Moniem of a village & he was restricted from looking after his duty till the life time of his father & one Venkata Rama Naicker was ordered to continue his incumbency ship. (vide Exhibit A order of the Deputy Collector dated 19-3-93)
II (a) Pattavare for this village was conducted on 24.12.92 by Mr. K. Subbiah. Subbaroya's claims were overlooked by the Deputy Collector after admitting the facts of the Deputy Collector's orders mentioned in Exhibit A & passed order stating that he is a "fool" & is not fit for duty. (vide para 3 of Exhibit B copy of the Pattavare order).

(b) The remark of the Deputy Collector "fool" has no meaning whatever & is thoroughly of a prejudiced opinion & is in contradiction to the original order passed in his favor in 1877 wherein he is declared to be thoroughly fit & competent.

(c) Even though he (Deputy Collector) may so think that your petitioner is a fool which is not really a fact, his low (your Excellency's humble Memoria List) may be appointed as he possess the educational attainments required for the village officers place as prescribed by the recent orders of the Government.

III. One of the petitioners' brothers named Annachella Aiyar has preferred an appeal to the Collector against the Pattavare order of the Deputy Collector. Date of appeal 7-3-93. His appeal was dismissed on no valid grounds.

The petitioners' eldest brother one Subbaroya Aiyar has then appealed to the Collector on 26-3-93 also your Excellency's humble Memoria List on

IV. The Collector in his Proceedings No. 432.96 dated 4.2.96 stated the following on the latter part of the order. (vide Exhibit C copy of the Collector's Proceedings.)
(1) The three brothers Subbaroya Aiyar, Annachella Aiyar and Sathagur Aiyar object to this appointment. Any competent man might have been appointed and the mirasidars of the petitioners need not be considered.

(2) Arumattulla Angar separately appealed against the order & his appeal was dismissed.

(3) He was not in office at the revision nor was his brother Seshagiri Angar.

(4) They have no claim to the office & whatever share of the appellants have any valid grounds of appeals and their appeal is accordingly dismissed.

V. The petitioner & his brothers preferred appeals respectively against the Vattavari order within the limited time.

VI. The petitioner & his eldest brother Subbaraya Angar both preferred an appeal to the Honorable members of the Board of Revenue that your petitioners may be given the post of mamam of the said Virupis Vattam as he is the rightful claimant of A village in which he is also now residing in preference to B Village incumbent who is made permanent mamam though he is unfit on the face of the dismissal order of his brother.

VII. The Honorable members of the Board of Revenue without carefully examining the records have passed orders that under the Madras Hereditary Village officers Act III of 1895

that no appeal is inadmissible in cases of appointments made at a revision &c. (vide Exhibit D. copy of the Proviso No. 1370 dated 18 May 1895).

VIII. It is much to be regretted that the applications for copies of extracts of the orders of the lower courts were not complied with & they were refused. Therefore it is prayed that the records in this connection may be called for either from the Deputy Collector's office or from the Collector of the District.

IX. The two eldest brothers of the petitioners have yielded their opinions in their statements given before the Deputy Collector Mr. J. Ragaviah on 21.11.95 that they are willing in case of petitioners being appointed for mamam office (vide Exhibit E statements).

X. The petitioners' eldest brother Subbaraya Angar requested the Deputy Collector and the Collector to return all the enclosures that were filed along with his appeal before the Collector.

Two different orders were received on the subject. One from the Collector stating that the petitioner is informed that the enclosures of his petition were returned to him by him (vide Exhibit F Collector's endorsement No. 805 of 26 dated 5.3.96).

And the other from the same collector
stating that the records submitted to
the Tahsildar by the Deputy collector
to be returned to the party are missing
and hence they are not to be returned to
the party. (vide Exhibit 7. Order of the
Collector No. 927 of 96 dated 20.11.96.)

XI. Details of Exhibits.

Exhibits

A. Acting Deputy collector's order dated 17.3.97

B. Vattavari order dated 24.12.92

C. Collector's Proceedings No. 20 dated 13. February 97

D. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

No. 1370 dated 18. May 1896.

E. Statement of Subbaraya Aiyer of Virupoor

given before the Dy. Collector dated 21.4.95.

F. Seshagiri Aiyer - statement

dated 20.11.96. Arundhati Aiyer - statement

dated 20.11.96. Arundhati Aiyer - statement

G. Endorsement of the Collector No. 805 of 96

dated 5.3.96.

H. Collector's order No. 927 of 96 dated 20.11.96.

Under the circumstances, the

petitioner most humbly & earnestly prays

that he may be appointed for the moniem

office of the said Virupoor Tahsil through

the Act III of 1875 does not give room

for an appeal in cases of appointments

made at revision, still neither his appeal
nor his brothers' before the collector against
the Vattavari order, is barred by limitation
under the grounds that none of the brothers
(i.e.) Sons of the dismissed moniegar
Venkatraya Aiyer (who lately died in May
last) during his life time may obtain
the moniem office.

The petitioner most humbly begs

to remain

Your Excellency's most obedient &

humble servant

(Signature)

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