

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4937

DATED 20th Sept 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording copy of petition from G. Mangam-
ma of North Arcot Dt, Bangalore addressed
to the Board of Rev, regarding the Chubbins
of a certain village.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 5000

The 7th has
been to the
may be numbered
W.W.

Order No. 4939 of 20 Sept. 97
R
4/17/97

Rundel

From

G. Mangamma,
Chendragiri taluk,
N. Arcot Dt.

No.

Dated 10th June 1897

Received 15-6-97

Registered 16-6-97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reg. the clubbing of
her village

CR.
28/4/97

Note. This is copy of petition addressed to B.
of dissatisfied with Browde's orders ^{when passed} for many

appeal in due course

CR

Used with special arrangements

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	100		2 2 2

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FOREMAN
 17/3/1917
 R. J. Woodward
 17/3/1917
 REV. DEPT.

The Honourable members of the Board of Revenue
 PETITION
 Land Revenue department.
 Madras
 The humble petition of Jollacherry Mangamma
 Inamdar of Panakam village, Chinnai Taluk,
 North Arcot District, most respectfully sheweth
 That the petitioner having learnt that Madras
 Proprietary Village Service Act II of 1894 is to be
 brought into force in this District applied to the
 Collector of North Arcot as to how the petitioner's
 Panakam village was dealt with. And the Collector
 in his endorsement dated 5.03.97 dated 9.2.97
 (copy herewith put up) has stated that village of
 Panakam has been included in the Govt. Village
 of Kunturapakkam.
 The petitioner humbly begs to represent
 to the Honourable members that such clubbing
 is not consistent with the existing rules as shown
 below—
 (a) The Board have in their proceedings No 184
 communicating G. O. No 184 Rev states
 that Inam villages should not be clubbed with
 Govt villages as a rule and this can only be
 done under very exceptional circumstances
 and with special orders.

(B) That the village of Panakam stands at a distance of over 4 miles from Kuntropakam and this is opposed to the draft rules framed under Section 32 of the act published in the Fort St. George Gazette Supplement dated 18-2-96.

(C) That there are other nam villages in the middle viz. Vallamanikalva, Mundlapudi and Vemur which are at a distance of 1, 2, and 3 miles respectively from Govt. village of Kuntropakam and if it is deemed necessary any of one of these 3 nam villages ought to have been clubbed with Kuntropakam instead of the petitioner's village and the village of Panakam does not border the limits of Kuntropakam. It is highly desirable that the village should be taken separately considering the importance of the locality. It has got 4 hamlets with 100 houses and 700 people.

(D) Nam villages which have less than 100 houses and are of less importance and which are within one or $\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the Govt. village are taken as separate villages. For instance, Kalur. And it is the petitioner's misfortune that the petitioner's village should be clubbed with the Govt. village 4 miles distant.

(E) The Sasildar of Chennajiri Taluk who is the local officer does not seem to have recommended such a proposal but he proposed that the village should be treated as a separate village.

(F) That if unfortunately the village is so clubbed it will be impracticable

for the village officers of Kuntropakam which has a salary of nearly 500 Rs. to discharge the duties of this village in collecting the Kents etc.

(G) That in submitting proposals for clubbing the petitioner was never consulted as required by Section 16 of the act.

H. That the proposed clubbing would defeat the end of justice and good administration and the petitioner being of a female sex every assistance should be given to her.

(I) That the petitioner's humble request is that this should be treated as a separate village and if this cannot be complied with, the petitioner humbly begs that this village may at least be clubbed with Nam village of Mundlapudi which is 1 mile distant and which is now proposed as a separate village. Probably the honourable members of the Board may be of opinion that two nam villages of different proprietors should not be clubbed together.

The petitioner has arranged with the proprietor of Mundlapudi and he has no objection to the proposal of clubbing. The

189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL

B.B.—

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