

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 653

DATED 26th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring Ramana Venkatakrishna
late Kammam of Kuvempu, Sakkunapalli Taluk
Kistna Dist. to the provisions of Madras
Act II of 1897.

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. 1048

To be over with
current 2/1 6404 of 1896
5/5/97

Read cross 6404 of 96 and
cross 1048 of 97

From Komara Venkatappayya,
Late Karmam of Krorur,
Pattinapalli Taluk,
Kistna dt.

Order R. No. 653 of 26 March 97

The pet is refer-
red to the provisions
of Madras act
II of 1897.

No.

Dated 29-1-97

Received 3-2-97.

Registered 4-2-97.

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying that orders may be
passed on his previous petition
of 7th September 1896, regarding
the Karmanship of Krorur.

23/3/97

Left

To the pet with

23-3-97

cc

Ex officio petition

When was this appeal
filed answered

23/3/97

Reg's clerk

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

3 FEB 97

0092

REVENUE DEPT.

His Excellency the Governor
in Council
Madras.

UNDER SECRETARY
FEB 7
PUBLIC DEPT.

The humble petition of Komara-
Venkatappaya, late Curram of Koroow, Sattina-
palli Taluq, Kistna District.

May it please your excellency, that,

The petitioner begs to state
that he submitted a petition to your excellency
on 4th September 1896 regarding the curramship of
Koroow, but not being favoured with a reply
to it as yet and finding difficult to maintain
himself, he now submits this Reminder petition
and prays that justice be done to him.

2 He brought a Summary suit
in No ³³/₁₈₉₁ stating his better claims to the
curramship of Koroow before the Sub Collector.
The sub Collector confirmed the said post upon
the petitioner on 21st November 1892, in accordance
with the admission of the father of the respondent
Komara Ramayya to his (petitioner's) superior claims
and therefore begs to state that as he was a
curram before 24th November 1892, no appeal can
be preferred against him according to G. O.

3. Even in the appeal by the respondent before the Collector, the lower court's decision was confirmed in No. $\frac{254}{20.1.98}$ of the Collector's office.

4. The respondent having again appealed to the Revenue Board, the Board thereupon asked the lower courts to let them know who was owner of the land before the passing of the Regulation VI of 1831. Though that question was replied in petitioner's favour and though the respondent's father admitted to the superior claims of the petitioner, the Board removed the petitioner from the land.

A kind perusal of the decisions of the lower courts and of the Revenue Board will clearly show that injustice was done to the petitioner.

5. The petitioner is fit for the post having passed the Survey Test and having possessed better Mirasi rights as the records show, whereas the respondent is an uneducated man in Survey and possessed no Mirasi right.

Therefore the petitioner most humbly begs that justice be done.

to him after a kind perusal of all the records, submitted with the former petition. For which act of charity, the petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray.

The petitioner begs to remain
Your excellency's most obedient
Servant

29th January
1897

R. Subbaraman

Revenue (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 6404

Order.

From
Komara Venkatappaya
Late Curam of
Krosur
No. Sattenapalle
Tel
Kistna Dt.

Dated 30.8.96
Received 4.9.96
Registered 7.9.96.
Enclosures 6.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Praying for restoration

Do he over?

Wm
7/9
W. 8/9


det 7/9

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2134 30-12-95		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



PETITION

0003

REVENUE DEPT.

To
His Excellency
the Governor in Council
at Madras.

The humble petition of Komara Venkataswamy
the late Curman of Krosur, Sathupalle Taluk
Kistina District.

Most Honored and Respected Sir.

I beg to report that I have
hitherto preferred an appeal to your honor
praying for the revision of the Revenue Board's
orders in B.P. No. 1971 regarding the
Curman-ship of Krosur village, for which
I have better merasi claims than the
Respondent Komara Ramayya. Your honor
was then pleased to issue an endorsement
No. 2134
30.12.95 informing me that no appeal
lies to Government under Section 23 (1) of
Madras Act III of 1895. This endorsement
order is enclosed for favour of refusal
of my appeal petition and of passing orders
with reference to the orders contained in
G.O. No. 276
22.6.96 recently issued as there is
an express provision in this order that
appeals filed under Regulation VI of 1831
before the Madras Act III of 1895 came
into force, should be disposed of under
the provisions of the Regulation VI of 1831.

Since repealed
by Act II of 1917

The following are the chief grounds among others, which your honorable excellency will be pleased to peruse in this case.

- 1 My myrasi right was admitted by the respondents father, to the Curman's post of Krosur village (Vide copy of Sub Collector's decision marked A. enclosed)
- 2 My claims to the Curman's office was also admitted by the Collector (Vide copy of Collector's decision marked C).
- 3 The Board in its Proceedings mis no ³⁵⁻³² 13-6-93 required the Court of 1st instance to record distinct finding on the following points -
(1) who was the paimaidhar in the Komare family (2) Are either of the parties directly descended from him and if so how. To prove my ancestors held curman's office before passing of Regulation VI of 1831 I filed before Mr L. G. Moore the then Sub Collector one patta marked L. dated 3. 3. 1826 prepared by my paternal uncle, Komare Venkayya on behalf of Bapiray who was also my paternal uncle. The respondents father also admitted that neither he nor his ancestors held Curman's office before the year 1841. The Sub Collector Mr L. G. Moore submitted report to the Board admitting the above facts (Vide copy of report marked D)

It is surprising to me to see that the Board in its proceeding no 1971 19.4.95 reversed the decision of the lower courts and restored the respondent to the curman's office without giving any reasons for confirming the office on the respondent.

Under these circumstances, I most humbly ~~beseech~~ that your honorable excellency will be pleased to peruse the records enclosed and my last appeal petition and to restore me again to the curman's office. Cancelling the B. P. No 1971 19.4.95.

30-8-96

I beg to remain -

Most honored and Respected Sir,
Yours most obedient and humble servant.

W. D. D. D.
W. D. D. D.

*It is the policy of the Government to keep the
 records in its possession as long as possible
 in order to preserve the memory of the nation
 and to furnish the necessary information to the
 Government and the people. It is the policy of the
 Government to keep the records in its possession
 as long as possible in order to preserve the
 memory of the nation and to furnish the necessary
 information to the Government and the people.
 The records of the Government are kept in its
 possession as long as possible in order to
 preserve the memory of the nation and to furnish
 the necessary information to the Government and
 the people. The records of the Government are
 kept in its possession as long as possible in
 order to preserve the memory of the nation and
 to furnish the necessary information to the
 Government and the people.*

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

LETTERS OF GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL

N.B.—

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