

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 672

DATED 26th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Muni Reddi, late Monegar Munciff,
of Namtalli Village, Chittoor Taluk, North Arcot

District, that, under section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act II of 1897, no appeal lies to Government.

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 (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 5978

From

Muni Reddi
late monegar & suff
of Nampalli
Chittoor Dy
No. N. Arcot A-

Order

Dated —

Received 19.8.96

Registered 19.8.96

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT

Reg: the monegar office
of Nampalli

To be over
20/8

Rev 5-6

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
The Governor in Council of Fort St. George
PETITION
Madras



0617

REVENUE DEPT.
The humble petition of appeal

against the decision of the Board of Revenue
in Proceedings No 482 Routine dated
18th February 1896 submitted by Muni Reddi
Mirasi Monigar and Munsiff of Nampalli
village attached to Chittoor Taluq North
Arcot District most respectfully sheweth:

I. That during the revision of village es-
tablishments the petitioner was confirmed
as Monigar and Munsiff of the villages
of Polakala and Nampallai attached to
the said Taluq.

II. The petitioner was doing his Maniam
duties personally in the village of Polakala
and was doing the duties of Nampallai
village by appointing a Compstant Gumastah
on his behalf.

III. While so one Govinda Reddi whose claims
were totally rejected at the time of Revision
appealed to the Board of Revenue and
Government, but his claims were rejected
by those authorities.

IV. After the matter was completely settled
by the highest authorities against Govinda
Reddy, he again moved the then acting
Collector of this district on the 17th of
September 93 requesting that he may be
appointed either as permanent Monigar or
Monigam Gumastah for the village of Nampalli
in the place of the confirmed Mirasi Moniga
the petitioner.

V. The then acting collector without considering the legal aspects of the mirasi rights of the petitioner and his confirmation for the said two villages at the time of revision, directed the divisional officer to consider the claims of the said Govinda Reddi once more and appointed him as the permanent Monigar of Nampalli in the place of the petitioner who was admittedly confirmed as monigar of Nampallai.

VI. The divisional officer in pursuance of the illegal order of the collector appointed the said Govinda Reddi as Monigar and Muniff of Nampallai Village.

VII. The petitioner Muni Reddi immediately put in a petition to the permanent collector who after a lapse of long time decided against the petitioner misconstruing that the petitioner was not appointed as monigar of Nampallai village at the time of revision. The collector illegally stated in his judgment which is herewith enclosed that the petitioner's mirasi claims to the Maningam-ship of Nampalli village were legally extinguished by the revision and stated further that he had no grounds for interference.

VIII. The petitioner Muni Reddi there-upon appealed to the Board of Revenue on the following grounds:

(a). That in the appeal presented to the collector by the petitioner no notice was given to him and the result of the appeal was not even communicated to him up to date.

(b). The collector is entirely mistaken in saying that the petitioner's mirasi claims to Nampalli village were legally extinguished by the revision.

(c). The claims of the petitioner to this village were recognised at the revision and even the acting collector has clearly admitted in his decision that the petitioner is the mirasi monigar of Polakala + Nampallai.

villages confirmed at the time of revision and Govinda Reddi also admitted this fact in his petition to the Ag. Collector.

(d). The petitioner having been confirmed as the Mirasi Monigar of the said two villages is permitted by the rules of the Revenue Board and Government to manage the duties of one village by appointing a Competent Gumastah for himself.

(e). Govinda Reddy's prayer in his petition to the Ag. Collector was that he should at least be appointed as Monigam Gumastah of Nampallai Village.

(f). Govinda Reddy's claims having been rejected by the Revenue Board and Government neither the acting nor permanent collector had any right or power to interfere in the matter again and re-open the question by considering his claims.

(g). The Collector has no power under any circumstances to set aside the decision of the Board and Government and thereby render it a nullity.

IX. The Board of Revenue without considering any of the above mentioned grounds passed an endorsement to the effect "that the petition is rejected as under act 3 of 95? now in force there is no second appeal in the matter of appointments at the revision of village establishment."

X. The endorsement of the Board of Revenue is perfectly illegal. The board is wrong in considering that the application of the petitioner is a second appeal when it is only a first appeal. The petitioner having been confirmed as Monigar and Munsiff of the village of Nampalli at the time of revision (viz) in the year 1890 and Govinda Reddy's claims for the same post having been rejected by the Board & Government the Board's endorsement is quite unjust and inequitable.

XI. There was no appeal made to the collector by the petitioner in the matter of this appointment but is simply brought to the notice of the collector the circumstances under which he was previously appointed to this village of Nampalli and Govinda Reddy's second attempt to the same village should not be taken into consideration

XII. Neither the collector nor the Board fully comprehended the grievances of the petitioner, but passed orders which have no bearing in the petitioner's case.

XIII. His excellency being the highest authority to set right the legal imperfections of the subordinate authorities the petitioner most humbly prays that the petitioner's original appointment as mowigar of Nampallai should not be disturbed by substitution or any other man but by a confident Gumatash who would be appointed at the pleasure of the petitioner to manage the duties of this village reserving the responsibility in the petitioner himself.

XIV. The petitioner therefore prays that the decision of the Board of Revenue in connexion with this matter should be completely reversed.

[Signature]

X.

X.

Government of Madras.

Read no 5978 of 1896.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 6728426th March 97

The petitioner is informed that no appeal lies to Government under Section 23 (1) of Madras Act III of 1895. as amended by act II of 1897.

26/3/97
Sole
The petition does not bear any date and was received ~~on~~ on 19-8-96.

The Board's order appealed against is dated 18th 7/6/96.
(A.
25 March 97)

(By Order.)

[Signature]

Under Secretary to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,

189

To the pet^r with encl

64.31-3.97

64/24/3/97

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, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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