Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 675

DATED 26th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Rama Raju, late Monegar Munsiff, of Muhammadpuram Village, Vellore 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. 5977

From

Rama Raju
late Monegar &c:
of Muhammadpuram
Vellore Tq,
No. N. Accob Db

Order

Dated 14.8.96

Received 19.8.96

Registered 19.8.96

Enclosures 10

Spare copies

SUBJECT

Praying for restoration

To Collector
2/8

Rep 19.8

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

SECR. GOVT. MADRAS
19 AUG 95
REV. DEPT.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE,

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

FORT ST. GEORGE.

SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

PETITION

0016

REVENUE DEPT

MADRAS.

The humble petition of RAMA RAJU, *late Monigar Munsiff of Muhammadpuram, Vellore Taluq, North Arcot District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

With deep reverence and profound submission I beg to submit the following circumstances to your Excellency's close enquiry and consideration and trust that justice may be done to my case.

I beg to state that I am the direct male descendant (great grandson) of Venkatarama Raju, Monigar, Muhammadpuram.

The office has continued in my family from even prior to the British rule and I have personally held both the Monigar and Munsiff's post for about 10 years.

In 1889 at the time of the revision Muhammadpuram was left alone and I was confirmed at the revision as Monigar Munsiff of that village.

The village of Karungali was first made a separate group clubbed into Pallikuppam. But the Government not having approved of the arrangement directed that the village be clubbed with Muhammadpuram.

This led to a second revision which was done by the Sub-Collector on the Report of the Tahsildar and in the revision I was thrown out of my appointment. The Tahsildar, M. R. Ry. Raju Moodelliar Avergal, recommended Tiruvengada Goundan on the score of seniority as he happened to be senior by 7 years. The Sub-Collector accordingly sanctioned the arrangement proposed by the Tahsildar. In consequence of this arrangement I was removed from my old ancestral village without the least consideration to my services extending to a period of 10 years. It is against this order I now beg to appeal to your Excellency as

I have not proper redress from the Collector and the Board of Revenue.

With due deference I beg to point out that the Collector seems to have misunderstood my contention which will be found in detail in the petitions herewith forwarded and the District authorities too have not given due effect to Rule III. contained in G. O. No. 1168, dated 24th November 1892.

That rule lays down that the appointment may be conferred on any duly qualified person, preference being given to members of old Mirasi families as against outsiders. I wish to bring to your prominent notice that no regard was paid to this provision. Qualification was not at all taken into consideration. If qualification had been taken as the standard of selection I would certainly have been appointed to the post on that ground. The matter was entirely overlooked by the District authorities. The Tahsildar on whose recommendation Tiruvengada Goundan was appointed seems to have adopted a wrong criterion, *viz.*, the seniority, whereas Rule III. of G. O. No. 1168 requires that selection should be made by the standard of highest fitness.

In the beginning of 1889, the Board issued certain definite rules for the selection at revision. There were two sets of these rules : the first being applicable to clubbed villages and the second set to single villages. In the second set of rules it has been stated that when both are Mirasidars, the man of longer service should be selected subject to the proviso that the stronger Mirasidar or the Mirasidar whose family held the office longer, should have preference. If this rule was at all considered I should have been selected without hesitation. Reference is respectfully solicited to the Board's Proceedings of April 1889. The District authority has apparently taken the rule which apply to single villages.

I beg to represent that it is admitted that Muhammadpuram is the main village. I am the Mirasidar of that village and my opponent Tiruvengada Goundan is the Mirasidar of the clubbed village. Hence applying the rule, the appointment falls to my share and the Sub-Collector's order is therefore improper under the rules.

2nd because.—Tiruvengada Goundan is not a resident of Muhammadpuram but of Karungali, being a road side important village with 5 hamlets, much

inconvenience will be felt by the public if the village Magistrate and Munsiff were to be located away from Mahammadpuram.

3rd because.—Tiruvengada Goundan has not got lands or houses in Muhammadpuram and his inclinations would always be towards Karungali.

4th because.—Tiruvengada Goundan has only lands even in Karungali, to a very small extent paying abount Rs. 80 or 90 a year, while I have got lands of greater extent paying about Rs. 250 in Muhammadpuram, and about Rs. 70 in Pangarisiruppam, Gudiyatam, *i. e.*, Rs. 320 in all.

5th because.—The Bariz of Mahammadpuram is Rs. 2,200 and odd a year while that of Karungali is only Rs. 1,600 and odd. As per B. C order of 1889 referred to in No 444 of 1890 the appellant who is the Mirasidar of the main village namely Muhammadpuram should have been elected as Managar. This was not done in the case under appeal though the rule was applied for through the District during revision establishment.

In these circumstances I earnestly pray that your Excellency, after a careful perusal of the facts above stated and in consideration of my services extending to a period of 10 years and the claim I possess for the appointment in preference to my opponent Tiruvengada Goundan, will be pleased to restore me to my former appointment.

I beg to enclose for reference the copies of my appeal to the Collector of North Arcot and the Board of Revenue on the subject of my claim.

For which act of kindness I shall EVER PRAY for your long life.

14th August 1896

M. [illegible]

Late manager of
Mahammadpuram village
Vellore Taluk
North Arcot

S. V. & CO., PRINTERS, MOUNT ROAD—MADRAS.—31-7-96.

Government of Madras.

Read cro 5977 of 96

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 675 Rd 26-Inam-97

Kp 26/8/97

Note

The petitioner is
dt 14-8-96.

25 mar 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.

(By Order.)
(O.C.)

Under Secretary to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
189 .

To Tirupati with enc

Rd. 20-3-97

eAW 24/3/97.

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined ——
When signed ——
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

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.