

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2113

DATED 16th May

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to interfere on behalf of the
petitioners Kalapatapur Mukatavargu and
Hannuanta Rao. Inhabitants of Gndra,
District D2. praying for the Cancellation of the
micneta imposed on them.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

O
18 4,000-19-7-97.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 3235

16/5/98

From

*Kalapalajee Venkatarayana
and Hanumantha Rao
Inhabitants of Gudur
Kistna Dist.*

No.

*Endorsement No. 2113 d/16th May 98.
Order*

*The Govt sees no reason
to interfere on the petitioners'
behalf.*

KD
16/5/98

Dated 23/4/98

Received 30/4/98

Registered 30/4/98

Enclosures 2

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

*Praying that the income
tax imposed on them may be
cancelled.*

*The petitioners
with 2 encs. } 20/5/98.*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

1899

REVENUE DEPT.

The Government
of Madras

The humble petition of Malapatasu
Venkataswamyam and Manuvaran
inhabitants of Epurathur District

They humbly and respectfully
beg to bring to your Lordship's kind
considerations that they have been levied
income tax Rupees 10/- for the year
1897 and 98 by the Tahildar Bunder
Talag Mistra at before whom they
presented an objectionable petition
to the tax imposed on them, but he
confirmed the tax with a view that the
petitioners are annually getting Rs 500/-
which is not a matter of fact. They
then appealed against the decision of
the Tahildar, to the Deputy Collector
of Secunderabad District, who also
favoured them with the same decision
upon which they appealed to the
Board of Revenue Madras and have
been endorsed that under Section
27 of the Income Tax Act is not open
to further revision by the Board.

It is entirely illegal to the justice
law and record to impose income
tax on them.

III

It is not said in income tax act that those who get less income than Rs 500/- should be taxed but those who get Rs 500/- income or more than that amount annually.

IV

Their annual income is not Rs 500/- and it does not appear in records that they are getting that amount or more than that.

V

They have no grain trade or money lending or any sort of trade and they acquire nothing by means of trade.

VI

Mr. Venkatarayanam one of the two petitioners has Curucebanu to Sildanapuramgollapalem which belongs to proprietors. He gets annually about Rs 100/- in shape of Curucebanu. The 2nd petitioner, Annamantaram was hitherto getting Rs 10/- per mensem Rs 12/- annually by private service under the Gaikudat of Vulluru Estate. He was 4 months ago removed from the service as the Estate is under the management of Receiver. They are poor enough and have a large family for maintenance. Both of their annual income is barely sufficient for maintenance. In addition to it they are feeling much since two years by famine. There will be no remain whatever in their income.

VII

In case of being taxed, both of the petitioners income is to be considered separately but not mixed together and it is not even sufficient to be taxed though the income of their both is added together.



together.
The fact to be levied tax is quite against
to the law, justice and records as they
have no any sort of dealings in trade.
If they are not justified in this unlawful
case what is to be done in these painful
days. If your honor does not consider
justice, they will certainly be bound to
undergo difficulties for want of meals
having been taxed by the officers who
are here and who will press, without
justice, to pay tax as they established
without least consideration.

IX

They therefore pray your hon^{rs} to
bring the above matter to your hon^{rs}
kind Consideration to be justified and
favoured with a decision of Cancellation
of the Tax imposed on them who are
not getting the amount of Rs 500/-
annually by any means.

The true copy of decision of the
Assistant Collector ^{of the Board of Revenue Madras} ^{and is are} ^{and is are}
here with enclosed for your hono's
perusal.

Lucas, the above named petitioner,
do state that what is stated above

is true to the best of information
and belief.

6/23/4/98.

~~signed & sworn~~
~~signed & sworn~~

~~signed & sworn~~
~~signed & sworn~~

~~signed & sworn~~
~~signed & sworn~~

Petition from Kalapatapur Venkata
Narayanan and Hanumantha Rao
inhabitants of Gudur, Krishna
District D. 23. 4. 98 (C. No 3235)

To See:

The petitioners ^{were} ~~were~~ assessed
by the Tahsildar of Nandur to pay
an income tax of Rs 10. On a
revision petition presented to the
Assistant Collector requesting ~~for~~
a remission of the tax on the
ground that the petitioners ~~do not~~
get ^{any} taxable income, the
officer dismissed the petition and
confirmed the tax. The Assistant
Collector ^{the} states: "Petitioner states
that he has no means of livelihood
and therefore does not keep accounts.
His first witness maintains that
his income is only Rs 100. The 2nd
witness, however, admits that the
income is Rs 200. In addition to
this, small sums are advanced
without interest. From these contra-
dictory statements it is evident
that no reliance whatever can be
placed upon the evidence adduced."

See

In their petition to Govt. the
 petitioners do not adduce any
 evidence to show that they do
 not get a taxable income.
 In these circumstances it is
 thought that no grounds have
 been shown for interference
 on the petitioners' behalf.
 2. Please see a draft order
 put up on the back of the
 current.

KD
 16/1/98

*see these
 are precedents*
 16/5/98

3,000-5-2-98.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____ } 189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

RE OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED 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.