

E. R.

H-e.
CE's office
Madras Port Trust
(~~copy~~) 3016)
E.C.T. 306

T. A. V. Varadhan
39, North Madra St
VILLIVAKKAY
Madras. 49

**In The Court of The Subordinate Judge of
TRICHINOPOLY.**

Present:—T. T. RANGACHARIAR Esq., B. A., B. L.,

Subordinate Judge.

Tuesday the 27th day of August 1907.

Original Suit No. 22 of 1905.

(O. S. 32 of 1904 District Court, Trichinopoly)

Between:—

Sri Parama Hamsa Sri Ranganarayana Jeer Swamigal.

—Plaintiff.

And:—

1. K. Seshadri Iyengar, 2. Ko, Ka, Sri Vathula Desika
Pranatharthi Hara Rangachariar, 3. Karalpadi Alavanthariah
(died), 4. S. O. Narayanasami Iyer, 5. Uthamanambi
Ramaswami Iyengar, 6. Sri Vedavyasa Alasinga Bhatler,
7. Sri Vedavyasa Thirumalai Bhatler, 8. Sri Vedavyasa Sri
Rama Bhatler (died), 9. Minor Sri Parasara Alasinga Bhatler
by guardian Sri Ranganachar Ammangar, 10. K. S. Kuppusami
Iyengar.
—Defendants.

When the case came on for further trial on the 27th August
1907 after the examination of seven witnesses for the Plaintiff in
the presence of Mr. T. Desikachariar Vakil for Plaintiff and of
Mr. A. V. Gopalachariar, Vakil for 1st defendant, and Mr.
S. O. Narayanasami Iyer for himself and as pleader for defen-
dants 2, 7 and 10 and the defendants 5, 6 and 9 being absent and
the defendants 3 and 8 having died, the parties (Plaintiff and

defendants 2 and 10) filed a Razinamah and the court passed the following Order.

Suit to have it declared that the proceeding of the temple managers dated 3rd February, 13th April and 1st May 1904, preventing the Plaintiff from exercising his rights and privileges in the temple by virtue of the office he holds are null and void, for an injunction preventing defendants from interfering with the Plaintiff and his successors in the duties appertaining to his or their office, for past emoluments withheld and for future emoluments.

2. Plaintiff alleges that the Plaintiff is an ascetic presiding over the Mutt called "Sriranganarayana Jeer Mutt" at Srirangam, that this Mutt is attached to the Srirangam Devasthanam and is being maintained and its establishment and other charges incurred from the Devasthanam funds, that the course of succession in this Mutt which is also called Udayavar Mutt after the name of the original founder was for a long time regulated by the head of the Mutt appointing his successor during his life time, that in default of such appointment, the Stalathars for the time being of the Srirangam Devasthanam appointed the Jeer, that the Jeer of this Mutt either by himself or by his proxys had also the power of superintendance in the temple and had some perquisites and emoluments, that when the management of the temple was handed over to the Committee, the Jeer ceased to exercise his extensive powers though he still continued to discharge the duties, receive the honours and emoluments set forth in schedules B, C, and D, that the Plaintiff has been installed in February 1899 according to the immemorial usage stated above, that he has been ever since his appointment performing the pooja and giving religious instructions in the Mutt and also been performing the secular and religious duties in the temple set forth in schedule B and enjoying the honours and emoluments in schedules C and D, that the Jeer represents Udayavar, the spiritual head of the Vaishnavites and his duties in the Mutt and temple are mostly religious, that defendants who are managers of secular affairs have no manner of right to interfere with the Plaintiff's discharge

of the duties and receipt of honours, that the defendants 1 and 2 colluded together and passed a proceedings on 3-2-04 directing the Plaintiff not to perform his duties in the temple as he was ailing from some disease, that the said proceedings are illegal having been passed without the knowledge of the permanent manager, the 3rd defendant, that even if Plaintiff is incapacitated by his illness from carrying his duties, it is illegal to deprive him of his honours and perquisites as was done by the proceedings dated 13-4-04 as the Plaintiff's office is a "corporation sole" that the order of the defendants 1 and 2 dated 1-5-04 preventing Plaintiff from sending his own nominee for "Lachanai service" is illegal that his proxy is even to this day performing certain duties mentioned in schedule E, that Plaintiff has served the defendants 1, 3 and 4 with a written notice on 4-7-04 for the cancellation of the said proceedings and for allowing him the usual perquisites, that contrary to the immemorial custom, the managers have appointed the 4th defendant in place of the minor 9th defendant, a hereditary Stalathar trustee, and that defendants 5 to 9 have a right of management and so they are impleaded and that Plaintiff is therefore entitled to have the reliefs sought for.

3. The 1st defendant in his written statement denies the allegations in the plaint, denies the rule of succession of Sriranga Narayana Jeer and adds that the Jeer is appointed by the trustees of the Srirangam temple on the recommendation of the Stalathars, that the Jeer is at best only an accredited servant of the temple and so amenable to the control of the temple authorities, that on the death of a Jeer and till another is appointed for the office, the Mutt property and idols are all placed under temple guards, that the present Plaintiff was appointed by this defendant and some other trustees in 1899 on the recommendation of the Stalathars, that the Plaintiff was removed from office as complaints were received from many quarters regarding the virulent form of leprosy in his body which rendered his presence obnoxious to worshippers, that the Plaintiff is granted a compassionate allowance of Rs. 20 for his maintenance which he has not duly accounted for, that the Plaintiff is not entitled to

question the legality of the appointment of the 4th defendant, that the Plaintiff cannot question the legality of the several proceedings and cannot seek to set aside all of them in a single suit, that the suit is bad for misjoinder of causes of action, and that this defendant does not admit that the several functions of the Jeer in the temple can be looked after by his proxy.

4. Defendants 2, 4 and 7 adopt the defence of the 1st defendant.

5. 3rd defendant in his written statement admits the Plaintiff's claim and says that the temple funds should not be charged for the Plaintiff's claim but should be recovered from the property of the managers who passed the order. He died after the trial began and the 10th defendant has been added in his stead.

6. Defendants 5, 6, 8 and 9 admit the Plaintiff's claim and say that the temple funds cannot be charged for the damages and costs which the Plaintiff seeks to recover in his plaint.

7. The issues are:—

(i) Is the suit bad for misjoinder of parties and causes of action?

(ii) Is the ascetic known as "Sriranganarayana Jeer" the head of a Mutt who cannot be removed from such position or deprived of such authority by the managers of the Sriranganadhaswami Devasthanam, or is he only a temple servant who can be deprived of his office by such managers?

(iii) What is the rule governing the devolution of, and succession to the rights appertaining to the "Sri Ranganarayana Jeer" on the death of the incumbent for the time being?

(iv) What are the rights, privileges and perquisites that Plaintiff is entitled to as Sriranganarayana Jeer?

(v) What are the duties that have to be performed by him as such Jeer and which of them may be performed by proxy according to the usage, if any, prevailing in the matter?

(vi) If such usage as is referred to in the last issue be proved to exist, is it valid and enforceable?

(vii) Is Plaintiff incapacitated by illness from discharging the duties appertaining to his position as such Jeer?

(viii) If so, is the Plaintiff in the position of a 'corporation sole' and cannot be deprived of his right to be Sriranganarayana Jeer, doing the duties by proxy?

(ix) Is the order of the managers preventing the Plaintiff from discharging the duties and receiving the honours and emoluments due to the Jeer, invalid for any of the reasons set out in the plaint?

(x) Is Plaintiff entitled to any, and if so, to what amount as damages and loss of perquisites claimed in the plaint?

(xi) What relief, if any, is Plaintiff entitled to?

Plaintiff's vakil appears and admits the Razinamah petition. Plaintiff signed the Razinamah.

1st defendant's vakil states that he does not oppose the Razinamah, that he is one of the three trustees of the temple and that the majority have agreed to compromise the case with the Plaintiff.

2nd defendant signed the Razinamah and his pleader admits the petition on his behalf.

3rd and 8th defendant are dead. 4th defendant is before the Court. He is the vakil for many defendants and states he has no interest in the suit. Defendants 5, 6 and 9 admitted by their statements the Plaintiff's claim.

10th defendant signed the Razinamah and his Pleader admits the petition for him.

7th defendant by Narayanasami Iyer states that he opposes this Razinamah. Seven witnesses were examined for Plaintiff. 7th defendant's pleader reports that he examines no witnesses.

I find that the Plaintiff by his evidence has established a case in his favour so as to entitle him to all the reliefs claimed herein as against the 1st and 7th defendant.

The decree in the suit will follow the terms of the Razinama.

(Sd). *Mundabba Bangara*, Subordinate Judge
for Mr. T. T. Rangachariar.

LIST OF EXHIBITS FILED :

For Plaintiff :—

- A. 5—2—04 Yadast sent by the trustees prohibiting the Plaintiff from entering the temple and partaking in the functions.
- B. 22—7—01 Yadast sent by the managers of the Srirangam temple to the Plaintiff.
- C. 4—2—99 Yadast by the trustees to the Head Peishkar of the Srirangam temple.
- D. 11—3—87 Registered lease deed executed by the Plaintiff's 3rd witness to Sriranganarayana Jeer (Plaintiff's Predecessor) in respect of certain rights in the temple.

For Defendants :—

- I. 16—10—03 Yadast by the Plaintiffs to the managers of the Srirangam temple.
- II. 22—6—01 Petition by Sthanlkam Annasami Iyengar to the managers of the Srirangam Devasthanam.
- III. 18—2—04 Yadast by the Committee to do.
- IV. 20—2—35 Arzi by the Sheristadar to the Collector.
- V. 15—6—35 Arzi by the Provincial Court Pundit to the Collector.
- VI. 5—2—24 Copy of the deposition of Sriranganarayana Jeer before the Collector.

7

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED :

For Plaintiff :—

1. Sri Parama Hamsa Sri Ranganarayana Jeer Swamigal
(Plaintiff) 2. K. Seshadri Iyengar (1st defendant), 3. Ranga-
sami Iyengar, 4. Thiruvengadathiengar, 5. Srinivasa Iyengar,
6. Srinivasa Iyengar, 7. Doraiswami Iyengar.

For Defendants :— Nil.

(Sd). *Mundabba Bangara*, Subordinate Judge
for Mr. T. T. Rangachariar.

(True copy)

In the Court of the Subordinate Judge

OF
TRICHINOPOLY.

PRESENT — T. T. RANGACHARIAR ESQ., B. A., B. L.,
Subordinate Judge.

Tuesday the 27th day of August 1907.

Original Suit No. 22 of 1905.

(O. S. 32 of 1904, District Court, Trichinopoly)

Between :—

Sri Parama Hamsa Sri Ranganarayana Jeer Swamigal,
Head of the Mutt, residing in the Matam at North Uthara Street,
Sriengam, Trichinopoly Taluq. — Plaintiff.

And :—

1. K. Seshadri Aiyangar adopted son of Kodiyalam Thatham Aiyangar, Temple Manager, residing at West Uthara Street, Sriengam, 2. Ko. Ka. Sri Vathula Desika Pranatharthihara Rangachariar adopted son of Sri Vathula Desika Sriengachariar residing at East Chitra Street, Sriengam, 3. Karalpadl Alavanthar Aiyah, residing at North Uthara Street, Sriengam (died), 4. S. O. Narayanaswami Aiyar adopted son of Sivarama Aiyar, residing at West Adayavalanjan Street, Sriengam, 5. Sri Uthamanambi Ramaswami Aiyangar son of Sri Uthamanambi Rengaswami Aiyangar residing at West Uthara Street, Sriengam, 6. Sri Vedavyasa Alasinga Bhutter son of Sri Vedavyasa Venkata Bhutter residing at North Uthara Street, Sriengam, 7. Sri Vedavyasa Thirumalai Bhutter son of Sri Vedavyasa Venkatasudarsana Bhutter residing at the same place 8. Sri Vedavyasa Sri Rama Bhutter son of Sri Vedavyasa Alasinga Bhutter residing at the same place (died), 9. Minor Parasura Alasinga Bhutter adopted son of Sri Parasura Sri Ranga Raja

Bhutter by his adoptive mother and guardian Sriranganachar ammanagar residing at South Uthara Street, Srirengam, 10. K. S. Kuppuswami Aiyangar son of Kuvalagudy K. Singam Aiyangar residing at East Chitra Street, Srirengam. — *Defendants.*

Suit to have it declared that the proceedings of the Temple Managers dated 3rd February, 13th April and 1st May 1904 preventing the Plaintiff from exercising his rights and privileges in the temple by virtue of the office he holds, are null and void, for an injunction preventing Defendants from interfering with the Plaintiff and his successors in the duties appertaining to his or their office, for past emoluments withheld and for future emoluments.

Value of the claim :—

- (a) Rs. 400—0—0 for declaration and injunction.
- (b) „ 2,000—0—0 the amount of damages prayed for.
- (c) „ 630—15—3 the amount of the perquisites and emoluments claimed up to date of plaint.

Or in all Rs. 3,030—15—3.

Cause of action arose on and from 3rd February 13th April and 1st May 1904 and is a continuing one.

This case coming on for further trial this day after the examination of seven witnesses for the Plaintiff, in the presence of Mr. T. Desikachariar, Vakil for Plaintiff, and of Mr. A. V. Gopalachariar, Vakil for 1st Defendant and Mr. S. O. Narayanaswami Iyer for himself and as pleader for Defendants 2, 7 and 10 and the Defendants 5, 6 and 9 being absent and the Defendants 3 and 8 having died and it appearing that the parties (Plaintiff and Defendants 2 and 10) have agreed to compromise the matter of the suit and that they have put into Court a deed of compromise praying that this court will pass a decree in accordance with the terms thereof, this Court in pursuance of the said deed of compromise and on a perusal of the evidence

recorded in the case, both order and decree that the Plaintiff be given during his life time the perquisites and emoluments due to his office according to custom and according to the Devasthanam accounts by the trustees out of the temple funds, that Plaintiff do perform the duties attached to his office and mentioned in the plaint as heretofore either by himself or by proxy without any hindrance to the Devasthanam affairs, that till he is able to attend in person to see whether the Archakas do use Pulukappu and Thailam properly and to receive Thirumalvattam honours, the Plaintiff do appoint an honest Archaka with the approval of the trustee at his cost to superintend the above duties at that time and place, that the trustees do pay to the Plaintiff in a week for past emoluments the amount due, after settling the accounts in respect of the lease now given out and in respect of other amounts, after deducting the amounts already paid to the Plaintiff, that the other disputes in the case be not settled at present, that each party do bear his or their own costs in the suit and that the trustees do allow him to receive the honours due to him (Plaintiff) without hindrance, whenever the Plaintiff attends the temple.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this 27th day of August 1907.

(Sd.) M. MUNDABBA BANGARA,
Subordinate Judge,
 for Mr. T. T. RENGACHARIAR.

Description of duties and privileges attached to the Plaintiff's Mutt as mentioned in the plaint:—

1. For the use on the foreheads of the Images of the God and the Goddess in the Srirenganatha Temple, the Plaintiff to take out, either himself or by proxy, the prescribed quantity of purified camphor and "Punugu Sattam" ointment kept under Plaintiff's seal in the temple and to issue by his proxy the prescribed quantity to be mixed with the sandal for use as "kallaji" to the said deities.

2. To supervise the daily ritual in the temples in accordance with the tenets of the Tenegalai sect and the Pancharatra Agama Sastra and to have the delinquents punished.

3. To have "Pulugappu Thailam" ointment prepared every Friday by extracting the ointment from "Punugu Sattam" and by adding to it the prescribed quantity of purified camphor and to divide the same into three parts one to 'Periyakoil Srirenganatha Temple', one to 'Nachiar Temple' and one to 'Sakarathalwar Temple' and have them applied to the deities of those temples under the supervision of Plaintiff or his proxy.

4. During the time of annual abishekams known as "Jeshtabishekams" in the temples of Srirenganathar, Nachiar, etc. Sakarathalwar etc, in the months of Anl and Adi (June August) the Plaintiff by himself or by his proxy to test the quantity of purified camphor known as "Pachakarpuram", saffron, Kungamappoo and Kastoori produced by the temple managers, then to have "Santhukappu" ointment prepared for application to the big Deity in the Chief inner shrine by mixing 'Sandal' 'Punugu Sattam Ointment' and 'Purified Camphor' from his custody, then to have prepared "Ulkappu" for being applied within the coats of armour of the "Utsava" images of the Periyakovil and the Nachiar Temple, mixed with purified camphor Kastoori from Plaintiff's custody and Sandal to issue from his custody the quantity of purified camphor necessary for the abishekam of the said Deities, such camphor being applied with Sandal, to see finally that the mixtures are applied to the Deities as mentioned above. The Plaintiff has also several other minor duties to be done by proxy on the above occasions which are all regulated by "mamool" or Immemorial usage.

5. During the month of Pirattasi, (September—October) every year, to cause "Santhukappu" to be prepared by Plaintiff's men in the same way as aforesaid and see it applied to the recumbent Deity in the inner shrine.

6. Every year on the day following the "Jeshtabishekam" Plaintiff to send through his men "Sirappu Alangaram" to the said big Deity in the "inner shrine" from the store-house known as Kottaram in the temple at the expense of the temple

7. To decide about the ritual to be done in the temple whenever disputes arise about them, according to the tenets of the Tengalai persuasion and Pancharatra Agamam.

8. To supervise the ritual in the temples.

9. To cause the prescribed quantity of purified camphor to be issued by his proxy for use in the abishekam known as "Choornabishekam" during every seventh day festival and on other "Choornabishekam" occasions in the temple.

10. To give daily religious instructions to the disciples of the mutt and the temple servants in the Plaintiff mutt and to fix the usual red-hot seals on the shoulders of the disciples of the mutt at their expense.

11. To keep in his custody a set of keys of the boxes containing jewels etc., of the temples in the room known as Thekkilarai in the temple and to cause the same to be opened and shut by proxy as occasion requires, and to cause his seal to be put upon the locks of all the rooms etc., where any of the temple articles are kept along with the seals of the other officers and cause his seals over them to be examined before they are opened on necessary occasions.

12. To appoint his own men as Lechanalkaran and Sthanathipathi and to exercise his duties and privileges in the temple by them as proxies without any reference to the temple trustees.

(Sd.) MUNDABBA BANGARA,
Subordinate Judge,
for Mr. T. T. RENGACHARIAR.

Typed by :— (Sd.) T. P. Vaithinatha Aiyar, Copyist. 28—1—16

Examined by :— (Sd.) T. K. V. Nath, Examiner. 29—1—16

(Sd.) D. Krishnaswami, Ag. Superintendent. 31—3—16

(Sealed) Application made 21—1—1916. Stamp papers called for 27—1—1916 Stamp papers deposited 27—1—1916 Copy Ready 31—1—16. Do. Delivered 31—1—1916. (Ind) D. K. Superintendent. S. D. M. C., O. S. 430 of 1924 Plaintiff's Exhibit.

Received 29th November, 1924 sealed District Munsiff's Court of Srirengam.

Received 2nd December 1924 sealed District Munsiff's Court of Srirengam.

Sealed District Munsiff's Court of Srirengam. I. A. 1328. of 24. O. S. 430 of 24 Produced on the 29—11—24 by Plaintiff. Proved or admitted by Defedents pleader. on 2—12—1924 and filed as Exhibit G.

Vide memo dated 2—12—24

(Sd) K. S. V. ROWJE,
District Munsiff.

(True Copy)

திருச்சிண்பள்ளி சப் கோர்ட்டார் அவர்கள் சமூகத்துக்கு
ஷே கோர்ட்டு அசல் 22/05 நெ.

ஸ்ரீ பரமஹம்ச ஸ்தலத்தாரில் முதன்மையான
ஸ்ரீரங்க நாராயண ஜீயர் —வாதி

K. சேஷாத்திரி ஐயங்கார் வகையறா —பிரதிவாதி

ஷே நம்பரில் வாதியும் பிரதிவாதியும் ஆஜர்
படுத்தின ராஜினுமா ஸ்ரீரங்கம் தேவஸ்தானத்தைச்
சேர்ந்த ஸ்ரீரங்கநாராயண ஜீயர் விஷயமாய் ஷே
ஸ்தானத்தில் இப்போது எழுந்தருளியிருக்கும் ஜீயர்
ஸ்வாமி வியாதினால் பிடிக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதையிட்டு
அவருக்கு மீ 1க்கு ரூ 20-00 கொடுத்துவருகிறதென்றும்
ஷே ஸ்தானத்தைச் சேர்ந்த கோவில் கைங்கர்யங்களைப்
பார்த்து வரவேண்டியதைப் பத்தி தகுந்த ஏற்பாடு
செய்யவேண்டுமென்றும் அப்போதைய மாணேஜர்கள்
பிற்பித்த உத்தரவை ரத்துசெய்ய வேண்டுமாயும் தனக்கு
நிறைவரும் படியுடன் நஷ்டம் கிடைக்க வேண்டுமாயும்
ஷே ஸ்வாமி டிரஸ்டிகள் பேரில் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற
ஷே தாவாலில்;

ஷே தாவாலிலும் அது ஸம்மந்தமாய் மேல்மேலும்
நடத்தவேண்டிய நடவடிக்கையில் தேவஸ்தானத்துக்கு
ஏற்படும் வீணான செலவை உத்தேசித்தும் ஷே ஸ்வாமி
உயிருடன் இருக்கிறவரையில் அந்த ஸ்தானத்தில் வேறு
ஒருவரையும் வைப்பது சரியானதாயும் அவ்வளவு உசித
மானதாயும் இராதென்று காணப்படுவதாலும் ஷே

ஜீயருக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிற வரும்படிகளை தேவஸ்தானத் திலேயே விற்பனைசெய்து அவருக்கு மீ 1க்கு ரூ 20 மேனிக்கு கொடுத்துவருவது தேவஸ்தானத்துக்கு வீண் வேலையென்று தெரியவருவதாலும் ஷே சங்கதிகளை செம்மையாய் யோஜித்து அடியில்கண்டபடி ராஜியாய் போய் தாக்கல்செய்த ராஜிநாமா விவரம் :—

1. வாதி ஆதீனத்துக்கு ஏற்பட்ட ஸகல வரும்படிகளை எப்போதும்போல் வாதிக்கு அவர் ஜீவஸ்தராயிருக்கும்வரையில் தேவஸ்தானம் கணக்குப் படிக்கும் வழக்கப்படிக்கும் இனி டிரஸ்டிகள் தேவஸ்தானம் ஐவேஜியிலிருந்து கொடுத்து வருகிறதென்றும்

2. வாதி ஆதீனத்துக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிற பிராதிற் கண்ட கைங்கர்யங்களை எப்போதும்போல் வாதி தானும் தன் மனுஷியானைக்கொண்டும் தேவஸ்தானம் கார்யங் களுக்கு ஒரு குந்தகமன்னியில் நடத்தி வருகிற தென்றும்

3. பெருமானுக்கு புழுகாப்பு தைலம் இதுகள் சாத்தும்போது மாத்திரம் ஜீயர் ஸ்வாமிக்கு நேரில்வந்து தைலம் லுவை ஸரிவர அர்ச்சகர்கள் சாத்துகிருர்களா வென்று பார்க்கிறதற்கும் திருமாலவட்டம் ஸேவிக்கிற தற்கும் சக்திவந்து அவரே செய்கிறவரையில் ஷே ஜீயர் ஸ்வாமியே தன்னுடைய சிலவில் அந்த இடத்திலும் சமயத்திலும் இருக்கக்கூடிய நம்பிக்கையான ஒரு அர்ச்சகரை தேவஸ்தானத்தாருடைய அனுமதியின் பேரில் வைத்து பார்த்துவரவேணும்.

4. வாதி ஆதீனத்துக்கு நாளது வரை சேர வேண்டிய வரும்படிகளில் நடுவில் பத்து வழியானது போது மீதியில் இப்போது குத்தகைக்கு விட்டிருக்கிற துகையையும் மற்றவகைகளையும் டிரஸ்டிகள் கணக்கு பார்த்து ஒரு வாரத்தில் வாதிக்கு கொடுத்துவிடுகிற தென்றும்

5. மற்றபடி இந்த கேஸில் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிற விவாத அம்சங்களைப்பற்றி இப்போது ஒருவிதமாயும் தீராமல் இருக்கவேண்டியதென்றும்

6. இந்த தாவாவில் அவரவர்கள் செலவை அவரவர்கள் பொறுத்துக்கொள்கிறதென்றும்

7. வாதி எப்போது எப்போது கோவிலுக்கு எழுந்தருளுகிறாரோ அந்த அந்த காலங்களில் அவருக்கு வழக்கப்படி ஏற்பட்ட மரியாதைகளை டிரஸ்டிகள் யாதொரு தடையுமன்னியில் நடத்திவரவேண்டுமென்றும்

8. மற்ற எக்ஸ்பார்டியாயிருக்கிற டிரஸ்டி ஆபீசர்களை பொறுத்தும் இதில் கண்ட ஷரத்துப்படியே வாதிக்கு தீர்மானமானால் போதும் என்றும் ராஜியாய் விட்டபடியால் இதை அனுசரித்து தீர்ப்பு செய்ய வேண்டுமாய்ப் பிரார்த்திக்கிறோம்

(Sd) Language not known.

(Sd) K. S. Kuppaswamy Iyengar 27-8-1907.

(Sd) ஸ்ரீ நாராயண ஜியர் -வாதி.

(Sd) S. O. Narayanaswamy, Pleader for Deft. 2 & 10.

(Sd) V. Desikachariar, Vakil 27-8-07.

சாക്ഷிகள் :

(Sd) S. Ramanuja Iyengar, Pleader.

(Sd) Illegible அறிவேன்.

I am instructed neither to oppose the Rajinama no join in it. (Sd) A. Gopalaratnam, Vakil for 1st Deft. V. Desikachariar I. A. No. 490 of 07. O. S. 22 of 05. உபயவாதிகளும் கொடுத்த ராஜினாமா Sec. 375 C. P. C. (Sealed) Subordinate Court Tiruchirappalli. Received 27 Aug. 1907.

Plaintiff vakil appears and admit this petition. Plaintiff signed this razinamah. 1st defendant vakil states that he does not appose the razinamah, that he is one of the three trustees of the temple and that the majority have agreed to compromise the case with the Plaintiff.

2nd defendant signed the Razinamah and his pleader admit this petition on his behalf.

3rd and 8th defendants are dead. 4th defendant is before the court. He is the vakil for many defendants and states he has no interest in the suit. Defendants 5, 6 and 9 admitted by their statement the Plaintiff's claim.

10th defendant signed this razinamah and his pleader admits this petition for him.

7th defendant K. G. Narayanasami Iyer states that he opposes this Razinamah. Seven witnesses were examined for Plaintiff. 7th defendant pleader reports that he examines no evidences I find that the Plaintiff by his evidence has established a case in his favour so as to entitle him to all the reliefs claimed herein as against the 1st & 7th defendant.

The decree in the suit will follow the terms herein.

(id) Illegible Subordinate Judge. 27-8-07.

True Copy

Copied by 5th and last page

(Sd).....
(Sd)..... Superintendent.

Trichy District Court

O. P. No. 69 of 1948 dated 3-8-1954

1. R. Ramasami Ayyah
2. Seshayya

} *Petitioners*

Vs

1. The Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Board by its President
2. Sadhu Sri Valshanva Kada Kada Ramanujacharlar
3. Srirangam Sri Ranganathaswami Devastanam by its Executive Officer
4. The Commissioner appointed under the Madras H. R. & C. E. Act, 1951
(Added as per order on I. A. No. of 51, dated 4-12-1951)

} *Respondents*

Petition dated 21st June 1948 under section 79-A (3) of the Madras H. R. & C. E. Act praying that the order of the 1st respondent (bearing Board's Order No. 6060 dated 17-2-1948 in C. No. 9458/46 Adm) be set aside and the petitioners' right to recite pinnadi and receive emoluments, perquisites and sambavana on all occasions on all goshties be also recognised and the 3rd respondent be directed to give effect thereto and 2nd respondent be restrained by an injunction from interfering with the exercise of these rights by the petitioners and the other members of the six families of whom petitioners represent two and that the respondents be ordered to pay petitioners costs of this application.

This petition having been heard on the 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 19th, & 31st days of July 1954 in the presence of Sri R. Seshadri, Advocate for the petitioners and of Sri S. Sengamalam Pillai, Advocate for respondents Nos. 1, 3, and 4, Sri S. Kasturi Rangachariar, pleader for the 2nd respondent, and having stood over to this day for consideration, the court passed the following order:—

This is a petition under section 79-A (3) of the Madras H. R. & C. E. Act 1926 to set aside an order of the Board passed under section 79-A (1) negating the claim of the petitioners as members of the community known as the Srirangam Kovil Miras Sathathavas to membership of a body called the Adyabhaga Goshti, whose right and duty it is to chant prabhandam on various occasions at the Srirangam temple and during the festivals when the deities are taken out on procession. It is the petitioners' case that the members of the six families to which they belong have all along been members of this goshti and that it is their right to recite the pinnadi or the latter half of the verses in the prabhandam while the munnadi or earlier half is recited by the Brahmin members of the goshti. They are also entitled to share, equily with the Brahmin members, the prasadam, sambavanas and honours which constituted the emoluments of the services rendered by the goshti.

2. The 1st respondent in the defunct Board whose place has been taken by the 4th respondent, the commissioner appointed under the new Act (Madras XIX of 1951). The 2nd respondent is a Brahmin leader of the Goshti who is alleged to have obstructed the petitioners in the exercise of their right in July 1943 & whose obstruction was upheld by the 3rd respondent, the executive officer of the Davasthanam by his proceedings dated 6-2-1943 and on a petition therefrom by the 1st petitioner, by the Board on 16-2-1948. It is this order of the Board that the petitioners seek to set aside.

3. After sixteen documents were marked and six witnesses examined for the petitioners and twelve documents marked and five witnesses examined on the side of the respondents, the petitioners and the 2nd respondent made a joint application to the Court praying that the Sriranga Narayana Jeer, who is the high priest of the temple, may be examined as a witness and agreeing to abide by his evidence as finally determining the matters in controversy. To this course respondents 3 and 4 subsequently agreed.

4. The Jeer was accordingly examined and his evidence is conclusively against the rights claimed by the petitioners. It follows therefore that, in terms of the joint application the petition has to be dismissed. In fact all what the petitioner now ask is that, having regard to the way in which the petition has ended, no costs should be awarded against them.

5. I dismiss the petition. But having regard to all the circumstances, I direct each party to bear his own costs. The petition has been pending from 1948 and has suffered 83 adjournments and has not undergone a full trial. I therefore fix the Vakil's fee at Rs. 400/- (one set).

Pronounced in open Court this 3rd day of August 1954.

P. T. RAMAN NAYAR,
District Judge,

Sri Ranganathasamy Etc., Devasthanam

SRIRANGAM

Rc. No. 3056/67-D. 1.

1st May 1958

From

**Sri K. K. Menon, B. A., B. L.
Executive Officer.**

To

**The Commissioner,
Hindu Religions and Charitable Endowments,
Administration Department, MADRAS-2.**

Through

**The Deputy Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments,
Administration Department, MADRAS-2.**

Sir,

**Sub: Establishment — Jeers post — Filling up of
Remarks.**

Ref: 1. Commissioners's Rc. 11128/58-A 2/10-4-58.

2. Dy. Commissioner's Rc. 4745 /58 / 29-4-58.

I enclose

- (1) Copy of my note to the trustees dated 24-4-58
on the history of the post and the necessity for
retaining it.**
- (2) Description of the duties attached to the post
as given in schedule 'B' of the judgement in
O. S. No. 22/1905.**
- (3) Emoluments attached to the post.**
- (4) Honours attached to the post as given in schedule
'D' of the judgement in O. S. 22/05.**
- (5) Board's Order 675 dated 2-3-1942**
- (6) Resolution of the Trustees 317/67 — C. 1 dated
28-4-58.**

**In this connection I may also be permitted to mention
a few words about the petitioner. A copy of the letter sent
to the Government is sent to me also. Though nothing is**

known of the association known as 'Public Welfare Committee' the records in this Devasthanams throw considerable light on the gentleman who has signed himself as the Secretary of it. He was a clerk in this Devasthanams, some years back for a short period in a leave vacancy. Subsequently, I am told he was appointed as the Executive Officer of some temple in Jayakondam, when some charges were framed against him by then Assistant Commissioner, Sri K. Somasundara Desikar and has been sending letters to the Government about the administration of this temple, most of them supporting Vadagalal interests and against Thengalai interests. In 1952, he made some complaints regarding the procession of Sri Nadhamunigal and Sri Vedanta Desikar in connection with Vaikunta Ekadasi Festivals. In reply, the then Executive Officer, referred to numerous legal proceedings and said that the Devasthanam could not do a thing which had not met with recognition in any of the Civil or Criminal Courts. Now again he has recommended for the abolition of the post of Jeer which as will be seen from the enclosures, is a post of great responsibility and honour and held by a Thengalai. In another letter addressed to the Commissioner (Copy forwarded to me) he as the Secretary of the same association states that in the Trust Board the Vadagalal community is represented only by one person, that the Thengalai community has two representatives and has requested that the latter be reduced to one and the seat allotted to some other caste. On the whole, therefore, I feel much weight cannot be attached to his representations as he has apparently more of sectarian interests and prejudices at heart than the interests of the temple or its administration.

(Sd.) K. K. MENON,
Executive Officer.

P. S. N. 2/5.

Enc :

Advance copy submitted to the Commissioner, H. R. and C. E.,
Madras.

A NOTE TO THE TRUSTEES' REGARDING THE NECESSITY FOR RETAINING THE POST OF THE JEER.

History records that Sri Ramanuja (11th Century) assumed management of the affairs of this temple from the Amudanars and that he was responsible for effecting various reforms in the administration and for laying down details of the various rituals and other customs which govern the conduct of pujas and festivals in this great shrine. As the renowned Saint and Scholar of the age, as the propounder of the Visishtā Advaita philosophy he occupied a unique position and the frame work of the administration moulded by him in this temple was considered as the model to be copied in every other Vaishnavite temple. Tiruvarangam thus became not only the foremost Vaishnavite Shrine but also the "Arāṅgam" for the guidance of customs, rituals and ideals of administration for all the remaining 107 Vaishnavite Shrines. After Ramanuja, the temple seems to have been administered for a time by some of his disciples in whom he had, during his life time, reposed great confidence and subsequently by their descendants. They were not Sanyasins.

By about the beginning of the 12th century one Kuranarayana Jeer, a foreigner to the place by birth, appeared on the scene. He was the disciple of Periya Battar and a great scholar. Though unattached to the temple, by his devotion he was able to perform many miracles. He is said to have wrecked the attempts by his magical powers of a wicked sanyasin to remove Peria Perumal to Srirangapatam. Once when Perumal was taken through Kaveri in a raft for "Pathinettamperukkam" festival the raft was carried away by the floods. On hearing this, it is said that Kuranarayana Jeer turned the Valaya pavitram (ring of darba grass) he had on his finger when the boat turned against the current and came back to the shore. He gathered a large following and

they felt that the ideal set up by Sri Ramanuja could be followed only by a sanyasin of such high attainments and not by people clothed in worldly environments. He was therefore assigned "the mutt of Udayavar the Udayavar seal and the ring of the sacred conch" by Kandadal Ayl who was holding them. From that time onwards Kuranarayana Jeer, who by his wonderful devotion was radiating goodness all over, came to be called Sri Ranganarayana Jeer. The post seems to have been continuously held thereafter by sanyasins, the deceased Jeer being the 49th in the parampara.

It is seen that the post was filled up even when the East India Company was directly administering the affairs of this temple between 1801 and 1842. Reference is seen in one of the orders of the Collector to the Head Peishkar on 12-6-1821 that one of the keys of the Karuvoolam was with the Jeer. Again in an earlier litigation O. S. 130/1808 the Jeer is seen to have been the 1st Plaintiff. It is seen that he enjoyed a unique position then, and that he enjoyed the company circars confidence more than even the Stalathars. One of the Collectors of the District, A. P. Onslow, in his report to the Board of Revenue dated 22-2-1842, while giving his suggestions for divesting himself of the administration of the temple, stated as follows :- "Owing to long desuetude, the Stalathars could not be entrusted with the management of the funds belonging to the pagoda without a powerful check and such I am assured will be found in the superintendance of a Jeer who being bound by his profession not to accumulate wealth for worldly aggrandisement and having in virtue of his high office renounced all ties of kindred and so being free from all the motives which commonly conduce to cause speculation, will not fail to enforce in the Pagoda of which he is the head the due appropriation of the funds allotted to its maintenance". He also suggested that the Jeer shall during his life time nominate a person to succeed him in the same manner as Gooroos are accustomed to name their successors.

The duties assigned to the jeer, the honours he is entitled to and the details of emoluments and perquisites due to him have been laid down in a decree in O. S. 32/1904 of the Dist. Court, Trichy subsequently transferred and filed as O. S. 22/1905 of the Trichy Sub Court. Schedule B gives the duties and privileges attached to the mutt. They are twelve in number and are given in enclosure (1) The emoluments and perquisites have had some slight variations due to changing conditions. The present list is enclosed (2) The "honours" attached to him are given in schedule C of the said decree and in enclosure (3). It is thus seen that, in addition to the historical background, he occupies a unique position in the administration that apart from other duties, *he is practically the sole monarch to supervise and guide the administration in most of the religious and ritualistic matters.* Most of these are places where the Executive Officer and his non-brahmin assistants, have no admission. In some places even Brahmins other than archakas have no admission. The archakas belong to the Vadakalai sect and the Jeer belongs to the Thenkalai sect. Though he belongs to that sect and would normally protect the rights and privilege of that community for the reasons graphically explained by Onslow in his report of 22-2-1842, he is not likely to encroach upon the rights of the Vadakalai sect. Yet it cannot but be said that this sectarian difference and the unique position he holds in the matter of honours and in keeping the balance even often lead sectarian fanatics to take sides and cloud the issues with personal and sectarian sentiments.

The temple is considered to occupy the first rank among all the Vaishnavite Shrines, the temple of temples and Sri Ranganatha, the holy of the holies. The names "Kovil" and "Periaperumal" refer to this shrine and this deity only. In the mangalasanams of the 108 Vaishnavite Shrines the prayer is "*Tiruvarrngam Vazhka*" *This unique position occupied by the temple entails the necessity for preserving its*

customs, its ideals, its sacredness and above all its divinity to radiate its rays of culture and ideals on all the other vaishnavite shrines.

It is with these backgrounds that we have to examine the question as to whether the post should be retained at some cost or whether, as a matter of economy or retrenchment, it should be abolished. In this connection the following points deserve special consideration.

1. The question has to be viewed in an unbiassed way, dissociating our minds from possible influences of enthusiastic sectarian sycopancy and fanaticism.
2. The maintenance of the unique position the temple occupies among the vaishnavite world and among the other vaishnavite shrines.
3. If the post is one dealing with administrative of secular functions, we can view it from a commercial angle. This was a post created by Udayavar himself and Mudallndan, his chief disciple and his sister's son was the first Korattu maniam. But his present duties are only secular and administrative, though he also supervises indoor administration. He checks whether X comes in time, Y prepares prasadam properly or Z distributes them properly. These are only secular or administrative. *But the Jeer supervises the religious and ritualistic side of things. And I feel when "religious portion" or "Ritualistic aspects" step in, "commercial ideas" must bid good-bye. Temples exist only to maintain religion and rituals and they are to be maintained. Irrespective of monetary considerations—particularly in temples which lead the way to others.*
4. It is true that the expenses may *prima facie* look a bit high. But it is to be remembered that some of the duties assigned to him have to be got done by subordinates,

that he has to maintain a retinue and feed some of the desantharies who go to the mutt, consistent with the practice and dignity of the mutt.

5. The dignity of the temple, the purity of the Pujas and the sanctity of the rituals are undoubtedly enhanced when they are under the superintendance of - as the old Collector put it - "a Jeer who being bound by his profession not to accumulate wealth for kindred" and who leads the life of a Sanyasin.

Taking all these aspects into consideration I am strongly of opinion that in the interest of the temple - the maintenance of its unique position among Valshnavite Shrines - the need for the preservation of the temple's sanctity and sacredness demand the continuance of this "holy office" irrespective of monetary considerations. The discontinuance of it will cause great discontent, dissatisfaction and heart burning among the pious devoties. I feel so and the trustees, I hope, will in one voice agree with me.

(Sd.) K. K. MENON, B. A., B. L.,
Executive Officer.

AV. 24-4-1958.