L. & M.
9,000-8-8-95.

Local & Munl. (1895) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2397 L.

DATED 9th Decr 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

Batta.

Recording letter from the President, District Board, Chingleput, regarding an application for ---- claimed by the village munsif of Siruvallur in connection with a certain case.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

---

[7]

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 9-12-95

No. 2397 L

INDEXED.

When given for copying..

[Despatch Abstract.]

Batta

Recording letter from the Pt. Distr Bd Chingleput, regarding ~~the dist~~ an application for — claimed by the Village Munsiff of Seravallur, in connection with a certain case.

√

READ AGA[illegible] ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189 , No , MISCELLANEOUS.

BACK PAPER, No. of 189

FURTHER PAPER, No. of 189

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

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

Copied by
Examined by

Local & Municipal Dept.
1895. CURRENT No. 3568 L

FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE
DISTRICT BOARD,
CHINGLEPUT.

To
THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVT.
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
MADRAS.

N
Misc:

Order No 2397 Misc. 9.12.95

Recorded

Dated 4th December 1895

V.R.
9/12/95

Wlsd
9.XII.95

ENCLOSURE, /one/

6 DEC 1895

No. 1095/L of 95.

SUBJECT.

Submitting copy of letter of President Saidapet Taluk Board, withdrawing his application for the batta claimed by the Village Munsiff of Seruvallur for having attended the District Munsiff's Court in O. S. No 68 of 1894.

/With order/

A9/12
7/12

11/12
9/12

the application made for the sanction of the batta etc in letter Reference on No $\frac{732}{J.B.}$ dated 6th June 1895.

G.O. No $\frac{1154\ L.\ loc}{3.7.95}$

I have the honor to be.

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

(Signed) M. Tillainayagam
President
Taluk Board Saidapet.

(True copy)

No $\frac{1095}{L}$ of 1895.

Forwarded with the Taluk board Presidents' further communication dated 27th November 1895 Reference on No $\frac{1904}{J.B}$ explaining the circumstances under which the batta was claimed for the Munsiff from local funds and now withdrawing the application.

CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT BOARD'S OFFICE,
Saidapet 4th December 95.

Vice President
for President
District Board

D.L.

Saidapet Taluk Boards Office.

Reference on No. 1747/T.B of 1895.

Saidapet 25th October 1895.

CURRENT No. 3568 L

From.

M. R. Ry. M. Tillainayakam Pillai Avergal
B.A.
President of the Taluk Board. Saidapet.
Chingleput District.

To.

The Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department

Through the President District Board.

Sir.

With reference to G.O. 1154L/3.7.95 Mis. — Calling on me to report if the batta claimed by the Village Munsiff of Siruvallur has been included in the costs awarded in O.S. No. 68 of 1894 on the file of the District Munsiff of Poonamallee. I have the honour to state that the Taluk Board had nothing to do with the suit which was instituted against the Collector and defended by that Officer. The claim for batta and trainage of the Village Munsiff who was summoned as a witness in that case need not have been brought before the Taluk Board, which is not bound to bear the expense. I beg permission to withdraw — the

---

Current Refs No 3031 L
20-11-95

From
The President
Taluk Board
Saidapet

To
President
District Board
Chingleput

Dist. Collector's Office Chingleput 28 Nov 95

Dated 27 — 11 — 95

Despatched 27-11-95

Refer no 1904/T.B of 95

E — 88

Return 28/11

Subject.

Submitting the report with records regarding the claim of battah by the village Munsiff of Siruvallur who have attended the Dist. Munsiff's court to give evidence in S. No 68 of 94

1/3568 L/95

Saidapet Taluk Boards Office.

Reference on No. $\frac{1747}{T.B}$ of 1895.

Saidapet 25th October 1895.

CURRENT No. 3568 L

From.

M. R. Ry. M. Tillainayakam Pillai Avergal
B.A.
President of the Taluk Board. Saidapet.
Chingleput District.

To.

The Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Through the President District Board.

Sir.

With reference to G.O. $\frac{1154L}{3.7.95}$ Mis. — calling on me to report if the batta claimed by the Village Munsiff of Sriruvallur has been included in the costs awarded in O.S. No. 68 of 1894 on the file of the District Munsiff of Poonamallee, I have the honour to state that the Taluk Board had nothing to do with the suit which was instituted against the Collector and defended by that Officer. The claim for batta and trainage of the Village Munsiff who was summoned as a witness in that case need not have been brought before the Taluk Board, which is not bound to bear the expense. I beg permission to withdraw — the

---

Current Regr No 3031L
28-11-95

From

The President
Taluk Board
Saidapet

To

President
District Board
Chingleput

Dated 27 — 11 — 95

Despatched 27-11-95

Refer No $\frac{1904}{T.B}$ of 95

E — 88

Retn

Subject.

Submitting the report with records regarding the claim of battah by the village Munsiff of Sriruvallur who have attended the Dist. Munsiff's court to give evidence in S. No 68 of 94

3568 L / 95

Saidapet Taluk Boards' Office

Reference on No. $\frac{1747}{T.B}$ of 1895.

Saidapet 25th October 1895.

CURRENT No. 3568

From.

M. R. Ry. M. Tillainayakam Pillai Av

B.

President of the Taluk Board. Said

Chingleput Dist

To

The Chief Secretary to Government

Local and Municipal Departmen

Through the President District Board.

Sir.

With reference to G.O. $\frac{1154L}{3.7.95}$ Mu
Calling on me to report if the batta c
by the Village Munsiff of Seruvallur has
included in the costs awarded in O.S. N
1894 on the file of the District Munsi
Poonamallee, I have the honour to state
the Taluk Board had nothing to do with
suit which was instituted against the
and defended by that Officer. The cla
for batta and trainage of the Village M
who was summoned as a witness in th
case need not have been brought befor
Taluk Board, which is not bound to be
expense. I beg permission to withdraw

---

have been included in the defendant's cost in the decree. As the judgment and the decree appear to be in your office, a reference may be made to them and ascertained if the battah claimed is included in the costs or not.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servt

M. Tillainayakam

President,

ll

27/4

Current Regr No 3031/L
28-11-95

From
The President
Taluk Board
Saidapet

To
The President
District Board
Chingleput

CHINGLEPUT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
28 NOV 95

Dated 27-11-95

Despatched 27-11-95

Ref in No 1904/T.B. of 95

E-88

1/3568/95

Subject.

Submitting the report with records regarding the claim of battah by the village Munsiff of Sevvi valluv who have attended the Dist. Munsiff's court to give evidence in S. No 68 of 94

---

9. The above is the information I have been able to collect from the papers available which have been forwarded herewith as per separate list. I have not been able to get all the papers connected with the matter as some of them have been filed in the munsiff's court and some are probably with the Government pleader or ~~my~~ in your office. I have not got even a copy of the judgment in the case—

10. Vencatacharriar was ordered to appear before the ~~26th~~ District Munsiff under a departmental ~~circular~~ order and summons were not taken for him. The Government pleader, therefore, thinks that the battah claimed by the munsiff might not

Current Regr No 3031/L
28-11-95

From
The President
Taluk Board
Saidapet

To
The President
District Board
Chingleput

CHINGLEPUT COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
29 NOV 95
RECEIVED

Dated 27 - 11 - 95
Despatched 27-11-95

Ref in No 1904/T.B of 95

E — 88

Return
w/2 M[illegible]

Subject.

Submitting the report with records regarding the claim of batta by the village Munsiff of Sriperumbudur who have attended the Dist. Munsiff's court to give evidence in S. No 68 of 94

1/3568 of 95

---

made on the Revenue side between the Dy Collector and Collector -

5. Again in his letter no 475 Rev / 2-7-92, Mr Thomson ordered the Dy collector to take proceedings on the magisterial side in the capacity of Divisional Magistrate under chapter X of Criminal Procedure code, and to have opened the way closed by Narayanaswami Naydu. Mr Ramachandra Ayyar, one of my predecessors, issued accordingly notice on the magisterial side under section 133 of the criminal Procedure Code for the removal of the obstruction.

6. Narayanaswami Naydu, thereupon instituted suit no 58 of 94 on the file of the District Munsiff of Poonamallee against the Collector and not the President District Board, and the suit was defended

by the collector in his capacity as collector and in the interest of Government or the public, and the Local Fund Board had nothing whatever to do with the suit -

7. The battah claimed is by the Village Munsiff who was deputed to give evidence in the suit - Before I had full knowledge of the correspondence, I thought that the battah should be ~~met~~ paid by the Local Board -

8. Mr Hanumantha Row, who acted for me during my absence on other duty, applied for sanction of the battah from the Local Funds evidently on the strength of my endorsement on the Munsiff's application for the battah - As I have learnt subsequently that the suit was defended by the collector in his Revenue capacity, and in the interests of the public or Government and as the path did not vest in the Taluk Board, I have thought it would form a proper charge on provincial funds and withdrawn the application for sanction of the battah from the Taluk funds - It will thus be seen that the matter was opened by the chairman, obviously without authority; that it was then taken up by the collector on the Revenue and Magisterial side, and that the suit, which was for the cancelment of the notice of the Deputy Magistrate, was against the collector, who and not the District Board President, it was that defended it -

the Dist. Munsiff's court
to give evidence in S. No 68 of 94

Local

9. The above is the information I have been able to collect from the papers available which have been forwarded herewith as per separate list. I have not been able to get all the papers connected with the matter, as some of them have been filed in the munsiff's court and some are probably with the Government pleader or ~~m~~ in your office. I have not got even a copy of the judgment in the case —

10. Vencatacharriar was ordered to appear before the ~~2d~~ District munsiff under a departmental ~~circular~~ order and summons were not taken for him. The Government pleader, therefore, thinks that the battah claimed by the munsiff might not

Presidents - But at this stage, the President District Board, addressed the Dy Collector in his letter, dated 8th January 1892 and pointed out to him that cart-tracks, recognized and used passing on pattah lands, cannot be closed by the pattadars, as allowances have been made in the settlement on account of these and the like - Mr Thomson has observed in para 3 of the letter that, if there is any further disturbance over the matter, he will have the old track opened, and he further ordered written notices to be given to the pattadars so as to preserve Government rights -

4. Ever since the receipt of these instructions, the correspondence on the subject ceased on the Local Fund side and was

9. The above is the information I have been able to collect from the papers available which have been forwarded herewith as per separate list. I have not been able to get all the papers connected with the matter, as some of them have been filed in the munsiff's court and some are probably with the Government pleader or ~~m~~ in your office. I have not got even a copy of the judgment in the case —

10. Vencatacharriar was ordered to appear before the ~~2d~~ District munsiff under a departmental ~~circular~~ order and summons were not taken for him. The Government pleader, therefore, thinks that the battah claimed by the munsiff might not

---

Ref. No $\frac{1904}{T\text{-}B}$ of 95

Saidapet Taluk Board's
office. Tankar's choultry
28th November 95

E-88

From
The President Taluk Board
Saidapet.

To
The President District
Board, Chingleput.

Sir,
With reference to your endorsement Regr No $\frac{3031 L}{11\text{-}11\text{-}95}$, requesting me to detail the nature of the suit in which the village munsiff of Tiruvallur claims battah, and how the said charges were first recommended to be paid from Local Funds, I have the honor to report that one Kandasamy Mudali, the husband of Gurunammal of Tiruvallur in the Sembium Union, was prosecuted by the

by the Chairman for obstructing a public thoroughfare before the Taluk magistrate of Saidapet who found that the thoroughfare was on his private property and acquitted him - He pointed out that the public path marked in the survey plan was in field numbers 23 and 50, and that it was blocked up by Narayanaswami Nayudu the husband of Parvathi Ammal - Both were then prosecuted before the Taluk Sheristadar magistrate who convicted them - The conviction of Kandaswami Mudali, was however quashed on appeal by Mr Pinto, to whom the appeal was transferred by the District Magistrate - There was also some difficulty in draining water at that point and arrangements were made with Narayanaswami Nayudu, who purchased land from Mr Foxen, for the same and allowed the water to pass through the same - But he however refused to open the thoroughfare through his fields Nos 23 and 50, though it is marked clearly in the Survey plan - Kandaswami Mudali removed the obstruction caused by him pending disposal of the case of obstruction caused by Narayana swami Nayudu -

2. The late President of the Taluk Board appears to have entertained doubt as to whether he could take any proceedings for opening the path across his private property but closed by raising a wall by Narayanaswami Nayudu -

3. Upto this all correspondence on the subject passed between the District and Taluk Board

Presidents - But at this stage, the President District Board, addressed the Dy: collector in his letter, dated 8th January 1892 - and pointed out to him that cart-tracks, recognized and used passing on pattah lands, cannot be closed by the pattadars, as allowances have been made in the settlement on account of these and the like - Mr Thomson has observed in para 3 of the letter that, if there is any further disturbance over the matter, he will have the old track opened, and he further ordered written notices to be given to the pattadars so as to preserve Government rights -

4. Ever since the receipt of these instructions, the correspondence on the subject ceased on the Local Fund Side and was

---

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.