as regards the
plastering I am disposed

1887.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 5843

From The Suptg: Engr: VI Circle

ENCLOS.—

No. 224 J. C.
Dated 23rd July 1887
Received 28th —"—

SUBJECT.

Inspection Rolls of the Supt Engineer VI Circle for July 1887, on Repairs to European Barracks at Trichinopoly.

DISPOSAL.

No. 2565 C of 2nd August 1887

Returned with the remarks of the Chief Engineer.

To
The Suptg: Engr: VI Circle

1888.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 10451.

From Suptg: Engr: VI. Circle

ENCLOS.—

No. 545. T. C.
Dated 14th } December.
Received 20th }

SUBJECT.

Regarding the Infantry and Artillery Barracks at Trichinopoly.

—

DISPOSAL.

No. 61 C Dated 7th January 1888

Returned to the Suptg Engineer VI Circle with remark that Lieut Talvey's explanation is not satisfactory, but that as Mr Martin paid for a good deal of the work, it should first be settled what share of the money wasted is debitable

No 2112 W of 12th July 1888.

Quarterly list of Memorials addressed to the Govt of India and withheld by the Govt of Madras for the Quarter Ending 30th June 1888.

From whom	No & date	Subject	Rule under which withheld
2113 & 2111 12-7-1888 Awaiting		Nil	

To, The Secretary to the Govt. of India P.W. Dept.

Draft CR 9.7.88

9.7.88

Sd 10/7/88.

PW 917 917

No 2111 W of 12th July 1888

Quarterly list of Memorials addressed to Home Govt and withheld by the Govt. of Madras, under Govt of India Home Department Resolution No 1772-95 dated 26th September 1879 for the quarter ending 30th June 1888.

From whom	No & date	Subject	Rule under which withheld
		Nil	

To The Secretary to the Govt. of India P.W.D.

Draft. 9-7-88

9.7.88

10/7/88.

1140W-16-4-88

No 2111 W of 12th July 1888

Draft answer.

That the Plaintiff claims the restoration of lands said to have been taken up in 1881 and 1887.

(1) That his claim is barred by limitation for lands said to have been taken up in 1881.

(2) That, as a matter of fact, no such lands were taken up in 1881, the enlargement of the bank having been made upon lands taken up and paid for in 1869-70 and that Plaintiff has therefore no title to the lands said to have been taken up in 1881 which are the property of Government.

(3) That no land has been taken up in 1887 nor have any one's rights been interfered with the action of the Government officers having been confined to a preliminary marking out of certain lands; hence there is no cause of action.

(4) That Defendant is unaware of Plaintiff's title to sue in this matter as there are many sharers for the fields entered in the schedule.

F A Nicholson

A/ Collector

Rec'd 331 1888

Rpmbk 12/7/88

Enclosure in a
letter from the Collector
of Tinnevelly dt 14-6-88
No 343

P.W. Enc 2
6653/88

Ex Ref 1953/111

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

Dated 28th June 1888.

No. 583 Press

J. Grose Esquire, M.A

READ ..... the following letter, from the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 14th June 1888, No 343.

In reply to the Board's Proceedings dated 17th February 1888, No 1056 Miscellaneous

I have the honor to report that I have been through all the papers available on the subject of Original Suit no 296 of 1887 on the file of the District Munsif of Srivaikuntham and examined Mr Gopalakrishnaiyar, the Assistant Engineer. I have also discussed the matter with Mr. Russell, the Executive Engineer.

2.

2. As admitted in para 4 of the Plaint, Some lands in the village of Sriparan-Kusanallur were in 1869 and 1870 taken up for the South main channel branching off from the Srivaikunthum Anicut and were duly paid for.

3. In 1881, the bank of the channel was Strengthened in order that it may also Serve as the left flood bank of the river. The Assistant Engineer was then Specially deputed to find out if more land was required than what had already been taken up and paid for in 1869-70. The Assistant Engineer, on personal inspection answered the question in the negative. He was on the spot for a month and made all necessary enquiries with the Karnam. From the Karnam's statements, he took down his notes and plotted the results on a plan which we now have and which shows the whole strip of land available to Government. During that month, no one came forward and claimed any Compensation for any land but only for pits dug in other parts of the various fields.

4. The Tahsildar also made a report in 1881 to the effect that no more lands than what have already been taken up are required for Strengthening the bank. This report is based on that of the late Revenue Inspector who as well as the Tahsildar are Since dead.

5. At the request of Mr. MacCartie, the lands actually Covered by the bank have now been measured up with the result that the Area is only 10.08 acres, of Course including peramboke &c originally belonging to Government,

Whereas

whereas the total area taken up in 1869-70
as shown in a statement prepared du-
-ring the time of and Signed by —
Mr Puckle is 24·55 acres. It is therefore
absolutely impossible that Government
could have taken up in 1881 more
lands than were already in their
possession. They possessed by their action
in 1869-70, 24·55 acres plus the area of the
original bank, whereas the whole bank
as now enlarged occupies even now
only 10·08 acres. This itself shows the
baselessness of plaintiff's demand.

6. Again in 1883, Compensation was
paid for filling up pits from which
earth was taken for the bank in the
Same village. The Plaintiff and other
ryots of the village have Signed a
Statement in proof of their having
received Compensation. Neither then,
nor at any previous time, does plaintiff
(nor any other ryot in this area) appear
to have put forward any claim for land
taken up.

taken up. He never put into our know-
-ledge, any petition on the Subject, nor
does his deposition make any mention
of it. His original petition of 1881, and
his deposition of 1883, are available and
bear out my allegation. So far as we
know (and I have had all our re-
-gisters Searched) petitioner never pre-
-sented any petition or made any
claim on this Subject till now, and
his allegation in the plaint that he
gave frequent petitions is unverified.

7. This is all the information I am
able to gather.

8. No records showing the field was
particulars of the lands taken up in
1869-70 are forthcoming. We cannot
therefore say positively whether the
Plaint lands form part of those taken
up and paid for, but as the land
was required for the bank and as
the fields in which plaintiff is part
owner.

owner are riparean fields, it is presumable that the lands taken up were from his lands if he is the owner of the plots alongside the bank, a point which he must be made to prove. The village accounts of 1869-70 have unfortunately been destroyed, as there were more than 10 years old.

9. The Plaint is so very vague and consequently we do not know what sort of evidence will be adduced in support of the Plaintiff's contention

10. Under these circumstances, we have little more to do than to deny the Plaint and leave the Plaintiff to prove his claim. I propose the following answer in substitution for that proposed by Mr Russell, and am sending him Copies of this letter and answer with a note for the guidance of the defence.

11. The Suit has been adjourned to 17th July 1888.

Resolution

Submitted for the information of Government.

order?

Government with reference to Government order dated 26th January 1888, No 606.

/True Copy and Extract/

A Ross
Ag Secretary.

To The Secretary to Government, R.D. with one enclosure in original to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Tinnevelly.

M
Dec 4

P. W. Sh.
6653/88.

ABSTRACT.

P.W.Cn. No. 6653

G.O. Mis: No. 3879.

Transferred to the Public Works department with reference to order in that department dated 23rd June 1888, No. 278 W.)

× Board's Madras

H. Allnutt.
Under Secretary to Govt.

Cotacamund
4th July 1888.
No. 2109 W dt 12th July 1888
L.R.

Communicated to the Supdg Engineer 6th Circle in continuation of G.O. 278 W dt 28th January 1888
G.O. 278 W dt 23rd January 1888

No. VI Circle for
S. VI Circle.
7/7/88

35/VII/88
7/7

(1888.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 4331.

From

The Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue).

Recd: 9-7-88.

Dated 28th June } 1888.
Received 2nd July }

Enclosures ?
No. 2109 W dt 12th July 1888
No. 583 Revn.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt. report from Collector of Tinnevelly in connection with O.S. No. 296 of 1887 on the file of the District Munsiff of Srivaikuntham praying to procure a strip of land measuring 1¾ miles taken for a public purpose in the above district.

P.T.O.

To W.

No. 1711 dt 19.6.88
Enc: 6

To enable me to draft standing orders based on the Government of India standing order No. 77 of 1887, herewith enclosed, please obtain orders of Government as to

(1) who is the departmental superior whose consent is required to the resignation by soldiers of their appointments in the department. Is it the Executive Engineer, the Supg. Engineer, the Chief Engineer P. W. Department or Government in the P. W. Department ?

(2) whether the sanction of Government under Code para 772 would be necessary in such cases, or, whether paras 771 and 772 may be amended by making them applicable only to cases of remand for misconduct or incompetence.

C.

19.6.88.

Dlr No. 5896

(6)

R 20-6-88

E 6

No 2108 W of 12th July 1888

No 2108 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 12th July 1888

READ the following

Office note from the Ex. P.W.D. No. 1711 of 19 June 1888.

The departmental superior whose consent is required to the resignation by a soldier of his appointment in the P.W. Department, will be the Chief Engineer of the Department.

2 Paras 771 and 772 of the P.W. Code clearly apply to cases of remand for misconduct or incompetence and have no connection with voluntary resignations

Examined P.W. Secy with 6 enclosures.

22.6.88

3/7/88

Dlr 19/VII/88 to M. 4.7.88 R 6.7.88

(6)

E 12.7.

No. 2108 W d/ 12 July 1888