(1)

(2)

# Revenue Department

## Minutes of Consultations

22nd Sept 1857

Back nos 28 & 29

Order no 960 to 1019 Sept 185

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு - 1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் - ஜெ. நாராயணசாமி

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 11/2006

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் 3/2007.

சரிபார்க்கும் முதல் மு.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்க்கும். 2ம். நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்.

ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்

2/960

*Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 22d September 1857.*

No. 28. Read the following letter from J. NARRAINSAWMY, Naidoo; to E. MALTBY, Esq., Acting Chief Secretary to Government Fort St. George; dated Madras 14th July 1857.

SIR,

With reference to the orders of Government, as conveyed to me in Extract Minutes of Consultation, No. 624, Revenue Department, dated 22nd June 1857, I beg to forward, as directed therein, two more copies of the Memorial addressed to the Honorable the Court of Directors.

---

No. 29. ORDER THEREON, No. 960; dated 19th September 1857.

Resolved that the Board of Revenue be requested to submit, at an early date, copies of the Proclamations issued for the sale, as well as resale, of the Abkarry Farm of the District of Chingleput for Fuslies 1266 to 1270 with any observations they may have to offer on the claim adduced by the Memorialist. The object of Government in calling for the Proclamations is to see what the penalty prescribed for failure to pay in the stipulated deposits was, and what the terms of the Proclamation for resale were, as far as the interests of the Memorialist were concerned. The Board will furnish any other papers that may throw light on the subject.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
*Acting Secretary to Government.*

14 July

3/960

No. 28

Madras 14th July 1857

To,

E. Maltby Esquire

Acting Chief Secretary to Government

Fort Saint George

Sir,

With reference to the Orders of Government, as conveyed to me in Extract Minutes of Consultation No 624, Revenue Department, dated 22d June 1857, I beg to forward, as directed therein, two more copies of the Memorial addressed to the Honorable the Court of Directors.

I beg to Remain

Sir,

Your most Obedt humble Servt

J. Narrien Secretary Board

Dft to Cons 23d June/57
№ 52 [illegible]
[illegible] in [illegible] to
[illegible] 1858 № 35

Revenue 1857
Dft to Cons 22d Septr.
№ 810

From J. Narraindawn,
Naidoo Merasidar of
Yeroamboo leyore in
Chingleput.

Dated 14th July 1857
Recd 15th

2 Encls: 1 Cert B. Bd of Rev
S.P.C. № 960 - 19 Sept
Forwarding with reference
to H. Mins Cons. of the 22nd
June 1857, № 624 Rev.
Dept. two more Copies of
the Memorial addressed
to the Hon. the Court of
Directors.

№ 28.

C14 Disp. Rec

5/960

5/960

To

The Honorable the

Court of Directors of the

East India Company.

&c. &c. &c.

The humble Memorial of Le Narrainsawmy

Naidoo Merassidar of Yeroomboleyore

in the Gillah of Chingleput Talook

Sydapet.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That your Memorialist most respectfully begs to bring the following circumstances to the notice of your Honorable Court in the sanguine hope that his case may be taken into their favorable consideration, and that they will render Memorialist such justice as the facts of his case deserve.

2. That the Abkarry Farm of the District of Chingleput for Fusslies $\frac{1266}{1856}$ to $\frac{1270}{1860}$ having been put up by Mr. A. G. Shubrick, the Collector, to public sale on the 2nd June 1856 your Memorialist became the purchaser.

3. That the amount for which the Farm was purchased by him was Rs. 99,450 per annum

amount, or about 11,000 Rs in excess of the Contract which was then about to expire.

4. That your Memorialist having paid the 1st deposit of Rs 904-8-0 he was required to make a further deposit on the 9th of June of about 14,000 Rs for which the Collector had taken (a Kararnamah) an agreement from him, in which it was set forth that in the event of his failing to make good the said deposit, the Farm will be resold, and that any loss which may be sustained thereby will be realized from his (Memorialists) estate.

5. That your Memorialist and his Co-partners waited on the Collector on the day above specified with the deposit Viz: Rs 14,000 and begged of him to Register the whole of their names, but which the Collector declined doing urging that he would only register Memorialists name and not those of the others. This, however, Memorialist begs leave to explain to your Honorable Court, was not in accordance with previous usage, the purchaser of the Contract being invariably dependent on others whom he associates with himself in the undertaking, and altho' he is the responsible



responsible party to the Collector yet the names of those of his associates are likewise registered. The Collector then wrote to the Board of Revenue suggesting that the Farm be resold as your Memorialist had failed to pay the 2nd deposit which however your Honorable Court will observe was not the case.

(1) This privilege altho' denied to your Memorialist has been conceded to the individuals who have since purchased the Contract.

6. Your Memorialist begs here respectfully to state that he had twice addressed the Board of Revenue and once the Right Honorable the Governor in Council of Fort Saint George (copies of which addresses are herein enclosed) explaining fully all his grievances but it is your Memorialists misfortune that these authorities supported the Collector in the views he had taken prejudicial to your Memorialist.

7. Your Memorialist further begs to represent that the Abkarry Farm having been sold for Rs 2222 over and above the original purchase made by him Viz: Rs 904-8-0 he thinks it due to him that his deposit of Rs 904-8-0 should be returned your Memorialist can hardly believe that advantage would be taken of him by appropriating his money for the benefit of Government, when they are gainers

and

and not losers by the resale of the Farm.

8. In conclusion your Memorialist most respectfully submits his case to your Honorable Court in the full confidence that your Honorable Court will condescendingly be pleased to peruse this Memorial and its accompaniments and pass such orders as will restore to your Memorialist his deposit of Rs. 904-8-0.

Your Memorialist as in duty bound.

Shall ever Pray.

S. Narrainsawmy

Madras
27th May 1857

7/960

To

The Honorable President and Members of the Board of Revenue &c &c &c

The Humble Petition of S. Narrainsawmy Lucidar, Incumbent of the Village of Sroor Poolloor, attached to the Talook of Sydapet, subject to the Zillah of Chingleput.

Most Humbly Sheweth,

That your Petitioner most respectfully begs to bring to your kind notice, the injustice practised by the Collector of Chingleput, which he was led to do by his Head Shirestadar, as may be inferred by the particulars hereunder stated.

That Abkarry Farm was put up in public auction for 3 years by the Collector of Chingleput, when your Petr. had bidden the auction for Rs. 90,400 per year and deposited with the Collector Rs. 904-8-0

at one per Cent, and on demanding receipt for the same, the Collector, in the presence of 3 witnesses, took from your Petr, a Kuria-manah, on condition, that your Petr should deposit 2 months Rent in a week, that in default of which within the given term, it will be put into re-auction, and that whatever sum that may be found deficient in such auction, shall be recovered from his Estates. Accordingly, one day previous to the expiration of the said term, your Petr taking the Rent of 2 months viz. Rs 14,170-8-0, went to the Collector accompanied by certain of his partners, and requested him to have his name registered, together with that of his partners; but as he said, that he will only take your Petitioner's name in the Register, and evinced a disinclination at the same time, to the registry of the names of that of his Partners his partners took their respective shares, and went away, when your Petr having had his share of Rs 6,000, and odd in readiness,

being

being their about the dusk of the Evening, and considering the expiration of the term within that day, requested that authority, to take his shares of the said sum, to have his name registered, that he will deposit the remainder within the course of tomorrow morning, and that he will even do give a tangable Security only for that night, should any doubt be entertained of him; but he did not give his consent at all. On the morning of the following day, your Petr, taking the remainder sum, came to the Collector, when he said, your term of depositing Money had expired yesterday only, and what necessity had you to come here. Thereupon your Petr brought this circumstance to the notice of your Honorable Board, through an Arjee, soliciting to accept the deposit amount, and to confirm the Contract on his behalf, which your Board, not having taken into consideration, had made an Endorsement admitting what the Collector had said was right.

That

That your Petr now begs to state Gentlemen, that while the Collector by virtue of the said Kurrumnah is prepared on failure to cause your Petrs estates, such as Villages, houses &c to be put in auction, and to fill up, by the proceeds of the sale, such deficiency as may arise by the 2d sale, such deficiency as may arise by the 2d sale, now by the subsequent auction it was bidden for Rs 92,650, and there effected an increase of Rs 2,200 than that it was bidden first by your Petr himself As your Petr, by the wording of the said Kurrumnah is bound to undergo any loss or profit if occasioned by lowest bidding, he presented to the Collector 3 Urzees, on different dates, soliciting therein to restore the amount of Rs 904-8-0 which he had already deposited, as well as the increased sum of Rs 2,222 realized by the sub-sequent auction, and another Petition to favor him with an Ekrar of the said Kurrumnah in stamp paper, but he after causing your Petr to write

at his Cutcherry for about 20 days till at length, ordered him to depart saying, that he will neither grant any Endorsement nor Ekrar of the Kurrumnah, and that Petr may recourse to justice in any place &c wherever.

That your Petr further begs to state, Gentlemen, that the Collector who had once refused in this case, to have the names of your Partners registered with that of his Petr, and to allow only a single to enable him to make good of the sum there required, was now inclined to register the names of that single individual, who had recently bidden this very Contract, with that of his partners and this notice was even taken of, when these parties deposited their money 2 days after the elapse of the stipulated period, and under what circumstance this was done so, your Petr is at a loss to conceive, but however he is led

to

to suppose, had it not been for the interference of the said Sheristadar Vurdah Charry.

In conclusion, your Petr. most respectfully begs to solicit your Honorable Board will, after sifting the matter to the bottom, be graciously pleased to inspect the Havaunaudi granted to the Collector by your Petr., with the attesting witnesses, and to restore him to his money viz. Rs. 904-8-4 which he has already deposited with the Collector, as well as the increased amount of Rs. 2,222 realized by the subsequent auction to which he is lawfully entitled by virtue of the said Havaunaudi as enclosed herein.

For which act of justice, your Petr. as in duty bound.

(Seal) (Signed) V. Narrainsawmy Naidoo.

Madras
14th July
1836

Fee

10/960

To

The Honorable President and Members
of the Board of Revenue
&c. &c. &c.
Fort Saint George.

The humble Petition of V. Narrainsawmy Naidoo Merasidar of the Village of Sroombooloor attached to the Talook of Sydapet, subject to the Dillah of Chinglepat.

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

With reference to your Petitioners Petition to the address of your Honorables Board under date the 14th Instant, relative to the subject of the restoration of the deposit money, as well as the increased Amount of Rupees 2222 effected by the subsequent auction of the Abkarry Farm by the Collector of Chinglepat, your Petitioner respectfully begs to bring to your kind information that this Contract was, in year last, taken for Rupees 79550 by Messrs. Henrich and Adams, and to the Late Sheristadar Vurdah Charry, through capidity and interested motives of certain

of

of the Sub Contractors of the said Gruttenden intends to have given up the same to them at the above rate, but which, your Petitioner, and one Chittoor Venkataramah Moodelly, having bidden for an increased amount of Rupees 90450 and took two Months Kists to the Collector at 8 A.M. on the very day in which the Money should be paid accompanied by his partners. The Naib Sheristadar thro' this animosity, and with the view of ruining your Petitioner, and of gaining his object in view - Namely to give up this Contract to the above individuals did not call for your Petitioner and his partners for the deposit of money, but made them to wait at the Cutcherry till 4 P.M. and on his misrepresentation to the Collector something against this authority, all in a sudden, declared, that Petitioners name will only be taken in the Register, and that he should himself deposit the two Months Kists of Rupees 14170-8-0 when his partners went away quietly with their respective shares. As your Petitioner had no ample time to procure this enormous amount at the moment being then about the dusk of the evening, he requested



requested the Collector to allow him 30 hours in the night to enable him to make good of the amount as it was utterly impracticable to meet the demand of so enormous amount, but he would not attended to.

That subsequently the favorites of the Naib Sheristadar, emboldened, under the impression, that he, the Naib Sheristadar, is under their hands, have taken this Contract to your Petitioners great detriment at a higher rate (the result of which will in the course of the year be brought to your notice of which your Petitioners needs not dwell) and notwithstanding they failed to deposit 2 Months kists within the specified time, but paid after the lapse of 3 days, no notice was taken of them, nor was any Kurrarnamah received from the Contractors as from your Petitioner.

That in one of the Petitions presented to the Collector by your Petitioner, he has made an endorsement, (this endorsement in question has just been received from the Cutcherry it being hitherto in some of the records) to the effect, on

"that

"that it is mentioned in the notices that he who bids
"the Contract, should, at the moment deposit money
"at 1 Rupee per cent, that he should besides deposit
"2 Months Rist in a week, and that in default
"of which, he shall forfeit the deposit money;
"but according to the statement of the Petitioner,
"as it is not said in the Notice, that the increased
"amount, that shall have been realized by the
"subsequent auction to be given up to him or
"he is accountable for such sums as may be
"found deficient by the subsequent auction or
"to restore the deposit money to him, the prayers
"of the Petitioner cannot be acceeded to." This
Endorsement, and the Copy of a Petition addressed
"to the Collector touching the self same subject
"are herein enclosed for your inspection.

That while the endorsement of the Collector is in this article, what necessity had the Collector, Gentlemen, to receive from your Petitioner in a publick Cutcherry a Karrarnamah with 3 attesting witnesses, to cause your Petitioners estates to be put in out cry, in case of his failure of depositing 2 Months Rists in a week? Would not

12/960

not the Collector have been prepared to execute his design, in accordance with the dictates of the Karrarnamah, though he denies in his notification, had a deficiency occurred by the subsequent auction. Now by virtue of the Karrarnamah, as your Petitioner is accountable both for losses and profit, he is of course entitled to the increased amount.

Moreover, as your Petitioner was only given to understand after he had deposited the Money Viz: 904-8-0 that he will have to execute a Karrarnamah, notwithstanding it has not been mentioned in the notification any thing of this kind, he made a humble request before the Collector in person thus- While Petitioner is accountable for losses that might occur by the subsequent auction, he should, at the same time, be allowed to enjoy any increased Amount if effected, but to which he made no answer whatever, and continued silent. Subsequently your Petitioner, considering himself that die is cast already, or say in other words, that he has forthwith deposited the Money, and having had no any other alternative, he was obliged to yield to the granting of the required Karrarnamah, though

though he was conscious that it was actually repugnant to the Notification. Will it be possible for a single individual, Gentlement, to under take the contract of this description? or is its practicability in force in any of the Provinces of the Madras Presidency? Your Petitioners answer is in the negative. On the other hand, will it be justifiable on the part of the Collector Gentleman, to allow 4 persons to be partners with the Subsequent Contractor, while such cooperation is denied in his behalf, but however so manifest and down right an injustice your Petitioner humbly begs to submit for your impartial consideration.

In conclusion, your aggrieved Petitioner humbly begs to solicit your Honorable Board will, after thorough perusal, and due deliberation of the foregoing particulars, be pleased to render him that impartial justice which he earnestly expects at your hands, in issuing peremptory orders for the restoration of his deposit money Viz: 904-8-" as also the increased amount of Rupees 22 22 realized by the Subsequent auction.

For which act of justice your Petitioner as in duty bound.

Shall ever pray

Signed J. Narrainsawmy Naidoo

13/960

Madras
16th July 1856

P. S. The grounds upon which the Petitioner bases his points are 4 Namely.

1st The Collector having forcibly taken a Karranamah from the Petitioner himself quite contrary to his Notification, while he has not done so from the Subsequent Contractor.

2d Of his having declined allowing 30 hours in a night for the deposit of such an unexpected enormous amount, while he had allowed 3 days to the Subsequent Contractor.

3d Of his having refused to register Petitioner name with that of his partners, while he readily consented to do so in the case of the Subsequent Contractor.

Of

4th

Of his having declined to order the payment of the increased amount, while he, the Petitioner was accountable for the decrease - and these 4 points, and the fact of your Petitioner having been ready at the Cutcherry with his pay.ts with 2 Months Rists at 8 A.M. and waited till 6 O'Clock P.M. your Petitioner is prepared to corroborate by 12 credible witnesses -

---

The prayer of the Petitioner cannot be complied with -

Revl. Bd. Office
Fort St. George
31st July 1856

(By order)
(Signed) G.t Forbes
Secretary -

14/960

To

The Right Honorable Lord Harris
Governor in Council of
Fort Saint George

&c &c &c

Madras.

The humble Petition of Petrairan Sawmyestaido, Nerasidar of the Village of Sevamoloor, attached to the Valook of Sydapet, to the Zillah of Chingleput

Most Respectfully sheweth

That your Lordships aggrieved Petitioner most respectfully begs to bring to your kind information, the following manifest injustice perpetrated by the Collector of the Chingleput District, which he was led to do by his favorite Naib Sheristadar Vurdah Charry, trusting, that your wille give the subject your mature consideration, and render him due justice.

That Akkarry Farm was put up for auction by the Collector in the year 1855, and which was

was taken for Rupees 79,550 by Messrs Kenrick and Adams. The Naib Sheristadar Durdah Charry through Cupidity and interested motives of certain of the Sub Contractors, intended to have given up the Lease to them at the above rate, but which your Petitioner, and one Chittoor Venkataramah Moodely having bidden for an increased Amount of Rupees 99,500 and took 2 Months Kists to the Collector at 8 A.M. on the very day in which the Money should be paid, accompanied by his Partners. The Naib Sheristadar, through malicious feelings, with the view of ruining your Petitioner, and of gaining his object, Viz- to give up this Contract to the above individuals, did not call for your Petitioner, and his Partners for the deposit of Money, but made them wait at the Cutcherry till 5 P.M., and on his misrepresentation to the Collector something against he the Collector, all in a sudden declared that Petitioners Name will only be taken in the register, and that he should himself deposit the 2 Months Kists of Rupees 14,170-8-- upon this his Partners went away quietly with their respective shares, and the only Money he had in hand at the time was Rupees 5000

and

15

15/960

and odd and as there was no ample time to procure the remainder at the moment being then about the Dusk of the evening, he requested the Collector to accept what he had in hand and to allow him till next morning at 8 to enable him to make good of the required amount and even promised him security till that hour but he would not attended to.

That subsequently, the favorites of the Naib Sheristadar emboldened under the impression that the Naib Sheristadar is under their hands, have taken this Contract to your Petitioners detriment at an higher rate, (the result of which will in the course of the year be brought to your notice, of which your Lordships Petitioner needs not foretel) and notwithstanding they failed to deposit 2 Months Kists within the specified time, but paid after the lapse of 3 days, no notice was taken of them, nor was any Karrarnamah received from these contractors as from your Petitioner.

That in one of the Petitions presented to the Collector by your Petitioner, the Collector has made the following endorsement - "that it is "mentioned in the Notice, that he who bids the

Contract

"Contract should at the moment deposit money at 1 Rupee per
"cent, that he should besides deposit 2 Months Kists in a
"week, and that in default of which, he shale forfeit
"the deposit money, but according to the statement of the
"Petitioner, as it is not said in the Notice, that the increased
"Amount that shall have been realized by the subsequent
"Auction to be given up to him, that he is accountable
"for such sum as may be found deficient by the
"subsequent auction, and that to restore the deposit
"money to him, the Prayers of the Petitioner cannot be
"acceded to."

That while the endorsement of the Collector is in this article, what necessity had the Collector to receive from your Lordship's Petitioner before a Public Cutcherry, a Kurrarnamah with 3 attesting witnesses, to cause Petitioners estates to be put in outcry, in case of his failure of depositing 2 Months Kists in a week? Would not the Collector have been prepared to execute his design in accordance with the dictates of the Kurrarnamah, though no mention made of this in the Notice- had a decreased occurred by the subsequent Auction. Now by virtue of the Kurrarnamah as your Lordship's Petitioner is

16/960

is accountable for losses, he is of course by justice entitled to the increased Amount. Moreover as your Petitioner was only given to understand after he had deposited Money Viz 904-8--, that he will have to execute a Kurrarnamah, he made a request before the Collector thus- While Petitioner is accountable for losses, that might occur by the subsequent auction, he should at the same time be allowed to enjoy any increased Amount effected- To which he has evidences too. Thinking that your Petitioner had forthwith deposited the Money, and having had no any other alternative, he was obliged to yield to the granting of the required Kurrarnamah though he was conscious that it was actually repugnant to the Notice-

That your Lordship's Petitioner now begs to state, that will it be possible for a single individual to undertake the Contract of this description without Partners, or is it so in the Notice, or is its practicability in force in any of the Provinces of the Madras Presidency? No! On the other hand will it be justifiable on the part of the Collector to allow 4 persons to be partners with the subsequent Contractor while such indulgence or Co-operation was

flatly

flatly refused on his behalf.

The grounds upon which your Lordships Petitioner leases his points are 4.

1st. The Collector having forcibly taken Kurrapa-
=nah from your Petitioner quite contrary to his
Notice, while has not done so from the Subsequent
Contractor.

2d. Of his having declined allowing 30 hours
in a night for the deposit of such an unexpected
enormous amount while he allowed 3 days to
the Subsequent Contractors.

3d. Of his having refused to register Petitioners
name with that of his Partners, while he readily
consented to do so in the case of the Subsequent
Contractor.

4th. Of his having declined to order the payment
of the increased amount, while Petitioner is
accountable for decrease.

That your Lordships Petitioner
addressed the Board of Revenue 2 Petitions on
different dates, Namely 14th and 16th July last, bring-
=ing to their notice in full particulars of the injustice
of the Collector as well as the above 4 Points; but they
instead

17
960

instead of taking them into their mature consider
=ation and rendering him due justice, have simply
made endorsements thus - The Prayer of the
Petitioner cannot be complied with. These endorse
=ments are enclosed for your Lordships inspection
Should the Board, who are considered to be just
in rendering due justice to the cases of this nature,
throw off the Prayers of the Petitioner over Board,
during this Blessed Government, how will it be
forseen that an injured like your Lordships
Petitioner should live with safety. Consequently
your Lordships Petitioner respectfully begs to solicit
the Right Honorable the Governor in Council
will after thorough perusal and due deliberation
of the particulars above enumerated be graciously
pleased to render him that impartial justice which
he earnestly expects at your Lordships hands, by
issuing peremptory instructions for the restoration
of his deposit money Viz: 904-8-; as also the
increased amount of Rupees 2222 realized by
the Subsequent auction.

For which act of justice, your Lordship's
Petitioner as in duty bound shall ever pray

Madras
25th August 1836

/Signed/ S. Narrainsawmy Vaidoo
Your

P.S. Your Lordship's Petitioner can corroborate the above facts by 12 credible evidences.

5 Enclosures.
2. Petitions to the Board of Revenue and their Endorsement.
1. Harrarnamah.
1. Notice of the Collector.
1. Endorsement of the Collector.

17 to 8 / 960

The prayer of the Petitioner cannot be complied with.

Revenue Bd's Office
Fort St. George
31st July 1856.

/By Order/
/Sigd/ R. Forbes
Secretary

18/960

No. 1841 of 1856.

Petitioner prays for the restoration to him of the Money he deposited on account of the Akkary Contract of the Chingleput Billah for the year 1855 and also that Rs. 2222, the Amount which the Contract realized on its resale in excess of the Sum given by Petitioner, may be given to him.

Petitioner's prayer was rejected by the Collector and the Board of Revenue informed him that his request could not be complied with.

Government observe that by Petitioners own showing he failed to make the requisite payment of 2 Months Rist on the day mentioned in the Collectors proclamation, a necessary consequence of which default was that his deposit Money Rs. 904-8-0 was forfeited and the Contract resold.

The Government see no reason whatever to interfere, the Petition is rejected.

By Order

(Signed) W. Norman
Dep. Sec. to Government

For Saint George
18th September 1856.

19/960

True Translation of an agreement given by Ramasawmy Pandoo, Inhabitant of Pamplemousses, Talook of Pydapah, to the Collector of Pamplemousses, on the 3rd June 1856.

That the Abkarry Farm of the District of Pamplemousses from July 1866 to 1870, having been put up by the Collector to public auction on the 2nd instant, I became the purchaser for Rs 9045, and paid on account, I deposited a sum of Rs 904-8- Cash your Excellency at the rate of a Pataca per Cent. On the 9th instant I shall deposit at your Excellency the sum of Rs 14,174-8- being the two months first, deducting Rs 904-8- which having been already deposited by me, On failure, the Abkarry Farm will be put into resale and the loss will be redeemed from my own Estate.

This agreement was written, and granted with my own consent.

(Signed) J. Ramasawmypillay

Rev Dept 20

20/960. N° 960.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
under date the 19th Sept 1857

Read the following
letter from Patrick
Sweeny, Caridas Mercander
of Queenstown before mr
Chronicle Post

(Here enter 14 July 1857)

Resolved that the
Board of Revenue be
requested to enhance,
at an early date, copies
of the Proclamations
issued for the sale, as
well as resale, of the
Abbeyfeale Farm of the
District of Chunglehaut
for Fasties 1366 to 1370
with any observations
they may
have to offer on the
claim

Cons. 23 June 57 No 5259

Copy in vol. Letters to C. of 22 Augt 1857 No 35

Revenue 1857 Departt. R
D. to Cons. 22d Septr.

No 960

Extract Mins. of Cons.
Of 19th Septr 57

Extract from Bd 29th Octr 57
& No 1287 in Revr & Cec

Requesting the Board of Rev. to submit copies of the Proclamation issued for the Sale as well as resale of the Arkany Farm of the Bis.ic of Chingleput for Fasslies 1266 to 1270 with any observations they may have to offer on the claim adduced by the Memorialist S. Narraimsamy Pandaram Marasi: dar of Yeurumbooliyore.

No 28 & 29.