1

# Revenue Department

## Minutes of Consultations

12th March 1858

Back No. 33, 34, 35 & 36

Order No 295 D/ 5th March

1858

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு-1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர்:

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக்- கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள்

சரிபார்க்கும் முதல் முறையாக கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்க்கும் 2ம் முறையாக கையொப்பம்

உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்



*Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 12th March 1858.*

Read the following papers.

No. 33. *To the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort Saint George.*

The humble petition of Streerow Rama Row, proprietor of Veeravullypolliem in the Zillah of Rajahmundry, dated 10th April 1856.

SHEWETH,

That your Lordship's Petitioner's grand-father Rawmiah, and after his death his son Vencataroyaningaroo, and afterwards the Petitioner himself held successively as Survadoombala or free from assessment lands yielding 10 Pootties, and 4 gardens in the villages of Yendapully, Coottapully, and Vencathippah in Pettapore Remindary, which his adoptive mother Vengammah entrusted to the care of the Zemindar of the above Estate during the minority of the petitioner, because he was her sister's husband, with the understanding that he should give her the produce of the said lands and gardens, and proceeded on a pilgrimage.

That upon the death of Neelauthree Naidoo, the former Zemindar of Pettapoor talook, the Circar zufted the whole of his Estate, including the property of your Petitioner, and as soon as it was restored to Surearow Bahadoor, the late Zemindar, and who was the legal heir of Neelathreerow, he put the petitioner in possession of his lands and gardens above referred to under a puttah duly issued by him dated Cartheecabahoola Supthamee of the year of Soumeanama, corresponding with the 6th November 1849, bearing his seal and signature, and issued takeeds bearing the same date to the village Curnums.

That upon the death of Soorearow Mr. Prendergast the late Collector of Rajahmundry, acting upon the erroneous information furnished to him by the subordinates of his Cutcherry, called upon your Lordship's Petitioner for the payment of Kist upon the lands in question, which your petitioner refused, as his family enjoyed them as moneum for a series of years, extending over a period of upwards of 40 or 50 years.

That the Collector having insisted upon the payment of the Kist, your Petitioner presented a petition to the late Commissioner the Honorable Walter Elliot, Esq., under date 30th August 1853, on the subject, who referred it to that officer with instructions, to inform him as to whether there existed valid grounds for the continuance to the petitioner of the moneum lands in question. Whereupon the present Collector made a report on the 30th November 1855 to the Commissioner, transmitting, at the same time, certain accounts having, as it is said, reference to your petitioner's lands, who furnished to your petitioner with the following endorsement bearing date the 11th January 1856.

"Row Ramrow claims certain lands and gardens in the villages of Yendapully, Vencatippa, and Cattapilly in the Pettapoor Zamindary, in succession to his adoptive father Row Vencatarow who died in the year 1825. The Collector has reported fully on the case. It seems that Row Vencatarow the adoptive father did hold some lands and gardens, but whether on a sufficient title is not apparent. On the death of his person in 1825, the then Zemindar of Pettapore resumed the lands and gardens in question and there has been no enjoyment since on the part of the family till fusly 1258, or about 25 years since the resumption; in fusly 1258 Row Ramrow acquired possession, but whether with the verbal or written consent of the late Zemindar is not clearly shewn. Row Ramrow alleges that he was put in possession on a written document or puttah, but the authority of this paper is open to suspicion.

"Row Ramrow alleges that resumption did not take place in 1825 but that the Zemindar received charge of the lands and gardens on behalf of the widow of his adoptive father occasionally remitting to her the proceeds. This is shewn to be incorrect by Urzees of the widow to the Collector in 1825, complaining of resumption and by the puttah on which Ram Row alleges he acquired possession in which the complete suspension of enjoyment during the interval noticed is apparently set forth.

"For the foregoing reasons the claims of Row Ramrow to hold the lands and gardens in question free of assessment must be disallowed."

That your petitioner most respectfully begs leave to submit that the report of the Collector was partial, inasmuch as it was based upon information of the subordinates of his Cutcherry, who, your petitioner has reason to believe, has misled that officer by laying before him documents which did not throw a clear light upon the case at issue. The enjoyment by your peti-

tioner's adoptive father of some lands and gardens is distinctly admitted by the Cellector; though the title under which they were held is repudiated on grounds which are wholly untenable in themselves, and shallow in their nature. The puttah under which the disputed property is held by your petitioner is a genuine one, and unless it is proved otherwise, which was not done, your petitioner humbly submits that it is an act of flagrant injustice to deprive him of the property which was successively held by his family for a lengthened period without let or hinderance.

That no investigation was held to ascertain the authority or otherwise of the said puttah, and as the whole case hinges upon that document, it was the more incumbent both upon the Collector and Mr. Goldingham, the present Commissioner, to adopt the necessary measures to test its genuineness. The omission is a grievous misfortune; but your petitioner most deferentially urges that it is unjust that he should be victimized for the faults of others. The puttah in question bears an anterior date of one year to the death of the Zemindar, and that the petitioner enjoyed the lands and gardens during that period, as will more particularly appear from the entries made in the accounts of the Zemindar, so that there are no legal grounds to suspect its genuineness, and your Lordship's Petitioner begs to assure, with all due deference, that the truth of his statement will be verified if impartial investigation is made into the matter.

That Mr. Goldingham observes, on the authority of the Collector's report, that there has been no enjoyment on the part of the Petitioner's family of the property in question for about 25 years from the year 1825, when the then Zemindar was said to have resumed it, inconsequence of the death of your petitioners adoptive father. This statement is founded upon the petition presented by your petitioner's adoptive father's wife (or the mother) complaining of the resumption by the Zamindar of the lands, but a joint petition signed by herself and the Zamindar was presented to the Collector on the 29th April 1826, in which the transfer to your petitioner's mother of the above lands was duly notified, which petition is now in the records of the Collector's Cutcherry at Rajamundry, and to which a reference may be made. Even supposing the case is otherwise, your petitioner would respectfully beg to state that, with reference to the Minutes of Consultation dated 27th July 1848, the right of the Proprietors to the Maneum lands, exempted from the permanent accounts, is not affected by lapse of time. This opinion is further confirmed by the Commissioners Messrs. Walter Elliot and Goldingham in the proceedings held by them on the Enam lands noted in the Margin.*

* 1 *A person named Rajayogee an inhabitant in the Zillah of Rajahmundry having complained at the resumption of his Enam by the Circar for a period of 30 years, the late Commissioner issued an order bearing the date 25th November 1850, to replace him in possession of it, on the ground that this was exempted from the permanent account.*

1 *The similar circumstances took place in the cases of G. Nursimloo, M. Rungachary the inhabitants of the same District, who were placed in the possession of their Enams by the orders under date 29th September 1850 and 11th October 1855.*

That under these circumstances, your Lordships humble Petitioner, confiding in your Lordship's sense of justice, equanimity and impartiality, earnestly begs that your Lordship in Council will be pleased to call for the documents set forth in the annexed list, as they will shed a great light upon the subject, and order the restoration to your petitioner of the lands and gardens, which the Collector himself admits were in the enjoyment and possession of the petitioner's late adoptive mother and father, and also to suspend the collection of the past produce amounting Rupees 2890 pending the disposal of this petition.

That your petitioner begs to enclose herein the Urzees presented by him to the Commissioner and his endorsement thereon for your Lordship's information.

---

No. 843 of 1856.

The Commissioner will be good enough to forward to Government the report of the Collector with the puttah and the document alluded to by the petitioner.

(By order.)
(Signed) G. TAYLOR,
*Acting Deputy Secy. to Govt.*

Fort Saint George,
*22th April* 1856.

295/3



No. 34. *To the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, Fort St. George; &c., &c., &c.*

The humble petition of Row Vencataramaniah the legal representative of Row Ramarayanungar deceased, presented by his Vakeel Mydavole Ramunnah, dated Madras, 10th November 1857.

Sheweth,

Understanding that the Collector of Rajahmundry has reported to your Lordship regarding the appeal of your Petitioner's Maniums which was presented to you on 10th April 1856, your Petitioner begs most respectfully to inclose herewith 3 documents as noted in the margin*, and inform you a few lines, as an addition to the above appeal, for your Lordship's serious consideration.

*1 *Original Taked to the village Moonsiff Curnum written by the late Zemindar.*
1 *Endorsement of the Collector under date 8th April* 1856.
1 *Proceeding of the Session Court.*

1. That upon the report of the former Commissioner of Northern Sircar under date the 30th September 1852, about the Enams situated in the Vejayanagarum Zemindary, your Lordship in Council passed the minutes bearing date 24th December 1852, exempting the certain classes of Enams from the resumption. Your Petitioner therefore requests you to call for the said minutes at the time of disposal of this case, as it is similar to that in which your Lordship in Council passed the above minutes.

2. It appears clearly that the Collector admitted in his endorsement that the original Puttah and others were executed by the late Zemindar. The Session Judge of Rajahmundry refused to grant the copy of the deposition given by the head Police of Pettapore, which gives a clear light upon the Statement that the seal &c. of the Zemindar were zufted at the time of his death.

3. In conclusion your Petitioner humbly requests that your Lorpship in Council will be pleased to sift the matter to the bottom and dispose the case at an early period.

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

---

No. 2618 of 1857.

It is observed that a report was called for in this case on 25th April 1856, from the late Commissioner Northern Circars; the Board will be good enough to report what has been done in the matter.

By order.
(Signed) M. NORMAN,
*Deputy Secy. to Government.*

Fort Saint George,
*18th Dec.* 1857.

---

No. 35. Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1858, No. 527.

Read letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry dated 14th September 1857.†

† *In Consultation 4th February* 1858.

(Here enter No. 121.)

Resolved that the above letter and the documents which accompanied it be laid before Government with reference to their Endorsement on Petition No. 843 of 1856.

(A true Extract.)
(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Sub-Secretary.*

---

No. 36. Order thereon, No. 295; dated 5th March 1858.

In 1852 under order of the Commissioner Northern Cirkars, certain land claimed by Row Ramarow as enams, and held by him under a Puttah said to have been granted in 1849, by the late Zemindar of Pittapoor, Sooria Row, in renewal of the sunnud held by Petitioner's adoptive father the late Venkut Row, were brought under assessment, leaving it to the Minor Zemindar to renew them or not as he may think best, on attaining his majority.

*Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 12th March 1858.*

2. On a Petition from Row Ramarow, the late Commissioner Northern Cirkars called for a report on the case from the Collector and on the 11th January 1856, he rejected his claims on the grounds, that the sufficiency of the title of Petitioner's adoptive father was not apparent; that on his death in 1825, the then Zemindar resumed the land; that it certainly was not in the enjoyment of the Petitioner from that time till 1849; and that the Puttah now produced, which was granted only one year before the late Zemindar's death was open to suspicion.

3. Ramarow denied the fact of the alleged resumption in 1825, but the Petitions of his adoptive mother to the Collector complaining of the measure place the fact beyond a doubt, and the Razinamah said by Petitioner to have been filed in 1826 by his mother, and the Zemindar, is not to be found in the records.

4. It appears that the sunnud under which Petitioner's adoptive father held part of the land in question was executed by the then Zemindar only in 1805, and though it styles the land his maniem, it states that it not having been in his enjoyment of late it was *again* granted to him. No documents are produced to show his title to the rest of the land, and the Extracts from the permanent settlement accounts do not seem to establish the fact of his being in possession at that time.

5. Row Ramarow died in November 1856, and under all the circumstances of the case the Government see no reason to interfere with the order of the Commissioner directing that the lands in question should be brought under assessment, during the minority of the present Zemindar.

6. Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on Petition No. 2618 B. of 1857.

"The Government having taken all the circumstances of Row Ramarow into consideration, see no reason to interfere with the decision of the late Commissioner Northern Cirkars rejecting his claim to hold the lands in question free of assessment."

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

2795
B

To

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council
Fort St. George.

The humble Petition of Veera
Rama Row, proprietor of Veera-
vully pollem in the Zillah of
Rajahmundry.

Sheweth,

That your Lordships Petitioners
Grand father Rawmiah, and after his death
his son Venkatarayamungaroo, and afterwards the
Petitioner himself held successively as Zemin-
dar in free from assessment lands yielding
the Pootlies and 4 Gardens in the Villages
of Pondapully, Coottapully, and Vencatapad
in Pettapore Zamindary, which the adoptive
mother Veragammah entrusted to the care
of the Zamindars of the above estate during
the minority of the Petitioner, because she and
her sister's husband, with the understanding
that he should give her the produce of the
said lands and gardens and proceeded
on a Pilgrimage.

That upon the death of Neelan
Rajah, the former Zamindar of Pet-
tapore Taluk, the present Zamindar with the

of his estate including the property of your
petitioner, and as soon as it was restored
to Sadeirow Baladoor the late Zamindar and
who was the legal heir of Neelatheerow, he
put the petitioner in possession of his lands
and pardons above referred to under a putta
duly signed by him dated Cartheecabatola
Sulthamee of the year of Soumeanama cor-
responding with the 6th November 1819
bearing his seal and signature and issued
to Reeds bearing the same date to Village Cav-
anmar.

That upon the death of Sadeirow
Mr. Pendregast the late Collector of Rajah-
mundry acting upon the erroneous informa-
tion furnished to him by the subordinates of
his cutcherry called upon your Lordship's
petitioner for the payment of Kists upon the
lands in question which your petitioner
refused, as his family enjoyed them as
inam for a series of years, extending over
a period of upwards of 40 or 50 years.

That the Collector having in-
sisted upon the payment of the Kists, your
Petitioner presented a petition to the late
Commissioner the Honorable Walter Ellis
Esq. under date 30th August 1853 on the
subject, which was referred to the officer with



instructions to inform himself whether
there existed valid grounds for the con-
tinuance to the petitioner of the inam lands
in question. Thereupon the present Collector
made a report on the 30th November 1855
to the Commissioner, transmitting at the same
time certain accounts having reference to
referred to your petitioner's lands, which for-
warded to your petitioner with the following
endorsement bearing date the 11th January 1856.

Row Ramrow claims certain lands
and Gardens in the Villages of Jandapilly
Vencatippa and Cattapilly in the Pettah
Pamulapurru in succession to his adoptive
Father Row Venkatarow, who died in the
year 1825. The Collector has reported
fully on the case. It seems that Row Venca-
tarow the adoptive Father did hold some
lands and Gardens but whether on a suf-
ficient title is not apparent. On the death
of his person in 1825 the Row Zamindar of
Pittapore resumed the lands and Gardens
in question and they have been in enjoy-
ment since in the hands of the family till
Fusly 1238, or about 25 years since the
resumption; in Fusly 1238 Row Ramrow
acquired possession, but whether with the
verbal or written consent of the late Zamin-

...s not clearly shewn. Row Ramrow alle...
...ged that he was first in possession on a
...written document or Puttah, but the au...
...enticity of that paper is open to suspicion.

"Row Ramrow alleges that resumption did not take place in 1825 but that the Zamindar received charge of the lands and gardens on behalf of the Widow of his adoptive Father occasionally remitting to her the proceeds. This is shown to be incorrect by Urzees of the widow to the Collector in 1825, complaining of resumption and by the Puttah on which Ram Row alleged he acquired possession which the complete suspension of enjoyment during the interval noticed is apparently set forth.

"For the foregoing reasons the Claims of Row Ramrow to hold the lands and gardens in question free of assessment must be disallowed."

That your Petr. most respectfully begs leave to submit that the report of the Collector was partial, in as much as it was based upon information of the subordinates of his Cutchery, who, your Petitioner has reason to believe, has misled that officer by laying before him documents which did not throw a clear light upon the

case



case at issue. The enjoyment by your Petitioners adoptive father of some lands and Gardens is distinctly admitted by the Collector, though the latter under which they were held is represented on grounds which are totally untenable in themselves, and shadowy in their nature. The Puttah under which the disputed property is held by your Petr. is a genuine one, and unless it is proved otherwise, which was not done, your Petitioner humbly submits that it is an act of flagrant injustice to deprive him of property which was successively held by his family for a lengthened period without let or hinderance.

That no investigation was held to ascertain the authority or otherwise of the said Puttah and as the whole stress hinges upon that document, it was the more incumbent both upon the Collector and the Govt. of Madras, the present Commissioner, to adopt the necessary measures to test its

genuineness

genuineness. The omission is a grievous misfortune; but your Petitioner most deferentially urges that it is unjust that he should be victimized for the faults of others. He further begs leave to state that the anterior date of one year to the last of the Zemeendar, and that the Petitioner enjoyed the lands and farm dues during that period, as will more particularly appear from the entries made in the accounts of the Zemeendary, so that there are no legal grounds to suspect its genuineness, and your Lordship's Petitioner begs to assure with all due deference, that the truth of his statement will be verified upon further investigation is made into the matter.

That Mr Goldingham in observes on the authority of the Collector's report, that there has been



reasonable enjoyment on the part of the Petitioner's family of the property in question for about 2 Years from the year 1825, when the then Zemeendar was said to have resumed it, in consequence of the death of your Petitioner's adoptive father. His statement is founded upon the Petition presented by your Petitioner's adoptive father's wife (the Mother) complaining of the resumption by the Zemeendar of the lands, but no final petition appeared to have been presented to the Collector on the 29 April 1826, in which the above Petition was duly noticed, which Petition is now on the records of the Collector's Library of Rajahmundry, and to which a reference may be made. Even supposing the case in favour of your Petitioner would respectfully beg

beg to state that, with reference to the minutes of consultation dated 8th July 1845 the right of the Proprietors to the Manaaru Lands exempted from the permanent accounts, is not affected by lapse of time. This opinion is further confirmed by the Commissioners Messrs Waller Elliot and Gottlieb Samuells in the proceedings held by them on the Enam Lands noted on the Mar-

Petitioner confiding in your Lordships sense of justice, equanimity and impartiality, earnestly begs that your Lordship in Council will be pleased to call for the documents set forth in the annexed list and they will shed a great light upon the subject and order the restitution by your Petitioner of the lands and gardens which the Collector

himself

1 † A person named Rajayogee an inhabitant in the Pettah of Bangalore having complained of the resumption of his enam by the Circar for a period of 30 years, the Commissioners issued an order bearing the date 25 September 1851, to replace him in possession of it, on the ground that this was enam-fixed for the permanent account ‖ The similar circumstance took place in the cases of Gr. Narrumbee, N. Rungachary the inhabitants of the same District, who were placed in the possession of their enams by the orders under date 29th February 1850 and 11th October 1854—

himself admits were held by the ancestors and kinsmen of the Petitioner's late adoptive Mother and Father, and also to suspend the collection of the last produce amounting Rupees 2890 pending the disposal of this Petition.

That your Petitioner begs to enclose herein the Arzees presented by him to the Commissioner and his endorsements thereon for your Lordships information.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound

Will Ever Pray

10th April 1856

No 863 of 1856

The Commissioner will be good enough to forward to Government the report of the Collector with the petition and the document alluded to by the Petitioner—

By order

Fort St George
25th April 1856

A. D. Asst to Govt

by his adoptive parents
& held by him under a Settlement
from the late Genl. Sonya
Rose of Pitherow, after
calling for examining the
papers bearing upon the
cases as per the annexed
list.

Received 18th May 1858

Returned 11th September 1857

Rec. [illegible] 1856 Depth
to Rev. C. 813. 1856
Rev. 1858 Depth
to Com. Allowed, No 346
From Stirling

Petition of the Executors
of Dr Joseph Gibson
&c. Registered in
Reg. Deeds May
Recd 8th May 1856

Dated 10th

Regd

In Re Joseph Gibson &c.
Deceased Recd
In Com. 8th February 1858.
Calling in Question
the Accounts of the Executors
contained in the following Report
which formed the basis of
the Com. Endorsements
herein contained / which
are hereby approved of &
Lumsden Chamberlain Commissioners
Lands & Heritages engaged

295/10

[illegible] that the Collector
[illegible] Yaun Londshebs
[illegible] Rebenues —
[illegible] umbed Expen
[illegible] Chaun Legs
[illegible] bequeath
[illegible] the margin,
[illegible] Proceedings
[illegible] Yaun a few lines, as an added
[illegible] to the Appeal for Yaun Londshebs consi
[illegible] Bell Council Dec
consideration
[illegible] upon the report of the
Commissioner of Northern Circumscription
dated the 30th September 1852 about the Enamo
situated in the Vegaya Nagaram Yaun Lond
yaun Londshebs in Council passed the minu
bearing

[illegible] 1852

heavy date 24th [illegible] ber 1852 exempting the Certain
of ensues [illegible] resumption Your Petitioner therefore
requests ya & call for the said minutes at [illegible] time of
[illegible] of his case & that in particular to that in which
Your Petitioner exhibited exhibit Papers the above minutes
It appears clearly that the Collector admitted in
his Endorsement the Original Petition & others
were Executed prior to Surrender. The Session
Judge of [illegible] to grant the Copy
of the Petition [illegible] Police of
Petitioner [illegible] on the
Statement [illegible] were
appointed [illegible]
In Conclusion
that ya [illegible] requests
[illegible] he
implead [illegible]
Petitioner [illegible] Petitioner

[illegible] as which act of [illegible] year [illegible]
[illegible] that [illegible]
[illegible]

Kadapa } H. Raymunt
18th November } [illegible]
1857 } [illegible] Keil

[illegible]

No 26 of 1857 298

It is observed that a report was called for in this case on
25th April 1856 from the late Commissioner Northern Circars of the Board
will be good enough to report what has been done in the matter

Fort St George
7th December 1857 }

By order

[illegible]
Dep Sec to Govt

2/5/B
12

Revenue Department

N°35

N°527

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1858. N°527

Read letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry dated 11th September 1857.

In Cons 4th February 1858.

(Here enter N° 121)

Resolved that the above letter and the Documents which accompanied it be laid before Government with reference to their Endorsement on Petition N° 843 of 1856.

(A true Extract)

Sub Secretary.

To,

A. Forbes Esq
Ag Secretary to Government
Revenue Department.

A. Forbes.

Revenue 1858 Depart.
Dy. to Coms 12th March

No 348

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 4th
Recd 8th } February 1858

No 527

Submitting a letter with its enclosure from the Collector of Rajahmundry on the subject of Petition No 843 of 1856

No 35

A-295

295/12/15 I.R.D.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the 3rd March 1858 —
Read the following Letters

From Sheerow Ramrow proprietor
of Veerapully Jeolem in Rajahmundry (Here enter 10th April 1856.)

From Row Venkataramaniah repre-
sentative of Row Ramarayanungaru
deceased thro' her Vakeel M. Ramamah (— do — 12th November 1857)

Extract from the Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue (— do — 4th February 1858 No 27)

A.
B
C

Letr from the Govt. No. 1832. under
date the 4th Decr 1856 with
Cowlnamahs, Certificates
and Claims preferred by
Sheerow Ramrow
Venkataramaniah
Ramamah
Ramarayanungaru
Ramamah
Ramarayanungaru
and Extracts
from the Proceedings
of the Board of
Revenue

the late Venkut Row.
was brought under
assessment, having
at the Manor Principal
to make them not
as he may think just.
as claiming
Lis
Judgment.
& for a petition from
Lord Raban Nov. the
late Court. R. Ackers
Esq. was appointed to
take from the Steps and
case from the 1st of
on 11. January 1836. to
Ejected his claims
to the premises
& that the Respondent
the title of Appellant
father was stated
that on his death
1825, the Lands
Lands at the
that it certainly was





In this case there
and in those where there
the Manor Principal
"Just" or aggregate value
Estates may be taken over
or Petitioner the Steps of the original
the Principal. Power to Commissioners
or to reject the individual
to the discretion
of the Collector
Principal Owners have
Protest the Petitioner to
Plan of Enfranchising
the Village community
a Corporation.
should be subscribed by
Chief
The remaining Steps,
and Houses under
the Existing system of
Rents. until the Enfranchise
consequent on the Survey
against Error or
the Assessment shall
adjust the "Terms" date

But if there are Land
the Lowest assessment
which is higher than
Tenant of the Tokes,

Minority of the present Grantor.

Robert that the following Indorsement is found S.E. Pro. Vol. 268 pp 185).

8 "The Dr. Lord takes all the circumstances of the case of Low Slave Law. into consideration & is of opinion that the Memorialists claim to hold the lands in question free of assessment

V.R.

22. Feby/50

Report to the Board of Com. Pro. & Dep. Rec. Gen.

subject the land in question has remained by the Grantor only in 1805 and he it states the land in question. it states that it did not rain when he his Engagement of it was again granted to him. Documents are produced Esther his title to the land. and part of the land to the Petitioner seems to do not seem to establish the fact of his being in possession at that time.

6 Low Slave Law died in Nov. 1836. and under all the circumstances of the case the Dr. Secretary is of opinion that the order in Council of the 22nd Feby/50 that the lands in question should be brought under assessment. During the

295/19

Revenue 1858 Depart.
Dy. to Comr. 12th March

295

No. 295
Extract Minr. of Comr.
Dated 5. March/58

Declining to interfere with the decision of the late Commissioner Northern circuit in rejecting Rom Ramarons claim to certain lands free of assessment.

No. 33 at 36

V.

L. 21 Feby 1859 ck