

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

1109

Press
Mis.

Dated *19th August* 185*9*.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
from 13th to 19th August 1859.*

No. 50. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd August 1859, No. 2988.

Read again order of Government, dated 18th November 1858, refering for the opinion of the Board of Revenue, a report from the Collector of Rajahmundry, on a Government Petition No. 1618 of 1857.

(In Con. 28th December 1858, A after No. 5236.)

The Petitioner seeks leave to sue in the Courts for recovery of certain Inam land formerly belonging to his father but now in the possession of the family of Petitioner's father-in-law, as *they* assert under a deed of sale executed by Petitioner to the father of his father-in-law, but as *he* (Petitioner) who denies the execution of the sale deeds, declares by fraud, his father-in-law having during his (Petitioner's) minority been entrusted with the management of his estate, and surreptitiously induced the Curnums to alter the entry of the land.

2. Petitioner originally complained before the Collector on this subject and on enquiry before the Tahsildar stated that a moochilfia had been executed by his father-in-law's father as *tenant* of the land on a yearly rent from Petitioner in 1847, the year entered in the sale deeds. Subsequently the parties filed a razeenamah, under which a portion of the land was restored to the Petitioner, and a further sum of Rupees 300 was paid to him for the remainder which is still in the possession of his father-in-law's family, and which Petitioner now seeks to recover by civil suit.

3. The Board are not aware of any objection to his being permitted to bring his action, the whole Inam having unquestionably been registered in his grandfather's name in the Bhoband account of Fusly 1208, and the question for the Court being the validity of the deeds of sale produced by the present holders of the land, which purport to have been executed prior to the promulgation of the rules of 1848.

4. The Board regret the excessive delay that has occurred in the submission of this reply to the Government order, which arose from the papers having been mislaid in their office.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 51. ORDER THEREON, 18th August 1859, No. 1109.

The Honorable the Governor in Council grants permission to petitioner, Tantah Pattermah of Judoopally in the Amlapoor talook of Rajahmundry, under Section 2, Regulation IV. of 1831, to sue for the recovery of certain Inam land in the village of Judoopally which he alleges to be improperly withheld from him.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

No. 2988.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 3d August 1859.

Read again order of Government, dated 18th November 1858, referring for the opinion of the Board of Revenue, a report from the Collector of Rajahmundry, on a Government Petition No. 1618 of 1857.

(In Con. 28th December 1858, A after No. 5236.)

The Petitioner seeks leave to sue in the Courts for recovery of certain Inam land formerly belonging to his father but now in the possession of the family of Petitioner's father-in-law, as *they* assert under a deed of sale executed by Petitioner to the father of his father-in-law, but as *he* (Petitioner) who denies the execution of the sale deeds, declares by fraud, his father-in-law having during his (Petitioner's) minority been entrusted with the management of his estate, and surreptitiously induced the Carnuns to alter the entry of the land.

2. Petitioner originally complained before the Collector on this subject and on enquiry before the Tahsildar stated that a moochilka had been executed by his father-in-law's father as *tenant* of the land on a yearly rent from Petitioner in 1847, the year entered in the sale deeds. Subsequently the parties filed a razeenamah, under which a portion of the land was restored to the Petitioner, and a further sum of Rupees 300 was paid to him for the remainder which is still in the possession of his father-in-law's family, and which Petitioner now seeks to recover by civil suit.

3. The Board are not aware of any objection to his being permitted to bring his action, the whole Inam having unquestionably been registered in his grandfather's name in the Bhobund account of Fusly 1208, and the question for the Court being the validity of the deeds of sale produced by the present holders of the land, which purport to have been executed prior to the promulgation of the rules of 1848.

4. The Board regret the excessive delay that has occurred in the submission of this reply to the Government order, which arose from the papers having been mislaid in their office.

(A true Extract.)

J. D. Bourdillon

J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Sub Secretary.

Revenue 1859 Report
 No. 1109 of 1859
 Proceedings of the

Board of Revenue.

Dated 3rd August 1859
 No. 5
 Dec. 5
 E. L. O.

No. 2938

Submitting the No.
 post called for by Govt.
 on a communication from
 the Collr. of Raja Benwar
 on the subject of the
 petition No. 1615 of 1854,
 seeking permission to sue
 in the Courts for the recovery
 of certain Gram land,
 formerly belonging to
 petitioners father.

With an order
 No. 1109. 18th August 1859

No. 1109.

That the
 the Government in
 it grants permission to petitioners
 in the Courts for the recovery of
 the land in question
 of 1854, to have for the recovery of
 certain Gram land in the village
 of Sunderpally with the alleged
 to be in property with the present
 title.

The Board of Revenue
 18th August 1859
 The Board of Revenue
 No. 1109

18th August 1859

With an order