

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<i>867</i>	Press Mis.
Dated	<i>1st July</i>	185 <i>8</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
from 25th June to 1st July 1859.*

No. 59. Read the following Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th June 1859, No. 2109.

Read letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated 28th April 1859, No. 306.

(In Con. 6th May 1859, No. 2035.)

Ordered to be submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In the particular case of Vezia Gopaula Raz, referred by Government for further enquiry by the Collector in Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 2nd April 1859, No. 463, R. D., on the ground of informality in the original Proceedings, it appears that a personal enquiry was made by the European Officer so long ago as 1852, and a decision then passed, although depositions were not recorded.

3. The orders of Government as to the formal judicial record to be framed in these investigations will of course be attended to in future, but in the present instance with reference to the length of time that has elapsed since the original enquiry was held, the Board submit for the consideration of Government whether any good end is likely to be attained by a re-investigation at the present moment.

4. As the Board do not understand the orders of Government conveyed in Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 2nd April 1859, No. 462, R. D., as intending the re-opening generally of cases already decided but merely as a guide for the future, they do not see any need to fix a limit of time as proposed by the Collector in his letter above recorded.

(A true Extract.)

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

No. 60. ORDER THEREON, 1st July 1859, No. 867.

The matter in dispute is believed to be a Curnum Meerassy, or a share of such a property though the purport of the Petition as given at the head of the order might indicate rather that it is merely an appeal against a dismissal from the office of Curnum. If the former is really the true nature of the case, the course with respect to appeals is laid down in Section V. Regulation VI. of 1831, and the Board will be guided by that.

2. With regard to Mr. Reade's proposal to limit the time within which cases are to be re-opened, it was not the intention of Government that cases of this kind in question already decided should be re-opened generally, but only those in which one of the parties should desire it.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,

Secretary to Government.

In Con. 6th May 1859, No. 2035.
From C. W. READE, Esq., Collector of VIZAGAPATAM,

dated Vizagapatam, 28th April 1859, No. 306.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of an Extract from Minutes of Consultation, No. 463, of date the 2d April, also the Minutes of Consultation, No. 462, of the same date, and I infer from these orders that both the Government and Board expect me to re-open and re-investigate the matter of the Petition on which the Government recorded their Minute, No. 463.

2. I would desire to point out that this Petition was originally enquired into and disposed of by Mr. Fane, then Principal Assistant in 1852, who had the parties before him when in the Talook and personally questioned them, although it is true he made no formal investigation in writing.

3. An appeal was then made which was for some years in abeyance, and soon after my arrival I took up the case among others and disposed of it on the 1st October 1857, and my decision *recorded at length in my own hand writing* was affirmed by the Board under date the 25th March 1858.

4. I would submit that some limit should be fixed to re-opening cases of this kind disposed of heretofore without personal investigation by the European Revenue Officers; for otherwise every similar claim notwithstanding its date may again be resuscitated producing great embarrassment and endless trouble without any corresponding good. I therefore suggest that one year be fixed as the period within which claims, now declared to have been irregularly disposed of, may be again re-opened, and all decisions of an anterior date should I think be held as final.

5. If some step of this kind be not adopted the demands for re-investigation on the ground of informality as now ruled will prove most perplexing to Executive Officers.

Printed Copy of

N: 2035-

From The Collector of
Nagapattinam

To The Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Trichy 28th April 1859

Recd 6th May

N: 2036-

In Low 6-

P 1004/59

Submits his office
- now on certain petitions
and suggests that one
should be fixed as the first
200 within which claims
now declared to have
been irregularly disposed
of may be again re-
-ferred.

In N 2109 of 1859

6th July 59 N: 2039

Revenue Department

N: 867

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 1st July 1859

Read the following
Extract from the Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue

(Presented 7th June 59 N: 2109)

The matter in dis-
pute is believed to be a
curium meerosoy, or a
share of such a property
though the purport of the
Petition as given at the head
of the order might indi-
cate rather that it is
merely an appeal against
a dismissal from the
office of Curium. If the
former is really the true
nature of the case,

L

W

W

the course with respect
to appeals is laid down
in Section V Regulation
VI of 1831, and the Board
will be guided by that.

2. With regard to
Mr. Reader's proposal
to limit the time within
which cases are to be
reopened, it was not the
intention of Government
that cases of this kind
in question already
decided should be re-
opened ^{generally,} but only those
in which one of the
parties should desire it.

J. A.

6 Copies to the B. of Revenue Decd 2^d
1 - Mr. Secy.

Received 1859 - Sept 11th
Pro: of Govt 1st class

No 867.

Pro: of the W. & A. & G. & G.

2nd July 1859.

6-7-59
8-11-59

Should be guided
by the Council laid down
in the Regulation respecting
regarding the case of
the principal day in the
regulation provided it is a
common property or a
share of such a property.

No 57 + 60