M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 56 Press ~~Mis.~~

112-113

Dated 10 — 1 — 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 112. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 13th December 1859, No. 5149.

Read the following letter from J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Collector of Chingleput; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort St. George, dated Saidapet, 23d November 1859, No. 440.

I have the honor, with reference to the endorsement of Government on petition No. 1317 of 1858, to state, that referring to the old registry of ináms prepared in 1810, it appears that 14 K. 5 As. of inám land situated in 12 different villages of this district, were originally acquired by one Appau Aiyana Charriar from the late Nabob Sadat Ali Khan. Subsequent to the demise of Appau Aiyana Charriar, the lands were registered in the joint names of his grandson, Appayar No. 8, and his grandson's nephew, Tirumala Charriar No. 13, in the genealogical statement herewith accompanying, and are now enjoyed by Srinivassa Aiyengar No. 18, Appangar No. 21, and Ramanuya Chari No. 22, as well as the petitioner No. 19. The petitioner takes exception to Srinivassa Aiyengar No. 18, and to Ramaunja Chari No. 22, as being members of a family unconnected with the inám.

2. The objection seems, however, to be quite unfounded, as the forefathers of the individuals objected to, appear to have been regular descendants of the original grantee, and the petitioner himself, on a former occasion, would seem to have filed a razinamah before the Púnamalí Tahsildar, acknowledging their right to participate in the lands. Under these circumstances, and in consideration of the long enjoyment of the ináms by the parties objected to, it does not seem desirable to allow the petitioner to sue them in the Civil Court, more especially, as the right of all the parties will in due course be disposed of by the Inám Commissioner.

Submitted to Government, with reference to their endorsement on petition No. 1317 of 1858, soliciting leave to sue for certain maniyam land.

2. The Collector does not recommend that leave should be granted on the ground that petitioner's objection to the present occupants is shown by the genealogy of the family, to be unfounded, that petitioner himself on a former occasion withdrew a similar claim, and acknowledged by razinama the rights he now contests, and that the parties he seeks to disturb have been in long possession.

3. The Board do not think these reasons sufficient for denying petitioner leave to prosecute his claim in the Civil Courts, and the ordinary course of law, and recommend that the desired permission to institute the suit may be granted.

No. 113. ORDER THEREON, 10th January 1860, No. 56.

1. The Board make a recommendation in opposition to that of the Collector, who would not permit petitioner one Narasímha Charriar of Tírúmeshí, in the Púnamalí táluq, to sue for the recovery of his inám lands in the Civil Court.

2. The Government agree with the Board. The interests of Government are in no way concerned, and it is the proper function of the Courts to decide such disputes between private individuals. The required permission is therefore given under Section II Regulation IV of 1831.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

1859 Depart.

Inv. Letter from the Coll.
of King's dated 23. Nov. 59.

No. 440

No.

To The A. Secretary to the
B. of Revenue
Fort St. George

R 2387/59

Genealogical
Statement

In the 5880 of 1859

1859 Depart.t

Incl.d Letter from the Coll.r
of King.n dated 23. Nov.r /59.
No. 440


No.

To The Asst Secretary to the
Bd. of Revenue
Fort St. George

R 2387/59.

Genealogical
Statement

In the 5880 of 1859
In Cour 25 Nov.r



Note.
Circles are Males
Squares are Females
Black Int Bars Dead
Red Int Bars Surviving Members

Chingalpet District
Collector's Kachhárí
Saidápet 23d Nov. 1859

Collector.

No. 30.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 10th January 1860.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Submitting a report from the Collector of Chingleput on Petition No. 1317 of 1858 } dereliction No. 5749 dated 13 December 1859.

The Board make a recommendation in opposition to that of the Collector, who would not permit petitioner one Narasimha Chariar of Tirukmeshi, in the Pinnamalli Taluq, to sue for the recovery of his Inam lands in the Civil Courts.

2 The Government agree with the Board. The interests of Government are in no way concerned, and it is the proper function of the Courts to decide such disputes between private individuals. The required permission is therefore given under Sec. II. Reg. IV of 1831.

6 Copies to the Bd. of Rev. & Disp. 6th
1 — Do. Dep. with Do. Rec.

Revenue 1860 Dept.
Pro: of Govt. 10th January.

No 56.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dt 10th January 1860.

Permitting Para:
Sunka Narrain of
Tirumeishi in Chingle-
put to Sue for the
recovery of his inam
lands-

Nos 112 & 113-