

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	722	Press
	72-73	~~Mis~~
Dated	7-5-186.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
for the month of May 1860.*

No. 72. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th April 1860,
No. 1,792:—

Read letters from the Officiating Collector of Chingleput, dated 12th and 31st March
1860, Nos. 77 and 95.

(In Cons. 14th March and 2nd April 1860, Nos. 1,171 and 1,484.)

Resolved, that the above letter be submitted for the information of Government, with
reference to paragraphs 4 to 7 of their Order, dated
In Cons. 18th Feby. 1860, No. 770. 17th February 1860, Revenue Department, No. 247.

2. In the second of the letters above recorded, Mr. Ellis reports that the weight of
evidence in the village is in favor of Kuppammál's enjoyment of the two shares, Séshádrí Sástri,
her son-in-law, residing with her and managing them.

3. The Board are not disposed to attach much importance to the evidence of the Karanams
or the village registries, and as Kuppammál is now in possession, they would not recommend
her ejectment or the registry of the lands in the name of her opponent, Séshádrí's son's widow,
who is referred to as "Petitioner" in the Government Order. In addition, however, to this,
it now appears that the "Petitioner's" husband, Ramaswami Iyar, pre-deceased his father
Séshádrí Sástri, and the Board apprehend that under Hindu Law she could not inherit Séshádrí's
shares in preference to Kuppammál, who, as Séshádrí's father-in-law's widow, would be a
nearer heir.

4. This, however, is a legal question for the Court to decide, but it serves to confirm the
Board in their opinion that Government need not do more than grant Petitioner in Nos. 624 of
1856 and 708 of 1858 permission to sue under Regulation IV of 1831.

5. The Board cannot concur with Mr. Shubrick in the view he seems to have taken of the
village registers. These, as the Board gather from Mr. Ellis' letter, are the public accounts
of the village, and as such the Karanam has no right to make alterations at will. Mr. Ellis is
requested to issue stringent instructions calculated to maintain the integrity of the village
registers and accounts; and will severely punish any breach of it.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 73. ORDER THEREON, 7th May 1860, No. 722.

1. Of the two shares in dispute, one is alleged to have passed by gift, the other by
inheritance. The right in both cases is disputed by the Petitioner, and the village register is
no evidence, the entries in favor of both parties having been made by the Karanam, without
any Order from a competent authority, and without the enquiry which would have preceded
such Order. The question is one for the Courts to decide.

2. Ordered, therefore, that the following Endorsement be passed on Petitions Nos. 624 of
1856 and 708 of 1858.

"The Government are pleased under the provisions of Section 2, Regulation IV of 1831,
"to grant permission to Sávitri Ammál to sue for two shares in the Srottriyam village of Saina-
"puram in the Chingleput District."

3. The Government fully agree with the Board in condemning Mr. Shubrick's views
regarding the village registers. They desire that immediate steps may be taken to correct the
laxity of practice thus recognized in this District.

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

Courts

Rev Sept

N^o 722

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 7th May 1860.

Read the following
Proc. of the Board of
Revenue.

Submitting for
information in to the Board's
observations letters from
the Collector of Chingleput
supplying the information (There enter 14 April 60
N^o 1792)
required by Govt as to the
necessity of granting Peti-
tions in N^o 624 of 1856 and
708 of 1858 permission to
enc under Reg. IV of 1831.

1. Of the two shares in
dispute, one is alleged to have
passed by gift, the other by in-
heritance. The right in both
cases is disputed ^{by the Petitioners} and the vil-
lage register is no evidence,
the entries ^{in favour of both} for the ~~contending~~
parties having been made
by the Kharanani, without
^{from a competent authority}
any order and without the in-
quiry which would have
preceded such order. The
question is one for the
Courts

Courts to decide.

2. Ordered therefore that the following endorsement be passed on petitions Nos 624 of 1856 and 700 of 1858.

1788/89 Nos 71-72

20 2-69

The Govt are pleased under the provisions of Sec. II Reg. IV of 1831 to grant permission to Savitri ammal to sue for two shares in the satriam village of Sainapuram in the Chingleput District.

3. The Govt fully agree with the Board in condemning Mr Shubrick's views regarding the village registers. They desire that immediate steps may be taken to correct the laxity of practice which has been thus recognized as prevailing in this District.

Y.M.

11 Copies to the Board of Rev. with 2 Encls.

1 - in Oct with 20 P. 1858