M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2160	Press ~~Mis.~~
145-146	
Dated 12 — 11 — 1867.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 12th November 1861.

No. 145. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st October 1861, No. 5,786 :—

Read again letter from the Collector of the Kistna District, dated 10th August 1861, No. 202.

(In Cons. 15th August 1861, No. 5,196.)

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 4th October 1861, No. 245.

1. In reply to the Board's Proceedings, dated 20th August 1861, No. 4,562, I have the honor to state that the case in point is one of several in which I have received applications from persons holding Pattas from the Inám Commissioner for lands not in their enjoyment, and I desired to know whether the Pattas, issued as they are on behalf of the Governor in Council, were to be looked upon as *bona fide* decisions of the Government by whom alone, as pointed out by the Board in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, actual possession in the case of Ináms can be disturbed, in the absence of permission to sue in the Courts.

2. In the case referred to the dispute was between two sharers in the Inám, but I have also received application from a person, holding a Title Deed from the Commissioner, to place him in possession of land held as Seri for 30 years by certain Pariah cultivators of the village of Tativarru in Gudivada Táluq. The cultivators naturally object to vacate the lands for which they have paid Sist for so many years, and I do not see that I have any right to disturb them. On the other hand the holder of the Title Deed claims the Inám to which the Commissioner on behalf of Government has acknowledged his title.

3. The Board will, I think, see that there is some difficulty in these cases, and will not, I trust, consider that I have occupied their time by needless references.

Ordered to be submitted for the consideration and decision of Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 146. ORDER THEREON, 12th November 1861, No. 2,160.

Referred to the Inám Commissioner for early report.

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

In Cons. 15th August 1861, No. 5,196.

From G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of the KISTNA DISTRICT,
dated Masulipatam, 10th August 1861, No. 202.

Abstract.—Requests the Board's opinion as to whether the Puttah of the Inam Commissioner regarding the enjoyment of an Inam of Majumdar Lutchmee Narasimharao, &c., should be acted up to or continued in the possession of those who were in enjoyment thereof up to the time of the issue of Puttahs. (*Vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 20th August 1861, No. 4,562.)

Exd. J. Tulloch.

No. 4,562.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th August 1861.

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Masulipatam, 10th August 1861, No. 202 :—

1. I have the honor to submit, for the orders of the Board, the following question relating to the enjoyment of Inams.

2. The produce of an Inam land belonging to Majumdar Lutchmee Narasimharao, and two others in the village of Chavur of the Gudivada Taluq in this District, was formerly enjoyed in three equal shares ; one of the three partners died in 1833 without issue, and his widow having proceeded abroad, the remaining two partners enjoyed the third share also from 1833 up to last year.

3. During the investigation of the Inams, the widow presented herself, and requested the grant of a title deed separately in her name, for the share in the Inam land formerly under the enjoyment of her deceased husband. This request was acceded to, and a separate Patta was granted to her by the Inam Commissioner. The co-sharers being dissatisfied with it, petitioned the Inam Commissioner, but no orders have been passed by him as yet.

4. I beg to be favored with the Board's opinion as to whether the Patta of the Inam Commissioner should be acted up to, or the Inam should be continued in the possession of those who were enjoying them up to the time of the issue of Pattas.

---

1. The Acting Collector will please to explain for what purpose he requires the Board's opinion on this point.

2. He is of course aware that actual possession of the kind described can only be disturbed by decision of a competent Court, or in the case of an Inam by decision of Government, if permission to sue has not been granted.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To G. Thornhill, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District.

Exd. J. Wright.

1861 Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE,

Dated 20th August 1861.

No. 4,562.

Requesting to explain why the Collector requires the Board's opinion in regard to an Inam land in the Gudivada Taluk.

4

No. 202

Kistna District Collectors
Kacheri at Masulipatam
10th August 1861

From G. Thornhill Esqre.
Collector of Kistna District
To W. Huddleston Esqre.
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Chepauk

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for the orders of the Board the following question relating to the enjoyment of Inams -

2. The province of an Inám land belonging to Majumdar Lutchmeeta-rasumhardo, and two others in the Village of Chavur of the Gudivada Talug in this District, was formerly enjoyed in 3 equal shares - one of the three partners died in 1833 without issue, and his widow having proceeded abroad, the remaining 2 partners enjoyed the 3d share also from 1833 upto last year -

3. During the investigation of the Ináms the widow presented herself

herself, and requested the grant of a title deed separately in her name, for the share in the Inám land formerly under the enjoyment of her deceased husband. His request was acceded to, and a separate Putta was granted to her by the Inam Commissioner. The Cosharers being dissatisfied with it, petitioned the Inám Commissioner, but no orders have been passed by him as yet.

4. I beg to be favored with the Board's opinion as to whether the Putta of the Inám Commissioner should be acted up to, or the Inam should be continued in the possession of those who were enjoying them up to the time of the issue of Puttas.

I have the honor to be
sir,
your most obedt. Servant
J Thomwell
Actg Collector

I think the orders of Govt require that the old tenants in the possession of those who were at the time enjoying the

Compd J Blamha
N C

No. 5,786.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 21st October 1861.

Read again letter from the Collector of the Kistna District, dated 10th August 1861, No. 202.

(In Cons. 15th August 1861, No. 5,196.)

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 4th October 1861, No. 245:—

1. In reply to the Board's Proceedings, dated 20th August 1861, No. 4,562, I have the honor to state that the case in point is one of several in which I have received applications from persons holding Pattas from the Inam Commissioner for lands not in their enjoyment, and I desired to know whether the Pattas, issued as they are on behalf of the Governor in Council, were to be looked upon as *bona fide* decisions of the Government by whom alone, as pointed out by the Board in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings, actual possession in the case of Inams can be disturbed, in the absence of permission to sue in the Courts.

2. In the case referred to the dispute was between two sharers in the Inam, but I have also received application from a person, holding a Title Deed from the Commissioner, to place him in possession of land held as Seri for 30 years by certain Pariah cultivators of the village of Tativarru in Gudivada Taluq. The cultivators naturally object to vacate the lands for which they have paid Sist for so many years, and I do not see that I have any right to disturb them. On the other hand the holder of the Title Deed claims the Inam to which the Commissioner on behalf of Government has acknowledged his title.

3. The Board will, I think, see that there is some difficulty in these cases, and will not, I trust, consider that I have occupied their time by needless references.

Ordered to be submitted for the consideration and decision of Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to G. Thornhill, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District.

Exd. J. Wright.

Revenue 1861 Department.
Proc: of Govt for 4 Nov.
No: 2869

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 21st *October* 1861.
Despatched. 30 Do
Received. 31st Do
E-1-

May this go in duplt?

No. 5,786.

From Inam Commr dy
7 Sept/62 C.R: 1047.

Submitting for consideration and decision a letter from the Collector of Kistna forwarding explanation regarding an Inam case alluded to in Board's Proceedings of 20th August 1861, No 4,562.

No 425 & 446.

For Madras
No 2160. 17th Nov.
Letter Order

No 2160

Referred to the Inam Commissioner for early report.

Fort St George
12th Nov/61

EGH

6 Copies
To the Inam Commissioner
with Cir. Mem.
Copy Cir. 13

JDS