M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 523	**Press** ~~**Mis.**~~
III-112	
Dated 7 3 — 1861.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 111. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th March 1861, No. 1,238 :—

Read the following letter from P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Calicut, 22nd February 1861, No. 53.

SIR,

Ataporom Shangaren Embrandery of Cherudayi Umshom Kavai Táluq.
Versus.
1 *Mithele Illom Damudren Embrandery.*
2 *Karáden Amhu.*

1. I have the honor to lay before the Board a translate of the Plaint in suit No. 322 of 1860 on the file of the District Munsif of Kavai, in which I have been included as a supplemental Defendant at the instance of the Plaintiff.

2. I beg also to submit the draft of my proposed answer to be filed before the Mufty Sudder Amín of Tellicherry, to whose Court the suit has been transferred, and request that the sanction of Government may be obtained for its defence at the public expense.

3. The Plaintiff, it will be observed, seeks restoration of two pieces of land (Nos. 1 and 2) which he asserts to be his jenm property.

Both the pieces are, incontestibly, the property of Government. The whole of No. 1, and a large portion of No. 2 form the bed of a river, as did also, in time past, the remaining portion of No. 2, now dry, which has been gained by the river having receded.

4. By law as well as local custom, such lands belonging to the State, and the dry portion just adverted to, was paimáish or surveyed as *Government waste*, so far back as M. E. $\frac{982}{1806\text{-}7}$ The other portion of No. 2, and the entire area of No. 1 being then, as they are now under water, they were not paimáished; but that they belong to Government, there can be no question.

5. The Plaintiff endeavours to establish the fact, that the lands form a portion of his land denominated "Raman Kay." The total extent of the latter land, according to the paimáish of it in $\frac{982}{1806\text{-}7}$ is only 10,017 square yards.

A re-measurement of it now made shows, however, an excess of 1,406 square yards. This leads me to the impression that he must, from time to time, have appropriated and added to it, fresh pieces from the adjoining Government land (No. 1), as the recession of the river admitted of it; and that, at last, he has adopted the plan of claiming the whole of that land, as well as the land No. 2, on the plea that they form portion of his land abovenamed. But this plea is untenable. The physical formation of the lands rebuts the assertion, and is of itself a sufficient proof of the right of Government. There are other facts also which render the Plaintiff's claim untenable.

	Square yards.
Area of Plaintiff's land as per Paimáish.....	10,017
Excess found on re-measurement.....	1,406
Extent of lands Nos. 1 and 2...	8,695
Total...	20,118

6. The extent of these two lands alone, amounts to 8,695 square yards. Had they been included in the Plaintiff's land, its actual area would have been 20,118, and not 10,017 yards only, as it is more than improbable that so large a space of ground as the lands in question comprise, would have been allowed to be wholly excluded from *his* land, while it was surveyed in $\frac{982}{1806\text{-}7}$. But as it was so excluded, and the dry portion of one of the lands (No. 2) was, as I have shown in paragraph 4, surveyed as *Government property* at *that* time, without any objection being raised to the measure, it is clear that neither of the lands under litigation, was then considered to appertain to the Plaintiff's land aforementioned. In fact, it was not possible for any one to lay claim to lands which were obviously the property of Government, and which were not, and could not, therefore be transferred to the Plaintiff or his father, with the land he now holds.

7. I deem it proper to notice, that the Plaintiff has been in the habit of cultivating a waste ground contiguous to the lands now under litigation, and the crops raised on it are inspected and paimáished as usual, during the annual Jamábandí Settlement.

Availing himself of this circumstance, he alludes to this ground, in his Plaint, in a manner calculated to lead to the inference that it includes the lands in dispute, while such is not actually the case. The waste ground alluded to; though denominated "Kaipad Nillom" a general term for lands bordering rivers, has nothing to do with the lands in question, on which he has carried on no cultivation whatever.

The Plaintiff, however, cunningly included these lands in his application for a Cowle, pretending, at the same time, to a jenm right over them. His application was not complied with. He subsequently gave a deposition * inferentially relinquishing such right, but notwithstanding this, it was not deemed advisable to give the lands to him. They were granted to the 1st and 2nd Defendants. The Plaintiff was, however, allowed to carry on his cultivation on the waste ground above adverted to, for which no Cowle was considered necessary.

* NOTE.—*This deposition he has thought it wise to call "a fabrication." But it bears his signature and I have no doubt as to its genuineness.*

P. S.—The period allowed for filing my answer will expire on the 24th proximo.

(Signed) P. GRANT, *Collector.*

O. S. No 322 of 1860.
Plaintiff.
Ataporom Shangaren. Embranderi of Kunamdeshom, Kavai Táluq.
Versus.
1. *Jenmy Mithelu Illom. Damudun Embrnanderi.*
2. *Karaden Amhu.*
3. *P. Grant, Esq., Collector.*

1. The Collector of Malabar reports the institution of a suit against him for the recovery of a plot of ground which the Plaintiff claims as his "jenm" property.

2. The Collector resists the claim on the plea that most of the land is now part of the bed of a river and that the remainder was so, until recently. Such land by law and the usage of the District belongs to the State. The Collector relies on other circumstances, such as the survey of the land in 1806 as Government property and the excess in Plaintiff's possession over and above his admitted estate, as proof of the Government title.

3. The question is one of evidence and as the Collector is confident of the justice of the claims of Government and of his ability to make good his case, the Board recommend that he may be permitted to defend the suit at the public expense.

4. The time for filing an answer expires on the 24th instant.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 112. ORDER THEREON, 7th March 1861, No. 523.

The Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the defence, in the first instance at the public expense, of O. S. No. 322 of 1860 instituted against the Collector of Malabar and others in the Court of the District Munsif of Kavai by Ataporom Shangaren, but he will determine, when a copy of the decree shall be submitted, whether the costs, if any be adjudged against the Collector, shall be borne by that Officer or by the Government.

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

No. 1,238.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th March 1861.

Read the following letter from P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Calicut, 22d February 1861, No. 53 :—

Atapuram Shangaren Embrandere of Cherudayi Umshom Kavai Taluq,
versus
1. Mithele Illom Damudren Embrandery.
2. Karaden Ambu.

1. I have the honor to lay before the Board a translate of the Plaint in Suit No. 322 of 1860, on the file of the District Munsif of Kavai, in which I have been included as a supplemental Defendant at the instance of the Plaintiff.

2. I beg also to submit the draft of my proposed answer to be filed before the Mufti Sudder Amin of Tellicherry, to whose Court the suit has been transferred, and request that the sanction of Government may be obtained for its defence at the public expense.

3. The Plaintiff, it will be observed, seeks restoration of two pieces of land Nos. 1 and 2 which he asserts to be his jenm property.

Both the pieces are incontestibly the property of Government. The whole of No. 1, and a large portion of No. 2 from the bed of a river, as did also, in time past, the remaining portion (of No. 2), now dry, which has been gained by the river having receded.

4. By law as well as local custom, such lands belong to the State, and the dry portion just adverted to was Pymashed or surveyed as *Government waste*, so far back as M. E. 982 (A. D 1806-7). The other portion of No. 2, and the entire area of No. 1 being then, as they are now under water, they were not Pymashed, but that they belong to Government, there can be no question.

5. The Plaintiff endeavors to establish the fact that the lands form a portion of his land denominated "Raman Kayi." The total extent of the latter land, according to the Pymash of it in 982 (A. D. 1806-7) is only 10,017 square yards.

A re-measurement of it now made shows, however, an excess of 1,406 square yards. This leads me to the impression that he must from time to time have appropriated and added to it fresh pieces from the adjoining Government land No. 1, as the recession of the river admitted of it; and that at last he has adopted the plan of claiming the whole of that land, as well as the land No. 2, on the plea that they form portion of his land abovenamed. But this plea is untenable. The physical formation of the lands rebuts the assertion, and is of itself a sufficient proof of the right of Government. There are other facts also which render the Plaintiff's claim untenable.

6. The extent of these two lands alone amounts to 8,695 square yards. Had they been included in the Plaintiff's land, its actual area would have been 20,118, and not 10,017 yards only, as it is more than improbable that so large a space of ground as the lands in question comprise, would have been allowed to be wholly excluded from *his* land, while it was surveyed in 982 (A. D. 1806-7). But as it was so excluded, and the dry portion of one of the lands (No. 2) was, as I have shown in paragraph 4, surveyed as *Government property* at *that* time, without any objection being raised to the measure, it is clear that neither of the lands under litigation, was then considered to appertain to the Plaintiff's land aforementioned. In fact it was not possible for any one to lay claim to lands which were obviously the property of Government, and which were not, and could not, therefore, be transferred to the Plaintiff or his father, with the land he now holds.

	Sq. Yds.
Area of Plaintiff's land as per Pymash.....	10,017
Excess found on re-measurement...	1,406
Extent of lands Nos. 1 and 2...	8,695
Total.....	20,118

7. I deem it proper to notice that the Plaintiff has been in the habit of cultivating a waste ground contiguous to the lands now under litigation, and the crops raised on it are inspected and Pymashed as usual, during the annual Jamabandi settlement.

Availing himself of this circumstance, he alludes to this ground in his plaint, in a manner calculated to lead to the inference that it includes the lands in dispute, while such is not actually the case. The waste ground alluded to, though denominated "Kaipad Nillom," a general term for lands bordering rivers, has nothing to do with the lands in question, on which he has carried on no cultivation whatever.

The Plaintiff, however, cunningly included these lands in his application for a Cowle, pretending at the same time to a jenm right over them. His application was not complied with. He subsequently gave a deposition* inferentially relinquishing such right, but notwithstanding this, it was not deemed advisable to give the lands to him. They were granted to the first and second Defendants The Plaintiff was, however, allowed to carry on his cultivation on the waste ground above adverted to, for which no Cowle was considered necessary.

* NOTE.—This deposition he has thought it wise to call "a fabrication." But it bears his signature, and I have no doubt as to its genuineness.

P. S.—The period allowed for filing my answer will expire on the 24th proximo.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

To the Court of the District Munsif of Kavai.

The Bill of Plaint of Proprietor Atapuram Shangaren Embrandere of Kunaru Deshom, Cherudayi Amshom in the Kavai Taluq.

1. The following is my Bill of Plaint against, 1st, the Jenmy Mithele Illom Damudren Embrandere, and 2d, Karaden Ambu.

1*st*. The jenm right of the land called "Ramen Kayi" sowing 15¾ Podis of seed, situated in the aforesaid Deshom, was sold in Chingom 990 (August and September 1815), by Varanakot Naranen Nambudri, to Kiyeke Karuvenganom Embrandere, together with the former documents appertaining thereto, and in Magarom 1005 (January and February 1830), the latter Embrandere sold the land to my deceased father Vishun Embrandere. The revenue thereof is registered in my name, and paid by me, and I enjoy the land, although the waste ground called "Kaypat Nilom," included within the boundary specified in the above documents, situated to the west of the aforesaid land, was cultivated by me for some years and the survey made in my name, I presented a petition to the Head Assistant Collector on the 24th Mitunom 1032 (6th July 1857), requesting that a Cowle may be granted for the reclamation and management of the waste, and the revenue thereon foregone in consideration of the great expense that I would have had to incur in improving it. Accordingly, the 3d Gumashta of the Kavai Taluq came and inspected the ground, measured it, drew out an account in my name, and after causing it to be signed by me, took it along with him. Having learnt that a Cowle was given to the 1st Defendant instead of to me, according to the said account, I presented petitions to the Head Assistant Collector under Miscellaneous Nos. 638, 841 and 914 of 1858. From the answer given to them, it appeared that the above ground was divided into four portions; that it was resolved to give the third portion on Cowle to 2d Defendant; that the fourth portion was given on Cowle to the 1st Defendant; and that there was my deposition to show that I had relinquished the third and fourth portions. On the 16th Khany 1034 (30th September 1858), I presented a petition to the aforesaid Taluq Kacheri; on the 9th Medom (20th April 1859) to the Head Assistant Collector; and on the 5th Chingom (19th August 1859), 7th Khany 1035 (21st September 1859), and 20th Vreschigom (4th December 1859), to the Huzur Kacheri, stating in detail the fact of no such deposition having been given by me, and requesting, that if the Cherudayom Amshom Adigari who, prompted by cupidity and a desire to obtain possession of my land by artful means, is inducing his dependants, the Defendants to raise disputes, has gained over the 3d Gumashta, and got him to fabricate a deposition in my name, it may be cancelled, and a Cowle granted to me according to the former account. To these petitions replies were sent me by the Head Assistant Collector on the 6th July 1859, and from the Huzur Kacheri on the 6th September, stating only, that as the period (allowed for appeal) had expired, a second investigation into the matter could not be made. The Court will be convinced by the boundaries given in the indisputable documents presented herewith, and by the Pymash accounts, as well as by the result of the local inquiries to be held in the matter, that the aforesaid answer to the several petitions presented by me within the proper time is not just; that the property is my jenm, and that the Patteyom obtained for it by the Defendants by means of deceit, should be cancelled. The Court will be further convinced that the deposition which it is alleged was given by me, to the effect, that I possess no claim to the property which is enjoyed by me on jenm, is actually a fabrication.

2. I pray, therefore, that the Defendants may be summoned and examined, the Cowles which had been granted, heedless of the fraud that was practised, for the Raman Kaipad Nilom, mentioned as Nos. 3 and 4 in the Head Assistant Collector's order, the jenm value of which amounts to Rupees 60, and which is included within the boundaries given below, may be cancelled, the property taken out of the possession of the Defendants and restored to me for enjoyment, and the cost of the suit caused to be paid to me. The three jenm documents pertaining to this land and dated Medom 890 (April and May 1715), Edavom 975 (May and June 1800), and Magarom 1005 (January and February 1830), are herewith produced.

Number.	Name of the property.	Extent in Koles of 6 feet each.		Boundaries.			
		From east to west.	From north to south.	East.	South.	West.	North.
1	Ramen Kaipad, waste land mentioned above as No. 3.	76	Eastern extremity 5. Middle 6. Western extremity 55.	Our Nangala Padana.	Dam.	Land No. 2 obtained on Patteyom by 1st Defendant.	Kaipad land in my management.
2	Kaipad—Waste Land maintained as No. 4.	52	80	Land No. 1 obtained on Patteyom by 2d Defendant and Kaipada land in my management.	Dam.	Border of a river.	River.

I do hereby declare that what is stated above is true to the best of my information and belief. Dated 6th Medom 1035 (16th April 1860).

Signature of the VAKIL SHUPU NAYER.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) P. GRANT, *Collector.*

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

To the Court of Mufti Sudder Amin of Tellicherry.

The answer of P. Grant, Esq., Collector of Malabar, Supplemental 3d Defendant in Original Suit No. 237 of 1860, on the file of the above Court presented by Ambu Podwal, *alias* Mutha Podwal, Government Vakil in the above Zillah.

1. The lands stated in the plaint to have been given on Cowle to 1st and 2d Defendants, cannot, on any just grounds, be claimed by Ryots.

2. With the exception of a portion of the land No. 2, lying to the north, the remainder of that land, and the whole of the land No. 1 still form the bed of a river.

3. Cowles were granted to 1st and 2d Defendants to reclaim and cultivate the portion under the water of the river. According to local custom, such lands belong to Government. The very situation of the lands in question renders it evident that no one else can have any claim on them.

4. The northern portion of the spot No. 2 was formed by a gradual accumulation of sand from the river. That this portion also does not appertain to the Plaintiff, will be patent from the Allavu Pymash account of 982 (A. D. 1806-7), which will be filed in the Court, and in which the portion just adverted to is entered as the jenm property of Government.

5. It appears by the Title Deed of the "Ramen Kayi land" purchased by the Plaintiff's father, that it takes 15½ Podis of seed; but deducting the extent of ground required for this, there is still an excess capable of sowing 7 and odd Podis of seed. The suit, therefore, being a fictitious one, I pray that it may be dismissed with costs.

Dated February 1861.

(Signed) P. GRANT, *Collector.*

Original Suit No. 322 of 1860.

Atapuram Shangaren Embrandere of Kunaru Deshom, Kavai Taluq, *Plaintiff,*

versus

1. Jenmy Mithele Illom Damudren Embrandere,
2. Karaden Ambu,
3. P. Grant, Esq, Collector,

Defendants.

1. The Collector of Malabar reports the institution of a Suit against him for the recovery of a plot of ground which the Plaintiff claims as his "Jenm" property.

2. The Collector resists the claim on the plea that most of the land is now part of the bed of a river, and that the remainder was so, until recently. Such land by law and the usage of the District belongs to the State. The Collector relies on other circumstances—such as the survey of the land in 1806 as Government property, and the excess in Plaintiff's possession over and above his admitted Estate—as proof of the Government title.

3. The question is one of evidence, and as the Collector is confident of the justice of the claims of Government and of his ability to make good his case, the Board recommend that he may be permitted to defend the Suit at the public expense.

4. The time for filing an answer expires on the 24th instant.

(True Copies and Extract.)

To J. D. Bourdillon, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D. *Secretary.*

Copy to P. Grant, Esq., Collector of Malabar.

Exd. J. Wright.

To,

The Court of Munsiff Sader Amin of Tellicherry.

The Answer of P. Grant Esqr Collector of Malabar - Supplemental 3d Defendant in O.S. No. 237 of 1860, on the file of the above Court, presented by Ambu Podwall, alias, Muthan Podwal Government Vakib in the above Tilav.

1. The lands stated in the Plaint to have been given on Cowle to 1st & 2d Defendants cannot, on any just grounds, be claimed by ryots.

2. With the exception of a portion of the land No. 2, lying to the North, the remainder of that land, and the whole of the land No. 1 still form the bed of a river.

3. Cowles were granted to 1st & 2d Defendants to reclaim and cultivate the portion under the water of the river. According to local custom, such lands belong to Government. The very situation of

of the lands in question, renders it evident that no one else can have any claim on them.

4. The northern portion of the spot A°2 was formed by a gradual accumulation of sand from the River - That this portion also does not appertain to the Plaintiff will be patent from the Allavu Paimash account of 982, 1806/7 which will be filed in the Court, and in which the portion just adverted to, is entered as the Jenm property of Government.-

5. It appears by the title deed of the "Ramen Kayi land" purchased by the Plaintiffs' father, that it takes 15½ Podis of seed, but deducting the extent of ground required for this, there is still an excess capable of sowing 7 odd Podis of seed - The Suit therefore being a fictitious one, I pray that it may be dismissed with costs.-

Dated February 1861.

/Signed/ P. Grant.-
Collector.-

(A true Copy)

J. H. Lee
Secretary.-

Canto C.C.

To
The Court of the District Munsif
of Kavai.

The Bill of Plaint of Proprietor
Mapuram Mangaren Embranderi
of Annara Deshom Cherudayi
Amshom in the Kavai Talug.-

The following is my Bill of
Plaint against 1st the Jenny Mithele
Mom dammedren Embranderie, and 2
Karaden Ambu.

1st The Jenm right of the land called
"Ramon Kayi" sowing 15¾ Podis of seed,
situated in the aforesaid Deshom was
sold in Chingam 990 by Vayanatt
August 29 to Sept 28 1815
Nayaren Nambendri to Lejeke Karuven-
garam Embranderi, together with
the former documents appertaining
thereto and in Magayom 1005, the latter
January 29 to February 1830
Embranden sold the land to my deceased
father

father Vishnu Embranderi. The Revenue
thereof is registered in my name, and paid
by me, and I enjoy the land. altho' the
waste ground Called "Kayyat nilom," &c
included within the boundary specified
in the above documents, situated to the west
of the aforesaid land was Cultivated by
me for some years and the survey made in
my name. I presented a Petition to the
Head Assistant Collector on the 24th &c
Milnnom 1032 July 1859 requesting that a Cowle
may be granted for the reclamation and
management of the waste and the revenue
thereon foregone in consideration of
the great escpense that I would have
had to incur in improving it accord-
-ingly, the 3d. Gumashta of the Kavai
Talug came and inspected the ground,
measured it, drew out an account in
my name, and after causing it to be
signed by me, took it along with him.
Having learnt that a Cowle

was

was given to the 1st. defendant instead
of to me, according to the said account;
I presented Petitions to the Head &
Assistant Collector under Miscellaneous
Nos. 638, 841 & 914 of 1858. From the answer
given to them, it appeared that the
above ground was divided into 4 portions;
that it was resolved to give the 3d. portion
on Cowle to 2d. defendant, that the 4th.
portion was given on Cowle to the 1st.
defendant, and that there was my &
deposition to show that I had relinquished
the 3d. & 4th. portions. On the 16th. Kkanu 1034
30th. September 1858
I presented a Petition to the aforesaid Talug
Kacheri; on the 9th. Madom to the Head &
Assistant Collector, and on the 5th. Chingom
19th. August 1859,
7th. Kkanu 1035 & 20th. Vrevchigom to the
21st. September 1859 4th. December 1859
Hajur Kacheri, stating in detail the &
fact of no such deposition having been
given by me, and requesting that
if the Cherundayom Anshom Adigari,

who

who, prompted by cupidity and a desire to obtain possession of my land by artful means, is inducing his dependants, the Defendants to raise disputes, has gained over the 3rd Gumashta, and got him to fabricate a deposition in my name, it may be cancelled, and a Cowle granted to me according to the former Account. To these Petitions, Replies were sent me by the Head Assistant Collector on the 6th July 1859, and from the Huzur Kutcheri on the 6th September, stating only, that as the period (allowed for Appeal) had expired a second investigation into the matter could not be made. The Court will be convinced by the boundaries given in the indisputable documents presented herewith, and by the Paimash Accounts, as well as by the result of the Local Enquiries to be held in the matter, that the aforesaid answers to the Several

X

several petitions presented by me within the proper time is not just, that the property is my jenm, and that the Patteyam obtained for it by the Defendants by means of deceit, should be cancelled. The Court will be further convinced that the deposition which it is alleged was given by me, to the effect, that I possess no claim to the property which is enjoyed by me on Jenm, is actually a fabrication.

2 I pray therefore, that the Defendants may be summoned and examined, the Cowles which had been granted, heedless of the fraud that was practiced, for the Raman Kaipád below, mentioned as Nos. 3 and 4 in the Head Assistant Collector's order, the Jenm value of which amounts to Rs. 60, and which is included within the boundaries given below, may be cancelled, the property taken out of the possession of the Defendants and restored to me for enjoyment, and the cost of the Suit caused to be paid to me. The 3 Jenm documents pertaining to this land and dated Medom 890 April, May 1715

Edavom 975 May and June 1800 and Magarom 1005 January and February 1830. are

are herewith produced.—

Number	Name of the property	Extent in Roses of 6 feet each		Boundaries			
		From East to West	From North to South	East	South	West	North.
1	Ramen Kaipad Waste land mentioned above as No 3—	76	Eastern extremity-5 Middle-6 Western Extremity 55	Our Mangala Padana.	Pam	Land No 2 obtained on Patteyam by 1st Defdt.	Kaipad land in my management—
2	Kaipad Waste Land mentioned as No 4.———	52	80	Land No 1 obtained on Patteyam by 2d Defendant & Kaipad a land in my management	Pam	Border of a river	River

I do hereby declare that what is stated above is true to the best of my information and belief.

Dated 6th Medom 1035
16th April 1860

Signature of the ——
(True Translation) Vakil Shaper Nayer

(Signed) P. Grant
Collector

(True Copy)

Secretary.

Compd. C. Burton

R. D.

No 523.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 7th March 1861.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Submitting, a letter from the Collector of Malabar reporting the institution of O. S. No 322 of 1860 on the file of the District Munsiff of Kavai against him for the recovery of a plot of ground and recommending that he may be permitted to defend the suit at the public expense.

(Here enter 5th March 1861 No 1238.)

The Hon: the Govr: in Co. sanctions the defence, in the first instance at the public expense, of O. S. No 322 of 1860 instituted against the Coll: of Malabar and others in the Court of the Distt. Munsiff of Kavai by Ataparam Thangaven, but he will determine, when a copy of the decree shall be submitted, whether the costs, if any be adjudged against the Coll:, shall be borne by

Suit against the Coll
of Malabar

by that Officer, or by
the Govt.

10 Copies
To the Bd of Rev.
Dists-8

Lut-Som

Revenue 1861 Departt.
Pro: of Govt. for March.

No. 523.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dy. March/61.

Pro. Bd Rev: d/ 11th Oct/61
Encl 2,483 in Pro. 24th
Oct. No. 2030.

Do. do. 23 augt./62 Encl
2404 in

Defence in O. S.
No. 322 of 1860 on the file of
the District Munsif of
Kavai instituted against
the Collector of Malabar and
others, sanctioned.

Nos 111 & 112.