M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1031	Press / Mis.
204 205	
Dated 9 S. 1862	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 9th May 1862.

No. 204. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th April 1862, No. 2,498:—

Read the following letter from G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated 31st March 1862, No. 106.

SIR,

V.	M.	G.
0	4	84½

	Rs.	A.	P.
Taruf Assessment	9	2	9
Kaval fee now levied.....	0	10	0
Difference..	8	8	9

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,844 of 1861, addressed to the Board by one Strinivasaingar, applying for permission to sue for certain Survamaniem land as noted in the margin.

2. The land is included in a grant under which V. 23 M. 5 in the village of Kottayur,* were given by Raja Sahaji in the year 1696, on Survamaniem tenure to one Lakshiminarasimha Paundarikayaji. The grant accordingly appears in No. 343 of the Register made in 1810.

* Combaconum Táluq.

3. From inquiries made on the subject of this Petition, it appears that the land now in question was acquired by purchase (from whom is not known) upwards of 30 years ago by the Petitioner's forefathers. It was sold by his father about 8 years since to one Gopal Chetti (deceased), whose son one Ramaia Chetti is at present in enjoyment thereof.

4. Petitioner states that his father was by Hindu† Law incompetent to alienate immovable property without the consent of his son and next heir, the Petitioner, and it is to have the alienation so made declared null and void by a Judicial decree that he (Petitioner) seeks to resort

† Strange's Manual of Hindu Law, page 28, Section 149.

Civil action.

5. Both Petitioner's father and the party now in occupation admit the fact of the sale above mentioned, but demur to the plea set up by the Petitioner.

6. As the case stands, and as the claim of the present occupant is only based on purchase, and not on inheritance from the original grantee, it is clear that the provisions of Regulation IV of 1831, will in no way be defeated by the grant of the permission sought for by the Petitioner, and I would therefore recommend that it be accorded.

Ordered to be submitted to Government with the Board's recommendation that the Petitioner be granted the permission to sue which he desires.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 205. ORDER THEREON, 9th May 1862, No. 1,031.

Under Section 2, Regulation IV of 1831, the Government permit Strinivasaingar to sue in the established Courts for V. 0, M. 4, G. 84½ of Survamaniem land situated in Kottayur village, Combaconum Táluq, Tanjore District.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

No. 2,498.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 16th April 1862.

Read the following letter from G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated 31st March 1862, No. 106:—

V.	M.	G.
0	4	84¼

	RS.	A.	P.
Taruf assessment.....	9	2	9
Kaval fee now levied....	0	10	0
Difference...	8	8	9

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,844 of 1861, addressed to the Board by one Strinivasaiangar, applying for permission to sue for certain Survamaniem land as noted in the margin.

2. The land is included in a grant under which V. 23 M. 5 in the village of Kottayur,* were given by Raja Sahaji in the year 1696, on Survamaniem tenure to one Lakshiminarasimha Paundarikayaji. The grant accordingly appears in No. 343 of the Register made in 1810.

* Combaconum Taluk.

3. From inquiries made on the subject of this Petition, it appears that the land now in question was acquired by purchase (from whom is not known) upwards of 30 years ago by the Petitioner's forefathers. It was sold by his father about 8 years since to one Gopal Chetti (deceased), whose son one Ramaia Chetti is at present in enjoyment thereof.

4. Petitioner states that his father was by Hindu* Law incompetent to alienate immoveable property without the consent of his son and next heir, the Petitioner, and it is to have the alienation so made declared null and void by a judicial decree that he (Petitioner) seeks to resort to Civil action.

* Strange's Manual of Hindu Law, page 28, Section 149.

5. Both Petitioner's father and the party now in occupation admit the fact of the sale above mentioned, but demur to the plea set up by the Petitioner.

6. As the case stands, and as the claim of the present occupant is only based on purchase, and not on inheritance from the original grantee, it is clear that the provisions of Regulation IV of 1831, will in no way be defeated by the grant of the permission sought for by the Petitioner, and I would therefore recommend that it be accorded.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

Ordered to be submitted to Government with the Board's recommendation that the Petitioner be granted the permission to sue which he desires.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Sub-Secretary.

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

Copy to G. A. Ballard, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rev^z 1862. Department.
Pro: of Govt for 11 May.

No. 1200.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 16th *April* 1862.
Despatched. 25 ^{00}
Received. 26 th
& 10 ^{m}

No. 2,498.

Submitting letter from the Acting Collector of Tanjore reporting on Petition No 3844 of 1861, with the Board's recommendation that the Petitioner be granted the permission he desires to sue for certain Survamaniem land.

N^o 1031 9^th May
With an Order

Jr-1031-
Under Section 2 Reg
IV of 1831, the Government permit Strinivasaiengar to sue in the Established Courts for 7 M 4 0 4- 84 ½ of Survamaniem land situated in Kottayur village, Combaconum taluq, Tanjore district.

Board of Rev^e & Sudr Chokt
Dat^d 10 th