

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1335

Press
Mis.

295-296

Dated

19 - 6 - 1862

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
19th June 1862.*

No. 295. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th May 1862, No. 3,482:—

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Masulipatam, 10th May 1862, No. 103.

SIR,

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 67 of 1861, (herewith returned), I have the honor to state that the Petitioners complain that one Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayena Avadhanulu declined to give them up their shares in the Inám lands situated in the four villages noted in the margin, and pray that they may be permitted to sue him in the Civil Court.

1 Chennabhotlapallem.
1 Jagarlamudi.
1 Devarapalli.
1 Pedavogirala in the Bapatla Division.

2. The said Lakshmi Narayena Avadhanulu states that during the life-time of his father, the Inám lands belonging to the whole family were divided, and the Petitioners received their shares in the same; that the Inám land situated in the village of Uppalapadu fell to the share of the Petitioners; but that it was since attached for arrears of Bediga, and incorporated with Seri; that he subsequently granted to the Petitioners 7 Vissams and 12 Piras of land out of the property* which had fallen to his share, for their maintenance; and the Petitioners have nothing to complain of.

3. No inquiry was instituted by the Inám Commissioner regarding the Agraharam of Chennabhotlapallem, and therefore, neither was the quit-rent fixed, nor was a Title Deed granted.

4. The circumstances regarding the Inám lands situated in the other three villages were inquired into, Title Deeds granted, and the quit-rent fixed, as particularized below:—

Villages.	Names of the holders of Title Deeds.	No. of the Title Deed.	Land.		Quit-rent.
			A.	C.	
Davarapalli Prattipad Taluq... ..	Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayena Avadhanulu.....	771	9	19	2 0 0
	Dhulipala Venkatanarsu and Yeganna.....	7	5	40	2 0 0
Jagarlamudi Martur Taluq... ..	Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayena... ..	687	5	12	0 4 0

5. Under the foregoing circumstances, I see no objection to the Petitioners being authorized to sue their opponent in the Civil Court, for the recovery of their share in the Inám lands, situated in the Agraharam village of Chennabhotlapallem above referred to.

6. In the three other villages, the Ináms having been enfranchized by the Inám Commissioner, no certificates need be granted by Government under Regulation IV of 1831.

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their Endorsement on Petition 266 of 1861, and with the Board's recommendation that the required permission be granted as proposed by the Collector in the case of the Agraharam village of Chennabhotlapallem.

2. No permission seems necessary as regards the three other villages mentioned in the Petition.

(A true Copy and Extract.)
(Signed) C. G. MASTER, Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 296.

1 Chennabhotlapallem.
1 Jagarlamudi.
1 Devarapalli.
1 Pedavogirala in the Bapatla Division.

ORDER THEREON, 19th June 1862, No. 1,355.

Under Section 2, Regulation IV of 1831, the Government permit Yagunnah and Striramulu to sue in the established Courts for their shares in certain Inám lands situated in the villages of the Kistna District noted in the margin, withheld from them by Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayena Avadhanulu.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th May 1862.

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Masulipatam, 10th May 1862, No. 103:—

1. With reference to the Board's Endorsement on Petition No. 67 of 1861 (herewith returned), I have the honor to state that the Petitioners complain that one Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayana Avadhanulu declined to give them up their shares in the Inam lands situated in the four villages noted in the margin, and pray that they may be permitted to sue him in the Civil Court.

2 The said Lakshmi Narayana Avadhanulu states that during the life-time of his father, the Inam lands belonging to the whole family were divided, and the Petitioners received their shares in the same; that the Inam land situated in the village of Uppalapadu fell to the share of the Petitioners; but that it was since attached for arrears of Bediga, and incorporated with Seri; that he subsequently granted to the Petitioners 7 Vissams and 12 Piras of land out of the property* which had fallen to his share, for their maintenance; and the Petitioners have nothing to complain of.

3. No inquiry was instituted by the Inam Commissioner regarding the Agraharum of Chennabhotlapallem, and therefore, neither was the quit-rent fixed, nor was a title deed granted.

4. The circumstances regarding the Inam lands situated in the other three villages were inquired into, title deeds granted, and the quit-rent fixed, as particularized below:—

Villages.	Names of the holders of Title Deeds.	No. of the Title Deed.	Land.		Quit-rent.		
			A.	C.	RS.	A.	P.
Davarapalli Prattipad Taluk.....	Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayana Avadhanulu.....	771	9	19	2	0	0
Jagarlamudi Martur Taluk.....	Dhulipala Venkatanarsu and Yeganna.....	7	5	40	2	0	0
Pedavogirala Challa-palli Taluk.....	Dhulipala Lakshmi Narayana.....	687	5	12	0	4	0

5. Under the foregoing circumstances, I see no objection to the Petitioners being authorized to sue their opponent in the Civil Court, for the recovery of their share in the Inam lands, situated in the Agraharum village of Chennabhotlapallem above referred to.

6. In the three other villages, the Inams having been enfranchized by the Inam Commissioner, no certificates need be granted by Government under Regulation IV of 1831.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their Endorsement on Petition No. 67 of 1861, and with the Board's recommendation that the required permission be granted as proposed by the Collector in the case of the Agraharum village of Chennabhotlapallem.

2. No permission seems necessary as regards the three other villages mentioned in the Petition.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Acting Sub-Secretary.

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

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

10 The Service/STN April 7-48
107 " " May 22-48
26 " May 22-48 - 4872-4883

Rev. = 1842. Department.
 Bro: of Govt for Quince

1592-1593

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 30th May 1862.

Despatched. 4 June

Received. - 50.00

Ex. 1. 23

No. 3,482.

Submitting letter from the Collector of this Kistna District reporting on Petition No 67 of 1861, with the Board's remarks thereon and recommendation that Petitioner be granted permission to sue for his Inam share in the Agraharam village of Chennabhotlapallehm.

Ms. A. 9. 2. 5. 4. 296.

to 1885-19 June.

Wm. C. C. C.

6/1/35. h-1355-

Wieder-deid, Ogen N. d. 1831

The Gen. Inform. of the German and Aust.

of the mind - it was in the culmination

Wouldn't for them otherwise in our hands

Sharon Leach, 6141 13th St.,
St. Louis, Mo.

William of the Sea-Down. Obedient

metastatic nodules in the margin.

with the following observations:

*My little girl has had her first
experience.*

Parry's "Spiritualism."

John W. Lewis
120 June 1862

Dear Mr. C.

The Editor of the Boston Herald