

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	504	Press
		~~Mis.~~
	105-106	
Dated	7-3-18	62

Not to be folded or roughly handled

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	504	~~Press~~ Mis.
Dated	Sch	19. 186.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Statement shewing the progress of the Collections of Revenue in comparison with the Budget Estimate
of 1862-63 in the District of Tanjur.
for 1862.

Heads of Revenue.	Total Es- timate of 1862-63.	COLLECTIONS.			Remarks.
		Up to this month.	In this month.	Total.	
Land Revenue and Sayer	1,220,080	133,645	71,69	131,392	
Abkarri	3,120,000	71,918	25,462	98,380	
Income Tax	62,770	32,959	13,156	46,115	
Customs	1,76,475	83,175	20,875	1,04,050	
Salt	8,15,730	2,28,706	64,639	2,92,145	
Tolls	3,11,000	57,789	24,801	81,590	
<i>Total</i>	<i>59,28,055</i>	<i>18,15,298</i>	<i>15,38,02</i>	<i>19,69,100</i>	

Tanjur

10th September 1862.

By
R. S. S. S.

C. E. S.

Collector
Ag. Collector

By
Collector

By
Collector

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th March 1862.*

No. 105. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th March 1862, No. 1,495:—

Read the following letter from H. A. BRETT, Esq., Collector of Salem, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Salem, 28th February 1862, No. 45:—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings, dated the 23rd instant, No. 1,322, forwarding a copy of the Government Order, dated 22nd February 1862, No. 389, calling for a report in the matter referred to by the Advocate General in his letter to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated the 5th February 1862.

2. It appears from the Board's Proceedings, that they have submitted to Government, since the receipt of the above order, a copy of my letter, dated the 17th February 1862, No. 29, explaining in full detail all the proceedings that have taken place in my Office, in connection with the property referred to by the Advocate General, commencing from the time the late Acting Collector first assumed charge of the property in February 1860 to the present date. I do not, therefore, see more than one or two points on which further explanation can be required.

3. With regard to paragraphs 20 and 23 of the Advocate General's letter, I beg to state that the letter described by the Advocate General as a private letter was a letter in the usual official form, and that on receipt of this letter it was, I thought, incumbent on me to comply with the Court's instructions. I looked upon the letter as equivalent to an order. A copy of the Civil Judge's letter was submitted to the Board of Revenue with my letter under date the 18th instant, No. 18, referring to the Salem Suit for the Ankusagiri property.

4. With reference to paragraphs 16 and 19, I would explain that the circumstances under which the Collector took possession of certain private lands and personal property left by the Poligar were not considered in my Office to have any bearing on the action of ejectment. The Advocate General was, I believe, consulted on the subject of the private lands and private property as a separate matter. His opinion, however, on this subject was not, it would seem, given nor asked for, till after the Civil Court of Salem had addressed me regarding the property, and had directed me to retain possession. The Opinion is dated the 4th of January last, and was given in reply to a letter from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue bearing the same date. The advice that I had before me at the time I received the Civil Judge's letter, was that given by the Government Pleader in the Sudder Court.

5. I beg leave to remark, with reference to paragraph 13, that the action of ejectment was not brought in the first instance for lands at all. It was a suit for ejecting the supposed Defendants from the possession of a Revenue Estate.

6. With regard also to the Proceedings of the Government in connection with this Estate, the Government, in determining the question of succession to the Polliam, did not in any way interfere with the possession of, or the landowner's rights in, any of the lands situated in the Polliam; nor was the Collector's act, in assuming charge of the Polliam, equivalent to taking charge of any lands therein. Though, therefore, the action of ejectment is now apparently confined to certain lands (described by the Advocate General as "certain lands other than the Polliam") there is reason to infer that the Poligar's interest in the Public Revenue is still the real subject of the suit.

7. The true object of the amendment was, I conceive, to describe the Polliam by specifying the total area of the land over which the Poligar's revenue rights extend. The extent of land entered in the amended plaint (many thousands of acres, including both waste and cultivated) seems alone sufficient to preclude the idea that the amendment was made for the purpose either of extending the claim, or for confining the claim, to the landowner's property in the private lands, the whole extent of which is only 165 acres.

Palakistramah.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th March 1862.*

8. The amended plaint may fail to express what the plaintiff intended; but, as the plaint now stands, or as it stood at first, the facts submitted to the Advocate General in the first instance were, I believe, all the facts that had any real bearing on the claim therein described. As the two kinds of property involved in this case are totally distinct in their nature, so also is the explanation to be given in respect to each; and, in the event of both kinds of property being included in the same suit, the line of defence applicable to each would necessarily be different. I trust, therefore, the Advocate General will allow that the complaint which he apparently makes in paragraph 16 is unfounded.

9. I also beg to state, with reference to paragraph 23, that I have never known any legal business transacted by means of private letters. The Advocate General believes that the practice is not "unfrequent." I have not only never seen myself any legal business so transacted, but have never heard of such a practice obtaining in any part of the country.

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their order quoted by the Collector.

2. The action for ejectment is, as stated by the Advocate General, a tissue of fictions from beginning to end; and there is no reason to doubt that the change in the plaint from the Polliam itself to the "thousands of acres, &c. &c.," was intended to obviate the objection to the Court's jurisdiction in the matter of this Polliam and to apply to the small extent of private "Kummatum" lands, which may eventually prove to be personal property and not an appanage of the Poligar's office and part of the Poliput.

3. The Board, however, understand that the Suit in ejectment has been abandoned in favor of the Suit in Equity recently instituted.

4. The letter of the Court to which the Advocate General objected as no sufficient authority has been followed up by an order submitted to Government on the 3rd March 1862.

5. If the Advocate General wrote under the impression that the letter in question was a private or demi-official one, he is acting on a wrong assumption.

6. The Board have no reason to suppose that any such practice prevails any where in the Mufassal Courts at the present time.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, Secretary.

No. 106.

ORDER THEREON, 7th March 1862, No. 504.

1. These papers will be communicated through the Judicial Department to the Advocate General in continuation of the Order in the Revenue Department, dated 26th February 1862, No. 423.

2. A copy will also be forwarded to the Government Pleader, Sudder Adalat, for his information.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

which may eventually prove to be personal property and not an appanage of the Poligar's Office and part of the Poliput.

3. The Board, however, understand that the suit in ejectment has been abandoned in favor of the suit in equity recently instituted.

4. The letter of the Court to which the Advocate General objected as no sufficient authority has been followed up by an order submitted to Government on the 3rd March 1862.

5. If the Advocate General wrote under the impression that the letter in question was a private or demi-official one, he is acting on a wrong assumption.

6. The Board have no reason to suppose that any such practice prevails any where in the Mufassal Courts at the present time.

(A true Copy & Extract)

[Signature]
Secretary.

J. D. Sim, Esq.,
Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Ed. Mas. A. S. Sander
Esq. M. Balakrishnamah.

No: 22. *St. Anthony* 1852. 449-450
 " 26. " 524-525
 Copy in letter to *St. Anthony*
 21 March 1861.

No: of *St. Anthony* 1852. 449-450
 21 March 1861.

No: 25-106.

No: 1862. *St. Anthony*
 No: of *St. Anthony* 1862. 449-450
 Specimens of the *St. Anthony*
 of *St. Anthony*.

No: 1862. *St. Anthony*
 No: of *St. Anthony* 1862. 449-450
 Specimens of the *St. Anthony*
 of *St. Anthony*.

1862.

Submitting with remarks
 letter from the *St. Anthony*
 giving explanation in re-
 spect to the order of *St. Anthony*
 23 July 1862. No: 1862. 449-450
 the *St. Anthony* visit.

1862. *St. Anthony*

With our order

11 Copies to the *St. Anthony* (1862)
 1 in *St. Anthony* (1862)
 3 in *St. Anthony* (1862)

11 Copies to the *St. Anthony* (1862)
 1 in *St. Anthony* (1862)
 3 in *St. Anthony* (1862)

1862

These persons will be

communicated through the

the judicial department

to the *St. Anthony*

General in connection

with the *St. Anthony*

20. *St. Anthony* 1862. 449-450

which will be

the *St. Anthony* visit

Government *St. Anthony*

which *St. Anthony* for the

11 Copies to the *St. Anthony* (1862)
 1 in *St. Anthony* (1862)
 3 in *St. Anthony* (1862)

1862