

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 708	Press
512.573	Mis.
Dated	31.3.1862.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
31st March 1862.*

No. 512. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th March 1862,
No. 1,514:—

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLE-
STON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Vellum, 15th February
1862, No. 58.

Sm,

	V.	M.	G.
Extent.....	0	17	85 $\frac{1}{2}$
	RE.	A.	P.
Turnf assessment	21	2	4
Deduct Cavel fees.....	0	0	0
Difference.....	21	2	4

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,466 of 1861, addressed to the Board by one Ramu Chetty, soliciting permission to sue in the established Courts for the recovery of certain Survamaniem land, &c., situated in the village of Matti Malayappanallur in the Combaconum Taluq, and the extent and value of which are noted in the margin.

2. From the inquiries made, as also from an examination of the Survamaniem records in this Office, it appears that V. 48, M. 10, G. 50 of Nanja, Panja, &c., land in the said village were, in the year 1762, granted as Survamaniem by Raja Pretapsing to certain Brahmins. The grant is entered in No. 393 of the Register made in the year 1810. The land was at the time of the register, in the enjoyment of 159 individuals.

3. Petitioner states that Latchminarayana Sastri *alias* Visvanataiyan was in enjoyment of the land, &c., now under dispute, and which had descended to him from his ancestors; that in 1855, he (Latchminarayana Sastri) mortgaged the same (the possession however being retained by himself) to Gunabalu Chetti, and borrowed of him Rupees 500 under a deed for a term of years; that term having expired, the mortgagee made over the said deed to the Petitioner receiving from him Rupees 700 inclusive of both principal and interest; and hence he (Petitioner) seeks to recover the amount by means of a Civil action regarding the land.

4. The Defendant appears to have removed to Madras, about two years ago, and before his departure he disposed of the land, &c., now under dispute to one Subbramani Aiyar, who is now in their enjoyment.

5. The particulars as to the connection of the Defendant with the original grantees cannot be traced.

6. As the case stands, I see no objection to the permission sought by the Petitioner being granted.

1. From Petitioner's own statement it appears that the party, who he is desirous of suing, succeeded to the land from his ancestors; it seems therefore probable that he is a descendant of the original grantee, and as such entitled to the protection afforded to his property by Regulation IV of 1831, and under these circumstances the Board do not concur with the Collector in considering that Petitioner's request should be granted, but resolve to submit the case to Government for their orders.

2. The Board observe that if, as stated by the Collector, the lands have been already disposed of to a third party, there would be no objection to granting permission to Petitioner to sue him for any rights he may have in them.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 513. ORDER THEREON, 31st March 1862, No. 708.

With the understanding that paragraph 2 of the foregoing Proceedings correctly sets forth the present occupation of the land in dispute, the Government, under Section 2, Regulation IV of 1831, permit Ramu Chetti to sue in the established Courts for seventeen Mas and odd of Survamaniyam land situated in Matti Malayappanallur village, Combaconum Taluq, Tanjore District.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

No. 1,514.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 7th March 1862.

Read the following letter from W. M. CADELL, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras, dated Vellum, 15th February 1862, No. 58 :—

	V. M. G.
Extent.....	0 17 35 $\frac{3}{4}$
	RS. A. P.
Taruf assessment.....	21 2 4
Deduct Cavel fee.....	0 0 0
Difference...	21 2 4

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,466 of 1861, addressed to the Board by one Ramu Chetti, soliciting permission to sue in the established Courts for the recovery of certain Survamaniem land, &c., situated in the village of Matti Malayappanallur in the Combaconum Taluk, and the extent and value of which are noted in the margin.

2. From the inquiries made, as also from an examination of the Survamaniem records in this Office, it appears that V. 48, M. 10, G. 50 of Nunjah, Punjab, &c., land in the said village were, in the year 1762, granted as Survamaniem by Raja Pretapsing to certain Brahmins. The grant is entered in No. 393 of the Register made in the year 1810. The land was at the time of the register, in the enjoyment of 159 individuals.

3. Petitioner states that Latchminarayana Sastri *alias* Visvanataiyan was in enjoyment of the land, &c., now under dispute, and which had descended to him from his ancestors; that in 1855, he (Latchminarayana Sastri) mortgaged the same (the possession however being retained by himself) to Gunabalu Chetti, and borrowed of him Rupees 500 under a deed for a term of years; that term having expired, the mortgagee made over the said deed to the Petitioner receiving from him Rupees 700 inclusive of both principal and interest; and hence he (Petitioner) seeks to recover the amount by means of a Civil action regarding the land.

4. The Defendant appears to have removed to Madras, about two years ago, and before his departure he disposed of the land, &c., now under dispute to one Subbramani Aiyar, who is now in their enjoyment.

5. The particulars as to the connection of the Defendant with the original grantees cannot be traced.

6. As the case stands, I see no objection to the permission sought by the Petitioner being granted.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. From Petitioner's own statement it appears that the party, who he is desirous of suing, succeeded to the land from his ancestors; it seems therefore probable that he is a descendant of the original grantee, and as such entitled to the protection afforded to his property by Regulation IV of 1831, and under these circumstances the Board do not concur with the Collector in considering that Petitioner's request should be granted, but resolve to submit the case to Government for their orders.

2. The Board observe that if, as stated by the Collector, the lands have been already disposed of to a third party, there would be no objection to granting permission to Petitioner to sue him for any rights he may have in them.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. H. Cadell

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.

No. 726.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 7th March 1862.
Despatched, 14 Do
Received, 15 Do
Eust 1 Do

No. 1,514.

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Tanjore reporting on Petition No 3466 of 1861, and recommending that Petitioner be permitted to sue for the recovery of certain land,

876708

With the understanding that
Paragraph 2 of the foregoing 100
Weeks correctly sets forth the
present occupation of the land
in dispute, the Government,
under Act No 14 of 1891, has
withdrew itself to sue in the
Federal Court for a decree
that said Act of Congress
shall operate in such a way
as to allow the Government
to acquire the land.

25

Jim Holt Scott
 3105 Grand Ave
 W Chicago Ill 60647

No 5124512.

22 March 1827

Miss-Elizabeth
With an answer