

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 779	<u>Press</u> <u>Mis.</u>
128-127	
Dated	8-11-18 62

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
8th April 1862.*

No. 128. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th March 1862, No. 1,782:—

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 Vellum, 28th February 1862, No. 78.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,058 of 1861, addressed to the Board by Narayana Tevan, soliciting permission to sue in the established Courts for the recovery of certain Shróttrium land situated in the village of Kilvalkulacherri in the Manargudi Táluq, and the extent and value of which are noted in the margin.

Extent.....	V. M. G. 0 3 52
Taruf assessment.....	Rs. A. P. 4 10 8
Deduct Shróttrium Jólí..	1 8 11
Difference.....	3 1 9

2. From the inquiries now made, as also from an examination of the Sarvamaniyam records in this Office, it appears that V. 21, M. 10, G. 0 of land in the village of Valkulacheri Kiriya-penkatlai were, in the year 1780, granted by Tulja Maharájá to Venkat Ráu Dadaji and ten others on Shróttrium tenure. The Arza Rokkha, which is forthcoming in support of the grant, is not registered.

3. Petitioner states that his ancestors were Mirásidárs of the said village, and as such acquired possession of the land now under dispute, when a certain extent of land in the village was granted by the Rájá above specified to some Brahmins on Shróttrium tenure; that Marudai-vandaian and others having subsequently usurped possession of the same, he (Petitioner) sued for the recovery thereof, and having obtained decrees in his favor both in the Original and Appellate Courts, was put in possession of the land under the said decrees; that the Defendants in the meanwhile representing that, in the absence of the express sanction from Government, the land was not subject to the process of the Court had themselves placed in possession of the land; and that therefore he (Petitioner) seeks to move the Court for the recovery of the land on producing the Government sanction.

4. The Defendant admits the Petitioner's statement with reference to the decrees of the Original and Appeal Courts in regard to the land, but states that he has obtained a decree in his favor by the Special Appeal Court, and that he has long been in the enjoyment of the land.

5. In the Pymaish account of Fasli 1239, M. 2, G. 3½ of the land in dispute are entered in the name of Ramateyan, Petitioner's father, and M. 1, G. 48½ as Gramasamudayam.

6. In the Anubhogum Register of Fasli 1238 the whole of the disputed land is entered in the name of the Petitioner's father.

7. Neither of the contending parties appears to be, in any way, connected with the original grantees, and I therefore see no objection to the required permission being granted.

Ordered to be submitted to Government, with the Board's recommendation that the Petitioner be granted the permission to sue in the established Courts which he solicits.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 129. ORDER THEREON, 8th April 1862, No. 779.

Under Section 2, Regulation IV of 1831, the Government permit Narayana Tevan to sue in the established Courts for three Mas and odd of Shróttrium land situated in Kilvalkulacherri village of Manargudi Táluq, Tanjore District.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

No. 1,782.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 18th March 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 Vellum, 28th February 1862, No. 78 :—

	V. M. G.	
Extent.....	0 3 52	
	RS. A. P.	
Taruf assessment ...	4 10 8	
Deduct Shrotrium Jodi.	1 8 11	
Difference....	3 1 9	

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,058 of 1861, addressed to the Board by Narayana Tevan, soliciting permission to sue in the established Courts for the recovery of certain Shrotrium land situated in the village of Kilvalkulacherri in the Manargudi Taluk, and the extent and value of which are noted in the margin.

2. From the inquiries now made, as also from an examination of the Suivamaniem records in this Office, it appears that V. 21, M. 10, G. 0 of land in the village of Valkulacheri Kiriyaippenkatlai were, in the year 1780, granted by Tulja Maharaja to Venkat Row Dadaji and ten others on Shrotrium tenure. The Arza Rokkha, which is forthcoming in support of the grant, is not registered.

3. Petitioner states that his ancestors were Mirasidars of the said village, and as such acquired possession of the land now under dispute, when a certain extent of land in the village was granted by the Raja above specified to some Brahmins on Shrotrium tenure; that Marudaivandaian and others having subsequently usurped possession of the same, he (Petitioner) sued for the recovery thereof, and having obtained decrees in his favor both in the original and Appellate Courts, was put in possession of the land under the said decrees; that the Defendants in the meanwhile representing that, in the absence of the express sanction from Government, the land was not subject to the process of the Court had themselves placed in possession of the land; and that therefore he (Petitioner) seeks to move the Court for the recovery of the land on producing the Government sanction.

4. The Defendant admits the Petitioner's statement with reference to the decrees of the Original and Appeal Courts in regard to the land, but states that he has obtained a decree in his favor by the Special Appeal Court, and that he has long been in the enjoyment of the land.

5. In the Paimash account of Fasli 1239, M. 2, G. 3½ of the land in dispute are entered in the name of Ramatevan, Petitioner's father, and M. 1, G. 48½ as Gramasamudayam.


6. In the Anubhogum Register of Fasli 1258 the whole of the disputed land is entered in the name of the Petitioner's father.

7. Neither of the contending parties appears to be, in any way, connected with the original grantees, and I therefore see no objection to the required permission being granted.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

Ordered to be submitted to Government, with the Board's recommendation that the Petitioner be granted the permission to sue in the established Courts which he solicits.

(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.

