

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 482	<u>Press</u> ~~Mis~~
432. 433	
Dated 22 . 2 . 1866 .	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 482	<u>Press</u> ~~Misc~~
432, 433	
Dated	22 . 2 . 1866 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd February 1866.*

No. 432. Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Kistna District, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Masulipatam, 16th February 1866, No. 10 :—

1. In reply to Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 44, dated 6th January 1866, Revenue Department, I have the honor to inform you that, in correspondence with the Civil Judge of Guntoor, I find that in Original Suit No. 15 of 1865, M. Narsimha Puntulu, the 2nd Defendant, is described as the "Sumsrooshtatandri," or re-united father, of M. Ananta Lutchminursu, the 1st defendant. The Plaintiff's name is Tota Gopayya. The 1st Defendant obtained a postponement of the case, pleading the absence of Narsimha Puntulu, his father, after whose arrival he promised to pay up the sum claimed, viz., Rupees 26,325-2-8. Narsimha Puntulu returned in July, and put off the Plaintiff from time to time until he, Plaintiff, was forced to proceed for the recovery of the money.

2. The second Suit is No. 16 of 1865, in which the Sallapally Zemindar sues M. Ananta Lutchminursu Puntulu and M. Narsimha Puntulu (his father) for a balance of rent due by the 1st Defendant, and loss sustained by the Zemindar by his having to rent the villages at a lower rental, the amount sued for is Rupees 1,20,146-9-0. The Defendants visited the Zemindar at Sallapally, as admitted by their Pleader in Court, and the second Defendant (the Deputy Collector) went with his Pleader to Guntoor, when he overstayed his leave.

3. There is yet a third Suit, in which M. Ananta Lutchminursu (the Deputy Collector's son) sues the Sallapally Zemindar for Rupees 3,90,018-7-0, the estimated amount of loss sustained by the latter cancelling his first lease. The first lease was for 68 villages, and the second for 25 villages.

4. For these cases a Pleader of the High Court is employed by the Deputy Collector and his son.

5. The Deputy Collector's son is also the transferee of Decree, Chava Verama *versus* the Potur family, from Lachimipati Naidu of the Vasserreddi Estate, who originally purchased it from Chava Verama. The transferee will soon get possession of these bonds from the Court, and will then be in a position to sue the Zemindar of Sallapally, and this appears to be held, *interrorem*, over the Zemindar.

6. Whether the Deputy Collector Narsimha Puntulu is re-united with his son or not, will, Mr. Hodgson informs me, be tried on the 2nd July 1866.

7. I am unable, therefore, to say whether a division now exists or ever took place, but considering that Lachminarsu Puntulu, the Deputy Collector's son, is said to be only twenty years of age, the presumption is that no division exists or ever did exist, and that Narsimha Puntulu is actually the principal in all the litigations herein reported.

8. Should the Government deem necessary, I should be happy to forward Mr. Hodgson's letter with enclosures, which are very lengthy.

No. 433. ORDER THEREON, 22nd February 1866, No. 482.

Miscellaneous.

The Collector will forward the papers referred to in paragraph 8 of his letter, and also report in due course the result of the trial mentioned in paragraph 6.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

To the Collector of Kistna District.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Puntulu returned in July and put off the Plaintiff

No. 10

Kistna District
Collector's Kacheri
Marsulipatam
16th February 1866

From T. A. N. Chase Esq^r
Acting Collector of Kistna Dt

To J. D. Sim Esquire
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort Saint George

Sir,

In reply to Proceedings of the
Madras Government No 44 dated 6th January 1866
Revenue Department, I have the honor to
inform you that on correspondence with the
Civil Judge of Guntur I find that in original
suit No 15 of 1865 M. Varsimha Pantulu the
2^d Defendant is described as the "Sumerooshta
tandee" or re-united father, of M. Ananta
Lutchiminsu the 1st Defendant - The Plaintiff's
name is Tata Gopayya - The 1st Defendant
obtained a postponement of the case pleading
the absence of Varsimha Pantulu his father,
after whose arrival, he promised to pay up the
sum claimed namely Rs 26325.-2-8. Varsimha
Pantulu returned in July and put off the
Plaintiff

by himself, by his
codefendants, his son,
or by their attorney?
W.D.

N. Parul of course
say he knows nothing
of them!

perhaps it were the alleged
fact that the Pelt's
statement

Plaintiff from time to time until he, Plaintiff, was forced to proceed for the recovery of the money -

2 The second suit is N° 16 of 1865 in which the Sallapally Zemindar sues Mr. Anantur Lutchmunnarsu Pantulu and M. Tarsimha Pantulu / his father / for a balance of rent due, by the 1st Dependents and lost sustained by the Zemindar by his having to rent the villages at a lower rental, the amount sued for is Rs 120/46-9-". The Dependents visited the Zemindar at Sallapally, as admitted by their Pleader in Court, and the 2^d Defendant (the Deputy Collector / went with his Pleader to Guntur, when he overstayed his leave -

3 There is yet a 3^d suit in which Mr. Anantur Lutchmunnarsu / the Deputy Collector's son / sues the Sallapally Zemindar for Rs 3,900/18-7-". The estimated amount of loss sustained by the latter cancelling his 1st lease. The 1st lease was for 68 villages and the 2^d for 25 villages -

4 For these cases a Pleader of the High Court is employed by the Deputy Collector and his son -

5 The Deputy Collector's son is also the transferee of decess, Chava Virama versus the

Potter family from Lachinipati trader of the Vassereddi Estate, who originally purchased it from Chava Virama. The transferee will soon get possession of these bonds from the Court and will then be in a position to sue the Zemindar of Sallapally and this appears to be held in favor over the Zemindar -

6 Whether the Deputy Collector's son, Chava Pantulu is re-united with his son or not, will, Mr Hodgson informs me, be tried on the 2^d July 1866 -

7 I am unable therefore to say whether a division now exists or ever took place, but considering that Lachmunnarsu Pantulu the Deputy Collector's son is said to be only 20 years of age, the presumption is, that no division exists or ever did exist, and that Tarsimha Pantulu is actually the principal in all the litigations herein reported -

8 Should the Government deem necessary I shall be happy to forward Mr Hodgson's letter with enclosures, which are very lengthy -

I have the honor to be

Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant
J. Caste
Acting Collector.

Minor cases at
H. by K. S. Law.
W. Y.

Sup J. D. C. S. S. S.
H. C.

1880-1884

1866
Oct 10
of Southey 8-10

from
all
of
the

The Helms Society
of Indiana District

the Secretary

to Government
Revenue Department

20th. Jan. 1894

Dated 16th February 1866
Received

9. 20/10.

measures have

Government-Feeding dates

16th January 1866 & 1944, that the Aggravation is that no

division exists or even did

exists between the partnership
partners and his son and

that - ^{the} - ~~particular~~ position

is a necessary consequence of
in all the litigation referred.

To - 10489.83 only
W. H. W. Order

98.482.

the Liberator with forward

the nations are found to

in June 1846

and also be fresh in

2. 14. 15

See sketch in case

the first been much

3. June 1917

College of the Holy and

✓ ✓ Wm.

22⁹ July 1881

10432 VZ33.

To the Board of Trustees of the
Anti-Slavery Bazaar of N. Y.

22° 57' 10" N.