M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2880 Press Mis.

573-574

Dated 25-10- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
25th October 1866.

No. 573. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue :—

Submitting, for consideration and orders, questions raised by Collector of Vizagapatam in connection with Board's orders on Petitions Nos. 2,921 and 3,693 of 1865, regarding grant of a Puttah for certain land. } (Here enter 25th September 1866, No. 6,867.)

No. 574. ORDER THEREON, 25th October 1866, No. 2,880.

Land Revenue.

1. No appeal against the decision of the Board having been made by the parties interested, the Government deem it inexpedient to pronounce any opinion on the merits of the case submitted.

2. The Board have the same authority to revise decisions under the Durkhast Rules as they have to revise all other orders issued by Collectors.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Extract from an "Official Memo" dated 21st August 1861, sent to the Principal Assistant Collector.

x x x x

4. The 3rd item is that of "Nagadmaphs" amounting to Rs 8135-5-3. This is on lands cultivated but represented as of an inferior description. This system took its rise some 15 years ago when prices were low and unremunerating, and when the Permanent Pattah was not in vogue.

5. The Collector now considers that the system of "Nagadmaphs" should no longer exist, and would request that all Ryots holding lands at reduced rents be informed that they must, if they wish to continue to hold them, pay the full rent, or should be required to relinquish them to others who are willing to take them, of whom there are understood to be a great number.

6. It will be observed that several villages are now on rent; to these, with the exception of the Hill villages, the foregoing remarks cannot now apply; but they should be made applicable whenever the rents expire, and it is the Collector's wish that no villages be hereafter rented.

7. As regards the "Hill villages" they must be continued on rent, but there is no reason why some of the renters should not pay the full rent of their lands, as is the case with the renters of Lambasinghy, Lothugedda, Goodem, Untadah, Chittempandu and Bundevulsah.

8. The sum annually lost under this head is Rs 995, and the Collector is of opinion that the

the renters noted in the margin should be called upon to pay in full or nearly, from the current Fasly. The Principal Assistant will, when at Narsapatam, send the requisite notice to the parties concerned and obtain their replies. The renters should be informed that if they do not agree to pay full sist, their Muttahs will be let out to others.

	Gudicutta	Nazadmaph
1 Dutsurty Mootah	1200	600
2 Maharum do.	500	200
3 Coyoor do.	400	80
4 Gudelaru do.	80	45
5 Guntaseema do	70	70
	2250	995

/ Signed / C. Lane
Collector

/ True Extract /

By Hornby
Assistant for Collector

J. Nr. P.

1865
Revenue Department
Enclosure 1

In an Endorsement
from the Collector of
Vizagapatam dated 19th
January 1866
Forwarding
The Collector of
Vizagapatam
To
The Secretary
to the Board of Revenue
Fort Saint George
In No. 2921/66

Extract from an official Memorandum
dated 21st August 1861.

Rev: 343 7/66.

Proposes October 16. 1873

B373-571

dered to operate to the hardship of these Rayats on the contrary the Tasildar gave them with mustaten leniency five or six

the renter

1 Defendt Ga

Appeal Suit No. 2 of 1865.

Plaintiffs / Respondents | Defendant / Appellant /

1. Munsri Virapa. | Boodharaza Venka

2 Venkaya | -tapati Rauza.

It appears here that the Nagadi Mof or remission of portion of the Assessment, which obtains in certain villages of the Govt. Taluqs here, was ordered to be discontinued from and after the present Fusly 1275.

2. Amongst others, the two Ryots who are the Plaintiffs in this case, declined to hold their lands on the new footing of no remission under the head of Nagadi Maf and gave in Rajinamahs accordingly to the Tasildar under date 3rd July.

3 Accordingly the lands were made over on the new condition to defendant the Darkastdar.

4 The Plaintiff appealed to the Dt. Aft. on the ground that at time they gave in the Rajinama aforesaid "they were out of their proper senses in consequence of family Calamities.

5. The Dt. Aft. did not investigate this declaration probably declining it too absurd for enquiry, but he adjudges the restoration of the lands to Plaintiffs because "the Tasildar did wrong in accepting resignation from them after the 31st May.

6 Allusion is here made, it is presumed to Rule 2 of the revised Kooloumnamah which holds a Ryot responsible for the sist of all his lands for the ensuing year, unless he tenders a relinquishment of the same or any portion of it on or before the 31st May of the current year or Fusly but it is obvious to remark that the intention of the term allowed not be considered to operate to the hardship of these Ryots on the contrary the Tasildar gave them with mustaken leniency five or six

additional weeks for consideration.- The orders to strike off "Sagadi wof" for the future was circulated by the D.C "Asst" in December last and ofcourse was widely known a few Rayats and a few only continued abstinate and preferred relin=quishing their lands to holding them under the new Condition.

The Tasildar gave them time to think over it and they still continued abstinate, finally resigning the lands formally on the 3rd July. This leniency extention of the time limited was no disadvantage to the Ryots and it appears far from equitable that the Defendant should be injured by it. The Plaintiffs did whatever sooner or later- resign their holdings with the usual formalities upon which the Defendant applies to accept the lands under the conditions rejected by those parties his offer was accepted and he must be upheld as the occupant.

Decision of D.C. Asstt. reversed.

17th August 1865

Signed D. F. Carmichael.
Collector.

Pros: 3487/65
Cuttack 29/12/65
Trans: Cuttack 15 Dec 1865
P 28th Dec 65
D 13-3-66

5
2

To,

The Revenue Board Madras.

Special appellant Plffs
1 Muntry Venkiah
2 Y. Veerappa

1 Defendant Boodda raza Venkatapaty Razu garu residing in Mamidivada in Salem Talug.-

These 2 persons are the hereditary Pattadars of Kottoor attached to Sarvasiddi Talug in the zillah of Vizagapatam.

No. 1. Appellant is the Village Munsiff.

The appellants requesting the reversal of the order dated 17th August last passed by the Collector, upon the decision No. 11 of 1865 of the Principal Assistant Collector of the District, submit herewith the Copies of the decisions of both Courts.

1. The 1st appellant has got land bearing a sist of 190 Rs. & the 2nd bearing a sist of 105 Rs, thus we two persons residing in Kottoor of Sarvasiddy Talug, continue to cultivate from a long time the Zeraayat land bearing a Tiruva of 295 Rs. in all, and to pay the Kist to Circar having Pattas issued in our names.

2. The Tahsildar informed us on the 18th June

June last, that the remission of Rs. 30-5-" upon our Patta lands, should be paid back as per Principal Assistant Collectors orders Nos. 157, & 421, respectively dated 20th June & 17th September 1864- We told him that the former Collr. made the remission as we had sustained loss in our Patta lands, and that as per Boards Hookumnamah it should be collected within the 31st May, and that to Collect the same now is not just:-

3. Upon the Tasildar writing an Arzy in respect of the aforesaid matter on the 21st June, the Principal Assistant Collr. passed an order No. 867 on the 24th June, to the effect that business should be conducted in accordance with that Hookoomnama.

4 While the appellants were out of their sense, in consequence of the death of the 2nd Appellants wife & when the appellant himself was insensible owing to the attack of Cholera, the Tahsildar told them on the 3rd July, that they should pay the said Nagadu Raf (or ready money remission,) if not they should relinquish the

the Patta lands, then the appellants knew nothing about what took place in consequence of their insensibility, but on a Darkast being presented by the Respondent that we have given up the lands, and that they should be made over to him, the Tahsildar accordingly put the Respondent in possession of our Patta lands.

5. We presented an Arzy to the Assistt. Collr. on the 10th July last, stating that we have not relinquished the land with our consent, that the Tahsildar in opposition to the Hookumnama admitted the Darkast of the Respondent, and made over our Patta lands to him- The Principal Assistant taking into his consideration these facts, passed proceedings dated 20th July 1865 to the effect, that the Patta lands should be made over to the appellants, and the Darkast presented by the Respondent to the Tahsildar should be rejected,- accordingly we were restored to our lands.

6. Upon Respondents appealing to the Collector, he without any enquiry confirmed the

the Darkast presented to the Tahsildar by the Respondent, cancelled the Principal assistant's order, & passed an order No 2 dated 17th August 1865, to put our Patta lands in possession of the Respondent. We cite instances to prove that this was erroneously and unjustly passed.

1. The relinquishment of land by us was not done Voluntarily; but it was done when we were not in possession of our senses.

2. There is no reason to confirm such relinquishment. It is said in the 2nd Para of the Kooteoomnamah passed by the Board of Revenue, that any change in the Yarayaty lands should be made before the 31st May, and not subsequent to it; and that order is carried out thro out the Distt; altho we made proposals to offer the remission money, yet the Respondent's Darkast was approved, and the lands which we were enjoying from a long time were put in his possession; the Board will consider these facts for the sake of justice.

3. The Collector states in his order, that an order was passed in December by the Principal Assistant Collector for the refundment of the remission money, that a few persons might have known the same, & that it is our fault not to have paid the remission money, although the Tahsildar gave 5 or 6 weeks time.

While it is the fault of the Revenue officers in not having mentioned to us (appellants) that the same should be collected within the 31st May in accordance with Circular orders, it is not just to accuse us to be guilty of the same.

The Tahsildar did not give us 5 or 6 weeks time to pay the said remission money. Its not having been mentioned in the Decree is itself a proof.

7. We humbly pray that the Board will take all these foregoing statements

their consideration, cancel the order passed by the Collector, and put us in possession of our Patta lands, confirming the decision of the Principal Assistant Collector.

18th Sept 1865.

Translation.

Mosbrahmania Shastry.

No. 1,685.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 12th March 1866.

Read the following paper from B. HORSBURGH, Esq., Assistant, for Collector, Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 19th January 1866:—

Endorsement on Petitions Nos. 2,921 and 3,693 of 1865, of the Board's file.

1. In reply to paragraph 1 of the Board's endorsement, dated 20th ultimo, the accompanying extract from an Official Memorandum, dated 21st August 1861, explanatory of the system of Nagadmaph, is forwarded.

	Rs.	A.	P.
1. In Fusly 1270.—Vide paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Settlement Report, dated 27th August 1861	694	6	1
2. In Fusly 1271.—Vide paragraph 9 of do. of the 9th September 1862	175	2	0
3. In Fusly 1272.— do. 8 of do. of 24th August 1863...	839	11	6
4. In Fusly 1273.— ,, do. 6 of do. of 6th September 1864...	86	4	0
5. In Fusly 1274	323	4	7
Total ...	2,118	12	2

2. The recoveries under this head since Fusly 1270 have been annually reported, and are given in the margin for facility of reference.

3. In reply to paragraph 2, it is stated that there is no record to show how long petitioners have held those lands, but they themselves say that they held them for the last ten and twenty years, respectively.

2. The Darkhastdar, it appears, holds only a small piece of pasture land in the petitioners' village.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Extract from an Official Memorandum, dated 21st August 1861.

1. The Board consider that the Collector would have exercised a wise discretion had he allowed the decision of the Principal Assistant to stand.

2. It is evident that although the former and long standing occupants of the land in question did hastily and foolishly relinquish their valuable property, they almost immediately afterwards repented of their act and endeavoured to cancel it, the Razinama being dated 3rd July, and the application to withdraw it on 10th idem, and under these circumstances the Board consider that the order making over the land to a third party cannot equitably be upheld.

3. The Collector will be good enough to restore the land to the former holders on condition of their re-imbursing the Darkhastdar for any reasonable expenses he may have incurred on it.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 2,966.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 27th April 1866.

Read the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 27th March 1866, No. 284 :—

1. Referring to Board's Proceedings, No. 1,685, dated 12th March instant, I have the honor to state that the Durkhastdar stoutly refuses to leave the farm relinquished by the Board's Petitioners, and I can discover no lawful and peaceable means of ejecting him, especially as the Puttah at the last Jummahbundy was issued in his name. He states that, on entering upon the possession of this farm, he gave up a valuable lease he held in a neighbouring Zemindary, and that he has spent several hundred Rupees in improving the present tenement. His refusal to give up the land is, however, unconditional; a tender of the money he has laid out he rejects utterly.

2. I apprehend, therefore, that it only remains for the Petitioners to sue him in Civil Court—*Ubi jus ibi remedium*, if indeed this is not one of those cases where there has been *damnum abs que injuria*.

—

Under the circumstances reported, the only course open to the Collector is to cancel the Puttah given to the Durkhastdar, and to issue a new Puttah to the Petitioner, leaving him to regain possession of the land through the Civil Courts. Mr. Carmichael should be especially careful that both Petitioner and his opponent are supplied with a certified copy of the order now to be issued, cancelling the previous order granting a Puttah to the Durkhastdar.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

Exd. J. Wright
Rec'd 25 Apl 1866 -

1866. Department

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Rec'd 27/4/66.

Dated 12th March 1866.

E/-/-

No. 1,685.

Rec'd 25th April 1866

Directing Collector of Vizagapatam to restore to Petitioners in Nos 2981 and 3693 of 1865 the Puttah land claimed by them, on condition of their re-imbursing the Durkhastdar for any reasonable expenses he may have incurred on it.

P. 25 April 1866

Directing Collector of Vizagapatam to issue a new Puttah to Petitioners in Nos 2921 and 3693 of 1865 for land relinquished by them, and to cancel that given to Durkhastdar.

No. 2,966.

Dated 27th April 1866.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

1866. Department.

No. 3,851.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th June 1866.

Read the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th May 1866, No. 391 :—

Referring to Board's Proceedings, No. 2,966, of 27th April ultimo, I beg to state that the Durkhastdar and the Board's Petitioner appeared before me this day, in order that I might carry out the Board's instructions in the matter. But it has proved impossible to do so, the Durkhastdar altogether refusing to give up the Puttah, and the Petitioner declining to take a new Puttah, unless the land is simultaneously made over to him in a summary way. The intervention of a Civil Suit he views with abhorrence and alarm.

---

1. The Collector should have supplied the Durkhastdar with an order informing him that in accordance with the orders of the Board, the Collector had cancelled his previous order, granting the Durkhastdar a Puttah, and that the Puttah so granted was, consequently, valueless. The Petitioner should have been, at the same time, furnished with a Puttah, on which a certificate should have been endorsed to the effect, that the Puttah was granted in lieu of one which had been granted to another party, and subsequently had been cancelled by an order of a certain date. Mr. Carmichael should now adopt this course, and report the result to the Board.

2. He should also be careful to receive payment of the Kists from the Petitioner only, and to grant receipts for the same to no other person but him; and the Board trust that by this means, and with the Collector's aid, the Petitioner will be re-instated without further trouble, or the necessity of a Civil Suit.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

1866. Department

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 5th June 1866

No. 3,851.

Issuing instructions to Collector of Vizagapatam for granting a Puttah for certain land in district to Petitioner in Nos 2921 and 3693 of 1865, and cancelling that already given to Durkhastdar.

No. 6,867.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 25th September 1866.

Read the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd July 1866, No. 518:—

1. I beg to inform the Board, with reference to their Proceedings, No. 3,851, of 5th June ultimo, that the Board's petitioners and the Durkhastdar appeared before me yesterday. I offered the new puttahs, duly endorsed with the certificate specified by the Board, to the petitioners, but they persisted in declining to accept them, unless the land was simultaneously made over to them in a summary way. The "Order" specified by the Board was at the same time handed to the Durkhastdar, with due intimation of its contents: but acting apparently under legal advice, he said he could not think of accepting any such order. Late last evening, as I was leaving the office, the Board's petitioners said they had changed their mind. They were told, therefore, to call this morning, when the documents were made over to them in the presence of the Durkhastdar, who, however, has not changed *his* mind.

2. In further compliance with the orders received, the Tahsildar has been directed not to receive any payments of kist from the Durkhastdar. I know not that anything more remains to be done. I am enjoined indeed to give my "*aid*" to the petitioners, which, coming in addition to the other means employed, it is expected will "re-instate the petitioners without further trouble or "the necessity of a Civil Suit;" but it will occur to the Board, on reflection, that in a matter of this delicate and somewhat exceptional nature, I should not be safe for a moment, except when acting under the most clear and specific directions.

3. And, now, having carried out the Board's instructions, as far as it was possible for me to do so, I have the honor to request that the papers may be laid before Government,* in order that it may be determined whether—

* Circular Order, Board of Revenue, 22nd February 1836.

(1.) The Board's petitioners are entitled to relief, at the expense of the Durkhastdar, after solemnly resigning their puttahs.

(2.) Whether the puttah granted to the Durkhastdar can be cancelled without his consent, it being conceded that the District authorities were acting within the scope of the authority delegated to them, that there was no irregularity, and that the petitioners have no case except that, at the end of a week's consideration, they felt they had done a foolish thing in resigning their puttahs.

(3.) Whether it can be expected that the proceedings taken against the Durkhastdar will be upheld in a Civil Court, especially when it is considered, as has been already represented, that in order to engage in the cultivation of these lands, he gave up his farm in a neighbouring Zemindary.

(4.) Whether it is expedient in any case that the officers of Government should resort to other means than regular Civil process through a Court of competent jurisdiction, when they wish to set right what they conceive to have gone wrong in a matter affecting private rights of this nature.

4. I may add that the Durkhastdar has not the slightest intention of waiving the right which he is advised he has in the land.

Board's Proceedings, 12th March 1866, No. 1,685, with enclosure.
Board's Proceedings, 27th April 1866, ,, 2,966.
Do. do. 5th June 1866, ,, 3,851.
Translation of Appeal Petition No. 2,921 of 1865.
Copy of Collector's order, dated 17th August 1865.

1. Resolved that the foregoing letter, together with the papers noted in the margin, be submitted for the consideration and orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, as desired by the Collector.

2. In September last year, two ryots of Kotoor in the Survasidihi taluk of the Vizagapatam District, appealed to the Board from the orders of the Collector under the following circumstances:—The lands which petitioners had held, for, it is said, ten and twenty years respectively, had originally been of an inferior description, and were therefore allowed, in accordance with a district usage, a certain annual remission under the name of "Nagadi Maf;" but this kind of remission has of late years, with the Board's approval, been gradually discontinued throughout the district. In December 1864, the Principal Assistant, within whose division the land in question lies, issued orders that the "Nagadi Maf" remission should be discontinued from and after the following Fusly. It seems, however, that the petitioners were not made aware of this order until the 20th of June 1865; that in a fit of ill-advised dissatisfaction they tendered a deed of resignation for their lands on the 3rd of July; and that their opponent's durkhast for the same land was accepted by the Tahsildar, a subordinate native revenue authority, be it observed, before the 10th of the same month, on which date the petitioners addressed the Principal Assistant Collector, stating that their resignation had not been voluntary, and appealing against any compliance with their opponent's durkhast.

3. The Principal Assistant, seemingly conscious of the substantial injustice done to the petitioners, disallowed the Tahsildar's proceedings, on the ground that he should not have accepted petitioners' resignation after the 31st of May, and restored the petitioners to the possession of their lands. On an appeal being submitted to the Collector, he upheld the proceedings of the Tahsildar, and reversed those of the Principal Assistant, considering that the Tahsildar was influenced by mistaken leniency when he extended, in petitioners' case, the period for the relinquishment of land from 31st of May to 31st of July, and that such leniency should not be allowed to operate to the disadvantage of petitioners' opponent.

4. The Collector's decision is dated 17th August 1865, and on the 18th of the following month, petitioners appealed to the Board. Their appeal was forwarded to the Collector for report on the 20th December, and, in their Proceedings dated 12th March 1866, the Board directed the Collector to restore the lands to the petitioners, on condition of their re-imbursing their opponent for any reasonable expenses which he might have incurred. The Board observed that the Collector would have exercised a wise discretion if he had permitted his Principal Assistant's order to stand; and that, under the circumstances of the case, the order making over the land to petitioners' opponent could not equitably be upheld.

5. In his letter dated 27th April 1866, the Collector reported, in reply to these Proceedings, that petitioners' opponent declined to give up possession of the land; that the puttah for it had been made out in his name; and that there were no lawful or peaceable means of ejecting him. The Board accordingly directed the Collector to cancel the puttah he had issued while the case was under appeal, to furnish both petitioners and their opponent with a copy of his order, and to supply petitioners with new puttahs for the land, leaving them to regain possession of it through the Civil Courts.

6. On the 12th of May, the Collector again addressed the Board, stating that it was impossible to carry out their orders, as petitioners declined to receive new puttahs unless they were placed in possession of their lands, and as their opponent declined to give up the puttah issued to him. The Board then directed Mr. Carmichael, in more specific terms, to draw up an order cancelling the puttah issued to petitioners' opponent; to issue a new puttah in petitioners' favor, endorsed to the effect that it was granted in lieu of another puttah for the same land, which had been cancelled by the orders of the Board; to direct the Tahsildar to recognize petitioners as the owners of the land, by declining to receive the land-tax from any other person, and to give petitioners any further assistance in his power.

7. In his letter, recorded at the head of these Proceedings, Mr. Carmichael reports that these orders had been carried out so far as it lay in his power to give them effect, and then proceeds to request that four propositions, relative to the case under discussion, may be submitted for the consideration and orders of Government. In the first proposition, Mr. Carmichael questions the propriety of the Board's decision on the merits of the case. In the second, he questions the Board's appellate authority in such cases. In the third, he expresses his opinion that the proceedings directed by the Board will not be upheld by the Civil Courts. In the fourth, he impugns the propriety of the course of procedure directed by the Board.

8. As to the first proposition, the Board need only observe that the case as detailed above speaks for itself. The Collector's proceedings were, in the Board's opinion, characterized by very unnecessary harshness, in so readily ousting from their valuable hereditary landed property some foolish ryots, impatient of an increase to their assessment; the Tahsildar was irregular in accepting a resignation for land after the period prescribed in the Standing orders of the Board,* instead of proceeding to recover the tax, or balance of tax, payable on it by the usual process, a course of action which, by necessarily giving petitioners time for reflection, would have saved them the loss of their ancestral property, for they would doubtless have paid the tax; and the Collector's proceedings in issuing a puttah and confirming possession to petitioners' opponent at the Jummahbundy, though at the time the case was under appeal to the Board, were also erroneous.

* Circular Order, 2nd February 1861.

9. As to the second proposition, the Board need only refer to Sections 5 and 37, Regulation I of 1803, by which the Board of Revenue is vested with authority to superintend and *control* all persons employed in the executive administration of the public revenue, and is specially required to guard against encroachments which may ensue on the rights of the people from an excess of zeal on the part of the Revenue officers; and to paragraph 11 of the Durkhast rules, by which it is expressly provided that the puttah is only to be issued at the Jummahbundy, "if no appeal shall have been previously made."

10. The third proposition the Board need not notice; and as to the fourth, while questioning the propriety of Mr. Carmichael sitting in judgment on the course of procedure adopted by his official superiors, the Board would ask him, by what "regular civil process" he himself ousted petitioners from possession of their lands in favor of their opponents, when he reversed his Principal Assistant's orders; for it appears, from the petitioners' statement, that the Principal Assistant restored them to possession when he reversed the Tahsildar's proceedings.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

H Walzell

Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with correspondence, &c., specified in margin of paragraph 1 of Proceedings.

Copy to the Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rev. 1866. Department.

Proc. of Govt for October

No. 3437.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 25th September 1866.

Dep. 2 Cobs
Rec.
C.R.

No. 6,867.

Submitting for consideration and orders questions raised by Collector of Vizagapatam in connection with Board's orders on Petitions Nos 2921 and 3693 of 1865 regarding grant of a puttah for certain land.

No 2880-25 Octr
With order

No 573-574.

12 Oct 1866.

Mr Carmichael to be
return these papers
along with
the R. Board's
proceedings of a Meeting
held on the
25th Inst. to enable them
to pass orders thereon
as the Board is about
to assemble
[illegible]

No 2880.

No appeal against the
decision of the Board having been
made by the parties interested
deem it inexpedient
to pronounce
any opinion on
the merits of
the case submitted.

The Board have the same
authority to revise decisions under
the Durkhast Rules as they have
to revise all other orders issued
by [illegible]

The other questions raised by
Mr Carmichael do not require notice

25th Octr 1866.