M.R.O. 1—39,000—16-10-29

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2807 Press Mts.

125-26
Dated 7-11- 19 1868

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2807

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
7th November 1868.

No. 125. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th September 1868, No. 6,507 :—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 30th July 1868, No. 213.

From Mr. R. F. Phillips, dated 28th May 1868.
,, the Acting Special Assistant Collector, Ootacamund, 26th June 1868, No. 103.

1. I have the honor to forward the accompanying original correspondence, noted in the margin, for such orders as the Board deem proper.

2. Mr. Phillips requests the remission of arrears of quit-rent on certain lands purchased by him under the Rules for the sale of Waste Lands on the Neilgherry Hills, amounting to Rupees 3,742-0-3. The reasons assigned by him for this application are, first, that this demand is a very heavy one for him to pay in addition to quit-rent due for Fusly 1277; secondly, that had he been called upon in 1865, 1866, and 1867, to pay the quit-rent year by year, he could have done so; and, thirdly, that he has sustained great inconvenience and loss owing to the delay in the issue of Title-deeds. These points are so fully dwelt on in Mr. Roupell's letter, that no further explanation seems called for from me.

3. It will appear that Mr. Roupell does not recommend the total remission of the arrears, but suggests their recovery by three yearly instalments *minus* interest. This recommendation has my concurrence, and I request the Board's orders on the subject.

From R. F. PHILLIPS, Esq., to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Warbreccan, near Kotagherry, 28th May 1868.

1. I have the honor to address you on the following subject, namely :—The arrears of quit-rent which I am *now* asked to pay, and I petition for a remission of the same, in consideration of the reasons stated herein.

2. I am a Chinchona and Tea planter, residing at Kodanaud. Last week I was served with seven quit-rent bills for land which I own on this side of the Hills : four of these bills were made out for the current year (1867-68), and I am now making arrangements to pay them *at once*.

3. The other three bills are for arrears of quit-rent, dating back from the *4th of July* 1864 ; and the accumulated rent amounts to Rupees 3,742-0-3, which is a very heavy sum to pay in addition to quit-rent due for the current year.

4. Had I been called upon in 1865, 1866, and 1867, to pay the quit-rent year by year, I could have done it ; as, however, I was *never* asked to pay, I spent the money on the land ; consequently, I now find it almost impossible to pay down such a large sum.

5. I hope, however, you will kindly take into consideration the *great inconvenience* and *loss* I have sustained, owing to the delay about "Title-deeds." I only received mine (for the land in question) about "*two months ago*," having written year after year, striving to obtain them ; moreover, the absence of these "deeds" has tended to complicate the sale and transfer of a portion of this property, to prevent my borrowing money upon it, and to lessen its value in the market.

6. For instance, in 1866 I visited England with the object of effecting a sale of the property : I was obliged to leave India, however, without *any* document to shew that I had purchased the land from Government, and paid for it *in full two* years previously. Again, in April 1867, I sold 150 Acres of land on the Koondahs, for which I was to receive the balance of payment on delivery and transfer of the "Title-deeds."

7. I have not *yet* received *these* "deeds," although I purchased the land alluded to on (on about) the 7th of September 1865.

8. In conclusion, I wish to state that I was the first to take up land, and to induce others to settle at Kodanaud—a locality hitherto occupied only by Todas. I have experienced great difficulties in experimenting with Tea and Chinchona on *this* side of the Neilgherries, owing to the absence of roads, &c. Moreover, as I shall have to wait some years before my produce is fit for the market, I feel that the present demand for 'arrears of quit-rent' is a heavy burden, and (in connection with the inconvenience and losses sustained from want of Title deeds) *sufficient* to deter others from opening out and investing capital on these hills.

9. Requesting your kind attention to this matter, and praying that the arrears of quit-rent alluded to may be remitted, I have, &c.

Forwarded to the Acting Special Assistant Collector for report as to the claim made, the delay in issuing Title-deeds, and suggestions in reference to remission.

COONOOR,
30*th May* 1868.

(Signed) A. WEDDERBURN,
Collector.

From the Acting Special Assistant Collector, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated Ootacamund, 26th June 1868, No. 103.

1. With reference to enclosed original letter, to your address, from Mr. R. F. Phillips, of Warbreccan, near Kotagherry, dated 28th May 1868, and forwarded to me on 13th instant, with your endorsement, calling for a report as to the claim made, the delay in issuing Title-deeds, and suggestions in reference to remission, I have the honor to state for your information as follows :—

2. (*a*) *As to the claim made.*—Mr. Phillips observes that last month he was served with seven bills for assessment due upon land held by him on the north-east side of the Neilgherries. Of these bills, four were made out for the current Fusly, and he is now making arrangements to pay these at once. The other three bills for the three last Fuslies, the amounts entered in which aggregate Rupees 3,742-0-3, Mr Phillips says that he was never before asked to settle. He complains that the charge at one time of the above amount, as well as of the dues for the current Fusly, is a very heavy one, which he now finds it almost impossible to pay down. On the ground that the bills for the three past Fuslies were never before served upon him, Mr. Phillips now applies for a remission of the total dues therein entered, and with reference to this application, prays that the great inconvenience and loss owing to the delay in the submission of his Title-deeds may be taken into consideration. He points out that "this delay has tended to complicate the sale and transfer of a portion of this property, to prevent my borrowing money upon it and to lessen its value in the market." With a view to illustrating the remarks in the above quotation, Mr. Phillips calls attention to a visit made by him to England in 1866, the special object of which was to effect a sale of his property, and shews how he was obliged to leave India without any document to prove that he had purchased the land from Government, and had paid for it *in full* two years previously. Lastly, Mr. Phillips lays stress on the circumstance that he was the first to take up land and to induce others to settle at Kodanaud—a locality hitherto occupied only by Todas ; that he has experienced great difficulties in experimenting with Tea and Chinchona on *this* side of the Neilgherries owing to the absence of roads, &c.; and, moreover, that as he will have to wait some years before his produce is fit for the market, he feels that the present demand for arrears of quit-rent is a heavy burden, and (in connection with the inconvenience and losses sustained from want of Title-deeds) sufficient to deter others from opening out and investing capital on these hills. After these explanations Mr. Phillips concludes by again praying that the arrears of assessment above alluded to may be remitted.

3. Such being Mr. Phillips's case, as stated by himself, I propose noticing his arguments *seriatim*. Mr. Phillips, doubtless, may be correct in stating that he was never served before this year with any bills for the assessment due upon his land. Upon this point I have no explanation to offer, not having been in charge of this office at the times referred to, but think it probable that the non-service of the bills was due to the non-issue of the Title-deeds. I fail, however, to see the force of Mr. Phillips's remark, that because he was not called upon to pay assessment in the very year in which it fell due, he should, therefore, be entirely excused payment of such amount. The point, therefore,

to be considered is, whether the other arguments adduced are sufficient to warrant any deviation from the ordinary practice in such cases. That portion of his letter in which Mr. Phillips adverts to the difficulties he experienced two years ago in raising money upon the security of his property, and in effecting a sale of a portion of it, appears to me the most deserving of attention. These difficulties he attributes to the absence of Title-deeds : and certain it is that if, but for the want of deeds, he might have given effect to his wishes, (which I suppose may be inferred, though Mr. Phillips does not definitely state so,) he has been a loser in no small degree. Had he succeeded in selling a portion of his estate, he would have been a gainer by the amount of the purchase money, as well as of the yearly assessment, which from the date of sale would have been paid by the purchaser. On the other hand, it is to be borne in mind that the non-collection of the Government dues in the early stage of his planting operations, allowed of Mr. Phillips making free expenditure upon his estate, unshackled by any Government demands ; that he has been the gainer hitherto by the amount, principal and interest, of such demands, and that Government have correspondingly lost. I confess, however, that I cannot consider the above advantage to Mr. Phillips as at all adequately counterbalancing the annoyance and pecuniary loss sustained through the non-receipt of Title-deeds ; and in estimating Mr. Phillips's chances of selling property well at the time to which he refers, it would not be fair to judge by the standard of the present day. That *furor* for coffee speculation, which was the characteristic of a few years back, has now to a great extent subsided. Formerly, hardly was it known that an eligible planting site was in the market before applicants came forward for its purchase. *Now* the sale of plantation land is not so easily effected.

4. Towards the close of his letter, Mr. Phillips refers to the heavy charges upon this land as being sufficient (when taken in connection with the inconvenience and losses sustained from want of Title-deeds) to deter others from opening out and investing capital on the Hills. This is a somewhat strong assertion to make ; but I am fairly persuaded that, though not acceptable in its entirety, it contains more matter for reflection than would at first sight appear. In the course of official duty on these Hills, I have had frequent opportunities of conversing with Planters upon matters affecting their estates, and have been too often disappointed in finding nearly all, I may say quite all, of opinion, that in the working of the Neilgherry Waste Land Rules, they (the body of Planters) had grievances to complain of. This prevalent feeling, that their endeavours, by the outlay of private capital, to develope the resources of the country have been frustrated considerably by the working (or if I may be permitted to use the expression, the failure in working) of the Waste Land Rules, is one which it is most desirable to remove. Or, if this may not be, then to alleviate, so far as possible, by a policy of concession and liberality, where occasions for such may arise. I confess I do not see how in the heavy press of applications some few years ago, the Waste Land Rules could possibly have been satisfactorily worked out by the small establishment deputed for this purpose. The coffee mania of those times has been succeeded by a re-action consequent upon numerous speculative failures, arising in many instances doubtless from the incompetency of the fortune-hunters for the work undertaken by them. To those who still remain, and, in spite of difficulties and reverses, struggle on, having sunk their *all* in their various enterprises, (Mr. Phillips has always resided upon and himself conducted the management of his estate,) it seems matter of great moment that a helping hand should now be extended. The effect of Government encouragement must be most beneficial. In the present condition of affairs, its value can hardly be over-rated.

5. (*b*) *As to the delay in the issue of Title-deeds.*—The deeds of which Mr. Phillips writes that he is now in possession, are three in number, given for lands purchased by him on the 4th July 1864 and 15th May 1865. These deeds I found in course of preparation on 3rd May 1867, when I first took charge of this office. They were despatched to Mr. Phillips for execution on the 8th idem, and finally forwarded to him (duly stamped with the Government seal and registered) on 19th February 1868. It would appear from the records that deeds for these properties had previously been drawn up, and had, after execution by Mr. Phillips, been forwarded to the late Collector, by whom they were returned as containing inaccurate entries, and being, therefore, worthless. The records also shew that these deeds had formed the subject of two references by the late Collector to the Board of Revenue, as embodied in Board's Proceedings of 12th March and 30th August 1866.

6. The cause of delay in the case of the deeds for the land at Melkoondah was quoted in the tabular statement of deeds not yet granted, forwarded to you with my letter of 13th instant, No. 99. From this you will observe that the survey of the land in question is nearly completed, and that plans are shortly expected.

7. (c) *Suggestions in reference to remission.*—The above remarks (paragraph 3) upon the claim made will shew that I consider Mr. Phillips, under the circumstances set forth by him, had undoubtedly to forego some two or three years back, and through no fault of his own, the chance of materially improving his pecuniary position and prospects. It is not so much that he has actually lost by the course of affairs complained of, as that he has had to relinquish his hopes of gain. But after all it matters but little in what way Mr. Phillips has been a loser, so long as he was not on that account personally to blame, but was a sufferer through tardiness in official business. I would observe that, being under the impression at the time of issuing the (so-called) quit-rent bills, that Mr. Phillips had never before been called upon for payment, I had the bills drawn out for the amount of assessment merely, and no charge for interest was included: a considerable item in the case of sums so large as those payable by Mr. Phillips, when fallen three years into arrear. An additional method of relief would be found by allowing the payment of these yearly assessments *minus* interest, by instalments, instead of in a lump sum. In three years, by paying annually twice the amount of the ordinary assessment, Mr. Phillips will have liquidated all dues.

8. Should any further assistance be considered right, it will, of course, be for the Government to decide to what extent this should be. I do not see that Mr. Phillips's claim for total remission can for a moment be entertained. Before concluding, I would request your special attention to the largeness of the amount due, compulsory immediate payment of which, in a lump sum, would undoubtedly, in this instance, paralize all planting transactions for some time to come, and cause great disappointment and loss, if, indeed, not absolute ruin, and would beg leave to repeat once more my conviction that cases such as this should be treated in a liberal spirit, not merely from motives of commisseration for the particular instance, but from considerations of policy and of the development and prosperity of plantation cultivation on the Neilgherries.

THE Board resolve to submit this case for the orders of Government.

2. The circumstances are very fully and very clearly stated in the letter of the Special Assistant Collector.

3. Mr. Phillips claims remission of arrears of quit-rent for land taken up under the Waste Land Rules for Fuslies 1274, 1275, and 1276, amounting to Rs. 3,742, the peculiarities in the case being that the demand has now been made for the first time, and that Title-deeds for the lots on which the arrears accrued, purchased in July 1864 and May 1865, were not delivered till February 1868.

4. The Board are of opinion that Mr. Phillips has established the fact that he has by this delay sustained a pecuniary loss, and that the enforcement of the full rate of quit-rent would not be equitable. In one sense it may be said that possession was given without survey to meet the convenience of the applicant; but the Board do not consider that Government could fairly shield itself behind this plea. No purchaser would put down his money (as Mr. Phillips did) if he was to wait for possession from three to four years.

5. They would, therefore, recommend that half the arrear should be remitted, and that the remainder should be collected in three equal annual instalments.

6. The Board have under consideration the expediency of introducing the cowle system in the Neilgherry Hills; the eager demand for land which formerly prevailed has abated under the influence of the experience gained by purchasers, as

it is found that much time, labor, and outlay are required before a return is secured. They will again address Government on this subject.

7. The second Member dissents from the view of the majority of the Board, and has placed his reasons on record.

No. 126. ORDER THEREON, 7th November 1868, No. 2,807.

Land Revenue.

1. The Government do not concur in the view taken by the Board of Revenue of Mr. Phillips' case, and must decline to assent to their recommendation that a moiety of the arrears of quit-rent due by him be remitted. They do not find from the papers that Mr. Phillips has established the fact of his having sustained pecuniary loss by the delay in the issue of his Title-deeds, as stated by the Board in paragraph 4 of their Proceedings.

2. Under all the circumstances of the case, the Government think with the Collector and Special Assistant Collector, that it will be a sufficient concession to Mr. Phillips if he be allowed to pay the arrears in question by annual instalments and without interest; the period for the payment, however, being extended from three years, as proposed by those Officers, to five. This arrangement is accordingly sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant General.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Govt. of [1868] Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated November, 7th.

Read.

G. O., 7th November 1868, No. 2,307.

Pro. of the Board of Rev. 19 July 1866 No. 2,206.

NOVEMBER.

Nos. 125-129.

Mr. Phillips' land on the Neilgherries.—Board's recommendation to remit a moiety of the arrears of quit-rent declined. The arrears to be recovered by five annual instalments.

No. 6,206.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th August 1866.

Read the following letter from P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 5th July 1866, No. 176:—

1. In their Proceedings of the 12th March 1866, No. 1,671, passing orders on the reference made by me in regard to the lands purchased by Mr. R. F. Phillips and Commander Mitcheson on the Neilgherries under the waste land rules, the Board have directed "that the demands against "the two gentlemen be amended on the principle that the actual cost of the estimated area was "the amount bid *in excess of the estimated cost of survey*, and that the actual cost of the *ascer-* "*tained* area is to be calculated at the same rate, the actual cost of survey being a distinct item "of charge against the purchaser to be adjusted with reference to the deposit money required "from him." They further state that "the price at which they bought their respective lots will "be taken at one Rupee, that being the sum which they actually bid for the land in each case." These instructions have been duly carried out in determining the sums payable by the two gentlemen on the lands purchased by them. In preparing the deeds to be issued to them, I am doubtful as to the sums to be entered in them. Take the case of Commander Mitcheson. The estimated area of land as declared at the time of sale was 250 acres. Taking the price of this land at one Rupee as directed by the Board, the proportionate price chargeable on the actual area found on survey, viz, Acres 330·91, is Rupee 1-5-2. The actual cost of demarcation and survey of this lot came up to Rupees 74-2-11, making in all Rupees 75-8-1. The point to be now settled, is whether the sum, to be entered in the Title Deed as the price offered by the purchaser is the aggregate amount of Rupees 75-8-1, or only Rupee 1-5-2; the actual cost of demarcation and survey being considered a distinct item. If the latter, it occurs to me that it will be contrary to the terms of the Title Deed. Supposing that the actual cost of demarcation and survey had been ascertained at the time of sale, and the land put up at an upset price of Rupees 74-2-11, and that the highest bid for it was Rupees 75-8-1, the amount to be entered in the Title Deed, as the price "offered" by the purchaser, would be Rupees 75-8-1. The Board's early orders on this point are solicited.

All the Title Deeds hitherto issued were drawn out on this principle.

2. I would also beg to be favored with specific orders on the following point for my future guidance in drawing out Title Deeds generally:—

A applies for a piece of land, and deposits the sum of twenty Rupees as the estimated cost of survey and demarcation. On the day of sale the plan of the said land not being ready, it is put up at the estimated cost of twenty Rupees, and is knocked down to B for Rupees 100.

As the sum deposited by A must at once be returned to him, B is called upon to pay down the sum of Rupees 20, and as B elects to pay the remainder in instalments, he pays down also ten per cent. on the remaining eighty Rupees, *i. e.* Rupees 8.

On receipt of the survey, it appears that the actual cost of demarcation and survey is only Rupees 10. Therefore a sum of Rupees 10 must be returned to B, because the "actual cost," and not the "estimated cost," is to be the upset price as now ordered. Thus the amount bid for the lot must be taken at ninety Rupees. Is this the sum to be entered in the Title Deed as the price offered for the land, or Rupees 80, which is exclusive of the cost of demarcation and survey? I think that, according to the terms of the Title Deed, the former sum should be entered, but the point requires to be authoritativey decided.

3. I take this opportunity of informing the Board, that according to the rules, the price offered for a lot includes the cost of demarcation and survey, and such cost is paid from the money recovered from the purchaser; the net amount alone being carried to the credit of Government under its appropriate head. For instance, a lot of land was put up at the upset price of ten Rupees, of which two Rupees are the cost of demarcation, and eight Rupees the cost of survey. The highest bid offered for it was twenty Rupees, or ten in excess of the upset price. The cost of demarcation (two Rupees) is paid for materials required for boundary marks and for coolies who erected them. The cost of survey (Rupees 8) which comprizes the pay of the surveyor and his lascars, &c., is remitted to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey according to the arrangements made by him with the Special Assistant Collector of Ootacamund: the net amount to be carried to

purchased

the credit of Government is only ten Rupees. The amount to be entered in the Title Deed must be the sum offered, viz., Rupees 20, but this does not agree with the entry in the cash accounts. It occurs to me that, in order to maintain perfect agreement between the Title Deed and the Cash Accounts, and to prevent the confusion and trouble arising from the present system, the cost of survey and demarcation should be treated altogether as a separate item, the land being put up without any upset price, as orignially ruled in the orders of Government dated 6th December 1862, No. 2,554, or at the nominal upset price of one Rupee, which latter appears to me the preferable mode.

---

1. The Board authorize the Collector to deal with the cost of demarcation and survey as a distinct item in the case of lands on the Neilgherries *sold before Survey*. They see nothing in the rules to preclude the adoption of this course.

2. He will add to the conditions of sale annexed to the Sale Advertisement, that the purchaser will be liable to pay, on demand, the ascertained cost of demarcation and survey, as a perfectly distinct item from the amount of the purchase money bid at the sale, and that all bids must be made and will be received on this understanding only.

3. The land will be offered for sale without any upset price, but subject to the above special condition in addition to the ordinary conditions of sale for lands on the Neilgherries *sold after Survey*. The Board do not see that any useful purpose would be served by adopting a nominal upset price of one Rupee as suggested by the Collector. The Collector will dispose of the cases of Mr. Phillips's and Commander Mitcheson's land in accordance with the above instructions.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

Exd. J. Wright.

1866. Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated 30th August 1866.

Received

No. 6,206.

Issuing instructions to Collector of Coimbatore in regard to preparation of Title Deeds for lands sold on Neilgherries before Survey, and directing disposal of the cases of Mr. Phillips's and Commander Mitcheson's land in accordance with those instructions.

Rep. "Mem. 11th Oct. 125."

5.

Revenue Depart

Memo: for orders on No 8086

In consequence of the difficulty in obtaining surveys of waste lands on the Neilgherries before purchase, the requirement of the waste land rules was for the convenience of purchasers temporarily placed in abeyance in G.O. date 28th February 1868, No 489. They were permitted to select the lands desired by them, to have them demarcated and to enter into possession after purchase by auction in

in the usual manner, on the understanding that the purchase money would be adjusted after survey.

It seems that in the case now brought to notice by the Board of Revenue, Mr. Phillips acted & Purchased on Plantation obtained some land in 1864 under this provision of the rules, and that though the survey was made shortly afterwards, he did not obtain

Collect
1 of 2
befrm
ses of
's land

Patent in the follow-
-ing year. No assess-
-ment seems to have
been demanded for
the land until after
the issue of the deeds,
and hence Mr. Phillips
is now called upon
to pay four years'
assessment at
once. He asks
to be credited three
years' assessment
on

on the ground that

he has lost heavily by the delay in the issue of Title deeds.

The Special Assistant sets forth the case very clearly in all its bearings, and recommends that the arrears be covered in

in three annual instalments leaving it to Govt. to decide whether Mr. Phillips is to obtain any further Compensation for his alleged loss. The Coll. supports his Asst. recommendation, omitting, however, the recommendatory Clause to the further consideration of Govt. The majority of the Board recommend that half the arrears be remitted and the balance recovered in three annual instalments. The second Member

Supports

the Board address
Govt: in a separate
Communication on
the subject—

I cannot entirely in the opinion of the Special
Apt-Com., the Com., and the 2nd member of the Bd
of Rev, that it would be a satisfactory conclusion to
Mr. Phillips, if he be allowed to pay the arrear of
Instl-ent- by three yearly instalments- without
interest - A more indulgent- conclusion will be
evidently an awkward precedent.
I should find from the papers that Mr. Phillips
has established the fact of his having sustained
pecuniary loss by the delay in supplying whom formal
title deeds - and to me it seems very obvious, that
when he proceeded to buy land to effect a sale of part
of his land, it was quite easy to calculate with tole-
rable exactness as to what he might have had for the money
originally paid for the land at the Govt- sale
when based on prices known what he
had purchased and thoroughly calculated talent:
The subject of waste land, on wh- the Bd of Rev
intend to address the Govt- needed be noticed
until their intention has been carried into effect
22 Oct.

WDL

I agree with my colleagues
that the principles of this letter
of the Collector & the 2nd member
of the Board of Revenue is the
correct one as far as regards
the principle of receiving
any portion of the principal and the
5 per Cent Interest. But I should
be disposed to give him a longer
period for the payment of
the arrears and would fix
the time at 5 years instead of
three. Even then Mr Phillips will
have to pay each year Rs 748 odd
besides the first instal of the
year for the next five years.

AJA.

very well
WDL

Memo: for Orders

Remission of Rent

Reclaimed by Mr

Phillips, a Tea

planter

2035

Revenue Department.—

№ 2807

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 7 ~~October~~ Nov 1868.—

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board

of Revenue.—

Submitting to Govt correspondence relating to Mr Phillips claim to remission of quit-rent for land taken up by him under Waste Land Rules for Fasliss 1274, 1275 and 1276, and recommending that half the arrears should be remitted, and that the remainder should be collected in three equal annual instalments.— (R. & 12th Sept 1868 № 1507.

The Government cannot concur in the view taken by the Board of Revenue of Mr Phillips' case, and must decline to assent to their recommendation that the remission of a moiety of the arrears of quit rent due by him — They do not find from the papers that Mr

Mr. Phillips has established the fact of his having sustained pecuniary loss by the delay in the issue of his Title Deeds, as stated by the Board in para 4 of their Proceedings.

2. Under all the circumstances of the case, the Govt think with the Collector and Special Assistant Collector, that it will be a sufficient concession to Mr. Phillips if he be allowed to pay the arrears in question by annual instalments and without interest; the period for the payment, however, being extended from three years, as proposed by those Officers, to five - This arrangement is according by sanctioned. —

arrangement

14 Copies For the Bd of Rev Desp No 10
6 — — Asst to Govt

Sd W Birch

Revenue 1868 Despatch
Pro of Grant for Nova

A. 2807

Pro of the Madras Grant
Dy 4th November 1868

A. 125 & 126