

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	644	Press Mis.
¹⁷⁶⁻⁷⁷ Dated	12-3-	18 68.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 176. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 25th February 1868, No. 1,373.

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Circuit Cutcherry at Gudewada, in Gudewada talook, 14th January 1868, No. 29½:—

1. I have the honor to enclose translation of the plaint in Original Suit No. 67 of 1867, dated 13th February 1867, filed in the Court of the District Munsiff of Guntoor by Paladugu Bapayya, against the Collector of Kistna and some others, Curnums, &c., of Pedduravoor, for the recovery of Acres 1·03 of land in the village of Repally talook, which he claims to have been in his possession for the last five years, and to have been by the first defendant's Order, No. 39, dated 5th February 1866, wrongfully given to Collepara Tandavayya and others, Agraharumdars of Chinna Purimi, as part of the compensation granted them for lands taken up for public purposes. The facts are briefly these:—

Up till Fusly 1270, Curnum's No. 303, recorded to contain Acres 19·21, was held by Paladugu Pichayya, who relinquished it in that year. In the following Fusly 1271, the plaintiff applied for 10 acres of this relinquished number, and received a block of that extent on the south of the number; its northern boundary is the dotted line on the sketch enclosed. At this time the demarcation had been completed, and the Curnum's No. 303 was divided into two numbers as per sketch, of which the northern contains by survey Acres 10·40, and the southern Acres 11·03. The land now in dispute is the space between the demarcation line AB, and the dotted line CD. From the first the plaintiff raised his claim to it, and protested against its being given to the Agraharumdars. I think he had good cause, too, for under the rules the lands, &c., relinquished, Curnum's No. 303 (= Demarcation Nos. (513 + 518)) should have been taken up as relinquished, or the divisions of the old number which had been made by the Settlement Department should have been respected. It is true that the extent now held by the plaintiff is said to be 10 acres, but according to the Curnum's accounts the probable extent of the Survey No. 518 is only Acres 9·21. If the plaintiff's right is denied, the rules of the Revenue Department may confessedly be violated at discretion by subordinate officers. I propose, therefore, to correct the error hitherto made, and to obviate the occurrence of sub-divisions in a survey number, which are sources of endless trouble to the Settlement Department, by making over the land to the plaintiff, who, even if he had not the right before, had the preferential title when the right was disputed, and making up the difference to the Agraharumdars on the other (northern) side of the block given them from land regarding which there is no dispute. I request the Board's sanction to the compromise proposed.

To the District Munsiff's Court, Guntoor.

Plaintiff.

Paladugu Bapayya, of Kumma caste, living by cultivation, and an inhabitant of Peda Ravur, in the Repulla talook.

Defendants.

1. G. Thornhill, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, at present residing at Bunder.
2. Narumunchi Ramanna, Brahmin, living by Merasi.
3. Ravuri Venkata Subbaya.
4. Do. Puttaya.
5. Pichaya, Gumastah on behalf of Jagur-lapudi Venakatappaya, a Minor, inhabitant of Peda Ravur.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th March 1868.*

Plaint preferred by Konduri Ramanuja Charlu, Pleader on behalf of the plaintiff, under Section 26 of the Civil Procedure Code.

The defendants conspired together and caused an acre of land, (situated in the centre of Field No. 513, which has been under my enjoyment for five years, and was defined by the boundary stones posted by the Demarcation Department,) which yields an annual produce of Rupees 4, and which is valued at Rupees 8, to be given to Kallepara Tandavarayya, and others, inhabitants of Chinspurmi, who are their (defendants) adherents, in lieu of the Maniem land which fell under the channel excavated by Government, though there is an extent of about 15 acres of Bunjer land along the side of my field.

Though I presented Arzis four or five times to the Collector on the subject, yet, from my bad luck, that officer without admitting my Arzis granted an endorsement, under 13th January 1867, to the effect that the land could not be included in the Bunjer. The aforesaid endorsement is also enclosed in this, which I pray the Court will be graciously pleased to peruse, and direct my land to be retained in my possession without being alienated to others, and my costs to be paid by the defendants.

(Signed) K. RAMANEJA CHARLU,
Pleader.

13th February 1867.

I, Paladugu Bapayya, plaintiff in the above suit, do declare that what is herein stated is true to the best of my information and belief.

(Signed) PALADUOGU BAPAYYA,
Plaintiff.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYYA,
Acting Deputy Collector.

Enclosure No. 2.—Sketch.

Submitted to Government, with the Board's recommendation that the Collector be authorized to carry out his proposals.

No. 177.

ORDER THEREON, 12th March 1868, No. 644.

Miscellaneous.

The Board's recommendation is approved.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Ed. S. T. Augustin.

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Rev. Dept.,
with original Sketch.
Copy to the Acting Collector of the Kima district.

Ed. J. Wright.

176-177

17 March 1868

11th March 1868
The Board's recommendation is approved.

12th March 1868

Rev. 1868. Department
Pl. of Govt. for March
No. 678.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 25th February 1868.

Copy 28 March
Pl. of Govt. for March
with original Sketch (1868)

No. 1,373.

Recommending that Collector of Kistna district be authorized to carry out his proposal to effect a compromise with Plaintiff in O. S. No. 67 of 1867 filed in Guntur District Munsiff's Court for recovery of certain land.

M. 644. 12 March
With order