No. 306.- Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 13th September 1870, No. 5,708:—

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 8th November 1869, No. 8,261.

Read also the following letter from the Acting Sub-Collector, in charge of the Godavery District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 18th August 1870, No. 250.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith translations of Judgment and Decree* passed by the Principal Sadr Amin's Court in Suit No. 40 of 1869, the defence of which was sanctioned in the Board's Proceedings, dated 8th November 1869, No. 8,261.

* Together with originals.

2. The Court have adjudged the possession of the land to the plaintiff under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859, on the ground that it was cultivated by the ryots of Kotipally, the plaintiff's Zemindary village, in Fasli 1278. This cultivation was made by the ryots of Kotipally on the pretence that it was made over by the Principal Sadr Amin's Court to the Zemindar in Suit No. 18 of 1866. This was pointed out particularly for the consideration of the Court, but no notice was taken of it. No appeal can be made against this decision under Section 26, Act XXIII. of 1861. The land in question is certainly the property of the State. It was manifestly an accretion to the lanka of Ainavilly, a Government village, on the same spot where parts of the assessed fields† of the Ainavilly lanka were washed away, as shown in the accompanying plan. For further particulars of the case, I beg to refer you to the Collector's letter, dated 21st October 1869, No. 262, and the draft answer contained in the Proceedings noted in the margin. I am of opinion that a regular Suit should be filed on behalf of Government for the recovery of the land. If the Board agree with this view, I request that the Board will permit me to file a Suit at the Government expense. A draft of the plaint is herein enclosed for the approval of the Board.

† Nos. 780, 781, 782, 787, and 788.

8th November 1869, No. 8,261.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

In the Principal Sadr Amin's Court of the Rajahmundry District.

PRESENT: SAMINENI VENKATADRY NAIDU, *Principal Sadr Amin.*

Original Suit No. 40 *of* 1869 *on the file of this Court.*

Plaintiff	*versus*	*Defendant.*
Muppavarapa Venkatanandam Puntulu Garu, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff, His Highness the Maharajah Mirje Sri Vizia Rama Gajapatiraz Maharaj Manne Sultan Bahadur of Vizianagaram Samastanum, K.C.S.I.		James Fraser, Esq., Collector, Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.
Pleaders.		*Government Vakeel.*
1. Saripalle Sattenna.		Chittrapu Kumaraz.
2. Do. Gopalakristnamma.		

Judgment.

THE plaintiff has preferred this Suit under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859, stating that on 23rd February 1869 the defendant had ousted him from the possession of the zirayati lanka land under his possession and enjoyment, attached to the village of Kotipally in Vizianagaram Samastanum belonging to himself, and measuring eight acres, and resumed the same with a view to incorporate it with the lands of Ainavilly, a Government village, and requesting that the said land of eight acres, situated within the boundaries specified in the plaint, and yielding an annual assessment of Rupees 350, might be ordered to be made over to him.

2. In the statement put in by the defendant—

1*st*.—He denied the right to, and possession of the plaintiff in, the land claimed by him, put him to the proof of his title, stated that this land being an accretion to the Ainavilly lanka, belongs to Government; that it is therefore the property of the Crown.

2*ndly*.—That, as shown in the plan, parts of the Ainavilly lanka fields, Nos. 780, 781, 782, 787, and 788, had been washed away subsequent to the demarcation and survey conducted in 1859 and 1860; that on and near the same spot, the land in dispute had newly been formed adjoining to the Ainavilly lanka; that this land having been included in the rents of the other lankas of Ainavilly, had been occupied and cultivated for Faslies 1276 and 1277 by the ryots of Ainavilly; that in Fasli 1278 the ryots of Kotipally had, with the privity of the Kotipally Tanedar, unlawfully encroached upon and cultivated this land surreptitiously; that this having been brought to his notice, an order had been issued to the Tahsildar to attach the produce of cultivation thus surreptitiously made; that the Tanedar had then stated before the Tahsildar that the land in question had been made over to him by the Court under the Decree passed by this Court in Suit No. 18 of 1866; that the land now claimed had not been included in the plaint filed by the plaintiff in that Suit; and that this the Court will observe from the boundaries of the land therein claimed, and described in the plaint, and therefore prayed the Court to dismiss the Suit with costs.

3. When this Suit came on for hearing the Court was of opinion that a judgment might be given without settling issues and obtaining evidence. The pleading on behalf of both the parties and the facts represented by the pleaders have been considered.

4. This Suit has been preferred by the plaintiff under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859, consequently whether the lanka land in dispute was attached and taken possession of by the defendant while in the possession of the plaintiff, is the only point to be disposed of. From the defendant's own admission, it appears that the ryots of the plaintiff cultivated the lunka land and raised a crop in it in Fasli 1278, and that the defendant caused the produce to be attached in February of that year. From this, it is to be concluded that the defendant took possession of the land at that time. Moreover, the defendant does not say that he made over the land to the plaintiff. These reasons prove that the disputed land was taken possession of by the defendant while in the plaintiff's possession. With reference to this object of the law, the Court is of opinion that it is right to adjudge the delivery of the lanka to the plaintiff, and that which of the both parties has a right to that lanka is a matter that should not now be disposed of.

5. The Court directs that the lanka land claimed be made over to the plaintiff; that the costs incurred by him be paid by the defendant; and that those incurred by the defendant be borne by himself.

15*th July* 1870.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) S. VENKATADRY NAIDU,
Principal Sadr Amin.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th October 1870.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Decree passed by the Principal Sadr Amin's Court of the Rajahmundry District.

PRESENT: SAMINENI VENKATADRY NAIDU, Principal Sadr Amin.

Original Suit No. 40 *of* 1869.

Plaintiff	*versus*	*Defendant.*
Muppavarapa Venkatanaudam Puntulu Garu, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff His Highness the Maharajah Mirje Sri Vizia Rama Gajapatiraz Maharaj Manne Sultan Bahadur of Vizianagaram Samastanum, K.C.S.I		James Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.

Pleaders.	*Government Vakeel.*
Saripalle Sattenna.	Chittrapu Kamaraz.
Do. Gopalakristnamma.	

THE plaintiff has preferred this Suit under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859, stating that on 23rd February 1869 the defendant had ousted him from the possession of the zirayati lanka land under his possession and enjoyment, attached to the village of Kotipally in Vizianagaram Samastanum belonging to himself, and measuring eight acres, and resumed the same with a view to incorporate it with the lands of Ainavilly, a Government village, and requesting that the said land of eight acres, situated within the boundaries specified in the plaint, and yielding an annual assessment of Rupees 350, might be ordered to be made over to him.

2. Having gone through the record, the Court decrees that the plaintiff be put in possession of the lanka land in dispute; that the costs incurred by him be made good by the defendant, and that those incurred by the defendant be borne by himself.

Costs incurred by the Plaintiff.

	RS.	A.	P.
Value of Stamp paper used for Plaint	47	8	0
Do. do. for Vakalatnamah	0	8	0
Do. do. for Petition	0	1	0
Half of the Pleader's fee	70	0	0
Total to be paid to the plaintiff by the defendant...	118	1	0

Costs incurred by the defendant.

Value of Stamp paper used for Statement	0	8	0
Do. do. for Petitions	1	2	0
Half of the Pleader's fee	70	0	0
To be borne by defendant himself	71	10	0

The 15th of July 1870.

The lanka land under dispute is bounded on the north-east by the lanka land belonging to the plaintiff, south-east by the Godavery water, south-west by the high bank of the Godavery near the village of Ainavilly, and on the north-west by the lanka land belonging to the plaintiff.

Note.—With reference to the High Court's Proceedings under date the 27th June 1867.

This is a claim for zirayati lanka land attached to the Vizianagaram Samastanum, and yielding an annual assessment of Rupees 350.

Note.—No process of execution will be issued to enforce this decree, unless some proceeding shall have been taken to keep the same in force within three years next preceding the application for such execution.

(Signed) S. VENKATADRY, NAIDU,
Principal Sadr Amin.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

In the Principal Sadr Amin's Court of Rajahmundry.

Original Suit No. *of* 1870.

Plaintiffs	*versus*	*Defendant.*
The Government of Fort Saint George.		His Highness the Maharajah Sri Vizia Rama Gajapatiraz Maharaj Manne Sultan Bahadur of Vizianagaram Samastanum, K.C.S.I.

Plaint.

THE relief sought is—

(1.) The recovery of eight acres or thereabouts of lanka land assessed at Rupees 350 a-year, and valued at Rupees 1,750, the possession of which has been adjudged to the defendant under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859 in Suit No. 40 of 1869 of your Court's file.

(2.) Payment by the defendant of the plaintiff's costs of Suit herein.

2. The land in question is the property of Government, because it was an accretion in Fasli 1275 to the Ainavilly lanka, which was demarcated and surveyed as such by the Settlement Department on the same spot where parts of the Ainavilly lanka fields, Nos. 780, 781, 782, 787, and 788, were, subsequent to the demarcation in Fasli 1269, washed away as shown in the accompanying plan. This land was in the occupation of the Ainavilly ryots under joint-rents in Faslies 1276 and 1277. Kotipally ryots merely cultivated it in Fasli 1278 on the pretence that your Court made it over to the defendant in Suit No. 18 of 1866, while it was not included in the plaint, plan or decree in that Suit. Nor was it an accretion to the land marked B. claimed by the defendant, who was the plaintiff in that Suit, it being separated by a stream of the Godavery as shown in the plan.

3. The land claimed is bounded on the north and east by the Godavery water, south by the Ainavilly lanka, and west by the Kotipally lanka.

I, Jeremiah Garnett Horsfall, the Acting Sub-Collector and Joint Magistrate in charge for the time being of the Godavery District, do declare that what is stated in the above plaint is true to the best of my information and belief.

(Signed) J. G. HORSFALL,
Acting Sub-Collector in charge.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Plan.

THE Government will be requested to sanction the institution of a Suit against the Zemindar of Vizianagaram for eight acres of land forming an accretion to the Ainavilly lanka.

2. The Zemindar has obtained possession by a Suit under Section 15, Act XIV. of 1859, and can only be ousted by a regular Suit. There seems to be no doubt but what the land belongs to Government.

No. 307. ORDER THEREON, 27th October 1870, No. 1,649.

Miscellaneous.

AGREEABLY to the recommendation of the Board the Government sanction the institution of a regular Suit against the Zemindar of Vizianagaram for the recovery of the land in question.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

25-3-521

Govt. of {1870} Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated October, 27th.

Read.

G. O., 27th October 1870, No. 1,649.

Encl.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 306-307.

Suit against Zemindar of Vizianagaram for the recovery of certain lunka land.—Institution as recommended by the Board of Revenue, sanctioned.

No. 8,261.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 8th November 1869.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 21st October 1869, No. 262:—

I HAVE the honour to send herewith, translation of a plaint* filed in the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court at Rajahmundry, by the Zemindar of the Vizianagarum Estate, under Section 15 of the Act No. XIV of 1859, for the possession of 8 acres of Lunka land, bearing an annual assessment of Rupees 350.

*No. 40 of 1869.

2. The land in question is part of a Government Lunka of Ainavilly, in the Amalapur Talook. As shown in the accompanying plan, this land formed portions of certain demarcated and surveyed fields of Nos. 780, 81, 82, 87, and 88 of Ainavilly. It was washed away by the Godavery subsequent to the demarcation and survey, and new land was formed on and near the same spots adjoining the numbers. In Fusly 1278, the remaining portions of the above numbers were permanently assessed by the Settlement Department, and occupied by the ryots of Ainavilly, under ryotwar system. The newly formed Lunka being much lower than the above land, was left unassessed by that Department.

3. This land was cultivated by the ryots of Ainavilly in Fuslies 1276-77, as it was included in the lease of other Lunka lands. In Fusly 1278 the plaintiff rented out the land to the ryots of Kotipalli, the zemindary village, and they cultivated it on the ground that this land was made over to plaintiff by the Principal Sudder Ameen according to the decree passed by him in Suit No. 18 of 1866—*Vide* correspondence on the subject noted in the margin.

Board's Proceedings, 23rd October 1866, No. 7,653.
Do. do, 25th October 1866, No. 7,747.
Do. do. 16th November 1866, No. 8,307.

4. In the plaint filed in Suit No. 18 of 1866, the boundaries of the Lunka land claimed by him were described. It is evident from it that the land now claimed was not included and no decree was passed for it.

5. This land being an accretion to the Government Lunka land formed on and near the spot on which the Government Lunka lately stood, is manifestly the property of the Crown. I, therefore, ordered the Tahsildar to attach the produce of the cultivation which was surreptitiously made by the ryots of Kotipalli in Fusly 1278 and to credit the value of the produce under Government deposit. I rented out the land in question to the ryots of Ainavilly for Fusly 1279 for Rupees 170.

6. I beg to propose that the enclosed draft of an answer should be filed, if the Board approve of it, and sanction the defence at the Government expense.

7. The day fixed for the hearing of the suit is 6th November 1869. But an extension for one month from the above date has been applied for.

8. At this moment a running stream (branch of the Godavery) divides the Ainavilly Lunka from that made over to Kotipalli—*Vide* plan forwarded.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ORIGINAL SUIT No. 40 OF 1869.

To the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court of the Rajahmundry District.

Plaint preferred under Section 15, Act No. XIV. of 1859, by Muppavarapu Venkatanandam Pantulugar, residing at Vizianagarum, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff, His Highness The Maharajah Mirje Sri Vizia Rama Gajapatiraz Maharaj Manne Sultan Bahadur of Vizianagarum Samastanam K. C. S. I.

Against defendant.

James Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.

ON 23rd February 1869, the defendant ousted the plaintiff from the possession of the Zirayati Lunka land of 8 acres, attached to the village of Kotipalli, in Vizianagarum Samastanam, belonging to the plaintiff, yielding an annual assessment of Rupees 350 and situated within the

undermentioned boundaries, to which the plaintiff has a right and which had been in his possession and enjoyment, and resumed the same with a view to incorporate it with the lands of Ainavilly, a Government village.

2. The said land is bounded on the north-east by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff, on the south-east by the Godavery water, on the south-west by the high bank of the Godavery near the village of Ainavilly and on the north-west by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff.

3. I request that on an examination of the witnesses and a perusal of the documents for the plaintiff, a decree may be given directing that the land abovementioned be made over to the plaintiff.

July 1869. (Signed) SARIPALLI SATTENNA,
Pleader.
(Signed) GOPALAKRUSHNAMMA,
Pleader.
(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Huzoor Accountant and Moctyar or Attorney.

I, Muppavarapu Venkatanandam, Moctyar or Attorney on behalf of the plaintiff named in the above plaint, do declare, that what is stated therein is true to the best of my information and belief.

(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Moctyar or Attorney and Huzoor Accountant.

Stamp paper, correct, with four additional stamps worth Rupees 45-8-0.
(Signed) V. V. NARASIMHA ROW,
Sheristadar.

Filed in Court this 10th September 1869.
(Signed) S. VENKATADRY,
Principal Sudder Ameen.

(True Translation.)
(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

IN ORIGINAL SUIT No. 40 of 1869.

To the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry.

Plaint preferred by Muppavarapu Venkatanandam Pantulugar residing at Vizianagarum, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff, the Zemindar of Vizianagarum Estate, against defendant, James Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.

THE written statement of the defendant.

2. The defendant denies the right to and possession of the plaintiff in the land claimed by him, and puts him to the proof of his title. This land is an accretion to the Ainavilly Lunka belonging to Government, and is, therefore, the property of the Crown.

3. As shown in the Plan, parts of the Ainavilly Lunka fields Nos. 780, 81, 82, 87, and 88, were washed away subsequent to the Demarcation and Survey which were made in the years 1859 1860, and on and near the same spot, the land in dispute was newly formed adjoining the Ainavilly Lunka. This land was occupied and cultivated for Fuslies 1276 and 1277 by the ryots of Ainavilly, as it was included in the rents of the other Lunkas of Ainavilly. In Fusly 1278 the ryots of Kotipalli with the privity of the Kotipalli Tanedar, unlawfully encroached upon and cultivated this land surreptitiously. This having been brought to the defendant's notice, an order was issued to the Tahsildar to attach the produce of the cultivation thus surreptitiously made. The Tanedar then stated before the Tahsildar that the land in question was made over to him by your Court, under the virtue of the Decree passed by you in Suit No. 18 of 1866.

4. In the plaint filed by the plaintiff in this suit, the land now claimed was not included. The Court will observe this from the boundaries of the land therein claimed and described in the plaint.

5. The defendant, therefore, prays that the Court will dismiss this suit with costs.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Plan.

THE proposed answer is approved and the defence of the suit sanctioned.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godavery District,
with Plan.

Copy to the Accountant-General.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

undermentioned boundaries, to which the plaintiff has a right and which had been in his possession and enjoyment, and resumed the same with a view to incorporate it with the lands of Ainavilly, a Government village.

2. The said land is bounded on the north-east by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff, on the south-east by the Godavery water, on the south-west by the high bank of the Godavery near the village of Ainavilly and on the north-west by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff.

3. I request that on an examination of the witnesses and a perusal of the documents for the plaintiff, a decree may be given directing that the land abovementioned be made over to the plaintiff.

July 1869. (Signed) SARIPALLI SATTENNA,
Pleader.
(Signed) GOPALAKRUSHNAMMA,
Pleader.
(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Huzoor Accountant and Moctyar or Attorney.

I, Muppavarapu Venkatanandam, Moctyar or Attorney on behalf of the plaintiff named in the above plaint, do declare, that what is stated therein is true to the best of my information and belief.

(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Moctyar or Attorney and Huzoor Accountant.

Stamp paper, correct, with four additional stamps worth Rupees 45-8-0.
(Signed) V. V. NARASIMHA ROW,
Sheristadar.

Filed in Court this 10th September 1869.
(Signed) S. VENKATADRY,
Principal Sudder Ameen.

(True Translation.)
(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

IN ORIGINAL SUIT No. 40 of 1869.

To the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry.

Plaint preferred by Muppavarapu Venkatanandam Pantulugar residing at Vizianagarum, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff, the Zemindar of Vizianagarum Estate, against defendant, James Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.

THE written statement of the defendant.

2. The defendant denies the right to and possession of the plaintiff in the land claimed by him, and puts him to the proof of his title. This land is an accretion to the Ainavilly Lunka belonging to Government, and is, therefore, the property of the Crown.

3. As shown in the Plan, parts of the Ainavilly Lunka fields Nos. 780, 81, 82, 87, and 88, were washed away subsequent to the Demarcation and Survey which were made in the years 1859 1860, and on and near the same spot, the land in dispute was newly formed adjoining the Ainavilly Lunka. This land was occupied and cultivated for Fuslies 1276 and 1277 by the ryots of Ainavilly, as it was included in the rents of the other Lunkas of Ainavilly. In Fusly 1278 the ryots of Kotipalli with the privity of the Kotipalli Tanedar, unlawfully encroached upon and cultivated this land surreptitiously. This having been brought to the defendant's notice, an order was issued to the Tahsildar to attach the produce of the cultivation thus surreptitiously made. The Tanedar then stated before the Tahsildar that the land in question was made over to him by your Court, under the virtue of the Decree passed by you in Suit No. 18 of 1866.

4. In the plaint filed by the plaintiff in this suit, the land now claimed was not included. The Court will observe this from the boundaries of the land therein claimed and described in the plaint.

5. The defendant, therefore, prays that the Court will dismiss this suit with costs.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Plan.

THE proposed answer is approved and the defence of the suit sanctioned.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godavery District,
with Plan.

Copy to the Accountant-General.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

undermentioned boundaries, to which the plaintiff has a right and which had been in his possession and enjoyment, and resumed the same with a view to incorporate it with the lands of Ainavilly, a Government village.

2. The said land is bounded on the north-east by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff, on the south-east by the Godavery water, on the south-west by the high bank of the Godavery near the village of Ainavilly and on the north-west by the Lunka land belonging to the plaintiff.

3. I request that on an examination of the witnesses and a perusal of the documents for the plaintiff, a decree may be given directing that the land abovementioned be made over to the plaintiff.

July 1869. (Signed) SARIPALLI SATTENNA,
Pleader.
(Signed) GOPALAKRUSHNAMMA,
Pleader.
(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Huzoor Accountant and Moctyar or Attorney.

I, Muppavarapu Venkatanandam, Moctyar or Attorney on behalf of the plaintiff named in the above plaint, do declare, that what is stated therein is true to the best of my information and belief.

(Signed) MUPPAVARAPU VENKATANANDAM,
Moctyar or Attorney and Huzoor Accountant.

Stamp paper, correct, with four additional stamps worth Rupees 45-8-0.
(Signed) V. V. NARASIMHA ROW,
Sheristadar.

Filed in Court this 10th September 1869.
(Signed) S. VENKATADRY,
Principal Sudder Ameen.

(True Translation.)
(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

IN ORIGINAL SUIT No. 40 of 1869.

To the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court of Rajahmundry.

Plaint preferred by Muppavarapu Venkatanandam Pantulugar residing at Vizianagarum, recognized Attorney on behalf of plaintiff, the Zemindar of Vizianagarum Estate, against defendant, James Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, on behalf of the Madras Government.

THE written statement of the defendant.

2. The defendant denies the right to and possession of the plaintiff in the land claimed by him, and puts him to the proof of his title. This land is an accretion to the Ainavilly Lunka belonging to Government, and is, therefore, the property of the Crown.

3. As shown in the Plan, parts of the Ainavilly Lunka fields Nos. 780, 81, 82, 87, and 88, were washed away subsequent to the Demarcation and Survey which were made in the years 1859 1860, and on and near the same spot, the land in dispute was newly formed adjoining the Ainavilly Lunka. This land was occupied and cultivated for Fuslies 1276 and 1277 by the ryots of Ainavilly, as it was included in the rents of the other Lunkas of Ainavilly. In Fusly 1278 the ryots of Kotipalli with the privity of the Kotipalli Tanedar, unlawfully encroached upon and cultivated this land surreptitiously. This having been brought to the defendant's notice, an order was issued to the Tahsildar to attach the produce of the cultivation thus surreptitiously made. The Tanedar then stated before the Tahsildar that the land in question was made over to him by your Court, under the virtue of the Decree passed by you in Suit No. 18 of 1866.

4. In the plaint filed by the plaintiff in this suit, the land now claimed was not included. The Court will observe this from the boundaries of the land therein claimed and described in the plaint.

5. The defendant, therefore, prays that the Court will dismiss this suit with costs.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Plan.

THE proposed answer is approved and the defence of the suit sanctioned.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godavery District,
with Plan.

Copy to the Accountant-General.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Enclosure in the Proc: of the Bd of Rev: to the Secr: to Govt: R D. dated 13th Sept: 1870

1869. 91-5708.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 8TH NOVEMBER 1869, No. 8,261.

Encl.

Rev. 1 / 2855/70

Received

Pros: 29th October/1870 2306

NOVEMBER.

No. 8,261.

Suit.—No. 40 of 1869, filed against Government in Rajahmundry Principal Sudder Ameen's Court, in Godavery District, by Zemindar of Vizianagrum for possession of certain Lunka land.—Defence of,—sanctioned, and proposed answer approved.

No. 1649

Agreeably to the recommendation of the Board, the Sort Vaucheen the institution of a regular suit against the Zemindar of Vizianagrum for the recovery of the Land in question.

Sd/ [illegible]

27 Oct.

To Collr of Rajahmundry & Sheb Deputies

M.R.O. 1—39,600—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	1649	Press Mis.
Dated	27. 10.	1930

Not to be folded or roughly handled