M.R.O. 1—39,000—16-10-29.

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1829 Press Mis—

34-12 Dated 22-11-1870

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

No. 311. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th November 1870, No. 6,565 :—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Cuddapah, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th October 1870, No. 187.

I HAVE the honour to forward copy of a letter from the Acting Sub-Collector, dated 6th instant, No. 350, relative to an escheat under Regulation VII. of 1817, for the sale of which sanction is by law required.

2. It seems a pity that the Board and Government should be troubled with such trumpery matters. In their Proceedings* quoted by Mr. Storr, the Board have suggested that Collectors should be authorized to dispose of such trivial cases without reference. No order seems to have been issued on the subject.

* Board's Proceedings, 18th and 26th February 1870, Nos. 1,115 and 1,362.

3. In a similar case, my predecessor held that immovable property of a person dying intestate should be disposed of under the provisions of Clauses 5 and 7, Section 16 of Regulation III. of 1802, and the matter left to the Civil Judge for the necessary action.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. STORR, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated Madanapally, 6th October 1870, No. 350.

IN the taluq of Royachoty in the village of Maditaud, a man named Campsala Seddhalingadoo died intestate, and without heirs, in May 1870, leaving a shed valued at Rupees 1-10-0. As this property becomes an escheat under Regulation VII. of 1817, I have the honour to request that the necessary orders of Government may be obtained for its sale.

2. As the Tahsildar reports that if the sale is delayed the building will become entirely valueless, I have, in anticipation of sanction, directed him to sell it at once.

3. You will observe that I have not, in this instance, followed the procedure laid down by you in docket No. 49 of 1870, dated 21st February 1870, but have reverted to that suggested in my letter, No. 43, of 12th February 1870, as I find this is the plan pursued in similar cases, and appears to be correct—*Vide* Board's Proceedings for February 1870, Nos. 1,115 and 1,362.

THE Board request the sanction of the sale of the escheat, valued at Rupees 1-10-0, referred to in this letter.

2. With regard to paragraph 2, the Board observe that in Government Order, 28th April 1870, No. 596, Government have ruled that the present procedure in cases of escheat must continue to be followed.

3. The provisions of the law referred to in paragraph 3 do not apply to *escheats*.

No. 312. ORDER THEREON, 22nd November 1870, No. 1,829.

Miscellaneous.

THE sale is sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
*Secretary to Government.*

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

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

Rev- 1870. Oct.

# Board of Revenue,

MADRAS. No. 3540

PROCEEDINGS, 9TH NOVEMBER 1870, No 6,565.

Desp. 14 Nov 70

Encl.

Received 15.

NOVEMBER.

No. 6,565.

*Shed*—in Maditadu village in Royachoty Taluq, Cuddapah District, left by an individual who died intestate and without heirs in May 1870,—Sanction of Government requested for sale of certain, as an escheat.

No. 1829

I. D. I. the sale is sanction

22 Nov 70.

11th April /70 No 147/8

28 — 33 7/8

14 Extra Dup Rev. Disp. 23 Acctt Govt

Govt. of 1870 Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated November, 22nd.

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 22nd November 1870, No. 1,829.

NOVEMBER.

Nos. 311-312.

*Intestate property in Cuddapah District.—Sanction granted for its sale as an escheat.*