

## MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1950 Revenue Press  
Mis.

Dated 6th December 1870.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

that

Memo. for Orders on No. 2921.

See G. O. ~~Lat~~ 22<sup>d</sup> Decr 1866 and  
18<sup>th</sup> Octr 1867 with Memoranda  
attached and notes of the members  
of Govt. -

I have always ad-  
vised the measure  
proposed by the H. C.

The rules of Co. for  
cemetery are to put  
the at I could do at  
low in Division in  
all cases - where the  
parties unite in do-  
ing it - ~~and~~ I would  
give it in point of  
title - J. D. S.

A. A. J. P.  
She

1. After careful consideration  
and a good deal of discussion,  
it was determined in 1867 to allow  
the registration of separate shares  
in joint whole Indian Villages  
under certain circumstances and  
on certain conditions. -

2. It was at the same  
time stated that the Board of  
Rev. would be at liberty, after  
the experiment had been sufficiently  
tried in regard to Inams of  
not less extent than an entire  
Village, to propose its extension  
to smaller Inams, on similar  
tenure, should they be satisfied  
with the result of the first  
trial. -

3. The Board now recommend  
that

that the privilege conceded in the case of the entire Villages held on joint Inam tenure should now be extended to all Inams held on joint tenure.

4. It appears, however, that as yet little or no effect has been given to the orders in regard to the entire village Inams and the experiment can scarcely yet be said to have been tried. The Board are of opinion that the sub-division of small Inams is more likely to be taken advantage of than the sub-division of Village Inams held by a large number of persons.

5. It is submitted that until it has been shown more decidedly that the proposed measure is needed, any changes in the existing arrangements

are

The Balance of local authority appears to me to be against the proposed measure.

It does not seem to me to be desired or necessary. If it was extensively used I apprehend that a great deal of minute business would be thrown on the

Subordinate Revenue authorities. I think it would be best to leave matters as they are but the question might be discussed in Council. N

are unnecessary.

6. Probably the incomplete nature of the sub-division allowed, is the reason why so little advantage has been taken of the permission to register sub-divisions, and this would apply equally in the case of minor Inams. A sharer who had had his share sub-divided would still remain liable for a default of any other sharer, supposing that the share of the defaulter was insufficient to meet the claim of Cook.

Memo  
Enfranchisement of  
Joint Tenure  
in Joint Tenure

Revenue Dept.  
No 1950  
of 6-12-1870

Council

Revenue Department  
No 1950.

Proceedings of the Madras Government  
Under date the 8<sup>th</sup> Decemr/70

Read the following  
Proceedings of the Board of  
Revenue.

Sub: with remarks replies  
from Collectors in regard to the  
advisability of extending orders  
authorizing sub-division of joint  
liability of shareholders in Inam  
enfranchised whole villages on acct  
of Govt's quit rent.

(F. & 14<sup>th</sup> Sept<sup>r</sup>/70 N<sup>o</sup> 5715)

The Government  
adopt the Board's proposal  
in para 9 of the above  
Proceedings and authorize  
them to instruct Collectors  
that the rules for the sub-  
division of enfranchised  
joint tenure Inam villages  
may be applied to cases  
of

4m.

of similar trams of less  
extent than an entire  
village. The Board will  
consider and report  
whether it is necessary  
to fix any other limita-  
tion as to the minimum  
of subdivision than  
what the rules already  
prescribe

*[Signature]*

14. Letter to Board Dec 14/94

List

Ordered in Council

29<sup>th</sup> Nov 1894

*[Signature]*