

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.

Read the following:—

No. 399. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1870,
No. 7,018.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavery
District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada,
4th November 1870, No. 347.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Maize seed, received with reference to
the Board's Proceedings, dated 16th November 1869, No. 8,466, was distributed
throughout the district for cultivation

2. The directions of the Superintendent, Mr. W. Robertson, to be attended
to in its cultivation, were received some time after the seed was distributed and
sown; but they were, however, published in the District Gazette for guidance of
the growers. The result of its cultivation is tabulated in the form prescribed in
the above Proceedings. The growers were the Zemindar of Pittapoor and the
Tahsildars of the Ramachendrapoor and Amalapoor Talooks. Nine of the best
cobs are sent for the Board's inspection in a parcel in the steamer.

3. From the short directions first sent by Mr. Robertson, it seems that the
seed is considered the chief object in the cultivation, but from the pamphlet subse-
quently sent, and which has been translated, it seems that its principal use is as
green fodder. Maize is little used as food in this district, and not largely cultivated;
but this seed that has been sent has certainly grown admirably, as I think the
cobs sent will testify.

4. I request that the Cheeta skin which has been put in the same parcel with
the Maize may be ordered to be delivered to the Officer Commanding the Govern-
ment Body Guard at Madras.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Statement.

FORWARDED, together with the cobs which appear to have suffered in the
journey, to the Superintendent of the Government Farm for his remarks.

No. 399A. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th January 1871,
No. 452.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 8th December 1870, No. 7,018.

Read also the following official memorandum from the Honorary Secretary,
Government Farm, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
dated 19th December 1870, No. 98.

THE Honorary Secretary, Government Experimental Farm, has the honour
to forward, herewith, some remarks by the Superintendent of the Farm on the
experimental cultivation of Maize in the Godavery District.

551

Handwritten notes at the top of the page, including "No. 399" and "Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1870, No. 7,018."

Handwritten notes on the left side of the page, including "No. 399" and "Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1870, No. 7,018."

Large handwritten notes on the left side of the page, including "No. 399" and "Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1870, No. 7,018."

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

2. The results at Raly (No. 11) are peculiar, $\frac{1}{2}$ a lb. was sown, the plants withered away, but nevertheless produced 100 lbs. of straw and 90 cobs, weighing 56 lbs. The extent of ground was also very large compared with that in other experiments.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. R. ROBERTSON, Esq., Superintendent, Government Farm, to the Honorary Secretary, Government Farm Committee, dated Sydapet, 17th December 1870, No. 211.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of the Board, No. 7,018, dated 8th of December 1870, the statement and the cobs referred to therein.

2. The results of the first nine experiments are not recorded.

3. The experiments 1 and 2, conducted in the Amalapoor Talook, produced fair results. The weight of the cobs, 8 ozs. each, was very satisfactory. I am, however, at a loss to account for the very different results of the two experiments. Thus Plot No. 1, which was sown with 1 lb. of seed, and *was irrigated*, produced *only 40 cobs*; while Plot No. 2, sown with only $\frac{1}{2}$ a lb. of seed, *produced 90 cobs*. As the cobs are reported to be *the same in size*, the distance apart of the plants in the two experiments would in no way account for this. It seems probable that the plants were destroyed during the growth of the crop, or that some of the cobs were carried off before the results were ascertained. In the first instance, at the least 600 vital seeds were sown; in the second only 300 vital seeds, whilst the second produced 100 per cent. more cobs than the first. The fact that *the cobs were the same size in both experiments* proves conclusively that the smaller result in the first instance was not due to climate soil, or cultivation.

4. In the next two experiments the crop is said to have failed, but no details are given.

5. The Pittapoor experiment appears to have been carefully made, the experimenter has, however, omitted to record the total weight of the cobs harvested.

6. The cobs sent are fair average-sized specimen. The grains are large, well formed, and placed regularly upon the spike. They have evidently been harvested before being ripe.

7. The 3rd line in paragraph 3 of Mr. Fraser's letter evidently alludes to the pamphlet on yellow cholam *Holcus sorghum*. I am not aware that I ever recommended Maize *specially as a producer of green food*. Indeed, in this respect, it is inferior to the cholams of this country. It is more costly to grow, and only produces *one cutting* of fodder; while our cholams require very moderate cultivation, and will produce three or four cuttings of green fodder. Maize is undoubtedly a valuable fodder producer, but it is rather as a grain producer, that it will be most valuable to the agriculturists of this country. The following statistics show its importance in other countries. The Commissioner of Agriculture for the United States of America, in his report for 1868, states that the aggregate yield of the Maize crop for that year amounted to nine hundred million bushels, while the aggregate yield of the Wheat crop did not exceed *two hundred and twenty-five million bushels*. Again, the English Trade Accounts for eight months ending August last recorded the following importation of grains;—

Wheat...	...	...	...	...	19,776,933
Barley...	...	...	...	...	5,007,142
Oats...	...	...	...	...	7,233,513
Beans...	...	...	...	...	998,334
Maize...	...	...	...	...	10,007,704
Peas...	...	...	...	...	1,451,440

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Statement showing results of Maize experiments.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

SUBMITTED for the information of Government.

No. 400.

ORDER THEREON, 27th March 1871, No. 551.

Miscellaneous.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHAS. MACLEAN,

Acting Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

„ Agri-Horticultural Society.

„ Honorary Secretary, Government Farm.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH JANUARY 1871, No. 452.

Received

Experimental cultivation of Maize—in Godavery District,—Letter from Honorary Secretary Government Farm, Committee forwarding remarks of Farm Superintendent on, submitted to Government.

8-551
Recorded

114 Lohio Post Pass on Main Creek Depth 29'
1 — — — — — above Rockcutural Society's
6 — — — — — Honorary Secy. Post Farm's

A. 377

Dec. 1871. Dear
 Sir,
 The Committee of Masters
 do the honor to thank
 you and Mr. A. B.
 Robinson for the
 gift of the George

Patented 24th March 1877
No. 243

250704.

Enclosure 3.
1860-62-11-17-18
I have a copy of the 74
Deft: with case, sent to
Mason dated 12-3-1861
1871 relative to the Apple =
- action made by the
officer against the
master of the boat, & the
Collector of Birmingham.
For the sake of a people.
I must be a little more
positive at this point, in
relating to the suggestion
of sale of the 1862 case. It is
possible & perhaps, and
in case, relating to the

Ms. A. 9. 2. 28 March 1711
Wm. Dorr &

255-76

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

21. 11. 1911

Wm. F.

Ms A.9.2.398

115

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

No. 401. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th March 1871, No. 971 :—

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 26th January 1871, No. 27.

WITH reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honour to forward copies of the Decrees and Board's Proceedings, dated 25th June 1869, Judgments passed in the Original Suits No. 4,598. Nos. 25 and 26 of 1869, on the file of the Civil Court of Coimbatore. The Head Assistant Collector was one of the defendants in these Suits, both of which, it will be observed, were decided in favour of plaintiffs.

2. The total expenditure incurred in defending the Suits, as per enclosed memorandum, is Rs. 15-4-0. The Court has ordered the other defendants to pay the Head Assistant Collector Rs. 6-11-3 of the total costs. I request that sanction may be given for the balance of Rs. 8-8-9, being debited to Government.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

In the Civil Court of Coimbatore, Thursday, the 21th day of February 1870.

Original Suit No. 25 of 1869.

Present : F. M. KINDERSLEY, Esq.

Plaintiffs

versus

Defendants.

1. Marappa Gounden.
2. Soobbummal.

1. Chinnacooty Gounden.
2. Nunjappa Gounden.
3. The Head Assistant Collector.

THIS Suit coming on for hearing the Court delivered the following Judgment :—

This is a Suit originally instituted in the Court of the District Munsif of Coimbatore, but called up by this Court under Section 6, Act VIII. of 1859; and it is, to a certain extent, connected with Original Suit No. 26 of 1869, similarly called up and now also disposed of.

2. The plaintiffs state that the 1st defendant had mortgaged certain land specified in the plaint to the 2nd defendant; transferring the puttah to 2nd defendant's name; that on 21st September 1867, the 1st defendant sold the said land to the plaintiffs, who discharged 2nd defendant's mortgage and got possession of the land; that on 3rd December 1867, the 2nd defendant promised to present a razinamah to the Revenue authorities for getting the puttah transferred to plaintiffs' names, but failed to do so, and that in consequence, the 3rd defendant, the Head Assistant Collector, refused to issue a puttah to the plaintiffs. Plaintiffs, therefore, sue for a Decree directing 3rd defendant to grant them the puttah for the plaint lands.

3. The 1st defendant pleads that plaintiffs have no cause of action against him, since they allege that they are in possession of the land; and denies having ever sold the land to the plaintiffs. He admits the mortgage to 2nd defendant.

4. The 2nd defendant denies that his mortgage was paid off, and that he promised to transfer the puttah to the plaintiffs. He alleges that he is still in possession of the land.

5. The 3rd defendant pleads that he should not be held liable for costs: since he was bound, by Circular Order No. 149 of the Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue, to refuse to transfer the puttah, no razinamah for such transfer having been presented by the Puttahdar.

6. The plaintiffs at the settlement of issues filed A., the mortgage bond executed to 2nd defendant by 1st defendant, which 1st and 2nd defendants admitted; B., Deed of Sale executed by 1st defendant to plaintiffs, which 1st defendant denied, and which 2nd defendant declared he

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

2. The plaintiff in the plaint states that he mortgaged usufructually to the 1st defendant the lands mentioned in the plaint for Rupees 200, and transferred the puttah to 1st defendant's name; that on 24th September 1867 he redeemed the land by payment of the mortgage amount; that on 3rd December 1867 the 1st defendant promised to re-transfer the puttah to him but failed to do so; and that in consequence the 2nd defendant, Head Assistant Collector, refused to grant a puttah to the plaintiff. He, therefore, sues for a decree, directing that puttah should be issued in his name.

3. The 1st defendant, admitting the mortgage and the bond produced by the plaintiff, alleges that the plaintiff received from him a further sum of Rupees 261, and in consideration of this and the mortgage amount, in all Rupees 461, plaintiff sold the land to 1st defendant in July and August 1867. He states that he cannot produce the Sale Deed, as it was not registered, being drawn on an insufficient stamp; that he asked plaintiff to execute another Sale Deed, but plaintiff and the plaintiffs in Original Suit No. 25 of 1869, forcibly took the mortgage deed from him. He claims to be in possession of the land.

4. The 2nd defendant pleads he is not liable, as he was prohibited, by order of the Board of Revenue, from transferring the puttah without consent of the former puttahdar.

5. The plaintiff admits that he did execute a Sale Deed to 1st defendant, as stated, for Rupees 461, but he declares that the 1st defendant said he did not want the land, but the money; that thereupon he (plaintiff), raised Rupees 300 by mortgage of the land to Peria Carooppa Gounden and Chinna Carooppa Gounden, and paid 1st defendant Rupees 461 about one or two months after the execution of the Sale Deed.

6. The plaintiff also filed B., copy of a razinamah (the same as E. in Original Suit No. 25 of 1869), purporting to be given by 1st defendant, plaintiff, and the plaintiffs in Original Suit No. 25 of 1869, before the Deputy-Tahsildar of Avenashy, but 1st defendant denied this.

7. The following were the issues settled:—1st, whether the plaintiff has redeemed the plaint land from the 1st defendant; 2nd, whether 1st defendant executed the razinamah B.

8. The two issues must be found in favour of the plaintiff. The 1st witness, the Deputy-Tahsildar, and Sub-Registrar, speaks positively to the razinamah, of which B. is a copy, having been given by 1st defendant and others. He is positive on this point, and accounts for his being so positive, by the fact that these parties were so frequently appearing before him in disputes about the land, that he knew them well, and is certain if any one had tried to personate 1st defendant, he must have detected him at once. He states that he himself questioned the parties, and from what they told him he had the razinamah drawn out and read over to the parties who then signed it. This witness is in no way interested in the case, and his evidence seems altogether beyond suspicion.

9. It is impossible, with this razinamah staring one in the face, to believe that 1st defendant had, prior to its date, acquired an absolute title in the land, and this so corroborates the evidence of plaintiff's witnesses as to the re-payment to 1st defendant of Rupees 461, that I have no hesitation in pronouncing that the plaintiff's story on this point is true.

10. It is also corroborated by the fact that plaintiff produces the mortgage deed A., which 1st defendant admits, and which, if the plaintiff had not redeemed, the land would have remained in 1st defendant's possession as a sort of Title Deed. The 1st defendant says that plaintiff took this deed from him by force, but he has not a particle of evidence in support of this assertion.

11. The plaintiff's 2nd witness is Chinna Carooppa Gounden, and he produces E., the mortgage deed executed to him and Periya Carooppa Gounden for Rupees 300, in order to enable plaintiff to pay 1st defendant. This bond purports to be attested by 1st defendant, and I think there is little room for doubt on the point.

12. The 1st defendant has called two witnesses, whose names appear as attesting witnesses in E. Of these, 1st witness admits his attestation, but he says he went away directly he had attested, being very busy, and therefore knows nothing more of the matter. But he declares that 1st defendant was present when E. was executed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

13. The 2nd witness is the 1st defendant in Original Suit No. 25 of 1869, and I have no hesitation in saying that his statement that he was not present when E. was executed is false.

14. The only doubt I have in this case is the same as in Case No. 25, whether a suit merely for transfer of puttah, plaintiff having possession, can be brought under the ruling of the High Court in Special Appeal No. 71 of 1865, II., H. C. R. No. 363, but I think it can be. It is distinguishable from that suit, in that the Revenue authority who refused to grant plaintiff a puttah has been made defendant in the present suit; and I think also that the Judgment in Special Appeal No. 79 of 1866, III., H. C. R. No. 134, is in favour of the view that the present suit will lie.

15. It is true that the puttah is not conclusive evidence as to title, and therefore that the non-granting of a puttah does not inflict any present injury on the plaintiffs. But it seems to me that when plaintiffs have legally acquired the ownership of the land, they should be, and have a right to be, recognized as such by the Revenue authorities; and though the absence of a puttah is no immediate injury to the plaintiff, yet, in course of years, such absence might be used as a strong presumptive fact, should any dispute as to title occur. There are, it cannot be denied, many cases in which the puttah turns the scale in disputes as to title, and notably in cases where the question is whether land has been permanently and absolutely conveyed, or only temporarily as under lease, mortgage, deposit, etc.

16. By the rules of the Revenue authorities, it seems that no puttah can be transferred unless the original puttahdar consents to and applies for such transfer, and such being the case, it seems hard to say to the plaintiffs "you should have no means whatever of obtaining a puttah for lands which you legally own," and thus leave to the former proprietor, who has actually parted with all right and title, an opening, should opportunity occur, for disputing plaintiffs' rights, and for producing documents which would be more or less presumptive evidence against plaintiff.

I therefore decree that 2nd defendant do issue a puttah in the name of plaintiff, and that 1st defendant, who is the cause of this suit, do pay plaintiff's and 2nd defendant's costs.

Memorandum of documents filed and witnesses examined.

Plaintiff's documents.

A.—Mortgage bond regarding land with a well, executed to Nunjappa Gounden by Cooty Gounden, on the 1st May, 1860, for Rupees 200.

B.—Copy of razinamah executed before the Deputy-Tahsildar of Avenashy, by plaintiff, 1st defendant Soobayee Muttou Gounden and Marappa Gounden on the 3rd December 1867.

C.—Endorsement granted by 2nd defendant in favour of plaintiff on the 13th October 1869.

D.—Copy of razinamah marked B.

E.—Mortgage bond executed to Periya Carooppa Gounden and Chinna Carooppa Gounden by plaintiff on the 24th September 1867 for Rupees 300.

Plaintiff's Witnesses.

1. Teroomalay Moodelly.
2. Chinna Carooppa Gounden.
3. Ramien.
4. Nulla Gounden.

1st Defendant's witnesses.

1. Nunjappa Gounden.
2. Chinnacooty Gounden.

(Signed) F. M. KINDERSLEY,
Acting Civil Judge.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 3 and 4.—Copies of decrees in Suits Nos. 25 and 26 of 1869.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Memorandum of Costs.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

SUBMITTED, with a copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 25th June, 1869, No. 4,598, for the information of Government.

2. Plaintiffs in both cases sued to obtain puttahs for certain land belonging to them for which the puttahdars refused to execute the usual razinamahs.

3. The Acting Head Assistant Collector was made a defendant, because he declined, in the absence of razinamahs, to transfer the puttahs.

4. The Court has decreed that puttahs be issued to plaintiffs by the Acting Head Assistant Collector, but has directed that his costs be paid by the other defendants. The amount of costs awarded in the decrees is Rupees 6-11-3. The amount actually incurred is Rupees 15-4-0. The sanction of Government is solicited for the payment of the balance, Rupees 8-8-9.

No. 402.

ORDER THEREON, 27th March 1871, No. 552.

Miscellaneous.

SANCTIONED, Rs. 8-8-9.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary to Government.

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

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1871.*

Rev: 1871. Dept:
**Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.** *17-8-71*

PROCEEDINGS, 6TH MARCH 1871, No. 971.

Def: 2/13 March 1871
Received *14* *9/10/71*

MARCH.
No. 971.

Original Suits Nos. 25 and 26 of 1869, — on file of Civil Court of Coimbatore regarding puttah for certain lands, — Copies of Decree and Judgment passed in, submitted to Government, and their sanction requested for payment of balance of costs viz. Rupees 8-8-9.

Sanctioned
17-8-8-9.
27 March 1871

the old line of road. Those will be used for the bridge on the salt road to which this expenditure will be charged, and the total cost eventually adjusted by distribution as above proposed.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Public Works Department.
,, the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

ue, dated 3rd

na District, to
ndivada, 30th

ember 1870,
2, in regard to
s to make the
to Bantumilli
gh sketch of

a, to Wadali.
odu channel
ttle north of

ground, and
es, though a

Polrazkodu
umilli salt
ld be built

ll secure a
anctioned.
ost of the
airs under
from the

is already
be built on

Govt. of 1871 Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated March, 27th.

Recd. Dtd.

G. O., 27th March 1871, No. 552.

MARCH

Nos. 401-402.

Suits Nos. 25 and 26 of 1869, regarding
Puttah for certain lands in Coimbatore Dis-
trict.—Balance of cost incurred in connectio
with them, sanctioned.

No.

to th

decl

Hea

ants.

actu

payr

No.

To

„