

(1) Number of Pages..... 6
(2) Date of repair..... 29. 7. 1966
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... *[Signature]*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 509
B.P. No.

Press
Mis.

Dated 27. 4. 1874 1966

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th April 1874.*

No. 211. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th April 1874, No. 858:—

Read the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Sub-Collector of North Arcot, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, dated 20th February 1874, No. 142:—

With reference to your foot-note, dated 17th December 1873, in the Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 1,319, dated 4th idem, I have the honour to state that the Village Accounts, Nos. 3 and 11, were not reported by Mr. Knox as to have been lost. He simply stated that the entries in No. 11 are blank. By the present report of the Tahsildar, it appears that these accounts were not written and filed in the Taluq Catcherry at all. This is, of course, the late Carnam Gumaatah Venkata Row's fault.

2. The Receipt or Kachayat given to the ryot was produced by him at the time of inquiry, and is now with the records marked 2.

3. As regards the Tandal or Village Account, No. 10, which is the Chittah of the daily collection from each individual, every inquiry has been made by the Tahsildar, and no satisfactory evidence is forthcoming as to who the guilty party is. Venkata Row and Terumalacharry accused one another. The latter has since died, and it is not, therefore, probable that the loss of the account can be satisfactorily accounted for.

4. As regards the reason why the accounts were not called for in fasli 1270, the present Tahsildar, who was lately appointed, is unable to give any satisfactory explanation, and the then Tahsildar and Taluq Sheristadar are no longer in the service.

5. It does not appear clearly when the intimation of the loss of the account was first received by the Tahsildar, but it turned up during the inquiry in 1870.

6. The Tahsildar, however, suggests that, as there is not satisfactory proof that the money was actually credited to Government, the Monegar and Carnam may be ordered to pay up the amount.

7. Tahsildar's Arzi and enclosures are herewith forwarded for your information.

No. 125.

Submitted to the Board of Revenue, with reference to their endorsement, dated 10th December 1873, Miscellaneous No. 8,431, on Government Order, dated 4th idem, No. 1,349.

2. Under the circumstances reported by the Sub-Collector, the refund cannot be made from the Government treasury, but, as the ryot is entitled to it, the Carnam must pay it.

RANIPET.
6th March 1874.

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Collector.

Submitted to Government, with reference to G. O., dated 4th December 1873, No. 1,319.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th April 1874.*

2. The Board are of opinion that the Monegar, Gangamah Naidu, who, received the money, must pay it. The word "Curnam" in the Collector's Memorandum seems to be a mistake.

No. 212.

ORDER THEREON, 27th April 1874, No. 509.

Land Revenue, No. G.

Both the Monegar and Curnam are responsible for the money collected by the former not being credited nor remitted to the taluq. The Curnam does not seem to have been a satisfactory public servant, and has since been dismissed.

2. Under these circumstances, it will be sufficient if a moiety of the sum collected from V. Kassim Sahib be recovered from the Monegar, the balance being refunded by the Collector.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Ed. F. L. Bantleman.

Proceedings of the Board of Railway, dated 14th April 1875.

With reference to your foot-note, dated 17th December 1873, on the Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 1319, dated 4th idem, I have the honour to state that the Village Accounts, Nos. 3 and 11, were not reported by Mr. Knott as to have been lost. He simply stated that the entries in No. 11 are blank. By the present report of the Tahsildar, it appears that these accounts were not written and filed in the Taluq Catcherry at all. This is, of course, the late Ournam Gumaastah Venkata Row's fault.

3. As regards the Tandal or Village Account, No. 10, which is the Chittah of the daily collection from each individual, every inquiry has been made by the Tahsildar, and no satisfactory evidence is forthcoming as to who the guilty party is. Venkata Row and Torunallacharry accused one another. The latter has since died, and it is not, therefore, probable that the loss of the account can be satisfactorily accounted for.

5. It does not appear clearly when the intimation of the loss of the account was first received by the Tahsildar, but it turned up during the inquiry in 1879.

7. Tahsildar's Arzi and enclosures are herewith forwarded for your information.

SUBMITTED to the Board of Revenue, with reference to their endorsement, dated 10th December 1873, Miscellaneous No. 8,431, on Government Order, dated 4th idem, No. 1,349.

MANIPUL. (Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
8th March 1874. Collector.

2. The Board are of opinion that the Monogaz, Gangamah Naidu, who received the money, must pay it. The word "Gurnam" in the Collector's Memorandum seems to be a mistake.

[Signature]
Secretary

Wm. D. Eastman

卷之四

1874

MADRAS.

Examinado em 1 de Junho de 1974. B. 2. 1. 100

Handwritten: *Amphispiza*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

REBEL

林下風光

Payment of Assessment.—amounting to Rs. 35,000 for one Kachin tribe of Manipul and Rs. 25,000 for North Achei District for April 1897, but the latter is recorded in accounts—Report from Chinlungh referring to—submitted to Government. Chinlungh expressed that Monsang, Gangnah Nida who received the money, should pay it.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

卷之四