

(1) Number of Pages..... 8
(2) Date of repair..... 27. 6. 68
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... 2. 1. 69

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

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

1149.

Press
Mis.

Dated 29. 5. 1875 -196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Statement of suits filed against Collector to enforce
ending 31st March 1875 Vide Board's Standing Circular Order N^o.

registration of Plaintiffs as Pullakadars for the Quarter
XXVII of 1874 Chingleput District.

1149
2

Court N^o 4
date of hearing
Plaintiff and
Defendants
Substance of Plaintiff

Substance of Defence

Remarks

1
N^o 719 of 1874
on the file of the
District Munsiff
of Trivellore
15th February 1875
Plaintiff
Vengumma
wife of Vappagunta
Raghavier
Defendants
1. Subbier
2. Raghavier
3. Appier
4. Sreeramier
5. Gessoomaerthy
6. Narasier
7. Venkatarayalu
8. Ponnappillay
9. Poomi Chetty
10. Collector of the
Chingleput D.
The value of the suit is
Rupees 91.13.4.
Requesting the issue of
a separate puttah in the
name of the Plaintiff for
her $\frac{1}{4}$ share separating it
from the joint puttah
issued in the names of
Plaintiff, Defendants from
1-5 and the maternal grand-
mothers of the 6th Defendant.

The 10th Defendant submits (1) that
the lands sued for by the Plaintiff are
entered in a joint puttah issued in the
names of the Defendants 1-5 Plaintiff
and the 6th Defendant's grandmothers
(deceased)

(2) that Plaintiff did apply for the
issue of a separate puttah in her name
for them alleging that they constituted
her share, but as she did not produce
the Razeemamah of the Co puttadars,
this Defendant had no alternative but
to refuse such puttah. He is however
willing to abide by the Courts decree.
Prays for costs.

2
N^o 504 of 1874
on the file of
the District
Munsiff of
Ponnammallu
9th April 1875
Plaintiff
1. Maksa Narayana
2. Mani Niyayer
3. Abdul Maped
Defendants
1. Gundasamy Mudally
2. Singara Mudally
3. Muthusamy Mudally
Value of the suit is Rs. 48.6.
Requesting the transfer
of a puttah for the fields
mentioned in the plaint
to the names of Plaintiff
from those of the Defendants
1 & 3 on the ground that

The 7th Defendant submits
that as the lands sued for are held
on a joint puttah by Gundasamy
Mudally and Muthusamy Mudally
1st and 2nd Defendants respectively, it
was not competent for him to have
made any alteration in it without

4. Apayara
Munyan
5. Veesammy
6. Rahuman
Sahib
7. Collector of
the District

they (Plaintiffs) purchased
the same from the fathers
of the 1st and 3^d Defendants.

the Puttahdar's Razeemamab which
the Plaintiff never produced; there
is nothing on record even to show
that they ever made an application
on the subject. He is however
willing to abide by the Court's decree
and pray for costs.

3

Plaintiff

The value of the suit is

N^o 280 of 1874
on the file of
the District

Subroya Pillai
Defendants

Rupees 99.12-"
Stamp duty 10-"

Munsiff of
Chingleput

1 Anniasami
Mudally

11th November 1874

2 Haruppi
Amzmai

but an extension

3. The
Sub Collector

of 2 months

has been

obtained.

Praying for the issue of
a separate puttah in the name
of the Plaintiff for the lands
specified in the plaint and
purchased by him from
1st Defendant.

The 3^d Defendant is willing
to abide by the Decree of the Court
as regards the issue of separate puttahs
for portions of the several N^{os} (Pyotwary
land) referred to in the plaint, the
Government having recently permitted
the sub-division of survey fields,
but as two of the N^{os} 86 and 9
are held on puttah by parties
other than 1st or 2^d Defendant he
would submit the advisability of
the puttahdars having being made
parties to the suit

2. It is not usual to issue
puttah for house sites or backyards
as claimed by the Plaintiff; but
should the Court so order, the 3^d
Defendant has no objection to enter
Plaintiff's name against them
in the Adangul accounts or to
enter the portion actually purchased
by him in his sole name.

3. The 3^d Defendant declines to

Ching Lepet District
Collector's Office
Saidpet 5th May 1875

register the Gyana Mansim referred
to in the plaint in his name, because
according to the practice of the District,
these Mansims are not registered in
the name of any particular individual
in the Revenue accounts and the
Jama Commissioner even has
not entered them in the name of any
particular individual. Prays for his
costs.

1 Sig? / R. I. Melville
Sp. Collector.

True Copy

H. H. Thomas
By Secretary.

W. W. Hughes

Copd. Measles morning

1149.
3
Revenue Department
Miscellaneous No 4526

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 21st May 1845.

Read statement from the Collector
of Chingleput dated 5th May 1875 N^o 229 of
suits filed against Collector to enforce re-
-gistration of plaintiffs as Puttahdars for
the Quarter ending 31st March 1875.

Submitted for the information
of Government.

7 Trees Extract,

St. Petersburg

By Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with Copy of Statement.

E. H. Muesel

Capt. McClellan

Concluded in Accord-
ance of the Board of
Treasurers to the Society
to be transmitted. P. C.
of 21st May 1875,
Ms. A. N. 24526.

Copy of statement
of suits filed against
Collectors to enforce
registration of Panikho
as Puttadans for the
quarter ending 31st
March 1955-

Rev 2020/75

1149
4

Ans: 1875: 2466
No 22849: 2020
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 21st May 1875
Recd 28th Aug 24

By

W. M. M.

To the Board of Rev Dec 5th June

Suit—Filed against Collectors
of Wharfedale District to enforce
regulation of Wharfedale as
Puttala, Stationary
for the quarter ending 31st
March 1875, submitted for
information of Govt.
1874/75 Recd 28th Aug 24

29th May 1875