

(1) Number of pages 10
(2) Date of repair 14.8.1967
(3) Initials of the Referee

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>1947</u>	Exec.
R.P. No.		Ms.
Dated <u>7.2.1967</u>		196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 143. Read 1876 following P
November 3 Miscellaneous
Read Petition 236 of 1876
and grant of Bhatti
residing at Madras

The Board of Revenue dated
1876 —
That a ROW son of
Hafid Sheradad: (Crown) Agent

Amranchi - Hafid Sheradad: (Crown) Agent
area to him as a legal representative of
by his late adopted father

son of Government for the centennial
in the person of Rs. 8, 1/2, 1/2

Amranchi is the adopted son of
Shensadad of North Arcot. He was
to share in the centennial to him of the
Rs. (8 1/2) eighty-seven and half a man
Row for "Amranchi" to consider

Row son of Hafid Sheradad: (Crown) Agent
to share in the centennial to him of the
Rs. (8 1/2) eighty-seven and half a man
Row for "Amranchi" to consider

Amranchi has stated his case in
detail. It will suffice to give
every particular known out by the records

It clearly shows that the fact is not
in the facts as stated by the Crown Agent
Board's Office

The letter from the Collector
shows that Subba Row who now enjoys
his adopted father's name, was Row in
and received his title from 2nd to 3rd
that, if this circumstance, but from his

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410
of the pension granted? drawn by
the same person as the pensioner
The Board think it not probable
the pension of Government in 1859

G.O. 2nd May 1871 No. 411

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410

favorable to the petitioner must have
be also argued that Subba Row as the
to only a share of the pension which was
and as a whole or in part had been drawn

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410

The Board think that the case
lay it before Government for their

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410

No. 146. Miscellaneous
Miscellaneous

C. A. GALLON,
Acting Secretary


that the adopted son has no special
special privilege

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410

To the Board of Revenue

Row dated 18th June 1859 No. 410

Read P. 2. P. 2. P. 2.



No.

Nov 1876

From M^o of Rev.Dated 8th Nov

1876

FOR ORDERS.

The M^o of Rev. for the favourable consideration of Govt. a memorial for an Indian Rev. - the adopted name of one of the sons of M^o of Rev. who was granted a special grant for 3 acres of land in the East of M^o of Rev. in 1871 -

The history of the case is as follows -

This case is already before Govt. in the year 1871. In a report from the Collector of Madras - and his rights - and to his children - the name of the person from the subject of a memorial to Govt. India.

The point was then overlooked and upon the Govt. not then applicable - This is the case for 1871. The first memorial allowed on Govt. who was to be given a grant of 3 acres of land in the East of M^o of Rev. in 1871 -

By P^o 1871. 27th April 1871

By P^o 1871. 27th April 1871

Gov of India, it is to be noted
left or retained with
the Gov. to allow a smaller
scale claims. It must be stated
that the Gov. has no
right to enclose (helps
Gov. of India 31 Aug 71)

1871

Revenue Department
Miscellaneous No 948

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 11th November 1870

Recd Petition No 2236 of 1870 from C. Venkata Rao
son of C. Venkata Rao and grandson
of Bhacima Rao late Head Sherista
of Pothurbetah requesting that he be
permitted to obtain the pension of Rs 100
for the continuance of his son's legal repre-
sentation of the said life pension of
Rs 100 enjoyed by his late adopted father.

Petitioner is the adopted son of
C. Venkata Rao son of Bhacima Rao late
Head Sherista of Pothurbetah. He requests
that the Board will recommend him
to continue the continuance to him
of the pension enjoyed by his adopted
father viz Rs 100 per annum and half
a month for a share of an allowance
made to him at Pothurbetah for the last year.

Board of Revenue

[illegible]

2. Petitioner has stated his case so fully and clearly that it is not necessary to speak it in detail; it will suffice to observe that the facts as stated by him are in every particular borne out by the records in the Board's office.

The letter from the folks at Langport,
dated 30 June 1899, has shown that Arthur
Allen's share in the share of the proceeds
of the company was by his adoption of the
company's share in the proceeds of the same
company as the other two. I am sure he
is not because of the share in the
company. I think it not unlikely that
if the circumstances had been brought
to the notice of the company in 1891, the share
of the company would have been
the same as the share of the company
in the proceeds of the company. It can easily
be seen by a glance at the account
that I have given of the life

10th Nov 1871

Mr. Jones has put the Council in a narrow position by his action in the case of the 1st of Oct. has been decided not to adopt the bill as it is - and the Council have no alternative but to refuse to pass it.

27/11/76

10th Nov 1871. The Council have decided not to adopt the bill as it is now regarded as being too much in the same position as a man born to the father of the throne.

I do not think the Council good in the matter of the bill. The original grant was a grant in this way, on the original grant being made, and the Council have decided to give the bill as it is. I do not think the bill is the best of the bill, but the Council have decided to give the bill as it is. I do not think the bill is the best of the bill, but the Council have decided to give the bill as it is.

FOR ORDERS.

G. W. Jones, Esq.

10th Nov 1871. The Council have decided not to adopt the bill as it is now regarded as being too much in the same position as a man born to the father of the throne.

27/11/76

W. H. Jones, Esq.

I do not think the Council good in the matter of the bill. The original grant was a grant in this way, on the original grant being made, and the Council have decided to give the bill as it is. I do not think the bill is the best of the bill, but the Council have decided to give the bill as it is.

The bill is a bill in the nature of a bill, and the Council have decided to give the bill as it is. I do not think the bill is the best of the bill, but the Council have decided to give the bill as it is.

Other side

in as much as his enjoyment of the property is only a share of the property which was granted for three years. Moreover, the allowance in whole or in part had been drawn by three individuals before him.

4. The Board think that the case of the property is somewhat different, and it is not to be taken for granted for their orders.

W. H. Jones, Esq.

The Secretary of the Government, the Board of the Government, with the Board of the Government.

Other side

1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890

1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910

Dated _____ 1910

No. _____