

(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.		Mis.
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 Bhatta
residing at Madras

The Board of Revenue dated
1876 —
That a ROW son of
Hafid Sheradad

Amrath - Hafid Sheradad - who
was to him as a legal representative of
by his late adopted father

son of Government for the cent
in the person of Rs. 87 1/2

Amrath is the adopted son of
Sheradad of North Arcot. He was
to him as the representative of him of the
Rs. (87 1/2) eighty-seven and half a man
Row for "Amrath Sheradad" to consider

Row son of Hafid Sheradad
Sheradad Sheradad Government
moved by the Government of the
a share of an allowance in
his valuable public services

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

It clearly shows that the money was
of the facts as stated by the Board's Office

The letter from the Collector
shows that Hafid Sheradad who now enjoys
his adopted father's name. Hafid Sheradad
as regards his title. It is not to be
that, if this circumstance, Hafid Sheradad

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

G.O. 2nd May 1871 No. 411

favorable to the petitioner. It is
to the argument that Hafid Sheradad is to
to only a share of the pension which was
and as a whole or in part had been drawn

It is not probable that the
of the pension granted in answer
Government of 1859. However, the allow
to individuals who had been

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

It is somewhat hard and tends to

C. A. GALLON,
Acting Secretary

No. 144. Miscellaneous
Miscellaneous


1876 No. 1912
Has the Government the Comma
no reason for not opening the
Government of India have decided
that they are not to be considered

that the adopted son has no right
special grant

W. F. CARRUTHERS,
Secretary to Government

To the Board of Revenue

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
of an Indian Rev. - the adopted son
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 1857 -

The history of the case is as follows -

This man's claims have already been
before Govt. in the year 1871. in a memorial
from the Government of Madras - and
his rights + interest to his adoption + the
share of his property from the subject
of a memorial to Govt. India.

The point was then overlooked
and upon the Govt. not then applicable
- This is that under Govt. 1st 1871. The Govt.
remained all over the Govt. who was
to be given a grant to the Govt. + a grant
which is the subject of the case of the case.

By Rev. 1871. 27th April
1876

Rev. 18th May 71
— 8th July 71

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 increase (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 Poththachur requesting to obtain the pension for the continuance of him as legal representative of the late life pensioner of Poththachur by his late adopted father.

Petitioner is the adopted son of C. Venkata Rao, son of Bhacima Rao late Head Sherista of Poththachur. He requests that the Board will recommend for the continuance to him of the pension enjoyed by his adopted father by the Poththachur and half a month for a share of an allowance made to him at Poththachur.

Board of Revenue

The former has got no Council nor
no reason for improving the
case in the Feb. of last year have
decided that the adopted
Plan had no right - wonder
the change ^{now} comes ^{any} candidate
in financial grounds.

20
27.11.76

1026. *Prunella* *Y. occidentalis* 1891
a flower on the addition, and
it is now regarded as having
the right place in the same position
as a flower on the tree to the
right of the tree.

do not think the conduct
good on the ^{other} ~~part~~ ^{side} of the case.
The original grant was a
mistake. The way on the
original grant being def-
ective, converted into
a money purchase divided
among the sons. I do not
think the latter of the fault of
either party, nor carrying
out the intention of the
contract. But I do think
the grant was a mistake
in the good sense of
the word. I would give
the price for that but have
no authority to the United
States. I have the
original of the grant.

B. W. Mason, Esq.
Cambridge, Mass.

1829. Open the case
 - The case has an Air added con-
 sidered more successful in
 all a different position
 better for such a measure

2000年12月

1875

Dear Mr. Smith, I am in the same
position regarding the same.

He was distinctly old. He is
forming the point that we suppose
we had not noticed before.
But that one precise point.
He said to be possibly that with

The first thing we saw when we
descended from the boat was the
disgraceful & ill conditioned
but his adoption is false, he is
not a person who ought to go to
his adoption mother at his own
choice. He is being sent down to
Columbia River. If

1977-1978

in as much as his engagement entitled
to only a share of the pension 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 I think that the
Case of Petitioners is serious but that
and we are to lay it before Government
for their orders.

John B. Johnson

The Secretary of Government
 The same department
 with Patton who returned

