

(1) Number of Pages.....12

(2) Date of repair.....12-12-68

(3) Initials of the Referencer.....*[Signature]*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	212	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	14. 2. 1876	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th February 1876.*

No. 163. Read the following Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 11th February 1876:—

Read the following letter from H. W. BLISS, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated 26th January 1876, No. 10.

From the Court's Proceedings marginally noted, it will be seen that a suit has

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Dated 28th Aug. 1874, No. 2,436. | been filed against Chithambram Chetty |
| 2. " 6th Oct. " " 2,908. | on behalf of the minor Zemindar of |
| 3. " 4th Jan. 1875, " 14. | Ramnad for the recovery of Hanumanthan- |
| 4. " 27th " " " 180. | gudy and two other villages alienated to |

the former by the late Zemindar. The circumstances connected with this alienation are set forth in the letters embodied in the above Proceedings.

2. I have now the honor to submit herewith translation of a plaint filed by the aforesaid Chithambram Chetty against the Agent of the Court of Wards and the Collector. The plaintiff has brought the present suit to have the above three villages separately sub-assessed and registered under Regulation XXV. of 1802. I request sanction for defending the suit from the funds of the Ramnad estate so far as the interest of the minor is concerned, and also at the cost of Government so far as they are concerned with the sub-assessment and registration.

3. I beg to enclose also for approval copies of two drafts of written statements I have prepared,—one to be filed on behalf of the Agent of the Court of Wards, and the other on behalf of the Collector. It is proposed to be contended on behalf of the minor that the alienation of the villages by the late Zemindar in favor of Chithambram Chetty is not binding on him (minor), as it was not in any way necessary for any family purpose whatever, and as it was made after his conception, and his acquirement thereby of rights in the property which his father could not alienate save for such purposes; and that the minor objects therefore to the registration of the villages under Regulation XXV. of 1802.

4. The suit is posted for hearing on the 15th March next. I will apply to have it tried as one suit with the suit against Chithambram Chetty, as the issues raised are substantially the same. The value of the suit is stated at Rs. 10,000.

A suit on behalf of the minor Zemindar of Ramnad has been filed against Chithambram Chetty for the recovery of three villages which the latter holds under a deed of gift from the late Zemindar, on the ground that the alienation of the property is invalid as against the minor.

2. Chithambram Chetty has now brought a suit against the minor and the Collector for the separate assessment and registration of the villages in question under Regulation XXV. of 1802.

3. The Court of Wards sanction the defence of the suit at the cost of the estate on behalf of the minor, and approve the draft answer.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th February 1875.*

4. The sanction of Government is requested for the defence of the suit on behalf of the Collector.

5. The suit is to be heard on the 15th March 1876.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 164.

ORDER THEREON, 14th February 1876, No. 212.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government sanction the defence of the suit, and approve the draft answer submitted by the Acting Collector.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Court of Wards.

4
behalf
£

No.

T.

15-10-58
Govt. of 1876: Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE COURT OF WARDS.

Dated February, 14th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 14th February 1876, No. 212.

FEBRUARY.

Nos. 163-164.

Suit against Minor Zemindar of Rannad. —
Sanctioning the defence of the — instituted by
Chithambram Chetty regarding certain villages,
and approving the draft answer submitted by the
Acting Collector.

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,
dated 11th February 1876

N^o. 10

Read the following

From,

J. B. W. Bliss Esquire
Acting Collector of Madras

To,

J. B. C. Stokes Esquire
Acting Secretary to the
Court of Wards
Madras

Sir,

1. Dated 28th August
1874, n^o. 2436.

2. 6th October 1874,
n^o. 2908.

3. 4th January 1875
n^o. 14.

4. 27th — Dec. — 1875
n^o. 180.

From the Court's Proceedings
marginally noted, it will be
seen that, a suit has been filed
against Chithambram Chetty on
behalf of the Minor Zemindar of
Rannad for the recovery of Rana-
manthangudy and 2 other villages
alienated to the former by the late
Zemindar. The circumstances connected
with this alienation are set forth
in

in the letters embodied in the above Proceedings.

2. I have now the honor to submit herewith translation of a plaint filed by the aforesaid Chithambaram Chetty against the agent of the Court of Wards and the Collector. The Plaintiff has brought the present suit to have the above 3 villages separately sub assessed and registered under Regulation XXV of 1802. I request sanction for defending the suit from the funds of the Ramnad Estate so far as the interest of the Minor is concerned and also at the cost of Government so far as they are concerned with the sub assessment and registration.

3. I

3. I beg to enclose also for approval copies of 2 Drafts of written statements I have prepared, one to be filed on behalf of the Agent of the Court of Wards, and the other on behalf of the Collector. It is proposed to be contended on behalf of the Minor that the alienation of the villages by the late Zemindar in favor of Chithambaram Chetty is not binding on him (Minor) as it was not in any way necessary for any family purpose whatever and as it was made after his conception, and his acquirement thereby of rights in the property which his father could not alienate save for such purposes; and that the Minor objects therefore

therefore to the registration of the villages under Regulation XXV of 1802.

4. The suit is posted for hearing on the 15th March next. I will apply to have it tried as one suit with the suit against Chithambaram Chetty as the issues raised are substantially the same. The value of the suit is stated at Rupees 10,000.

Collector's Office } I have &c
Madras } C^d H. C. W. Bliss
26th January 1876 } As Collector

A suit on behalf of the Minor Zemindar of Ramnad has been filed against Chidambaram Chetty for the recovery of three villages which the latter holds under a deed of gift from the late zemindar, on the ground that the alienation of the property is invalid

invalid as against the Minor.

Chidambaram Chetty has now brought a suit against the Minor and the collector for the separate assessment and registration of ^{the} villages in question under Regulation 25 of 1802.

The Court of Wards sanction the defence of the suit at the cost of the estate on behalf of the Minor and approve the draft answer.

The sanction of Government is requested for the defence of the suit on behalf of the collector.

The suit is to be heard on the 15th March 1876.
True copy & Extract

Ch. C. W. Bliss
Acting Secretary
To the Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with original enclosures to be returned

Ch. C. W. Bliss
C. M. S.

No 212

The Government sanction the defence
of the suit & approve the draft answer
submitted by the defendant

And Copy to the Board of Revenue
14th February 1876

14th February 1876

14th Feb 1876

Revenue 1876 Sept
No 619
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 11th Feb 1876
Despatch 11th Feb 1876
Recd 12th Feb 1876

Sanctioning the defence of
the suit brought by Chidambaram
Chetty against the Mins
Zemindar of Ramnad re-
garding certain villages,
approving the Draft answer
& requesting sanction of Govt
for the defence of the suit on
behalf of collector
with order

12 Feb 1876. 14 Feb 1876