

(1) Number of Pages.....8

(2) Date of repair.....7.2.1969

(3) Initials of the Referencer.....S.L.H.

## MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

*Revenue* DEPARTMENTG.O. No.  
B.P. No.

516.

Press  
Mis.

Dated 21.4.1876 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

516

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*  
21st April 1876.

No. 115. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th March 1876, No. 870:—

Read the following letter from C. T. LONGLEY, Esq., Collector of Salem, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tripatur, 4th March 1876, No. 55:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1875, No. 2,376, directing the withdrawal of the declaratory suit filed in the Subordinate Judge's Court on behalf of the infant of Veeramal against Muthyalamal and two others, I have the honor to report that the suit in question has been withdrawn, and to request that the Board will be pleased to obtain sanction for the adjustment of the sum of Rupees 867-8-0 expended in connection with the suit as shown in the memorandum below, and for the payment to the Government Pleader of Rupees 146-8-0, being one-fourth of the regular fees chargeable on the amount of the suit under Section 31, Regulation XIV. of 1816:—

*Memorandum.*

|                         | RS. | A. | P. |
|-------------------------|-----|----|----|
| Stamp for Plaint ... .. | 865 | 0  | 0  |
| Do. for Vakalat ... ..  | 0   | 8  | 0  |
| ... ..                  | 2   | 0  | 0  |
| Total ...               | 867 | 8  | 0  |

G.O., 4th Nov. 1874, No. 1,395.  
 „ 10th Mar. 1875, „ 392.  
 „ 5th Apl. „ „ 538.  
 „ 23rd „ „ „ 642.  
 „ 10th Aug. „ „ 1,198.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government with reference to the orders noted in the margin.

2. On the death of Lavanga Reddy, the proprietor of Namkal and

other muttals, his mother and widows entered into an agreement making a disposition of the property prejudicial to the reversionary right of Lavanga Reddy's daughter, a minor. The intervention of the Court of Wards at first contemplated was found impracticable as no property had devolved on the minor. It was, therefore, resolved, as suggested by the Government Pleader, to institute a suit on behalf of the minor praying for a declaratory decree as to her right to the property. This course was adopted not only for the protection of the minor but in order to secure the ultimate rights of Government adverting to the possibility of an escheat.

3. A suit was accordingly filed by the Collector on behalf of the minor. Shortly afterwards, with reference to a recent decision of the Privy Council, the Government Pleader intimated that he had altered his opinion as to the probability of obtaining a declaratory decree and suggested the withdrawal of the suit.

4. This course was sanctioned by Government with the remark that the interests of the minor might be left to her uncle, and that action on behalf of the possible ultimate reversionary right of the State under the law of escheat is not called for.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*  
*21st April 1876.*

5. The Collector now reports the withdrawal of the suit, and requests sanction for payment of the costs incurred, Rupees 1,014. The Board recommend that payment of the amount be sanctioned.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 116.

ORDER THEREON, 21st April 1876, No. 516.

Miscellaneous.

SANCTIONED Rs. 1,014.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.  
„ the Accountant-General.

No. 2,376.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 23rd August 1875.

Read the following letter from H. H. SHEPHARD, Esq., Officiating Government Pleader, Madras, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 13th August 1875, No. 83:—

In continuation of my letter, dated 2nd ultimo, No. 48, embodied in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue as per

Dated 9th July 1875, No. 1,906.

margin, I have the honor to report, for the information of the Board, that the Government in their Order, dated 10th instant, No. 1,198, have directed me to take the necessary steps for the withdrawal of the plaint in the suit instituted on behalf of the infant for a decree declaring her right to Namkul and certain other muttas in the Salem District.

2. I have, therefore, to request that the Board will issue the necessary order of Salem.

COMMUNICATED to the Collector of Salem who will act accordingly.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,  
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Salem.

Copy to the Government Pleader.

Exd. A. Grubert.

REVENUE.

Dist. of 118761

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Date April 21st

Recd.

G.O. 21st April 1875, No. 518.

APRIL.  
Nos. 115-118.

Post — instituted on behalf of the late daughter of the late Laxmamma. Today for a decree declaring her right to Namkul and certain of Muttas in Salem District. — Sanctioning payment of Rs. 1,014, being amount of costs incurred, account of —

Suit—instituted on behalf of the infant daughter of the late Lavanga Reddy for a decree declaring her right to Namkal and certain other muttans in Salem District.—Report of Government Pleader that he has been directed by Government to take steps for withdrawal of plaint in—, communicated to Collector who will act accordingly.

AUGUST.  
No. 2,376.

Received

Dec-13/60/66

Encl.

PROCEEDINGS, 23RD AUGUST 1875, No. 2,376.

MADRAS.

1875.  
Board of Revenue,

No. 870.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th March 1876.

Read the following letter from C. T. LONGLEY, Esq., Collector of Salem, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tripatur, 4th March 1876, No. 55:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1875, No. 2,376, directing the withdrawal of the declaratory suit filed in the Subordinate Judge's Court on behalf of the infant of Veeramal against Muthyalamal and two others, I have the honor to report that the suit in question has been withdrawn, and to request that the Board will be pleased to obtain sanction for the adjustment of the sum of Rupees 867-8-0 expended in connection with the suit as shown in the memorandum below, and for the payment to the Government Pleader of Rupees 146-8-0, being one-fourth of the regular fees chargeable on the amount of the suit under Section 31, Regulation XIV. of 1816:—

Memorandum.

|                         | RS. | A. | P. |
|-------------------------|-----|----|----|
| Stamp for Plaint ... .. | 865 | 0  | 0  |
| Do. for Vakalat ... ..  | 0   | 8  | 0  |
| Process Batta ... ..    | 2   | 0  | 0  |
| Total ... ..            | 867 | 8  | 0  |

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government with reference to the orders noted in the margin.

G.O., 4th Nov. 1874, No. 1,395.  
" 10th Mar. 1875, " 392.  
" 5th Apl. " " 538.  
" 23rd " " " 642.  
" 10th Aug. " " 1,198.

2. On the death of Lavanga Reddy, the proprietor of Namkal and

other muttans, his mother and widows entered into an agreement making a disposition of the property prejudicial to the reversionary right of Lavanga Reddy's daughter, a minor. The intervention of the Court of Wards at first contemplated was found impracticable as no property had devolved on the minor. It was, therefore, resolved, as suggested by the Government Pleader, to institute a suit on behalf of the minor praying for a declaratory decree as to her right to the property. This course was adopted not only for the protection of the minor but in order to secure the ultimate rights of Government adverting to the possibility of an escheat.

3. A suit was accordingly filed by the Collector on behalf of the minor. Shortly afterwards, with reference to a recent decision of the Privy Council, the Government Pleader intimated that he had altered his opinion as to the probability of obtaining a declaratory decree and suggested the withdrawal of the suit.

4. This course was sanctioned by Government with the remark that the interests of the minor might be left to her uncle, and that action on behalf of the possible ultimate reversionary right of the State under the law of escheat is not called for.

5. The Collector now reports the withdrawal of the suit, and requests sanction for payment of the costs incurred, Rupees 1,099. The Board recommend that payment of the amount be sanctioned.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,  
with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1875, No. 2,376.

Copy to the Collector of Salem.  
" to the Government Pleader.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

104 March 1876 - 26 - 47  
 10 March 1876 - 126 - 75  
 5 April - 72 - 75  
 12 do - 171 - 75  
 23 do - 254 - 75  
 10 August - 24 - 75

No. 576

Sanctions 1014

21 April 1876

14 To the Secretary to the Govt of Madras  
 6 The Secretary to the Govt of Madras

4.4.76

No. 1260  
 Madras 1876. Depts  
 Board of Revenue,  
 MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH MARCH 1876, No. 870.

24th 30th 176

Encl.

Received 4: April 76

MARCH.  
No. 870.

Suit—instigated on behalf of the infant  
 daughter of the late Lavanga Reddy for a decree  
 declaring her right to Nankal and certain other  
 muttals in Salem District.—Submitting to Gov-  
 ernment Collector's report of the withdrawal  
 of —, and recommending that sanction be ac-  
 corded for payment of Rupees 1,028 on account  
 of costs incurred.

with order

No. 576 21 April 1876