

(1) Number of Pages 14
(2) Date of repair 27-3-69
(3) Initials of the Referencer W. A. B.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

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

571

Press
Mis.

Dated

3-5-1876

196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

521

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd May 1876.*

No. 26. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th April 1876, No. 1,132A:—

Read the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tinnevely, 24th April 1876, No. 254:—

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the Board's approval and sanction, a draft answer proposed to be filed in O. S. No. 51 of 1875 on the file of the Tinnevely Sub Court in which the Sub-Collector is made 1st defendant.

2. Subramania Mudali 1, Perumaul Panikan 2, and Isuran Chetty 3, were Abkari renters of Ambasamudram and Tinnevely Taluqs for Faslis 1282 to 1284. As these renters fell into arrears to the extent of Rupees 4,270 in the Ambasamudram and of Rupees 9,000 odd in Tinnevely Taluqs their lease was cancelled, and the property standing in the name of Kuttalem Chetty, alleged adoptive father of the last named individual, was attached for the realization of the arrear.

3. One Valenaden Chetty filed the present suit to set aside the attachment on the ground that the property belonged to him, as he was the adopted son of the said Kuttalam Chetty and not Isuran Chetty.

4. Both these men severally claimed to be the adopted sons of the deceased Kuttalam Chetty and applied to the District Court for a certificate of heirship, and the Court issued a joint certificate to them both.

5. The date of hearing is fixed for the 6th May 1876. The Government Vakil has been instructed to apply for an extension of two months and to put in the answer in anticipation of sanction if the Court refuses to grant the extension.

6. The value of the suit is Rupees 2,593-12-5. The following is the draft answer proposed to be filed:—

The property in dispute was attached for arrears of abkari revenue due by Isuran Chetty, as it was alleged by Isuran Chetty to belong to him by right of his being the adopted son and heir of Kuttalam Chetty whose property it was. A certificate of heirship has been granted by the Court to Isuran Chetty. The 1st defendant is willing to release the property from attachment if the Court finds he is not the heir, and prays that the suit as against him may be dismissed with costs.

7. Evidence will be produced at the hearing through the Tahsildar that Isuran Chetty is the adopted son of Kuttalam Chetty. It is however not unlikely that Isuran Chetty will collude with Valenaden Chetty as he has nothing to gain by winning the suit, since the property if his is not sufficient to cover the arrear.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government with the recommendation that the defence of the suit be sanctioned and the proposed answer approved.

2. The Collector should have submitted a copy of the plaint.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd May 1876.*

No. 27.

ORDER THEREON, 3rd May 1876, No. 571.

Miscellaneous.

THE defence of the Suit is sanctioned
and the draft answer approved. As
observed by the Board, copy of the plaint
should have been submitted by the Collector.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Frd. W. J. Lewis.

Trivellore
Tinnevely
24 April 1896.

No. 254.

From. A. J. Stuart Esqr.
Ag. Collector.

To. b. A. Galton Esqr.
Ag. Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.
Madras.

Sir
I have the honor to forward for the
Board's approval and sanction a
draft answer proposed to be filed in
O.S. No. 51, of 1895, on the file of the
Tinnevely Sub. Court, in which the
Sub. Collector is made 1st Defendant.

2. Subramania Mudali¹, Perumal
Paukew² and Sennu Chetty³ were
Atkary renters of Ambasamudram,
and Tinnevely Taluq for Fushis 12825/12826.

As these renters fell into arrears to
the extent of Rs 4270, in the Am-
basamudram and of Rs 9000 odd
in Tinnevely Taluq, their lease was

Cost of 1876 Madras.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated May 3rd.

Recd.

G.O., 3rd May 1896, No. 571.

Encl.

MAY.

Nos. 26-27.

Original Sent No. 51 of 1895 on the file of the
Tinnevely Sub-Court—Sanctioning the defence
of — and approving the draft answer.

cancelled and the property standing
in the name of Kuttalam Chetty alleged
adoptive father of the last named
individual was attached for the
realization of the arrears.

3. One Valensden Chetty filed the
present suit to set aside the attach-
ment on the ground that the property
belonged to him as he was the
adopted son of the said Kuttalam
Chetty and not Sauram Chetty.

4. Both these men severally claimed
to be the adopted sons of the deceased
Kuttalam Chetty and applied to the District Court
for a certificate of heirship and the Court
issued a joint certificate to them both.

5. The date of hearing is fixed for the 5th May 1906.
The Government Vakil has been instructed
to apply for an adjournment of two months and
to put in the answer in anticipation of sanction
if the Court refuses to grant the adjournment.

6. The value of the suit is Rs 2593-12-5.

57/18
The following is the draft answer
proposed to be filed.

The property in dispute was attached
for arrears of Abkarry revenue due by
Sauram Chetty and it was alleged by
Sauram Chetty to belong to him by right
of his being the adopted son and heir
of Kuttalam Chetty whose property
it was. A certificate of heirship
has been granted by the Court to Sauram
Chetty. The 1st Defendant is willing
to release the property from attachment
if the Court finds he is not the heir
and prays that the suit as against him
may be dismissed with costs.

7. Evidence will be produced at
the hearing through the Tahsildar
that Sauram Chetty is the adopted son
of Kuttalam Chetty. It is however
not unlikely that Sauram Chetty
will

5
will collude with Valenaden Chetty
as he has nothing to gain by winning
the suit since the property if his
is not sufficient to cover the arrears.

I have &
(cc) of Stuart/
by Collector
(Truecopy)

W. C. M.
Acting Secretary

Go 3 Dec 1876

1876/76-

Enclosure in Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue
to the Secretary to Govt
dated 28 Oct 1876

Rough copy
of the
Proceedings

Rough copy

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 28th April 1876 No. 1130

Read letter from the As Collector
of Tinnevely, dated 24th April 1876
No. 254, submitting for Board's ap-
-proval and sanction a draft of
an answer proposed to be filed in
Q.S. No. 51 of 1875 on the file of the
Tinnevely Sub Court, in which
the Sub-Collector is made 1st Defendant.

Submitted for the orders of
Government with the recommendation
that the defence of the suit be
sanctioned and the proposed answer
approved.

The Collector should have
submitted a copy of the plaint.
(True Extract)

W. C. C. M.
Secretary

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with copy of Collector's letter.

R. S. S.
C. M.

1.23 May 76 Q33 May

No 571

The defence of the subject sanctioned &
the draft answer approved. As observed
by the Board, copy of his plaint & answer
were submitted by the collector

In Copy to the Board of Dec 5 May
14 Copy Dec 15 May

3 May 1876

1-5-76

18736
Revenue 1890 District
No: of the District of Rev.

dated 25th April 1876
Dated 28th May
Dec 1st May

No 571 - 3 May 1876

Recommending for the
same time the defence
of the No 571 of 1875
as file of the District
monthly with Court.
revisions