Secrt. I (3)-E—10,006—7-10-70.

(1) Number of pages 11

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	2052	Press / Mis.
Dated	20- 6- 1977.	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

20th June 1877, No. 2,052.

Read the following paper :—

No. 433. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd March 1877,

Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 10th March 1877, No. 1,017, Revenue Department.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on Board's Proceedings recommending that sanction be accorded for the defence of suit filed by Thorapalli Agraharamdars in Salem District regarding sale of the agraharam for arrears of revenue.

COMMUNICATED to the Collector of Salem, who will, through the Collector of North Arcot, obtain from Mr. Jones an explanation as regards his conduct in the matter.

2. The Board beg Government to consider what the promise of consideration of the plaintiffs' position means. It can only be that the difference between the purchase money at the second sale and the value of the property should be paid to the plaintiffs in addition to costs of suit. The whole will amount to at least 16,000 Rupees.

3. The Collector should file the accompanying answer in pursuance of the orders of Government.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 434. ORDER THEREON, 20th June 1877, No. 2,052.

Miscellaneous.

ON receipt of these Proceedings, the Collector of Salem was ordered by telegram, with reference to paragraph 2, to withdraw the answer in the Thorapalli Suit if not filed, and to ask for ten days. No reply has been received to this message. The Collector will explain the apparent neglect.

2. His Grace the Governor in Council considers that the revised answer prepared by the Board may be filed, excluding the last paragraph.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. T. D. Ryan.

2

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

To

The BOARD of REVENUE.

Dated June 1877.

Read

G.O. No. 1877, No. 2,952.

Enclosure

No. 1884-81.

Proposal for remission of Salem District Printing Press Rent to explain the reasons to be given to the public in connection with the—

Proposal for remission of Salem District Printing Press Rent to explain the reasons to be given to the public in connection with the proposed Telegram.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No.

Torapilli Agraharam

From Telegram to Collector Salem

Dated 27 March 1877

FOR ORDERS.

This telegram of Collr - The answer answer must be put in without the last para: Where was Madras when Govt were deciding the matter

On receipt of Board's Proc: dy 23 March (yy No 1314 Honble Members observed that the promise made in G.O. 10th March was not beyond the intention of Govt & should be revised, and a telegram was ordered

15/6 to 1st 19/5/77

to be sent with-
drawing the ans-
wer which the
Board had de-
sired the Collec-
tor to file.

Telegram ac-
cordingly went
on 24th March
"If answer not
filed withdraw
rule for ten days."

No reply has
been received from
the Collector pos-
sibly because the
Court was closed

R. D.

No 2052

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 20 June 1877.

Read Proceedings of
the Board of Revenue dated
23 March 1877 No 1314 Submit-
ting observations with refer-
ence to answer directed by
Govt to be filed in Suit
No 5 of 1876 instituted in
District Court of Salem
regarding sale of Thorapilli
Agraharam for arrears of
Revenue.

—

1 On receipt of
these Proceedings the
Collector of Salem was
ordered by telegram,
with reference to paragraph

2

2, to withdraw the answer
in the Thorapalli Suit
if not filed and to
ask for ten days. No
reply has been received
to this message. — The Minute will explain
the apparent neglect.

2 His Grace the Gover-
nor in Council con-
siders that the revised
answer prepared by
the Board may be filed
excluding the last
paragraph.

[signature]

The Chief Secretary
1 To the H.P.C. Commissioner 6-11-17.
2 Office 7 12-6-17.

(2) G.O
Suit regarding
Thorapalli Agraharam
in Salem Dt.

No. 1,314.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 23rd March 1877.

Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 10th March 1877, No. 1,017, Revenue Department:—

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on Board's Proceedings recommending that sanction be accorded for the defence of suit filed by Thorapalli Agraharamdars in Salem District regarding sale of the Agraharam for arrears of revenue.

COMMUNICATED to the Collector of Salem who will through the Collector of North Arcot obtain from Mr. Jones an explanation as regards his conduct in the matter.

2. The Board beg Government to consider what the promise of consideration of the plaintiffs' position means. It can only be that the difference between the purchase money at the second sale, and the value of the property should be paid to the plaintiffs in addition to costs of suit. The whole will amount to at least 16,000 Rupees.

3. The Collector should file the accompanying answer in pursuance of the orders of Government.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Salem, with Revised Answer.
" Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with copy of do.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

Extract of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 23rd March 1877.

Read the letter to Board's Proceedings dated 10th March 1877 with enclosure from Collector of Salem submitting that Sanction be accorded for the expenses proposed to be incurred by the Thorapalli Agraharam Committee in the sale of the Agraharam for arrears of revenue.

Communicate to the Collector of Salem who will thereupon take the Orders of Government as contained in Mr. Jones' letter dated 10th March 1877 and call upon the Committee to explain why they should not be required to pay the expenses incurred in the matter.

1. Mr. Bourne
2. Secretary
3. Commissioner
4. Mr. Jones
5. Collector of Salem
6. Head Assistant

1877.

Board of Revenue, MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 23RD MARCH 1877, No. 1,314.

Encl.

Received

MARCH.

No. 1,314.

Suit—No. 5 of 1876 instituted in District Court of Salem regarding sale of Thorapalli Agraharam for arrears of Revenue.—Submitting observations with reference to answer directed by Government to be filed in —, issuing instructions to Collector on subject, and calling for an explanation from Mr. Jones as regards his conduct in the matter.

means. It can only be that the difference between the purchase money at the second sale, and the value of the property should be paid to the plaintiffs in addition to costs of suit. The whole will amount to at least 6000 Rs.

3. The Collector should file the accompanying answer, in pursuance of the orders of Government.

I have &c

J. Elwin
Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with copy of revised answer

Ed. A. C.
Ch.

Revised answer

3

The property referred to in the plaint was on the 4 July 1876 sold for arrears of revenue due thereon under act 2 of 1864 (Madras) and the sale is legal & valid.

2. The sum in deposit was Rs 1909-12-6 and not Rs 7000 odd as alleged by plaintiffs and the sum due being Rs 3113-8-5 which the amount in deposit, over which 1st defendant had no control, did not cover 1st defendant had no option but to proceed against the agaharam. The 1st defendant did issue orders to the then Tahsildar A. D. M. Jones on the 25 october 1875 to proceed against the movable property of the 2nd defendant for the

arrears

Rev: 1877 Deft

No 1905

E-1

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

dated 23rd March 1877

Recd 24 " "

Recorded

Vice Sel: No 2067 27-3-77

arrears of Fasli 1284 only and
the property of the 2nd defendant
was attached by the late
Tahsildar but was subsequently
released by the Tahsildar without
reference to or knowledge of
the 1st defendant.

3. On receiving the demand
Mention and Balance Statement
for the month of February 1876
first defendant found there
were Rs 3113-8-5 due against
the Thorapalli agraharam
and issued orders to the
Tahsildar to realize the arrears
by the attachment and sale
of the agraharam. The agraharam
was accordingly attached
and in due course sold the
Plaintiffs having from date
of attachment to date of
sale

2091/P

sale made no objection to the
attachment by or the procedure
of the 1st defendant. The sale
of the 9th May 1872 having been
on 1st April 1875 declared illegal,
the 1st defendant had no option
in February 1876 but to proceed
against the agraharam for the
arrears due and the agraharandars
having been declared by the
Court the owners of the agraharam
Notices Nos 4, 5 and 7 were served
on them and not on the 2nd defendant,
they being the defaulters.

4. It is admitted that in the
circumstances the position of the
Plaintiffs who have thus for
the second time lost their village
by its sale for arrears of revenue
is to be greatly commiserated
and the defendant is authorized

6

to state that should the Court intimate in its decision that reparation is due to the plaintiff owing to the action of the Canada authorities the Government will give every consideration to the same although the plaintiffs suit may be thrown out.

I have
Secretary.

CC.

20/
250

Affidavit
Letter from Board
Settlement refused
Writ delivered 8/7
2nd Statement
Cancelled 4/ decm

for the recess.
No instructions however appear to have been given as to the mode in which the answer shd be revised & these were now solicited.

FOR ORDERS.

c. 14 June 77 R. 18 June 77

Enclosure in
Board Proceedings
of the Secretary of State
Records Department
dated 23 March 1877
RBO: 1905/77

Revised Answer
to be filed in
Suit reg Thiruvalli
Ayyakannu in
Salem District
C 20-6-77 V. 30-2