

(1) Number of pages 8 Sheets
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer homb

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REY- DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2138	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	28-6-1877	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

28th June 1877, No. 2,138.

Read the following paper:—

No. 626. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 14th June 1877.

Read the following letter from J. GROSE, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 5th June 1877, No. 2,751.

THE Atmakur ryots, who have received small advances for wells under the Land Improvement Act, have expended those advances without completing the work, and now apply for further advances preferring due security.

2. The Additional Sub-Collector, in a letter to me on the subject, says
* i.e., the grant of the advances. "Rule XXII ** seems to prohibit the course* suggested and to impose a restriction of very doubtful expediency."

3. The rule requires that second advances for the same work should not be made without a reference to the local Government. I am not aware what difficulty the rule is framed to meet, but I think it might be safely and advantageously suspended so far as regards the advances made by Tahsildars under G.O., 12th February 1877, No. 640, Revenue Department.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

4. The Board agree with the Collector, but on condition that a second advance should only be given when it is shown that the first has been *bona fide* expended on the work. The Board assume that the commonest cases are those in which the original estimate has proved insufficient.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 627. ORDER THEREON, 28th June 1877, No. 2,138.

Land Revenue, No. 14.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council is of opinion that the rule referred to does not apply to cases in which the first advance was only part of the estimated cost of the work to be done, and that where this is the case the further advance may be made under the general provisions of the rules up to the estimated cost without reference to Rule XXII.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Financial Department.

Erd. A. F. Goodall.

proffered

Revenue Department
 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
 Dated 4th June 1877

B.P. 6395 Read the following No. 2751

From J. G. Rose Esquire
 Collector of Kellore

To H. E. Stokes Esquire
 Secretary to the
 Board of Revenue
 Madras.

Sir,
 The Alimkur ryots who have
 received small advances
 for wells under the Land
 Improvement Act, have im-
 pended those advances with-
 out completing the work and
 now apply for further advances
 preferring

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
 REVENUE
 THE BOARD OF REVENUE,
 Madras.
 No. 2751
 Dated 4th June 1877.
 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, No. 2193.
 From J. G. Rose Esquire,
 Collector of Kellore.
 To H. E. Stokes Esquire,
 Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
 Madras.

Small advances under Land Improvement Act, 1859, may be made under the general provisions of the Act up to the estimated cost of the work to be done.

proffering due security.

2. The additional Sub Collector

a letter to me on the subject

says "Encls no - I desire to pro-
hibit the course suggested and ^{in the} grant of
the advances

to impose a restriction of very
doubtful expediency."

3. The rule requires that se-
cond advances for the same
work should not be made
without a reference to the local

Government - I am not aware
~~of~~ differently the rule is
framed to meet, but I think it
might be safely and advantageously
suspended as far as regards the

advances made by Tahsildars
under Government Order, 12th Feb-
ruary 1877 No 640 Revenue De-

partment.

Chellor
Collector's Office
5th June 1877

I have &c
(Sd) J. Groves
Collector

Submitted for the orders of
Gov^t

The Board agree with the
Collector; but of course the
second advance should
only be given when it is
shown that the first has
been bonafide expended on
the work - The Board
assume that the commonest
cases are those in which
the original estimate has

has proved insufficient.

(True Copy & Extract)

Wm

Secretary

To The Secy. of Govt. P.D.

A

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 2912

Pres. Board of Revenue

Dated 14. June

1877.

FOR ORDERS.

Sentiment agree with
the Board & w^o ab-
one abrogate the
rule at the old tempo
Carif - A rule of this
kind is apt to de-
feat itself. As I believe
the rule against ex-
ceeding estimates is
done by the D. P. M.
And hence the
naturally is disin-
clined to take up a
case as possible

Revenue 1877 Sept 14
No 2912

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

dated 14. June

Revenue 1877
No 2912

Subscribed for the order
of Govt. letter from the Board
of Revenue regarding the
rule regarding the
second advances for the
service work under the
Board's supervision and
Board's not to make.

For orders

Chalk

1877-6-14

1877-6-14

for no man can
 can possibly avoid
 & makes often a
 short statement of
 to do not suppose
 it - poor money is
 thrown away & the
 best applicant
 guards himself
 from excessive
 turn - the bal of
 which he spends on
 the this

22/8 1881

I don't think we
 can straighten the
 8th rule. but I
 think it does not
 apply - because in A. the

6

first advances
 only part of the
 estimated cost of
 the work to be done.
 & that when this
 is the case no
 further advance
 may be made
 under the rules
 up to the estimated
 cost. Under the
 General provisions
 of the rules. like
 2nd Rule 23.

1/11/23/10

11/11/23/10

Land Revenue

7

N^o 2138

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 28 June 1877.

Read Proceedings of the
of Revenue dated 14 June 1877, N^o 2138,
submitting letter from the collector
of Mellore requesting that the rule
requiring the second advances for
the same work under the Land
Improvement Act should not
be made.

His Grace the Governor
in Council is of opinion that
the Rule referred to does not
apply to cases in which the
first advance was only part
of the estimated cost of the
work to be done, and that
where this is the case the
further advance may be
made under the general
provisions

[illegible]

2250th St. N. W. of Riverside St. N. W.
 W. H. Friedman & Co.

8

G.C.

Grant of ~~advance~~
advance to certain
bills in full re D.

1/2