

Regular No.
Miscellaneous

of 189

FOR WHAT CURRENT.		To whom given.	When taken out.
No.	Year.		

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 265

DATED 17th January 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Pro. of W. Court guard passing
order on ~~order~~ ^{report} from W. C.M. of Coimbatore
on alienations in the Sivasaikundram
estate, recorded.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8662

85-17/1/99

Read Cuo 8662 998

174 999

From

The Secretary to the Court of Wards
Madras.

Order No. 265-7/17th Jan 4 1899

No. 1474 Misc.

Revised.

11/10/98

Dated 17th December 1898.

Received 18th

Registered 19th

Enclosures 2

Spare copies



To the Court of Wards with the encl. returned.
Dec 20-1-99

SUBJECT.

Passing orders on Collector's
report on alienations in the Siva-
samudram Estate, Coimbatore Dist.

6/1/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards.

Dated 17th December 1898, NO.1474 Misc.

Read endorsement of J.A.Cumming Esquire, Acting Collector of Coimbatore, dated 21st October 1898, R.C.NO.87/C.W of 1898 submitting to the Court for sanction statement of inam alienations in the Sivasamudram Estate.

Resolution.

In the above letter, the Collector of Coimbatore reports on three cases of alienations in the Sivasamudram Estate: and the Court resolves to pass the following orders in regard to them:-

Item 1. The late Jaghirdar is reported to have resumed certain service inam lands (assessed at Rs.33-10-0) assigned by the British Government as remuneration for the Karnam office in the Sattedgal village and granted instead certain wet lands assessed at Rs.34-3-6. The Karnam's daughter-in-law and heir having subsequently alienated the lands to one Naranappa, a suit was filed by the late Agent of the Sivasamudram Estate for the recovery of the possession thereof; but it was dismissed by the Original and Appellate Courts, and the Court of Wards considered it unadvisable to file an appeal to the High Court (Court's Proceedings NO.462, dated 22nd March 1897). The Karnam Gumastah who now does the work is paid Rs 6 per mensem out of Estate funds.

The Collector's proposal in regard to this item is to enfranchise the lands (originally assigned for karnam service and now in the possession of the Estate) on the extension of the proprietary Estate Village Service Act (11 of 1894) to Srotriyams and to credit the quit-rent to the Proprietary Village Service Fund. The question whether the lands in question formed the emoluments of the Karnam office was in issue in the litigation just referred to: but the papers available in this office do not

show what the finding on this particular point was. The Collector is requested to look into the matter and to consider the advisability of appointing a karnam and recovering the assessment for him under Section 59 of Madras Act 11 of 1864. In the event of the assessment being so recovered, the feasibility of discontinuing or reducing the payment, now made from estate funds, should also receive consideration.

Item 2. This grant, made for the purpose of feeding estate servants visiting Sattagal on estate duty, was discontinued under Court's Proceedings NO. 1075, dated 21st September 1898.

Item 3. Pending disposal of Second Appeal NO. 1525 of 1898 (on the file of the High Court) in which the nature and conditions of this grant are in issue, final orders as to how this item should be dealt with will be deferred.

(True Extract)

Lonel Davidson

Acting Secretary

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department with a statement *sent*
(to be returned)

C.M.N.

18 4,000-18-10-98.

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 174

From

The Court of Wards.
Madras.

Order Mer

Recorded.

No. —

Dated —

Received } 9th January 1899
Registered }

Enclosures —

Spare copies. —

SUBJECT.

Submitting an erratum in the
Court of Wards Proceedings No. 1474,
dated the 17th Dec. 1898.

Note.

This is with reference
to a telephone to the Board
and reply. — put up with
C. No 8662 of 98, which is now
with the U.S.

C. No 8662 of 98

V.M.
70/1/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Erratum in Court's Proceedings NO.1474, dated the 17th December 1898.

In the penultimate sentence of the remarks under item 1,
for "Section 59" read "Section 52"

Lucas Davidson

Acting Secretary

To the Secretary to Government Revenue Department.
To the Collector of Coimbatore.



Code Class.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. Monthly Number.

To (Office)

Telephonic

From (Office)

Message

Words.

Day.

Hour.

Minute.

Official

Instructions.

To (Person)

Register
Revenue Dep

From (Person)

Manager
Consty Ward

Section 52 who means an
erratum slip will be sent
separately.

CH

64 Word Form.

Recd. from

LN.

Sent to

LN.

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

At

Hrs.

Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

Copy of
Telephone
to the Board.

With reference to Cl's No.
1474 Mis d/17th Dec 98,
Kindly say how Sec 59
of Act II of 1864 is applicable
to the case, as stated in the
remarks against item (11).
d/4-1-99 (Sd) C.R.
Reply Registrar.

Sec 69 ~~was meant~~ is
a clerical error for sec 59.
d/5-1-99
Dec 6/11 Telephone

With reference to my
message yesterday, there
appears to have been some
mistake. What I wanted
to know was how Sec 59
was applicable, and not
Sec 69. Will you kindly
say now?

d/6-1-99 (Sd) C.R.
Regn.

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189 .

Read again G.O., No. _____
 189 ,

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH RITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DETATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

A A A A A A A

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.