Scott. I (I)-I—10,008—7-10-70.

(1) Number of pages 14

(2) Date of repair 26.5.1971

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 249 Press
B.P. No. Mis.

Dated 23.1.1971 197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd January 1877.

No. 657. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st November 1876, Miscellaneous No. 10,186:—

Read the following letter from J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madura, 23rd October 1876, No. 387.

THE Committee of the Madura Devastanam claim as their property the mantapam now occupied by the Town Magistrate and Deputy Tahsildar as an office, and request that it may be made over to them.

2. The claim was first preferred to Mr. McQuhae in 1875. As no proofs were adduced that the building was the property of the devastanam, he informed the manager that he could not recommend that it be made over to him.

3. The Committee have now sent me an original order and copies of papers from their records which show that in 1842 the then Collector ordered the Devastanam Peishcar to submit an estimate for the repair of the building from Devastanam funds, and that, when in 1856 and 1863 lists of the buildings belonging to the Devastanam were called for by the Collector, this mantapam was on both occasions entered therein though under different names. An original arzi addressed to the Collector by the Devastanam Peishcar was found on the Huzur records. It contains a complaint that a certain individual interfered with the mantapam by putting a wall close to it and prevented the drainage of the rain-water falling on the roof.

4. The building is close to the present Huzur Cutcherry, and appears to have been used first for a record-room, and afterwards for some fifteen years as the Town Magistrate's Office. How it came to be occupied by Government there is nothing to show. It was probably simply taken possession of as the mantapam at Caroor formerly occupied by the Sub Collector of Coimbatore and that at Shermadevi now occupied by the Sub-Collector of Tinnevelly were.

5. I request instructions as to whether it should be made over or not.

6. I think that the claim now made to it can be successfully resisted as barred by limitation, but I have no doubt that the building really is the property of the Devastanam, and cannot therefore recommend that their claim be resisted.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board are of opinion that the mantapam should be given up. This will necessitate either the erection of a new cutcherry for the Sub-Magistrate or the renting of office-accommodation for him. The latter course will probably be the more convenient at present.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23rd January 1877.

No. 658. ORDER THEREON, 23rd January 1877, No. 299.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government agree with the Board that the mantapam should be given up to the Devastanam and a suitable building rented for the Sub-Magistrate's Cutcherry for the present. It is observed that a plan and estimate for building a new Sub-Magistrate's Office were sanctioned in G.O., 7th November 1876, No. 2,088, Public Works Department, and that the work will commence in 1877-78.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Of contains a compliment that a certain individual under = stood with the Collector to lay building a wall close to it and removed the doorway of the main water facing on the road.

4 The building is close to the present Kanzoor Cutcherry and adjoins to the same first, for a rent of Rs. and after two years as the Government officials. Now it came to the occupied by Government there is nothing to show. It was tentatively built by the permission of the Collector formerly occupied by the Sub Collector of Coimbatore, and that Chemidoleiri now occupied by the Sub Collector of Dindigul, were.

5. I request instructions as to whether it should be made over or not.

6. I think that the Cases will be made to stand as applied for by Counsel, but I can be guided entirely by the Instructions of the Board in the premises, and Commissioners will be selected.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servant
Edward Pennefather

Endorsed for the
orders of Commissioners

2. Mr. Pennefather
Opinion that the Cases should be framed
and Counsel instructed
as suggested by Commissioners

No. 10186 Treasury Department

Minutes of the Board of Treasury
dated 21st November 1849
and the Correspondence
Vol 1849

From
G. Pennefather Esq
Collector of Customs Dublin
To
E. B. Foster Esq
Secretary to the
Board of Treasury London

Sir

The Commissioners of the Customs Department of Ireland
at their sitting on the 19th instant
Communicated to the Board
Mr. Pennefather's Letter
of the 17th instant
requesting to be informed
whether the Board
would
2. Give directions for
the Cases
to be framed
in the
Opinion
of Counsel
as to the
Liability
of the Department

be informed thereof
that he could not be
sure that it be made over
to him.

3. That in case he
can't give an equivalent
and copies of papers
their tender which have
that in 1842 the then Collector
ordered the Deputations Collec-
tor to enforce Excise duty
for the refund of the Distillery
Distillation funds and rel-
ative in 1855 and 1863 sent by the
Collector Calcutta to the Deputa-
tion were [illegible]
Collector; the same was [illegible]
with the accounts [illegible]
therein stating that the petition-
ers on the original were
added by the Collector by
the Deputation. That the
two [illegible] on the Petitioner's

Cal 503/17

Yates

Rec: 18th Sept
No 5096
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 21st Oct 1876
Desp. —
Rec 22 —

No 239

The Govt agree with the Board that the sanitary and should be forwarded to the Divisional and a suitable building erected for the Sub Registrar's Cutchery for the present. It is observed that a plan & estimate for building a new sub-Registrar's office were sanctioned in G.O. 7 dated 25th Jan 1876 No 298 Pub. Works Dept, and that the work will commence in 1877-78.

25th January 1877

GO 23 June 1877 No 299

Submitting for Sanction, with reference to Letter from the Collector of Cuddapah No 1st Sept 1876 forwarding letter from the Sub-Collector of Proddatur on the Question of providing a new Sub-Registrar's office at Proddatur and Report of the Public Officer.

With Order

14 to Bd Rev
21 Dft Sept
6 Add Guard