(1) Number of pages ~~64~~ 62

(2) Date of repair (Statement 8 Nos) 31-7-1984

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1521 Press.
~~B.P. No.~~ ~~Mis.~~

Dated 19-9-1878 ~~197 .~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives I—5,806—24-2-78.

1521
1

GOVERNMENT MADRAS.

REVENUE D ARTMENT.

19th September 1878, No. 1,521.

Read the following papers:—

No. 213. From P. NARASIMHA SASTRY, a Kattubadi Inamdar of Penumadam Village, Nursapur Taluk, at Gummaloor, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 1st May 1878.

ABSTRACT.—Appeals against the enclosed endorsement of the Inam Commissioner, dated 12th March 1878, No. 27, and brings to notice that petitioner had for a long time been in the enjoyment of 14 acres of Kattubadi Inam in the said village; but owing to the machinations of the village officers no puttah was granted to him, as he was at the time of the Inam Settlement absent from the place; that after his return he applied to the Inam Commissioner for a puttah, but he rejected it saying that the Inam was appropriated to Government so far back as Fasli 1250, although it was recognised both by Zemindars and Government Officers as Kattubadi Inam and Dumbalas, &c., granted to that effect.

Prays that the records of the Inam Commissioner may be called for and perused together with the enclosed documents and orders issued for the grant of a puttah for the said Inam in his name.

No. 1,021.

REFERRED to the Inam Commissioner for brief report.

(By Order,)

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

OOTACAMUND,
8th June 1878.

No. 214. From H. E. SULLIVAN, Esq., Inam Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Madras, 3rd August 1878, No. 184.

WITH reference to the endorsement on Petition No. 1,021 of 1878, I have the honor to submit, for the information of Government, the papers marginally noted, from which it will be seen that on full reports received from the local officers on the petitioner's case, it was decided by Mr. Ballard that there was no ground for restoring the lands in question to petitioner.

1. From the Collector of Godavari, 8th December 1876, No. 27.
2. To do. 11th April 1877, No. 91.
3. From do. 9th January 1878, „ 4.
4. To do. 16th March 1878, „ 69.
5. Extract from the Inam Register.

I am, however, of opinion that long and uninterrupted enjoyment for nearly fifty years on payment of a light rent and this after the Inam was resumed by the Zemindar and the possession by the Inamdar of receipts in which the land is invariably referred to as Inam, are points strongly in favor of the petitioner. The light assessment equal in amount to the Kattubadi payable before the resumption of the Inam was continued after the lapse of the Zemindari to Government.

The petition and its enclosures are herewith returned.

1521/2

No. 215. ORDER THEREON, 19 September 1878, No. 1,521.

Miscellaneous.

THE case contains elements of doubt, but in view of the petitioner's very strong claim by prescription, the whole of the original Kattubadi Ina be restored to him, and the Inam Commissioner will issue the usual title-d

2. The petitioner will be referr o the Collector who will explain to him that this order does not empower him to i rfere with the occupation of those who may now hold any portion of the Inam.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Inam Commissioner.
" the Petition Department.
" the Collr. of Pondicherry thro' the Dy. Collr. of Porto Novo

Erd. F. R. Bantleman.

Petition 1521
3

No 1021 of 1878 Dt. 1st May 1878

Recd 9th May —

From C. Narasimha Sastry
a Kattubadi Inamdar of Penu-
=madam village, Narsapur
Taluk at Gummalur

Appeals against the endor-
sement of the Inam Com-
missioner dt. 12th March 1878 No
27 and brings to notice that peti-
had for a long time been in the
enjoyment of 14 acres of Kattu-
=badi Inam in the said village,
but owing to the machinations
of the village officers no puttah
was granted to him as he was at
the time of the Inam settlement
absent from the place; that after
his return he applied to the
Inam Commissioner for a
putta, but he rejected it saying

that

1021
Order:
The Petitioner held
four fields as
Kattubadi Inam.
Assessment amounted
to Fasli 1250
1340 Rs
the lands were
in consequence
Returned.
One field it is
admitted was then
alienated held
by another person.
The other three
also were improperly
at all events
held by other
persons & possession
eventually given to

saying that the Inam was appropriated to Govt. so far back as Fusli 1250, although it was recognized both by Zemindars and Government officers as Kattubady Inam and Dumbalas se granted to that effect

Prays that the records of the Inam Commissioner may be called for & perused together with the enclosed documents and orders issued for the grant of a puttah for the said Inam in his name

---

With a copy of report from the Inam Commissioner dated 3rd August 1878 No 184.

proportion of the Pottah land then on a low Rent-clear equal to the Proportionate assessment of the Kattubadi fields assessment finally due on the four fields.

He retained the free fields until the Settlement when he relinquished their but he took up two again.

The question is whether the Pottah being allowed the free fields on so favorable an assessment was equivalent to allowing him back the Inam.

Mr. Ballard states not fully (See folder of Jan 78 1064) but Mr Sullivan states the point in

his favor hand Weight. 152 1/4 Lbs

There is no question that the Inam was resumed in F. 1250.

Subsequently the Inamdar got possession of a portion of the land at a low rate by the favour of the villagers. It was a joint-rent village - and by the same means some of his receipts were made out by the Cummums as it had been for Kattubadi - not assessed.

It does not seem reasonable that the uncontrolled action of the villagers should be taken into consideration as proving land to be held on favorable tenure when such tenure had been forfeited previously. Yet this is the chief ground put in the opinion which Mr Sullivan has recorded in opposition to Mr Ballard's decision

The case has been carefully considered & it is submitted that

The favorable rent (Kattubadi) Inam seems to have continued uninterruptedly (as regards 3 out of the 4 fields) down to the introduction of the new Settlement. & the possession of the 3 fields seems to have been left to the family for the greater part of the time & the Settlement accounts kept. to Vellupur recognizing the claims of the Pottah under the Inam system, assumed the Zemindar's Cultivation

Should the claim by prescription (as to the Cultivation) be very strong leaving that the Pottah No 1 left the Inam Commr. does not think that the tenure should be confirmed when only 3 out of 4 fields claimed when only 3 out of 4 fields claimed & he waives the imposition of the full assessment on the lands No 2 which are in cultivation for the Pottah resigning in favour of the old favorable tenure on the terms of ancient origin

Govt. Mountain Pottah Ballard's decision 28th Feb 1878

× see his letter dy 3 August 1878 No 184

I think the Pottah

no cause is shewn for interference.

1521
5
Rev Depts

No 1521

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 19th September 1878

Read the following Petition from P. Narasimha Sastry, a Kattubadi Iraundar of Kummadam village, Nursapur Taluk at Kummalam, dated 1st May 1878 No 1021, with report from Inam Commissioner, dated 3rd August 1878 No 184.

The case contains elements of doubt but in view of the petitioner's very strong claim by prescription the whole of the original Kattubadi Inam will be restored to him and the Inam Commissioner will

MD
7/9

12/8.

1521/6

issue the usual title-deed.

2. The petitioner will be referred to the Collector who will explain to him that this order does not empower him to interfere with the occupation of those who may now hold any portion of the Inam.

Note
It is understood that he is to have all four fields that originally constituted the Inam appear to be now held by another tenure

2nd To the Inam Commissioner

1 The Collector of
2 Collector of Pudanoy Dist. Ord. Ord.

Ser. 2 Dossl

4 Del

No 27

Godavery District
Collector's Office
Cocanada,
8th December 1876.

From

James Hope Esquire
Acting Collector

To

The Inam Commissioner
Madras

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement of the 22d May last on the Petition No 106 presented by Pamarti Venkatarya Dikshitulu and his brother Narasimhasastrulu of Penumadam in the Narsapur Taluq and your Official Memorandum dated 18th July 1876, No 181, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of the General Duty Deputy Collector's letter dated 19th ultimo reporting on the claim of the Petitioner

2. Venkatavadhanulu has produced certain Dubalas and Receipts to show that even after Fasli 1250 in which the Inam was resumed, he used to pay Kattubadi. Of the receipts produced

8

+ Herewith returned

8 were written on paper and 8 on Cadjan leaves. In some of the receipts given on paper the amount paid to Government was called Kattubadi and in others sist (assessment) while in all the receipts on Cadjan leaves it was put in as Kattubadi. The Karnam of the Village explains that as the land was given as Nimebadi (land favorably assessed) the late Karnams entered the assessment as Kattubadi as it was not full assessment.

3 The Petitioner has also produced 2 endorsements one given by a late Sub-Collector and the other by the Inam Deputy Collector to show that he claimed the Inam twice once in 1863 and again in 1867. The lands claimed by the Petitioners as Inam not being so entered in the accounts, they were not disposed of as Inams by the Inam Department

4

4 Under the circumstances described in the Deputy Collector's letter herewith forwarded, there appears no reason to treat the land as Inam.

I have &c.

(signed) James Hope
Acting Collector

(True copy)
A Cumming
Inam Commissioner

Godavery District
Office of the Deputy
Collector on General
Duty Narsapúr
19th September 1876
152
9

From
The Deputy Collector
on General Duty

To
James Hope Esquire
Acting Collector
Godavery District

Sir

Referring to your Docket No 190
dated the 6th June last and cath No 259
dated 7th ultimo, I have the honor to report
on petition dated 8th May 1876 to the Inam
Commissioner by Pamarti Venkatáver-
-Lhámulu of Penumadam in the
Narsapúr Taluq

2 The Petitioner claims as his Inam
1-1-C
14·7 of Government land as per present
accounts, situated in his village, stating
that the same had not been treated as
Inam by the Inam Commissioner, petitioner's

fathers

1
Rs 1-14 (1878 Inam Dept.
8

father being absent at the time, and the Village Karnam having not through malice brought this case under enquiry

3 It would appear from the Tahsildar's report on the subject that P.T. Mo A 18 8 (A C 7·40) of Inam with a Kattubadi of Rs 12 8 0 had been in the enjoyment of one Pamadi Ramesa (petitioners grand father) up to F 1214, when on a complaint made by him to the then Proprietor of the village, that the Kattubadi was rather heavy it was reduced to Rs 10 2 0. The Inam continued in the enjoyment of Ramesa up to F 1248/1858-59 Subject to the payment of the reduced Kattubadi thereon.

4 In consequence of the absence of the Inamdar in remote places, arrears of Kattubadi having accrued on the Inam in F 1248 & 1249 the Proprietor resumed it in F 1250, but he subsequently granted to him on Jirayati tenure, the entire land except the field called "Alliparra" for an assessment of Rs 4 6 0. The field "Alliparra" was then granted to a stranger. The Inamdar enjoyed the land up to F 1272/1862-63 (15 7/10) when he gave it up not being willing to hold it, paying the increased assessment according to the new settlement, which was introduced in that Fasli. The entire Inam of the petitioners father was demarcated and assessed as follows

	D. No	A. C	Assessment Rs A P
Kodamanadu	851	8·18	20 7 2
Tirucheruvadda	648	·12	0 4 10
Nadagavalapampu	440	3·05	2 4 7
Alliparra	1122	2·72	6 12 10
		4·07	29 13 5

In Fasli 1282 petitioner applied for the first two fields which were then Government waste, and they were granted to him on a Patta. The other two fields had been already in the occupations and enjoyment of strangers also on Pattas. It seems that the land claimed by petitioner as Inam not being so in accounts at the

Inam

Inam enquiry, it was not taken up by the Inam Department and disposed of as Inam.

5 Under these circumstances, the claim of Petitioner to the four fields in question as his Inam, is untenable.

6 The papers connected with the subject are forwarded herewith for reference and return.

I have &c.

(signed) Koti Subba Row
Deputy Collector

(True copy)

(signed) J. Hope
Ag. Collector

(True copy)

A Rumsey
Inam Commissioner

Nº 91. 152/11

Official Memorandum

1 In the Inam Commissioners Memorandum dated 18th July 1876 Nº 181, the Collector of the Godavery District was requested to report on a Petition presented by one Pamarti Venkatavadhanulu regarding certain Kattubadi Inam said to have been enjoyed by him in the village of Penumatham, in the Narsapur Taluq. The Collector in reply submits with his letter 8th December 1876 Nº 27 a report from his Deputy Collector reporting on the claim advanced.

Nº 106 of 1876.

2 In his letter dated 19th September 1876 the Deputy Collector states that this Kattubadi Inam was presumed in F. 1260

For

for default of payment of Kattubadi and to have been subsequently granted to the Inamdar on Jirayati tenure with the exception of one field Alliparru made over to a stranger. The Deputy Collector therefore concludes that the Petitioner's claim for the enfranchisement of his Inam is untenable.

3 The question to be determined is whether the Inam in question was granted to the Inamdar in Fusli 1250 on jirayati tenure, i.e. on payment of full assessment instead of the favorable assessment previously paid, and whether he had since then and till the introduction of the new settlement paid the full assessment. If so the Inamdar's claim for the Inam Title Deed falls to the ground and this case is to be struck off— From the following facts it would appear that the Inamdar has been only paying the Kattubadi or favorable assessment on his Inam till the introduction of the settlement rates.

4. The whole Inam grant as per Settlement accounts amounts to acres 14.07 assessed at Rs 29-13-5 as shown below

Field	D. No	Acres	Assessment
Ajusti cheruvu odai	857	8.18	20-7-2
Ura cheruvu odai	648	12	0-4-10
Madagalapalapampu	1440	3.05	2-4-7
Alliparru	1122	2.72	6-12-10
	Total	14.07	29-13-5

5. From the Deputy Collector's letter it appears that the field Alliparru escient acres 2.72 present assessment Rs 6-12-10 was made over to a stranger on full assessment and that the rest of the Inam was made over to the Inamdar for an assessment of Rs 4-6-0 i.e Rs 5-12-0 [illegible] in the Kattubadi payable by the Inamdar for the whole Inam inclusive of Alliparru

It seems clear from this that on account of the field Alliparru being alienated, the Inamdar had a remission

as

in his Kattubadi of Rs 5-12-0 per annum equivalent nearly to the present Settlement assessment of that field and this fact leads to the supposition that no change was made in the favorable tenure under which the Inam was held by the Petitioners. The Dumbalas and receipts referred to by the Collector in para 2 of his letter & filed by the Petitioner's brother with Petition No 63 herewith sent seem to show "that even after Fasli 1250 in which the Inam was resumed, he (Petitioner or Inamdar) used to pay Kattubadi." From these facts it must be presumed that the Inam could not have been resumed and fully assessed with Fasli 1250 but that it was attached and subsequently restored to the owner with the exception of one field made over to a stranger for which the Zamindar gave the Inamdar credit for full assessment Rs

Rs 5-12-0 collecting only the balance of Rs 4-6-0 as Kattubadi on the remaining extent acres 11.35 assessed at Rs 23-7-0 152/P

In the Collector's letter Para 3 it is observed that this Inam is not entered in the accounts. But from the register prepared by the Inam Department in 1869 the Inam appears to have been granted prior to F. 1210 and to have been entered as Kattubadi Inam in several subsequent accounts. A copy of this register will now be sent to the Collector & he will be requested to submit his views with reference to the observations made above & to report on the following points

1 Whether a Patta was granted to Field Alliparru when it was made over to a stranger & whether a similar course was observed with reference to the remaining Inam

2 On what grounds the Deputy Collector bases

1521
14

bases his statement that the Inam was granted on full assessment subsequent to Fasli 1250, when it is alleged to have been resumed, & whether there are records to support his statement. The Collector will also be requested to send on the records of enquiry held in this case both in his & the Deputy Collector's Office.

Appeal Petition No 79 presented by the Petitioner's brother requesting that the collection of assessment of the land in question may be suspended pending the enquiry into his claim, is forwarded herewith for the favorable consideration of the Collector. The land should not be sold on account of arrears till this case is disposed of by this Department.

Revenue Board Office
Inam Department
Madras 11th April 1879

Signed/ D. Arbuthnott
Inam Commissioner

To

The Collector of the Godavery Dist.

(True Copy)

A Sadasivachary
Inam Commissioner

Godavery District Collector's Office
Cocanada 9th January 1878

No 4.

152/15

From I[illegible]tor
Godavery District

To The Inám Commissioner
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum dated 11th April 1877, No 91, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of a letter, received from the General Duty Deputy Collector together with all the papers in original connected with the enquiry in regard to the land alleged by Pamarthi Venkatarawdhanulu to have been enjoyed by him as Inam in the Village of Penumatham in the Narsapur Taluk.

2 I observe from the [illegible] that the land enjoyed by the Petitioner's father, as an Inam paying Kattubadi of Rs 10-6- was resumed in Fasli 1250 owing to his absence in other places, and treated as jeroyte, being rented out

* Dated 29th Septr 1877 No 314

2.

No 284 of 1878 from Deputy Collr

Quarterly

No 1

[illegible]

out to some others for such sum as
was equal to the Kar[illegible] that it
has been entered ever[illegible] as jeroyth
in all the accounts; a[illegible] when
he returned to the Cou[illegible] subsequently

called Allipara was granted to him,
and the Village authorities considering
the fact that he had been deprived
of the right as Inam arranged that
a light assessment (Rs 4-6-) might
be paid by him. The Deputy Collector
based his statement in his former
letter that the Inam was granted
on jeroyth tenure as the Land has
been clearly entered as such in all
the accounts subsequent to Fasli 1250.
But the Land as you supposed had

the absence of the Petitioners father
and restored to him after a time.

3. The assessment above stated
was paid till Fasli 1272 when the
new

new Settl[illegible] was introduced. The
Petitione[illegible] wards relinquished the
Land [illegible] settlement assessment being
high-

4. [illegible] in Fasli 1282 the Petitioner
knowing [illegible] for 2 fields out of
the Land held by him previously, they
were given for the full settlement assess-
ment.

5. It was not usual to grant
individual pattas previous to the
settlement which took place in
Fasli 1272. So no pattas could have
been granted to field Allipara or
those held by petitioner previous
to Fasli 1272

6. Almost all the accounts subse-
quent to Fasli 1250 entered in the Copy
of the Inam Register received with
your official memorandum have
been carefully looked into - It is clear
from them that the Land claimed
by petitioner as Inam is not so
entered in them.

7. It is only from the Dumbalas
and

and some of the receip[illegible]oduced
by the Petitioner that [illegible] con-
tinued to be enjoye[illegible]ttubadi
Inam since the latter [illegible] such
entries as relate to the [illegible] of
[illegible]ption
of the Inam. But some receipts show
that it was entered in them as sist.
not Kattubadi. I am inclined to
think that the entries made in the
accounts are more reliable than the
papers produced by the Petitioner.

8. The petition &c received with
your memorandum under reply are
herein enclosed.

I have &c
(Sig[illegible]) W. S. Foster
Collector

(True copy)
A. Cumine
Inam Commissioner

Godavery District
Office of the Dy Collector
on General Duty
Narsapur 29th Sept. 1877.

No 314.

152
11

From [illegible] Deputy Collector
[illegible] Godavery Dt

To
W. S. Foster Esquire
Collector, Godavery District.

Sir

With reference to your Endorse-
ment No 115 dated 28th April last on
an Official Memorandum No 91 dated
11th Idem, I have the honor to state that
in the Bhubaud account for F 1249
the name of Pamarti Ramanna is
entered for the whole Inam. In that
for F 1250, it is stated for the 1st time
that Pamarti Ramanna's Inam is
incorporated with Jerayeti (Government
land) in that [illegible]. In those for F 1251
52-53-54-55-57-58-59-60-61-63
and 64 the Inam is deducted from the
head "Inam" and added to the head
"Jerayeti" as presumed Inam. In the

Inamati

Inamati form for 7/1254, a remark is made opposite the Inam that it was incorporated with Jerayati and penked out in 7/1250 for an abekment equal to the K tachi. In mine / not appear. In the Khubard account for 7/1262 the Inam is entered as incorporated with Government land. In the Zamindhadi account for 7/1264 the four fields in question are entered in different persons' names —

These accounts showing that the Inam was incorporated with Jerayati and the Inamati account for 7/1254 among them also showing that it was penked out in 7/1250 for an apeasment equal to the Kattubadi and it having been proved that petitioner subsequently obtained [illegible] of three of the fields excepting the 4th one called "Allipara", I stated in my letter No 312 dated 19th September 1876 referred to by the Inam Commissioner that

that they were granted the petitioner on Jerayati tenure (not on full apeasment as stated by the Inam Commissioner) The Inamati account for 7/1254 showing that an amount [illegible] to the Kattubadi was levied as the apeasment of the 4 fields and the Villagers stating that petitioner paid on his 3 fields Rs 4-6-- out of Rs 10-2-- (the amount of Kattubadi) I said in my letter that the Inam except "Allipara" was made over to the Inamdar for an apeasment of Rs 4-6--. In those days there being no fixed apeasment on lands, it was optional with the authorities to apeas them as they liked, the petitioner having lost the Inam, it is not unlikely that the fields registered by him may have been [illegible] pity charged with light apeasment arranging for the levy of the difference between the same and the Kattubadi of Rs 10-2-- on "allipara" which came to

to be professed by a stranger whose
case deserved no special treatment.
In the receipts and Dumbalas preferred
to the amount paid by petitioner
was called Kattubadi and the land
on which it was paid was
Inam. While the accounts referred to
above prove that the Inam was incor-
-porated with Jeroyeti in Fasli 1250
and deducted from the head Inam
in several subsequent accounts, I
cannot say that the Inam was
attached and restored to petitioner
after a time, nor can I say how
the receipts and Dumbalas produced
were obtained by petitioner. There
is no doubt that the Inam though
resumed was allowed to be enjoyed
by petitioner on favorable agreement.
All the accounts entered in the
Inam Register sent by the Inam
Commissioner are not to be found here.

Those

1521/19

Those that have been found are
identical with those referred to.
It is clear from them that the land
claimed by petitioner as Inam is
not so entered in them.

In reply to the 1st point referred to
by the Inam Commissioner, I beg to state
that the Village having been under the
Joint Rent system, there could have been
no individual Pattahs for Jeroyti lands.
So no Pattahs would have been granted
to petitioner. However there should have
been an account called "Amaraka form"
for each year showing the extent of land
held by each Ryot. No such accounts
seem to exist for this Village. The
Zamindari account for Fasli 1264 showing
that the finer fields were held by persons
other than the petitioner, it is presumable
that they were all nominally entered
in the names of some others, but that
three of them were allowed to be enjoyed

by

15-21/20

by petitioner either by those persons or by the Villagers.

In reply to the 2nd point, as to the grounds on which my statement that the Inam was granted on full assignment subject to Peishcush was based, I beg to state that I have mentioned them above.

The accounts &c bearing on the subject are sent herewith as directed.

I have &c

(Sig.) Kota Subba Rao
Deputy Collector

/True Copy/
(Sig.) W. S. Foster
Collector

/True Copy/

[redacted]
Inam Commissioner

No 69

1521/21

Official Memorandum.

Read letter from the Collector of Godavery
dated 9th January 1878 No 4.

On a perusal of the above letter and the correspondence connected with it, it seems clear that the Inam was virtually resumed in F1250 and that though Petitioner had enjoyment of portions on more or less favorable terms by village arrangement subsequently for a few years, the enjoyment of the Inam was never restored.

In these circumstances, the Inam Commissioner is unable to see grounds for making a reference and the petition must be dismissed.

The records which accompanied the letter under reply are herewith returned.

(Sig^d) G. A. Ballard
Inam Comm^r

Revenue Board Office,
Inam Department,
Madras 16th March 1878.

To The Collector of Godavery.

(True Copy)
A Rutherford
Inam Commissioner.

3.

Rec^d 18th March 1878. Inam Branch

Ans 28th Ditto

To Collector of Godavery

enjoyment for nearly fifty years
on payment of a light rent and
this after the Inam was resumed
by the Zamindar & the possession by
the Inamdar of receipts in which
the land is invariably referred to
as Inam are points strongly in
favor of the Petitioner. The light
assessment equal in amount to the
Kattubadi payable before the
resumption of the Inam was con-
tinued after the lapse of the
Zamindary to Government.

The Petition and its enclosures
are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedt. Servant

Inam Commissioner

not 50 years ago

given by the villagers
but invariably

It was a joint
rent village
& there was no
interference
with details
of assessment
already in force

Encl. to I. 8/6/78 : 1021

Revenue 1879 Deptt
1878 Political (Rev) Deptt

From No 3895
The Inam Commr.

To
The Secretary to Govt
Revenue Deptt

Dated 3 August 1878
Received 6 do
No 184

Enclosures. ~~None~~
6

& Ol. No 1021 : 19 September 1878

Reports on Government Petition No 1021 of 1878.

No 214

C 27-8-78. RC 30-8-78
R 28-8-78 R 31-8-78
RC 28-8-78 RC 11-9-78
R 29-8-78 R 11-9-78