(L)

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 26

(2) Date of repair 24-7-1968

(3) Initials of the Referencer 24.7.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	246	Press / Mis.
Dated	10-3-1892	196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 6th February 1892, Mis. No. 855 :—

THE HON. MR. J. GROSE.

Read—the following letter from G. STOKES, Esq., Collector and District Magistrate of Salem, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Salem, 9th January 1892, Ref. on No. 3871-Eng. :—

I have the honour to state that in G.O., dated 4th October 1889, Mis. No. 6324, communicated in Board's Proceedings, dated 17th October 1889, Mis. No. 6312, the Government approved and sanctioned the Board's recommendation to resume the inam attached to the Muthu Chetti Chattram at Tirupatúr and to transfer it to the Taluk Board, Tirupatúr, for the maintenance of a new chattram to be constructed by it at Tirupatúr. The full assessment as per settlement of the inam lands, viz., Rs. 71–6–0, is now collected from the Inamdar and paid over to the Taluk Board, Tirupatúr.

2. Looking back at former correspondence it appears that the then Collector, Mr. Orr, in his letter, No. 124, dated 23rd November 1831, recommended "that such an extent of unoccupied land, as is subject to an assessment of Rs. 60 per annum, be granted for the support of this choultry," that the Government, in its order, dated 7th February 1832, communicated in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd idem, sanctioned "the proposed grant of land," and that Mr. Orr, in his order, dated 21st August 1832, No. 45, granted the marginally-noted lands "out of the podugal (land which has been assessed but is not in occupancy—*vide* page 338 of the Salem District Manual, Volume II) lands relinquished by Muthu Chetti." The inam register shows that at the survey and in fasli 1232 (1822–23) the land was "circar," and that Muthu Chetti's name appeared in the accounts of fasli 1248 (1838–39). The above clearly shows that at the time of the grant the lands were at the disposal of Government. There is therefore no reason to allow the lands to remain with the Inamdar, and I request that the necessary sanction may be obtained for the transfer of the lands also to the Taluk Board which would then get the kudivaram as well as the assessment.

No.	Extent.	Assessment.	Jodi.
108	38 5 4	40 4 0	
112	2 29 0	13 6 8	0 15 7
98	0 38 0	5 12 8	
99	0 10 0	1 8 3	
	42 2 4	60 15 7	

3. The Inamdar has not shown that the lands were private property at the time of the grant. He is, however, not prepared to make over possession of the lands from which he will have to be evicted only under process of civil court on a suit by the Taluk Board.

Resolution—dated 6th February 1892, Mis. No. 855.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In the circumstances explained by the Collector, the Board supports his proposal to transfer to the Taluk Board the lands granted by Government in 1832 for the support of Muthu Chetti's Chattram at Tirupatúr.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
for Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with letter in original, to be returned.

„ the Collector of Salem.

ORDER—dated 10th March 1892, No. 246, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Government considers that 60 years' possession ought to be respected and is unable to accept the Board's recommendation.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with the Collector's letter returned.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

40 Copies.

Original

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 10th March 1892, No. 246.

MARCH.

Muthu Chetti's Chattram at Tirupatur.

Considering that 60 years' possession ought to be respected and declining to accept Board's recommendation to transfer to the Taluk Board the lands granted by Government in 1832 for the support of the —.

28-3-03
5-8-05
4-4-06

13-10-07
18-1-07
2-2-08
11-12-12
10-12-15
20-5-16
23-9-16
1-2-18
9-5-27 BIII
11.12.37

1 Cno. 661 D

3

To Supdt clerk, Madras.

I have examined the o.m.e files with me to see if the original of Ro. 246 Rev. dt 10.3.1892 is in any of them. It is not here. Please get from o.R. the originals of Ro 246 Rev. dt 10.3.1892 and also of Ro no. 1045 dt 11.10.1892.

2. It may be well to put up, with Supdt's permission, also the previous papers quoted in the two Ros., as some of them contain discussions in the notes attached to them.

19.4.06 23.4.06

X Original of Ro no 246 dt 10.3.92 has to be sent for from Cno. 4563 of 1905 & No. of the 6512 Dept. & 4-10-0 Question whether papers in the Cno 3655/05 also to be sent for.

Dept. No. 1045 dt 11.10.92

Chief Auditor's memo dt. 24.4.06

Mr Pannaiah,

The ore of Go no 246 dt 10.3.92 is not traceable here. Please

9 REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

V

the receipts of the DR
Go no 6324-Mis dt 6.10.89
Instructions d put up for
Exec Enq 365 & 805 sheet d not
yet disposed of. It appears
the Exec Asst asked the opinion
of the Advocate General
As for Go 246 dt 10.3.92
Please See there also

NRA
24.4.06

Mr N Rao.

I have made a careful search again here. The original of Go. No. 246 dt 10.3.1892 is not in any of the files here. Wherever that Go. is just to find only a spare copy is just with. I have examined the H & M file above referred to. I do not find the Go. there either.

Please get the original of Go. No. 286 dt 27.3.1906 which is still in M.D. & see in the blue docket sheet attached to it whether the original or copy of the Go. of 1892 was put up for it.

Please also enquire in the H & M Deptt. for any O.M. or intact file relating to Chattram & endowments & see whether the Go. of 1892

is in any of their files & also if any O.R. papers are lying about in our office. If the Go. cannot be found by any means please submit the case for further orders.

RR
27.4.06.

To Mr Percival.

I showed the file to the Supdt of Cers and he says that the Deptt Cers not say anything. The Go. does not find place in the OR. I have made a search here but it is not forthcoming. The Supt remembers a file about Venkateswara Swami mutt Godavari St (Cerfl). He wants now to look up the file and see if the Go is there. He asked me to make further search here but meanwhile to send the file up to ours. If the Go is found it will be sent immediately.

NRA
30.4.06

Exec. 1617 1893

To Supdt.
To Draftsman Clerk, Mrs.

The Rajahmundry Mutt file is in circulation. Perhaps it

Original

X

to Returns.

The linked file has not been submitted to Supdt. tho I had attached a 'Two Cases' slip purposely. It is re-submitted.

KP
2/5/06.

It seems better that, ~~any~~ if this file is to be sub? to W.S. the further note on the result of the search for the original G.O. No. 246 Rev dy 10.3.1892 is written ~~by the~~ at the Madras

KP
2/5/06

To Mr. N Rao

The original G.O. No. 246 Rev dy 10th Mar. 1892 is not in the Rajamundry Melut file referred to by the Superintendent.

Did you ask O.R. Office to examine the spare copies bundle please?

Please don't return the file to me without a reply to the Secretary's remark.

KP
3.5.06

OR

Search made in the MRB 5.5.06

A further search has been made for the G.O. but in vain. It was put up for a clerical error on 5.8.05 and has not been returned. There is a dummy slip in the bundle and the entry

Quinquennial

In the list of records sent with the Record Office has just been struck out as the Co. having been wound up.

H.E. 9/5/61

H.E. 9/5/61

H.E. Lahore.

Will you kindly let me know about C.P. 246/62

I have myself made a search in the Office Record and in the old Records, as well, I am afraid it is locked up with some untidy file [illegible] Lahore in the R.D. or Lahore Secretariat. A search has been made in the Agent's Office (Dept. Line) as well — see Memo slip attached. Please have final search made in the Lahore Record Room and in the Office Records and let me know the result.

H.E. 9/5/61

H.E.

Sorry we have not been able to find the rest of the file.

H.E. 9.5.62

Bundle

6 7

To Head clerk

Further search has been made in ofty office. The ref. is not forthcoming.

12.5.06.

Show Rev. CN 4563 for 05 the missing ref was put up on 5.805 Ref. 15506

To Secy.

The original of Ref. no. 732, dated 10.8.1905, in which the above current was disposed of is submitted. (Flag Z.)

15.5.06.

4 8

To ~~H~~ Head Clerk.

The missing G.O. no. 246 Rev. d. 10-3-1892 has been found in the file relating to the revision of village establishments in the Trichinopoly Dt. in which another orig. G.O. of 1892 (relating to Vill. Offrs.) has been put up. The G.O. is put up below this note.

2. The Inam file for which the missing G.O. was required has returned from circ. this morning. Perhaps H.C. would like to inform the Secy. that the G.O. has been since found, when the inam file goes to Secy "from circulation".

This note is subd, as I will come late to office, ~~with~~ under H.C. permission.

18.5.92

Residual

10

9 REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

It appears from the file of notes put up that G.O. No ~~732 d. 10.8.05~~ 246 d. 10 Mar. 1892 was put up for Rev. C. No. 4563 - of 05. This C.No was disposed of long ago on G.O. No 732 d. 10.8.05, & the Refs for it must have gone back to the record.

G.O. 246 - d. 10 Mar 1892 has now been found put up with another file, & on the back of it is an entry — 4.4.06. It is thus evident that it was re-issued on that date. But the Dummyslip of last August still remains, & the record office entries have not been corrected.

Enquiry shld be made to ascertain who wrote — 4-4-06" on the G.O. & why the record entries were not corrected

AGI 18 5 06

20 C.S.R
Madras.

Kindly look into this matter & let us have a report.

Yours
P.V.B

P. T. O.

File received in R.O. on 21.5.06.
Original of the G.O. called for (21/6 Revs & 10.2.93)
through the Revenue Refs. — 22.5.06
G.O. received from the Rev. Refs — 28.5.06.

21.5.06

H. C.
Rev.

I have enquired into this matter.

G.O. No:246, Rev. d/10.3.'92 does not appear to have been returned to the Record office when Rev. C. No:4563 of 1905 was disposed of by G.O. No:732 dated 10.8.'05.E.M.C. No:915 dated 22.8.43, which was put up for the same current on the same date, was returned to the Record office only on the 5:10.'05 although the current was disposed of in August previous. The entry in the Record register in the latter case however has been scored out and the date of return of the E.M.C. has been duly entered.

The Rev. and some of the other departments taking papers from the Record office, are sometimes in the habit of retaining the put-up G.O.s for a time and then returning them to the Record Office. This happens especially in the case of files that are kept intact until a subject is finally disposed of. If these G.O's are required meanwhile for other currents, they are put up, but the R.O. is not informed of the currents for which these are subsequently put up, and the entries in the bundles thus consequently remain unaltered.

It is probable that G.O. 246 Rev, dated 10.3.92 was thus put up along with other more recent G.Os in the Rev. dept. itself for C.No:766 D of '06 when the file was sent to the Record Office for other Record Office papers to be put up. The Record Office Referencer must have then put up the latter papers and sent the file to the Checking Clerk for entry in the Register of Records entrusted to the Record Office on 4.4.'06. The Checking Clerk in entering the Record Office papers entered

also G.O. 246 of '92 (being a Record Office G.O) (assuming that it was then taken out, as reissued on that day) and the attender assisting him marked on the back of the G.O. the date, 4.4.06. There were five other G.O's put up for C. No:766 D and in each case 4.4.06 is entered in the dummy slip as the date on which they were issued; but no entry has been made in the dummy slip put in place of G.O.246 of '92 showing that it was returned (to the records) and was reissued on the 4th April 1906. Nor is there any entry in the Register of 'Records sent out' showing the return of this G.O. to the Record Office. It is possible that these entries were not made by an omission, but it is difficult to say, as it is also possible that the G.O. might have been put up by the Revenue Dept. itself and sent to the Genl. Records for other papers. In order to provide a check in such cases I have altered the procedure at present in vogue by which the papers are collected by the Referencer concerned and passed on to the Checking Clerk for entry in the 'Register of records sent out of the Record Office'. The Checking Clerk has no means of knowing what records were collected at the time, but enters all the papers in the file which happen to be over 7 years old. To rectify this I have directed that the Referencers concerned should mark the date of reissue themselves on each paper got up at the time for the file in hand. Both the Referencer as well as the Checking Clerk will then be able to detect papers of the Record Office which have been put up by the current reference of any department and sent with files to the Record Office. An entry can then be made in the dummy slips in the bundle showing that certain G.Os were not returned to the records but were put up with currents and sent to the Record Office for

other papers, and the date of reissue of the particular C.O. c[illegible]t the same time be entered in the dummy slip i[illegible] the bundle. The entry in the Register of R[illegible]cords sent out of the Record Office can also then be closed.

31/5/06

13

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE
MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 6 February 1892.

No. 855 Mis.
~~Routine.~~

The Hon. Mr. J. Grose.

READ letter from G. Stokes Esq: Collector and District Magistrate of Salem dated 9 January 1892 Report Sy 3871 Eng.

Resolution

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In the Circumstances Explained by the Collector, the Board Support his proposal to transfer to the Taluk Board the lands granted by Government in 1832 for the Support of Muttun Chettis Chutram at Tirupatur.

(True Extract)

for Sy.
For Ag. Secretary

To
The Secretary to Govt. R.D. with letter in original to be returned
Collector of Salem.

G.O 4-10-89 № 6326
7-2-32 № 127

Revenue 1892 Dept

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Current Number 1318.

To

The Secretary to

Government Revd.

G. Cedf 10 Feby 1892 no: 246 C.S.S

Reed 10 Feby En 1.

Proceedings, dated 6 February 1892,
No. 855 Mis. Routine 10 FEB 92

Subject Requesting Sanction of Govt. for the transfer of lands attached to Mutha Chetty Chattram, Salem Dt to the Tirupathur Taluq Board.

G.O

The Govt. is unable to accept the Board's recommendation. Possession of the inam lands for 60 years decrees to be respected even though the circumstances of the resumption of the inams are such as justify the imposition of full assessment.

To the Comrs of Land Rev

Dirn. Form orders

G.O 4-10-89 № 6326
7-2-32 № 127

Q.O min

The collector's proposal supported by the Board of Revenue is approved and sanctioned.

Dy 7/6/92
2 2

LRD
22/2 To the Comrs of Land Revenue with the enclosures returned.

I consider that Zemindars generally ought to be respected, even though the circumstances of the case, which therefore justify their dismissal, are such as justify full assessment. I would therefore reject the Board's proposal.

LRD
19 Feb

Lapse

Mis
G.O. Ntg Gr 10 Feby 1892 no 246

G.O The Govt. considers that Zemindars generally ought to be respected & should be dismissed only when the circumstances of the case justify full assessment. The Board's proposal is therefore rejected.

Copies sent to the Collr of Salem 1/s
RC 22/2
Dy 29/2