

Original

Govt. of {1894} Madras.

REVENUE.

issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th June 1894, No. 398.

JUNE.

Land.

Stating that the piece of — at Narasaraopet applied for by the Rev. J. Aberlay of the American Evangelical Lutheran Mission, Guntūr, being a quarry, does not belong to the Local Board and that it should therefore be dealt with as ordinary Government poramboke under paragraphs 10 and 11 of Board's Standing Order No. 37 (new edition).

7TH JUNE 1894, No. 398, REVENUE.

ORDER—dated 7th June 1894, No. 398, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The land in question being a quarry, not a road, does not belong to the Local Board unless it has been specifically granted which does not appear to have been the case. It should therefore be dealt with as ordinary Government poramboke under paragraphs 10 and 11 of Board's Standing Order No. 37 (new edition).

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
„ the Local and Municipal Department.

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.

40 Copies.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C-3563

supp 7.

Re question whether certain Road
Poramboke belongs to a Local Board

~~to send~~ Printed 7/6.

The Hon. Mr. Lyose m.a. & C^s again
~~The Hon. Mr. Bliss C.D.~~ 44

G. Co. 7th June 1894, No. 398

44
4/6

7. My view is that all so-called Local Fund immoveable property is only Government property vested in the Local Fund Board for a certain time and certain object. Whenever the Local Board gives up such property, it necessarily reverts to Government. In the present case, the Local Board has given up the land in question and by turning it into village site there is no transfer. It appears to me therefore that the Government Order above quoted does not apply ; but as there is a doubt, I beg to request that Government may be pleased to issue orders whether the transfer of Local Fund immoveable property from the Board to Government requires Government sanction.

I believe that Road Peramboke, has a land assigned along side of roads for their repair & because needed in L & Bds under Sec 49 of the act. If so it was only needed in them when they used it as a quarry & they cannot divert themselves of it without the consent of Govt., but this is not a matter of importance in the present case. I don't see why the collector should not be allowed to sell the land instead of assessing it under Sec 10 S.O. 37 or selling it by auction under Sec 11

I think not. But in case the draft is b. b. & H. to be. Very well
 2/6/94
 3/6/94
 3/6/94
 3/6/94

Printed
 C. No. 3563

Order of 7 June 1894, No 398.

The land in question, being a quarry, not a road, does not belong to the Local Board until unless it has been specifically granted which does not appear to have been the case. It should therefore be dealt with as ordinary Govt. peramboke under paras 10 & 11 of Board's S.O. No 37 (New Ed.)

To The Comr of Land Revenue
 Local & Municipal Deptt.
 4/3

Note. With reference to the Hon. Mr. Bliss's direction that the land should be ~~not~~ sold to the mission; it is thought that the H.M. does not wish to interfere with the discretion allowed to Collectors in such cases (under paras 10 & 11 of Board's S.O. No 37) either to sell the land or to assess it at ordinary or special rates

Revenue 1894 Deptt
 From Number 3563

J. A. Atkinson Esq.
 President District Board Kistna

To, The Chief Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department

Madras.

Dated 14-4-94
 Dispt 14-4-94
 Recd 14 May
 Recd 17 APR. 94

Cus 65
 Govt. Secy
 14 MAY 94
 DEPARTMENT

Subject
 Requesting to issue orders whether the transfer of Local Fund immovable property from the Board to Government requires Government sanction

17/5
 (M. R. S.)

Pub. 9-5-91-5195

H. M.

Ref The President is requested to submit a sketch showing clearly the position of the land in question.

For orders
 It is submitted that no sketch is necessary as the meeting agreed on a proposed to alienate is "high road peramboke" vested in the Local Board which has however chosen to utilize it as a quarry under the S.O. to which Mr. Atkinson refers (S.O. 16.4.89 No. 5582). The sanction of Govt. appears necessary to its alienation, even though the transfer is only from the Local Board to the Govt. It is not very clear why the mission should not be asked to purchase it.

This I think is the correct view

The land is a quarry and therefore does not belong to the L. Bd. unless it has been specifically granted, which seems not to have been the case. It belongs to Govt. & the mission should buy it as suggested.

No 351
 Transferred to the Revenue Department with notes in original

(H. M. S.)
 Local Davidon
 as Secy Secretary
 President, District Board

8-5-94 Kistna

14 MAY 94
 DEPARTMENT

Revenue 1894 Dept
H. No. 3563

J. A. Atkinson Esq.

President District Board
Kistna

To, The Chief Secretary to
Government, Local and
Municipal Department

Madras.

Dated 14th 4-94

Dispd 14-4-94

Recd 14-4-94

Recd 17 APR. 94



Subject

Requesting to issue orders
whether the transfer of Local
Fund immovable property
from the Board to Govern-
ment requires Government
sanction

does not apply: but as there is a
doubt, I beg to request that Govern-
ment may be pleased to issue orders
whether the transfer of Local Fund
immovable property from the Board
to Government requires Government sanction.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant
A. Sundarabhaiah
for President.

13496

17/5

(With Ref)

6. A question has been raised whether this relinquishment requires the sanction of Government on the ground that it falls under the terms of G. O. No: $\frac{8582}{16-8-87}$ which lays down that "no immovable property vested in a Local Board shall be transferred by sale, mortgage, exchange or otherwise without the sanction of the Governor in Council."

7. My view is that all so called Local Fund immovable property is only Government property vested in the Local Fund Board for a certain time and certain object. Whenever the Local Board gives up such property, it necessarily reverts to Government. In the present case, the Local Board has given up the land in question and by turning it into Village site there is no transfer. It appears to me - therefore that the G. O. above quoted

as High Road Poramboke and is used by the Local Fund Department as a quarry.

4. On receipt of the application from the Revd J. Aherday, the General Deputy Collector, Vinnukonda, obtained the consent of the Local Fund Overseer concerned to give up the land, and applied to the Collector for sanction to convert it into Village site. The Collector ordered that the consent of the Overseer was not sufficient and that that of the Local Board concerned should be obtained.

5. The District Board, in its resolution No: $\frac{7}{9-9-93}$, accepted the General Deputy Collector's proposal to give up the land in question and the Collector, in his proceedings No: $\frac{3767}{Var}$ of 1893, sanctioned its conversion into Village site.

b. a

No. 653
DB

KISTNA DISTRICT BOARD'S OFFICE,

Camp Masulipatanu.

Dated the 14-4-1894.

From

J. N. Atkinson Esquire.

PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD

KISTNA.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit
the following for the orders of Government.

2. A mission bungalow at Narsarowpett
is situated on D. No. 360 and a portion of
D. No. 361 $\frac{B}{1}$ measuring 19 cents lies between
the bungalow and the Peralu - Nesarikal road.

The Rev. J. Abertay of the American -
Evangelical Lutheran Mission, Guntur,
applied for this portion with a view to
bring the bungalow compound up to the road.

3. The D. No. 361 $\frac{B}{1}$ measuring acres 3-8
is entered in the Settlement Register
as