

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	82	Press ~~His~~
168-70 Dated 12-1-1820 19		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th January 1870.*

No. 169. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th December 1869, No. 8,967 :—

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Nellore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 4th November 1869, No. 2,090.

I HAVE the honour to enclose an English copy of the Judgment passed by the District Moonsiff of Nellore in Suit No. 345 of 1868, the defence of which was sanctioned by the Board in their Proceedings, dated 5th November 1868, No. 7,875.

2. The plaintiff in the above suit has appealed to the Civil Court in No. 34 of 1869, and the 1st defendant has also
* *Vide Arzi*, No. 32-3,601, dated 29th October 1869. appealed in No. 35 of 1869. But the Government Vakeel reports* that in neither of these appeals has the Collector been included as Respondent.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

No. 345 of 1868.

Plaintiff.
Kolapally Soobbiah.

versus

Defendants.
Hazarat Bhema Sababagaroo and 3 others.

Judgment.

Plaintiff sues to recover possession of twelve cents of land, as per limits specified in the plaint, valued at Rupees 0-8-8 and 9 rupees, as loss of labour from the 1st defendant and her ill-adviser, the 2nd defendant; to get the demarcation stones, put down by order of the 3rd and 4th defendants, removed; and to cancel the order excluding twelve cents of land from the puttah granted to him from Fusly 1277; in consequence of the 4th defendant having issued orders to exclude twelve cents of land from his puttah, and include it in that of the 1st defendant's, on a petition presented by the 1st defendant to the 3rd defendant, stating the demarcation stones on the southern side of the garden-land, had not been properly put down, and the demarcation stones having been removed and fresh ones put down on the 4th August 1868, and thereby caused him a loss; and declares Mowlavee Syed Vazeer Rooddeen and Mahomed Khaderally Saib had sold him 5 acres and 57 cents of land situated within the demarcation No. 465, to the west of Nabobpett, a suburb of Nellore, together with the trees and well therein, for Rupees 350, and that it has been in his possession; ever since that, agreeably to the application presented by the said Khaderally Saib, the 4th defendant had granted him a puttah for 5 acres and 57 cents of land in Fusly 1276; that in November 1867, the 2nd defendant and others having trespassed into his land and felled certain trees in the western fence, he had brought a charge before the Assistant Magistrate of the Nellore District, who inquired into the case and declared, "the fence belonged to his land or garden," and fined the 2nd defendant and others in a sum of Rupees 30 for the trespass, and gave him 15 rupees out of the sum.

2. The 1st defendant in her written statement denies the plaintiff's claim, and declares that the fence under dispute had been put up long ago, as the eastern boundary of her land, and it is her absolute right; that the western limit of the plaintiff's land is specified in the Deed of Sale as the boundary, or her fence; that it can be seen from the decision of the Assistant Magistrate, that the plaintiff's statement in his plaint, that the right of the fence had been confirmed to him by the said Assistant Magistrate is false; that as the said fence had been thickly covered with prickly-pear, the demarcation stones had first been put a short distance off, and afterwards the Revenue authorities of the district, finding out the error, had inquired into the matter and rectified the limit, by putting down the demarcation stones in their proper place, and that in Fusly 1277, they had excluded the twelve cents of land from the plaintiff's puttah and included it in hers.

3. The 2nd defendant in his written statement denies the plaintiff's claim, and declares that he has been living with the 1st defendant for about 20 years and is well aware that the fence

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th January 1870.*

under dispute is the 1st defendant's; that he has been made a defendant to prevent his giving evidence on behalf of the 1st defendant, and that he is not liable for this claim.

4. The 4th defendant in his written statement declares that the land under dispute, measuring twelve cents, is the ground occupied by the fence of the 1st defendant's garden; that the demarcation stones had been by over-sight placed so as to include the land in the plaintiff's garden No. 465; that after the puttahs had been granted for Fusly 1276, this error having come to his notice, he inquired into the matter, and rectified the error and granted puttahs accordingly in Fusly 1277; that he had not, as stated by the plaintiff, excluded the land as being in excess; but because it was found to be the 1st defendant's property; that the plaintiff had failed to file the Deed of Sale; that the Curnum of Nellore has declared he had signed the Deed of Sale as a witness, and it is therein stated the said fence belongs to the 1st defendant; that the plaintiff should be made to produce the said Deed of Sale, and should be examined as a witness; that the Revenue authorities had not taken any steps to prevent the enjoyment by plaintiff; that they had merely rectified the error committed in demarcating and nothing more; that the land in dispute is in the enjoyment of the 1st defendant; that if the plaintiff can establish his right thereto by a Civil action the Revenue authorities will alter the puttah accordingly, and that according to the Standing Circular Order of the Board of Revenue, No. 300, no separate Kyfiet will be filed by the 3rd defendant as he had acted on the order of the 4th defendant, informing the Bhinnams or dividing the land.

5. Plaintiff filed three documents, viz., A., Original puttah granted by the Collector of Nellore District to the plaintiff in Fusly 1276, for the land, etc., under dispute, to show that the land in dispute together with the twelve cents had been included in his puttah; B., Original puttah granted by do. to do. for Fusly 1277, excluding twelve cents of land; C., Deed of Sale of land filed by 2nd defendant as desired by plaintiff, executed by Hussain Khadery to Syed Mahommed Abbasalikhan Saib, under date the 9th April 1827, selling the tope, etc., as specified in the document for 420 rupees, to show the boundary is different.

6. The 1st defendant filed three documents, viz., attested copy of the registered document executed by Mowlavee Syed Vazee Rooddeen, Mahomed Khaderally Saib to plaintiff, selling the said land, etc., for Rupees 350, to show the western limit of the plaintiff's garden; No. 2, puttah granted for Fuslies 1276 and 1277, including the twelve cents of land in dispute; No. 3, attested copy of the decision passed by the Assistant Magistrate in Case No. 229 of 1867, on the file of his Court, imposing a fine of 10 rupees each, on the 2nd defendant and two others, under Section 427 of the Indian Penal Code "for having caused mischief," and ordering 15 rupees to be paid to the plaintiff therefrom.

7. The issues settled in this case are, whether the present boundary hedge on the western side of plaintiff's land had been put up by the plaintiff subsequent to purchase, and whether, and what loss he has sustained.

8. The plaintiff examined five, and the 1st defendant seven witnesses, respectively.

9. The plaintiff, in his plaint, first sued to recover possession of twelve cents of land on the grounds that extent had been excluded from the puttah given to him for Fusly 1277 after it had been given to him in Fusly 1276, as per limits previously demarcated.

10. In a subsequent statement, at the time of recording issues, it had come out of the boundary hedge between the plaintiff's and the 1st defendant's garden was the base of contention; the plaintiff declaring he had put it up after he had purchased the garden as per document No. 1, within the boundary therein specified; while the 1st defendant contended it was the original eastern boundary of her garden and been erroneously excluded from her land by the Demarcation Department.

11. The Deed of Sale No. 1, clearly defines the plaintiff's western limit as the 1st defendant's eastern "Caragoda" boundary hedge, and the question is, did the plaintiff put a new fence on his purchased land, and what had become of the 1st defendant's eastern "Caragoda" boundary alluded to in the said document?

12. The evidence of the plaintiff's 2nd and 3rd witnesses who say they had removed the prickly-pear on the eastern side of the said hedge and put up a new fence for the plaintiff, is

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th January 1870.*

grossly contradictory with regard to the non-existence of a former boundary hedge and the putting up a new one, and the 1st and 4th witnesses have evidenced to support their statement; but from the evidence of the plaintiff's 5th witness, a former cultivator of the land purchased by the plaintiff, and a personal inspection of the said hedge twice, the Court has every reason to believe the present boundary hedge under dispute is the original boundary hedge of the 1st defendant's garden, alluded to in the document No. 1, and the plaintiff had taken advantage of the demarcation stones having been put upon the inner side of the 1st defendant's hedge and got the said hedge repaired as his own, after clearing away all the prickly-pear on his ground up to the said hedge, which is about a yard and-a-half high in parts.

13. The evidence of the 1st defendant's 1st and 7th witnesses, Curnums of Nellore, supports the above version of the case, while the evidence of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th witnesses for 1st defendant is of no great weight in the matter, but the evidence of the 5th witness evidently brought over, is somewhat against the 1st defendant's claim, inasmuch as he declares the 2nd defendant a close relation of the 1st defendant had been present, and got the demarcation stones put down originally, and might have gone against the 1st defendant had it been supported in any way.

14. There appears no doubt about the present hedge being the 1st defendant's original eastern boundary, but it is to be observed a space of eleven links in width allowed by the 4th defendant is too much for a boundary hedge, and as the defendant's witnesses declare the old boundary hedge had been kept in repair by the present holders of the land purchased by the plaintiff, and as the plaintiff has purchased up to the said hedge, it is hereby decreed that the hedge under dispute as it now stands be the property of the 1st defendant's with all the trees thereon, and the land east thereof, from which the plaintiff appears to have cleared away the prickly-pear, be taken by the plaintiff; notwithstanding the stones subsequently put down by order of the 3rd and 4th defendants, being a five feet away from the said hedge, which must be rectified through the proper authorities at the expense of the plaintiff, who will pay all costs of suit.

(Signed) J. SMITH,
Munsiff.

21st December 1868.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government, together with a copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 5th November 1868, No. 7,875, in which the defence of the suit was sanctioned.

2. The Collector's costs have been ordered to be paid by the plaintiff, who has appealed to the Civil Court.

3. The 1st defendant has also appealed, but the Collector, 4th defendant in Original Suit, is not included as respondent in either case.

No. 170.

ORDER THEREON, 12th January 1870, No. 82.

Miscellaneous.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. WELLESLEY,
Acting Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 7,875.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th November 1863.

Read the following letter from J. A. C. BOSWELL, Esq., Acting Collector of Nellore, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 29th October 1863, No. 3,931:—

I HAVE the honour to enclose translation of a Plaint, the Draft of proposed Answer, together with an abstract of the plaint and my remarks thereon in Suit No. 345 of 1863, on the file of the District Munsiff's Court, Nellore.

2. The Nellore Tahsildar and myself are included as the third and fourth defendants. Under the Board's Standing Order, No. 300, the Answer will be filed by me alone, and I request sanction to conduct the defence at the public cost, as usual.

3. The circumstances of the case are fully set forth in the abstract referred to. I shall describe the same, briefly, as follows:—

4. In Nabobpet, a suburb of Nellore, the first defendant holds a garden demarcated as Nos. 461, 462, and 463. Adjoining to two of these, Nos. 461 and 463, there is another garden demarcated as No. 465 belonging to the plaintiff.

5. Twelve cents of the first defendant's land, forming the boundary hedge of his garden, was included at the demarcation in the adjoining garden of the plaintiff.

6. The plaintiff purchased his garden, and obtained a puttah for it in Fusly 1276 for the first time, when the survey areas were introduced in the Nellore talook. The survey having been made with reference to the demarcation limits, the total extent shown by the Survey No. 465 was entered in his puttah, which thus included the twelve cents in question.

7. The first defendant having petitioned me on this point, an inquiry was ordered, and the error was adjusted by fixing a sub-number for the same, and deducting it in the puttah granted to the plaintiff in Fusly 1277, a corresponding addition to the puttah of the first defendant being made at the same time. In either case the assessment was entered as before, pending the introduction of the new rates.

8. The plaintiff preferred a Magisterial charge against the second defendant, and two others, for cutting the trees in this hedge, and the Assistant Magistrate convicted them on a charge of mischief.

9. The plaintiff has not produced the Deed of Sale. The Curnum has deposed before the Tahsildar that he attested the same as a witness, and that it refers to the land in dispute as the property of the first defendant. The Tahsildar proposes to examine the plaintiff as a witness to compel him to produce the deed. I approve of the Tahsildar's proposal, and I have, accordingly, inserted a paragraph to that effect in the Draft Answer.

10. The date for filing the Answer has been postponed till the end of November next. The Government Vakeel has been provided with an anna stamp for presenting an application to the Court to obtain copies of the plaint, etc.

Vide Arzi from Government Vakeel, dated —.

Vide Takeed to Cash-keeper, dated —.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Suit No. 345 of 1863, on the file of the District Munsiff's Court, Nellore.

Plaintiff.	versus	Defendants.
Kolapalli Subbia.		1. Hazarat Bima Sahiba. 2. Musa Sahib. 3. Kauchi Subba Row, Tahsildar of Nellore. 4. J. A. C. Boswell, Esq., Acting Collector of Nellore.

Abstract of the Plaint.

1. That the plaintiff purchased from one Mavulabi Syed Vajihuddin Mahommed Kadar Alli	the sale.	The Acting Collector has no knowledge of the sale. The plaintiff has not filed the alleged
---	-----------	--

Acting Collector's Remarks.

Abstract of the Plaintiff.

Sahib, Demarcation No. 465, measuring 5-57 Acres, together with the trees and well in it for Rupees 350.

2. The plaintiff obtained a puttah from the fourth defendant, ni Fusly 1276, at the request of the said Kadar Alli Sahib.

3. That, in November 1867, the second defendant and others having entered into the plaintiff's garden in question and felled certain trees on its western hedge, the Assistant Magistrate Mr. Knox, to whom a complaint was preferred, inspected the spot personally, and after examining the Curnums and others, convicted the second defendant, etc., for entering into the plaintiff's garden, and upheld the plaintiff's claim to the hedge in question as part of his garden, fining the defendants 30 Rupees, and awarding a moiety thereof to the plaintiff.

Acting Collector's Remarks.

Deed of Sale with his plaint. The area in the Deed of Sale could not have been entered as 5-57 Acres, as it is the extent according to the new survey entered in the plaintiff's puttah after he obtained possession of the land in question.

According to the Curnum's account the land in question is numbered 440, measuring 7 Acres, 15 Kuntahs, and 14 Visams, assessed at Rupees 3-3-8. It was transferred to the plaintiff by the party named, who is the brother of Pirammad Sahib, who held the puttah and who died some time ago. The transfer was made in January 1867, and the puttah was drawn out in the name of the deceased up to the end of Fusly 1275. In the next Fusly, the survey areas having been introduced in the Nellore talook, the corresponding Demarcation No. 465, with the survey area of 5-57, was entered in the plaintiff's puttah.

I. The Assistant Magistrate, Mr. Knox, fined the second defendant and others Rupees 30 having convicted them on a charge of mischief.

II. The 2nd Assistant Magistrate, Mr. Boyle, now in charge of the office, reports as follows:—

"The complainant Kolapalli Subbaya claimed to be owner of a garden in Nabobpet in which he had planted young trees. About 29th October the defendants entered his field and dug up a strip of land along the side of the boundary hedge which separated their adjoining garden from that of the complainant. They pulled up some 60 or 70 trees, valued at Rupees 8 each. The Assistant Magistrate considered the fact of the mischief proved; the defence of the defendants resting mainly on the fact that they had been previously annoyed by the complainant's taking away or altering part of the boundary hedge. The case evidently turned upon the disputed title to the hedge which had been thus widely raised by both sides successively, and could only be settled by a Civil Court. The Assistant Magistrate apparently considered that the mischief caused by pulling up the trees was independent of, and not to be excused by, the defect of title alleged by the defendants in registering the complainant's occupation of the ground."

III. The Curnum, who was examined by the Assistant Magistrate Mr. Knox, deposed that "the hedge on the west belongs to the defendants."

IV. Mr. Knox's decision does not establish the right of any parties. He simply punished for mischief.

Abstract of the Plaintiff.

4. The first defendant having through this grudge represented to the third defendant (Tahsildar) that the demarcation stones on the western side of the plaintiff's garden were not correctly placed, he (third defendant) reported to the fourth defendant (Acting Collector) stating that 12 Cents of the first defendant's land were erroneously demarcated with the plaintiff's land, and that the fourth defendant ordered the 12 Cents to be deducted from the plaintiff's puttah adding the same to that of the first defendant under a fractional number.

5. That Kadar Alli Sahib, referred to in the first paragraph, held a puttah for 5-57 Acres, and that relying on this fact the plaintiff purchased the land for Rupees 350.

Acting Collector's Remarks.

I. On the 29th October 1867, the first defendant presented a petition to the Acting Collector representing that there was a mistake made in putting up the demarcation stones to her garden. The Nellore Tahsildar, to whom it was referred for report, replied by Arzi No. 1,107-6,051, dated 29th November 1867.

II. He stated that the first defendant held land measuring 30 K., 4 V., 4 P., according to the Curnum's account, assessed at Rupees 12-9-3; that the land was demarcated as Nos. 461, 462, and 463; that the borders of Nos. 461 and 463 being overgrown with prickly-pear, there was an oversight in putting up the stones, so as to exclude from the said numbers 12 Cents of land and including the same in the adjoining number 465; that the 12 Cents were in the enjoyment of the first defendant as the boundary hedge of her garden; that No. 465 was sold to the plaintiff; that the Curnum deposed to his having attested the Deed of Sale and to the entry in the Deed of the 12 Cents as the property of the first defendant; and on these grounds recommended a sub-number being assigned for the 12 Cents in question.

III. Thereupon Takid, dated 10th December 1867, No. 861, was issued by the Acting Collector directing the Tahsildar to recognise a sub-number accordingly deducting the same from the plaintiff's puttah and including it in the first defendant's puttah in due course.

I. There was no puttah held by Kadar Alli Sahib, as alleged by the plaintiff. The puttah stood in the name of his deceased brother, as already stated, up to the end of Fusly 1275. The area of 5-57 Acres was for the first time entered in the name of plaintiff in Fusly 1276, when introducing survey areas.

II. The area of the land purchased by the plaintiff is 7 Acres and odd, as already shown according to the Curnum's account. The survey area in this case happens to fall short of the area previously registered in the accounts, and the plaintiff is entitled to only as much land as was enjoyed by the holder from whom he obtained it. The including of the whole extent surveyed in No. 465, in the puttah newly granted to the plaintiff, was a mistake which was the result of the error in the demarcation. The first defendant having shortly after the issue of the puttah complained against the mistake, the Tahsildar was ordered to inquire, and the mistake was adjusted as already stated. Such adjustments have been made in several other cases.

Abstract of the Pleint.

Acting Collector's Remarks.

III. In introducing the survey areas no change has been made in the assessment which is entered as before pending the introduction of the new rates. While by assigning a sub-number for the 12 Cents under dispute existing possession is not disturbed, the plaintiff has no ground to complain of any loss to him. If by the Deed of Sale, or otherwise, he can establish his claim to the 12 Cents satisfactorily before Judicial Officers there will be no objection on the part of this office to recognise his claim and amend the puttahs accordingly.

The explanation above given applies to this allegation also.

The Assistant Magistrate's decision cannot fix the area of a field which must be ascertained by the survey.

The question which had to be decided when a sub-number was assigned to the 12 Cents in question had no reference to excess or deficit. The extent was not deducted from the puttah of the plaintiff on the ground of its containing an excess over the recorded extent as he endeavours to show. It was simply an adjustment of a mistake, and nothing else.

(Signed) J. A. C. BOSWELL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.
No. 345 of 1868.

TO THE TALOOK MOONSIFF'S COURT OF NELLORE.

Plaintiff. versus Defendants.

Kottapalli Subbaya, Baliga caste, living by landed property, residing at Nabobpetta.

1. Hazarath Bheema Sahiba, Mahomedan caste, living by landed property.
2. Hussain Sahib.
3. Kanchi Subba Row Puntulu Brahmin, Tahsildar of Nellore.
4. J. A. C. Boswell, Esq., Acting Collector of Nellore.

Pleint filed under Section 26, Act No. VIII. of 1859, as follows:—

1. I took possession, by right of purchase, for 350 Rupees of land Demarcation No. 465, extent A. 5, C. 57, with trees and well thereon situate on the west of Nabobpett, suburb of Nellore, belonging to Mavulabi Syedu Mavugivuddin Mahommed Khadar Alli Sahib.
2. The fourth defendant granted me puttah for A. 5, C. 57, in Fusly 1276, agreeably to the application made by the said Khadar Alli Sahib.
3. In November 1862, the second defendant, etc., having entered my garden, cut down a tree on the boundary wall, I preferred a complaint before the Assistant Magistrate of Nellore. Mr. Knox, who inspecting the spot, and inquiring the Curnums, etc., held that the western boundary wall was mine, and in consequence, inflicted a fine of Rupees 30 on the second defendant for trespassing on my garden, awarding 15 Rupees to me as amends.
4. The first defendant presented an Arzi to the third defendant, actuated by feelings of malice, stating that the demarcation stones on the western side were not properly placed, and that an extent of twelve cents was added to my garden, owing to the placing of a demarcation stone within the

boundary wall of the first defendant, in consequence of rank growth of prickly-pear on the boundary of Nos. 461 and 463: upon which the third defendant wrote an Arzi to the fourth defendant on the subject; and the fourth defendant ordered that the extent in question should be separated from my puttah, and added to that of first defendant, and accordingly granted puttah, demarcating on the 4th item, the fraction that was recognised.

5. I purchased the puttah of Khadar Alli mentioned in paragraph 1 for Rupees 350, on the consideration that he holds his puttah for A. 5, C. 57 of land.

6. A puttah was issued to me, in Fusly 1276, agreeably to the aforesaid puttah.

7. It was confirmed by the decision of the Magistrate that inclusive of land under dispute, my garden extent does not exceed A. 5, C. 57.

8. It is an error to deduct twelve cents from my Puttah D. No. 645, whose extent has been determined to be A. 5, C. 57; under the impression that there is an increase in it, and to add the same to that of first defendant without measurement.

9. I request that my case may be inquired into; that the marks placed by Demarcation Office at the western boundary wall of my garden may be left unaltered; that the extent of twelve cents, recognised as a fraction situate within these limits; cost of demarcation stone, placed in my garden; south of boundary demarcation stone of Baru Rama Row's garden; west of demarcation stone (sic.), north of demarcation stone near the road of Runganayakula pettah, yielding a shist of A. 1, C. 1, valued at A. 8, C. 8, eight times the amount, together with the loss of 9 Rupees and costs may be ordered to be paid by the first defendant, and her bad counsellor the second defendant; that the stones recently placed to recognise the fraction may be removed, and that the deduction inserted in my puttah for Fusly 1277 may be cancelled. I also annex two puttahs granted to me for Fusly 1276-77. 10th August 1868. Filed on the 10th.

I, the plaintiff in the above suit, do hereby declare that what is stated therein is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

+ mark of Subbaya.

(True translation.)

(Signed) J. A. C. BOSWELL,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

Draft Answer proposed to be filed by the fourth defendant in Suit No. 345 of 1868, on the file of the Munsiff's Court, Nellore.

UNDER the following ground, the first defendant requests that the pleint may be non-suited, and the costs recovered for him in due course:—

- 1st.—That the land sued for, measuring twelve cents, forms the hedge of the first defendant's garden.
- 2nd.—That in putting up the demarcation stones, the land in question was, by mistake, included in the plaintiff's adjoining garden demarcated as No. 465.
- 3rd.—That the mistake in the demarcation having been brought to notice after issuing a puttah to the plaintiff in Fusly 1276, the error was adjusted after due inquiry, and the puttah amended accordingly in Fusly 1277.
- 4th.—That the land in question was not deducted from the plaintiff's puttah because of an excess, as alleged by the plaintiff, but because it was the property of the first defendant.
- 5th.—That the plaintiff has failed to produce the Deed of Sale.
- 6th.—That the Curnum of Nellore states that he attested the deed, and that the land in question therein referred is the property of the first defendant.
- 7th.—That the plaintiff may be examined as a witness, and compelled to produce the deed.
- 8th.—That the Revenue Authorities have in no way interfered with the possession of the land.

nothing having been done but to correct a discovered error in the demarcation. First defendant is in possession of the land, and if plaintiff prove his right to it in a Civil Court, the Revenue Authorities will, of course, in due course alter his puttah.

9th.—Under the Board's Standing Order, No. 300, no separate answer will be filed by the third defendant who acted under the orders of the fourth defendant in fixing a sub-number for the land sued for.

(Signed) J. A. C. BOSWELL,
Acting Collector.

The proposed Answer is approved, and the defence of the suit sanctioned.
(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Nellore.

Copy to the Accountant General.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rev^d 1869. *Left*
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

N^o 4188

PROCEEDINGS, 6TH DECEMBER 1869, No. 8,967.

C. P. 10 December 1869. Encl. 1
Received *11/12/69*

DECEMBER.

No. 8,967.

Suit.—No 345 of 1868, filed in Nellore District Moonsiff's Court for recovery of certain land.
—Letter from Collector forwarding copy of Judgment in, and stating that both plaintiff and 1st defendant have appealed to Civil Court against Moonsiff's decision, and that in neither of those cases has Collector been included as Respondent, submitted to Government.

Recorded

12/12/69

C. 16th Dec 1869/10/11/Jan/69

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

1868.

Department:

P 4188/19
No. 1

Dated 5th November 1868.

Received

No. 7,875.

Suit No. 345 of 1868 on file of Nellore District Moonsiff's Court regarding certain land—
Defence of — sanctioned. Proposed Draft Answer, approved.

See 12th Dec 1869 & 11/12/69