

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2827	Press
	582. 533	Mis.
Dated	28-11-18	67.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th November 1867.*

No. 532. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 26th November 1867.

Read the following letter from the Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 21st November 1867, No. 320 :—

Board's Proceedings, dated 6th August 1867,
No. 5,045.
Government Order, dated 31st July 1867,
No. 1,752.

1. In acknowledging the receipt of the Board's order noted in the margin, I have the honor to state that the Zemindar of Calastri has, with some reluctance, consented to the question of the disputed boundary between his estate and the Trivalloor talook of the Madras District being referred to arbitration, under Act XXVIII of 1860, and has named his Vakil Chittambara Seshagherri Row as an arbitrator in his interests.

2. The Zemindar requests further that an umpire, who shall be unanimously selected by the arbitrators on both sides, be appointed as referee in the negotiation.

1. Submitted for the information of Government, with reference to the Order to which the Collector refers.

2. The Board are of opinion that such an important matter should not be entrusted to an Officer of limited experience, and they would therefore beg to suggest that Mr. G. Thornhill be appointed arbitrator on behalf of the Government. He might be placed on special duty for the purpose, on Mr. Fane's arrival.

No. 533. ORDER THEREON, 28th November 1867, No. 2,827.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government do not consider the requirements of the case to be such as would warrant the employment of Mr. Thornhill in the manner proposed, or that it would be seemly to appoint an officer of nearly twenty-five years' standing, and the Collector of Masulipatam, on special duty, as joint arbitrator with a Zemindar's Vakil for the settlement of a boundary dispute in the Madras District under Act XXVIII of 1860.

2. The Board will, in communication with the Collector of Madras, submit another nomination for the approval of Government.

3. An officer of the grade of Tahsildar or Deputy Collector, of experience and judgment, would seem suitable for the purpose, as the two arbitrators have to nominate a third to act with them. The selection should be made from a district not contiguous to the Calastri Zemindary.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

St-2827-1

The Govt. don't consider

the requirements of the case to
be such as to warrant the
employment of W. Thornhill in the
manner proposed - or that it
will be security & appoint an
officer of nearly twenty five years
standing & the Collector of
~~Madras~~ ^{Madras} on special duty as
joint arbitrator with a Jemindar
to settle for the settlement of
boundary disputes in the Madras
District under Act 28. of 60.

~~The Govt. of the District~~

~~is to be made out of the~~

The Govt. will in consequence

with the Coll. of Madras submit
another nomination for the
approval of Govt. - an officer of

The grade of Dist. or Dist. of
experience & judgment but
some might be for the purpose
as the his arbitrators have to
nominate a third to act with
them. L.P. The selection should be made
from a district not contiguous
to the Calashy jurisdiction. L.P.

28th Nov. / 67.

Nov. It appears to me quite out of the
question to nominate the Dist. of Dist. to
act with the Native Council of the Jurisdiction
on an equal footing. With possibly an
exception, as a compromise. in a case
of this kind. The best way that the parties
interested (i.e. the Govt. & the Jurisdiction in the
case) shall apply to the Settlement or other
officer (i.e. the Govt. of the Dist. in this case) to
refer the matter in dispute to arbitration
& shall each name an equal number of
arbitrators. Who shall mutually appoint
an umpire. or if they can't agree to one, the
Settlement or other Officer shall do so for them.

& then the Settlement or other officer shall
refer to the arbitrators by an order
under his signature the matters in
dispute for decision. (See Sec. 8. & 24
of Act XXVIII. of 1850.) I cannot

believe that Mr. Dornick will be willing
to place in this position. - some quite
sure he might not & he is placed.

26. Nov. / 67. L.P.

Mr. Dornick's views are, I consider,
quite correct. I am surprised, indeed, that
the Board could have ventured to make
such an outrageous proposition. An intelligent
Shareholder would be an appropriate person
for a person in the position of the Registrar
to select, provided he be taken from a section
not contiguous to the Calashy Jurisdiction.

W.D.K.

I entirely agree. I remain

Re 31 July 1867 53.6/13
the Council
inspired as a
most propitious
one -

Y. H.
Sol. Agar & Deane
help entertaining the
impression that in this
inspired the Board.
had to convenience
of N. Thornhill
rather more in view
than the interest
of the matter
under dispute
N.

N. 532-533.
C. 26th Nov 1867

Re 1867 De 11th
No of Court for move
No 3210.
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue.

Dated 26th
Decr. 28th } November 1867
Re 26

No
N. 2827. 28th Nov
Submitting to Govt. letter
from Collr of N. Street re-
-porting that zemindar of
Kalahastri has consented
to question of disputed
boundary between his estate
and Tirvallore Taluk of
Madras Dist. being referred to
arbitration under Act XXVIII
of 1860. and recommending that
Mr. Thornhill be appointed
arbitrator on behalf of Govt.