

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 1978

DATED 12th November

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Muthuswami Pillai, late Kannan
of Edaval & Kkur Villages, Arcoot, Taluk, North Arcot

District, that, under section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act II of 1897, no appeal lie
to Government.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[Pub.
29.
2,000-6-97.]

Rev
Public (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. *888*

Mathiaswami Pillai

From

*Karnam of
Edaval and Akkur,
Arcot Taluk
N. Arcot Dh.
No.*

Order R N: 1978 *1st November 97*

The petitioner is informed
that under sec 23 of Act III of
1895, as amended by ~~sec~~ Act II
of 1897, no appeal lies to Govt.

Dated *27th Sept. 97*

Received *4th Oct 97*

Registered *5th*

Enclosures -

Spare copies -

SUBJECT. *R P*

*Praying that the respondent
Ranga Pillai's appeal
may be dismissed.*

List

(P.)

29 Oct 97

To the pet. No. 3-11-97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

The petra states as follows:-

1901 The petra father Ramaiya Pillai was the Kurnam of Edavai and Akkur and his name is entered as such in the Miraspatir of fard 1215 in the main register of fard 1223 and in the paimash account of fard 1230 of 1236. After Ramaiya Pillai's death the petra filed a suit for the recovery of the office and was appointed to the same by taking Nos. 1039 and 306 dated 30th July 1891 and 30th March 1892 respectively. On August 1892 the respondent Rengat Pillai was appointed joint Kurnam with the petra. The petra thereupon applied to the Col. for the removal of the respondent and was told (in writ) no. 122 dated 29th October 1892 that he would be retained in office. Accordingly a revision was which took place on 16th May 1890. The respondent was removed from office. Against this he appealed to the Col. who dismissed the appeal in his order no. 249. Thereupon he filed a summary of 5 of 1892 before the Sub. Col. and dismissed the same as the law produced by the petra proved that he was the son of Ramaiya Pillai the paimashdar named above. The respondent appealed

Collo may be sent for and
and that the response is
(to the Board, etc.) may be

1892

C.O.

12.10.11

1

1312

REVENUE

၆၅၈ နတ်ရဲ ပေ နှစ်သုံးဆယ် - လေးရာ
 ၆၅၉ နတ်ရဲ နှစ်သုံးဆယ် - လေးရာ
 ၆၆၀ နတ်ရဲ နှစ်သုံးဆယ် - လေးရာ

சுமதி வந்தி
சுததர் ஜிலா
சுமதி வந்தி
213 சுமதி வந்தி
சுமதி வந்தி

அமல மாதிரி வாதி
தித்தான் ஜீவனா
அநாதகாடு தாலாககா
212-அமல-பெடவலா
213-அமல-அதகா-1-2
யாத்தலோனாடு தாலாககா
தித்தகா தாலாககா
அமலா-அதகா தாலாககா

[illegible]

[illegible]