

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 2199

DATED 29th Nov

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring to the Collr. of
Kizaga-patain for report petition from
Mir Jaina Bibi, praying that the
grant of the village of Buradabanchar
Chipurupalli taluk, to the petitioner
may be confirmed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	3003		14-6-77				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	287		11/98				

[Pub.
29.
2,000-5-3-97.]

Rev.
Public (189)) Department.

CURRENT No. 4152

Read also case 9663/97

Order R. no. 2199 of 29th Nov 97.

Referred to the
Col. of Vixag for re-
port through the
Inam comm. Full
information should
be furnished as to the
terms on which the
inam was originally
granted.

list
To the Col.
tho' J. Com. 30/11/97

Note.

Please see item 24
on p 10 of G.P. no. 354 Pol de

From

Mr. Jaina Bibi
Mokhasadar of Burada Kanchara
Chipurapalli Ik
Vizagapatnam & Co.
No.

Dated 25-12-97

Received 9 Nov

Registered 35/12-97

Enclosures

Spare copies - 2

SUBJECT.

Praying to confirm the grant
of the Village of Burada Kanchara
on the Memorialist

This also of Rev.
Council Pts please
7/11/97

12/11/11

d. 4-6-96. The man
 was resumed under
 the impression that it
 was a service grant
 and that the conditions
 of the grant have been
 only very partially
 fulfilled. (vide G.O. 331 Pol
 d. 19-5-97 under Rev G.O.
 No. 3003 d. 14-6-97). The
 p^{er} however contend
 that the grant was
 primarily for the main-
 tenance of the donee
 and his heirs and
 secondarily for the per-
 formance of some
 religious service and
 that this fact was
 recognised in a Suit
 of 1844. (vide para 4 of
 the memo attached
 to C.O. 9664). Hence the
 reference to the collr.

A.
 16 Nov. 97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
3012	14-6-97		
2353	16-5-97		
352	14-6-97		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

[Pub.
 29.
 2,000-5-5-97.

Re V.
 Public

(1897)

Department.

CURRENT No.

9663
 11017

Order

From

Mir Kurabanalli Sahib
 Joint Mokhasadan of the
 Village of Buredakancherun
 Chikpurupalli
 No. Vizianagaram Dist.

Dated 15. 10 97

Received 29/12/97

Registered 30/12/97

Enclosures

Spare copies 2

SUBJECT.

Praying to confirm the
 grant of the Village on the
 Memorialist.

This is Rev. Council
 pub. place
 29/11/11
 R. 9
 11.4

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

The Hon. Mr. C. P. ...

The Hon. Mr. Shasif, Khan Bahadur

XXXI

V. (a) Will the Government be pleased to state, if it is a fact that in the Vizagapatam district the Mokhasa right of the Mokhasidar of Buredakancharam village, Chipurupalle taluk, was resumed by Government under the impression that the original grant by the Nabob of Chicacole under the orders of the Nizam of Hyderabad was a religious endowment in trust for the Asar-e-Sharif Darga at Chicacole, although the grant is said to be one of absolute estate to the original donee?

(b) Even conceding that the grant was a religious endowment will the Government be pleased to state under what circumstances it decided to resume the grant considering that, in its reply to my question No. XXVIII at the Council meeting held on the 9th February 1897, Government was pleased to declare that it was not its intention to resume such endowments or grants in future?

The Hon. Mr. ...

V

Flag B.C.

Approved as altered
Jg

(a).

It is a fact that the inam referred to has been resumed by Govt.

(b).

It was decided because it was reported that the inam which had been granted for Durga and Asar Sharif Service had been alienated and that the conditions of the grant (were) not properly observed and were partially fulfilled, notwithstanding that six months' notice was given to the inamdar to comply with them ~~and it was reported~~ the inam was resumed.

Note

Two petitions have just been received from the inamdar praying for reconsideration of the order vide C.O. 9663 & 9664 of 1897. It is submitted that they may be referred to the collr for report. The question is apparently inspired by them.

Yes - they are referred for report

Note to the Secy

Please see draft on C.O. 9664/97 below

(P.)

26/11/97

approved as altered
Jg

C. 17/11/97
12-15/11/97

In

Note

The question then asked was:-

Has the Govt. resumed or proposes to resume any of the above except for very bad management, if so, what?

Approved as amended

28
17/11/97

16 Nov 97

In the answer given to Question ~~XXVII~~ put at the meeting of the Council held on 9-2-97, the Govt did not state that it would ^{never} ~~not~~ resume ^{in future} ~~such~~ ^{in future} ~~services~~ for which they were granted ~~were not performed~~.

11
17-11-97

18/11/97