

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3742

DATED 28th July

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sanctioning the cancellation of L.R. dues Nos 784 & 785
which were obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation
by the Shroff Inamdar of Govada Village, Viravalli Taluk
Vizagapatnam Dist.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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



Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 5330

From

The Board of Revenue, Land
Revenue, Madras.

Order

No. 2268 Misc.

Dated

23rd June 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Recommending to Govt. that
Title Deed Nos. 784 & 785 which were
obtained by fraudulent misrepresen-
tation by the shroff Inamdar of
Govada village, Viravalli Division
Vizagapatam Dt., may be cancelled,
and the Inam restored to the shroff
service


27/6/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	827		8/1/97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue)

No. 2268 Misc., dated 25th June 1897.

Read the following :-

1. Endorsement of the Collector of Vizagapatam, R.C. No. 1704, dated 29th April 1897.

And the following Reference thereon dated 17th May 1897.

Forwarded to the Inam Commissioner for favor of remarks.

2. The Collector is requested to quote the Nos. of the title deeds relating to the Inam in question.

3. Letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, R.C. No. 2191, dated 24th May 1897.

4. Also letter from the Honourable Mr. C. S. Crole, Inam Commissioner, Dis. No. 266 of '97, dated 31st May 1897.

-----:O:-----

Resolution

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In his letter to the Collector embodied in the first paper read above, the Head Assistant Collector in Vizagapatam reported that a shroff service Inam in the Govada village, Viravalli Division had been enfranchised ~~in~~ at the Inam Settlement in 1865 ^{as} a personal Inam on the misrepresentation of the Inamdars. It would also appear that subsequent to the enfranchisement, a portion of the Inam covered by Title Deed No. 784 was sold for Rs. 1000 and another portion of the same was mortgaged. The Head Assistant Collector recommended that the enfranchisement should be cancelled and the shroff Inam resumed, as no services were performed but the Collector was averse to this proposal and thought that the

enfranchisement of the Iram should not be interfered with after the lapse of 55 years.

3. The Iram Commissioner, to whom a reference was made, states that the enfranchisement was null & void having been obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation and should now be cancelled by Government. In these circumstances, the Board recommends that Title deeds No. 764 & 785 (not 184 & 185 as reported by the Collector) may be cancelled and the Iram restored to the shroff service.

(True Copy & Extract)

M. S. S. S.
As. Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with 5 letters to be returned.

M. P. H.

Shroff

The Hon. Mr. Dixon. C. I. & Co.

18/7/97

Imm. 11/7/97

C no 5330 of 97

G. O. (Am) No. 3742 of 20th July 97

The Board's recommendation in para 3 of its Proceedings read above is approved and sanctioned.

18/7/97

To

The Board of Rev (L.A.) with enclosures

23-7-97

Note The Head Assistant Collector, Vizagapatnam reports that a portion of the shroff service iram in the Lovathu village, Viravalli Division was alienated by the Shroff and that ^{subsequently} the Shroff with the connivance of the then Karamam filed statements before the Settlement officer showing ~~that~~ the whole income as personal and got it enfranchised at the Iram settlement in 1883 in the name of himself and the alienor's heirs. It also appears also that subsequent to the enfranchisement a portion of the iram in the name of the shroff was sold for Rs. 1000 and ^{that} another portion of the same was mortgaged.

15/7/97

