Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3742

DATED 20th July

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sanctioning the cancellation of title deed nos 784 & 785 which were obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation by the Shroff Surandar of Govada Village, Veravalle Division Vizagapatam Dt

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

SECY. GOVT. MADRAS
27 JUN 97
REV. DEPT.

Revenue (189 7) Department.

CURRENT No.

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 misrepresentation by the shroff Inamdar of Govada village, Viravalli Division Vizagapatam Dt., may be cancelled, and the Inam restored to the shroff service

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue)

No.2268 Misc.,dated 23rd June 1897.

Read the following :-

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

And the following Reference thereon dated 17th May 1897.

Forward d 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.366 of '97,dated 31st May 1897.

--------:0:--------

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 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 L.1000 and another portion of the same was mortaged.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 Inam should not be interfered with after the lapse of 55 years.

3. The Inam Commissioner, to whom a reference was made, states that the enfranchisement was null & avoid having been obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation and should now be cancelled by Government. In these circumstances, the Board recommends that Title deeds No.784 & 785 (not 184 & 185 as reported by the Collector) may be cancelled and the Inam restored to the shroff service.

(True Copy & Extract)

Attested

Ag. Secretary.

To

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

G.P.H.

Read

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose. C. I. E.

18/7/97

Issued 22/7/97.

C 15/7/97

C No 5330 /97)

G. O. (ms) No 3742 dated 20th July 97

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

22/7/97.

To

The Board of Rev (C.A.) with enclosures } Aug. 23-7-97

Note The Head Assistant Collector, Vizagapatam reports that a portion of the shroff service inam in the Kovada village, viravalli division was alienated by the shroff and that subsequently the shroff with the connivance of the then Karnam filed statements before the Settlement officer showing the whole inam as personal and got it enfranchised at the Inam settlement in 1863 in the name of himself and the alienee's heirs. It appears also that subsequent to the enfranchisement a portion of the inam in the name of the shroff was sold for Rs 1000 and that another portion of the same was mortgaged

The Head Asst. Coll. recommends that the enfranchisement should be cancelled and the shroffiam resumed, and no service have been performed. The Collector, however, considers that interference with the enfranchisement of the inam made in 1863 is not advisable now after a lapse of 33 years, especially as a portion of the inam is not now in the possession and enjoyment of the original inamdar or his heirs and as no service has been rendered or required for many years past. But the Inam Com.r, to whom a reference was made by the Board of Revenue, states that the unfranchisement of the whole inam was null & void having been obtained by fraudulent misrepresentation and should now be cancelled by Govt, and the Board recommends that the title-deeds may be cancelled and the Inam restored to the shroff service.

2. If it is thought desirable that the Govt. should, before sanctioning the cancelment of the deed, see the shroff's

This will make it easily clear but I doubt if it is necessary

11/4/97

It is not necessary

flagged B.

statements referred to in para 3 of the Head Assistant Collector's letter, the following reference may for the present issue:—

11/4/97

G.O.R.

The Board of Revenue is requested to obtain and submit for the information of Govt. the statements referred to in para 3 of the Head Assistant Collector's letter No Rs 1187 of 1896/97 dt 21-4-97 as having been filed before the inam Settlement officer at the time of ~~settlement~~ Settlement.

To the Bd. of Rev (L.R.)

12/11/97