Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 634

DATED 25th March 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

INFORMING Vallava Naick, late Moneam Munsiff, of Pannellikottai Village, Adepidaram Taluk, Tinnevelly District, that, under section 23 of Madras Act III of 1895, as amended by Act II of 1897, no appeal lies 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.

Revenue (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 8483

To lie over
P.
24/11/96

Order

From Nallaoa Naik,
Parivillichollan
Ottapidaram Taluk.
Tinnevelly Dt

No.

Dated 16 — 11 — 1896

Received 20 — 11 — '96

Registered 21 — 11 — '1896

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Requesting that early Orders may be passed on his Memorial dated 18-7-96, regarding the appointment of a Village Munsif

Rev 23/11

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Gw 527	1/96		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

20 NOV 96
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
CHIEF SECRETARY
18 NOV. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
PETITION
0938
REVENUE DEPT

To

His Excellency the Right Honorable
the Governor in Council
Madras.

The humble petition of Vallava Vaik
Parivillikottai, Ettaiyapuram Taluk, Tinnevelly
District

Most humbly Showeth,

That the petitioner has submitted a memorial on 18-7-96 against the Proc. of the Board of Revenue regarding the appointment of Village munsif of the said Parivillikottai but no order has yet been received.

The petitioner therefore most humbly prays that early orders may be passed on the aforesaid memorial.

16-11-96

O/18 10,000—25-3-95.

ABSTRACT.

(1896.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number. 527/

From

Vallava Naick
Pativillikottai
Otapidaram Fy
Tinnevelly Dt

Dated 18.7.96
Received 23.7.96
Enclosures 6

No.

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be appointed as Monegar of the village.

Sept 24/7

of the memorialist. The Collector on appeal cancelled Sub Collector's order not because the petitioner had no claims to the post, but that the then village munsiff was doing duty for 25 years, and also ordered that the memorialist should wait for a vacancy (Exhibit B). The Board of Revenue Confirmed the order on appeal (Exhibit C).

2. In 1895 the munsiff maniyam being very old a deputy had to be appointed and the memorialist applied for it on the strength of the above order. His request was refused in Board's Proceedings No. 2134/29-4-95 since the memorialist was considered to have had no right. The Collector then pointed out in his letter dated 5th June 1895 No. 99 of 95 G. B. Gl that the Board's order requires reconsideration. (Exhibit D). The Board again rejected Collector's proposal in its Proceedings No. 3202/27-6-95. In the meantime the munsiff maniyam died

and a vacancy was actually created to which the memorialist was entitled under Collector's order dated 17-2-81 (Exhibit B). He applied to the Collector who referred the memorialist to Board's Proceedings No 2134 29-4-95 and 3202 27-6-95. The memorialist then appealed to the Board of Revenue who in its Proceedings dated 17th March 1896 No. 797 Routine informed the petitioner that under section 10 of Act III of 1895 the memorialist has no cause of appeal. (Exhibit E) The memorialist thereupon submitted a review petition to the Board who dismissed it in its Proceedings No. 1731 Routine dated 23d June 1896 (Exhibit F)

3. The memorialist most humbly begs to urge that the Collector's order to wait for a vacancy was passed in a suit under Regulation VI of 1831 before the Act III of 1895 came to force and cannot therefore be governed by G.O 1168 24-11-94 vide G.O 1004 21-11-93. That this order being a decree passed in a suit under Act VI of 1831 may be given effect to

14 (clause 3) of III of 95, that section
to under section 10 of this Act does not
apply to the case on hand.

4. In the remission Mr Pennington has given similar endorsements to many village officers whose services as Nattamai were dispensed with and those endorsements have been subsequently given effect to and that it is misfortune of the memorialist that his case alone was otherwise considered while others who had similar claims have enjoyed the benefit of their right of the office of Nattamai.

5. The memorialist finally begs to urge that in due Consideration of the memorialist's claim and the circumstances set forth above, Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to give effect to an order passed by the Revenue Court under Regulation VI of 1831 by appointing the memorialist as Pannisiff Maniyam of Parivillikottai and thus render justice.

FOR OWNER WARE

18-7-96

Government of Madras.

Read C.No. 5271 & 8483 of 96

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement No. 634 R dt 25-3-97

Note

The first petition
dt (8-7)-96.

C.R.
24 March 97

THE petitioner is informed that no appeal lies to Government under Section 23 (1) of Madras Act III of 1895 as amended by act II of 1897

(By Order.)

S.O.C.

~~Under~~ Secretary to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
189 .

To Petr
with Encls

dw 29-3-97

eff 24/3/97

When given for copying ____
When copied ____
When examined ____
When signed ____
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO								
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.