

Revenue (1897) Department.

ROUTINE SERIES.

G.O., No. 774

DATED 14th April 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing the petitioner that, as the Collector of Madras has reported that the document copy of which is applied for is not traceable, the Govt cannot take any action in the matter.

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.



5/4/97

From

Order R. No. 774 d. 14 April '97

The Collector of Madras

The Collector having reported that the document, copy of which is applied for, is not forthcoming among his records, Govt. is unable to take any action in the matter.

Ref on No. 22 G.B.

Dated 30 March 1897

Received 3rd April

Registered 5th

Enclosures as per list enclosed.

Spare copies

11/4/97

10/4/97

SUBJECT.

Reporting on Govindu Pillay's appeal for a Copy of an order alleged to have been issued by a late Deputy Collector regarding his quit-rent certificate.

To the petitioner

the Collr of Madras

with enclosures returned

Note

The petitioner applies

for

5/4/97

a copy of an order alleged
have been passed by the late
Collector R. Raghunatha Rao
directing that a quit-rent
certificate be granted issued
in the name of the petitioner
for a piece of ground measuring
1560 Sq ft and not for 1234
Sq ft as was actually entered
in the Certificate granted.
The Dy Collector and the Collector
state that no such order is
traceable; On the other hand,
they state that there are
records to show that the
Dy Collector directed the issue
of a certificate for 1234
Sq ft.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2432		
	26-12-96		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0977

REVENUE DEP



His Excellency Sir Arthur
Elbank Havelock, G.C.M.
G. G. I. C. Governor in
Council.
Fort St George.

The humble petition of
Jovinda Pillay residing at
No 3. Venkatachella
Naikes street Kosapet.
Pursawalkum
Madras.

Most Humbly Sheweth;

Petitioner begs to submit
this appeal to your Excellency in Council
against the order of the Collector of
Madras declining to furnish him
with a copy of order passed by
the late Deputy Collector Raghunatha
Rao respecting transfer of a certificate

No. He says the
order is not further
coming.

touching a certain extent of house ground
in Possession of Petitioner.

Petitioner begs most respectfully to represent that his Grand Mother Moothammal held under Collector's Certificate to an extent of ground - The entire extent of which is 1560 sq. ft. subject to levy of an annual assessment.

That the said Moothammal died, and after her death Petitioner, who is her legal heir, became the owner of the ground, and has been holding the enjoyment of the same for many years back.

That while such being the case, Petitioner made an application to the late Deputy Collector to transfer the said Certificate in his name. The Officer after a thorough enquiry into the matter passed an order to the effect that a fresh Certificate should be granted in the name of Petitioner to the entire extent of the ground i.e. 1560 sq. ft. specified in the Certificate held by Petitioner's Grand Mother but the fresh Certificate so made out in the name of

of Petitioner was only 134 sq. ft. leaving thus a difference of 326 sq. ft. without showing just and reasonable grounds for so doing. No notice was taken of the omission notwithstanding Petitioner had repeatedly brought the same to the notice of the Deputy Collector.

Petitioner begs to add that the deficit of 326 sq. ft. was encroached upon by one Ponnusawmy Gammay who holds land contiguous to Petitioner's. This man had recently made an application to the late Deputy Collector Mr. Pinto for issue of Certificate in his name for the ground in his holding inclusive of 326 sq. ft. referred to above. Petitioner objected to the grant of the Certificate, this led the Collector to hold an enquiry, and inspect the order passed by the late Deputy Collector. Raghunada Rao which order goes to show that a fresh Certificate to be granted to Petitioner to the entire extent held by the late Moothammal. Upon this the

Application of the said Cominsawung
to ~~grant~~ ^{for} grant of certificate was
rejected.

That in order to recover the bit of ground encroached by the said Ponnusawmy Gnaning ^{Petitioner} applied to the Collector to furnish him the copy of the order passed by the late Deputy Collector Ragunada Rao to the effect that the certificate which stood in the name of the Aforesaid Moothammal should be transferred to Petitioner's name but a reply was received from the Collector that the order is not forthcoming as will be seen from the Enclosure marked **A** as explained above.

Petitioner therefore
 solicits that the above order ^{passed} by the late
 Deputy Collector Ragunada Rao to grant
 a certificate in the name of Petitioner
 to the whole extent of ground specified
 in the certificate held by the said
 Mootharammal should be furnished
 to him -

For which act of kindness

Petitioner as in duty bound.

Shall Ever Pray.

கேள்வித்தரப்பினர்

30th Nov 1896.
Madras }

Ref on No. 22
GHB

MADRAS COLLECTOR'S:
30th March 1977

From

W. Austin Esq
COLLECTOR OF MADRAS,

Enclosures. as per
list enclosed.

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Revenue ~~PUBLIC~~ DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS.

SIR,

Adverting to G. O. No
2432, Revenue, dated 26th December
1896, the enclosures to which are
returned, I have the honor to
report that in August 1893, I
received a similar petition from
the same individual and the
Deputy Collector to whom I referred
it for report stated that the
order of the late Deputy Collector
M. K. Raghunatha Rao, Dewana
Bahadur, of which the petitioner
wants a copy, was not forthcoming
among his office records. He
was then asked to verify the
petitioner's allegations by reference
to

to other available records. The Deputy Collector then sent me two extracts, one from the Register of Revenue Inspectors report and the other from the Register of certificates. In the former the extent of the petitioner's property by actual measurement then made has been entered as $1234\frac{1}{2}$ square feet and the Dy Collector's order thereon was for the issue of a notice for that extent. In the latter extract also the same area has been noted, which shows that the above actual measurement was finally adopted by Mr. Remyatha Rao for the certificate. It also appears from this Register that the remaining part of survey no 2256 and old form certificate no 10609 forming the northern boundary of the Petitioner's holding, in question (covered by new form certificate no 6930) has been shown not as the petitioner's property but of one Kalluppa prammam. There is also in Mr. Remyatha Rao's

own

own handwriting a draft letter of that sent to me under date the 6th July 1882, wherein it is distinctly stated that the petitioner has been granted a certificate for only $1140 + 94\frac{1}{2}$ or $1234\frac{1}{2}$ square feet actually in his possession and not 1560 sq. ft as alleged by the petitioner, and that the remainder was in the possession of his neighbour. From all this it would appear that the petitioner's Certificate was correctly issued and that it is not at all probable that Mr. Remyatha Rao passed any order of the kind alleged by the petitioner and hence this office order appealed against.

2. On receipt also of the petition now under report, the petitioner was examined by the Tan coar and from particulars furnished by him the application for a certificate from his neighbour Pournasawmy prammam alluded to

by

by him for the adjoining holding
was traced with the connected
records, among which are found
two objection petitions from
the petitioner himself in neither
of which, he has alluded to the
encroachment now complained
of.

3. In these circumstances
the petitioner does not appear
to me to have a case for
consideration.

4. The connected records are
submitted, as per accompanying
list, for reference and return.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours most obedient Servt.

Collector.

On

List of enclosures that accompany
this office letter Refⁿ No $\frac{22}{9+13}$ dated 30 March 1897
to the Secretary to Govt. Rev. Department.

1. Petition of Govindu Pillay d 28.8.93.
2. Letter from Dy Commr of Madras to the
Collector of Madras No $\frac{1335}{15-9-93}$.
3. Memo from the Collector of Madras to
the Deputy Commr of Madras No $\frac{3292}{21-9-93}$.
4. Letter from the Dy Commr of Madras to the
Collector of Madras No $\frac{1415}{16-10-93}$.
5. Memo from the Collector of Madras to
the Deputy Commr of Madras No $\frac{3687}{24-10-93}$.
6. Letter from the Dy Commr of Madras
to the Collector of Madras No $\frac{1760}{22-11-93}$ with

2 enclosures.

7. Order on the petition of Govindu Pillay
d 15-12-93
8. Petition of Govindu Pillay d 10-1-94
9. — do — d 23-1-95
10. One file containing 33 papers for-
warded by the Deputy Commr of Madras
with his letter Ref No $\frac{20}{C}$ d 5-3-97.
11. Petition of Govindu Pillay to H.E.
the Governor of Madras d 30-11-96
with one enclosure.

Madras Collectors Office
30 March 1897

W. A. S. S.
Collector.