3,000—5-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2244

DATED 23rd May

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt. see no reason to interfere in the matter of the petition from V. Ramasami Reddi and 2 others, Proprietors of Pulicherla and Mangalampatti Payakats, N. Arcot Dt, praying for a reduction of peishkush payable by them on the ground that certain lands forming part of the Payakats were taken up for famine roads in 1877-78.

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 (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 3329

From The Board of Revenue
Land Revenue, Madras.

Order

No. 1107 Routine

Dated 2nd May 1898

Received 5th

Registered 6th

Enclosures 1.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Ordering that the letter from the Collector of North Arcot read in Board's Proceedings No. 3847 Lands, dated 13-10-97 may be forwarded to Government.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2000
25-4-98.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue).

No. 1107 Routine, dated 2nd May 1898

Read Government Order, Revenue Department, dated 21st April 1898, No. 1697

Resolution

Ordered accordingly.

(True Extract)

Lionel Davidson
Ag. Secretary.

To The Secretary to Govt.
Reve. Departt.
with one encl. to be retd.

C.V.
End [illegible]

T

Read ~~[illegible]~~ petition from V. Ramaswami Reddi and two others dated Feb. 1898 (in C.O. 1697 dt 21.4.98).

Read also B.P. 1107 R / 2-5-98 (Cno 3329).

Note.

The petitioners who are auction purchasers and proprietors of the Pulich la and Mangalampett payaka in the Chendragiri taluk of the N. Arcot Dt state that certain lands, which formed part of the estates, were taken up for famine roads during 1876-77 and pray that the assessment on these lands amounting to Rs 49-13-1 may be excluded from the peishkash due from the estates. The Collector and the Board of Revenue having declined to admit the claim, they now appeal to Govt.

2. From the collector's report to the Board of Rev, dt 22.9.97 on the case, it appears that the lands were taken up for the roads prior to the purchase of the estates by the petitioners and that ~~[illegible]~~ a declaration of assessment in regard to the estate has also

Enc. to Cno 3329/98 U

C 19/5/98 [illegible]

been made by the Collector under Act I of 1876 (Madras). If therefore, the petitioners were dissatisfied with the Collector's declaration of assessment on the ground that it did not exclude the assessment on the lands taken up by the roads, they should have appealed to the Board of Rev: within 90 days. This they do not appear to have done.

3. The condition of the lands at the time when they were taken up for the roads and whether the consent of the then proprietor was obtained are not known, but the petitioners have not shown that the lands would have been occupied and borne revenue had they not been taken up for the roads. They do not seem to have any real grievance and the annexed draft order is accordingly submitted for approval.

RS
17-5-98

18/5/98

19/5/98

14-5-98.

Copy put up.

× vide Section 7 of Act I of 1876 (M)

23/5

AM
21/5/98

Read petition from V. Ramasami Reddi & two others d/ Feb. 1898.
Read also B.P. 1107 R. / 2.5.98 (Cno 3329).

Order Misno. 2244 d/ 23rd May 98.

The Govt sees no reason to interfere.

18/5/98

19/5/98

Endt to the Petitioners with 4 encls.
Copy to the Board of Rev: L.R with enc. tools returned.

Dispr. 17.5.98

14.5.98.