

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2928

Confidential 1043

Dated 13th July 1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

Requesting the Collector of North Arcot
to apply ^{under certain circumstances} for an adjournment of O.S. no 42
of 96 on the ~~dis~~ file of the District Court
regarding the Karvatnagar Zamindari

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cu 34 59/99							

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 3276

Confidential No 33

Confidential

From

The Ag. Collector
North Arcot.

Order

No.

Dated 2nd May 1898

Received 3rd do

Registered 4th do

Enclosures 7

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Furnishing the information
Called for in G.O. 25 April
1898 No 1806 This in re-
gard to a certain Sub
connected with the Mar-
vathapara Zamindari

24
4/5/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Value of the Seal-Stamp payable under article 17 Clause II of Schedule II of the Court fees act.

encl No 1.

In the District Court of North Arcot
O.S. No. 29 of 1897

Sreenivas Mahanayaka Chari -
Mahanayaka Maharaja Rajadri Kungari
Zemindar Sashama Nayana Varoo son
of Rama Dasappa Nayana Varoo residing
at Chittoor } Plffs

Vers
Sreenivas Maha Munda leswara katar
Salwa Maharaja Amada Rajaka
Maha Raja Raji Brahma Rajka
Mahadour Dere Maha Rajalinggaroo
Zemindar of Karvattungaroo
The Secretary of State for India (encl. to order no A. 81) 2
The Plffs above named begs to state

as follows.

- 1 That one Sreenivasa Patnam Kristna-
mura Chari sued the 1st Deft and his late
father in C. S. No. 378 of 1880 and the file of
the High Court of Judicature at Madras
and obtained a decree.
- 2 That the said decree was transferred
for execution to this Honourable Court.
- 3 That an application was made to
this

this Honorable Court in execution application
no. 12 of 1885 for executing the said decree by
the attachment and sale of certain villages
appertaining to the 1st Dept's Zamindari.
4. That the said application was granted
and in pursuance thereof the attached
villages were commenced to be sold from
the 7th October 1895.

5. That in such auction sale Plff
purchased on the 22nd October 1895 for Rs. 10,150.00
the village of Dalanai pattada more particularly
described in the schedule here to annexed.

6. That auction sale of the scheduled
village was confirmed on the 15th January 1896
and a certificate of sale was granted to the
Plff on the 19th February 1896.

7. That the Plff was put in possession
of the said village on the 19th March 1896
through Court and has been in possession
and enjoyment of it since then.

8. That the Plff applied on the 20th January 1897
to the Collector of North Arcot under Act of 1876
for apportionment of Reishush and separate
registry in his name in order to remove
the inconvenience of not having separate
pattah for the above village.

9. Thereupon the Collector directed

directed the publication of Plff's Application
in the District Gazette but declined
grant it as the 1st Dept. objected to such
separate registry.

10. That if the scheduled village is not
so separately registered.

(a) The Plff will not derive the full
title to the scheduled village according
to Law.

(b) That he cannot be considered as the
sole proprietor of the village according to
revenue Law.

(c) That he will not be entitled to
exchange pattahs and Muchilibas with
the ryots or to institute summary suits
against those who refuse to receive pattah
and give Muchilibas or to tender pattah
to those who refuse to accept them.

(d) That at the instance of the 1st Dept.
the scheduled village will be in danger
of being attached for arrears of Reishush
due on other portions of the Zamindari.

11. That the Plff apprehends that the
Government may attach and sell for
arrears of Reishush of the whole Zamindari
this village also if any such thing occurs
Plff will be put to substantial loss and
it will not be possible to avoid it.

12. Therefore it is necessary that the said scheduled village should be separately registered in order that the above said things may not happen to enable the Plff to collect money properly from the ryots of the said village and to take measures regularly under Act VIII of 1865.

13. The Cause of action for the suit arose on the 12th March 1897 on which date the Collector's refusal to separate registry was communicated to the Plff.

14. That the Plff gave notice of this notice to the Collector of North Arcot under section 424 C. P. C. on the 20th May 1897 and it, in the usual course of business, should have reached him before the 15th May 1897.

15. The Plff therefore prays the Honorable Court to decide that the Plff is entitled to have the village of Dalavai pattadam more particularly described in the schedule hereto annexed divided from the Karnatimangal Zamindar and have it separately registered in the name of the Plff.

To order the said defd to separately register in the name of Plff

To order defd to pay the costs of this suit to Plff and to sanction such other relief

relief as might be given in the merits of the case.

Sd) V. Gopala Chary (sd) Seshamaayanaiah
Pleader. Zamindar.

23. 8. 97 (verified)

Sd) Seshamaayanaiah
Zamindar.

Sd) V. Gopala Chary
Pleader.

(sd) By Order
Balasubramaniam

Shrivastava

The above named plaintiff presents the following statement under Sec 100 C. P. C.

1. That the said village of Dalavai pattadam is situated in the Taluk of K. S. District of the Madras Presidency and is a village of the dependent nature of the Zamindar of the said District. The said village is situated in the Taluk of K. S. District of the Madras Presidency and is a village of the dependent nature of the Zamindar of the said District. The said village is situated in the Taluk of K. S. District of the Madras Presidency and is a village of the dependent nature of the Zamindar of the said District.

[illegible]

The above is a copy of the
 original of the letter dated 22nd Nov 1884
 and is the property of the
 British Museum.
 O.S. No 29/1887

Plaintiff	Defendant
Sreenani mahalka Bharyalagnaryna maha Raja Rajini Buegani Zamindar Seohansa nayaniwaroo Son of Rama dasappa nayaniwaroo residing at Chittur	Sreenani mahalka Mura : leswara Katani Sahoa maharaja Comaji Raja maharaja Raja Bommaraige Balakrishna Deva maha Rajulungar Raja of Karvet nagar

The secret ary state for
 India in Council through
 the Collector of North Arcot District

The above-named 1st defendant presents this written statement under Sec 110. C. P. Code.

1. That the Plff's suit is not sustainable according to law.
2. That under the terms of the Suddadi-malkiet. Istimzar granted to the ancestors of this defendant, no part of the Zemin-dari or Karvet-naggar can be separately formed or registered separately in the Collector's office unless the amount of pesh cash payable on the portion so separated is at least 500 star pagodas and upwards.
3. That pesh cash that may be fixed on the Village purchased by the plaintiff is far less than 500 star pagodas and hence the Village in question cannot be separately registered.
4. That at the time, when the Village, in question, was brought to sale, it was ordered by the Ct Court that the sale should take place subject to the sanction of the minor

4 The Plaintiff applied to the collector of North Arcot District for the collection of the village of Padda Konde pally, more particularly described in the Schedule here to annexed, was attached and sold on 15-1-96. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the Plaintiff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession on 9-2-96 and is in enjoyment thereof since.

5 The Plaintiff applied to the collector of North Arcot District for the collection of the village of Padda Konde pally, more particularly described in the Schedule here to annexed, was attached and sold on 15-1-96. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the Plaintiff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession on 9-2-96 and is in enjoyment thereof since.

6 The Plaintiff applied to the collector of North Arcot District for the collection of the village of Padda Konde pally, more particularly described in the Schedule here to annexed, was attached and sold on 15-1-96. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the Plaintiff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession on 9-2-96 and is in enjoyment thereof since.

7 In any event the Plaintiff is entitled to the collection of the village of Padda Konde pally, more particularly described in the Schedule here to annexed, was attached and sold on 15-1-96. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the Plaintiff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession on 9-2-96 and is in enjoyment thereof since.

Copy of Statement

In the District Court of North Arcot

O.S. No 29 of 1897

Plaintiff

The Rajah of

Pondicherry

vs.

The Collector of North Arcot

Pondicherry

1. J. Venkayya Chetty

Plaintiff

Valuation of the share payable under article 17 Schedule II of Rs 20 relief 1+2 at Rs 10 per relief

In the District Court of North Arcot

Original suit No 33 of 1897.

Pungalur Anthiah Chetty executor of late Pungalore Chinnayya Chetty of Tirupathi

Plff

Versus

1. Sreemam Mahamandalaswara Thakur Salwa Maharaja Somadajata Maharaja Rajai Bonina Raja Behodeer Dava Maharaja Lingam Zamindar of Thiruvattaragot.

2. The Secretary of State for India in Council (through the Collector of North Arcot District)

The Plff above named begs to state as follows.

1 That the Sreemam Mahamandalaswara Thakur Salwa Maharaja obtained a decree in C.S. No 378 of 1880 on the file of the Madras High Court on its ordinary original civil jurisdiction against the 1st Defendant the present Zamindar and his late father.

2 That the said decree was transferred for execution to the Honourable Court.

3 That in the execution of the said Decree by this Court the Village of Padda Konde pally, more particularly described in the Schedule here to annexed, was attached and sold on 15-1-96. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the Plaintiff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession on 9-2-96 and is in enjoyment thereof since.

4 The Plff there upon applied to the collector of North Arcot under section 1 of act 1 of 1876 for the registration of the Village in his (Plff) name and for the separate assessment thereof

5 Thereupon the collector instituted the necessary proceedings and finally refused to grant the plffs application on the ground that the 1st Defendant objected to the separate registry and apportionment of Peishch, in Plff's name.

6 The Plff submits that the collector ought to have ordered separate registry in plff's name and even if it should be held that the 1st Defendant's Consent is necessary for separate registry under act 1 of 1876, the collector ought to have registered the village in question in Plff's name under regulation 25 of 1802 as the Plff is a Purchaser at court auction and not a voluntary alienee of the Zamindar.

7 In any view the collector ought not to have refused separate registration and apportionment of Peishch ^{Cash} in Plff's name.

8 That if the said Village is not so separately registered

a) The Plff will not derive the full title to the village according to law.

b) That he cannot be considered as the sole proprietor of the village according to Revenue Law.

c) That he will not be entitled to exchange puttahs and machilikas with the ryots or to institute summary suits against those who refuse to receive puttahs and give machilikas or to tender puttahs to those who refused to accept them.

d) That the scheduled village may be in danger of being attached for arrears of Peishch due on the other portion

of Zamindari and sold, if any such thing happens plaintiff will be put ^{to} irreparable loss.

9 It is therefore necessary that the scheduled village should be separately registered and assessed in order that the above said thing may not happen and in order to enable the plff to collect money properly from the ryots of the said village and to take measures regularly under act VIII of 1865.

10 The cause of action for the suit arose on 10-11-96 on which date the collector refused to separate registry and assessment was communicated to the Plff.

11 That the Plff gave notice of suit to the collector of North Arcot under section 424 of the civil Procedure code on 9 April 1897.

12 The Plff therefore prays.

1) That he be declared to be entitled to have the scheduled village divided from the Harvaterigger Zamindari, and have it separately registered and assessed in his (Plff's) name.

2) That the 2nd defendant (collector) be ordered to separately register and assess the village in the name of Plff.

3) and to order the Plffs to pay the costs of the Plff.

4) and to grant any other reliefs which this honourable court may deem fit to grant under circumstances of the case.

Verified

(True copy) (sd)

(sd) G. Sreenivasa Chetty.

O Leader for Plff

6-11-97

Valuation of said

Stamp payable under article
17 of schedule II of Court fees
act for reliefs i & ii at Rs
10 for each relief Rs 20

In the District Court of
North Arcot

Original suit no. $\frac{35}{1897}$

V. Venkaiak son of Muniralamaiak } plaintiff
was communicated, pleader Chittloor -

Versus

Sree man maha munda Raswara
Kalarai Sathwa Sathu rajai sommai
Rajatha Sathu raja rajai sommai
Rajah Sahnoor Sema maha raja
Singeru Zamindar of Kartavijayam } defendant

The Secretary of State for India
in Council (through the Collector of
North Arcot District)

The Plaintiff above named begs to state
as follows -

I shal one Sreenangapatnam Raimamachari
obtained a decree in C.S. no. 378 of 1880 on the
file of maddas High Court in its ordinary
original civil jurisdiction against the
1st Defendant. The present Zamindar
and his late father.

I shal the said decree was transferred
for execution to this Honorable Court.

Plaintiff copy

In the District Court of North Arcot
D.S. No 33 of 1897
18th

Periugalar Aerial
V.S. Chetty

The Rajas of
Karnet Nagar

J.T. Vinnagappa (Plaintiff)

3 That in execution of the said decree by this Court. the villages of Jungalapatti, Muchalammari and Srungarsaharajapuram more particularly described in the schedule here to annexed were attached and sold on 19th & 21st October 1895 and plff purchased the same for Rs 8950. The said sale was confirmed on 15-1-96 and the plff obtained a certificate of sale and was put in possession 9th & 10th February 1896 and is in possession thereof ever since.

4 The plff therefore applied to the Collector of North Arcot under section 1 of act I of 1876 for the registration of the villages in his (plff's) name and for the separate assessment thereof.

5 Thereupon the Collector instituted the necessary proceedings and finally refused to grant the plff's application on the ground that the 1st defendant has not concurred in the application.

6 The plff submits that the Collector ought to have ordered separate registry in plff's name and even if it should be held that 1st defendant's consent is necessary for separate registry under act I of 1876 the Collector ought to have registered the villages in question in plff's name under Regulation 25 of 1802

as the plff is a purchaser at Court auction and not a voluntary alienee of the Zamindar.

7. In any view the Collector ought not to have refused separate registration and apportionment of peishcash in plff's name.

8. That if the said villages are not so separately registered

a) The plff will not derive the full title to the villages according to law.

b) That he cannot be considered as the sole proprietor of the villages according to Revenue law.

c) That he will not be entitled to exchange puttals and muchilikas with the ryots or to institute summary suits against those who refused to receive puttals and give muchilikas in exchange or to tender puttals to those who refuse to accept them.

d) That the scheduled mentioned villages may be in danger of being attached for arrears of peishcash due on other portions of the Zamindari. If any such thing happens plff will be put to irreparable loss.

9 It is therefore necessary that the schedule mentioned villages should be separately registered and assessed.

in order that the above said things may not happen and in order to enable the Plff to collect money properly from the ryots of the said villages and to regularly proceed under act VIII of 1865.

10 The Cause of action for the suit arose on 9-1-97 on which date the Collector refused separate registry and assessment.

11 That the Plff gave notice of the suit to the Collector of North Arcot under Sec. 424 of the civil procedure code on or about 19th March 1897.

12 The Plff therefore prays

(1) That he be declared to be entitled to have the schedule mentioned villages divided from the Karmakurayam gamindary and have them separately registered and assessed in his (Plff's) name.

(2) That the 2nd defendant Collector be ordered to separately register and assess the said villages in the name of the Plff.

(3) and to order the defendants to pay the Costs of the Plff.

(4) and to grant any other reliefs which this Honorable Court may decree fit to grant under the circumstances of the case.

(signed) V. Venkaiah
Plff.

(signed) S. Sreenivasachari
pleader for Plff.

Verification

I the Venkaiah the above named Plff do hereby declare that what is stated therein above is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(sd) V. Venkaiah
Plff. 11-11-97

(sd) S. Sreenivasachari
pleader for Plff.

11-11-97

Jawhars Chaultri
Peraudur.
6th March 1898

No 247.

(Copy)

My dear Sir,

I will be most happy to hear from you about your safe arrival at Calcutta. I beg to remind you of the note I gave you regarding the original suit now pending before the D^r Judge of North Arcot. Something must be done about this as you know yourself the importance of this. The suits now pending are as follows:-

1. In suit No 29/97 one Sishama Nagamiasoo, Zamindar of Bimbari Taluk & auction purchaser of Dalavoypathada in Karvetnagar has filed a suit for a declaration of his right to the village under the purchase & ordering the Collector the 2^d Dept in the suit to register the village in his name & to apportion the assessment thereon, & further to declare the objections of the 1st Dept (the Rajah) to be null & void against him. This gentleman first applied to the Collector for separate registration & apportionment of assessment. The Collector issued a notice & published the same in the D^r Gazette of North Arcot to the effect that the separate registration & apportionment of assessment shall be made if no objection is forthcoming within 6 months from the date of the application. The Rajah

Q^r has objected to this under the Madras Act-i of 1876 and the ruling of the Madras High Court in page 293 Vol XIX Madras Series. The Collector thereupon rejected petition for want of concurrence, thereupon the present suit is lodged.

2. In like manner, suit, in O.S. no 33/97, by Pungulur Andiah Chetty and suit, in O.S. no 34/97 by Venkier, were filed in the said Court with the same prayer.

3. Suit in O.S. no 1 was filed by one Vencatarama Reddi of Veeranathur praying (1) that the agreement between the Rajah & himself shall be valid, (2) that the defendant the Rajah be ordered to execute the Sale deed of Andivarahapuram (3) that the plaintiff be awarded with the mesne profits.

The statement in these suits are all same. These four suits as said before above are posted to the 21st & 22nd inst.

I hand you herewith per book post the copies of Plaintiff, Statement & copies for issues for your perusal. It is necessary that something must be done and that that should be done very soon.

I hope you will attend to this very soon. Trusting you will oblige me with your reply.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
sd R. Vengada Subramaniam
J.B. Narwidge Esq.
Calcutta

Sw Secy
21/3/98

Calcutta 17th March 1898

The Honble J. Grise C.S. & E.
Board of Revenue.
Madras.

Dear Sir,

re Karvetnagar

We beg to enclose a copy of a letter received from the Agent to the Rajah of Karvetnagar, also Copies of Plaint, Statements, and Copies for issues referred to therein. We are legally advised that application to stay suits pending passing of Act are not likely to be successful, as the Act will not have retrospective effect of setting aside sales already made.

The Rajah must do his best to protract hearing of suits and allow the Act to be passed in meantime so that the Receiver or Manager under the Act can negotiate with Plaintiffs to give up their claims to the villages and receive payment of the amounts due them. This could probably be arranged when Plaintiffs see that the Estate is going to be kept together and not broken up, as it would not pay them probably to hold isolated villages, within the borders of the original Estate.

It is possible that the orders already given by Govt to stay proceedings may be wide enough in their terms to justify an application to Court to stay the suits, and as Collector is a party, he might perhaps apply. The orders were probably not intended to apply to sales already made, but so long as a stay of proceedings could be obtained under the orders, without going too closely into the ultimate result of the legislation Government have undertaken, it would be to the Rajah's benefit to get a stay of proceedings - or at any rate an adjournment for say six months.

We shall be very much obliged if you will be kind enough to look into this matter, and give us any advice you consider necessary.

We are, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

MacKenzie-John

As No 42 of 96

District Court.

Thuvor Venkataramareddy - Plaintiff

1. The Zemindar of Karvetinagar

2. Gundu Gurusami aiyar.

3. Saravanapillay.

septs.

Plaint:- The 1st defendant executed in favor of the plaintiff a registered agreement of sale on the 29th oct: 1893 whereby he agreed that in consideration of

Rs. 1000, paid to him on the 27th aug 1893.

" 1500 paid to him on the said 29th oct 1893

" 1500 agreed to be paid at the time of the execution of the sale deed

" 14500 to be credited towards the discharge of the debts due to the Plaintiff by the 1st Sept.

Rs. 18500. The 1st defendant should within 4 months

from the 29th oct 1893 sell the property as per a schedule with liability on the Plaintiff's part.

Plaint represented 30-7-97.

Filed ——— 2-8-97.

Date of summons — 5-8-97.

Served
Summons to depts 1 & 2, 11 } 8/97.
13 }

Fresh summons to 3rd } 18-8-97.
Dept }

Date of summons — 19-8-97.

Served —

Date fixed for filing }
statements — } 27-8-97.

For issues to — 30-8-97.

Posted to for filing }
statements of depts } 20-9-97.
1 & 3 — 30/8

Issues ——— 23-9-97.

Adjourned to }
for issues — } 15-10-97.
22-9-97.

Do ——— 19-10-97.
15-10-97.

Issues fixed }
For evidence } 24-11-97.
19-10-97

Adjourned to 17-12-97
15/11

on pffs' request.

Do ———

By parties ——— 21-2-98.
14/12.

Do ——— 22-2-98
21-2

Do ——— 22-3-98
22-2

2.

part to pay to Government
Rs 250 a year for the fishery
and Road fund due on
said property, free the said
property from its encumbrances
execute a sale deed in
plaintiff's favor and put
him in possession of the
property.

On the same date the
plaintiff executed in
favor of the 1st defendant
an agreement by which
it was provided that in
the event of certain of 1st
defendants creditors
accepting an arrange-
ment by which they were
to receive $4\frac{1}{2}$ p.c. per annum
on the debts due to them
and taking fresh usufruct-
uary mortgage deeds
from the defendant and
of the 1st defendant paying
all the sums due to the
plaintiff.

plaintiff within 4 months from the said date the first agreement should be cancelled and the sum of Rs 2500 paid to the 1st defendant should be returned to the plaintiff but that in default, the said agreement should be enforced.

The 1st defendant did not pay to the plaintiff the amount due by him to the plaintiff and plaintiff learns that no usufructuary mortgage deeds were executed as above but certain agreements were taken from the said creditors but not within 4 months from the 29th Oct 1893.

Plaintiff is therefore entitled in accordance with

The Pleaders on both sides represent that the matter in dispute in this suit and other disputes between the parties will have to be settled once for all, that there is a fair chance of the settlement of the same if one month's time be granted and pray therefore for the suit being adjourned for a month.

adjourned to 22. March.
(initial)
22-2-88.

The chances of a compromise are said to be greater.
adjourned to the 22nd April
(initial)
22.3.88.

Adjourned to
13-7-98.
(initial)
22-4-98.

True copy. Original also
was in book form.
M. Bhatia
of Collection
15th 2nd

with the first agreement to have the encumbrances on the property (if schedule) discharged, to have a Conveyance of the property and to be put in possession of the same.

The properties mentioned in Schedules A+B. were usufructuarily mortgaged on 31st January 1882 for Rs 31793-6-5 in favor of one Veerasami Reddy and another by the 1st defendant and his late father.

The properties as per schedule A along with properties in C were again mortgaged by the 1st defendant on 23rd Nov. 90 for Rs 11,000 in favor of the said Veerasami Reddy and another.

The 2nd and 3rd depts. have on 9th Jan'y 94 with notice of the said agreement taken

due to the Plaintiff with interest.

3rd defts written statement not filed.

another mortgagee (sic)
Issues

1. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to have the agreement of sale specifically enforced or whether under the circumstances of the case, the Plaintiff is entitled to Compensation only.

2. Whether agreement referred to in para 1 of the plaint is in force or has it become inoperative.

3. To what relief is Plaintiff entitled.

19-10-97.

Documents - 5-11-97.

Hearing - 24-11-97.

Adj^d to tomorrow as the parties are speaking of compromise (verbals)

taken a mortgage of the property (A) along with other properties. Further the 2nd defendant has attested the said agreement. They are therefore made parties.

Plaintiff has sustained a loss of Rs 900 by the 1st defendant not having performed the said contract. The 1st defendant has not performed the agreement though requested to do so by a notice.

Hence reliefs sought for by the Plaintiff are:-

J. J. Veeraraghavachari
says he has no instructions from the 3rd Defendant.

19-10-97.

1. to declare the rights of the Plaintiff under the said first agreement,
2. to direct the 1st deft to convey to the Plaintiff the property as per schedule A free from all its encumbrances, execute

portion of the zemindari whose peishchuk will be less than 500 star pagodas, that a suit for specific performance cannot lie to compel this defendant to redeem a mortgage of a person who is not a party to the suit, that plaintiff cannot in one suit claim a decree to compel this defendant to redeem a mortgage and to ask him to execute a sale deed, that this defendant offered to pay up all the money due to him but the Plaintiff would not settle his accounts and that the case is one in which compensation is an adequate relief and this defendant is ready to pay the amount due

a sale deed in respect thereof in favor of the Plaintiff, register the same within a time to be fixed by the Court and deliver the same to the Plaintiff on being paid the said sum of Rs 1500 and being given credit to in the sum of Rs 14500 as said above and

3. to direct the 1st defendant to pay Plaintiff Rs 900 as damages and the Costs of the suit.

- Defendants 1 & 2 did not file any written statement as ordered.

3rd Defendants' 2nd summons not yet returned.

28/8.

2nd absent and is declared ex parte.

30-8-97.

North Arcot Collector's office
Chittoor 2nd May 1898.

9

as to the money payable by the Plaintiff the agreement cannot be legally enforced; that Plaintiff is not entitled to sue for specific performance of the contract, that the plaintiff village (Sch A) has been in the possession of the said Veerasami Reddy from 1882, that the plaintiff was aware of this prior to the date of agreement that he cannot give to the Plaintiff any title in the property without first redeeming the village by payment of Rs 42000 and odd, that this defendant is unable to do so now, that under the terms of the Saunad Melkich - Istimrar granted to the ancestors of this defendant, he is prohibited from alienating any

From,

J. K. Batten Esquire J.C.
Ag. Collector
North Arcot.

To,

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 1806 Rev. dated 25th April 1898. I have the honor to furnish a copy of the plaint, pleadings, and adjournment order made by the District Court in O.S. No 42 of 96, which is the only suit to which the statement given in para 3 of the letter to Mr Warwick from the Agent to the Rajah of Karvetnagar can apply. The description O.S. No 1 is evidently a mistake. It will be seen that the suit has been adjourned to the 13th July 1898 and that there is some prospect of a compromise.

2. The enclosures to the G.O. are returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
J. K. Batten
Ag. Collector.

Sd/-

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No.

Rev: Secretary's P O to H M d
31-3-98 + the latter's reply thereof
of the same From

Order

No.

Dated

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Revenue Secretariat,

31/3/1898

My dear Sir
 Please see to your
 reply. Do you wish
 further inquiries to be
 made of the J. K. S. S.
 Yours truly

W. Forbes

My dear Forbes,
 Yes, I think the cover should
 be bold and official. What a

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No.

H M's D to the Rev Secretary
 dy 31-3-98

From

Order

No.

Dated

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

My dear Forbes,

We have been
told that there are no
Rajyas in the actual
possession of the Rajah of
Kannuragar.

He has given me a
list of villages of which
he says he is in full possession.

Some of these are
Kannur, Tumpu or Chandu
villages. He declares that
the quitrent is paid. When.

3 Taluqs.

1. Pallipet
2. Narayanavanam -
3. Thuvattani

2) Narayanavanam is under mortgage with possession, to Thirichuadon.
(2, lacs under two documents)
Carrying 6 p. c. interest, the mortgagee to render accounts to the mortgagor. He has been in possession for nearly 12 yrs and according to his version, the income

total
has fallen short, of the interest
by 2 or 3 lacs -

The version of the Rajas agents
seems to be, that if an
accurate account is taken
he will be able only for
about 15 lacs

It is also said that the
principal of 21 lacs
includes ^a ~~about the~~ Commission
of about 5 or 6 lacs

(3)

Thiruthani ^{has been} ~~is~~ in the possession
of the Mahant, since 84;
In 1884, it was held on
usufructuary mortgage
for 14 lacs for carrying
6 p. C. interest, and it was
also charged, with another
debt of 3 lacs carrying
6 p. C. interest & in 1889
accounts were settled
and a fresh mortgage by 2
^{documents} was executed for 20 lacs —

to lessors, reserving
an annual rent

Under the terms of the
mortgage bond, the
Mortant is not entitled
to claim repayment
of the principal for
24 yrs beginning from
1889, unless any
Condition is broken.

I The Palliput Taluk

Comprises about
200 villages -

a) 50 or 60 villages

are under usufructuary mortgage to
Chengamannaudu
for 5 or 6 lacs - to be
enjoyed when of interest.

b) 30 villages are under
usufructuary mortgage
to one ^{Shetty} Chetty in
Madras for about 2 lacs.

To be Enjoyed in lieu of
interest

c) Several other villages
aggregating to 60 villages
are usufructually
mortgaged to several
Ryots. The particulars
cannot easily be
given -

d) about 50 villages
have been sold
in Court auction during
the last one year or so

And they have been
Confirmed.

4 Some villages in the
Thuruthane Taluk
Which were mortgaged to
the Mahant, ~~were~~ ^{had} previously
been hypothecated, to
other Creditors, who
obtained decrees -
thereon before 89 & in execution
of those decrees - 8 villages
were brought to sale & purchased
by the Mahant.

5. The Mahant also
redeemed from
prior mortgage, by
paying about Rs. 160,000
& it is believed that
2 lacs more are
outstanding on prior
hypothecations of villages
of Shuruthani Taluq.
& the Mahant has
also got personal
decrees to the extent of

about a lac of Rupees
He has also obtained
another money decree
for 170,000 Rs. being
the amount which the
mahaut had to pay
prior encumbrances.

in execution of other decrees

6. The Raja, it is believed,
is not in possession of
any village - belonging
to himself

7. The Dasabundum
villages. about
30, in all, are
held on the following
tenure.

One half of the rents
realized from wet
lands belongs to the
Zamindar's mother
or wife
for the time being
The other half

belongs to the Zamindar.

~~It is believed that~~
~~the Raja has mortgaged~~
The Rajas' mortgages
of rents ~~are~~ are
included in the
Mortgages of the
Respective Taluqs.

7. The personal
debts now
outstanding against

Who have not yet
Obtained decrees
Comes to 60 laas.

10. ~~Decrees~~

The balances due
under decree both
Simple + on mortgage
will come to nearly
20 laas.

11. Amount of ^{other} debts
(~~both Simple + on mortgage~~)
~~which may come to~~

0
18 4,000-07

Revenue (1898) Department.

Please put up the **CURRENT No. 117**

Previous No.

Confidential

125
130798

Com. Rev. 10/1/05

From J. H. Ballin Esq. 1898
As Collector, North
Arent

Order

No.

Dated 5th 7
Received 6th 7
Registered 6th 7 } July 1898
Enclosures 1
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the State
of the Harwetnapar Zamindari

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Confidential

List of villages which are in the possession of the Raja of Kärvetnagar

Ayan Villages.

Serial n ^o .	No. and name of Village	Barry.
1	11 Sriboimmarājūlangāripēta	119 4 3
2	16 Srikāvēśirājūlangāripēta	49 10 7
3	27 Trinivādhārājapuram	226 15 5
4	29 Kāthūr Rāmāyya Kāndigai	" " "
5	114 Pātāguntā	878 12 9
6	136 Mōtlachēnu	65 3 11
7	138 Satrubhangapuram	9 15 3
8	139 Bālakrishnāpuram	112 14 9
9	140 Pūliguntā	6 10 "
10	141 Sūrapuram	7 2 5
11	142 Kshudrabhangapuram	13 8 "
12	143 Rāmāpuram	" " "
13	144 Trinivāsapuram	" " "
14	151 Nalavēnganapallē	109 7 7
15	154 Kalirichēnu	101 3 5
16	159 Chavōanapallē	192 13 11
17	162 Mākayyagāripēta	2 12 10
18	163 Santabailā	86 15 11
19	329 Mākamāmbāpuram	45 3 4
20	186 Basivireddipallē	391 13 8
21	191 Bōdīdēvarapallē	615 3 "
22	212 Chīuna Bāpanapallē	279 11 3
23	" Kārvetnagar	36 15 6 3

Jāre Shrotrēm Villages

1	20. Pūranasanjivirān Khandigai	" " "
2	21 Reddipallē Subbārān Khandigai	" " "
3	40 Mākamāmbāpuram	2 14 5
4	70 Padmāpuram	59 8 "
5	71 Durgarājapuram	4 11 10

6	73	Mitapalluram	
7	74	Giddumakaraapuram	3 8 4
8	83	Krishnapuram	22 7 2
9	106	Mukkaravampalle	23 6 1
10	107	Lakshmiapuram	6 7 5
11	108	Kasavarajapuram Apaharam	50 1 6
12	110	Gangamambapuram	109 4 9
13	112	Akumallaramarajukhaudigai	144 8
14	113	Rangapalle	30 11 4
15	168	Makeswarapuram	2 10 4
16	169	Kaverimakarajulungari Agraharam	22 12 4
17	197	Venkatadrisimharajapuram Agraharam	116 8 10
18	198	Vavilichenu	3 9 3
19	229	Aswaravantapuram	168 11 3
20	230	Kagapudiapaharam	51 12 6
21	231	Kalyanapuram	107 6 8
22	232	Rama jotsyulakhaudigai	8 5 5
23	233	Padmapuram	74 4 10
24	252	Tirumalambapuram	62 8 8
25	258	Trikrishnapuram	46 15 3
26	287	Trivilasapuram	204 3 4
	288	Singasamudram	69 11 8
	319	Satyajalamvaradaacharla Khau- digai	15 1 11
	320	Iyagapuram	9 15 9
	321	Anilakondayya Khau- digai	1 1 4
	322	Anjaneyapuram shrotri- en	" " "
	324	Ramapuram	19 9 8
	325	Vellakur	208 12 4
	326	Raghavanadikuppam	65 14 11
	72	Narasimharajapuram	84 " "
	165	Verramarajupalle	84 9 "
	25	Velagaram	215 " 11
	44	Kottakuppam	70 " "
	115	Mondiveuganapalle	70 " "
	195	Kottur	29 10 7

List showing the no. of Villages in the possession of the
Rajha of Karvet naggar with their respective incomes

No.	Names of Villages etc.	Amount		
1	Karvet naggar	3762	3	1
2	Vijayamambapuram	81	5	6
3	Pallikat Palapattada	"	"	"
11, 15	Sree Sommarajulungani hella	95	2	"
15	Sree Kaveri Rajulungani hella	33	9	10
27, 6	Thirunatharajapuram	298	7	11
29, 7	Kothur Ramiah Kueudigai	"	"	"
114, 8	Patha queta	760	10	3
136, 9	Mittla Chenu	47	14	8
132, 10	Lathrubhangapuram	1	5	0
134, 11	Balakistnapuram	80	11	"
140, 12	Puli queta	"	3	3
142, 13	Surapuram	"	"	"
144, 14	Kshudrabhangapuram	"	"	"
143, 15	Ramapuram	"	"	"
146, 16	Sreenivasapuram	"	"	"
151, 17	Valla Veugana Pallai	445	9	5
152, 18	Kalivi Chenu	129	6	2
154, 19	Chervana pallai	127	9	11
20	Maukayyagari hella	3	15	3
21	Senthabagalie	121	3	7
22	Maukamaambapuram	13	2	6
23, 1	Basivi Reddi pallai	206	7	3
24	Bodi Devara pallai	439	7	7
25	Chinabapaua pallai	199	3	5
26	Total	6847	9	8
26	Bhinna Timmarajupattada	33	14	3
27	Puranam Sunjeeva Row bundigai	"	"	"
28	Reddi kally Subba Row bundigai	"	7	2

29	Valigarai	54 10	4	61
9	Kothakuppam	155 15	7	41
100	Mondivengaiapallai	124 0	9	20
101	Kothur	39 12	7	88
	Total	3187	1 0	51
102	Parasimmarajapuram	114 10	4	
103	Zerramarajapallai	105 14	4	88
	Total	220	8 8	91
104	Kolla gunla			95
105	Chillamakulapallai	555 5	0	15
106	Pathiri			25
107	Chourambaukam			05
108	Gungaiadiahapuram	555 5	0	45
	Total			25
109	Kierlagarai			25
110	Vettal Thadukku			25
111	Ethuvarpallai	467 5	0	25
112	Annur Khas Bagayat	467 5	0	85
	Total			95
113	Kandapuram	115 0	7	08
114	Thirumalakondamambagaripetta	89 4	3	18
115	Karlambaikum	134 15	0	28
116	Kuppam Batru	320 4	3	68
117	Paramala			18
118	Khas Gardu			28
119	Naveenadu Gardu			18
120	Uthiyavavanadu Gardu	2996	6 0	28
121	Chinnathoravari Garden			08
122	Maikayyagari Garden			08
	inclusive of Khas lands			08
	Forest income	2994	15 11	08
	Amounts paid mortgages under agreement	4698	8 5	08
	Total	11349	6 5	09
	Grand Total	27530	7 9	09
	Amount of saving from the Collection of peish cash from mortgages etc roughly	5000		09
	Total	32530	7 9	09
31 st March 1898. M. Annamalai Raja of Nagadi Gramam				

ul.
 Please have this
 copied & kept.
 File in the name

Confidential

To the Agent of N. Arcot

Dear Babbar

A question seems likely to
 come up for the consideration of the
 as to whether the cl. of works should
 take charge of the estates of
 embarrassed proprietors,
 legislation being prepared for the
 purpose.

Such legislation would
 benefit many of these Karst-
 nages; but ~~represent~~ it has
 been represented that it
 w^d be of no use in his
 case inasmuch as every
 part of the estate has been
 mortgaged with possession &
 the Rajah being in possession of no
 part of it, there w^d be nothing
 for the cl. to take charge
 of.

On the other hand the
 Rajah declares he is in
 possession of the 122 villages
 named in the list annexed.
 Of these
 25 are open villages &
 5 are resumed inams, of

29 Val
100

wh. the dajal alleges that he is
in full possession; while the rest
are in the hands of various
owners; & when the dajal states
he is in full possession of the
rest. The fact seems to be
generally whether there is anything
to be done? take charge of
+ in special whether the 30
villages indicated above are in
the dajal's full possession. You
will probably find it enough
to report known facts without
making inquiries & going into
details ~~concerning the~~
~~fact~~ If you have to make any
inquiry you ^{may} not be able to
the object of your inquiries.

Yours truly
S. H.
1/11/98

1st March 1898.

Clutterb 5-7-98

Dear Mr Forbes
With reference to your
Confidential D.O. dated
the 1st April 1898, I herewith
send the information I have
been able to obtain without
making a regular enquiry
such as would disclose the
object of my inquiries.
But I may mention that the
fact that Government con-
templates the possibility of
legislation with a view to
the Court of Wards taking
charge of the ^{my} Harvelnagar
estate seems to be a very
open secret. — Of the

The Rajah being in possession of
part of it, there will be nothing
to be done to take charge
of it.
On the other hand
declares he is in
possession of the 122 villages
mentioned in the list of
1875 and is in possession of
5 or 6 hundred acres.

C No. 117 Confidential

G.D. ① From J. K. Ballenby: Ag Collector of N. Arcot

Dated 5th July 1898.

FOR ORDERS.

A
B
C
D

Please see partitions marked at pp 2 to 4 of the lake aching. Adv: Gents letter dy 18-1-98; the lake from Mr Cross's D & S and the Rev Secretary's D & S dy 31-3-98; and the Rev Secretary's D & S to Mr Ballen dy 1-4-98.

It was ~~was~~ represented to Govt that ~~the~~ every part of the estate of Karnetnagar had been mortgaged with possession, that the Rajah was in possession of no part of it, and that the proposed law to enable the Govt of wards to take charge of the estates of embarrassed proprietors will not benefit Karnetnagar. The Rajah himself stated on the other hand that he was in actual possession of 25 Ayar villages and 5 resumed ~~in~~ villages, besides being in receipt of the

quitrent of 92 other income villages
and of the savings from mortgaged
villages; and Mr Wynne who knew
the district intimately was not able to
say definitely whether what the Rajah
stated was true. So a reference was
made to Mr Batten the ag Collector;
Mr D. C read above Mr Batten's reply.
The zamindari consists of 793 villages
of which 128 are inhabited. Of the
total number 10 are Gouthman villages. The
Rajah divides ^{the zamindari} into three taluks:
Tirukkani, Pallipat, and Narayana-
vanam.

2. It appears from Mr Batten's D. C that
the Tirukkani and Narayavanam taluks
are fully mortgaged with possessions, the
former to the Mahant ~~of Tirupattur~~ and the
latter to the Madras Lowcar Balammukunda
Das. With the D. C Mr Batten sends
a list of 63 villages in the possession
of the Rajah; 23 of these are again &
40 are jan (inam) Shrothru; and
all of them with the exception of ~~the~~
the village of Karvetnagar are in
the taluk of Pallipat. Mr Batten
says that ~~the 63~~ ^{the 63} villages in the
list are all mortgaged without
possession and that no part of
the estate is unencumbered. ~~that~~
the Rajah is now living on the estate

FOR ORDERS.

N. erat D. C. Manual Vol II page 377

Balammukunda?

funds which are stated to be sufficient
at his disposal. ~~The information~~
~~the villages in the Rajah's list~~
available on some other points is in-
complete, and the Collector says that
he will make further enquiries if so
desired. But it is submitted that no
further enquiries are needed at this stage.
A portion, though a very small portion
of the zamindari, is still in the
possession of the Rajah. The 63 villages
in Mr Batten's list are all included in the Rajah's list.
Rd
15-7-98

Sey

Govt has recently
instructed the Collector to apply
to the District ^{Court} to adjourn
a suit (to compel the
Zamindar to sell estate
lands) on the ground
that a law suit
should be passed to
enable the Court of
Wards to administer the
estate. So it has been
decided that the Ct of Wards
is to take possession
of such portion of the
Zamindari which the
Zamindar still holds

annexation. Full enquiry
 as to what the position is
 and is best made when
 possession is assumed
 by the Court. We know
 now that there is something
 for the Court to take
 possession of. ~~no further~~
 action seems to be
 required at present
 till
 16/7/98

Have put up a map

18/7/98

a map of the N. area district
 showing the Karvetnagar Zamindari
 is put up
 res
 18-7-98

absolutely useless!

The map put up does not
 show ~~the~~ the
 divisions of the Zamindari and
 but few of the villages.
 However, it is apparently clear
 that there are still some villages
 in the Zamindar's actual possession.

The information was obtained from
 the late Mr. W. J. P. information; but
 no further action is immediately required
 the M. may be lodged with the file 8/2/23.7.98
 21/7/98

Revenue (1898) Department.

D.O. CURRENT No. 183

From J. K. Ballenby, J.C.S.
 As Collector of North
 Arcot

Order

No. —

Dated 5th
 Received 7th
 Registered 10th } Nov. 1898
 Enclosures —
 Spare copies —

SUBJECT.

Requesting that certain
 affidavits or material for
 affidavits may be supplied
 for being filed in connection
 with the suit against the
 Karvetnagar Zamindar.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Chittoor 5.11.98.

Karvatinagar Immindari

Dear Mr. Forbes.

By G. O. No 2928 Rev dated 13th July 1898 I was asked to apply for the further adjournment of O.S. 42 of 1896. The telegram was received after the Court had risen, but on the application of the parties the Court had referred the case to Arbitrators. The Arbitrators fixed October 27th for the taking of Evidence &c, but I understand that one of the Arbitrators was sick on that date and the matter was postponed.

No. 183 of 1898

From J. K. Batten Esq. J.C.S.
Collector of N. Arcot

Dated 5th November 1898.

FOR ORDERS.

To the Under Secretary.

The Collector of North Arcot states that the hearing of the Execution application in D.S. No 42 of 1896 on the file of the District Court re: Karvetnagar Zamindari has been adjourned to the 21st instant & that on that date the Court will require affidavits giving some definite information as to how long it will take before legislation is effected. It would appear that the creditors object to the postponement of execution & the Court may object to postpone execution for an indefinite period. The Collector therefore requests that he may be furnished with the necessary affidavit or materials for the affidavit before the 21st instant.

2. The reply of the Govt of India to letter No. 1998 5th April 98 re. the amendment of the Court of Wards Regulation V of 1854 to afford relief

FOR ORDERS.

to encumbered estates has been received
 & the papers are now in circulation.
 It is proposed in the note to address
 the Secretary of State requesting him
 to intimate by telegraph whether
 there is any objection to the introduction
 of the Bill into Legislative Council
 so that the Bill may be proceeded
 with expeditiously. Probably it
 will take about six months for
 the Bill being passed into law.
 It is submitted that the Collector
 may be informed also that the
 Bill will be introduced as soon
 as the Secretary of State's sanction
 is received, that the legislation
 will be effected in about six months!
 & that he may apply to the Court
 for an adjournment for this period.

Edw.
11/11/98.

Leary
11/11/98

H.O.

The file is with you, & the
 points on ch. orders are wanted
 are not ~~of considerable~~ numerous.

We might get the despatch
 from the S. of State sent off by
 next mail. If so we may
 pretty safely assume that

Hardly I fear
 H.O.

! A fortnight after the
 Bill is introduced.
 S.F.

The assent of the Gov.
 Genl. will have to be
 obtained & published
 before the law comes into
 force. I think we may
 say 3 months or 4 at
 most.

Send the Colr. a draft
 of the Bill.

11.11.98.

the Bill will be passed within
 three months. But I wd. also
 send the J. of a draft of
 the Bill to attach to his
 affidavit, so that the
 J. of see whether the
 proposed legislation will
 benefit the Zam. in the
 different cases affecting
 the estate. It may in some
 out in others

S.R. 11/11/98

Please see draft & submitted.

Edw.
15/11/98.

Revenue Dept.

[U S]
82
400-7-8-06.

NOTE FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY.

In the D.O. to Mr. Batten
it is stated "a rough draft of the
Bill (as corrected) is enclosed to which
you may attach to your affidavit."
The Bill has not yet been corrected,
the file connected with it is now
with His Excellency the Governor.
For orders as to whether the despatch
of the D.O. to the Collector should
be delayed for a day or two pending
the return of the file from circulation.
The Collector has stated that he
must file an affidavit on the
21st instant.

C.D.
16/11/98

Secy

It seems hardly worthwhile
to delay on this acct. 16/11/98

Yes: but there are material
alterations proposed. Wait
a couple of days. Get every
thing else ready for despatch.

16/11/98

Rev. Dept.

Draft D.O.

Dear Mr. Batten.

In reply to your D.O. of the 5th instant re: the Kanungo-magar Zamindari I am to state that the bill to amend the Court of Wards Regulation V of 1804 to afford relief to encumbered estates will be introduced into the Legislative Council as soon as the Secretary of State's sanction is received & that the legislation will be effected in about three months or four at most and that you may apply to the Court for an adjournment for this period. A draft of the Bill is enclosed which you may attach to your affidavit so that the Judge could see whether the proposed legislation will benefit the Zamindars in the different cases affecting the state.

80 W 159
18. 5. 98
Recd 10/11/98

* ~~Letter to Mr. Batten~~

As corrected
S. J.

The red ink corrections are part of the Bill as proposed to be introduced

11/11/98
S. J.
16/11/98

S. J.
15/11/98

Code Class.		INDIAN		TELEGRAPHS.		Monthly Number.	
To Madras Fort St George				From Chittoor (Madras)			
Words.		Day.		Hour.		Minute.	
26		18		16		55	
						Official Instructions.	

To (Person) Secretary to Govern- ment Revenue Department	From (Person) Collector.
---	-----------------------------

Orders requested my D O
Fifth instant Karvetnagar cases
hearing twenty-first instant

F. C. 1.

Wire Letter despatched this Vol

Recd. from	LN.	Sent to	LN.
At	Hrs.	At	Hrs.
Mts. by		Mts. by	
11. 98		11. 98	
Telegraph Master		Telegraph Master	

C. S. P. Co. - No. 363 T-6-3-43-40.00-508

MADRAS FORT 18-11-98

#8 the period
Oct 21/578

As the suit were for a ~~debt~~
debt, & land belonging to the
3 minority was likely was ab-
sconded & not in consequence,
there might be cause for
getting an adjournment; but it
is not, & I don't think we need
take any action in the matter.
It is a suit to enforce an
agreement made & have been
made in 1893, to clear cer-
tain landed property for
mortgages & sell it to the Mff.
The hearing has been twice
adjourned, since the Reich's
Agent wrote to Mr. Warwick,
in the hope of a compromise,
& now stands adjourned to
the 13th July.

29
1815/98

It appears from the plaint (pages 5 and 6), that the relief sought, is that the bond is to be sold to plaintiff for a cash payment of Rs. 1500, and a credit payment in the shape of debt unpaid out, of Rs. 14500. Practically, the suit is for a debt, and bond will be sold in consequence; and therefore the suit,

Letter from the Collector of
N. Acad. of 2nd May 1898 (C. 12 3276)

To Secretary

The Collector of N. Arcat fur-
nishes the information called
for in G. O. $\frac{1806}{25-4-98}$, regarding
a suit on the file of the Dist^l Court
of N. Arcat about the Karuchis-
nagar Zamindari

He says that the description A & B
at No 1 given ⁱⁿ ~~in para 3 of~~ the letter
to Mr Warnick from the agent
to the Rajah of Karvetinagar
is evidently a mistake and
that the only suit to which the
statement given in para 3 of
that letter can relate is A & B
at No 42 of 1896. The plaintiff's
suit is for ~~the~~ compelling ~~the~~
Rajah to execute a sale deed of the
(Copies of schedules not submitted)
property in Schedule A ^{in favor}
of the plaintiff Shunoor.
(Not Veeramathur as in the
agent's letter) Venkataramu
reddy in pursuance of an
agreement executed by the
Rajah in October 1893.
The properties in schedules A & B

were usufructually mortgaged in 1882 for ~~about~~ Rs 31743 in favour of one Veerasami Reddy. The properties in schedules A & C were again mortgaged in 1890 for Rs 11000 in favour of the above named Veerasami Reddy and another. The agreement and the counter agreement entered into between the Rajah & the plaintiff Veerasami Reddy were so effected that the Rajah should in consideration of the sums noted on the margin ~~shall~~ the property in schedule A of all encumbrances & sell it to plaintiff; but if he the Rajah's ^{other} creditors should accept an arrangement in respect of the debts due to them & take fresh usufructuary mortgages, and if the ~~defendant~~ Rajah should pay to plaintiff all the sums due to the latter within four months the agreement should be cancelled. It also appears that in Jan. 1894 property in schedule A together with other properties was again mortgaged to the

in the 5th schedule, which it is the object of the new Act to take. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Justice would look at the case more, with the view of seeing whether it is not a matter in which a court would give some aid. Trying to get an adjournment.

26.5.98

He has been again with reference to the above matter. 17.5.98

Rs 1000 paid on 27-8-93
 Rs 1500 paid on 29-10-93
 Rs 1500 to be paid at the time of execution of the sale deed
 Rs 14500 to be credited towards the discharge of debts due by the Rajah to the plaintiff
 Rs 18500

As H.C. wishes it, application may be made if we get money from India before long. 29/5/98

Draft to. 14/6/98

To be over 214 July 26/98

persons Curumaniyar & Suresh Pillai. The hearing has been adjourned from 1st to 12th in view of compromise and the case now stands adjourned to 13th July 1898. It is presumed that the person in schedule A is the Andirahapuram mentioned in the Rajah's letter; but there is no information on the point in the latter's letter.

Rs 16-5-98 H.C. 17/5/98

Nale.

Reference is solicited
to H.M.'s instruction of
the 29th May on the note
on C.No. 3276. No reply
has yet been received from
the Govt I to our letter
no ¹⁹⁹₅₋₄₋₉₈ forwarding a bill to
amend ~~the~~ ^{the} Madras
~~Consolidated Land Revenue Act~~
of 1884. A draft G.O. directing the collector
of N. Arcot to apply for an
adjournment is accordingly
submitted.

RS
1-3-98

Lecy

The suit seems to be one
~~for specific~~ to enforce the
performance of a specific
undertaking to sell ~~the~~
certain lands to the
plaintiff. It does not
appear that the draft
bill contains any
provisions which
would enable the
collector to defeat the
plaintiff if he ^{is} were
to persist. If he is

would doubtless be persuaded
to compromise.

11/11
2-7-98

H.C.

as the suit is for
specific performance to hand
over a portion of the estate
it seems doubtful whether
the proposed Bill⁺ will enable
the ~~for~~ Ct. of wards to

intervene effectually to
stop the transfer if
decreed. The fraud of
the Bill⁺ is rather deniable

the Ch^W, where there are suits
against the incapacitated
proprietor for money, to
intervene to aid see to
an equitable execution
of the ~~debt~~ decrees or the
payment of the debts in the
manner most advantageous
for the incapacitated pro-
prietor.

It is for consideration whether we can go on longer adjournments on the part
asking adjournments on
behalf of the Zamindars
of possible legislative
monrover I agree

see flap U for Bill
as finally settled.

*sec 7 [29]

I do not see any advantage
in applying for a further
adjournment. Even if the
bill be approved, it could
not be passed into law
for about five months
& it is questionable whether

the Secy's note that
such a suit as the present
could hardly ~~not~~ fall under
the proposed legislation.

Let this Excy. see however.

MA 7.7.98

I understand that H.E. would
prefer to ~~not~~ apply for a
further adjournment. I
have no objection but
the telegram must go
off at once.

MA 13.7.98.

~~and~~ If it is thought we
may, then the ~~q~~ is
whether even if the Bill
became law, intervention
w^d. be of any real use.

If however it is
decided to intervene, the
draft below may issue

N.B. 7/7/98

To H.E. the Governor

N.B. 8/7/98

(Copy)

Cotacamund
25th April 1898

Dear Sirs,

With reference to your letter to the
Honorable Mr. Grose, dated the 17th March last,
regarding the Karvetnagar Jemindari, I am to
state that sufficient grounds do not appear to
Government to exist for applying to the District
Court for adjournments in the case of O.S. No. 29 of 1897
and 35 of 1897. As regards O.S. No. 1 the Government
is calling for further information to enable it to
decide whether it would be advisable to apply
for an adjournment.

Yours faithfully,

G. F. Forbes

Messrs. Mackenzie Hall & Co.
Calcutta.

Letter from the Collr of N. Arcot
dy 2nd May 1898. C.N. 3276

G.O. mis n^o 2928 dy 13. VII. 98

The Collector of N. Arcot
will be requested to apply to
the District Court ~~for a further~~
adjournment of the hearing of a.s.
N^o 42 of 1896. if the ~~suit~~ parties
^{do} should not come to a compromise
by the 13th instant. In support
of his application he may inform
the Court, if necessary, that the
Local Govt has ~~for some time~~
requested the sanction of the Govt
for the introduction into the Local
Legislative Council of a bill to
amend Madras Regulation V of
1804 so as to enable the Court
of Wards to assume the management
of the estates of embarrassed propri-
etors and that the reply of ~~the~~
Govt ^{of India} is expected shortly.

Ad 13.7.98 A.S.H. 13.7.98

The following telegram
will be despatched to the
(H.E.) Govt. of N. Arcot.

2
11-7-98

M.C.
2.7.98

For the Collector of N. Arcot

Despd
13/7/98

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189 .

AGAIN G.O., No.
 189 ;

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPER NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy leading only.