0/9. 3,000—5-8-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3167

DATED 28th July 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sanctioning the additional post involved in the transfer of Nanjundapuram, a hamlet of Sirigannallur village in Coimbatore Taluk to Ramanathapuram in the same taluk.

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 (189 8) Department.

CURRENT No. 4771

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE MADRAS

From

Read BdR' Ref No 726 dt 4-7-98

§. Order Misc No: 3167 dt 28th July 1898.

Sanctioned

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, Madras.

Ref No. 726

With
2317/98

Dated 4th July 1898.

To the Bd of L.R. with enclosures

Received 4/7

Registered 4/7

Enclosures 4

Spare copies

3.8.98 — 5778

SUBJECT.

Submitting ~~for the orders of Govt.~~ letter from the Collector of Coimbatore proposing the transfer of Manjundapuram, a hamlet of Singanallur village in Coimbatore Taluk to Ramanathapuram in the same Taluk.

& requesting the sanction of Fasli & the add. cost on account of Stills 3 for renewal on account of the third Salayara for the Ramanathapuram Stillage.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ld/C	13-8-88	573 S.	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Revenue Board office
(Land Revenue)
4-7-98

Read the following :-

1. Again Board's Proceedings No.247,dated 8th July 1896.

2. Letter from J.A.Cumming Esquire,Acting Collector of Coimbatore,to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras,Dis No.1176/Rev. of 1898,dated 27th April '98

And the following Reference No.565,dated 20th May 1898

Forwarded to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey for favor of remarks.

3. Also Letter from H.O'C Cardozo Esquire,C.I.E.,Superintendent,Madras,Survey,to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras,No.184/B,dated 1st June 1898.

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

Reference No.726,dated 4th July 1898

In his Letter embodied in the first of the papers read above,the Collector of Coimbatore proposed the transfer of the Civil and criminal jurisdiction over Nanjundapuram,a hamlet of Singanallur (West) in the Coimbatore Taluk to the adjacent Munsif of Ramanathapuram,on the grounds that the hamlet was two miles distant from the centre of each of the two munsifs' charges into which it was proposed to divide Singanallur and that it was not well adapted for the centre of a separate charge.The Board disapproved the proposal because it entailed the appointment of a special munsif in addition to the headman for each of the villages of Singanallur (West) and Ramanathapuram (Vide rule framed under section 7 of Madras Act I of 1889,embodied in Board's Proceedings,No. 145,dated 24th March 1893),and expressed the opinion that it would be better to transfer the hamlet of Nanjundapuram altogether to the village of Ramanathapuram.The Collector was accordingly called upon to submit the necessary proposals through the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

2. The Collector now reports that the proposed transfer of Nanjundapuram to Ramanathapuram was duly notified in the District Gazette, and that no objection was received to the transfer.

3. The addition of Manjundapuram to Ramanathapuram will raise the population of the latter from 3507 to 3991; and under the scheme for the revision of village establishments in the Coimbatore district approved in Government Order No.573, dated 13th August 1888, the village would be entitled to three talayaris, or one more than the number allowed at present. The additional cost involved is Rs.3 per mensem or Rs.36 per annum, and the sanction of Government is requested for this charge.

4. No other changes are called for in the establishments of the Singanallur (West) and Ramanathapuram villages.

Lionel Dawdson

Ag. Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with 2 Letters and Enclosures in original to be returned.

Md.P.H.

Read B.P. Ref No 726 of 4th July 1898
(C-No. 4771 of 1898)

Note.

In submitting proposals for the revision of the staff of monigars in the Coimbatore district, the Collector suggested (vide para 24 of his letter of 2nd Nov'95 & paras 2 & 3 of letter of 11th May'96 at p.p. 6 & 16 of fs. No 698 Rev. of 7th December 1896) that the Civil & Criminal Jurisdiction over Manjundapuram, a hamlet of Singanallur village in the Coimbatore taluk might be transferred to the Munsif of the adjacent village of Ramanathapuram (the distance between the two being 7 furlongs) on the ground that the hamlet was more than two miles distant from the centre of each of the two Munsifs' Ranges into which it was proposed to divide Singanallur & that it was not well adapted for the centre of a separate village. The Board of Rev. however, did not approve of the suggestion (vide para 2 of B.P. No 247 of 8 July'96 at p. 21 of f.p. No 698 Rev of 7 December'96) as under the Fin. L.

P = Copy abstract only

X Vid. I. 1079 Rev.

it entailed the appointment of a special munsif in addition to the headman for each of the villages of Singanallur (West) & Ramanathapuram. It considered that it would be better to transfer the hamlet altogether to the village of Ramanathapuram. The Collector was accordingly directed to submit the necessary proposals through the Supdt, Madras Survey, after publishing the usual notice in the District Gazette. He was also directed to submit a statement showing the changes to be made in the village establishments of the villages concerned.

2. The Collector reports (vide his letter 27 April '98) that the proposed transfer was notified in the District Gazette & that no objection was received to the transfer. Under Board's Standing Order No 21, the Board is competent to sanction transfers of lands from one village to another in the same taluk.

3. From the statement furnished by the Collector showing the changes to be made in the village establish-

to Ramanathapuram raises the population of the latter from 2507 to 3991. Under the scale of establishment sanctioned for the district (vide para 6 of the B.O. at page 6 of P.P. No 573 Rev 2/13 August 1888) the village of Ramanathapuram is entitled to three talayaris instead of two now employed. No other changes are called for. The add.l cost involved is Rs 3 per mensem or Rs 36 per annum. & the Board requests the sanction of Government for incurring this charge. It is submitted that the additional charge may be sanctioned.

Yr
KA
22.7.98.

C.R.
16/7/98.

Secy
HRLee
20/7/98
H.M. 21/7

Secy
Please see draft on docket.
HRLee
23/7/98

Soon the office note book

P = Copy abstract only

J. Thin

Should this be Fail
is a proforma statement
necessary?
MM
28/7/15

It is submitted that
copies of the order should
go to the Third Deptt and
to the A.G. It is not
usual to send proforma
statements in these cases.
vide precedents put up
G.os: 682/9.8.97, 3378/5.7.97 + 446/31.5.97

3526/10.7.97.
Miss Thomas cease this file

r = Copy abstract only

To the Under Secretary

The Special and local funds being it is submitted under the entire control of ~~the~~ administrative Depts ~~concerned~~, the F.D. is not consulted as to any ~~order~~ expenditure to be incurred out of those funds before sanction is accorded thereto in the Depts concerned. In the case of some of these funds it has been the practice to submit proposition Statements for increase or alteration of establishments but these Statements are not submitted thro' the Acct General as that officer does not exercise supervision over the details of Special Fund expenditure. Hence it is submitted therefore no necessity to send a copy of any order sanctioning such establishments to the F.D. tho' there does not appear to be any objection to doing it.

Vide G.O.
No 698 Rev
13. VIII. 89

in the office note above it does not appear that the submission of proposition Statements was ever insisted on in the case of village establishments.

RMM
26.VII.98

27/7/98

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

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.