

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4017

DATED 8th October 1898.

[Despatch Abstract.]

According to P. P. Connerney in the view
of the C.M. of C. M. S. P. that G. O. is not
entitled to the sale proceeds of the trees that
stood on a certain street for a number of
the Conjeevaram Municipality

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

Political (189⁸) Department.

CURRENT No. 1502.

2h
8/10/98

From



Board of Revenue, Land
Revenue, Madras.

Order No. 4017 of 8th Oct. 1898.

Recorded

8/10/98

No. 2580 Misc.

Dated 19th September 1898.

Received 2/

Registered 2/

Enclosures/

Spare copies

To the B^d of Rev (L & A)
with letter.

22.13-10-98

SUBJECT.


Concurring in the view of the
Collector of Chingleput that the Govern-
ment is not entitled to the sale
proceeds of the trees that stood on
a certain street paramboke in the
Conjeevaram Municipality.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue).

No. 2580 Misc., dated 19th September 1898.

Read Endorsement of D.W.G. Cowie, Esquire, Acting Collector of Chingleput, Ref. on No. 1350/genl. of 1898, dated 27th August 1898.

-----:O:-----

Resolution

The Board concurs with the Collector in considering that Government is not entitled to the sale proceeds of the trees in question.

(True Extract)

Amel Davidson

Ag. Secretary.

To

The Collector of Chingleput, with Enclosures.

The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with
Collector's letter to be returned.

Md. R. H.

R. H.

"but personally, I do not think
 "that it applies to the present
 "case. In the case dealt with in
 "the C. C., the ownership of the
 "trees was considered to be
 "vested in the municipalities,
 "but in the present case, Govt
 "was the owner of the trees and
 "the ownership thereof must be
 "considered to have been trans-
 "ferred to the Municipality along
 "with the streets. The trees stand
 "on the roadway inside the
 "ditches on either side of the
 "street. I am of opinion that
 "the Govt is not entitled to the
 "sole proceeds of the trees." The
 "Ag. Collector Mr. Cowie and the
 "Board of Revenue are also of the
 "same opinion as Mr. Young.

3. It is submitted
 that collector's view which is
 concurred in by the Board of Rev.,
 viz, that the Govt. is not entitled
 to the sole proceeds of the trees, is

vide Section 23 of the St. Mun-
 cipalities Act:

"apprehend that the proprietary
 "right of Govt in the trees, so
 "far as it arose from the fact
 "of the land being public proam-
 "bule, passed to the Commission-
 "ers under the Act, and unless
 "there are grounds for admitting
 "a private right, the Com-
 "missioners were entitled
 "to the trees".

Rs
 29.9.98

Rs
 3-10-98

Secy

The S.P. may be
 recorded?

He
 4/10/01

Yes. Done after order
 8/10/01

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

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATE

SENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENTS WITH DIET.

PAGES NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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