

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultation

11th May 1858

Book nos 69 & 70

Number 619 of 2nd Nov 1851

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 11th May 1858.

his Sheristadar for a Chutram, by whose son it is said to have been restored to the son of the original grantee, and the father of the present holder who petitioned to have the enam registered in his name in 1836, but no orders were passed.

Note.—The Board state that the grant was made by this man member of a Vedantic Institution, to the grandfather of the present holder who evidently belonged to the same fraternity. The Government do not find grounds for these conclusions. The surname of the grantee merely denotes that he had performed the Yagam or sacrifice called "Pundarika" but not that he belonged to any Vedantic Institution.

ment direct that the land in question be at once brought to full assessment, as it does not appear that the grantee ever claimed the right of giving it rent-free, the deed merely certifies that an ordinary transfer by gift of one man's possession to another, had taken place, and the omission of any allusion of exemption from taxation probably accounts for the non-registry of the grant. It may be added that, even assuming the right of the grantee to be valid, he had no power to transfer a grant made by the State to himself. But nothing is brought forward to shew that such was the case; on the contrary, the deed of gift executed by the Sheristadar's son, to the son of the grantee, seems to indicate that the grant, as Lakkiraj, originated with Mr. Travers.

• Vide Translation of the Sunnud. 4. No. 69 is avowedly an unauthorized alienation by a Cavalgar and Desh-Mookh, partly of the land which he held as such, and partly of lands which he rented. No hereditary claim to such grants can possibly be admitted, and No. 69 will be resumed at the death of the present incumbent.

(Signed) W. H. BAYLEY,
Acting Secretary to Government.

26970

No. 1167.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st April 1858.

Read letter from the Collector of Nellore, dated 30th January 1858, (Enclosure No. 18)

Read again letter from the same Officer dated 18th July, recorded in Consultation 25th September 1857.

Resolved that the above letters be submitted for the orders of Government with reference to para. 6 of Extract Minutes Consultation 9th October 1857, No. 1021.

In Com. 50th Oct. 1857. 2. In Extract Minutes Consultation 20th January 1857, No. 102, it is D.

the Enam No. 68 was directed to be resumed as an unauthorized alienation of the former Collector Mr. Travers, but from the information now supplied, it appears to have been erroneously classed among the grants conferred by Messrs. Travers and Fraser. It was originally granted as the Collector under the Mahomedan Government by the Foudar Vencateswara, but from the Sunnud, a translation of which accompanies it, seems to have been bestowed by a different person, by one Vencateswara Dandurica, a member of a Vedantic Institution in 1796, to the grandfather of the present holder who evidently belonged to the same fraternity. In Fussy 1212 A. D. 1802-3 this enam was attached by Mr. Travers, because it was not found entered in the enam register, and was subsequently transferred to his Sheristadar on condition that he would build a Choultry on it for the accommodation of travellers. In 1820 however, the Sheristadar's son restored the land to the original grantee's son, in whose family it has ever since continued. Of the validity of this grant, there seems no doubt from the fact of its having been made prior to the period of limitation specified in Section II, Regulation XXXI, of 1802; and as such grants are exempted from interference, the Board concur with the Collector that it should be continued to Ramanachari, grand son of the original grantee, subject to report on the occurrence of a lapse.

3. The enam No. 69 too, was included by mistake among those conferred by a former Collector. The Sunnud dated 1747, declares it to be a hereditary grant and looking upon it as made by a former Government, the Board think it may be treated as proposed by the Collector under the Enam Rules now in force.

(A true Extract.)

To H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, R. D.

Secretary.

Granted for the repair of land 3 and

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the April 1858

Accepted

Read the following by Pres
of the Board of Revenue

(Here enter 1 April 58 N 116)

In Nov 56, the Board
of Revenue submitted correspond-
ence from the Cbr of Nelson, in
which that officer reported on certain
enquiries, stated to have been made
by Messrs Travers and Fraser, for-
mer Cbr of that district, and sub-
mitted his recommendations as to
the mode in which they should
be dealt with. Among the enquiries
included in this report, which were
of various kinds and were identified
by different initials, Nos 58 and
69 were in & Min. Cons 29 Jan
1857, No 109, ordered to be resumed,
former, because it appeared to be
by parties totally unconnected with
the original grantee, and the latter
which belonged to a class of enquiries
granted for the repair of tanks and

When the terms in which
the grant was made
were considered by
the Board, it was
found that the
enquiries were made
by the Cbr of the
district, and that
the recommendations
were made by the
Board of Revenue.
The Board of Revenue
therefore recommended
that the grant should
be resumed.

Submitted a fresh
draft under No 109

By Sec
Apr 22

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received 1858
of the Secy of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

Received by the Secy
of the Board of Revenue

10-26-28
4
Channels, because it was thought
that the service could be provided
by the Public Works Dept.
On the 25th Sept following, the
Board laid before it a letter
from Mr. J. St. Taylor, Acting
Colo of Millers, dated 18th July 1877,
in which that gentleman
reported, in respect to these two
claims, that on proceeding to re-
view them, he discovered that a
mistake had been committed
in including them among the
grants made by Messrs Travers &
Fraser, ^{and that} they had really been
granted by the former Government,
but as the Board proposed to report
separately on this subject, and had
called upon Mr Taylor for the
original documents, the Govt re-
solved on 24th Nov. Cons. 9th Oct last
1877, to await their report, and in
the meantime directed the order of
assumption to be held in abeyance.

The Board accordingly bring
this matter again to the notice of
Govt in their present proceedings,
having obtained the original docu-

2
69 10

ments, and extracts from the public
records, from Mr. Elton the Colo.
On referring to para 11 of Mr Tay-
lor's letter of the 18th July 1877, it is
stated that he explains that No.
58 was a Chantry man originally
granted, under the Mahomedan
Govt, by the Mysore Vencappa to one
Medadon Vunder Vencabacharloo,
in 1798, but because the entry had
been omitted ^{from} the Registry of
claims prepared by Mr Travers
after the assumption of the country
by the British Govt, it was attached
by that gentleman in July 1872,
or the year 1802, while in the em-
ployment of the said Vencabachar-
loo; and was made over by him to
his Sheristadar as an endowment
to a Chattram, that the Sherista-
dar's son, however, restored it to
Kristnamacharloo, the son of the
original grantee, and the father
of Ramayacharloo the present
holder, that this individual pe-
titioned to have the claim registered
in his name so far back as 1836,

should be held in abeyance.

2. Then proceeding above
recorded, the Board bring the
matter again to the notice of
Govt and submit the origi-
nal documents (with translation)
on which the Siam is claimed.
It appears from Para 11 of Mr Taylor's
letter of 18 July 1857, that Rs 58
was an Siam originally granted
under the Sakomedhaa Govt by
a Faungda & one V. Venkatacharloo
in 1798. But that it was attached
by Mr Travers in 1802 on account of
its omission from the Register of Siam
which was made on the assumption
of the Country by the British, and
for a Chattram,
Governor of his Sheristabar, by whose
son it is said to have been restored
to the son of the original grantee, &
the father of the present Elder
who returned to have the Siam
registered in his name in 1886, but
no orders were passed.

Like the Board state
that the grant was made
by this man member of a
Pandantic Institution, &
the Pandantic of the present
Elder who indirectly delayed
to the same fraternity. The
Govt do not find ground for this
Conclusion - the surname of the
grantee merely denotes that
he had performed the Yagam
a sacrifice called Pandarika
but not that he belonged to
any Pandantic institution.

66910
3. The Govt observe that as pointed out
by the Board / the Siam was not
linked by a Faungda as expected
at first by the Govt Collectors, but
was given to the present claimant grandfather
by one Venkateswara Pandarika
grantee. Now not only is this man
right of the land of Siam,
but wholly surprised, but on ap-
proach to the grant, the Govt find
no mention whatever of the land
having been lacking at all
and the Siam must therefore
be looked upon as one granted
by Mr Travers, when he alien-
ated the land for the redemption
of a Chattram in 1802. Under
these circumstances, the Govt
must that the land ques-
tion be at once brought to full
settlement, as it does not happen
that the grantee ever claimed
the right of giving it back free.
The deed merely certifies that
an ordinary transfer by gift
of one man to another has
taken place, and
the omission of any allusion of

description from taxation probably
 accounts for the non-registry
 of the grant. It may be added
 that, even assuming the right of
 the grantor to be valid, he had
 no power to transfer a grant
 made by the State to himself.
 But nothing is brought forward
 to show that such was the case.
 On the contrary, the deed of
 gift executed by the then son-
 in-law, & the son of the grantor,
 seems to indicate that the
 grant, a *lakshya*, originated
 with Mr. Travels.

No 69 is admittedly an
 unauthorized alienation by a
 Coahagan and Leckmork,
 partly of the land which he held
 as such, and partly of lands
 which he rented. No hereditary
 claim such grants can properly
 be admitted, and will be
 resumed at the death of the
 present incumbent.

vid. Translation
 of the Summ

Consider the
 fact that the
 land is not
 a hereditary
 claim, but
 a grant of
 land for
 a specific
 purpose, and
 that the
 grantor has
 no power to
 transfer it
 to himself.

J. H. April 28
 1868

Revenue 1868 Dept.
 Cont. W. May

No 619

Extract from office
 of W. May 1868

Quinquaginta
 (see No 58, in volume he is one
 of the full of payment as the
 grantor never claimed the right
 of giving it out free, and that
 No 69 (an unauthorized alienation
 by a Coahagan) was resumed at
 the death of the present incumbent.

No 69

No 69 470