

File No. 1

1	Case No. & Year	01/1813
2	Visibility of the letters	Hardly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raja Haihar Bhauj s/o Raja Balvadra Bhauj deceased proprietor of Kaujna vs Raja Jagannath Bauj
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Father of the plaintiff died without leaving will for his sons. It led to a dispute among them over the successorship. The plaintiff moved to the court and the judge appointed Mr. Sadruddin, Darogha of the area to investigate the matter and the plaintiff was declared the successor of his father.
7	Date of Disposal	02.12.1815
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Name of the judge and location is not clear

File No. 2

1	Case No. & Year	768/1814
2	Visibility of the letters	Partially Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Achalkishan Tirtha Swami vs Ramparam Indar Swami
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused the respondent of not sharing the profit the respondent earned from a certain land or his area. After hearing the arguments from both the parties the judge ordered the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 7500/. At the end of the judgement court has also asked the respondent to pay ten percent interest of the total profit i.e Rs. 750/ for the delay.
7	Date of Disposal	6.01.1815
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Name of the judge- Mr. James

File No. 3

1	Case No. & Year	1024/1814
2	Visibility of the letters	Partially Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mahant Narayan Das vs Mahant Brandahan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff's father Nikam Das had written three wills which was handed over to the respondent as he was the secretaey/caretaker of Mr. Nikam Das. Since the three witnesses mentioned in the wills (Balram Das etc.) died, the plaintiff approach the court to validate the wills. Judge John Harbert Harrington approved the request of the plaintiff and disposed the case.
7	Date of Disposal	10.05.1815
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 4

1	Case No. & Year	5/1815
2	Visibility of the letters	Mostly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Pradhan Chowdhwry vs Collector of Cuttack & Radhesmadhale Banarjea
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Discription	The plaintiff accused the respondent of not sharing the profit the respondent earned from the land located at Cuttack, given them on rent by the respondent . After hearing the arguments from both the parties the judge Nawab General Corter ordered the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 14681/. The judge has also asked the respondent to pay ten percent interest of the total profit i.e Rs. 750/ for the delay. 14681
7	Date of Disposal	6.01.1817

8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Name of the Judge- Mr. James

File No. 5

1	Case No. & Year	01/1824
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Laxminarayan Banarjea & others vs Madhusudan Banarjea & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Discription	Bothe the parties were brothers and their father wrote a will of his property for all their children. The plaintiffs accused the respondents of not sharing the profit earned from their ancestral land. Before the final verdict both the parties made peaceful settlement outside the court. The judge Mr. Corner Smith accepted their settlement and disposed the case.
7	Date of Disposal	12.04.1824
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Location of the land is not readable. It could be read as District Nagore.

File No. 7

1	Case No. & Year	11/1832
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Choudhury Mahael Samanta Sinhar Mahapatra vs Government
4	Category of Case	NA
5	Nature of Dispute	NA
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	3.3.1832
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	All the pages are damged and not readable

File No. 8

1	Case No. & Year	44/1832
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gangadhar Das vs Masmata Kamkomawi mother of Jagardhar Chotta, Minor
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff demanded the half of the earning from the land located at Kahang at Nagpur and Rupees 833 from the respondent. The plaintiff also mentioned that the said amount had been given as a debt to the husband of the respondent. The respondent said to the court that her husband had bought the land from the plaintiff hence the demand is not valid. The respondent also showed the document that confirm the buying of the land from the plaintiff. The judge William Brad after hearing both the parties disposed the case in favour of respondent
7	Date of Disposal	10.10.1833
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 9

1	Case No. & Year	109/1832
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Lachman Hazari vs Sambhu & Gauri
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff said that he had given Rupees 951 as a debt to the respondent. The later had bought a land and grains at Cuttack with the said money. The plaintiff accused that the respondents had not return the debt and the earnings from the land which the respondent had bought from his money. After hearing both the parties the Judge Mr. Natail John disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff to return the debt along with the interest to be calculated since the time the

		debt was given to the respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	16.11.1834
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 10

1	Case No. & Year	111/1832
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Chowdhury Sudarsan Nisank Ray Mahapatra vs Chowdhury Bimbashar Nishanka ray Mahapatra & Others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff and respondent are brothers and had dispute in the share of land left behind by their father at Cuttack. After the death of the father the property of the deceased had been equally divided among his four sons. The plaintiff accused the respondent that the the share of land among them has not equally divided and also the respondent has not returned him the amount of Rs. 312 which he has earned from the land. The Judge Mr. Malcolm has asked the local police to investigate the issue and report to the court within thirty days. After the investigation the judge has disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff.
7	Date of Disposal	05.12.1833
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 11

1	Case No. & Year	215/1832
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raja Pitambar Prakaram vs Bikram Singh Bidyadhar & Others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused the respondent that he has not returned the profit from the land that the plaintiff has given to respondent for lease for 1 year. The respondent submitted to the

		court that he has asked for an extra Rs. 100 as an interest which was not mentioned earlier. The plaintiff has also accused that after the completion of the lease the respondent is still using the land. The Judge Mr. William has disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and asked the respondent to return the land and the amount with interest.
7	Date of Disposal	09.04.1841
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 12 (Regular Appeal)

1	Case No. & Year	175/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mohan Nanda and others vs Ali Baksh Khan
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The judgment page is damage and not readable. The plaintiff accused the respondent that he has used his land for 8 months and also demand an amount of Rs. 800.
7	Date of Disposal	06.05.1833
8	Decree in favour of	Not Readable
	Remarks	Details of the case could not be deciphered

File No. 13 (Lakhraj Appeal)

1	Case No. & Year	175/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Nityananda Mahant Sabayat Shyamchand Thakur
4	Category of Case	
5	Nature of Dispute	
6	Brief Description	Details of the case could not be deciphered
7	Date of Disposal	31.03.1835
8	Decree in favour of	Not Readable
	Remarks	

File No. 14

1	Case No. & Year	187/1833
---	-----------------	----------

2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mr. Ghon Atkinson vs Mr. George Annee
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff was the regional manager of village Mindaka as Cuttock and accused the respondent that being his supervisor he has not reimbursed the expenses he had made in his office. The respondent submitted to the court that the bills of the plaintiff would be cleared after approval from Calcutta and not holding it intentionally. The Judge Mr. Windsor William ordered the Calcutta office to check all the bills and reimburse the expenses of the plaintiff within 4 weeks.
7	Date of Disposal	1.6.1836
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 15

1	Case No. & Year	218/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Sulochana Dei vs Sarkar Bahadur
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff approached the court to recover money that he had given to the respondent deceased brother in January 1832. The informed the court that the respondent was working in the land after his brother death but refused to share the profit with the plaintiff. The Judge has asked the Darogha to investigate the agreement document signed between the plaintiff and deceased brother. The case was disposed of in favour of the plaintiff and the Judge Mr. Brad Simon order the respondent to Rs. 135 to the plaintiff.
7	Date of Disposal	16.04.41
8	Decree in favour of	It is not readable
	Remarks	

File No. 16

1	Case No. & Year	282/1833
---	-----------------	----------

2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Madan Mohan Zarafour vs Moray & Co.
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused the respondent that he has not been paid for 4 months.
7	Date of Disposal	16.04.41
8	Decree in favour of	It is not readable
	Remarks	Decree page is not readable

File No. 17

1	Case No. & Year	385/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raja Janardhan Amarsingh Mahinder vs Mushamat Ranee Kundan Dei mother and Guardian of Bhagyarath Mahendra
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff demanded the ownership of the earning from the land located at Karani at Nagpur. The plaintiff also mentioned that an amount of Rs. 935 had been given as a debt to the deceased father of the respondent. The respondent said to the court that her husband had bought the land from the plaintiff and also paid Rs. 1455. The respondent showed the agreement signed between the plaintiff and respondent's father. The Judge Mr. Winson Brad asked the local authority to investigate the agreement and other documents and report the court with two months. Later in the investigation it was found that the amount paid by the deceased father to the respondent was not for the disputed land but as a debt.
7	Date of Disposal	02.06.1841
8	Decree in favour of	It is not readable
	Remarks	Decree page is not readable

File No. 18

1	Case No. & Year	1184/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Bhagat Mohanty vs (Not Readable)
4	Category of Case	Civil

5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Most of the pages are damaged including the decree. The plaintiff has accused the respondent to return the land at village Kani, Nagpur.
7	Date of Disposal	18.03.1833
8	Decree in favour of	It is not readable
	Remarks	Decree page is not readable

File No. 19

1	Case No. & Year	1214/1833
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Visible
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Hari Mohanty & Others vs Kishori Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The complainant accused the respondent that he had not shared the total profit earned by the respondent from the land at Nagar Village, Cuttack. The respondent submitted that since he had already bought the land from the plaintiff, hence his demand is not valid. The respondent had submitted all the documents to prove that he had bought the land from the respondent. The Judge Mr. Warne Bridget had disposed the case in favour of respondent and also levied penalty on the plaintiff.
7	Date of Disposal	Not Redable
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Decree page is not readable

File No. 20

1	Case No. & Year	14/1834
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Ratnakar Bisoi & others vs Sarada Charan Mittan
4	Category of Case	Not Readable
5	Nature of Dispute	Not Readable
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	Not Redable
8	Decree in favour of	Not Readable
	Remarks	Not Readable

File No. 20_93_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	93/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Krupasindh Swanin vs Sudhakar Mohanty
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff approached the court as the respondent had not return the land to the plaintiff. The plaintiff submitted to the court that the disputed land belongs to him and also demanded interest for the period of time the land was kept by the respondent. The judge Dr Amini Sahab ordered the respondent to return the land to the plaintiff but did not pass any order on the request to pay interest by the plaintiff. The judge said that the no proper evidence had been placed by the respondent to claim the amount of the interest
7	Date of Disposal	30/01/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	Not Readable

File No. 19_86_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	86/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raghnunath Mohanty vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff approached the court because the government had asked him to pay tax on his land located at district Darhanipur. As per the plaintiff he had sold the land for Rupees 4801 and the tax imposed on him is not valid. However, the Judge Mr. William Belet was not convinced by the evidence produced by the respondent and disposed the case in favour of Government and asked the plaintiff to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	30/11/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	Not Readable

File No. 18_83_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	83/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gangadhar Pahraj vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	<p>The plaintiff approached the court because the government had asked him to pay high tax on his ancestral land located at district Srirampur.</p> <p>The Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ordered the respondent to pay back the plaintiff the amount of of Rupees 142. The judge has also asked the plaintiff to inform the court if the respondent fail to pay the amount.</p>
7	Date of Disposal	4/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 17_62_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	62/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kelei Jena
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	<p>The respondent had given his property on rent to the government. The plaintiff had asked the respondent to pay tax on the said property. The respondent refused to pay the tax as he submitted to the court that as per the judgment given by Mr. William the property is exempted to pay the tax if rented to the government. The present Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert agreed to the argument made by the respondent and ordered that no tax shall be imposed on the property till the time it is rented by the government.</p>
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 4_171_1835_C

1	Case No. & Year	171/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Bhagwan Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The respondent had given his property on rent to the government. The plaintiff had asked the respondent to pay tax on the said property. The respondent refused to pay the tax as he submitted to the court that as per the judgment given by Mr. William the property is exempted to pay the tax if rented to the government. The present Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert agreed to the argument made by the respondent and ordered that no tax shall be imposed on the property till the time it is rented by the government.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 12_259_1835_C

1	Case No. & Year	259/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mohan Singh vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused the respondent that the tax imposed on two of properties is not valid. The Judge Mr. William Blent was not convinced by the documents produced by the plaintiff and disposed the case in favour of the respondent and ordered to pay the imposed tax on the Plaintiff
7	Date of Disposal	30/11/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 1_51_1834_C

1	Case No. & Year	51/1834
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Choudhary Balvadra Das vs Sayid Irfan Ali
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The dispute is on Rupees 1223. The case was placed before the judge Mr. Francis Crown
7	Date of Disposal	24/05/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Not readable
	Remarks	Matter of the case is not readable

File No. 10_241_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	241/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Radhesyam Narinder Mohapatra vs Balvadra Sahu
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The respondent borrowed Rupees 2210 from the plaintiff and spend all the money to buy properties and unable to pay back the debt to the plaintiff. The plaintiff approached the court and judge Mr. Gerorge disposed the case in favour of the Plaintiff and ordered the respondent to return the debt along with the interest.
7	Date of Disposal	18/03/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 9_240_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	240/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Chaudhary Kishori nandan Das Mohapatra vs (Not Available)
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The advocates appeared Mr. Sriram Rai and Narakchandra Rai submitted to the court that the government has taken the ancestral land of the plaintiff. They further submitted that the government is not entitled to take the land and must return to the plaintiff Judge

		Mr. Willow Smith disposed the case in favour of the Plaintiff and ordered the government to return the plaintiff all the properties confiscated by the government.
7	Date of Disposal	5/02/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 3 307_1834_B

1	Case No. & Year	307/1834
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mushamat Dhanya Bibi vs Mirza Kuaar Beg
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Husband of the Plaintiff Mr. Halim Beg left her and married another woman because she could not give birth to children. The respondent is the son of Plaintiff's husband from another woman. After the death of Mr. Halim Beg the son, the respondent, took all his father's property. The plaintiff accused the respondent that some of the property belongs to her and should be returned to her. The judge Mr. Francis Crown asked the local authority to investigate the relation of the Plaintiff and respondent's father before any order to be issued
7	Date of Disposal	14/03/1837
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 7_218_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	218/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Indramani Jena & others vs Abhay Charan Mohapatra & others.
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Land dispute. Matter of the case is not readable. Name of the judge is Mr. John Fleming
7	Date of Disposal	22/05/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Not readable
	Remarks	

File No. 13_2318_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	2318/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mere Appeal by Sumana Bai
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The husband of the applicant submitted to the court that her deceased husband rented out his properties at the district Apala. The applicant requested the court that the an order may be issued so that the tenants return the properties to her. The judge Willow Smith pass the order that the said property should be return to the applicant after a proper investigation by the local authority.
7	Date of Disposal	24/10/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Applicant
	Remarks	

File No. 11_242_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	242/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Radhashyam Narindra Mahapatra vs Mahtab Ray Pandit
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent had borrowed a sum of Rupees 2798 for the period of three months. After three months and several reminders the debt was not returned to the plaintiff by the respondent. The Judge Mr. George Stalkwitch disposed the case in favour of plaintiff and ordered to the respondent to return the money with interest,
7	Date of Disposal	13/03/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 8_224_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	224/1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable

3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sheikh Fakrullah
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The Government imposed tax on the property of the respondent. The respondent submitted to the court that the said property had been bought by him at the cost of Rupees 1272 and also he rented out the same property to the government office. The Judge Mr. William disposed the case in favour of the respondent and ordered the government to quash that tax imposed.
7	Date of Disposal	06/06/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 15_19_1836_B

1	Case No. & Year	19/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Ananta Deb after his death Musamat Bilas Manjari Dibya, Mother of guardian of Brundaban Chandra Deb Gosain & others vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government imposed tax on the property belonged to the plaintiff Mr. Ananta Deb. After his death his family members could not pay the tax and they approached the court and requested to quash the tax. However, the Judge Thomas Herbert did not accept the request of the plaintiffs and disposed the case in favour of the government and asked to collect all the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	20/02/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 16_25_1836_B

1	Case No. & Year	25/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gopal Das vs Gopal Ramanuj Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Matter of the case is not readable. The case was disposed in favour of the plaintiff. Name

		of the Judge Charles Hardwick
7	Date of Disposal	14/08/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 14_2995_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	Misc Appeal 2995/ 1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Bai Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The dispute is on a well, claimed by the applicant that it is located at the applicant property, hence belong to him. The Judge Mr. Willow Smith stated that the documents provided by the applicant is not sufficient enough to claim the ownership of the well hence disposed off the case.
7	Date of Disposal	22/12/1835
8	Decree in favour of	Against the Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 6_190_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	190/ 1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Ramballav Rai & others vs Basu Mohanty & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Property Dispute. Matter not Readable. Name of the Judge Mr. William
7	Date of Disposal	17/12/1835
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 5_180_1835_B

1	Case No. & Year	180/ 1835
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Mahu Mian & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Dispute on tax imposed by the government on the respondent resident of District

		Bahrajpur. Matter of the case is not readable.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 2_52_1834_B

1	Case No. & Year	52/ 1834
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Balvadra Das vs Irfan Ali
4	Category of Case	NA
5	Nature of Dispute	NA
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	24/05/1837
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 1_25_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	Rent Settlement 25/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Ananta Deb Gosain and others vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government imposed tax on the land of the Plaintiff located at the district Payandeh. The plaintiff died during the trial and his sons requested the court to exempt the tax on the ground that they are minors. However the Judge Thomas Harbort disposed the case in favour of Government and asked the other party to pay the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	20/02/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 2_110_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	110/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raghunath Panda vs Labha Behari and after death Damodar Behari and Others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff informed the court that he had bought land from the respondent for 47 Rupees and 2 Aana. However, after the death of the seller his son approached the court and submitted that the said land had been sold for Rs. 102 by his deceased father. The respondent asked the plaintiff to pay the rest of the money. The Judge Vikram Singh Sahab said that the current value of the land is Rs. 102 and same amount should be paid if the plaintiff wants to buy the land.
7	Date of Disposal	19/12/1837
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	Not Readable

File No. 5_161_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	161/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Padmacharan Mohanty & Others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff informed the court that the respondent had not submitted tax of his land since 1791. The respondent did not appear during the trial. The Judge Thomas Harbort disposed the case and issue the order to collect the tax from the respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 4_160_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	160/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mahant Mukunda Ramanuj Das vs Ram Charan Das and others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff took a loan of Rupees 440309 and 6 Aana from the respondent. After the death of the respondent his son asked the plaintiff to return the loan amount and approached the court. The plaintiff submitted that he had bought land and other properties from that money and at present unable to pay the money. The Judge Mr. John Holland asked the respondent to repay the money in instalments with interest before the end of the year 1843.
7	Date of Disposal	3/7/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 6_162_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	162/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Chowdhury Ramakrishan Samant Sinha Mahapatra vs Subal Chandra Bose
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Land Dispute between the two parties. The Judge Mr. William Brown disposed the case in favour of Respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	23/5/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 7_163_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	163/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Nitai Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government submitted to the court that the respondent had not submitted tax of his land located at the District Walipur, Payandeh. The respondent had submitted to the court since the said belonged to his ancestor and ownership of the land had not been decided yet hence the tax may be exempted until, the owner of the land take possession of the same. The judge Thomas Harbort disposed the case in favour of the respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 8_166_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	166/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Hari Sevak Kanungo Sebayat Sai Gopalji Thakur
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government submitted to the court that the respondent had not submitted tax on his land near Murshidabad. Respondent submitted that as the said land had given on rent to someone hence the tax may be exempted. The judge Mr. Thomas Harbort disposed the case in favour of the respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 9_170_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	170/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Raghu Sharma
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 10_176_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	176/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Nidhi Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent located at Payandah because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 11_177_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	177/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Hasna Khan
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent located at Walipur because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 12_178_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	178/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Dharma Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent located at Walipur, Payandeh because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement

		that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 13_179_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	179/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kandur Chakrabarty
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent located at Brahamaputra, Payandeh because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 14_182_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	182/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kishan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government confiscated the land of the respondent located at Kawali, Payandeh because the tax was not paid on the land. The judge Thomas Harbort passed the judgement that the land should be returned to the respondent and a time period of 5 years may be given to the respondent to clear the tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 15_239_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	239/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Padmalav Paljoshi & others vs Rghu Prusti & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff gave loan of an amount of Rupees 1304 to the respondent. There were no agreement signed between them as they were well acquainted. After the death of the respondent his children refused to pay the debt as there were no proof left by the decease. The plaintiff produced witnesses before the court and the Judge Mr. Harbort Halden taking the accounts of the witnesses disposed the case infavour of the Plaintiff and order to the respondents to pay the money with interest.
7	Date of Disposal	2/1/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 16_254_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	254/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mohanta deb Raj Das vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government had collected a tax amount of Rupees 5000 from the respondent. The respondent submitted to the court that the tax imposed on the land did belong to him. The said land had been given to him on rent by Maharaja Satya Sahab hence the tax collected by the respondent is not legal. The judge Richard Bard disposed the case in favour of respondent and asked the government to return the collected tax within a year.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 17_261_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	261/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gangadhar Praharaj Mandhata Shekayat Sri Raghunathji Thakur vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Case related to collection of tax at Sri Rampur. The judge Mr. Vikram Singh disposed the case in favour of respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	7/6/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 19_290_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	290/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Govind Acharya vs Sarkar Bahadur
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Case related to collection of tax at Kouwande. The judge Mr. Vikram Singh disposed the case in favour of respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	16/5/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 20_1096_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	1096/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Govind Pande and Mohani Sahu vs Gangagovind Kumar
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	23/5/1836
8	Decree in favour of	NA

	Remarks	
--	---------	--

File No. 21_1946_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	1946/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Chandra Singh Ray vs
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The appellant submitted to the court that he had given loan of amount Rupees 424 with an interest of Rupees 1 per month to another person. The appellant did not receive the loan and interest for six months. He requested court to provide him the provision to recover the loan. The Judge Mr. Smith said the court would not pass any order until the submitted evidence checked properly.
7	Date of Disposal	31/8/1836
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 22_3287_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	Special Appeal 3287/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mahant Ramcharan Das vs Kula Tihadi & Others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff was the owner of lands located at Babisai which he was selling for Rupees 300. Raja of the area stopped him on the ground that the said land does not belong to the plaintiff. Raja forcibly took the possession of the land and gave Rupees 50. After the death of the Raja, Plaintiff approached the court and requested that an order be passed to collect the amount of Rs 300 from the family of Raja or the ownership of the land be given to him. The Judge Mr. Richard Bard passed the order and asked the Plaintiff to have the ownership of the land at the cost of Rupees 21 submitted to the court as the registry fees of the land.
7	Date of Disposal	7/3/1836
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 1_90_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	90/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Jangi Khan vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government imposed tax on the land of the Plaintiff located at the district Rawatrapur, Kodendeh. The plaintiff submitted that he had already submitted the tax. However, the respondent submitted receipt of the tax submitted by the plaintiff that shows that the tax deposited by the plaintiff is less than the imposed by the respondent. The Judge Thomas Harbort disposed the case in favour of Government and asked the other party to pay the remining tax.
7	Date of Disposal	17/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 2_93_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	93/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Parsu Mohapatra, Sabayet of Narsingnath Thakur vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Issue of the Tax imposed on the Property.
7	Date of Disposal	21/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	Judgement and other pages are missing

File No. 3_94_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	94/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gaga Panda alias gaga Satparthi Pajhari sai Gobind Jiv Thakur vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the tax imposed by the government on his

		property at Bakerabad is more than the value of it. The Judge Thomas Harbort was not satisfied by the document submitted by the plaintiff and raised the question on the document's authenticity. The Judge disposed the case in favour of the respondent and asked the plaintiff to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	28/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 4_98_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	98/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Jayer Naik Shebayat Sri Dhulia Linga Mahadev
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kadamkare, Kodendeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	7/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 5_99_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	99/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Bibi Khoia
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Raghunathpur, Kodendeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the

		argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	11/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 6_101_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	101/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sridhar Malia
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kaplsar Nagar, Kodendeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	15/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.7_105_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	105/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Bairaji Malia
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Bareng Pur, Bakerabad. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	15/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.8_106_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	106/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Narasingh Mulia Shivayant Kapileshwar Mahadev
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Sadakna, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	22/05/1841
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.9_108_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	108/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Madhu Barik
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had not submitted the tax of the property located at Sadakna, Kodande after several reminder. Judge Mr. Thomas Harbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ask the respondent to pay the tax and also the cost of the case.
7	Date of Disposal	16/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.10_112_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	112/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Adhikari Ballabh Das

4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kaisarpur, Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	15/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.11_114_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	114/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Daya Ram
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Raghunath Pur, Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	16/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.12_115_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	115/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Gadadhar Acharya
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Sidasharpur, Kokande. In the new

		document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	16/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.13_116_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	116/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Bhagwan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Raghunathpur, Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	9/08/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.14_117_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	117/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Minu Mohanty
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Raghunathpur, Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.

7	Date of Disposal	16/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.15_118_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	118/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Hurushi Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Paramahesh, Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	31/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.16_122_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	122/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Sitaram Das vs Tirumala Acharya Swami
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that his father had bought property from the respondent. However, after the death of plaintiff's father the respondent resold the same property to the Maharaj Nagpur. The Judge Mr. Vikram Mani Sahab after examining the documents disposed the case in favour of plaintiff and passed the order that the respondents shall return the property to the plaintiff and plaintiff shall deposit all the unpaid taxes of the property.
7	Date of Disposal	12/02/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.17_125_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	125/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Dina Rana Sevak
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Vemlak Karande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	29/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.18_127_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	127/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sham Charan Mahanta
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Rajhunathpur. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	20/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.19_128_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	128/1836
---	-----------------	----------

2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Ghanshyam Tiwari
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kontepur, Jajpur. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	16/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.20_132_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	132/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Hari Pujari
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kisnapur. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	30/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.21_133_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	133/1836
---	-----------------	----------

2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Arat Patjotisi
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Sarain. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	17/07/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.22_134_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	134/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Anadee Mohanty
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Bakerabad. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	19/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.23_136_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	136/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Shyam Charan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Bakerabad. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the respondent satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	17/07/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.24_137_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	137/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Rahima Begum after death Misri Begum (Grand Children) with Husband Fazl Hakim
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at different location. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr Thomas Harbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ask the respondent to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	30/04/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.25_148_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	148/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Chakra Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr Thomas Harbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ask the respondent to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	9/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.26_155_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	155/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Rosni Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kokande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	19/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.27_157_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	157/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Chandrasekhar Choudhary after death Kishan Choudhary

4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Budhyepur, Baharajpur. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	19/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.28_160_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	160/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Fakira Khan and Madhu Khan
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Radrapur, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	6/07/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.29_165_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	165/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sheikh Habibullah
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Raghunathpur, Kodande. In the new

		document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	30/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.30_167_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	167/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sheikh Bhikan & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff before the Judge Mr. Richard Bard accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Radrapur, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge.
7	Date of Disposal	30/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	Judgment not available

File No.31_168_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	168/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Parmanand Mohanty
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr Thomas Harbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ask the respondent to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	8/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.32_169_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	169/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Rusi Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Pramanish, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	9/08/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.33_171_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	171/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Ratnakar Mahapatra
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Radrapur, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	7/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.34_173_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	173/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Mahant Jaganath Das

4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Shampura. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr Thomas Harbert disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff and ask the respondent to pay the imposed tax.
7	Date of Disposal	9/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.35_184_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	184/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Nabin Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	20/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.36_186_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	186/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kasinath Acharya
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less

		tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.37_187_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	187/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kela Rai
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Awadh Para, Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	3/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.38_188_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	188/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Rahman Khan
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Nahripur, Kodande. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	6/07/1838

8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.39_189_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	189/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kishore Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Jabanpur, Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1838

File No.40_190_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	190/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sanatan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff accused that the respondent that the respondent had forged the document of the property the respondent had at Swang, Payandeh. In the new document the respondent declared less property to pay less tax to the government. Judge Mr. Edward Richard Bard did not find the argument of the plaintiff satisfactory and disposed the case in favour of the respondent at the cost of the court proceedings.
7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1838

File No. 1_192_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	192/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kanhai Tihadi after death Padi widow of Baldevji Thakur
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the after several reminder the respondent has not deposited the land tax. The respondent resident of Jubra, District Bakerabad submitted before the Judge Mr. Richard Bard that after the death of her father the property has not been divided among the deceased children yet.
7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No. 2_196_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	196/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Binod Pujhari, after death, Binod Bihari Thakur
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent has not deposited the land tax. The respondent appeared before the Judge Mr. Richard Bard and agreed to pay the tax imposed on his property at District, Bakerabad. The judge finalised the amount and disposed the case in favour of the Plaintiff
7	Date of Disposal	3/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No. 3_201_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	201/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Fateh Khan
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent has not deposited the land tax. The respondent appeared in the court and submitted that the tax imposed on him is higher than the actual value of the property he had at that time. The respondent also submitted that his nephew Mr. Najeed Khan son of Mr. Dalil Khan had already sold a portion of the total property. Hence the tax should be levied on the property which is left to him at that time. The Judge Mr. Richard Bard after reviewing the documents disposed the case in favour of the respondent and ask the Palintif to collect the tax as per the property which is left to the respondent.
7	Date of Disposal	7/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 4_217_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	217/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Madhu Das after death Rasik Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government submitted to the court that the respondent had not registered his property hence unable to collect tax from the respondent. The government had also submitted to the court that the respondent had not declared the revenue earned from the property because of that the tax amount was not be finalised. The government had also requested to the court that the government should take the ownership of the respondent's property on the ground of not registering the property and not declaring the earnings. However, the Judge Mr. Richard Bard rejected the Plaintiff request to take possession of the property and asked to

		collect the tax to be calculated from the earnings made from the property located at District. Sarsani
7	Date of Disposal	09/08/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 5_218_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	218/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Debadhi Barik
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent has not deposited the land tax. The respondent appeared in the court and submitted that the amount of tax government had imposed on his property at Gram Diuti, Gauwhati is twice the actual amount. The respondent submitted that the government had also asked him to pay the tax of the previous year that he had already paid. The respondent submitted the receipt of the tax he had paid. The Judge Mr. Richard Bard disposed the case in favour of respondent and ask the government to reissue the bill and recover the actual tax amount.
7	Date of Disposal	19/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No. 6_219_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	219/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Debadhi Barik
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent has not deposited the land tax. The respondent appeared in the court and submitted that the amount of tax government had imposed on his property at Gram Diuti, Gauwhati is twice the actual amount. The respondent submitted that the government had also asked him to pay the

		tax of the previous year that he had already paid. The respondent submitted the receipt of the tax he had paid. The Judge Mr. Richard Bard disposed the case in favour of respondent and ask the government to reissue the bill and recover the actual tax amount.
7	Date of Disposal	19/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.7_251_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	251/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Jogeshwar Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff claimed ownership of the respondent's unregistered property at Kokaken, district Brahamatr. However, the respondent in the earlier trial had been given a month time to register and prove the ownership of the said property. The respondent had sent his advocate with all the documents that proved the respondent's ownership of the property. The judge Mr. Richard Bard issued the order and ask the respondent to register the property and take the possession.
7	Date of Disposal	15/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.8_252_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	252/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kusai Rath
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	4/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.9_264_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	264/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Danai Otta
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	4/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.10_273_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	273/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Baldev Tihari
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	4/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.11_280_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	280/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Ram Sankar Chakrabarty and after his death Bholanath Chakrabarty & Others.
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Property Dispute Judge- Thomas Herbert
7	Date of Disposal	7/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.12_296_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	296/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Krittibas Acharya
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	17/04/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.13_297_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	297/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Banamali Mahapatra
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	7/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.14_298_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	298/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Narayan Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	7/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.15_477_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	477/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Barada Charan Swami vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil

5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that he had already paid the tax that the government had imposed on him. The Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert order to investigate the matter.
7	Date of Disposal	15/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No.16_834_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	834/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Maheshanand Das vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff approached the court on the ground that the government had imposed tax on his property which he had already paid. The Judge Mr. Richard Bard after reviewing the documents submitted by the plaintiff accepted the case and ask both the parties to appear on 18 July 1838 for his decision on the case.
7	Date of Disposal	25/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No.17_942_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	942/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Janardan Das & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable Name of the Judge- David Smith
7	Date of Disposal	9/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.18_1126_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	1126/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Not Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Radha Das & others

4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Not Readable
7	Date of Disposal	21/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.19_1906_1836_C

1	Case No. & Year	1906/1836
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Sanatan Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The respondent submitted to the court that the tax imposed on his property by the government is higher than the actual value of it. The judge Thomas Herbert said that the various such application had been received at Calcutta Court, written in English by the plaintiffs. The judge ordered to translate all the applications. But for time being, asked the respondent to pay the tax amount asked by the government.
7	Date of Disposal	4/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.20_100_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	100/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Sayed Salim Ali vs Lokanath Narinder
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	28/05/1840
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.21_139_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	139/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Raja Niladri Bihari Mansingh HarichandarMardraj Bhramarbar Ray vs Ranu Bishnu Malati Jeima Die
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	20/05/1840
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.22_145_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	145/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Rani Bishnu Masati Dei vs Kisan Chandra Rai
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	20/05/1840
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.23_162_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	162/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language

3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mahant Ram Charan Das vs Chaturbhuj Ramanuj Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	6/07/1840
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.24_165_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	165/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Jagrup Kar Gosain vs Nirmal Kar & others
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	30/06/1837
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.25_207_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	207/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Dhuma Bai vs Musamat Mana Kunwar
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent had taken a loan of Rs. 5000 from her husband. After the death of the plaintiff's husband the respondent had refused to pay the loan amount. Advocate of Plaintiff was Mouli Mohammad Ali. Advocate of respondent was Moulavi Karam Husain. The case was listed before the Judge Mr. Robert Halden.
7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1840
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	Order not written in Persian language.

File No.26_212_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	212/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Mahant Ramanuj Das vs Devraj Das
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language
7	Date of Disposal	17/06/1839
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.27_237_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	237/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Choudhary Ramkishan Samant Sinhar Mahapatra vs Kishanchandra Banpati
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that he had bought property from the respondent at the cost of Rs. 1055. However the respondent had not paid the pending tax of the property. The respondent requested the Judge Mr. John Ramesh Sahab to order the respondent to pay all the due tax pending before the date he purchased the property. The judge accepted the case and asked both the parties to appear before the court on 20/02/1838 for the order.
7	Date of Disposal	15/02/1838
8	Decree in favour of	NA
	Remarks	

File No.28_251_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	251/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Bhubadilal vs Swari Seth & Man Rageshwar
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that he along with the respondent had started a business in partnership. They both invested Rs. 4000 to buy a shop and Rs. 20000 to buy

		clothes and jewellery to do business. Later the plaintiff withdrew the idea of doing business in partnership and asked the respondent to return half of his money. Meanwhile the plaintiff realised that the respondent had registered the shop as its sole owner leaving his partner aside. The judge Mr. Robert Halden after reviewing the documents submitted by the plaintiff, disposed the case in favour plaintiff and asked the respondent to pay Rs. 12000 to the plaintiff.
7	Date of Disposal	25/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.29_259_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	259/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Durga Prasad Pandit, uncle and guardian of Gopinath Pandit
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The applicant submitted to the court that the government had taken his property at Kaek district. Advocate appeared on behalf of the applicant Munsii Dadar Baksh requested the Judge Mr. David Smith to pass the order and ask the government to return the property to its owner. Advocate appeared on behalf of the Government- Munsii Hasan Ali. The judge disposed the case in favour of the applicant and ask the government to release the property.
7	Date of Disposal	15/08/1837
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.30_407_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	407/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Written in Urdu and other language
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Natham Sahoo and after his death Dhubia Bai vs Musamat Mana Kunwar
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	Written in Urdu and other language

7	Date of Disposal	22/06/1840
8	Decree in favour of	
	Remarks	

File No.33_773_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	773/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Ananta Panda & Hari Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff imposed tax on the property possessed by the respondents. However, respondents submitted that the tax imposed by the government is higher than the actual value of the property. However the plaintiff submitted all the documents before the Judge Thomas Harbert, after reviewing the documents the judge disposed the case in favour of the plaintiff, and asked the respondents to pay the exact amount of tax asked by the plaintiff.
7	Date of Disposal	30/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.34_778_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	778/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Kanakeswari
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The government asked the respondent to pay the tax due on her property. The respondent submitted to the court that his deceased husband had already sold the said property and the person purchased it had not registered the same. Hence the notice to pay tax had been issued to her instead of the new owner of the property. Judge Mr. Richard Bard passed the order that the government may collect the tax from the respondent for

		the time period the property was under her possession. The rest of the tax may be collected from the new owner of the property.
7	Date of Disposal	30/05/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.35_787_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	787/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Brandaban Das Mahant vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the government had imposed certain amount of tax on his property. However, the said property belonged to him had been donated to him and tax demanded should be cancelled. The judge Mr. Richard Bard asked the respondent to pay the tax amount for this time but exempted him from paying tax on his property in future.
7	Date of Disposal	06/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.36_789_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	789/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Brandaban Das Mahant vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the government had imposed certain amount of tax on his property. However, the said property belonged to him had been donated to him and tax demanded should be cancelled. The judge Mr. Richard Bard asked the respondent to pay the tax amount for this time but exempted him from paying tax on his property in future.
7	Date of Disposal	06/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

File No.37_795_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	795/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gulam Hussain Khan vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that his property located at Kandarpur, district Bakerabad, had been taken in possession by the government. After reviewing the documents, the Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert disposed the tax in favour of the plaintiff and asked the government to return the property but asked the plaintiff to pay the due tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/08/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.38_796_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	796/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Gulam Hussain Khan vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that his property located at Kandarpur, district Bakerabad, had been taken in possession by the government. After reviewing the documents, the Judge Mr. Thomas Herbert disposed the tax in favour of the plaintiff and asked the government to return the property but asked the plaintiff to pay the due tax.
7	Date of Disposal	7/08/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	

File No.39_833_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	833/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Brandaban Das Mahant vs Government
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil

6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the government had imposed certain amount of tax on his property. However, the said property belonged to him had been donated to him and tax demanded should be cancelled. The judge Mr. Richard Bard asked the respondent to pay the tax amount for this time but exempted him from paying tax on his property in future.
7	Date of Disposal	06/06/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Respondent
	Remarks	

mFile No.40_841_1837_C

1	Case No. & Year	841/1837
2	Visibility of the letters	Partly Readable
3	Name of the Plaintiff and respondent	Government vs Madhu Panda
4	Category of Case	Civil
5	Nature of Dispute	Civil
6	Brief Description	The plaintiff submitted to the court that the respondent had not paid tax imposed on her property after several reminders. The judge Mr. Thomas Herbert passed the order and asked the respondent to pay the tax to the government at the earliest.
7	Date of Disposal	17/04/1838
8	Decree in favour of	Plaintiff
	Remarks	