

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1377	<u>Press</u> Mis.
145-146	
Dated	9 - 7 - 18 61.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th July 1861.*

No. 145. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 31st May 1861,
No. 2,779:—

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District,
to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated
Masulipatam, 8th May 1861, No. 105.

SIR,

With reference to the accompanying copy of an Extract from the Register of the Agraháram
of Potavarapupad in the Narasaraopeta Táluq in this District, received from the
No. 176. Inám Commissioner, with his letter dated the 27th ultimo, requesting me to release
the Agraháram from attachment, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to obtain
the sanction of Government for the restoration of the Agraháram.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 9th July 1861.

REGISTER No. 9—Register of Potavarapad Agraharam in the Taluq of Narasraopeta Kistna District.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Case No. 1.	Personal.	Gudikot.	0 17 8	357-88	Annual. 1,256	Collection. 124														
		Deduct			57	136														
		Peramboke.	0 11 0	17-05	58	132														
		Inams.	3 2 0	63-90	59	147														
		Remainder .	3 13 0	80-95	60	127														
		Cultivation	13 0 11	276-93	61	133														
		of Fasli 1269	11 4 0	230-4	62	127														
		Waste.	2 7 0	49-89	63	128														
					64	126														
					65	127														
					66	101														
					67	127														
					68	132														
					69	146														
		</																		

(Signed) G. N. TAYLOR,
Inam Commissioner.

that the village has not been treated as such by the Government authorities. The Curnum of the Agraharam account tendered by him, without any supervision or check on the part of the Taluq Officers. From these circumstances it would appear that the Agraharam has been under nominal attachment. It is entered in the annual accounts submitted to the Collector's Kacheri under the head of Jari Agraharam. In Fasli 1257 the Tahsildar issued a notice demanding the payment of the arrears; when it would appear one Teruvengala, a distant cousin of the Agraharamdars, who was on bad terms with the holders appeared and executed a Karinama binding himself to pay the arrears in six instalments without the knowledge of the enjoyers of the Agraharam, if he Agraharam was put in his possession. The Collector in his Order, dated 14th August 1848, declined to restore the village on the terms proposed by the said Teruvengala Charlu. From the Arzi of the Tahsildar, dated 11th August 1848, it would appear that the said Teruvengala Charlu produced no documents. The inquiry was partial and incomplete; and the said Teruvengala Charlu was not a proper claimant, having had no documents in his possession. The said Teruvengala Charlu must have been a distant cousin of the Agraharamdars, who was anxious to get possession of the village, in spite of the claims of the real holders, who were then absent at Hyderabad.
Again in Fasli 1262, the Tahsildar issued a notice demanding the payment of the arrears, when the present claimant Kumaree Teruvengala Charlu deputed a Vakil with the documents in his possession to the Taluq Kacheri. The Vakil deposed that the Zamindar in Fasli 1246 charged an extra Jodi of Rupees 40, raising the Jodi to 146, requesting that the village might be restored remitting arrears as an unauthorized cess. The record was sent up to the Huzur, but no orders have been passed on the subject. The Agraharamdars cunningly kept aloof the Beriz of the Agraharam having fallen considerably short of the Jodi of Rupees 140. In Fasli 1266, the Agraharamdars complained to the Collector that the Curnum refused to give him the accounts of the village. The Collector, in his order, supposed to be under attachment, no notice appears to have been taken either by the Huzur or Taluq officials. Having obtained no redress, the Agraharamdar, it would appear, anxiously waited for the appointment in the Inam Commission for justice; that the original Jodi of this village is Rupees 100, is clearly beyond doubt from the documents produced by the Inamdars. The aggregate collections of Fasli 1244 to 1269 far exceed the amount of Jodi payable by the Agraharamdars for those Faslis at Rupees 100 per annum by Rupees 409. Under these circumstances the Deputy Collector sees no reason why the Agraharam should not be restored to the holders, subject to the proper Jodi of Rupees 100, remitting all arrears. The Deputy Collector begs to recommend that the nominal balance of Rupees 680-11-6 may fairly be written off and the Agraharam put in possession of the Agraharamdars subject to the Jodi of Rupees 100, as per extract granted by Mr. Oakes. The value of the village may be fairly represented by Rupees 140.

To be confirmed under Rule 5, column 3. They enfranchise 2 Rs. 45 Rupees
Jodi 100

(True Extract)
Documents submitted for the consider- (Signed) G. N. TAYLOR,
ation of the Inam Commissioner. Inam Commissioner
Extract..... 1 (A true Copy)
Order of Mr. Oakes..... 1 (Signed) G. THORNBILL, (Signed) A. STREEVEYASA RAU,
Acting Collector.
Copies of orders, dated
14th August 1848, and
25th July 1857..... 2
Copy of Arzi, dated 11th
August 1848, No. 81. 1
5
Jodi of F. from 1214 to 1260 being
26 years at 100 Rs per annum. 2,600
Actual Collections..... 3,009
Increase..... 409

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
9th July 1861.*

1. Ordered to be submitted for the decision of Government.
2. The Agraharam which is of old date is stated to be properly chargeable with a Jodi of Rupees 100, but which the Zamindar raised to Rupees 146, and attached the village in default of payment.
3. The Zamindari itself was subsequently sequestrated on failure of heirs, and the Agraharam has since that time remained under the nominal attachment of the Government Officers, but really in the management of the Agraharamdar who is also the Curnum. The collections have exceeded the proper demand by Rupees 409, for the refund of which sum, and for the release of the Agraharam to the owner, the sanction of Government is solicited. The Collector will of course remit all further demand on account of arrears.
4. The above short abstract of the facts of the case should have been given in the Collector's letter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, Secretary.

No. 146.

ORDER THEREON, 9th July 1861, No. 1,377.

1. As recommended by the Inam Commissioner and the Board of Revenue, the Government sanction the restoration of the Pottavarapad Agraharam to its owner. No further demand for arrears of Jodi should be made.
2. With reference to the Board's proposal to refund Rupees 409, the sum stated to have been collected in excess of the proper demand, the Governor in Council observes that a portion of this was collected by the Zamindar, and there appears no reason why Government should be liable for this amount. Sanction will be granted for the refund of whatever sum may have been collected in excess since the village came into the possession of Government, on the same being reported.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

Revenue Dept

No 1377

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 9th July 1861

*Read the following
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue*

*Submitting with recommendation a letter from the
Collector of Tiruina soliciting
sanction to restore to the owner
certain Agraharams in the
Varasaruapeta Taluq.*

*As recommended
by the Inam Commissioner
and the Board of Revenue,
the Government sanction
the restoration of the Pottavarapad
Agraharam to its owner - No further
demand for arrears of
Jodi should be made.*

W.H.

Restoration of the
Pottavarapada Agraharam

Revenue 1861
No. of Govt. in July.

27/3/77.

No. of the Madras Govt.
29th July 1861.

From the Secy of the Govt.
in Oct/61, C. No. 1581

Sanctioning the
restoration of the Pottavarapada
Agraharam in the Pottavarapada
Taluk of the Krishna
District to its owner.

1745-746.