M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-6-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	297	Press ~~Mis.~~
34-35 Dated	3 – 2 –	18 68.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

297

No. 34. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th August 1867, No. 5,327.

Read the following letter from the Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 25th April 1867, No. 118:—

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings of 8th August 1864, communicating Orders of Government, dated 29th July 1864, No. 1,354, offering the village of Sreeramavaram to Rajah Simhadry Appa Row and Venkatadry Appa Row on the terms suggested by the Board, and directing me to institute an inquiry into the assets of Tungellamudy and Chavendra Muttahs in view to an adjustment of Peishcush, I have the honor to inform you that immediately on the receipt of the said orders, the views of the Government were communicated to the survivor Venkatadry Appa Row; the attendance of the Curnums of the villages of Chavendra Muttah with the accounts was also procured, and, as Tungellamudy Muttah is situated in the Godavery District, the Collector was at the same time requested to make a careful valuation of the assets of that Muttah for a period of ten years, from Fusly 1264 to 1273.

2. On 2nd March 1865, Venkatadry Appa Row addressed a petition to me, in reply to an Inayetnama sent to him on 24th August 1864. A translation is herewith forwarded for the information of the Board.

3. With respect to Sreeramavaram village, Venkatadry Appa Row observes that the Peishcush of Rupees 640, fixed with reference to the average collections of the village for the last seventeen years of the Government management, is very high, and points to the fact that even when the Peishcush was fixed at 530 Rupees, being one-half of the Peishcush originally levied before the famine, he was unable to meet the demand. He shews that the total collections under his management and that of the Government for twenty-six years amounted to Rupees 17,550, giving average collection of Rupees 675 per annum, two-thirds of which would amount to 450 Rupees, and prays that a further reduction of Peishcush to 350 Rupees may be made, which would enable him to discharge the Government dues in all seasons, whether good or bad.

4. In another petition addressed to me by Venkatadry Appa Row on 6th October 1866, he states that as the village of Sreeramavaram is now situated in Godavery District, whilst the rest of his Zemindary is in the Kistna District, he would be subject to much inconvenience in the management, and prays that the village of Chanubanda, in Vissunapeta division of this district, may be made over to him in lieu of Sreeramavaram.

5. The returns from the village of Sreeramavaram are at all times precarious; it is not within reach of anicut irrigation, and the tank is entirely dependent on local rains for its supply.

6. Out of the seventeen years shewn in the statement given in paragraph 8 of Mr. Foord's Report, dated 24th October 1863, No. 237, the collections in seven years were below the amount of the original Peishcush, viz., Rupees 1,061, which was fixed on an average of eleven years' collections, taken into calculation during the formation of Sub-division accounts in the year 1830. During the remaining ten years, the collections exceeded the Peishcush.

Fuslies.	Collections. Rs.
1247	224
1248	14
1249	19
1250	41
1251	24
1252	313
1253	254
1254	120
1255	214
1256	1,121
1257	718
1258	1,100
1259	1,243
1260	729
1261	1,040
1262	1,082
1263	608
1264	1,203
1265	1,103
1266	1,231
1267	1,201
1268	459
1269	183
1270	756
1271	1,253
1272	1,297
Total ..	17,550
Average ...	675

7. During the nine years of the Zemindar's management, from Fusly 1247 to 1255, if the returns can be trusted, the seasons were successively bad, whilst from Fusly 1256 to 1272 under the Government management, they were generally good.

8. The difference in the out-turn between the earlier and later years as shewn in the statement is very remarkable, and not easy to be accounted for; but, as the village was assigned to the Zemindar with a view to relieve him from an embarrassed position, and as it is clearly liable to considerable fluctuations of out-turn, it may be more equitable to strike an average of the above twenty-six years, which would give an average annual collection of 675 Rupees, and a Peishcush of 450 Rupees. With respect to the indulgence of a further reduction of Peishcush from 450 to 350 as prayed by petitioner, it is clearly a point which may be conceded by the liberality of Government, but cannot be demanded as a right.

9. With respect to the Zemindar's request for granting the village of Chanubanda in lieu of Sreeramavaram now offered, I beg to shew in the margin the collections of that village for the past seven years, from Fusly 1269 to 1275. The average would be Rupees 2,036, and two-thirds of that is Rupees 1,357-5-0. This exceeds the regular Peishcush (Rupees 1,061) of Sreeramavaram village, fixed as per Sub-division accounts in the year 1830, by Rupees 296-5-0.

Fuslies.	Collections. Rs.	A.	P.
1. 1269	1,295	7	3
2. 1270	1,132	0	0
3. 1271	2,304	13	0
4. 1272	1,872	13	3
5. 1273	2,378	3	0
6. 1274	2,432	5	11
7. 1275	2,836	9	0
Total...	14,252	3	5
Average...	2,036	0	6

10. Venkatadry Appa Row is willing to take up the village of Chanubanda on an annual Peishcush of Rupees 1,357; but I see no particular reason for granting the request.

11. Peishcush.—The Collector of the Godavery District has made a valuation of the assets of the villages of Tungellamudy Muttah belonging to the deceased Simhadry Appa Row, and sent to me the accompanying Statement A. shewing the Demand, Collection, and Charges of the eight villages of Tungellamudy Muttah, from Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273, inclusive.

12. From the subjoined statement the Board will observe that the average collections for the last ten years are Rupees 10,951, from which Rupees 2,979-11-3 being deducted on account of variation of season and cost of collections, as well as the Maramut charges, there remains Rupees 7,972-0-8, and two thirds of that is Rupees 5,314-4-1. This is below the present Peishcush (Rupees 5,591) by Rupees 276-14-8; as this difference is trifling, I beg the Board will be pleased to sanction the revised Peishcush:—

Statement shewing the average collections, deductions, and Peishcush proposed for the Estate of Tungellamudy, in the Godavery District.

Average collections of ten years, from Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273.	Deduct at sixteen per cent. on the collections for variation of season and cost of collections.	Remaining	Deduct Maramut charges.	Remaining assets.	Proposed Government Peishcush at two-thirds of the assets.	One-third of the assets on account of allowance to the Zemindars.
Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
10,951 11 11	1,752 4 6	9,199 7 5	1,227 6 9	7,972 0 8	5,314 4 1	2,657 5 7

13. With respect to Chavendra Muttah belonging to Venkatadry Appa Row, I have the honor to inform you that the Curnums attended my Office in the month of October 1864, with the original accounts of assets from Fusly 1264 to 1273. While they were preparing the accounts, the cyclone of 1st November 1864 occurred, and the whole of the accounts were lost; no materials, therefore, remain wherefrom to form a valuation of the assets of the villages, and there appears no course open but to adopt the scale of Peishcush* proposed by Mr. Porter in his Report of the 30th March 1849. It was fixed with reference to the collections of the items entered in the Circuit Committee accounts. The late Commissioner for the Northern Circars in his review of the Sub-division accounts of the Nedadavole Zemindary, fixed the Peishcush in reference to the actual collections at Rupees 5,217-14-2. The difference between these two scales is Rupees 479-13-0. The Zemindar prays that the lower sum may be adopted.

* Peishcush on Chavendra Muttah, Rs. 4,738-1-5.

14. All unauthorized alienations of land, and other alterations in the system of revenue made by the late Zemindar of Nedadavole subsequent to the Permanent Settlement, were omitted from his calculation by Mr. Porter, in fixing the scale No. 2, which was with reference to the collections of the items entered in the Circuit Committee accounts.

15. With reference to the Board's endorsement on Petition No. 4,066 of 1864, presented by Rajah Seetiah Appa Row Bahadur, widow of the late Simhadry Appa

Row, Zemindar of Tungellamudy Muttah, situated in the Godavery District, I have the honor to refer the Board to the correspondence noted in the margin, from which they will observe that the deceased Rajah Simhadry Appa Row and the present Venkatadry Appa Row divided their landed property, and executed a Deed† of Acquittal, in pursuance of which Simhadry Appa Row took the Muttah of Tungellamudy with the village of Catavaram, and Venkatadry Appa Row the Chavendra Muttah with the villages of Ravecherla and Sreeramavaram.

To Board, 11th March 1848, No. 18.
From do, 30th do. do.

† Dated 7th August 1846.

16. The village of Sreeramavaram was subsequently sold for arrears of Peishcush and incorporated with the Government lands in the year 1847. With the exception of this village, the other landed property was registered in the names of Simhadry and Venkatadry Appa Rows, agreeably to the conditions of the above-named Deed of Acquittal, after the sub-division accounts of the Nedadavole Zemindary had been confirmed by the Commissioner for the Northern Circars in the year 1850.

17. The petitioner Seetiah Appa Row states in her petition to the Board that the division of property by the late Naraya Appa Row was not justly made in the year 1846, inasmuch as the two villages of Sreeramavaram and Ravecherla were included in the share of Venkatadry Appa Row, and that the promises then held out to her husband, to recompense him in some other way for the loss of the said villages, were not at all fulfilled.

18. Had there been any disproportion in the division of property in 1846, petitioner's husband should himself have complained of it to the authorities, and procured a re-adjustment of it at the time. No such complaint was ever made, and there does not, therefore, appear any ground now for re-opening the question.

19. From paragraph 4 of the Deed of Acquittal, forwarded with Mr. Porter's letter of 11th March 1848, No. 18, and from the accompanying translation of an agreement interchanged in the year 1851 between Simhadry and Venkatadry Appa Rows, the Board will understand that Venkatadry Appa Row, who has male issue, has a reversionary right in the estate of his brother Simhadry Appa Row who died without any son, leaving only his widow, the petitioner, and two daughters. The petitioner would, therefore, appear to be incompetent to alienate or dispose of her estate against the interests, without the concurrence of her late husband's family.

Translation of an Arzi submitted to G. Thornhill, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, by Rajah Venkatadry Appa Row, Bahadur, Zemindar of Chavendra Muttah, dated 6th October 1860.

1. The Government in consideration of the troubles which I have been subjected to from the first, owing to the injustice done to me with respect to the Zemindary which ought to have fallen to the share of my father, was graciously pleased to grant me the village called Sreeramavaram as a Zemindary for my support. But as the village did not yield sufficient profit even to meet the

Peishcush arrears accrued, it (the village) was sold. Ever since I have continued to bring the fact of this unjust sale repeatedly to the notice of the authorities. On the Memorial which I submitted to them in 1863, Government was pleased to take my prayer into their consideration, and to order the restoration to me of the said Sreeramavaram.

2. Thankful to the Government for the favor which they entertain towards me, I respectfully beg to make the following request, which I pray may be taken into consideration.

3. The Honorable Government was at first pleased to grant me the village of Sreeramavaram for the welfare of our family, but as it has not been provided with any means of irrigation, it yielded no profit whatever, notwithstanding every improvement that could be made. Consequently the object of the favors which the Government have shewn me since long time, has been defeated. Now the village has been managed solely by Government for twenty years under a good system, when high prices prevailed; yet even during this favorable time, the village remained in an utterly impoverished state. If this village of Sreeramavaram, situated in another district which is far from my estate, be restored to me, I very much doubt whether I could be able to manage it so that I may not again deprive myself of the favor of Government.

4. Moreover, the Zemindary which I possess is situated in the Kistna District, whereas the village in question is in the Godavery District. By this small estate which I possess being in two districts far from each other, I shall merely incur considerable expenses and other charges, (owing to difficulty arising in the management of affairs,) but no profit can be derived by me.

5. Further, the Government is disposed graciously to grant me the village for my good, but not otherwise. I, therefore, beg to make the following request.

6. For the reasons above described, I request that the village of Sreeramavaram be retained by Government, and in lieu thereof the village of Chanubanda, in the Vissannapetta division, appertaining to the Kistna District, be granted to me with its hamlet, either remitting such amount from the Peishcush formerly fixed on that village, as the Government may think fit for the sake of my welfare, or with its former Peishcush.

7. If this be done, my entire Zemindary remains in one district, and under your honor's administration. Besides this, it is also situated near Ravecherla, a Jaghir village at which I reside. Consequently I shall be able to manage it without trouble, and be in a happy condition in every way reaping the fruit of the Government's long cherished favor towards me.

8. Moreover, as this village of Chanubanda yields a profit equal to that which the Government (through their favor towards me) may be pleased to determine as annual profit to me after deducting the Peishcush, I respectfully pray your honor will do me now this kindness in consideration of the representations made by me to Government during a long time.

9. I, therefore, most respectfully pray your honor will, out of favor, be pleased to take my request into your candid consideration, and grant me at present the village of Chanubanda, fixing thereon such Peishcush as your honor may think proper, and submitting this petition, supported by your favorable recommendation, to the higher authorities, obtain their sanction for permanently putting the village in my possession with a reasonable Peishcush. If this be done, I shall ever continue to remember the indulgence of the Honorable Government, and enjoy happiness with my family. I crave your honor will be pleased to grant my request. Please consider this—6th October 1860.

(Signed) RAJAH VENKATADRY APPA ROW BAHADUR,
Zemindar.

Agreement entered into by Rajah Simhadry Appa Row Bahadur, and Venkatadry Appa Row, on the 15th December 1851.

We formerly laid down a stipulation to the effect that the estates which we divided agreeably to the Samakhea or agreement we entered into on the 7th August 1846, ought to be enjoyed by us from generation to generation, and that they are not to be alienated to others.

The Deed was accordingly registered. With respect to the point of enjoying (the estates) from generation to generation, we do now hereby enter into a stipulation in the presence of Naraya Appa Row, to the effect that in the event of any misfortune befalling any of us, the survivors should succeed to the (deceased's) estate and support the women of his (the deceased's) family. We do, therefore, bind ourselves to act according to the stipulation we enter into this Deed with our free will.

(Signed) RAJAH SIMHADRY APPA ROW BAHADUR.
(„) RAJAH VENKATADRY APPA ROW BAHADUR.
(„) RAJAH NARAYA APPA ROW BAHADUR.

Witnesses.
(Signed) VELLCNKY SCRA ROW.
(„) KOTAGIRI SESHAYA.

This is written in the handwriting of Kavepurapu Vencatachellum, with the knowledge of the above witnesses.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) W. H. GLENNY,
Assistant Collector.

Translation of Extract from an Arzi submitted to G. Thornhill, Esq., Collector of the Kis'na District, by Rajah Venkatadry Appa Row Bahadur, Zemindar of Chavendra Muttah, dated 2nd March 1865.

* * * *

The Government was pleased to say in regard to the unjust acts done to me from the first, that they would redress my grievances, but things to the contrary having taken place, I was at last compelled to submit a Memorial to His Excellency the Secretary of State, praying him to extricate me from my distress. I received your Inayetnamah, dated 24th August 1864, wherein it was stated that the Government, taking into their consideration my petitions in which I prayed that the aforesaid Memorial might be submitted to its destination through the Government, have been disposed to modify certain points contained in that Memorial; and that they accordingly held Proceedings, No. 1,354, on the 29th July 1865, desiring your honor to ascertain whether I am willing that the above points should be modified, and if so, to report the matter to them. I have noted the contents of the aforesaid Inayetnamah, and beg to state the following circumstances, which I request your honor will take into your mature consideration.

1. With respect to the first point, I beg to state that the former Peishcush fixd on Sreeramavaram having been too high, sufficient profit was not derived to meet the demand. The Government therefore sold it. This village was made over to me in Fusly 1247. When it was made over to me, Rupees 530, being half of the full Peishcush, were fixed on the same. Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Memorial will shew the profit derived from the village, and the sums paid by me on account of Peishcush. The village did not yield enough to meet half of the Beriz. The Government attached it for Rupees 500 and odd. The village having been retained under Government management for thirty months, arrears accumulated to the amount of Rupees 1,200 and odd. Government sold it for Rupees 1,700 and odd. The fact of even Rupees 530 (being the annual Peishcush) not having been paid during the two and a half years of the Government management will be proved by the records.

Now it is stated that Rupees 640 on account of Peishcush, and Rupees 320 as one-third* payable to me are fixed; that these sums were determined on the average of the seventeen years during which the village had been under Government management, and that the village will be made over to me from the current year.

* Of the assets of the village.

2. It will be seen that Rupees 1,223 had been collected during the period of nine years from Fusly 1247, when the village was made over to me, up to the end of Fusly 1255, and that one-ninth of that sum would be Rupees 140.

3. If the collections, Rupees 1,223, of my nine years' management, and Rupees 16,327 of the seventeen years Government management, making in all Rupees 17,550, be apportioned on the twenty-six years, the Sist would be Rupees 650 per year. Of this the Government's two-thirds would be Rupees 432, one-third would be Rupees 216. Of this, the Zemindar's principal Revenue charges would be Rupees 150. Deducting this, there remain Rupees 66. This point also has to be considered.

4. The Government is aware of the fact of this village not yielding every year at a regular standard. I therefore pray your honor will be pleased to moderate the Peishcush (which was fixed at a high figure) so that there may remain some profit to me.

5. I pray your honor will take an indulgent view of my case, and grant me the village, fixing thereon an annual Peishcush of Rupees 350. If so, I shall ever continue paying that Peishcush to Government without difficulty, for some profit would be derived by me (after deducting charges) in years in which the yield may be good. I therefore request your honor will do me the favor and issue speedy orders on the subject.

6. With respect to the Peishcush on the Chavandra Muttah, my request was that Rupees 4,738 might be fixed as Peishcush agreeably to the account determined by Mr. Porter. So far from acceding to that request, your honor has stated that ten years' average will be taken into calculation out of the years from 1855, when the village was made over to me, up to the present time; and that if any increase is then found, it will be considered, and on the examination of correct accounts the Peishcush will be determined, regard being had to the views of Government.

7. I stated that Mr. Elliot deviating from the Peishcush fixed by Mr. Porter, increased the Peishcush on my Muttah by a sum of Rupees 450 per year, and prayed that the difference might be inquired into, and the amount, which may appear from your records to have been augmented, be reimbursed to me, and that orders might be issued to continue receiving from me henceforth that amount only. I never requested Government to fix the Peishcush with reference to the present out-turn.

8. I, therefore, now also pray your honor will take the matter into your consideration, and fix the same Beriz which was determined by the late Collector Mr. Porter.

* * * *

(True Translation.)

(Signed) W. H. GLENNY,
Assistant Collector.

A.—Statement shewing the Demand, Collection, and Charges of the villages of Tangelamudy Estate for Fuslies 1264 to 1273.

Fuslies.	Number of villages.	Land Revenue.				Ready-money collections, inclusive of the Cuttubady on Mokhasa villages.	Total.	Deduct ready-money allowances, &c.
		Assessment on dry lands.	Assessment on wet lands, inclusive of the Seri lands of the Zemindar.	Assessment on garden lands.	Total.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1264	8	875 12 0	11,227 9 6	155 0 6	12,258 6 0	4,502 15 7	16,761 5 7	188 0 0
1265	8	910 12 0	2,013 9 2	284 0 9	3,208 5 11	1,805 11 7	5,014 1 6	175 11 0
1266	8	485 9 3	9,677 9 0	11 9 6	10,174 11 9	4,235 6 11	14,410 2 8	190 9 0
1267	8	806 11 3	1,459 1 0	197 12 6	2,463 8 9	1,675 15 9	4,139 8 6	170 0 0
1268	8	875 11 0	8,574 13 6	57 5 9	9,507 14 3	3,820 6 9	13,328 5 0	201 0 0
1269	8	884 7 0	374 11 0	68 1 6	3,827 3 6	2,159 2 6	5,986 6 0	188 0 0
1270	8	1,258 5 3	7 [illegible] 5 0	32 5 0	9,112 15 3	3,391 13 0	12,504 12 3	201 0 0
1271	8	966 11 6	[illegible] 8 6	18 3 3	12,127 7 3	4,408 5 3	16,535 12 6	201 0 0
1272	8	1,268 10 9	[illegible] 15 9	197 5 0	6,853 15 6	2,807 5 3	9,661 4 9	188 0 0
1273	8	1,313 12 8	8,820 9 0	65 14 3	10,200 3 11	3,856 12 6	14,057 0 5	226 8 0
Total...	.....	9,646 6 8	69,000 11 5	1,087 10 0	79,734 12 1	32,663 15 1	1,12,398 11 2	1,929 12 0
Average...	.....	964 10 3	6,900 1 2	108 12 2	7,973 7 7	3,266 6 4	11,239 13 11	192 15 7

A.—Statement shewing the Demand, Collection, and Charges, &c.—(*Concluded.*)

Fuslies.	Remaining Jummahbundy Beriz.	Of which collected			Balance.	Assessment on subsequent Inams enjoyed by the Inamdars.	Charges	
		Within the end of Fusly.	Subsequent collection to the end of Fusly 1273.	Total.			On account of Maramut.	Peishcush.
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1264	16,573 5 7	15,505 5 2	40 8 6	16,545 13 8	27 7 11	290 4 5	4,793 10 4	5,591
1265	4,838 6 6	4,720 15 7	44 10 3	4,765 9 10	72 12 8	260 7 1	1,113 11 5	5,591
1266	14,219 9 8	13,593 5 2	492 7 3	14,085 12 5	133 13 3	52 6 0	2,059 15 8	5,591
1267	3,969 8 6	3,911 15 9	8 3 0	3,920 2 9	49 5 9	63 5 9	385 13 2	5,591
1268	13,127 5 0	12,632 11 11	449 6 3	13,082 2 2	45 2 10	161 3 9	1,041 0 11	5,591
1269	5,798 6 0	5,614 6 6	158 4 9	5,772 11 3	25 10 9	91 0 3	811 0 8	5,591
1270	12,303 12 3	12,120 0 8	145 9 6	12,265 10 2	38 2 1	137 1 3	551 8 6	5,591
1271	16,334 12 6	12,160 13 3	4,002 0 6	16,162 13 9	171 14 9	334 11 9	191 6 10	5,591
1272	9,473 4 9	8,560 5 10	711 2 5	9,271 8 3	201 12 6	138 12 9	163 7 9	5,591
1273	13,830 8 5	13,396 14 10	248 4 9	13,645 3 7	185 4 10	211 5 6	1,162 8 6	5,591
Total...	1,10,468 15 2	1,02,216 14 8	6,300 9 2	1,09,517 7 10	951 7 4	1,740 10 6	12,274 3 9	55,910
Average...	11,046 14 4	10,221 11 1	630 0 11	10,951 11 11	95 2 4	174 1 1	1,227 6 9	5,591

COCANADA,
13th December 1864.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Officiating Collector.

B.—Statement shewing the average Collections, Deductions, and Peishcush proposed for the Estate of Tangelamudy, in the Godavery District.

Average collections of ten years, from Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273.	Deduct at sixteen per cent. on the collections for variation of season and cost of collections.	Remaining.	Deduct Maramut charges.	Remaining assets.	Proposed Government Peishcush at two-thirds of the assets.	One-third of the assets on account of allowance to the Zemindars.
Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
10,951 11 11	1,752 4 6	9,199 7 5	1,227 6 9	7,972 0 8	5,314 4 1	2,657 5 7

COCANADA,
13*th December* 1864.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Officiating Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Petition.

1. In their Order, dated 29th July 1864, Government, on the recommendation of the Board, directed that the village of Streeramavaram should be offered to the Zemindar on a Peishcush of Rupees 6,405, being two-thirds of the average collections from Fusly 1256 to Fusly 1272 when the village was under Government management. The Board see no reason to propose any reduction in the Peishcush. The Zemindar's statement of the out-turn of the village from Fusly 1247 to Fusly 1255 is on the face of it untrustworthy, shewing nine successive bad seasons! The period of seventeen years taken by the Board and Government is long enough to secure a fair average of seasons. The Collector does not state what the village has yielded since Fusly 1272.

2. The Zemindar's desire to have the village of Chanubanda, in the Kistna district, in lieu of Streeramavaram, which is in the Godavery, would be reasonable enough were it not that he already has the Thengalamudy Muttah in the latter district. If, as the Board presume, Streeramavaram was while Chanubanda was not in his possession formerly, they would not recommend any change.

3. The Thengalamudy and Chevendra Muttahs were acquired in lieu of a pension of Rupees 7,200 per annum, and the Board in paragraph 6 of the Proceedings, dated 27th April 1864, stated that the proprietor was "fairly entitled" to derive an annual net profit of this amount; but on a review of all the circumstances, the Board see reason to alter this opinion. The petitioner's grandfather Narasimha Row claimed a share as a younger son in the Nuzid and Nedadavole estates, and when in 1802 these estates were made over to his elder brothers, his claims were either unintentionally overlooked or purposely ignored. The Court of Directors declared him entitled only to maintenance, and directed him to sue for this, giving him, meanwhile, a pension of Rupees 800 per annum. Ultimately in 1836 it was arranged that the Zemindars of Nuzid and Nedadavole should pay him, the former 200 and the latter 400 Rupees per annum, and the Government allowance then ceased. The Nuzid Zemindar failed to pay regularly, and in 1846 he ceded to petitioner the Chevendra Muttah in satisfaction of his share of the

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd February 1868.

maintenance allowance and the arrears which had then accrued, Rupees 18,470. The Thengalamudy Muttah* was acquired in a similar way from the Nedadavole Zemindar. The Board do not consider under these circumstances that *Government* are bound to maintain petitioner's net receipts from these Muttahs at a minimum of 7,200 Rupees per annum, as they themselves accepted them twenty years ago in full acquittance of their claims which were on them, *not* on Government.

* With seven other villages.

4. When these and certain other arrangements were carried out, the Peishcush was apportioned according to the actual collections of the previous twelve years, which is in accordance with the principle laid down in Regulation XXVI. of 1802.

5. The actual collection in Thengalamudy averaged Rupees 6,109, and the quota of Peishcush devolving on it was Rupees 5,591. The proprietor's share was thus only 518 Rupees per annum. The return now submitted gives the average collections of the ten years, Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273, as Rupees 10,951, so that the proprietor now has as his own share, Rupees 5,360, or rather more than ten times what he expected to receive when he accepted the Muttah from his relative. Were the Muttah now to be assessed, and the large proportion of one-third left to the proprietor, his Peishcush would be Rupees 7,300, instead of Rupees 5,591.

6. The Chevendra Muttah had a Peishcush allotted to it of Rupees 5,217, the actual collections having been Rupees 5,701, and the proprietor's share consequently only Rupees 484. The accounts were unfortunately destroyed during the cyclone, and there are therefore no means of ascertaining the present value of the property. It is not, however, alleged that the estate now yields less than it formerly did, and this is extremely improbable.

7. There can be no doubt that the plan on which the Commissioner, Northern Circars, apportioned the Peishcush, viz., according to the actual collections of preceding years, was not only in strict accordance with the law, but also more equitable than that proposed by the Collector Mr. Porter, who wished to do it according to the assets at the time of the permanent settlement. It is this plan to which petitioners wish now to revert, and compliance with their request would involve a corresponding enhancement of the Peishcush on the rest of the estate. Moreover, if the Peishcush was unduly high on any of the sub-divided portions, the parties concerned ought to have complained within the ample period (ten years) allowed for the purpose by Regulation I. of 1819.

8. In this view of the pension, and looking at the necessity of putting a stop to the re-opening of cases long since settled, the Board recommend Government to reject this application.

9. It is to be remarked that it has not been stated what extent of culturable waste each estate comprises, or what are its capabilities in respect of soil, irrigation, &c. But this is most important, for in the grant of a Zemindary it is not merely the share of the receipts at the time of the Settlement which is to be regarded as the

valuable property assigned, but those further increments to be expected reasonably enough from a Zemindar's good management and outlay of capital, and the increasing prosperity of the people whose destinies were intrusted to him.

No. 35. ORDER THEREON, 3rd February 1868, No. 297.

Land Revenue.

1. The Government concur in opinion with the Board that no good ground is shewn for reducing the Peishkush of the village of Striramaveram below two-thirds of the average collections of the seventeen years, from Fusly 1256 to Fusly 1272, during which the village was under Government management; but with reference to the reason assigned by the Board for not entertaining the petitioner Venkatadri Appa Raw's request, that the village of Chanubanda may be granted instead of Striramaveram for reasons of personal convenience, the Government observe that the Board are apparently in error in stating that the petitioner already possesses the Tungalamudi Mootah, in the Godavery District, and therefore can have no difficulty in managing a village in the same locality.

2. The Mootah named fell to the share of petitioner's deceased brother, Simhadri Appa Row, and is now apparently in the possession of the widow of the latter, although the reversion belongs to the petitioner, as his brother left no issue. Petitioner's Mootah is in the Kistna District, and Chanubanda is near his residence.

3. Under these circumstances, and as the village of Striramaveram has not been in the possession of the family since 1847, when it was sold for arrears, the Government deem the application of the petitioner deserving of consideration.

4. It is observed from paragraph 7 of the Acting Collector's letter, dated 24th October 1863, in Board's Proceedings, No. 7,834, dated 11th December 1863, that when Striramaveram was made over to petitioner and his brother in 1837, with the avowed purpose of bettering their position, it bore a Peishkush of Rupees 1,061, based on an average out-turn of Rupees 1,800, the actual collections in several of the years included in the series having exceeded Rupees 2,500, and in one year been as much as Rupees 3,769.

5. The village was in a very depressed state when it was made over to the family, but a remission of Peishkush was granted for some years with the express object of giving it time to recover, and there seems no reason to doubt that the Government relied on its ultimately producing to the family as good an income as it had done to the former proprietor.

6. This expectation was not fulfilled; but it seems not unreasonable to allow weight to the above considerations now that the question of re-assigning the village has to be decided.

7. The particulars for the village are furnished only down to Fusly 1272, and it is probable that the collections have increased in the later years.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd February 1868.

8. The particulars given in the present report for the village of Chanubanda come down to Fusly 1275, and shew average receipts of Rupees 2,036, two-thirds of which would be Rupees 1,357, or Rupees 296 more than the original Peishkush of Striramaveram, representing an additional income of Rupees 148 to the Zemindar, if granted on that tenure.

9. This difference in value is not such as to affect the question materially, and the Government are therefore disposed to meet the petitioner's wishes in this respect.

10. As regards the request for the re-assessment of the Peishkush of the Chavendra and Tungallamudi Mootahs, which originally formed part of the Nedadavole Zemindari, assigned to petitioner's uncle as one of the representatives of the ancient Zemindars of Nuzid, the request being based on asserted inequality in the apportionment of the Peishkush when the Nedadavole estate was sub-divided, the Government observe that the Collector's reason for recommending in 1849, that the valuation should be based on the collections of the items entered in the Circuit Committee's Report, was that the Zemindar had, subsequently to the permanent settlement, made extensive alienations of revenue by granting Inams and grain allowances in perpetuity, and remitting sundry items of demand to the detriment of his successors, and the Collector accordingly proceeded to re-assess in account all these unauthorized alienations as if no such changes had taken place, the result being to place on the Chavendra and Tungallamudi Mootahs a lower relative value as compared with the other divisions of the estate than they would have held if the value of the alienations had been excluded from the calculation.

11. The Commissioner for the Northern Circars, however, adopted the actual collections of the twelve years preceding the sub-division, as the basis for the valuation, thereby relieving the Pentapad Purgana (which has since come into the hands of Government) at the expense of the other divisions, and the Board observe that this procedure was in accordance with the principle laid down in Regulation XXVI of 1802.

12. That Regulation requires (Section 6) that the amount of the permanent revenue assessed on each division shall bear the same proportion to the actual value of such division, as the total amount of the permanent land tax may bear to the total actual value of the entire lands previously to such division, and it seems open to discussion whether the exclusion of the value of unauthorized alienations from the estimate of the assets was in accordance with this principle.

13. Considering, however, the reasons assigned by the Commissioner Northern Circars for the course adopted by him, viz., the impossibility of accurately valuing either the alienations or the assets on the Collector's mode of proceeding, and the understanding on which the parties interested had accepted their shares at the then actual value to the Nedadavole Zemindar, as well as the length of time that has elapsed since the apportionment was made in 1849, and the fact that petitioner and his brother allowed more than the ten years limited by law for appeal to elapse before they raised the question in their Memorial of July 1860, the Government are not disposed to re-open the question. At the same time they are not altogether

prepared to adopt the Board's argument, that the result of the apportionment in 1849 left the petitioner and his brother in the same position which they expected to occupy when they accepted the Mootahs in 1846, in satisfaction of their claims on the Zemindars, and the circumstance seems deserving of weight in deciding on the petitioner's request to have the village of Chanubanda in lieu of Striramaveram, especially as the Purgana of Pentapad, which is now in the hands of Government, alone benefited by the system of apportionment which was adopted.

14. Under all the circumstances of the case, the Government resolve to authorize the Collector to make over to the petitioner, Venkatadri Appa Row, the village of Chanubanda, in lieu of Striramaveram, on a permanent yearly Peishkush of Rupees 1,357, on petitioner's agreeing in writing to accept the arrangement in full satisfaction of the claims put forward by him.

15. In the event of his consenting to this arrangement, the Collector will cause a Sunnud to be prepared for execution in the same form as that which was formerly given for the village Striramaveram, and forward it to the Board for submission, with their remarks, to Government.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

D

B.—Statement showing the average Collections, Deductions, and Peishcush proposed for the Estate of Tangellamudy, in the Godavery district.

Average collections of ten years, from Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273.	Deduct at 16 per cent. on the collections for variation of season and cost of collections.	Remaining.	Deduct Maramut charges.	Remaining assets.	Proposed Government Peishcush at two-thirds of the assets.	One-third of the assets on account of allowance to the Zemindars.
Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
10,951 11 11	1,752 4 6	9,199 7 5	1,227 6 9	7,972 0 8	5,315 4 1	2,657 5 7

COCANADA,
13th December 1861.

(Signed) J. FRASER,
Officiating Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Petition.

1. In their Order, dated 29th July 1864, Government on the recommendation of the Board directed that the village of Streeramavaram should be offered to the Zemindar on a Peishcush of Rupees 6,40[illegible] being two-thirds of the average collections from Fusly 1256 to Fusly 1272 when the village was under Government management. The Board see no reason to propose any reduction in the Peishcush. The Zemindar's statement of the outturn of the village from Fusly 1247 to Fusly 1255 is on the face of it untrustworthy, showing nine successive bad seasons! The period of 17 years taken by the Board and Government is long enough to secure a fair average of seasons. The Collector does not state what the village has yielded since Fusly 1272.

2. The Zemindar's desire to have the village of Chanubanda in the Kistna district, in lieu of Streeramavaram which is in the Godavery, would be reasonable enough were it not that he already has the Thengalamudy Muttah in the latter district. If, as the Board presume, Streeramaveram was while Chanubanda was not in his possession formerly, they would not recommend any change.

3. The Thengalamudy and Chevendra Muttahs were acquired in lieu of a pension of Rupees 7,200 per annum, and the Board in paragraph 6 of the Proceedings, dated 27th April 1861, stated that the proprietor was "fairly entitled" to derive an annual net profit of this amount; but on a review of all the circumstances, the Board see reason to alter this opinion. The petitioner's grandfather Narasimha Row claimed a share as a younger son in the Nuzid and Nedadavole estates, and when in 1802 these estates were made over to his elder brothers, his claims were either unintentionally overlooked or purposely ignored. The Court of Directors declared him entitled only to maintenance, and directed him to sue for this, giving him, meanwhile, a pension of Rupees 800 per annum. Ultimately in 1836 it was arranged that the Zemindars of Nuzid and Nedadavole should pay him, the former 200 and the latter 100 rupees per annum, and the Government allowance then ceased. The Nuzid Zemindar failed to pay regularly, and in 1846 he ceded to petitioner the Chevendra Muttah in satisfaction of his share of the maintenance allowance and the arrears which had then accrued, Rupees 18,470. The Thengalamudy Muttah* was acquired in a similar way from the Nedadavole Zemindar. The Board do not consider under these circumstances that *Government* are bound to maintain petitioner's net receipts from these Muttahs at a minimum of 7,200 rupees per annum, as they themselves accepted them 20 years ago in full acquittance of their claims which were on them, *not* on Government.

* With seven other villages.

4. When these and certain other arrangements were carried out, the Peishcush was apportioned according to the actual collections of the previous twelve years, which is in accordance with the principle laid down in Regulation XXVI. of 1802.

5. The actual collection in Thengalamudy averaged Rupees 6,109, and the quota of Peishcush devolving on it was Rupees 5,591. The proprietor's share was thus only 518 rupees per annum. The Return now submitted gives the average collections of the ten years, Fusly 1264 to Fusly 1273, as Rupees 10,951, so that the proprietor now has as his own share, Rupees 5,360, or rather more than ten times what he expected to receive when he accepted the Muttah from his relative. Were the Muttah now to be assessed and the large proportion of one-third left to the proprietor, his Peishcush would be Rupees 7,300, instead of Rupees 5,591.

6. The Chevendra Muttah had a Peishcush allotted to it of Rupees 5,217, the actual collections having been Rupees 5,701, and the proprietor's share consequently only Rupees 484. The accounts were unfortunately destroyed during the cyclone, and there are therefore no means of ascertaining the present value of the property. It is not, however, alleged that the estate now yields less than it formerly did, and this is extremely improbable.

7. There can be no doubt that the plan on which the Commissioner, Northern Circars, apportioned the Peishcush, viz., according to the actual collections of preceding years, was not only in strict accordance with the law, but also more equitable than that proposed by the Collector Mr. Porter, who wished to do it according to the assets at the time of the permanent settlement. It is this plan to which petitioner wish now to revert, and compliance with their request would involve a corresponding enhancement of the Peishcush on the rest of the estate. Moreover, if the Peishcush was unduly high on any of the sub-divided portions, the parties concerned ought to have complained within the ample period (ten years) allowed for the purpose by Regulation I. of 1819.

8. In this view of the pension, and looking at the necessity of putting a stop to the reopening of cases long since settled, the Board recommend Government to reject this application.

9. It is to be remarked that it has not been stated what extent of culturable waste each estate comprises, or what are its capabilities in respect of soil, irrigation, &c. But this is most important, for in the grant of a Zemindary it is not merely the share of the receipts at the time of the settlement which is to be regarded as the valuable property assigned, but those further increments to be expected reasonably enough from a Zemindar's good management and outlay of capital, and the increasing prosperity of the people whose destinies were intrusted to him.

(True Copies and Extract.)

W. Bulkley
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with Petition

Copy to the Collector of the Kistna district.

Exd. T. Cartledge.

Rev. 1857. Department

No. 2575.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 17th August 1857.

No. 5,227.

Recommending that application of Zemindar Venkatndry Appa Row for the grant to him at a reduced Peishcush of the village of Sreeramavaram in Kistna District and for the reduction of Peishcush on Chevendra Muttah may be rejected

In 1853, Sundaray Appa Rao and Venkatadri Appa Rao presented a Memorial for transmission to the Secretary of State in which they requested:

I. That the village of Sriramavaram might be permanently restored to them on half Peishcush, or another village given.

II. That the Peishcush on the Mustahs of Gollamudi & Chevendra might be reduced

III. That a 5th village might be granted them as originally promised.

In their order thereon of 20th July, 1853 No 1,344 Govt reviewed the whole of Peddi case, which was briefly as follows:

On the introduction of the Permanent Settlement the Zamindari of Nuzeed which had been sequestered prior to 1802 was restored divided into two parts, one of which the Pedadasole Zamindari was given to the Son of the late Zamindar by his 1st wife, and the other the Nuzeed Estate went to the eldest Son of the 2nd wife. By this arrangement, Narasimha Appa Rao the 2nd Son of the 2nd wife, a Father of Peddi was left unprovided for.

After many attempts to resist Narasimha Appa Rao, Govt finally in 1830 referred the whole case to the Court of Directors, who remarked thereon that

that "Narasimha Appa Rao has no well-founded claim to a portion of the Zamindari, but merely to maintenance; & they directed him to sue for this in the Courts giving him meanwhile a pension of ₹ 600 per mensem.

In 1836 it was arranged after some negotiation that the Zamindar of Rajahmundry should pay the Peshcush (their father Narasimha Appa Rao having died) ₹ 600 per mensem & present them with ₹ 6,000 on condition of being released from all past demands.

In reporting this the Bd recommended that Govt should assist the Petrs by bestowing the village of Rajaveherla on Subhadri Appa Rao as a Surva Mokasa, and granting them the village of Sriramavaram subject to a Permanent Assessment. The Bd also proposed that half of the permanent Jumma of the latter village should be abated for 5 years. Govt acquiesced, & the arrangement was finally sanctioned by the late Ct of Directors in 1840.

In 1846 the Rajah Zamindar having fallen into arrears of maintenance, ceded to Petrs the Chavedi & Mutah in satisfaction of his share of maintenance allowance & the arrears. The Hereditary Mutah was acquired in a similar way from the Nedadavole Zamindar.

In 1843 the arrears against the village of Sriramavaram amounted to ₹ 2,023-4-1, & as the annual collections had fallen far short of even the reduced Jumma; the Bd recommended remission of the arrears, & the grant of the village on the same terms for another 5 years. To this Govt assented but warned Petrs that any further failure would entail sale of the Prop[t]. Accordingly in 1847 the village having again fallen into arrears, the village was put up to sale & purchased by Govt.

Govt having thus reviewed the former circumstances of the case called upon the Bd to report 1st if there was reason to suppose that the Peshcush of Sriramavaram was originally fixed at too high a rate; 2nd If the Peshcush of the two Mutas was as alleged too high.
3rd If Petrs had any claim to a 3rd village.

Before the Bd's report was received Venkatadri Appa Rao in 1853 presented a 2nd Memorial reporting his brother's death & making two new requests: viz
1st That he might be relieved from responsibility for all liabilities.
2nd That the Jaghire Village of Rajaveherla might be exempted from tax.
This was forwarded to the Bd for report.

(G.O. 27 Nov. 1863 No 2,147)

On the 27th April, 1864 the Bd submitted their report, which was to the following effect—
1st It seemed clear that the Peshcush originally fixed on Sriramavaram was considerably higher than was warranted by the assets & therefore recommended that it should be offered to the Zamindar in lieu of Peshcush of ₹ 6,401 being ⅔ of the average collections of 13 years.
2nd That the rates of Peshcush adopted for the 2 Mutas were in their opinion too high; and as they considered that the proprietor was fairly entitled to derive an annual net profit of ₹ 7,200 (inasmuch as they were granted in lieu of a monthly allowance of ₹ 600) from them, they recommended a careful valuation of the assets of the villages in order to adjust the Peshcush.
3rd That there was nothing to show that was ever in contemplation to grant a 3rd village.
4th & 5th That Petrs 4th & 5th requests were inadmissible & inexpedient.

(G.O. 27th July 1864, 1,357)

Govt accordingly authorized the Bd to offer the village of Sriramavaram to Petrs on the terms suggested: & to institute an enquiry into the assets of the Devalamma & Chevedi

Revenue Despatch

No. 297.

Proceedings of the Madras Govt. under date the 3rd February 1868.

Read the following

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Recommending that application of Venkatadry Appa Row for the grant to him at a reduced Peishkush of the village of Shiroomaveedrum in Palnad district, and for the reduction of Peishkush on Chevendra Muttah may be rejected.

(Here enter 17th August 1867, No. 6,327).

I would accept the Petitioner's proposition with the following modifications. I think that the remuneration of the Revenue Inspectors and Tahsildars should be regulated on the net collections of the village, and not on the Peishkush. I would also suggest that the Inspectors should be required to report on the state of cultivation, and the condition of the ryots, and the Boards should be empowered to grant remissions in the Peishkush in cases where they may consider it necessary.

W.D.L.

The Govt. concur in opinion with the Board that no good ground is shown for reducing the Peishkush of the village of Shiroomaveedrum below two-thirds of the average collections of the 17 years from Fasly 1206 to Fasly 1272 - during which the village was under Govt. management - but with reference to the reasons assigned by the Board for not entertaining the Petitioners Venkatadri Appa Rao's request that the villa-

IV

Installs. The other requests were rejected & Govt. declined to forward the Memorial presented in 18[illegible].

The Bd. now submit a further report from which it appears that Petr. requests that the Peishcush may be still further reduced, or another village in the Kistna District granted him in exchange. The Bd. would reject both requests on the ground that a period of 17 years which was taken in fixing the Peishcush is long enough to secure a fair average of collections, & that no adequate reason is given for an exchange.

In a review of the circumstances under which Petr. acquired the Installs of Tengadi & Chevendra, the Bd. see reason to change the opinion expressed in their former report viz. that Petr. is fairly entitled to an annual net profit of Rs. 3,200 inasmuch as Petr. himself accepted the Installs from his own relatives in lieu of a yearly pension due from them not from Govt.

It appears that the Proprietor now receives as his share more than 10 times what he expected to, & actually did receive, when he accepted the Installs & that if the Installs were now to be assessed the Peishcush would have to be raised not lowered.

The Bd. therefore recommend that as the plan on which the Peishcush of the Installs was apportioned viz. according to the actual collections of preceding years, was equitable & in strict accordance with the Law, the present application be rejected.

J. Haw

* & Sriramasseram

village of Chaurubunda may be granted instead of Sthreedunaveram for reasons of personal convenience, the Govt observe that the Board are apparently in error in stating that the petitioner already possesses the Sungalamudi mootah in the Godaveiy District and therefore can have no difficulty in managing a village in the same locality.

The mootah named fell to the share of petitioner's deceased brother Linhadri Appa Row and is now apparently in the possession of the widow of the latter - although the reversion belongs to the petitioner, as his brother left no issue - Petitioner's mootah is in the Kistna district and Chaurubunda is near his residence.

Under these circumstances and as the village of Sthreedunaveram has not been in the possession of the family since 1847 when it was sold for arrears, the Govt deem the application of the petitioner deserving of consideration.

It is observed from para 7 of the Acting Collector's letter, dated 24th Octr 1863, in Board's Proc: No 7534 dated 11th Decr 1863 that when Sthreedunaveram was made over to petitioner & his brother in 1837 with the avowed purpose of bettering their position, it bore a peshkush of Rd 1,061 based on an average out-turn of Rd 1,800, the actual collections in some of the years included in the 4 years having exceeded Rd 2,500, and in one year been as much as Rd 3,769.

The village was in a very depressed state when it was made over to the family - but a remission of peshkush was granted for some years with the express object of giving it time to recover - and there seems no reason to doubt that the Govt relied on its ultimately producing to the family as good an income as it had done to the former proprietor.

This

This expectation was not fulfilled - but it seems not unreasonable to allow weight to the above considerations now that the question of re-assigning the village has to be decided -

The particulars for the village are furnished only down to Fasly 1272 and it is probable that the collections have increased in the later years -

The particulars given in the present report for the village of Chambanda come down to Fasly 1275 - and show average receipts of Rupees 2036 - two-thirds of which would be Rd 1357 - or Rupees 296 more than the original peshkush of Shirumavelacum - representing an additional income, of Rd 148 to the Zemindar, if granted on that tenure -

This difference in value

3 13

value is not such as to affect the question materially - and the Government are therefore disposed to meet the Petitioner's wishes in this respect -

As regards the request for the re-assignment of the Peshkush of the Chavendra and Tungalloomudi mootahs which originally formed part of the Nedadavole Zemindary, assigned to petitioner's uncle as one of the representatives of the ancient zemin[illegible] of Nuzid - the request being based on asserted inequality in the apportionment of the Peshkush when the Nedadavole estate was

subwised

subdivided, the Government observe that the Collectors reason for recommending in 1849. that the valuations should be based on the collections of the items entered in the Circuit Committee's report - was that the Zemindar Land, subsequently to the permanent settlement, made extensive alienations of revenue by granting Inams and grain allowances in perpetuity and remitting sundry items of demand to the detriment of his successors - and the Collector accordingly proceeded to re-assess in account all these unauthorised alienations as if no such changes had taken

taken place - the result being to place on the Calavendra and Tungabhamudi Inamdars a lower relative value as compared with the other divisions of the estate than would, if the value of the alienations ~~was~~ excluded from the calculation.

The Commissioner for the Northern Circars however adopted the actual collections of the twelve years preceding the subdivision, as the basis for the valuation thereby relieving the Pentapad pargana (which has since come into the hands of Government) at the expense of the other divisions - and the Board observe that this procedure was in accordance with the principle laid down in Regulation 26 of 1802.

The

That Regulation — Patter requires (section 6) That the amount of the permanent revenue assessed on each division shall bear the same proportion to the actual value of such division as the total amount of the — permanent Land tax may bear to the total actual value of the entire lands previously to such division — and it seems certainly open to discussion whether the exclusion of the value of unauthorised alienations from the estimate of the assets was in accordance with this principle.

Considering however — the length of time that has elapsed since the apportionment was made in 1849 — and

The reasons assigned by the Commissioner for the course adopted by him viz: the impossibility practically speaking of tracing the alienations or the Courts or the Collectors proceeding to the undoing of nearly all the settlements in Estates in which such alienations have taken place the hardship to numerous

that Petitioner and his brother allowed more than the ten year limited by law for appeal to elapse before they raised the question in their Memorial of July 1860 - the Government are not disposed to reopen the question: but at the same time they are not prepared to although the Board's argument that the result of the apportionment in 1849 left the Petitioner and his brother in the same position which they expected to occupy when they accepted the Mootabe in 1846, in satisfaction of their claims on the Zemindary — and the circumstance seems deserving of weight in deciding on the Petitioner's request to have

the

the village of Chanubanda in lieu of Shiramaveram, especially as the purgana of Pentapad which is now in the hands of Government alone benefited by the system of appointment which was adopted.

Under all the circumstances of the case, the Government resolve to authorise the Collector to make over to the Petitioner Venkatadri Appa Row the village of Chanubanda in lieu of Shiramaveram on a permanent yearly peishkush of Rs. 1,357- on Petitioner's agreeing in writing to accept the arrangement in full satisfaction of the claims put forward by him.

In the event of his consenting to this arrangement, the Collector will cause a sunnud to be prepared for execution in the same form as that which were formerly given for the village Shiramaveram and forward it to the Board for submission, with their remarks, to Government.

E. B.

14 Copies to the Board of Revenue Despatch
To Copy to the Accountant General
1 Collector of the Chatra District

S. Clerk

34-35-

27/8/68
8.9.24 11

Crimm 1868. Oct. 11
Pro: of Gaut. for Stabg

Fe 2911

Pro: of the Madras Gaut
of 3 11 February 68

Pt 11 34 & 35.

Ent Dayly Rec Comp 68

Pt 11 34 & 35

Pt 11 25/12/73