

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

P.W. Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1901	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
2815284		
Dated	15-7-1874	195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

17

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th July 1874.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 281. From Lieutenant-Colonel J. F. FISCHER, R.E., District Engineer, Godavery District, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaisheram, 9th April 1874, No. 72.

ADVERTING to paragraph 2 of the Acting Collector's letter, printed in the Revenue Department. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 665, dated the 24th March 1874, I

have the honor to solicit the attention of the Government to that officer's remark:—
"The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt," plainly implying we are not to be trusted to do justice in such a case. In the next paragraph Mr. Foster complains of Mr. Hannan, that "he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct, such insinuations would not," etc. As this is the Acting Collector's deliberate opinion, and he considers that if acted up to would be of benefit to the public service, surely the best thing he could do would be to avoid making such insinuations himself, as that a whole body of public officers cannot be trusted to treat people in a fair, equitable, and honorable manner; it is preposterous to make a complaint that something may appear to be something offensive, and in the very same letter to condemn a whole body of officers on no grounds whatever.

2. I really cannot undertake to say what Mr. Hannan actually wished to convey, but I am certain he did not intend to give offence in any way; and it would have been far more considerate to demand an explanation before taking the serious step of submitting the matter to Government.

3. As regards paragraph 4 of the letter under reference, I beg to observe no member of this department has refused to give the Mansubdar water. I distinctly refused to allow him to cut a channel through the irrigated fields of Kothapilly village (a Government village) and destroy their cultivation; but it would appear nothing else will satisfy the man; for, after getting my refusal, I heard no more about the matter for two or three years; but as usual with these people, as soon as a change takes place amongst the Revenue Officers, the old complaints are revived by the Tahsildars, and I only wonder the Mansubdar has not re-constructed the bund which Mr. Horsfall had removed with Mr. Hannan in 1869, and again attempted to take all the water away from the Government villages altogether as he had before done on an order issued by a Tahsildar who had been for many years in charge of the taluq; this proceeding is called an error of judgment, as it only involved the loss of all the supply of water to several Government villages; but the Range Officer who acted promptly and decidedly to prevent the perpetration of this gross wrong and injustice is immediately reported to Government, because in the heat of the moment, when he saw the gross injustice being done

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th July 1874.*

with the connivance of the Tahsildar, he refused to listen to the cavillings of a Vakil in the matter, and a whole body of officers are impugned in order that the pretensions of this one Mansubdar may be supported without its ever being shown that he has any right to the water at all; that Mr. Hannan's conduct did not merit any serious notice or reprobation is apparent from the fact that the Sub-Collector and Magistrate of the district was present on the spot at the time of the occurrence and did not consider it necessary to interfere.

No. 282. From the same Officer, dated Dowlaisweram, 18th April 1874,
No. 197.

With reference to paragraph 2 of this office letter No. 72, dated 10th instant, I have the honor to add, for the information of Government, that I have since spoken to Mr. Hannan on the subject of the Acting Collector's complaint, and he explains that the Board of Revenue demanded of him if the translation was a true one, and this he could not certify to as the original was sent to him without the translation the Board referred to; the papers were sent from this office exactly as received in it from the Acting Collector. I trust then the Government will be pleased to accept the explanation afforded by Mr. Hannan, as I was quite sure all along he did not intend to insinuate anything against Mr. Foster.

No. 283. Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Revenue Department,
dated 5th May 1874, No. 554.

ABSTRACT.—*Water-supply from Buradacalva, Godavery District.*—Considers that Mansubdar of Rampah is entitled to —; requests immediate adoption of measures for determining quantity of water, and for its supply; and directs that the conduct of the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, be considered in the Public Works Department.

No. 284. ORDER THEREON, 15th July 1874, No. 1,901.

IRRIGATION, No. 25.

THE District Engineer will arrange for a survey being made and a channel cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as to the Government villages. He will see further that all his Assistants and subordinates understand that it does not appertain to them but to the Revenue Officers to settle questions of right to water. All they have to do is to plan and execute the works necessary to effect the distribution decided on.

2. The Tahsildar's proceeding in issuing an order allowing the reconstruction of a bund which the Sub-Collector had caused to be removed was highly

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th July 1874.*

improper. But Mr. Hannan's proceedings in tearing up that order, and still more his written arguments in justification of them, to say nothing of his tacit insinuation that such arguments may have been misrepresented, are so unjustifiable as to require marked expression of the displeasure of Government, which the District Engineer will convey to him with a suitable warning.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Godavery.
.. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
.. Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

No. 72

GODAVERY DISTRICT.

DISTRICT ENGINEER'S OFFICE

DOWLAISHWARUM, 9th April 1874

FROM

Lieut. Col. J. Fischer R.E.
DISTRICT ENGINEER,
GODAVERY DISTRICT.

TO

Colonel G. W. Walker R.E.

*Secretary to Government P.W.D.
Madras.*

Encls.

Sir,

Adverting to para 2 of the Acting
Collector's letter, printed in the Proceedings
New Depart^{mt} of the Board of Revenue No. 665, dated the
24th March 1874, I have the honor to solicit
the attention of the Government to that officer's
remark, "The Public Works Department should
point out the course which they think the Channel
should take, but it should not be left to
them to decide whether justice is done both
to the Government and the Munsabdar by
the course they propose to adopt," plainly implying
we are not to be trusted to do justice in such
a case. In the next para, Mr. Foster complains
of Mr. Hanman that "he appears to insinuate
that the translation may not be correct, such
insinuations would not do", as this is the Ag
Collector's deliberate opinion and he considers
that if acted upon, would be of benefit to the
public service, surely the best thing he could
do, would be to avoid making such insi-

=unations himself, as that a whole body of public Officers cannot be trusted to treat people in a fair equitable and honorable manner, it is preposterous to make a complaint that something may appear to be something offensive, and in the very same letter to condemn a whole body of officers on no grounds whatever.

2 I really cannot undertake to say what Mr. Hannan actually wished to convey, but I am certain he did not intend to give offence ⁱⁿ any way, and it would have been far more considerate to demand an explanation before taking the serious step of submitting the matter to Government.

3 As regards para 4 of the letter under reference I beg to observe no member of this Department has refused to give the Mausebar water. I distinctly refused to allow him to cut a Chamel (this the irrigated fields of Nathapilly village / a Government Village / and destroy their cultivation, but it would appear nothing else will satisfy the man, for, after getting my refusal I heard no more about the matter for 2 or 3 years, but as usual with these people, as soon as a change takes place amongst the Revenue Officers, the old complaints are revived by the Tashildars, and I only wonder the Mausebar has not re-constructed the bund which Mr. Horsfall had removed with Mr.

Hannan in 1869, and again attempted to take all the water away from the Government Villages altogether as he had before done on an order issued by a Tashildar who had been for many years in charge of the Taluk. This proceeding is called an error of judgment as it only involved the loss of all

the supply of water to several Government Villages; but the Range Officer who acted promptly & decided to prevent the perpetration of this gross wrong and injustice, is immediately reported to Government, because in the heat of the moment when he saw the gross injustice being done with the connivance of the Tashildar, he refused to listen to the cavillings of a Vakeel in the matter, and a whole body of officers are impugned in order that the pretensions of this one Mausebar may be supported without its even being shewn that he has any rights to the water at all. That Mr. Hannan's conduct did not merit any serious notice or reprobation is apparent from the fact that the Sub Collector and Magistrate of the District was present on the spot at the time of the occurrence and did not consider it necessary to interfere.

I have the honor to be,
Your Most Obedt Servant,
Wm. Fisher Esq. ^{Secy}
District Engineer & Surveyor

No. 197

From.

Sir Col. J. T. Fischer R.E.

District Engineer

Godavery District

To.

Colonel G. H. Walker R.E.

Secretary to Government D. P. W.

MADRAS

Sir,

With reference to para 2 of this Office letter No 72 dated 10th Instants, I have the honor to add for the information of Government that I have since spoken to Mr. Hannan on the subject of the Acting Collector's complaint, and he explained that the Board of Revenue demanded of him if the translation was a true one, and this he could not certify to as the original was sent to him without the translation the Board referred to; the papers were sent from this Office exactly as received in it from the Acting Collector; I trust then the Government will be pleased to accept the explanation afforded by Mr. Hannan as I was quite sure all along he did not intend to insinuate any

Recd 18th April 1874
 The District Engineer
 Godavery

The Secretary to
 Government D.P.W.

Dated 29th April 1874
 18th April 1874
 Received 16th May 1874

Offered to be remanded
 on the letter of the Dy.
 Collector of the District

Presented to Revenue
 Board's proceedings
 No 65 dated 24th March 1874

Regarding the supply of
 water to the village of

Manikadur of

Manikadur

E. O. No. 1301. 15-7-74

1874

District Engineer, Jamaica

Despatch to Army ^{1 May/74} 25 Oct/74

133

Department of
Public Works
to the Honorable Member
of the Board of Public Works
and Robinson on Board's Proceedings dated
24th March 1874 N. 665, passing orders for claims
of Mansubdar of Rampah and of Kotapally
rights to water supply from Pinnadaculua in
Godavery District and bringing to notice the
conduct of Range Officer Mr. Hannan in tearing
up an order issued by Tahsildar on this subject.

The Mansubdar is evidently entitled
to water and measures should be adopted
at once to determine the quantity and supply
it or enable him to procure it.

The part of Board's Proceedings relating
to Mr. Hannan should be transferred to the
Department Public Works. He should I think
be sent out of the District at once. He seeks to
make out that he tore up the Tahsildar's
letter in a moment of irritation. but it will
be seen that he wrote and told the Mansub-
dar that the Revenue authorities had no
jurisdiction in the matter and therefore their
communications had been destroyed? This
taut insinuation that the collector may have
forwarded

15B 5
forwarded in incorrect translation of this
letter is an aggravation of his conduct.
Colonel Fisher is to be blamed for not
having rebuked his subordinate for his
gross and wanton impertinence.
I think it is for the better.

Discredit is the lightest punishment
that Government can award - but I
propose no more, because I do not
know whether Mr. Hannan is a good
Officer and has done good work.

Signed J. D. S.
25/4

Agreed
Signed W. D. S.
5/5

True copy
Michael Campbell

Under Secy to Govt

Comp. [Signature]

173 5

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

Read the following:—

No. 73. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th March 1874,
No. 665.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of
the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of
Revenue, dated Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

WITH reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,591, dated
16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of
7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the
letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District
Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share
of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works
Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take,
but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the
Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel
must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not
entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to
the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer
acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my
translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be
correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought
not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves
whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector,
Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first
instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that
the Mansubdar should not have any water.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October
1873, No. 2,099.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd Septem-
ber 1873, No. 383.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English
translation.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 29th January 1874,
No. 25.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.

Handwritten notes:
15. 7/15 July/74
2. 8/11/283
3. 29/6/74
4. 1/7/74

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

CERTAIN villages belonging to the Rampah Mansubdar and certain villages belonging to Government obtain water from the Buradaculva and it has been decided that the Mansubdar has a right to "a sufficient" quantity of water for his tanks, but cannot obtain it by damming the stream above the Government villages.

2. The Mansubdar threw a bund across the stream in 1868, and the Sub-Collector in deciding that he had no right to do so directed him to get his water "as heretofore from a channel taking off from the Buradaculva above the Puttamimidoddi anicut."

3. When the case was first reported to the Board it was represented that the Mansubdar had been in the habit of getting his water by throwing a bund across the stream, and that when this was prohibited he was promised the use of the old channel as a kind of compensation. Both these points are now disputed but the papers leave no room for doubt that the Mansubdar had often thrown a temporary dam across the stream, and that when his right to erect a substantial dam was decided against he was induced to believe that "a sufficient" supply of water would be secured in some other way. It appears that the old channel in its present state does not convey enough water to the Mansubdar's tank, and that the District Engineer has told the Mansubdar not to deepen or widen it because he will injure land belonging to the village of Kottapally, through which the channel passes, in doing so, and has pointed out to him another line. The Mansubdar objects to this other line as too expensive, but is ready to pay compensation for land taken up in widening the old channel.

4. So far as the Board can judge the Mansubdar has a right to get water from the old channel, and Government ought in good faith to help him. The Collector and District Engineer should endeavour to arrange the matter in some way. If possible the old channel should be made serviceable and the supply to the Mansubdar and Kottapally distributed by regulating sluices. If not the new line should be surveyed and marked out, but the Mansubdar must supply the necessary funds.

5. The Board resolve to report the conduct of the Range Officer Mr. Hannan for the notice of Government. When he was removing the bund above referred to, the Mansubdar's Vakeel presented an order which the Tahsildar had issued allowing the bund to be raised. This order was the result of an error of judgment, but there was no need on that account to show discourtesy to the officer who issued it. Mr. Hannan took the paper and tore it in two. The Mansubdar then wrote and asked for his reasons. Mr. Hannan replied that he tore up the document because the power of settling irrigation disputes belonged to Range Officers and the Public Works Department and not to the Collector or Tahsildar, neither of whom had any such authority. When called upon for explanation Mr. Hannan explained the tearing up of the document to some extent by stating that the Mansubdar's agent who gave it to him was impertinent and he was much provoked, but his only explanation about his most improper letter to the Mansubdar is contained in these words addressed to the District Engineer:—"The Mansubdar wrote to me some time afterwards to know why I destroyed this document and the original letter forwarded with your Memorandum

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

under reply was my answer, a translation of which Mr. Foster sent to the Board of Revenue. *I am unable to state whether it was a correct one or not as it was not sent to me.*

Not italicised original.

No. 74. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 2nd July 1873, No. 214.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith copy of Acting Head Assistant Collector (in charge of Sub-Collectorate) letter of the 19th May, No. 173, with its enclosures, copies of correspondence between that officer and the Department of Public Works relative to the repair of an irrigation channel which supplies water to the tanks of the Mansubdar of Rampah in Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages, in the Mansubdari in the Kottapalli Division.

2. It will be seen that Buradaculva, a hill stream, supplies water to the Mansubdari villages named, as also to some Government villages. The Mansubdar appears to have been in the habit of throwing a mud anicut across the calva near the entrance of his supply channel, and carry the water to his tanks. The Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, and the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, were of opinion that an anicut so thrown was improperly put up, removed it, and allowed the Mansubdar to repair and use an old irrigation channel close by. The Department of Public Works, including the District Engineer, first expressed their willingness to mark out and repair the channel so as to secure a sufficient supply of water to the Mansubdar's fields, but they latterly declined to do anything with it. Rightly or wrongly, the Mansubdar was promised the use of the old irrigation channel, and I beg to recommend that the promise be fulfilled. I therefore request the Board's sanction to this course.

3. The original award of arbitration referred to in Mr. Pearse's letter, paragraph 7, is not to be found on record, probably having been destroyed with the old records.

4. The Department of Public Works seem to think that disputes as to the irrigating of land are not cognizable by the Revenue authorities. I beg to enclose translation of Mr. Hannan's reply to the Thanedar of the Mansubdar, dated the 19th August 1869, No. 73, and the Board will notice that he has confessedly destroyed certain documents issued by the Revenue Department in regard to irrigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. L. PEARSE, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 19th May 1873, No. 173.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for your perusal, copies of correspondence which took place between this Office and the Department of Public Works on the subject of the Vernacular record, as per accompanying list enclosed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

Rampah Mansubdar being allowed to repair an old channel from the Buradacalva, a hill stream situated in the Rajahmundry Taluq, near the village of Kottapalli, and request your instructions on the subject.

2. The above Buradacalva takes its rise from the mountains in the Rampah country. The irrigation tanks of Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages belonging to the Mansubdar, and those of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Streerangapatnam, etc., Government villages, are dependent on this channel for supply of water.

3. In 1868 the Mansubdar of Rampah ran a high bund of a permanent nature across the said calva so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy-Tahsildar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper, as all the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Mansubdar, while the Tahsildar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages; whereupon Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, and Mr. Hannan, the Range Officer, inspected the channel and the bund, and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr. Horsfall directed the Mansubdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply channel, by which certain lands of Kottapalli village are watered, and which commences from the river a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, one of the anicuts across the river.

4. The Mansubdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply-channel in question, Mr. Horsfall stated, in his letter to Mr. Hannan, No. 5, dated 20th February 1871, that he was satisfied, from personal inspection, that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Mansubdar with the required quantity of water, whilst the lands of Kottapalli and other Government villages were also irrigated from that channel, and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this, Mr. Hannan, in his letter, No. 43, dated 6th May 1871, declared that he had no objection to the Mansubdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr. Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth and breadth of the channel and fall of water. Mr. Gribble permitted the Mansubdar to repair the channel in question, subject to the conditions proposed by the Range Officer, and requested Mr. Hannan to see if the Mansubdar conformed to the conditions laid down by him. Then the Mansubdar requested Mr. Gribble to have the line of the channel marked out by the Department of Public Works, and was, in reply, directed to apply to the Range Officer himself. He also petitioned the Superintending Engineer to have the channel repaired by the Department of Public Works, agreeing to bear all costs himself, and was informed by that officer that instructions had been sent to the Range Officer to order the Overseer to carry out the repairs.

5. When Mr. Stuart was at Kottapalli last year the Mansubdar's son produced before him an order from the Overseer. Finding its purport to be at variance with the Inayetnamas issued to the Mansubdar by the Superintending Engineer and Messrs. Horsfall and Gribble, he wrote a letter to Mr. Hannan on the 1st December 1871, stating that when the bund constructed by the Mansubdar was removed permission was granted to him to widen the said channel near Puttamamididoddi anicut, and that this promise should be kept if possible. He further stated that the Mansubdar was ready to pay compensation for any land required in Kottapalli for the purpose; that there was no reason to think that the widening of the channel would injure the Kottapalli lands in any appreciable degree; and that the Mansubdar would be instructed to understand that his right to the water would only commence after the want of the Kottapalli people was satisfied. The Range Officer replied on the 13th of that month that, as the channel passes through the Kottapalli lands, it is, from its head until it leaves Kottapalli lands, the property of the Kottapalli ryots, and that the Mansubdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kottapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer (*vide* translation of Mr. Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer).

6. The Mansubdar having again applied to this Office, Mr. Stuart wrote to Mr. Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for by the Mansubdar

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.*

marked out, and was, in answer, informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer, who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Mansubdar is entitled only to water drained off Kottapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Mansubdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the bund removed by the Range Officer. He has ten tanks in three villages, the main supply of which he states to be from the river. One of the documents produced is an unauthenticated copy of the decision of a Panchayet convened in 1852 under orders of the Collector. From this it appears that the water brought down by the supply channel carried from the main channel should be shared equally by the Mansubdar and the Kottapalli ryots after certain other lands of Kottapalli were irrigated. The other document is a letter addressed in 1863 to the Mansubdar by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry communicating the permission of the Supervisor to the Mansubdar to repair a certain anicut and to take water to his tanks. One of these anicuts, called Peddakurimidi, is said by the Mansubdar to be across the main channel and the same that was removed by Mr. Hannan; but the Kottapalli people say that this anicut is one across the supply channel.

8. Whatever the previous right of the Mansubdar may be, Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Hannan gave him permission, when the bund put up by him was removed, to take water through a channel dug from the main channel a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, and Mr. Stuart sees no reason to withdraw that permission. It is most probable that it was usual to put a small temporary sand or mud dam across the river at the entrance of the supply channel leading from the river to the Mansubdar's tanks, and that the Mansubdar, by making this bund so large and strong as to turn all the water, brought upon himself a prohibition from Mr. Horsfall which was more sweeping than right to have been. Mr. Stuart thinks that the Public Works Department should abide by the terms then promised to the Mansubdar by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam at this point, and should assist him in any way they can to widen the Kottapalli channel as he proposes to do.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 9.—Copies of Correspondence.

THE Board are of opinion that the promise made to the Mansubdar ought to be fulfilled if possible. They desire that the Collector will communicate with the District Engineer, and, when advised by him, report by what means it is possible to afford the Mansubdar a supply of water while the interests of the Kottapalli ryots are respected.

2. The Collector will also forward the letter (herewith returned) of the Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, to the District Engineer, and request him to obtain information from the Assistant Engineer as to whether he acknowledges that letter to be a true copy of one written by him, and whether he wishes to offer any explanation thereof.

ORDER THEREON, 5th May 1874, No. 554.

No. 75.

Miscellaneous.

THE Mansubdar is clearly entitled to water, and measures should be adopted at once to determine the

quantity and supply it or enable him to procure it.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th May 1874.

2. The subject of paragraph 5 will be considered in the Public Work Department.

(True Extract)

Trueman

for Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue

Cholera

G.O. No. 1901.15-7-74.

Water Supply from Durdiceva, Godevay District. - Considers that Municipal of Rannab is entitled to -; requests immediate adoption of measures for determining quantity of water, and for its supply; and directs that the conduct of the Public Works Department.

MAY.
Nos. 73-75.

G. O., 5th May 1874, No. 534.

Dated May 5th.
Recd. - 1-21

Encl 8.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Secy, Secy, Secy

REVENUE

G.O. 1874, No. 534
G.O. No. 11874, Secy.
2996.

proceedings in tearing up that order; and still more his written arguments in justification of them; to say nothing of his tacit insinuation that such arguments may have been misrepresented, and so unjustifiable as to require marked ^{expression} (notice) of the displeasure of Govt.

which the Govt. will convey to him with a little warning. [This will be given, with least detriment to the public service, by his removal from the district.]

I am willing to let the Govt. know.
Am 4/7

He will accordingly
be relieved as soon as
possible from his
present charge and
sent to Bangalore, in-
stead of Int Wybrow,
who will take his
place, when free
to quit Trincomopoly.

G.W.

281 - 284

281 - 284

To the D.C. Godavery ✓
" Chief Engr for Brn ✓
" Revenue Dept with Genl: ✓
1. Copies despatched to all 21/7/74.

Public Works Department
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following
From the Dy. Godavery (H.B. No. 72 of 9th April 1874)
Do Do (H.B. No. 177 of 18th April 1874)
From Madras Govt
Revenue Dept (H.B. No. 554 dated 5th May 1874)

I sent the draft in to
Mr. A. P. K. Thammam.
He showed most unbecom-
ing irritation in terms of

Order, but the same was caused by the Engineer will arrange
for a survey being
made, and a channel
cut so as to give the
proper share of water
to the Manamhadar
as well as to the
Government Village.

[Signature]

See note at end

[Signature] 1.7.

He will see further
that all his Assistants
and Subordinates under-
stand that it does
not

not appointed to them
but to the Revenue
officers to settle questions
of right & water. all
they have to do is to
plan and execute
the work necessary
to effect the distri-
bution decided on.
The Subordinate's proceed-
ing in issuing
an order allowing the
recreation out of a
land which the Sub
Collector had caused
to be removed was
highly improper and
more than an error
of judgment. But
the Range Officer's
proceedings

quite for

Mr. Hamman

proceedings

22.8-74-78

213

Referred to the Mr.
Jain, & Mr. Robinson,
with reference to H. 8. The Gov.
even's Remarks -

Mr. Hamman is a good
Officer, and had been but
a short time in the Dept.
when he committed the of-
fence an account of which
it is proposed to send him
out of the District - He
would hardly feel it as a
punishment; and another
Officer might be seriously
inconvenienced by being
moved to replace him -

+ yes - when he took
up the order - but the
letter containing the
improper intimation is dated
23 Sept last. However I do not
desire to hear the transfer
if he is suitably
can be sent
L.M.W.
30.6.74
1/4/74

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Re: the followingFrom
The St. Cyprian Godavery (There entered No. 72 dated
9th April 1874)

The Government observe that it is the business of the Revenue Officers to settle questions of right to water, and in the particular instance under notice such a settlement was made by Mr. Horsfall, and the Tahsildar's proceeding in issuing an Order allowing a bund, the removal of which Mr. Horsfall had decided to be necessary, to be re-constructed was highly improper and was much more than

an

M. J. A.

decide the Mansubdar
to be entitled, can best
be conveyed, and there-
after the Officers of
both Departments
will take care that
the arrangements
finally determined
on are duly conform-
ed to. —

by 23/4/74

C.M.W.

To
The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation
Cc — Collector of Godavery
Dy. Dist. Engineer — do —
11

Recd to Secy 1st Div 1/74

Civ 20/4/74 Rtd - 28/4/74

2976-212-
247

2996 - 2210 - 2474

Govt. of 1874 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.



To

The Dist. Engr

Madras

Dated

Recd.

Encl. /

G. O. 15-guz 1874, No. 1901

No. 281-284.

Water supply from Buradla:
Calves Godavery &c -

A survey of the — ordered to be made & a channel cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Munsabdar of Ramprab — The proceedings of the Sub Tahsildar in ordering the reconstruction of a bund considered highly improper & the expression of the disapproval of Govt. is conveyed to Mr. Res. Engr. in connection with his proceedings in the matter.