

ORDINARY, MS.

Public	DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED	27-1-93.
No.	5-3

INDEXED.*When given for copying.*

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording first Revenue
dept. agrees with the
Board of Rs in considering
that the Rajapatinaga
man taluk should not
be transferred from the
Prinsep's charge to
that of the Senior
Collector.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 7th November 1892, Mis. No. 7215 :—

Read—the following papers :—
G.O., dated 17th June 1892, Mis. No. 2874, Revenue.

Reference thereon, dated 21st June 1892.
Forwarded to the Collector of Vizagapatam for very early report.

Letter from W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Vizagapatam, 4th October 1892, No. 2910 :—

With reference to the Board's reference in Petition Register No. 2043 of 1892 on G.O., No. 2874, dated 17th June 1892, calling for a report on the suggestion made in paragraph 4 (v) of the enclosed memorial * from the inhabitants of Vizianagrum that the Gajapatinagaram taluk should

* Herewith returned.
not be removed from the charge of the Principal Assistant Collector to that of the Senior Assistant, I have the honour to observe in the first place that the inhabitants of the taluk concerned do not seem to have taken any action in the matter themselves. The memorialists are, however, right in stating that it is more convenient for its inhabitants to be under the Vizianagrum than under the Párvatipur Divisional officer, but the advantage is trifling compared with the administrative disadvantages of not apportioning the work of the two divisions as fairly as possible between the two Divisional officers.

2. The chief items of business which the inhabitants of Gajapatinagaram have had to transact at the Divisional office during the past three years have been as follows :—

Business dealt with.	1889.	1890.	1891.
Cases under the Penal Code	2	5	3
Maintenance cases	2	11	17
Security to be of good behaviour cases	..	..	5
Criminal appeals	8	9	5
Cases under Act VIII of 1865	16	7	5
Suits under Regulation VI of 1831	3	1	1

It will be seen from this that the people of the taluk have very little need indeed to resort to the Divisional office. The inconvenience which they would be put to by the change would also be much less than the memorial would lead one to suppose, as Gajapatinagaram itself is by no means the centre of the taluk. Instead of the distance of the two divisional head-quarters being 13 and 39 miles respectively, I think that 17 and 35 miles would be a more accurate statement. They would also have many

opportunities of meeting their Divisional officer without going to Párvatipur. The Senior Assistant Collector is even now frequently traversing the whole length of the Gajapatinagaram taluk, as every attendance at a Local Fund meeting involves two journeys through it and other occasions on which a visit to the district head-quarters is necessary arise from time to time. If it were under his charge he would naturally spend a good many days in it every year. The Principal Assistant Collector's work on the other hand takes him usually in a different direction, as Gajapatinagaram does not lie on the road to any other part of his charge. The inhabitants would therefore have some compensation for the extra distance to Párvatipur in the more frequent presence of the Divisional officer amongst them. Lying as it does on the great road to Párvatipur, Sálúr and Bobbili, its interests are also in every way, except as regards the ownership of the soil, far more closely connected with the Senior than with the Principal Assistant Collector's division. The absence of the Senior Assistant Collector in the Agency at times would of course be a disadvantage, but on the other hand the Principal Assistant Collector will have to devote a great deal of time to Pálkonda and will often have to stay for weeks at a time in Vizagapatam during my absence in the more remote parts of the Agency, and with a reduction in the needlessly long time which the Senior Assistant is now expected to spend in the Agency (as proposed in my Agency report No. 873, dated 21st August 1892) I do not think that there will be much to choose between the two superior officers in this respect.

3. The following table gives the average work of the two offices for the last three years :—

Business dealt with.	Vizianagrum division.	Párvatipur division.
Criminal cases	96	34
„ appeals	49	36
Suits under Act VIII of 1865	240	114
„ Regulation VI of 1831	36	14

These figures evidence amply the great disparity between the amount of business which the Divisional officers have to deal with. The work of the Vizianagrum division will also be largely increased by Pálkonda becoming a Government taluk and by the general confusion which must prevail there for the first few years owing to the absence of proper village accounts and the incompetence of the karnams.

4. On the whole I think that any small inconvenience which the people may be put to should not be allowed to outweigh the great administrative advantages of the change.

Resolution—dated 7th November 1892, Mis. No. 7215.

Submitted to Government with reference to G.O., No. 2874, dated 17th June 1892, and G.O., dated 28th March 1892, No. 299.

2. The Board as at present constituted thinks that the connection of Gajapatinagaram with the Vizianagrum division should be continued. Mr. Willock admits that “it is more convenient for its inhabitants to be under the Vizianagrum than under the Párvatipur Divisional officer,” and the figures he gives shows that both divisions are light in point of work and that the Gajapatinagaram division will add little to the cares of either officer.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with G. R. No. 3166 in original, to be
returned, and with memorial.

Copy to the Collector of Vizagapatam.

ORDER—dated 21st December 1892, No. 1286, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Government agrees with the Board of Revenue in considering that the Gajapatinagaram taluk should not be transferred from the Principal Assistant's charge to that of the Senior Assistant.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
„ the Judicial Department.
„ the Public Department.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.

80 Copies.

Public
Govt. of {1892} Madras.
REVENUE.

2-7-92 or 665 R
2-5-92. 298 mis
14-6-92 405 mis
2-6-92 no 380 mis

Cl
mis

27 Jan 93 N 5

Recorded

Cl
24/1

25/1

Issued

Recd. 21st /
Regd 23rd } Jan 93

Encl. 4 S.C.

G.O., 21st December 1892, No. 1286.

DECEMBER.

Gajapatinagaram Taluk.

Agreeing with the Board of Revenue in considering that the — should not be transferred from the Principal Assistant's charge to that of the Senior Assistant Collector.

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 18

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 18

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18, No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURE.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DETTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DETTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.

B = Not to be copied.

P = Copy abstract only.

Q = Copy heading only.