M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

**DEPARTMENT.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **G.O. No.** 1379 | **Press** ~~Mis.~~ |
| **Dated** October 10, 1859. | |

52-53

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

No. 52. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th September 1859, No. 3541.

Read letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry, dated 23rd July 1859, No. 111.

(In Con. 2nd August 1859, No. 3865.)

*In Con. 4th May* 1857, *No.* 1500. *In Con. 29th Oct.* 1858.

In the above letter the Collector of Rajahmundry furnishes the information regarding the Munsubdary of Totapully called for in Extract Minutes Consultation, 25th April 1857, and 9th October 1858, R. D., Nos. 376 and 1365.

2. The Totapully estate was made over to the eldest widow of the late Munsubdar in the first of the above extracts, and the following matters were left for adjustment.

I. The widow was to elect one of the following alternatives for rendering the feudal service on which the estate is held, viz. to pay in money a sum equivalent to the cost of the required number of peons or permanently to assign a number of villages on the plains with a revenue equal to that cost.

Mr. Purvis states that the widow demurs to both these propositions pleading against the first that she has always responded to the requisitions made on her for peons, and against the other alternative, that the estate was considerably diminished in value.

Mr. Purvis, however, points out that on the few occasions on which her aid has been required, nothing like alacrity was shown, and the men ultimately furnished were ill-paid, badly armed and almost useless. For the present condition of the estate the widow is of course herself answerable, as Government have not interfered in its management.

The receipts from the estate were stated by the Munsubdar in 1858-59 to have been Rupees 23,125, but Mr. Purvis thinks the estimate formed by Mr. Prendergast in 1851, viz. Rupees 26,000 is nearer the truth, this, however, being inclusive (and not as Mr. Prendergast stated, exclusive) of Mocassas and Ináms.

Mr. Purvis thinks that one-fifth of this latter sum may equitably be fixed as the value of the service, which the incumbent of the Munsubdary is by tenure bound to render.

*E. M. C. 17th June*, 1856, *R. D., No.* 618, *in Con. 26th June* 1856, *No.* 768.

The number of armed peons which the Munsubdar is bound to furnish is 700, but this number the Board presume, was to be supplied only on particular occasions, and not to be permanently maintained in arms. The sum proposed by Mr. Purvis would suffice, (taking seven Rupees as the average monthly pay,) for the permanent employment of 62 really efficient peons. Under native administration such servants would probably be paid by assignments of lands, &c., which would perhaps rarely exceed two Rupees per mensem in value, and thus from 2 to 300 men might be entertained on the sum above named. It is clear that there are no real means of deciding what the Munsubdary service is actually worth, and the only course is to make a rough estimate of what would be a fair charge. The present value of the estate being taken at 26,000 Rupees per annum, the Board think one-fourth would be a reasonable charge.

Whatever sum may be ultimately fixed by Government, would be best levied, the Board think, in money, in the same way as the peshcush of a permanently settled estate, and this course is also recommended by the Collector.

II. The next point for consideration is the nomination of Vencata Dora as Manager of the estate.—The widow absolutely objects to this on the ground of the serious differences which have occurred between them. Mr. Purvis considers that Government should exercise its authority to compel her to give Vencata Dora a moderate subsistence allowance either in money or land.

*Para.* 12 *Honorable Court's despatch, in Ex. Min. Con. 9th October* 1858, *R. D., No.* 1365, *in Con. 29th October* 1858.

The Board doubt whether Government can properly interfere thus. The Sudder Court declared the widow's title to be the strongest, and Vencata Dora has been referred to the Civil tribunals for the establishment of any claims he may have to prefer. The Collector states that he has not the means of resorting to law, but this would scarcely warrant Government in itself usurping the functions of the Courts.

*Honorable Court's despatch above noted.*

III. The last question is the opening up of passes and making roads in the estate.—Mr. Purvis states that there is nothing like a made road in the property, but from the character of the country there is no great difficulty in traversing most of it. Mr. Purvis thinks the owner of the estate may be fairly required to spend a certain sum annually in the improvement of the communications.

There can of course be no doubt of the value of roads here as elsewhere, but whether Government can now require the Munsubdar to make them, is altogether another question. This has never yet been held an incident of the Munsubdar's tenure, and the Board do not think it should now be made one. In his present communication above, the Collector recommends the commutation of the service tenure, the enforced provision of an allowance for a member of the family at variance with its head, and the compulsory improvement of the country. The first is in accordance with the owner's tenure, but the other two are fresh obligations, and it is obvious that persons in the position of this Munsubdar must have their confidence in Government greatly shaken, when they see their obligations thus arbitrarily increased. The Board think, therefore, that such roads as are necessary should be made at the expense of the State, the tenure of the Munsubdar being scrupulously respected.

A memorial recently received from Vencata Dora on his claims is herewith submitted for the information of Government.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Acting Secretary.*

---

No. 53.

ORDER THEREON, 10th October 1859, No. 1379.

The Mansabdari of Totapalli, the subject of the above report, is in the hilly Northwestern part of the Rajahmundry District. It is a feudal Estate held on the condition of Military service only, and pays no Péshkash. The service is no longer required in its original sense, i. e. of turning out a large body of armed men on occasions of a raid from beyond the frontier; and of late years it has been very little called for at all by the District authorities, and very imperfectly rendered when called for.

2. In 1856, the case came before Government, on occasion of the death of the holder of the property, who left two widows and a male cousin twice removed as his next heirs. The Estate was continued* to the eldest of the two widows by name Venkiammál who was declared by the Sadr Ádálat to be the proper heir; but it was resolved to enforce the right of the State in connection with the ancient feudal service. With the concurrence of the Home Government, it was referred† to the widow, whether she would pay annually an amount equivalent to the ancient service, or make over permanently villages yielding that amount. The service itself not being required, this commutation was resolved on, just as similar services have been commuted elsewhere.

* *Govt. order, 25th April 1857, No. 376.*

† *Rev. Dis. 5th May 1858, No. 5, paras. 8 to 14. Order of Govt. 9th Oct. 1858, No. 1365, para. 7.*

3. The Board now communicate the Mansabdár's reply. She rejects both alternatives. The Board however go on to calculate the proper money value of the service she is bound to render. The value of the Estate is estimated at 26,000 Rupees a year; and the Board think that one-fourth of this sum, or 6,500 Rupees, may be fairly taken to represent the service. They recommend also that this should be levied like ordinary Péshkash. The service on condition of which the property is held, consists in furnishing 700 armed men when wanted: 6,500 Rupees is a very moderate, and indeed inadequate, equivalent for that service. This moderate commutation of 6,500 Rupees a year for a service hitherto badly rendered will, however, now be enforced; and the Collector will be instructed therefore to make the necessary arrangement, and inform the Mansabdár of this decision.

4. There are two minor points connected with this case, suggested by the Home Government; viz. first, whether the Mansabdár would accept B. Venkana Dhora, the male cousin above alluded to, as the manager of the Estate, in order to avoid litigation; and second, to effect some arrangements for opening passes and roads in the Estate. In regard to the first, she is decidedly averse to employing B. Venkana Dhora in the manner suggested: and the Government will not force on her as her manager a person disagreable to her in the extreme, and a rival claimant to the Estate. As to the second, there seems no more reason for compelling her to make roads in her property, than all the other proprietors in the country, who however are at present under no such obligation.

5. The following endorsement will be made on Petitions Nos. 2988 and 3128 of 1859, the former being from B. Venkana Dhora, and the latter from the younger widow, Sitáramáyamammál.

"The Government are unable to interfere on behalf of the Petitioner."

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
*Chief Secretary.*

---

No. 3541.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 7th September 1859.

Read letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry, dated 23d July 1859, No. 111.
(In Con. 2d August 1859, No. 3865.)

In the above letter the Collector of Rajahmundry furnishes the information regarding the Munsubdary of Totapully called for in Extract Minutes Consultation, 25th April 1857, and 9th October 1858, R. D., Nos. 376 and 1365.

In Con. 4th May 1857, No. 1500.
In Con. 29th October 1858.

2. The Totapully estate was made over to the eldest widow of the late Munsubdar in the first of the above extracts, and the following matters were left for adjustment.

I. The widow was to elect one of the following alternatives for rendering the feudal service on which the estate is held, viz. to pay in money a sum equivalent to the cost of the required number of peons or permanently to assign a number of villages on the plains with a revenue equal to that cost.

Mr. Purvis states that the widow demurs to both these propositions pleading against the first that she has always responded to the requisitions made on her for peons, and against the other alternative, that the estate was considerably diminished in value.

Mr. Purvis, however, points out that on the few occasions on which her aid has been required, nothing like alacrity was shown, and the men ultimately furnished were ill-paid, badly armed and almost useless. For the present condition of the estate the widow is of course herself answerable, as Government have not interfered in its management.

The receipts from the estate were stated by the Munsubdar in 1858-59 to have been Rupees 23,125, but Mr. Purvis thinks the estimate formed by Mr. Prendergast in 1851, viz. Rupees 26,000 is nearer the truth, this, however, being inclusive (and not as Mr. Prendergast stated, exclusive) of Mocassas and Inams.

Mr. Purvis thinks that one-fifth of this latter sum may equitably be fixed as the value of the service, which the incumbent of the Munsubdary is by tenure bound to render.

The number of armed peons which the Munsubdar is bound to furnish is 700, but this number the Board presume, was to be supplied only on particular occasions, and not to be permanently maintained in arms. The sum proposed by Mr. Purvis would suffice, (taking seven Rupees as the average monthly pay,) for the permanent employment of 62 really efficient peons. Under native administration such servants would probably be paid by assignments of lands, &c., which would perhaps rarely exceed two Rupees per mensem in value, and thus from 2 to 300 men might be entertained on the sum above named. It is clear that there are no real means of deciding what the Munsubdary service is actually worth, and the only course is to make a rough estimate of what would be a fair charge. The present value of the estate being taken at 26,000 Rupees per annum, the Board think one-fourth would be a reasonable charge.

E. M. C. 17th June, 1856, R D., No. 618, in Con. 26th June 1856, No. 768.

Whatever sum may be ultimately fixed by Government, would be best levied, the Board think, in money, in the same way as the peshcush of a permanently settled estate, and this course is also recommended by the Collector.

II. The next point for consideration is the nomination of Vencata Dora as Manager of the estate.—The widow absolutely objects to this on the ground of the serious differences which have occurred between them. Mr. Purvis considers that Government should exercise its authority to compel her to give Vencata Dora a moderate subsistence allowance either in money or land.

Para. 12 Honorable Court's despatch, in E. M. C. 9th October 1858, R. D., No. 1365, in Con. 29th October 1858.

The Board doubt whether Government can properly interfere thus. The Sudder Courts declared the widow's title to be the strongest, and Vencata Dora has been referred to the Civil tribunals for the establishment of any claims he may have to prefer. The Collector states that he has not the means of resorting to lands, but this would scarcely warrant Government in itself usurping the functions of the Courts.

Hon'ble Court's despatch above noted.

III. The last question is the opening up of passes and making roads in the estate.—Mr. Purvis states that there is nothing like a made road in the property, but from the character of the country there is no great difficulty in traversing most of it. Mr. Purvis thinks the owner of the estate may be fairly required to spend a certain sum annually in the improvement of the communications.

There can of course be no doubt of the value of roads here as elsewhere, but whether Government can now require the Munsubdar to make them, is altogether another question. This has never yet been held an incident of the Munsubdar's tenure, and the Board do not think it should now be made one. In his present communication above, the Collector recommends the commutation of the service tenure, the enforced provision of an allowance for a member of the family at variance with its head, and the compulsory improvement of the country. The first is in accordance with the owner's tenure, but the other two are fresh obligations, and it is obvious that persons in the position of this Munsubdar must have their confidence in Government greatly shaken, when they see their obligations thus arbitrarily increased. The Board think, therefore, that such roads as are necessary should be made at the expense of the State, the tenure of the Munsubdar being scrupulously respected.

A memorial recently received from Vencata Dora on his claims is herewith submitted for the information of Government.

(A true Extract.)

18/

To

J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D. Acting Secretary.

Copy to Collector of Rajahmundry.



REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

*PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.*

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

*Submitting with remarks a letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry, furnishing the information required by Government regarding the Mansabdari of Totapalli.* (Here enter 7th September 1859, No. 3541.)

ORDER THEREON, 10th October 1859, No. 1379.

The Mansabdari of Totapalli, the subject of the above report, is in the hilly Northwestern part of the Rajahmundry District. It is a feudal Estate held on the condition of Military service only, and pays no Péshkash. The service is no longer required in its original sense, i. e. of turning out a large body of armed men on occasions of a raid from beyond the frontier; and of late years it has been very little called for at all by the District authorities, and very imperfectly rendered when called for.

2. In 1856, the case came before Government, on occasion of the death of the holder of the property, who left two widows and a male cousin twice removed as his next heirs. The Estate was continued* to the eldest of the two widows by name Venkiammál who was declared by the Sadr Ádálat to be the proper heir; but it was resolved to enforce the right of the State in connection with the ancient feudal service. With the concurrence of the Home Government, it was referred† to the widow, whether she would pay annually an amount equivalent to the ancient service, or make over permanently villages yielding that amount. The service itself not being required, this commutation was resolved on, just as similar services have been commuted elsewhere.

* *Govt. order, 25th April* 1857, *No.* 376.

† *Rev. Dis. 5th May* 1858, *No. 5, paras.* 8 *to* 14. *Order of Govt. 9th Oct.* 1858, *No.* 1365, *para.* 7.

3. The Board now communicate the Mansabdár's reply. She rejects both alternatives. The Board however go on to calculate the proper money value of the service she is bound to render. The value of the Estate is estimated at 26,000 Rupees a year; and the Board think that one-fourth of this sum, or 6,500 Rupees, may be fairly taken to represent the service. They recommend also that this should be levied like ordinary Péshkash. The service on condition of which the property is held, consists in furnishing 700 armed men when wanted: 6,500 Rupees is a very moderate, and indeed inadequate, equivalent for that service. This moderate commutation of 6,500 Rupees a year for a service hitherto badly rendered will, however, now be enforced; and the Collector will be instructed therefore to make the necessary arrangement, and inform the Mansabdár of this decision.

4. There are two minor points connected with this case, suggested by the Home Government; viz. first, whether the Mansabdár would accept B. Venkana Dhora, the male cousin above alluded to, as the manager of the Estate, in order to avoid litigation; and second, to effect some arrangements for opening passes and roads in the Estate. In regard to the first, she is decidedly averse to employing B. Venkana Dhora in the manner suggested: and the Government will not force on her as her manager a person disagreable to her in the extreme, and a rival claimant to the Estate. As to the second, there seems no more reason for compelling her to make roads in her property, than all the other proprietors in the country, who however are at present under no such obligation.

5. The following endorsement will be made on Petitions Nos. 2988 and 3128 of 1859, the former being from B. Venkana Dhora, and the latter from the younger widow, Sitáramáyamammál.

"The Government are unable to interfere on behalf of the Petitioner."

(True Extract.)

*Chief Secretary.*

To the Board of Revenue.

" Petition Department. with 2 Petitions

Exd. H. M. Elliot.

No 1051

Dt 10th October 1859

1327

20

1

IX

The Right Honorable the
Governor in Council
Fort St. George.

The humble representation of Street
Yanamoola Boorche Teucau Dhorah
the only male heir to the Munsubdary
of the Situpally Estate attached
to the Rajahmundry District.

My Lord

With utmost respect and submission, I beg of
your lordship to excuse me for the trouble I now
give in addressing on the injustice I have been
labouring under; and I most sincerely hope your
Lordship be pleased to give a favourable Considera-
tion on the subject.

About 120 years ago, the said Estate had been founded
on Lease to Sovie the Circar, the ruling authority,
with an army of 7000 men and to catch hold of the
mutineers and in short to keep the district in
peace and tranquility. After the foundation
of the Estate, nearly 8 persons succeeded, and it
has all along been Customary to appoint
one of the nearest members of the family as successor
in failor of male issues, but never at any time
have females had succession in preference
to the male issues in the family. The last Munsubdar
Woodhuntone, Appah Dhorah is the grandson

of my grandfather's actual brother, and even since his
death 1851, I have been disputing to recover my
Estate before the authorities local and Inden.
In one paragraph of the record connected with my claim
the late Court of Directors arrived at the Conclusion
that they have concurred with the Government of the
Madras Presidency in making the late Mansubdars
wife as successor to the Estate, that I have only remote
& irregular claim against the Estate, and that if
the male heir be appointed as Manager of the Estate,
there will be no disputes, and that the deed for
remitting the debt was originally granted with the data
understood. The accordance to this resolution of the
late Court of Directors the Madras Government
on the 9th of October 1858 passed a minutes of Consultation
and approved the Collectors of the same.
In this orders were issued to me as well as to the present
Mansubdar Tegaymmah. In which the Collector
Lieut. Cheek, directed me to appoint me Co-heir
in the management of the Estate as stated
in the minutes of Consultation passed according to
the opinion of the Court of Directors; that I,
together with Dhoosah, will better do the services
required of the Mansubdar of the Estate; and that
there is no necessary to pay to the Government a sum
of Rs to the amount of Rs, when I am appointed
as Manager. Nearly three months have elapsed
on this subject.
4 It was nearly 8 years since
disputing about the Estate
the cause among the
parties [illegible]

[illegible] I commenced
before the authorities
performed the
[illegible] came to the present

any pretentions to the Collector. Up to this time, I was in
my brother's house supported by the joint-stock. Being
at the usual anger that I came forward and set
up my claim before the authorities, the late
Mansubdar was pleased immediately to send me and my family
at Rough, ever since that time I expended all my
property jewels and furniture under the wages
of my servants, male and female, and under my
own house necessaries; hence I incurred a debt
of 10000 Rupees from the individuals; Now I am
suffering much from want of means for food
and cloth for my servants as well as myself.
5 If I am made Manager of the Estate with an
allowance sufficient for food and cloth for my
servants as well as myself I most willingly accept
it, and serve the Circar with an army of 700 trained men
when required. I shall moreover execute a document
to the Circar binding myself to Crush Mutineers and
preserve peace, if there shall chance to arise any
thing of the kind in this District; not let any injury
done to the present Mansubdar to the best of my
ability and knowledge and to manage the
Estate to your Lordships entire satisfaction.
I shall moreover take an oath to this effect
before any authority your Lordship may order
for the purpose. This I represented to Mr. Alexander
Collector of this District.
6 The present Mansubdar collects from the Estate
a sum of 28000 Rupees exclusive of the Inams worth
of 12000 Rupees, and if your Lordship order a reference to
be made to the accounts kept by the village Clerks
your Lordship will find this statement of mine to
be correct one.

7 I have a thorough knowledge of the vernacular Telugoo language I am also well trained how to manage an Estate. If a sufficient number of troops be given to me I can personally lead the party against the rebels. This Estate is of a hilly place; and this is an Estate to be managed by a man, but the women who are always confined to the houses are not at all fitted to manage it, and it will be observed that amongst all the members of the family I am the nearest male heir simply vide reference to the reports of the Collector of this Zillah as well as of the late Commissioner for the Northern Circars. While my right to the Estate is thus established, the late Court of Directors owing to my absence at home have not stated that I be made successor, but that I shall only be appointed as manager and that my services shall then be again

8 The present Mansubdar Tucayemmah is a woman who can neither write or read. She represented to the Collector that she is not disposed to appoint me as manager simply yielding to the intrigues of her already employed servants who are afraid to lose their private advantages if I am made as manager. Out of this Mansubdary of my brother, I have claimed Singavaram of 500 Rupees Estimate besides a monthly allowance of 200 Rupees. I further beg to say that I was given by the late Mansubdar all the expenses attending my marriage &c. In short I was receiving a sum of 700 Rupees a year out of the Mansubdary. Since the commencement of my claim against my sister-in-laws for the Estate I was deprived of all means village and extra allowance.

10 I am totally unable to bring any regular suit against the Mansubdar. I and my servants are suffering from want of food and cloth this will be observed by the report of the Collector of this Zillah dated 4th August. Query native under the British sway in India get to justice besides myself. I am now without any means of livelihood I hope therefore your Lordship will be pleased to appoint me as manager of the Estate as shown above, and accept my services with an army of 700 Men, and the said Estate is one calculated for the support of all the members of the family, and if the Mansubdar has 4 or 5 brothers, it is usual and customary that the Eldest one succeeds to the Estate while each of the others is given two or three villages worth of 2 or 3 thousand Rupees. This will be borne out by the petition of the then Mansubdar Chinnah Bauputhorah dated July 1822, to Mr. Robertson the then Collector. This petition is in the record of the Collector; this is a public document, and I ardently hope your Lordship will be pleased to issue instructions to the Collector of the Zillah to give me out of the Mansubdary two or three villages worth of 3000 Rupees which will be required under the expenses of my house as shown above. I hoping my prayer will be taken into a favourable consideration I beg to remain

My Lord

your most obedient and humble Servant

Vallypoory
10th August 1859

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council

Madras

The humble repros

Yanoomoola Seetaramia

widow of the late Juggup-

-dar of Tatapilly estate in

of Rajahmundry

Humble Sheweth.

With due respect and submission I beg leave to lay these few lines before your Lordships. Viz.

My husband late Juggapthora died on the 8th April 1851 leaving Venciamma the elder widow and me, and one male heir Buchy Venceuthora the undivided paternal Uncles son. Then being a minor I and Vencayammah moved the Civil Courts for the right of the estate the Courts decided in favor of us both, Accordingly we both jointly managed the estates, for about 6 months. The elder widow then appealed to the Court of Sudr Adalut for the whole estate and obtained a certificate in her behalf.

2 My brother in law since the death of my husband presented several petitions to the Revenue and Civil tribunals and also tendered a Majarnamah Seven by respectable and elder persons of the estate that he is heir and with reference to the practice of the family and country that the estate should come to him but no final order procured Consequently he Addressed the Court of Directors who were pleased to send their favourable despach.

3 Vencayamma was requested by the Collector with reference to the above order

order to let him know whether she likes to make Boochy Vencanthora Manager of the estate or to ass certain villages valued equal to the Amount of cost for Sebeardy but she refused either of the two points.

Your Lordship is well aware with the tenure on which the estate was held by the ancestors of this family, that the Incumbrance should serve with 500 men as was duely by my late husband had once a piece when required by Mr Prendergast during the disturbance of Bozzula Ramareddy—

The service is to be performed by Males not by females, although a female is in possession of the estate yet she can never be able to come in the open field for war, with her force; besides this my late husband left the estate in a good Condition Vencayyamah on assuming charge she not only ruined the estate but sent me and the Nearest relations to starvation owing to her Mismanagement and leaving the whole business into the hands of her dewan whose conduct is not good. Which is a stain to her Conduct, and decency to the family which though the advice of the dewan the people in the hill tracts are oppressed they are all against her power. The men lately furnished by her lately during the disturbance in the hill by Maduchan Boochennah they were unable to perform their duties being entirely unacquainted with the duties and not being paid regular. Mr Davis for this was much displeased.

6 If a male had authority of the estate he would have more reason to support his estate and obey the orders of the authority by sending well armed men to do circar duty and stand in the field. Inconformity to the above reason the male heir in the family always succeeded to the estate but not a female.

7 My late husband paid monthly 200 Rupees and a village as dowry, bearing an assessment of 1000 Rupees for the maintenance of my brother-in-law Boochy Venkayamah after the death of my husband Venkayamah trusted the above maintenance & also had the same fate Consequently I was unable to reside in the Nellepore and went away to my fathers house and passing my time by borrowing money from different people for my support.

8 Though the Sudr Adalut made her heir to the estate not taking into their full Consideration the practice which long sence been prevailed in this family that that a male should succeed to the estate Boochy Vencanthora is unable to bring a regular suit before the Civil tribunals for the estate under the orders of the late Court of Directors being in a very distressed state for want of subsistance

9 Though I had lost my husband yet it is a principal point that Boochy Vencanthora should be supported by the estate according to the practice long been accustomed in this family but not for her own support and her dewan. Thus I most humbly solicit your Lordships will be pleased to take my distressed case into your candid consideration and issue ord

That I may be provided by a monthly allowance for my support fit for me by Your Lordships as well as the total amount calculated on the same rate sence the demise of my husband that I may be able to discharge my debts and support me or to make over the estate to Boochy Vencanthora that he may support the whole family as was hitherto done by my late husband and his ancestors. For which act of

duty as in bound

I shall ever pray

Cocanada

31st July 1859

Prem.e or Rev. No. 1635

In Rajamundry District, in the Hilly Northwestern part, there is a Maniabdári or named Cottapaly, held on the feudal enlistment of military service only, no Péshkash. This service is no longer required in its original sense, i.e. of turning out a large body of armed men on occasion of a raid from beyond the frontier; but of late years it has been very little called for at all by the District authorities, & any enlistment readily rendered when called for.

Fort St. George
The Excellency
Governor in Council
of Madras

Rec.d 8 cwt. Q.R.
P.P. 10 Oct.r 1854
Oct.r 13th.

Rec.d 13 Oct.r 1854

Elem. Pr. Clerk
Examr. Jammalamadugu
Dist.t Cuddapah
Collr. Proprietary Rights
Rajahmundry
Dated 31st Aug.t 1854
Rec.d 13 Sept.r 1854

1298 of 1854

2. In 1856 the case came before first, a decision of the death of the Widow of the Proprietor. The estate was confined to the [+] Compl. apx. 25 157. 2. 376.
absent of his two widows; but it was resolved to express the rights of the State in connexion with the ancient feudal service, [x] with the commencement of the Hima proof, [x] it was referred to the Widow whether she would pay annually the amount equivalent to the ancient service, or make over permanently a village yielding that amount. The service itself not being required, this commutation was resolved as, just as similar services have been commuted elsewhere. [x] Despatch May 5/56 Para 9 &c.

3. No 42 was communicated the Maharaja's reply. She rejected both alternatives - the 1st because she could go on 2 calculated the latter many orders of the service she is bound to render. The value of the estate is estimated at 26,000 Rupees a year; & the Maharaja thinks that we should be content with 6500 Rupees, may be fairly taken to represent the service. They recommended that this should be given in ordinary Pashkash - the service carried in furnishing 700 and men when wanted: evidently 6500 Rupees is a very moderate, indeed inadequate, equivalent for that -

4 - There are two other points, about which

apprehend there will be no difference of opinion -

II. Govt. will hardly force on the widow as her manner a man disagreeable to her in the extreme; or a rival claimant to the Estate; and

III. Now seems no more means for enabling her to make roads in her territory than all the other territories in the Country, & no towns are at present under no such subjection -

We ought clearly to enforce the payment of the moderate commutation of 6500 Rupees a year for the service which has been so badly rendered - but we have no right either to insist upon the Rani maintaining her Relation or upon her making roads through her district

I concur

Sept. 13

Cuttack Dte

Dated

Sept. 13

No 1379

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 11th October 1859.

Read the following
Pro: of the Board
of Revenue -

Submitting with re-
marks a letter from the Coll of
Rajahmundry, furnishing the
information required by Govt
regarding the Mansabdari of
Jotapalli.

(Here enter 7th Sept/59
No 3521)

The Mansabdari of
Jotapalli, the district of the
above report, is in the hilly
north-western part of the Raja-
=mundry district. It is a feudal
estate held on the condition of
military service only, and pays
no pishkash. The service is no
longer required in its original
sense, i.e. of turning out a large
body of armed men on occa-
=sions of a raid from beyond the
frontier, and of late years it has

been very little called for ab
all by the district authorities
and very imperfectly rendered
when called for.

2 In 1856, the case came
before Govt, on occasion of the death
of the holder of the property, who
left two widows and a male
cousin twice removed as his next
heirs. The estate was continued*
to the elder of the two widows by
name Venkiammál
who was declared by the Sadr
Adálat to be the proper heir;
but it was resolved to enforce
the right of the State in con-
nection with the ancient feu-
dal service. With the concur-
rence of the Board Govt, it was
referred* to the widow, whether
she would pay annually an
amount equivalent to the ancient
service, or make over permanently

* Govt order, 25th April 57, No 376.

* Rev: Dis: 5th May 58, No 5, paras 8 & 14
Order of Govt, 9th Oct 58, No 1365, para 7.

villages yielding that amount.
The service itself not being required,
this commutation was resolved
on, just as similar services have
been commuted elsewhere.

3. The Board now commu-
nicate the manúbdar's reply.
She rejects both alternatives.
The Board however go on to calcu-
late the proper money value
of the service she is bound to
render. The value of the estate
is estimated at 26,000 Rs a year;
and the Board think that one
fourth of this sum, or 6,500 Rs,
may be fairly taken to represent
the service. They recommend also
that this should be levied like
ordinary peishkash. The service on
condition of which the property is held,
consists in furnishing 700 armed
men when wanted: evidently
6,500 Rs is a very moderate, and

indeed inadequate, equiva-
lent for that service. This moderate
commutation of 6,500 Rs a
year for a service hitherto badly
rendered will, however, now be
enforced; and the Collr will be
instructed therefore to make
the necessary arrangement, &
inform the Mansabdár of
this decision.

4. There are two minor
points connected with this
case, suggested by the Home
Govt; viz. first, whether the Man-
sabdár would accept S. Venka-
rama Dhora, the male contin
above alluded to, as the manage
of the estate, in order to avoid
litigation; and second, to effect
some arrangements for opening
paths and roads in the estate.
In regard to the first, she is de-

cidedly averse to employing
S. Venkama Dhora in the
manner suggested: & the Govt
will not therefore force on her
as her manager a
person disagreeable to her in
the extreme, and a rival claim-
ant to the estate. As to the
second, there seems no more
reason for compelling her to
make roads in her property,
than all the other proprietors
in the country, who however
at present under no such
obligation. ~~Improvements~~
~~of this nature must therefore~~
~~devolve on the Lady.~~

5. The following endorse-
ment will be made on Peti-
tions Nos 2479, 2988 and 3128 of 1859.

"The Govt are unable

× the former ~~Petitioner~~ being from
S Venkama Dora, ~~urging his~~
~~claim to the Estate~~ and
the latter from the younger
widow, Sitáramásammál

to interfere on behalf of the petitioner."

6 Copies - Boards of Revenue Dep. 11.
Petitions Deputt.
with 2 Petitions -
Recd

Copy in a letter to England Dº 10th October No 55 of 1859.

12/68

359-831

Revenue 1859 - Dec.th
Pro: of Govt. 21st Octr.

No 1379.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dº 10th Octr. /59.

From the Secretary of State
April 1861 - C. No 995 in Pro3.
Mercy No 962

Further C. No 2910/63. -

Passing orders on
Petitions Nos 2988 & 3128 of
1859 regarding the Manzab.
dari of Totapalli.

No. 52 & 53.

C28 Sep. R3 Oct.

Cons: 28th April /57 — No. 16 @ 25
— 12th October /58 — 35
— 17th June /56 — 1849.

Rep. in a letter from Singapore
of 10 October No 55 of 1859

Rev. 1859. Depart.t
Pro: of Gov.t 21st Oct.r
F. 1635

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 7th
Desp.d 7 } September 1859
Rec.d 8
E. I. Of. Letter -
2 Encls Returned 7-11-59
No. 3541.

No. 1379. 10th Oct.r

Submitting with
the Bd.s remarks a
letter from the Coll.r of
Rajahs.e furnishing the
information required
by Gov.t regarding the
Inamsubdary of &c
Jotapully.

For Orders, with
a Minute -

No 52.

14th Sep.r R 21 C 28th R 3 Oct.r