M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1526 Press ~~Mis.~~

96-98

Dated 9 - 11 - 1859

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 96. Read the following letter from J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department; dated 9th June 1859, No. 2170.

In Con. 25th Jan. 1859, *No.* 168.

With reference to Extract Minutes Consultation, 12th January 1859, R. D., No. 56, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit a draft of lease to be issued to the Zemindar of Poonganoor for five years, pending the settlement of the question of granting a permanent Sunnud for the estate.

2. The Collector reports from personal acquaintance, as well as other sources of information, that the present Zemindar is competent to manage the estate satisfactorily and may be safely entrusted with the welfare of the people resident in it. The family is a very ancient one. In a Memorial received from Shunker Royel, the head of it, in 1811 (and considered reliable by the then Collector) it is said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A. D. 1250, and a brief history of it will be found in Sir Thomas Munro's letter to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 17th June 1802.

From North Arcot, 26th Aug. 1811, *No. in Con. 2d Sep.* 1811.

No. 97. OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM, from W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government Revenue Department; dated 26th September 1859.

In Con. 13*th Aug.* 1859, *My. No.* 3508.

1. With reference to the Official Memorandum from the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 10th August 1859, No. 202, the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue is directed to submit the following information on the points mentioned.

1. *On what data, and at what time was the Peishcush of the Punganoor Zemindary fixed?*

In Con. 29th June 1815.

2. The Peishcush of the Punganoor Zemindary was first fixed at the present amount, viz. 63,000 Rupees in 1815, under the sanction of Government dated 23d June of that year No. 903. For thirteen years previous to this date, the settlement was Ryotwary or on decennial leases, the Poligar being entrusted with the collection of the Revenue, and an allowance of $\frac{1}{3}$ or 20 per cent. of the gross revenue being made to him in consideration of his services, and for the maintenance of the family.

3. The results obtained from these direct settlements with the ryots (the last ten of which were on a lease) formed the basis on which the Peishcush was subsequently determined. In the Board's Proceedings dated 27th April 1815, which were submitted to Government on 29th May 1815, a full account is given of the Polliem and its resources. From para. 29 of this document it appears that the ultimate decennial rent (previous to 1815) was...

... ...	Pagodas	24,122	= Rs. 84,427
Jodee of village Maniems...	,,	1,828	= ,, 6,398
The value of the Nusker Peish villages ...	,,	1,069	= ,, 3,741½
Total...		27,019	= ,, 94,566½

making the gross revenues from the Polliem 27,019 Pagodas. Two-thirds of this amount, or 18,000 Pagodas (in round numbers) was fixed as the Peishcush payable to Government, and the remainder was granted to the Poligar; the difference between this, and the $\frac{1}{3}$th share already mentioned being considered as the equivalent for the average charges of collection and irrigation repairs, which under the Ryotwary settlement had been borne by Government, but which, when the Peishcush was *fixed*, were transferred to the Poligar. A reference to paras. 30 and 33 of the Board's Proceedings already quoted will show that the above arrangement was based upon the results of actual experience.

Rupees 63,000.

Letter from England dated 22d May 1818, *R. D. in E. M. C. dated 14th April* 1819.

In Con. 6th May 1819.

4. Upon the above conditions, the Polliem was granted to the Zemindar on a permanent Sunnud subject to the confirmation of the Honorable Court, who, however, directed that the settlement should hold good for the unexpired period only of the last decennial lease which had been rented out in Fusly 1224 or A. D. 1814, the year before the grant of the Sunnud by the local Government. The decennial lease terminated in 1825, and from that year till 1833, no distinct arrangement with the Poligar was concluded, though considerable discussion took place as to the terms to be granted. In 1833, however a permanent lease was proposed and sanctioned by Government to begin with a reduced Peishcush of 51,000 Rupees, in consequence of the then impoverished state of the country and its limited capabilities, the amount of annual payment to be raised gradually so that in the 20th year it should attain the maximum of Rupees 63,000 which should be permanent, the Poligar being restrained from demanding more than the reduced field assessment on any land from the ryots.

5. The Home Government however again declined to sanction the issue of a permanent Sunnud, but permitted the issue of a cowle for a term not exceeding 10 years renewable at the pleasure of Government, and in a subsequent despatch they authorized the extension of the term to 20 years as being the period embraced in the above arrangement.

6. This lease expired in 1853, and was renewed for 5 years by the orders of Government dated 26th April 1853, No. 460, Revenue Department, at the maximum rent of Rupees 63,000. It again expired on 30th June 1858; and a fresh lease for 5 years on the same terms was sanctioned on the 12th January 1859, No. 56, pending the decision by the Home Government of the question of a permanent settlement which has now been in agitation for more than 40 years.

In Con. 12th May 1853.

In Con. 13th January 1859.

2. Is the talook as extensive now as when Sir Thomas Munro wrote, or has any part been separated and placed under another jurisdiction.

From Mr. Ross 21st October in Con. 9th November 1815.

7. No change appears to have taken place in the limits of the talook since 1815, when the decennial lease was entered into. In that year, certain Shrotriem and surva maniem villages and Muzrahs were excluded which, up to that time appear to have been included in the land rent but it does not appear that the territorial boundaries of the talook were in any way affected by these arrangements.

3. What were the terms of the settlement with the Goorrumcondah Poligar, and what is the condition of that family and of that talook at present.

Enc. 3 of letter from Collector of North Arcot (Mr. Ross) dated 26th August 1811, *No.* 1052.

8. There seems to have been a Poligar of "Gurrumcondah" at a remote period, but none since the beginning of the present century. In an address presented by the ancestos of the present Poligar of Punganoor in 1811, the following passage occurs "The Peshcush of the Samustam of Punganoor was fixed at 32,000 Rupees and entered into the Shreemunt share and paid accordingly to the *Gurrumcondah Sirkar*. Hyderali at that time having risen into notice became lord above the ghats. He made a Jagheer of Gurrumcondah, and gave it to his wife's brother Meer Ruju Ali Khan &c.," This event, if true, must have occurred about 1770. In Sir Thomas Munro's Memorandum of Pollegars dated 20th March 1802, under No. 52, the following remarks are inserted "No other change occurred till Gurrumcondah was reduced by Hyder, when Meer Saib seized the Poligar* threw him into Prison and fed him on equal quantities of flour and salt till he died. His children remained privately in the country, and as they never excited any disturbances, sied Sahib, when he got *part of Gurrumcondah in Jageer in* 1792, restored the heir to his heredetary villages at the former Peishcush &." In 1802 when Sir Thomas Munro wrote there appears to have been no less than 44 Polliems in the Gurrumcondah talook at that time comprising portions of Royachooty and

Muddancherroo.
Basevant Nair.
* *Of Polliem No. 52 it is presumed.*

Poolavaindla talooks in addition to the territory now included in it. These Polliems were all resumed and pensions granted to the respectivo Poligars on hereditary tenure to *lineal* descendants during good behaviour. Many of these pensions have lapsed and have been renewed to heirs or otherwise dealt with, according to circumstances; according to a return furnished by the Collector of Cuddapah in Fusly 1252,* there were 20 pensions in the Talook in that year the most considerable of which were those noted in the margin. The present condition of these families or of those living adjacent to the Punganoor Territory cannot be ascertained without a reference to the local authorities, which the Board will be prepared to make should the Government wish it.

* 11*th July* 1843, *in Con. 7th May.*

	Per Annum.
Mullala Venkatapa.....	2,625
Doddy Pully Vencata Ragooputty.....	2,354
Pompecherla Chinna Kistama Naidoo...	1,161
Goondoopully Sashachellapatty Naidoo.....	1,312
Moodoolachervoo Pedda Venkata Cuddreepatty Naidoo.....	729
Goottopolliem Veerapa Naidoo.....	481
(*The rest of smaller sums*)	

From a Stat. recently prepared in the Board's office for the Chief Engineer.

9. The present talook of Gurrumcondah is entirely under Sirkar management, containing an area of 880 miles and yielding a revenue of Rupees 1,81,940.

10. The report called for in the second para. of the official memo. under reply is herewith submitted.

From North Arcot 25th August 1858, *in Con. 28th September* 1858.

No. 98. ORDER THEREON, 9th November 1859, No. 1526.

Para. 1. With the first of the papers above recorded, the Board of Revenue submit with reference to the Proceedings of Government dated 12th January 1859, No. 56, the draft of a five year lease to be issued to the Punganúr Zamíndár. They state, in answer to the enquiry made in that order, that the Collector reports the Zamíndár to be competent to manage the estate satisfactorily, and to be one to whom the welfare of the people may be safely entrusted; and they add that the family is a very ancient one, being said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A. D. 1250. In the second paper, the Board furnish information called for in an Official Memo, dated 10th August 1859, on certain points relating to the estate.

2. It appears from Sir Thomas Munro's report† in 1802, that the ancestors of the Punganúr Pálegáru served under the Vijayanagar Rayás and held districts in Hosakóta and Kolár in Jágír. About A. D. 1642, Kolar, where the family then resided, having fallen under the Vigayapúr Sovereign, the Pálegár's ancestor fled and ultimately repaired to Hyderabad, and obtained from the King, at a péshkash of "Sheweroy Pagodas" 30,000, the districts of Awalpilli and Punganúr which had been taken from the Maddanapalli Pálegár. In the reign of Aurangzeb the péshkash was Pagodas 10,000, but including military service, the Pálegár's contribution amounted to Pagodas 40,000. In 1713 the Nawáb of Cuddápah raised the péshkash to Pagodas 32,000 stipulating that the Pálegár should in time of war serve with 2,000 foot; and in 1747 it was reduced by the then Nawáb to Rupees 60,000. During the possession of the country by the Maráthas in 1755 the péshkash was Rupees 32,000; but from that period to 1775, during which time Punganúr frequently changed masters, it was continually varying. Under Hyder's Government, the péshkash was 20,000 Pagodas in 1774; and although the Pálegár was ordered to pay only 10,000 Kantharáya Pagodas yearly in future, it was raised in the following year to Kantharáya Pagodas 20,000 besides 5,000 Pagodas for Darbár charges. In 1785 the péshkash not having been paid, Tippoo expelled the Pálegár, who however recovered his district during the war in 1791. He was again expelled by Tippoo in 1795 for paying very little of the péshkash which was then Kantharáya Pagodas 30,000, but he regained possession in 1799. In the following year, the payment was Kantharáya Pagodas 20,000 in the proportion of one-third to the Company, and two-thirds to the Rájá of Mysore.

† *Dated 17th June* 1802.

3. From 1802 to 1815, the estate was in Amáni, i. e. the Revenue was collected on account of Government: the Pálegár being entrusted with the collection, and receiving an allowance of 20 per cent. for his trouble. In 1815 it was granted to him on a permanent sanad, subject to the approval of the Court of Directors, at a péshkash of Rupees 63,000; being two-thirds of the average gross receipts under the decennial rent then just expired. The Court disallowed† the permanent sanad, being unwilling, they said, to make this case an exception to the general prohibition of the introduction of a permanent settlement in new districts; and ordered that the engagement should terminate with the decennial lease. This lease had been granted in 1814 and ended in 1825. From 1825 to 1833 the arrangement which had prevailed from 1802 to 1815 was revived, viz. the Pálegár made the collections according to the Collector's settlement and received one-fifth for himself. In 1833, the Government again recommended to the Home Government the grant of a permanent lease; the péshkash to be Rupees 63,000 but to begin with Rupees 51,000 on account of the alleged impoverishment of the estate, and to reach 63,000 in the twentieth year. The Court again refused‡ the permanent engagement, stating as a reason that the whole question of the most beneficial mode of settling the revenue would shortly come under consideration and they wished their Governments to be free to act on the decision. They however sanctioned the proposed terms for twenty years. In 1853, on the expiry of that period, a lease at the full amount of Rupees 63,000 was given* for five years: this terminated in June 1858.

† *Despatch dated 22d May* 1818, *paras.* 79 *to* 82, *in Proceedings of Government* 14*th April* 1819.

‡ *Despatch dated* 20*th March* 1835, *No.* 1, *para.* 6, *in Proceedings of Government* 7*th August* 1835.

* *Order of Government* 26*th April* 1853, *No.* 460.

4. In bringing forward the question of renewal, the Collector of North Arcot, in which District Punganúr is now included, recommended the issue of a perpetual lease at the full rent of Rupees 63,000. The Government at first approved† of this proposal; but subsequently they resolved‡ to postpone acting upon the recommendation until they should know the opinion of the Home Government. Meanwhile, they thought that a five year lease as recommended by the Board of Revenue might be given; and they desired to be informed of the character of the Zamíndár. The Board's letter of 9th June 1859 recorded at the commencement of these Proceedings is in reply to that reference.

† *Order of Govt. 3rd November* 1858, *No.* 1481.

‡ *Do. 12th January* 1859, *No.* 56.

5. The Government have now to consider the proper course to pursue with respect to this estate, and a choice has to be made between the following three different modes of proceeding, viz.—

First, take it entirely out of the hands of the Pálegár and settle it on ordinary Ryotwar principles;

Second, to retain the Pálegár on the temporary footing which he has occupied since the downfall of Tippoo; or

Third, to give him a permanent interest in the property.

6. The question thus before Government is partly one of policy and partly one of r ight.

7. With respect to the question of right, it is seen from the foregoing review that the Punganúr family have substantially been in possession and enjoyment of the estate for above two hundred years. They have indeed, in times of war and disturbance, suffered from the exactions of successive conquerors; but they have never lost their hold of the estate; and though even displaced for short periods, they have speedily regained possession. Even under the levelling influences of British Indian rule, they have been allowed to retain uninterrupted possession of the property for more than half a century, though a permanent and valid title has been withheld. This long possession and enjoyment, and especially the continuance of it under the English Government must, in the opinion of Government, be admitted to constitute a right; and it would be a very strong measure, to use the mildest language, now to dispossess the family.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, for the month of November 1859.

8. Again, as a matter of policy, the Governor in Council is of opinion that it is expedient and wise not to reduce all parts of the country to a dull uniformity, but that it is beneficial, where a family is found raised in position above the general Ráyat population and upholding a character suited to that position, to maintain them in it. And this general consideration has special force in the particular case in question. The Punganúr family have uniformly been remarkable for their steady partiality to the English; and not less so for a degree of liberality and enlightenment far from common among landed proprietors of this class in India. And the Governor in Council is of opinion that it would have a beneficial effect, at the present time in particular, to exhibit an instance of steady loyalty rewarded by the grant of a valid and permanent title.

9. It must be added that no tenure could be more adverse to good management and to the improvement of landed property than that system of uncertainty and temporary engagements which has prevailed in Punganúr of late years; and it is highly creditable to the family that under these adverse and discouraging circumstances, the estate has been so well administered.

10. The proposal to give a permanent title to the family has been twice strongly recommended to the Home Authorities by this Government and twice negatived by them. The present Government therefore considers itself precluded from giving such a title without a reference to England. They resolve however to submit the case to the Secretary of State for India, with their strong recommendation based on the above recited grounds of both justice and policy, that they may be authorized to confer on Rájá Sangatúr Immadi Sankararáyalu Yasovanta Bahádúr and his heirs, a permanent title to the Punganúr estate, subject to the payment of an annual péshkash of Rupees 63,000; the rights of the proprietor to be those given by the Permanent Settlement of 1802, where not opposed to existing local rights and usages. Those usages and rights it will be left to the established Courts to maintain.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Revenue 1859 Re-court
Ro. of Govt. for November
No 1526
Ro. of the Board of Revenue
Government
Dated 9th November
1859

No. 2170.

From

J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

To

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

Sir,

In Con. 25th Jany. 1859, No. 168. With reference to Extract Minutes Consultation, 12th January 1859, R. D., No. 56, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit a draft of lease to be issued to the Zemindar of Poonganoor for five years, pending the settlement of the question of granting a permament Sunnud for the estate.

2. The Collector reports from personal acquaintance, as well as other sources of information, that the present Zemindar is competent to manage the estate satisfactorily and may be safely entrusted with the welfare of the people resident in it. The family is a very ancient one. In a memorial received from Shunker Royel, the head of it, in 1811 (and considered reliable by the then Collector) it is said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A. D. 1250, and a brief history of it will be found in Sir Thomas Munro's letter to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 17th June 1802.

From North Arcot, 26th Augt. 1811, No. in Con. 2d Sept. 1811.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort Saint George,
9th June 1859.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

Copy to Collector of North Arcot.

Draft of a lease to the Poonganoor Estate
in the District of North Arcot.

Whereas for a long series of years past the
Estate of Poonganoor, lately attached to the District
of Cuddapah and now included in the district
of North Arcot, in the Presidency of Forth St. George,
and consisting of the Villages hereinafter enumera-
-ted, has been held on temporary leases by the
family commonly known as the Zemindars of Poon
-ganoor on payment to the Government of Forth St.
George of a certain sum specified in the lease,
and whereas the family has always been dis-
-tinguished by its loyalty and good behaviour,
the Honorable the Governor of Fort St. George is pleased
to renew for a further period of 5 years Viz from
Fusly 1268 to Fusly 1272, both inclusive, the lease
which expired on the 30th June 1858, to Rajah Doo-
-gatoor Junnady Venkaravoyloo Esaventa Ba-
-hadoor, the present Head of the family, at an
annual rent of 63,000 Company's Rupees, on the
following conditions:

1st That he shall pay the annual sum of 63,000,
Company's Rupees to Her Majesty's Government,
through the Collector of North Arcot, by the follow-
-ing instalments, in each of the 5 years.

December	6,300
January	12,600
February	12,600
March	12,600
April	12,600
May	6,300
Company's Rs.	63,000

2d That he shall maintain all the sources of
irrigation in his estate in good order.

3d That he shall conduct himself with good
faith towards his ryots, treating them with tender
-ness and encouraging them to improve and extend
the

the cultivation of the land.

4th. That puttahs shall be granted to the ryots according to the practice which has hitherto obtain-ed, and that regular receipts shall be given to the ryots for all sums paid by them.

5. That he shall aid and assist the Officers of Government in apprehending and securing offenders of all descriptions and that he shall seek out and give notice to the Magistrate of all robbers and disturbers of the public peace, who may be found or may seek refuge in the estate.

6. That the ryots of the estate shall be entitled to and receive such modifications of assessment as may be granted in the adjoining Govern-ment Villages.

7. On breach of any of the above conditions; it shall be competent to the Government to resume the lease.

8. For the recovery of any balance of revenue, it shall be competent to Government to attach the estate.

9. The rights conferred by the lease are exclusive of the Revenue derived from the sale of Salt and Saltpetre, of duties on goods in transit of the Abkarry or tax on the sale of spiri-tuous liquors and intoxicating drugs, of the excise, which is or may be levied on articles of consumption, of all taxes personal, and professional, as well as those from Markets, fairs and Bazars, exclusive of Dackkerauj lands and lands paying quit rent (which quit rent is unchangeable by the lease) and exclusive of all lands and Rossooms heretofore

appropriated

appropriated to the support of the Police Establish-ments and of fines on Cattle trespassing.

10. The villages of the Estate are enumerated below.

Secretary.

Copy in a/c to
8th Nov. 1859 No 84

10/11/59. 98-78

Enclosure in a letter
from the Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.
To the Secy to Govt
Revenue Dept
Dated 9th Nov 1859.

Rec'd 12th Nov 1859

Draft of a Lease
to the Zemindar of Ristnagherry
in the District of Madura.

Official Memorandum.

With reference to the Official memorandum from the Secretary to Government R.D. dated 10th August 1859 No 202. the Actg Secretary to the Board of Revenue is directed to furnish the following information on the points mentioned.

Rec'd 13th Augt 1859
My No 3508.

1 On what data, and at what time was the Peishcush of the Pungunoor Zemindary fixed?

The Peishcush of the Pungunoor Zemindary was first fixed at the present amount viz 63,000 Rupees in 1815. under the sanction of Government dated 23d June of that year No 903. For thirteen years previous to this date, the settlement was Kyotwary or on decennial leases. the Poligar being entrusted with the Collection of the Revenue and an allowance of 1/5 or 20 per cent of the gross produce being made to him in consideration of his services, and for the maintenance of the family.

In Con 29th June 1815.

3 The results obtained from these direct settlements with the Ryots (the last ten of which were on a lease) formed the basis on which the Peishcush was subsequently determined

determined - In the Board's Proceedings dated 27th April 1815, which were submitted to Government on 29th May 1815, a full account is given of the Pollam and its resources. From para 29 of this Document it appears that the Ultimate decennial rent (previous to 1815) was

	Pagodas	Rupees
	24,122	= 84,427
Jodee of Village Maumuns	1,828	= 6,398
The value of the Ruskies Parish Villages	1,069	= 3,741½
Total	27,019	= 94,566½

making the gross revenues from the Pollam 27019 Pagodas. Two thirds of this amount, or 18000 Pagodas (in round numbers) was fixed as the Peishcush payable to Government, and the remainder was granted to the Poligar; the difference between this, and the 1/5th share already mentioned being considered as the equivalent for the average charges of collection and irrigation repairs, which under the ryotwary Settlement had been borne by Government, but which, when the Peishcash was fixed, were transferred to the Poligar. A reference to paras 30 & 33 of the Board's Proceedings already quoted will shew that the above arrangement was based upon.

Rupees 63,000

Letter from England dt 22d May 1818 R.C. in E. to C. 27th April 1819. In Cir. 6 May 1819.

upon the results of actual experience.

Upon the above conditions, the Pollam was granted to the Zemindar on a permanent Summud subject to the confirmation of the Honorable Court, who, however, directed that the Settlement should hold good for the unexpired period only of the last decennial lease which had been rented out in July 1224 or A.D. 1814, the year before the grant of the Summud by the local Government. The decennial lease terminated in 1825, and from that year till 1833, no distinct arrangement with the Poligar was concluded, though considerable discussion took place as to the terms to be granted. In 1833 however a permanent lease was proposed and sanctioned by Government to begin with a reduced peishcash of 5,000 Rupees, in consequence of the then unpoverished state of the country and its limited capabilities, the amount of annual payment to be raised gradually so that in the 20th year it should attain the maximum of Rupees 63,000 which should be permanent. The Poligar being restrained from demanding more than the reduced field

attested

assessment on any land from the Ryots.

The Home Government however again declined to sanction the issue of a permanent Cowle, but permitted the issue of a Cowle for a term not exceeding 10 years renewable at the pleasure of Government, and in a subsequent despatch they authorized the extension of the term to 20 years as being the period embraced in the above arrangement.

This lease expired in 1853, and was renewed for 5 years by the orders of Government dated 26th April 1853 No 160 RC. at the maximum rent of Rupees 63000. It again expired on 30th June 1858, and a fresh lease for 5 years on the same terms was sanctioned on the 13th January 1859 No 56 pending the decision by the Home Government of the question of a permanent settlement which has now been in agitation for more than 40 years.

No change appears to have taken place in the limits of the Talook since 1815 when the decennial lease was entered into. In that year, certain Shrotriem

× Rev. Book 204 of 1853

In Con 12th May 1853.

Talcon 13th Jany 1859

2. Is the Talook as extensive now as when Sir Tho Munro wrote, or has any part been separated and placed under another jurisdiction.

9

Shrotriem and Surva Manium villages and Mazrahs were excluded which, as it does appear to have been included in the land rent but it does not appear that the territorial boundaries of the Talook were in any way affected by these arrangements.

From Mr Ross 21st Oct. in Cons 9 Nov. 1815

3 What were the terms of the settlement with the Sovereign of the Poligar, and what is the condition of that family and of that Talook at present.

There seems to have been a Poligar of "Purrum coondah" at a remote period, but none since the beginning of the present century. In an address presented by the Ancestor of the present Poligar of Pungamoor in 1811, the following passage occurs "The Pishcash of the Sammistam of Pungamoor was fixed at 32,000 Rupees and entered into the Shreemunt's Shastra's books accordingly to the Purrum coondah Serkar. Hyderalie at that time having risen into notice became lord above the Skats. He made a Jaghier of Purrumcoondah, and gave it to his wife's brother Meer Raja Ali Khan &c." This event, if true, must have occurred about 1770. In Sir Thos. Munro's Memorandum of Pollegars dated 20th March 1802, under No 52, the following remarks are inserted. "No other change occurred till Purrumcoondah was reduced

Ans 3 of letter from Collector of North Arcot (Mr Ross) of 26th August 1811 No 1058.

Middle Chenoo Peasant Nair.

No. 96. Read the following letter from J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department; dated 9th June 1859, No. 2170.

In Con. 25th Jan. 1859, *No.* 168.

With reference to Extract Minutes Consultation, 12th January 1859, R. D., No. 56, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit a draft of lease to be issued to the Zemindar of Poonganoor for five years, pending the settlement of the question of granting a permanent Sunnud for the estate.

2. The Collector reports from personal acquaintance, as well as other sources of information, that the present Zemindar is competent to manage the estate satisfactorily and may be safely entrusted with the welfare of the people resident in it. The family is a very ancient one. In a Memorial received from Shunker Royel, the head of it, in 1811 (and considered reliable by the then Collector) it is said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A. D. 1250, and a brief history of it will be found in Sir Thomas Munro's letter to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 17th June 1802.

From North Arcot, 26th Aug. 1811, *No. in Con. 2d Sep.* 1811.

No. 97. OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM, from W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government Revenue Department; dated 26th September 1859.

In Con. 13*th Aug.* 1859, *My. No.* 3508.

1. With reference to the Official Memorandum from the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 10th August 1859, No. 202, the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue is directed to submit the following information on the points mentioned.

1. *On what data, and at what time was the Peishcush of the Punganoor Zemindary fixed?*

In Con. 29th June 1815.

2. The Peishcush of the Punganoor Zemindary was first fixed at the present amount, viz. 63,000 Rupees in 1815, under the sanction of Government dated 23d June of that year No. 903. For thirteen years previous to this date, the settlement was Ryotwary or on decennial leases, the Poligar being entrusted with the collection of the Revenue, and an allowance of $\frac{1}{3}$ or 20 per cent. of the gross revenue being made to him in consideration of his services, and for the maintenance of the family.

3. The results obtained from these direct settlements with the ryots (the last ten of which were on a lease) formed the basis on which the Peishcush was subsequently determined. In the Board's Proceedings dated 2.th April 1815, which were submitted to Government on 29th May 1815, a full account is given of the Polliem and its resources. From para. 29 of this document it appears that the ultimate decennial rent (previous to 1815) was...

... ...	Pagodas	24,122	= Rs. 84,427
Jodee of village Maniems...	,,	1,828	= ,, 6,398
The value of the Nusker Peish villages ...	,,	1,069	= ,, 3,741½
Total...		27,019	= ,, 94,566½

making the gross revenues from the Polliem 27,019 Pagodas. Two-thirds of this amount, or 18,000 Pagodas (in round numbers) was fixed as the Peishcush payable to Government, and the remainder was granted to the Poligar; the difference between this, and the $\frac{1}{3}$th share already mentioned being considered as the equivalent for the average charges of collection and irrigation repairs, which under the Ryotwary settlement had been borne by Government, but which, when the Peishcush was *fixed*, were transferred to the Poligar. A reference to paras. 30 and 33 of the Board's Proceedings already quoted will show that the above arrangement was based upon the results of actual experience.

Rupees 63,000.

Letter from England dated 22d May 1818, *R. D. in E. M. C. dated 14th April* 1819.
In Con. 6th May 1819.

4. Upon the above conditions, the Polliem was granted to the Zemindar on a permanent Sunnud subject to the confirmation of the Honorable Court, who, however, directed that the settlement should hold good for the unexpired period only of the last decennial lease which had been rented out in Fusly 1224 or A. D. 1814, the year before the grant of the Sunnud by the local Government. The decennial lease terminated in 1825, and from that year till 1833, no distinct arrangement with the Poligar was concluded, though considerable discussion took place as to the terms to be granted. In 1833, however a permanent lease was proposed and sanctioned by Government to begin with a reduced Peishcush of 51,000 Rupees, in consequence of the then impoverished state of the country and its limited capabilities, the amount of annual payment to be raised gradually so that in the 20th year it should attain the maximum of Rupees 63,000 which should be permanent, the Poligar being restrained from demanding more than the reduced field assessment on any land from the ryots.

5. The Home Government however again declined to sanction the issue of a permanent Sunnud, but permitted the issue of a cowle for a term not exceeding 10 years renewable at the pleasure of Government, and in a subsequent despatch they authorized the extension of the term to 20 years as being the period embraced in the above arrangement.

6. This lease expired in 1853, and was renewed for 5 years by the orders of Government dated 26th April 1853, No. 460, Revenue Department, at the maximum rent of Rupees 63,000. It again expired on 30th June 1858; and a fresh lease for 5 years on the same terms was sanctioned on the 12th January 1859, No. 56, pending the decision by the Home Government of the question of a permanent settlement which has now been in agitation for more than 40 years.

In Con. 12th May 1853.
In Con. 13th January 1859.

2. *Is the talook as extensive now as when Sir Thomas Munro wrote, or has any part been separated and placed under another jurisdiction.*
From Mr. Ross 21st October in Con. 9th November 1815.

7. No change appears to have taken place in the limits of the talook since 1815, when the decennial lease was entered into. In that year, certain Shrotriem and surva maniem villages and Muzrahs were excluded which, up to that time appear to have been included in the land rent but it does not appear that the territorial boundaries of the talook were in any way affected by these arrangements.

3. *What were the terms of the settlement with the Goorrumcondah Poligar, and what is the condition of that family and of that talook at present.*
Enc. 3 of letter from Collector of North Arcot (Mr. Ross) dated 26th August 1811, *No.* 1052.

8. There seems to have been a Poligar of "Gurrumcondah" at a remote period, but none since the beginning of the present century. In an address presented by the ancestos of the present Poligar of Punganoor in 1811, the following passage occurs "The Peshcush of the Samustam of Punganoor was fixed at 32,000 Rupees and entered into the Shreemunt share and paid accordingly to the *Gurrumcondah Sirkar*. Hyderali at that time having risen into notice became lord above the ghats. He made a Jagheer of Gurrumcondah, and gave it to his wife's brother Meer Ruju Ali Khan &c.," This event, if true, must have occurred about 1770.

Muddancherroo.
Basevant Nair.
* *Of Polliem No. 52 it is presumed.*

In Sir Thomas Munro's Memorandum of Pollegars dated 20th March 1802, under No. 52, the following remarks are inserted "No other change occurred till Gurrumcondah was reduced by Hyder, when Meer Saib seized the Poligar* threw him into Prison and fed him on equal quantities of flour and salt till he died. His children remained privately in the country, and as they never excited any disturbances, sied Sahib, when he got *part of Gurrumcondah in Jageer in* 1792, restored the heir to his heredetary villages at the former Peishcush &." In 1802 when Sir Thomas Munro wrote there appears to have been no less than 44 Polliems in the Gurrumcondah talook at that time comprising portions of Royachooty and

Poolavaindla talooks in addition to the territory now included in it. These Polliems were all resumed and pensions granted to the respectivo Poligars on hereditary tenure to *lineal* descendants during good behaviour. Many of these pensions have lapsed and have been renewed to heirs or otherwise dealt with, according to circumstances; according to a return furnished by the Collector of Cuddapah in Fusly 1252,* there were 20 pensions in the Talook in that year the most considerable of which were those noted in the margin. The present condition of these families or of those living adjacent to the Punganoor Territory cannot be ascertained without a reference to the local authorities, which the Board will be prepared to make should the Government wish it.

* *11th July* 1843, *in Con. 7th May:*

	Per Annum.
Mullala Venkatapa.....	2,625
Doddy Pully Vencata Ragooputty.....	2,354
Pompecherla Chinna Kistama Naidoo...	1,161
Goondoopully Sashachellapatty Naidoo.....	1,312
Moodoolachervoo Pedda Venkata Cuddreepatty Naidoo.....	729
Goottopolliem Veerapa Naidoo.....	481
(The rest of smaller sums)	

From a Stat. recently prepared in the Board's office for the Chief Engineer.

9. The present talook of Gurrumcondah is entirely under Sirkar management, containing an area of 880 miles and yielding a revenue of Rupees 1,81,940.

10. The report called for in the second para. of the official memo. under reply is herewith submitted.

From North Arcot 25th August 1858, *in Con. 28th September* 1858.

No. 98. ORDER THEREON, 9th November 1859, No. 1526.

Para. 1. With the first of the papers above recorded, the Board of Revenue submit with reference to the Proceedings of Government dated 12th January 1859, No. 56, the draft of a five year lease to be issued to the Punganúr Zamíndár. They state, in answer to the enquiry made in that order, that the Collector reports the Zamíndár to be competent to manage the estate satisfactorily, and to be one to whom the welfare of the people may be safely entrusted; and they add that the family is a very ancient one, being said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A. D. 1250. In the second paper, the Board furnish information called for in an Official Memo, dated 10th August 1859, on certain points relating to the estate.

2. It appears from Sir Thomas Munro's report† in 1802, that the ancestors of the Punganúr Pálegáru served under the Vijayanagar Rayás and held districts in Hosakóta and Kolár in Jágír. About A. D. 1642, Kolar, where the family then resided, having fallen under the Vigayapúr Sovereign, the Pálegár's ancestor fled and ultimately repaired to Hyderabad, and obtained from the King, at a péshkash of "Sheweroy Pagodas" 30,000, the districts of Awalpilli and Punganúr which had been taken from the Maddanapalli Pálegár. In the reign of Aurangzeb the péshkash was Pagodas 10,000, but including military service, the Pálegár's contribution amounted to Pagodas 40,000. In 1713 the Nawáb of Cuddápah raised the péshkash to Pagodas 32,000 stipulating that the Pálegár should in time of war serve with 2,000 foot; and in 1747 it was reduced by the then Nawáb to Rupees 60,000. During the possession of the country by the Maráthas in 1755 the péshkash was Rupees 32,000; but from that period to 1775, during which time Punganúr frequently changed masters, it was continually varying. Under Hyder's Government, the péshkash was 20,000 Pagodas in 1774; and although the Pálegár was ordered to pay only 10,000 Kantharáya Pagodas yearly in future, it was raised in the following year to Kantharáya Pagodas 20,000 besides 5,000 Pagodas for Darbár charges. In 1785 the péshkash not having been paid, Tippoo expelled the Pálegár, who however recovered his district during the war in 1791. He was again expelled by Tippoo in 1795 for paying very little of the péshkash which was then Kantharáya Pagodas 30,000, but he regained possession in 1799. In the following year, the payment was Kantharáya Pagodas 20,000 in the proportion of one-third to the Company, and two-thirds to the Rájá of Mysore.

† *Dated 17th June* 1802.

3. From 1802 to 1815, the estate was in Amáni, i. e. the Revenue was collected on account of Government: the Pálegár being entrusted with the collection, and receiving an allowance of 20 per cent. for his trouble. In 1815 it was granted to him on a permanent sanad, subject to the approval of the Court of Directors, at a péshkash of Rupees 63,000; being two-thirds of the average gross receipts under the decennial rent then just expired. The Court disallowed† the permanent sanad, being unwilling, they said, to make this case an exception to the general prohibition of the introduction of a permanent settlement in new districts; and ordered that the engagement should terminate with the decennial lease. This lease had been granted in 1814 and ended in 1825. From 1825 to 1833 the arrangement which had prevailed from 1802 to 1815 was revived, viz. the Pálegár made the collections according to the Collector's settlement and received one-fifth for himself. In 1833, the Government again recommended to the Home Government the grant of a permanent lease; the péshkash to be Rupees 63,000 but to begin with Rupees 51,000 on account of the alleged impoverishment of the estate, and to reach 63,000 in the twentieth year. The Court again refused‡ the permanent engagement, stating as a reason that the whole question of the most beneficial mode of settling the revenue would shortly come under consideration and they wished their Governments to be free to act on the decision. They however sanctioned the proposed terms for twenty years. In 1853, on the expiry of that period, a lease at the full amount of Rupees 63,000 was given* for five years: this terminated in June 1858.

† *Despatch dated 22d May* 1818, *paras. 79 to 82, in Proceedings of Government 14th April* 1819.

‡ *Despatch dated 20th March* 1835, *No. 1, para. 6, in Proceedings of Government 7th August* 1835.

* *Order of Government 26th April* 1853, *No.* 460.

4. In bringing forward the question of renewal, the Collector of North Arcot, in which District Punganúr is now included, recommended the issue of a perpetual lease at the full rent of Rupees 63,000. The Government at first approved† of this proposal; but subsequently they resolved‡ to postpone acting upon the recommendation until they should know the opinion of the Home Government. Meanwhile, they thought that a five year lease as recommended by the Board of Revenue might be given; and they desired to be informed of the character of the Zamíndár. The Board's letter of 9th June 1859 recorded at the commencement of these Proceedings is in reply to that reference.

† *Order of Govt. 3rd November* 1858, *No.* 1481.

‡ *Do. 12th January* 1859, *No.* 56.

5. The Government have now to consider the proper course to pursue with respect to this estate, and a choice has to be made between the following three different modes of proceeding, viz.—

First, take it entirely out of the hands of the Pálegár and settle it on ordinary Ryotwar principles;

Second, to retain the Pálegár on the temporary footing which he has occupied since the downfall of Tippoo; or

Third, to give him a permanent interest in the property.

6. The question thus before Government is partly one of policy and partly one of right.

7. With respect to the question of right, it is seen from the foregoing review that the Punganúr family have substantially been in possession and enjoyment of the estate for above two hundred years. They have indeed, in times of war and disturbance, suffered from the exactions of successive conquerors; but they have never lost their hold of the estate; and though even displaced for short periods, they have speedily regained possession. Even under the levelling influences of British Indian rule, they have been allowed to retain uninterrupted possession of the property for more than half a century, though a permanent and valid title has been withheld. This long possession and enjoyment, and especially the continuance of it under the English Government must, in the opinion of Government, be admitted to constitute a right; and it would be a very strong measure, to use the mildest language, now to dispossess the family.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, for the month of November 1859.

8. Again, as a matter of policy, the Governor in Council is of opinion that it is expedient and wise not to reduce all parts of the country to a dull uniformity, but that it is beneficial, where a family is found raised in position above the general Ráyat population and upholding a character suited to that position, to maintain them in it. And this general consideration has special force in the particular case in question. The Punganúr family have uniformly been remarkable for their steady partiality to the English; and not less so for a degree of liberality and enlightenment far from common among landed proprietors of this class in India. And the Governor in Council is of opinion that it would have a beneficial effect, at the present time in particular, to exhibit an instance of steady loyalty rewarded by the grant of a valid and permanent title.

9. It must be added that no tenure could be more adverse to good management and to the improvement of landed property than that system of uncertainty and temporary engagements which has prevailed in Punganúr of late years; and it is highly creditable to the family that under these adverse and discouraging circumstances, the estate has been so well administered.

10. The proposal to give a permanent title to the family has been twice strongly recommended to the Home Authorities by this Government and twice negatived by them. The present Government therefore considers itself precluded from giving such a title without a reference to England. They resolve however to submit the case to the Secretary of State for India, with their strong recommendation based on the above recited grounds of both justice and policy, that they may be authorized to confer on Rájá Sangatúr Immadi Sankararáyalu Yasovanta Bahádúr and his heirs, a permanent title to the Punganúr estate, subject to the payment of an annual péshkash of Rupees 63,000; the rights of the proprietor to be those given by the Permanent Settlement of 1802, where not opposed to existing local rights and usages. Those usages and rights it will be left to the established Courts to maintain.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Rev. Dept.

No. 1526

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 9th November 1859.

Read the following Papers

Letter from the Board of Rev.
Submitting a Draft of Lease
to be issued to the Zamindár of
Punganúr for five years, pending
the settlement of the question of
granting a Permanent Sanad
for the estate.

Offl. Memo from do
Submitting the information
required in Offl. Memo dated
10 August 1859 regarding the
Peshkash Nuzr of the Zamindári.

(Here enter 9 June 59 No 2171)

(Here enter 26 Sept 59)

Pl. With the Govt. of
the papers, the Bd. of Rev
submit with reference to
the Proceedings of Govt. dated
12 January 1859, No 56, the
draft of a five years
lease to be issued to
the Punganúr Zamindár.

They

Govt 1859 No. 1526

They state, in answer to the enquiry made in that order, that the Collector reports the Zamindar to be competent to manage the estate satisfactorily, and to be one to whom the welfare of the people may be safely entrusted; and they add that the family is a very ancient one, being said to have settled in that part of the country so far back as A.D. 1250.

In the second paper, the Board furnish the information called for in an Office Memo dated 10th August 1857 on certain points relating to the estate.

2. It appears from Sir Thomas Munro's report in 1802 that the ancestors of the Pungaúr Pálaiyakár served under the Bijanagar Rájahs and

* dated 17 June 1802.

Hosa

Vijayanagar

Pálegárs

and held districts in and Uscotta and Colár in Jágír. About A.D. 1642, Colár, where the family then resided, having fallen under the Bijapúr Sovereign, the Palaiyakárs fled and ultimately repaired to Hyderabad, and obtained from the King, as a peshkash of "Shaweroy Pagodas" 30000, the districts of Awalpilli and Pungaúr which had been taken from the Maddanapalli Palaiyakár. In the reign of Aurangzeb the peshkash was Pagodas 10,000, but including military service, the Palaiyakár's contributions amounted to Pagodas 40,000. In 1713 the Nawáb of Cadapá raised the peshkash to Pagodas 32,000 stipulating that the Palaiyakár should in time of war serve with

Aurangzeb

Pálegárs

Kadapa is correct, but "Cuddapah" is a corruption

Pálegár

2000

* Pálegárs: see general remarks in Introduction to Digest

2000 foot, and in 1747 it was reduced by the then Nawáb to Rs. 60,000. During the possession of the country by the Maráthas in 1755 the péshkash was Rs. 32000, but from that period to 1775, during which time Purgauner having frequently changed masters, it was continually varying. Under Hyder's government, the péshkash was 20000 Pags. in 1774; and although the Palaiyakár was ordered to pay only 10000 Kantaraya Pagodas yearly in future, it was raised in the following year to K. Pagodas 20000 besides 2000 Pagodas for Darbár charges. C. Pags. 1700. In 1785 the péshkash not having been paid, Tippoo expelled the Palaiyakár, who however received his district during the war in 1791. He was again

again expelled by Tippoo in 1795 for paying very little of the Péshkash which was then C. Pags. 30,000, but he regained poss-ession in 1799. In the following year the payment was K. Pags. 20,000 in the proportion of one third to the Company, and two thirds to the Rája of Mysore.

3. From 1802 to 1805, the estate was in Amáni, i.e. the revenue was collected on account of Govt. the Palaiyakár being entrusted with the collection, and receiving an allowance of 20 per cent for his trouble. In 1805 it was granted to him on a permanent sanad, subject to the approval of the Court of Directors, at a péshcush of Rs. 63,000, being two thirds of the average gross receipts

under

under the decennial rent then
just then expired. The Court
disallowed the permanent
sanad, † and ordered that
the engagement should ter=
=minate with the decennial
lease. This lease had been
granted in 1814 and ended
in 1825. From 1825 to 1833 the
arrangement which had prevailed from
no new engagement was
1802 to 1815 was revived, viz^t the Calavagha
entered into with the Calla=
=mudy the collections according to the
ahar but that of 1815 on
Collector's settlement and received
bonds, it seems, to be
one fifth for himself.
acted on. In 1833, the
Gov^t again recommended
to the Home Gov^t the grant of
a permanent lease; the
peshkash to be Rs 63,000
but to begin with Rs 51,000
on account of the alleged
impoverishment of the
estate, and to reach Rs
63,000 in the twentieth
year. The Court again
refused * the permanent
engagement, stating as a reason
that the whole question of the most
beneficial mode of settling the reve=
=nue would shortly come under
consideration and they wished there

† Despatch dated 22^d May 1818
paras 79 to 82 in Proc^s of Gov^t
14 April 1819.-

†† being unwilling, they said, to
make this case an exception
to the general prohibition of
the introduction of a perma=
=nent settlement in new Dis^ts

Pa'lagár

* Despatch dated 20 March 1835
No 1 para 6. in Proc^s of Gov^t 7^th
August 1835.

† Order of Gov^t 26 April 1853
No 160.

* do 3^rd November 1858 No 1481.

o do 12^th January 1859 No 56.

Governments to be free to act on the
decisions. They however sanctioned
the proposed terms for
twenty years. In 1853, on
the expiry of that period,
a lease at the full amount
of Rs 63,000 was † given for
five years: this terminated
in Fasli 1258.
4
In bringing
forward the question of
renewal, the Collector of
North Arcot, in which Dis=
=trict Punganúr is now in=
=cluded, recommended the
issue of a perpetual lease
at the full rent of Rs
63,000. The Gov^t at first
approved * of this proposal;
but subsequently they † resolved
to postpone acting upon
the recommendation
until they should know the
opinion of the Home Gov^t.
Meanwhile, they thought
that a five year lease as
recommended by the Board of Rev^e
might be given; and they
desired to be informed of the cha=
=racter of the Zamindár.

The

The Board's letter of 9 June 1859 recorded at the commencement of these Proceedings is in reply to this Reference.

5 The Government have now to consider 6 The question thus before Govt is partly one of policy and partly one of right.

7 With respect to the question of right, it is seen from the foregoing account that the Pungaon family have substantially been in possession and enjoyment of the estate for above two hundred years. They have indeed, in times of war and disturbance, suffered from the exactions of successive conquerors, but they have never lost their hold of the estate; and though even displaced ~~ousted from it~~ for short periods, they have speedily regained possession. Even under the levelling influence

of British Indian rule, they have been allowed to retain uninterrupted possession of the property for more than half a century, and through a permanent and valid title has been vested. This long possession and enjoyment, and especially the continuance of it under the English Govt must, in the opinion of Govt, be admitted to constitute a right; and it would be a very strong measure, to use the mildest language now to dispossess the family.

8. Again, as a matter of policy, the Govr in Cl is of opinion that it is expedient and wise not to reduce all parts of the country to a dull uniformity, but that it is beneficial, where a

family

the proper course to pursue with respect to this Estate, and a choice has to be made between the following three different modes of proceeding. Viz
1st, take it entirely out of the hands of the Talookdar, and settle it on ordinary Bycarah principles;
2nd, to retain the Talookdar on the temporary footing which he has occupied since the downfall of Tippoo, or
3rd, to give him a permanent interest in the property.

consideration and they wished them

family is found raised
in position above the general
Ryat population and
upholding a character
suited to that position, to
maintain them in it. And
this general consideration
has special
~~former additional~~ force
~~from the circumstances~~
~~of~~ in the particular case in question.
The Punganúr family
have uniformly been re-
markable for its steadi-
partiality
~~partiality~~ to the English,
and not less so for a de-
gree of liberality and
enlightenment far from
common among landed
proprietors of this class
in India. And the
Govt in Council is of opi-
nion that it would have
a beneficial effect, at
the present time in par-
ticular, to exhibit an
instance

instance of steady loyalty
rewarded by the grant of
a valid and permanent
title.-

9. It must be added
that no tenure could be
more adverse to good
management and to the
improvement of landed
property than that system
of uncertainty and tem-
porary engagement to which
has prevailed in Punganúr
of late years; and it is
highly creditable to the
family that under these
adverse and discouraging
circumstances, the estate
has been so well ad-
ministered.-

10. The proposal
to give a permanent title
to the family has been
twice strongly recom-
mended to the Home

Authorities

Authorities by this Govt
and twice negatived by
them. ~~though for what~~
~~reasons is not apparent~~
The present Govt therefore
considers itself precluded
from giving such a title
without a reference to
England. They resolve
however to submit the
case to the Secretary of
State for India, with
their strong recommenda-
tion based on the above
recited grounds of the
justice and policy, that
they may be authorized
to confer on Rája Sangatúr Immadi
gatúr Emúdi Apukára-
ráyalu Easwanta Bahádur
and his heirs, a perma-
nent title to the Punga-
núr Estate, subject to
the payment of an annual
peishKash of Rs 63,000, the

rights

consideration and they wished this

rights of the Proprietor
to be those given by the
Permanent ~~Sunnud~~ Settlement of 1802,
where not opposed to exist-
ing local rights and usages.
Those usages and rights it
will be left to the establishe
Courts to maintain.—

Yasovanta

Inst. Article 4 of the
a copy of this article
circumstances this Despat-
Permanent Land revenue, all
duties & police endowments,
(I.E. both land & fees) +
military and to cause them
to be attended in the
usual
order
with both
or other Inams & fees

b Copies
Board of Revenue
Cir. 20

Referred to Govt. Pg. No 61

Rt. 18th Janry. 59 — No 13-14-
Polit. 13th July 1802 — 9 12.

13-8-02
6-12-07
5-5-16

Revenue 1859 Depth.
Pro: of Govt. 10th Nov.

No 1526.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dt. 9th November 1859.
Further Pro: 16th April to No 48-49.

Nos 96 & 98.

Resolving to recommend to the Home Government that a permanent title to the Zemindaree Estate in North Arcot may be conferred on the Zemindar and his heirs.

C 28 October 31st