M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1679 Press ~~Mis.~~

15-16

Dated 13—12-1859.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 15. Read the following letter from C. PELLY, Esq., Member of the Board of Revenue; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 21st November 1859, No. 93.

I have the honor to submit for the orders of Government, my proposition for the re-arrangement of the táluqs of the Vizagapatam district.

2. There are it seems 3 revenue táluqs in Vizagapatam. In Mr. Bourdillon's memorandum only two are entered, and these 2 it was proposed to unite into one táluq. The táluqs are Pálkonda, in the extreme north-east of the district; and Golkonda and Sarvasiddhi on the west. The intervening space is Zamindárí territory. But at present the Pálkonda táluq is rented entire to Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co. and will not require any revenue establishment for it, (see Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 29th May 1856, No. 549.)

3. Mr. Thornhill, the acting Collector, proposes to retain the 3 táluqs as they are, fully agreeing in an opinion expressed by Mr. Reade, the former Collector, to that effect. The reasons assigned by Mr. Reade for not making any alteration were given in his letter on reply to Mr. Parker's circular, and I beg here to annex an extract from that letter: "strictly there are only 3 Government táluqs in the district, one of these Pálconda stands by itself as it were, and cannot be amalgamated with the neighbouring táluqs which are all Zamindárí; and I am of opinion that neither is amalgamation of the other two, namely of Sarvasiddhi and Golkonda, practicable. The latter tàluq has always hitherto been a difficult part of the district to manage, and a Tahsildar must be permanently resident at the head qaurters of Narasapatnam, and the hill tracts to the west and north of the táluq render it very inexpedient that this officer should ever be drawn away to any distance in other directions. It is true there is a Military Assistant Magistrate at Narasapatnam and Sibundies, but the duties of a Tahsildar in no way clash or can they be performed by a Magistrate, hence if only for the superintendence of the due collection of the revenues in those parts where the facilities for evading their payment are so great, and as well for the investigation and settlement of revenue complaints, I am of opinion that the Tahsildar cannot be withdrawn, and if so, I think it is beyond dispute that an officer of like grade should remain to superintend the revenue affairs of the táluq of Sarvasiddhi which is of some extent. I may also mention in further illustration of the difficulty existing to amalgamation that private estates of independent proprietors intervene between these two táluqs. Of course if the amalgamation is to be merely nominal, there can be no objection to it, but it is my opinion that amalgamation of Golkonda with Sarvasiddhi is not on any account an advisable measure, though am of opinion that each officer presiding in it should have an increase of salary if granted elsewhere. But while I am opposed to the amalgamation of these 2 táluqs, I think the petty Zamindárí or táluq of Kassim-Kóta now under my management in trust for the minor heir, may without any objection be incorporated with the táluq of Sarvasiddhi, as what revenue duties there are in Kassim-Kóta, are trifling, and would impose little additional labor on the Sarvasiddhi Tahsildar, whose duties at present are not very onerous, but I would remark that there will be no saving to Government by the arrangement, as the establishment kept up for the management of the Kassim-Kóta estate or táluq are paid out of its revenues and fall exclusively on the Zamindár."

Collector Vizagapatam to Revenue Board 13th July.

4. The táluq of Pálkonda must necessarily be retained as it is. The area is 488 square miles and the revenue 1,11,000 Rupees; but I am not prepared to accept the reasons given for retaining the two táluqs of Golkonda and Sarvasiddhi as separate táluqs. The area of Golkonda is 640 miles; but what is the revenue? only 55 to 56,000 Rupees; on the other hand the area of Sarvasiddhi is only 202 square miles the revenue more respectable, but still only 1,00,000 of Rupees. The total extent and revenue of the 2 táluqs combined would not be excessive, viz. 843 square miles and about 1½ lac of Rupees revenue. With such a revenue I cannot but recommend the two tàluqs being united into one revenue táluq.

As per Statement.

	Area.	Revenue.
Golkonda	640¾	55,687
Sarvasiddhi	202	1,08,015
	842¾	1,63,702
Pálkonda	487¾	1,10,908

5. As the estate of Kassim-Kóta will soon be under the management of the present minor proprietor and as it costs nothing now to Government, the question of amalgamating it with Sarvasiddhi need not be entertained.

6. The new táluq may perhaps be called Narasapatnam, the Kasba of Golkonda táluq, and the future revenue táluqs should be.

1. Pálkonda.
2. Narasapatnam.

7. Mr. Reade promised to note certain changes he proposed to make in the agency tracts; but Mr. Thornhill in forwarding the map has not noticed this subject and it may be deferred to a future time when the Police jurisdiction is under consideration.

To Board Revenue, 13th July, paragraph 5.

No. 16. ORDER THEREON, 13th December 1859, No. 1679.

There are only three Government táluqs in the Vizagapatam district, viz. Pálkonda in the north west, and Golkonda and Sarvasiddhi in the south. The acting Collector desires to make no alteration. The first mentioned, which is a lapsed Zamindárí, has been leased out ever since it reverted to Government; and for this reason it was not noticed in the Secretary's Memorandum of the 4th June, and he quotes the late Collector to the same purport. Pálkonda being surrounded by proprietary estates, cannot receive any addition, as correctly pointed out; and Golkonda is stated to be a difficult charge, in consequence of the wildness of both the country and the people. With respect to Sarvasiddhi, the only change suggested was the amalgamation with it of the minor estate of Kassim-Kóta, a proposition however, which, as Mr. Pelly observes, it is unnecessary to entertain, as the proprietor will soon assume its management, and as it costs the Government nothing. Mr. Pelly, differing from the district officers, proposes to unite Golkonda and Sarvasiddhi; the united táluq will have an area of 842 square miles, but a revenue of only about 1,50,000 Rupees. He agrees with the local officers that Pálkonda must be left as it is.

2. The Government agree in Mr. Pelly's plan to unite Golkonda and Sarvasiddhi; and in this decision they are fully supported by the Honorable Mr. Elliot, late Commissioner in the northern circars and intimately acquainted with the localties; who in his place in Council has declared his full approval of the union. The Kasba of the new táluq will be Narasapatnam; and that will also be the name of the táluq.

3. Mr. Pelly says nothing in his present report regarding the transfer of the Wadáda táluq from Ganjam to Vizagapatam, which he was asked to consider and report upon* in bringing forward his present arrangements. He will be requested to report to Government, to what decision he has been led by his further enquiries on the subject.

* *Proceedings of Government 24th September 1859 No. 1289.*

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

No. 93

From

C. Pelly Esq.
Member of the Board of Revenue

To

J. D. Bourdillon Esq.
Sec.y to Govern.t Revenue Depart.t

Sir,

I have the honor, to submit for the orders of Government my proposition for the re-arrangement of the Talúqs of the Vizagapatam District.

2 There are at present 3 Revenue Talúqs in Vizagapatam. In Mr. Bourdillon's Memo: only 2 are entered, and these 2 it was proposed to unite into one Talúq. The Talúqs are Palconda in the extreme North east of the District, and Golconda and Sarvasiddi on west. The intervening space is Zemindary Territory. But at present the Palconda Talúq is rented entire to Messrs Arbuthnot and Co. and will not require any revenue Establishment for it. (vide G. M. C. dated 29th May 1856 No 549)

Mr. Thornhill the acting Collector proposes to retain the 3 Talaqs as they are, fully agreeing in an opinion expressed by Mr. Reade, the former Collector, to that effect. The reasons assigned by Mr. Reade for not making any alteration were given in his letter on reply to Mr. Parker's Circular, and I beg here to annex an Extract from that letter.

Col.r Fly to Revr Bo 13th July.

"Strictly there are only 3 Government Talooks in the District, one of these Palcondah stands by itself as it were, and cannot be amalgamated with the neighbouring Talooks which are all Zemindary, and I am of opinion that neither is amalgamation of the other two, namely of Sirwaseddy and Golconnah, practicable. The latter Talook has always hitherto been a difficult part of the District to manage, and a Tahsildar must be permanently resident at the Head Quarters of Nursipatam, and the Hill Tracts to the West and North of the Talook render it very inexpedient that this officer should ever be drawn away to any distance in other directions. It is true there is a Military assistant Magistrate at Nursipatam and of Sebundies

Sibundies, but the duties of a Tahsildar in no way clash or can they be performed by a Magistrate, hence if only for the superintendence of the due collection of the Revenues in those parts where the facilities for evading their payment are so great, and as well for the investigation and settlement of Revenue complaints I am of opinion that the Tahsildar cannot be withdrawn, and if so I think it is beyond dispute that an Officer of like grade should remain to superintend the Revenue affairs of the Talook of Sirwaseddy which is of some extent. I may also mention in further illustration of the difficulty existing to amalgamation that private estates of independent Proprietors intervene between these two Talooks. Of course if the amalgamation is to be merely nominal there can be no objection to it, but it is my opinion that amalgamation of Golconnah with Sirwaseddy is not on any account an advisable measure, though I am of opinion that each Officer presiding in it should have an increase of Salary if granted elsewhere. But while I am opposed

opposed to the amalgamation of these 2 Jaloolies, I think the petty Zemindary or Jaloolk of Cassimcotah now under my management in trust for the Minor heir, may without any objection be incorporated with the Jaloolk of Sarvasiddy, as what Revenue duties there are in Cassimcotah, are trifling, and would impose little additional labor on the Sarvasiddy Tahsildar, whose duties at present are not very onerous but I would remark that there will be no saving to Government by the arrangement, as the establishment Kept up for the management of the Cassimcotah estate or Jaloolk are paid out of its Revenues and fall exclusively on the Zemindar."

4 The Jaloolk of Palconda must necessarily be retained

1 as

Revr. Dept.

No. 1679.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 13th Decr. 1859

Read the following letter
from C. Petty Esqre. Member
of the Board of Revenue.

Reports his proposals for re-arranging the Talugs of Vizagapatam.

(Here enter 21st Novr. 1859 No. 93)

There are only three Government talugs in the Vizagapatam District, viz Palkonda in the north west and Golkonda and Sarvasidi in the south. The acting Collector desires to make no alteration. The first mentioned, which is a lapsed Zemindary, has been leased out ever since it reverted to Government; and for this reason it was not noticed in the Secretary's Memo of the 2d June, and he quotes the late Collector to the same purport. Palkonda being

being surrounded by proprie-
-tary Estates, cannot receive
any addition, as correctly ~~it~~
pointed out; and Golkonda
is stated to be a difficult
charge, in consequence of the
wildness of both the country
and the people. With respect
to Sarvasidi, the only change
suggested was the amalga-
-mation with it of the
minor estate of Kasim-
Kota, a proposition however,
which, as Mr. Petty observes,
it is unnecessary to enter-
-tain, as the proprietor will
soon assume its manage-
-ment, and as it costs the
Government nothing. Mr.
differing from the District Officers proposal
Petty, ~~to~~ unite Golkondia
and Sarvasidi; ~~differing~~
~~from the District officers,~~
~~proposes~~ the united taluq
will have an area of 842
square miles, but a Re-
-venue of only about 50,000
Rupees

Rupees. He agrees with the
local officers that Pál-
-londa must be left as
it is.

2. The Government
agree in Mr. Petty's plan
to unite Golkonda and Sar-
-vasidi; and in this deci-
-sion they are fully sup-
-ported by the Honorable Mr.
Elliot, late Commissioner in
the Northern Circars and
intimately acquainted with
the localities, who in his
place in Council has de-
-clared his full approval
of the union. The Kasba
of the new taluq will be
Narasapatam, and that
will also be the name of
the taluq.

3 Mr. Petty says
nothing in his present
report regarding the
transfer of the Wadáda
táluq from Ganjam

to

to Vizagapatam, which he was asked to consider & and report upon in bringing forward his present arrangements. He will be requested to report to Government, to what decision he has been led by his further enquiries on the subject.

+ Pros of Govt 24th Sept 59 No 1289.

3 Copies
Mr C Nelly Capt 14
6 Board of Revenue

C 28 Nov 85 Dec

Copy in a Letter to England
dd 6th March 60 No. 21.

12/8/98

Revenue 1859 Dept.
Pro: of Govt. 20th Decr.

No. 1679.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dd 13th Decr 59.

R. No. 64-67
17-6-1859
" 28 & 29
3-6-1856.

Passing orders on
Mr Pelly's proposals
for re-arranging the
Talugs of Vizagapatam.

Nos 15 & 16.