M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 333	Press ~~Mis.~~
16-17	
Dated 1—3—1860.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, for the month of March 1860.

No. 16. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th February 1860, No. 817.

Read the following letter from G. S. FORBES, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort Saint George, dated Chetterpúr, 1st February 1860, No. 34.

I regret to report the death, on the 22nd ultimo, of Sri Srínivása Rájamani Rája deo, zamíndár of Mandasa táluq, which pays an annual Peshkash of 14,000 Rupees. His son Sri Rájamani Rája deo, who has already attained his majority, and who, I am given to understand, has been managing the affairs of the estate, has succeeded the late zamíndár.

Submitted for the information of Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 17. ORDER THEREON, 1st March 1860, No. 333.

Ordered to be recorded.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Read the following

No. 817.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 15th February 1860.

Read the following letter from G. S. FORBES, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort St. George, dated Chetterpur, 1st February 1860, No. 34.

I regret to report the death, on the 22nd ultimo, of Sri Srinevasa Rajamani Raja deo, Zemindar of Mandasa taluq, which pays an annual peshcush of 14,000 Rupees. His son Sri Rajamani Raja deo, who has already attained his majority, and who, I am given to understand, has been managing the affairs of the estate, has succeeded the late Zemindar.

Secretary.

To T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government.
Copy to Acting Collector of Ganjam.

Zamindar
Peshkash

Exd. J. Wright.

Rec. 1860 Sept. 1
Rec. of Govt. to Agreeb.
No. 372

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 15th
Dispd 18th July 1860
Rec. 20th

No. 817.

Submitting for information a letter from the Collr of Ganjam reporting the death of Sri Thimmarasa Rajamanne Raja deo Zemindar of Mandasa taluq and the succession of his son who has been managing the affairs of the Estate.

No. 16 & 17.

No. 333 dtd
to Revenue
1st March 60

C24 4 July / A29th

No. 323
Order thereon 1st March 1860 to be recorded.
Ordered to be recorded.

No. 54. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1860, No. 607.

Read the Proceedings of Government, dated 16th November 1859, No. 1557, R. D.

(In Con. 17th November 1859, No. 5766.)

In the above Proceedings of Government on the adjustment made by the Board, of the outstanding claim for jodi against the Srotriyamdárs of the Visvánatuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor district, it is observed, that in passing an order for the reduction of the jodi, the Board of Revenue exceeded their authority, and they are required to state the grounds of their opinion, that the proper amount of the jodi is Rupees 200.

2. The Board beg leave to observe that they are not sensible of having in any way assumed an authority not properly belonging to them, and they trust that the following explanation, even should it fail to satisfy Government of the correctness of the Board's opinion that the jodi properly chargeable is Rupees 200, will suffice to shew that what the Board intended to do was to ascertain what the demand really should be, a point regarding which great uncertainty prevailed, great variety of practice appeared to have taken place, and on which the Board considered they were as competent to form an opinion, from the materials before them, as the Collector of the district, on whose ruling apparently the arrear had been declared to exist.

3. In his letter of 3d November 1857, Mr. R. Cotton, then Acting Collector of Guntoor, pointed out that the Agraharum had been attached 23 years ago in 1835 for arrears which were then small, but had since accumulated to Rupees 2,425-4-8, and that the point at issue between the Agraharumdars and the Government Officers as to the amount of jodi properly claimable, on which the asserted arrear was founded, had still to be settled.

In Con. 13*th February* 1858, *No.* 4419.

	Rupees.
Srotriyam	200
Additional charges on Zamindárs' rent-free cultivation since transferred to the Agraharumdars.	
Savarums	75
Quit-rent on Ináms	27
Ordinary Nuzzur	3
First „	3
Bonus for Dumbala	2
Taharir, or fee to Serishtadar	1
Total Rs.	323

4. He stated that from 1832 the demand had been made annually at Rupees 323, composed as shewn in the margin, against which the Agraharumdars had constantly protested as excessive and unsupported by any official records. The difference, however, between this sum and that collected had been regularly charged against the village as an arrear, and thus the existing accumulation gradually accrued.

5. He appended a statement showing the account for 22 years from Fasli 1244 to Fasli 1266, from which it appeared that the average collections from the village during this series of years, throughout the whole of which the village had been under attachment, and the whole assessment (not merely the favorable jodi,) collected on behalf of the Government, were no more than Rupees 232.

6. It will probably be admitted that the natural inference, from the statement given above, would be, that the jodi of the Srotriyam was not Rupees 323, but something less.

7. The accounts according to the Collector's showing are most imperfect and confused, but according to them it appears that the collections on this account varied from Rupees 40 in Fasli 1203, to Rupees 363 in Fasli 1237, the amount varying in every year, and the Board are disposed to think that the entries have, to some extent, been misunderstood.

	Pags.	F.	C.	P.	F.
Dowle Shist.....				118	22
Deduct.					
Srotriyam.....	25	0	0		
Savarum.....	6	9	0		
Additional demand for straw...	0	18	0		
Quit-rent on Inám.....	7	22	10		
Fees to village Officials.....	2	18	0		
				41	31
Remainder...				76	27
or Rupees....				307	0

was Rupees 307, while to the Board it appears to not the "Srotriyam jodi," but the full assessm ráyats, while the demand against these last was R was, on the contrary, their clear profits.

9. And here again the Board think that Pa ing be assumed to represent the legitimate deman

10. The sannad conferring the village, whic the amount of Srotriyam," as Mr. Cotton expres annually. A dumbala issued in Fasli 1198, A. D Pagodas, or 120 Rupees.

11. In the accounts of Fasli 1213, Pagodas Srortriyam, with a remark that it is "independen on stamped paper was furnished in 1819, under h to the Srotriyamdárs, and in this copy the above does not state whether it bears any appearance of ther in fact the duplicate examined is an original in his letter, to be unauthenticated by any signati triyamdár, is signed by the Collector.

12. In a subsequent letter Mr. Wood, the Agraharu Sarishtada jodi is gi Srotriyam

Dated 28th September, in Con. 28th December 1858, *No.* 4436.

with the extract from the accounts which they pro

13. The whole estate of Chilkalurpad was released in 1834, and in 1836 was sub-divided. In the Colle from Fasl account t shows the

Dated 27th July, in Con. 11th August 1836, *No.* 2029.

which, as above pointed out, has since its attac account of "Srotriyam jodi," but the object of thi each division of the estate was, and as the Board h letter above quoted also remarks, it includes items this last constituting only a part of the sum itself.

14. The Board trust that the foregoing ren the proper amount of "Srotriyam jodi" being R assumption created the arrear, that that sum was re from the village during a series of 22 years, whic that Rupees 200, which the Srotriyamdárs admit

8. For instance, Mr. Cotton states that in the Demand, Collection and Balance statement for Fasli 1266, the demand is entered as Pagodas 118, and he seems to assume that in that year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs reached that amount, but he immediately afterwards gives a statement for Fasli 1232, as shewn in the margin from which he deduces that in the latter year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs prove that the above sum of Pagodas 118 was ent claimable by the Srotriyamdárs from the pees 167 at most, and not Rupees 307, which

odas 25, or Rupees 100, might without straind against the Srotriyamdárs for "Jodi."

h is dated more than 100 years back, "shows ses it, to have been 5 Pagodas, or Rupees 20 1788-89, by a former Collector, gives it at 30

50, or Rupees 200, is shewn under the head of t of certain items," but of this account a copy s signature, by Mr. Oakes, the then Collector, quoted remark does not appear. Mr. Cotton being an interpolation in the original, or whe- at all. It appears, from a subsequent passage re, while the extract produced by the Sro-

Collector, reported that in a statement of the ns in the Chilkalurpad estate, furnished by the r in the above year Fasli 1213, the Srotriyam en at Pagodas 50, (Rupees 200,) which the árs admit to be correct, and which corresponds duce.

under attachment for arrears in 1833, it was the accounts submitted on this last occasion by tor, the "*gross collections*" for seven years, 1235 to Fasli 1241, are shown, and in this he entry relating to the village in question, sum of Rupees 323, which is the amount, hment been assumed as the amount due on s account was to ascertain what the rent roll of ave already observed, and as Mr. Wood in his which are additional to the "Srotriyam jodi,"

arks will serve to show that the assumption of pees 323, was probably incorrect, but this ally far more than the whole average collections were no more than Rupees 232 annually, d, and which both Mr. Wood and Mr. Cotton

appeared to consider correct, was probably the r rate, it was not inconsistent with the resources long sequestration.

15. The point was still unsettled, and a d was not clear, but balancing probabilities, the justly for all parties, and they beg to observe, th judgment, rectified the decision arrived at by estate for an arrear based on a demand, which nei

From Head Assistant Collector in charge, dated 24th, in Con. 30th May 1859, *No.* 2449.

perhaps may be explained by the entire estate time. This decision, moreover, it is to be bor have carried it to its legitimate conclusion woul a date long anterior to the Board's interference district.

16. Should Government feel satisfied with Board beg to renew the application made in th authority to the Collector to write off from the a and to refund to the Srotriyamdárs the sum of the Ráyats, in excess of the amount settled to ha

(A true

(S

No. 55. ORDER THEREON, 6th

1. These Proceedings fully explain the ci deemed it right to reduce the Srotriyam jodi in t District. The particulars of the case are given recapitulation here.

2. It may be briefly remarked that the on subject is the account f

Paragraph 11. in 1819; and from this Rupees 200. The Boar

and the explanation now submitted also shews doing.

3. With reference to paragraph 16 of the ment grant authority for writing off from the ac and for refunding to the Srotriyamdárs the sur amount now settled to have been due from them

oper amount of Srotriyam jodi, and that, at any the village, as evidenced by the results of the

cision had to be come to on it. The evidence oard decided, as they thought, and still think at, in doing so, they merely, to the best of their the Collector, when in 1834 he attached the her did the Srotriyamdárs admit to be correct, the accounts justify, nor the authorities counte- nance so far as any records go to show, for no correspondence with the Board, relative to the attachment, seems to have taken place, which of Chilkalurpad being under attachment at the e in mind, was still in partial abeyance, for to l have involved resumption of the Srotriyam, at at the request of the Officer in charge of the

the explanation which has now been offered, the ir letter of 19th October 1859, No. 4239, for counts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, upees 514-7-4 collected on their account from ve been due from them as "Srotriyam jodi."

Extract.)

igned) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

March 1860, No. 352.

cumstances under which the Board of Revenue he Visvanátuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor at length by the Board, and do not require

ly authenticated document which bears on the rnished to the Srotriyamdárs by Mr. Oakes t appears that the Srotriyam was Pagodas 50 or therefore were correct in fixing that amount, that they did not exceed their authority in so

Proceedings under consideration, the Govern- counts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, of Rupees 514-7-4, collected in excess of the as Srotriyam jodi.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 54. Read the following Proceedings o
No. 607.

Read the Proceedings of Government, da

(In Con. 17th Noven

In the above Proceedings of Governmen
outstanding claim for jodi against the Srotriya
Guntoor district, it is observed, that in passing
of Revenue exceeded their authority, and they
that the proper amount of the jodi is Rupees 2

2. The Board beg leave to observe that th
an authority not properly belonging to them, a
should it fail to satisfy Government of the cor
perly chargeable is Rupees 200, will suffice to
ascertain what the demand really should be, a
great variety of practice appeared to have take
were as competent to form an opinion, from t
district, on whose ruling apparently the arrear

3. In his letter of 3d November 1857, M
point
In Con. 13*th February* 1858, *No.* 4419. years
but
that the point at issue between the Agraharumd
of jodi properly claimable, on which the asserte

	Rupees.
Srotriyam	200
Additional charges on Zamíndárs' rent-free cultivation since transferred to the Agraharumdars.	73
Savarums	27
Quit-rent on Ináms	8
Ordinary Nuzzur	8
First ,,	3
Bonus for Dumbala	2
Tabarir, or fee to Serishtadar	2
Total Rs.	323

5. He appended a statement showing t
1266, from which it appeared that the average
years, throughout the whole of which the vill
assessment (not merely the favorable jodi,) co
more than Rupees 232.

6. It will probably be admitted that the
would be, that the jodi of the Srotriyam was n

7. The accounts according to the Collect
according to them it appears that the collectio
1203, to Rupees 363 in Fasli 1237, the amount
to think that the entries have, to some extent,

the Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1860,

d 16th November 1859, No. 1557, R. D.

ber 1859, No. 5766.)

t on the adjustment made by the Board, of the
ndárs of the Visvánatuna Khandriká in the late
an order for the reduction of the jodi, the Board
are required to state the grounds of their opinion,
0.

ey are not sensible of having in any way assumed
d they trust that the following explanation, even
rectness of the Board's opinion that the jodi pro-
shew that what the Board intended to do was to
oint regarding which great uncertainty prevailed,
place, and on which the Board considered they
he materials before them, as the Collector of the
ad been declared to exist.

r. R. Cotton, then Acting Collector of Guntoor,
d out that the Agraharum had been attached 23
ago in 1835 for arrears which were then small,
ad since accumulated to Rupees 2,425-4-8, and
ars and the Government Officers as to the amount
l arrear was founded, had still to be settled.

4. He stated that from 1832 the demand
had been made annually at Rupees 323, com-
posed as shewn in the margin, against which
the Agraharumdars had constantly protested as
excessive and unsupported by any official
records. The difference, however, between this
sum and that collected had been regularly charg-
ed against the village as an arrear, and thus the
existing accumulation gradually accrued.

e account for 22 years from Fasli 1244 to Fasli
llections from the village during this series of
ge had been under attachment, and the whole
lected on behalf of the Government, were no

atural inference, from the statement given above,
Rupees 323, but something less.

's showing are most imperfect and confused, but
on this account varied from Rupees 40 in Fasli
arying in every year, and the Board are disposed
en misunderstood.

	Pags.	F.	C.	P.	F.
Dowle Shist.....				118	22
Deduct.					
Srotriyam.....	25	0	0		
Savarum.....	6	9	0		
Additional demand for straw....	0	18	0		
Quit-rent on Inám.....	7	22	10		
Fees to village Officials.....	2	18	0		
				41	31
Remainder...				76	27
or Rupees....				307	0

was Rupees 307, while to the Board it appears t
not the "Srotriyam jodi," but the full assessm
ráyats, while the demand against these last was R
was, on the contrary, their clear profits.

9. And here again the Board think that Pa
ing be assumed to represent the legitimate dema

10. The sannad conferring the village, wh
the amount of Srotriyam," as Mr. Cotton expr
annually. A dumbala issued in Fasli 1198, A. D
Pagodas, or 120 Rupees.

11. In the accounts of Fasli 1213, Pagodas
Srortriyam, with a remark that it is "independe
on stamped paper was furnished in 1819, under
to the Srotriyamdárs, and in this copy the abov
does not state whether it bears any appearance of
ther in fact the duplicate examined is an origina
in his letter, to be unauthenticated by any signa
triyamdár, is signed by the Collector.

12. In a subsequent letter Mr. Wood, the
Agrahar
Dated 28th September, in Con. 28th December 1858, *No.* 4436. Sarishtad
jodi is g
Srotriyam
with the extract from the accounts which they pr

13. The whole estate of Chilkalurpad was
released in 1834, and in 1836 was sub-divided.
the Coll
Dated 27th July, in Con. 11th August 1836, *No.* 2029. from Fa
account
shows th
which, as above pointed out, has since its att
account of "Srotriyam jodi," but the object of t
each division of the estate was, and as the Board
letter above quoted also remarks, it includes item
this last constituting only a part of the sum itself

14. The Board trust that the foregoing re
the proper amount of "Srotriyam jodi" being
assumption created the arrear, that that sum was
from the village during a series of 22 years, wh
that Rupees 200, which the Srotriyamdárs admi

8. For instance, Mr. Cotton states that in the Demand, Collection and Balance statement for Fasli 1266, the demand is entered as Pagodas 118, and he seems to assume that in that year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs reached that amount, but he immediately afterwards gives a statement for Fasli 1232, as shewn in the margin from which he deduces that in the latter year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs

C. 40 / 40 / 0 / 0

prove that the above sum of Pagodas 118 was
ent claimable by the Srotriyamdárs from the
upees 167 at most, and not Rupees 307, which

godas 25, or Rupees 100, might without strain-
d against the Srotriyamdárs for "Jodi."

h is dated more than 100 years back, "shows
ses it, to have been 5 Pagodas, or Rupees 20
. 1788-89, by a former Collector, gives it at 30

50, or Rupees 200, is shewn under the head of
t of certain items," but of this account a copy
is signature, by Mr. Oakes, the then Collector,
quoted remark does not appear. Mr. Cotton
being an interpolation in the original, or whe-
at all. It appears, from a subsequent passage
ure, while the extract produced by the Sro-

Collector, reported that in a statement of the
ms in the Chilkalurpad estate, furnished by the
r in the above year Fasli 1213, the Srotriyam
ven at Pagodas 50, (Rupees 200,) which the
dárs admit to be correct, and which corresponds
duce.

under attachment for arrears in 1833, it was
n the accounts submitted on this last occasion by
ctor, the "*gross collections*" for seven years,
li 1235 to Fasli 1241, are shown, and in this
the entry relating to the village in question,
sum of Rupees 323, which is the amount,
chment been assumed as the amount due on
is account was to ascertain what the rent roll of
ave already observed, and as Mr. Wood in his
which are additional to the "Srotriyam jodi,"

arks will serve to show that the assumption of
upees 323, was probably incorrect, but this
ally far more than the whole average collections
h were no more than Rupees 232 annually,
ted, and which both Mr. Wood and Mr. Cotton

appeared to consider correct, was probably the
rate, it was not inconsistent with the resources
long sequestration.

15. The point was still unsettled, and a
was not clear, but balancing probabilities, the
justly for all parties, and they beg to observe, t
judgment, rectified the decision arrived at by
estate for an arrear based on a demand, which ne

From Head Assistant Collector in charge, dated 24th, in Con. 30th May 1859, *No.* 2449.

perhaps may be explained by the entire estate
time. This decision, moreover, it is to be bo
have carried it to its legitimate conclusion wou
a date long anterior to the Board's interferenc
district.

16. Should Government feel satisfied wit
Board beg to renew the application made in th
authority to the Collector to write off from the
and to refund to the Srotriyamdárs the sum of
the Ráyats, in excess of the amount settled to h

(A tru
Extract.)
(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 55. ORDER THEREON, 6th March 1860, No. 352.

1. These Proceedings fully explain the c
deemed it right to reduce the Srotriyam jodi in
District. The particulars of the case are give
recapitulation here.

2. It may be briefly remarked that the
subject is the account
Paragraph 11. in 1819; and from thi
Rupees 200. The Boa
and the explanation now submitted also shew
doing.

3. With reference to paragraph 16 of th
ment grant authority for writing off from the
and for refunding to the Srotriyamdárs the s
amount now settled to have been due from the

oper amount of Srotriyam jodi, and that, at any
the village, as evidenced by the results of the

cision had to be come to on it. The evidence
oard decided, as they thought, and still think
at, in doing so, they merely, to the best of their
the Collector, when in 1834 he attached the
her did the Srotriyamdárs admit to be correct, the
accounts justify, nor the authorities counte-
nance so far as any records go to show, for no
correspondence with the Board, relative to the
attachment, seems to have taken place, which
of Chilkalurpad being under attachment at the
e in mind, was still in partial abeyance, for to
have involved resumption of the Srotriyam, at
at the request of the Officer in charge of the

the explanation which has now been offered, the
ir letter of 19th October 1859, No. 4239, for
ccounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8,
Rupees 514-7-4 collected on their account from
ve been due from them as "Srotriyam jodi."

rcumstances under which the Board of Revenue
the Visvanátuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor
at length by the Board, and do not require

ly authenticated document which bears on the
furnished to the Srotriyamdárs by Mr. Oakes
it appears that the Srotriyam was Pagodas 50 or
d therefore were correct in fixing that amount,
s that they did not exceed their authority in so

Proceedings under consideration, the Govern-
ccounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8,
m of Rupees 514-7-4, collected in excess of the
n as Srotriyam jodi.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 54. Read the following Proceedings c[the Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1860,
No. 607.

Read the Proceedings of Government, da[d 16th November 1859, No. 1557, R. D.

(In Con. 17th Nove[ber 1859, No. 5766.)

In the above Proceedings of Governme[t on the adjustment made by the Board, of the outstanding claim for jodi against the Srotriya[ndárs of the Visvánatuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor district, it is observed, that in passing[an order for the reduction of the jodi; the Board of Revenue exceeded their authority, and they[are required to state the grounds of their opinion, that the proper amount of the jodi is Rupees 2[0.

2. The Board beg leave to observe that t[ey are not sensible of having in any way assumed an authority not properly belonging to them, a[nd they trust that the following explanation, even should it fail to satisfy Government of the co[rectness of the Board's opinion that the jodi properly chargeable is Rupees 200, will suffice to[shew that what the Board intended to do was to ascertain what the demand really should be, a[point regarding which great uncertainty prevailed, great variety of practice appeared to have tak[n place, and on which the Board considered they were as competent to form an opinion, from[he materials before them, as the Collector of the district, on whose ruling apparently the arrear[had been declared to exist.

3. In his letter of 3d November 1857, [Mr. R. Cotton, then Acting Collector of Guntoor, poin[ted out that the Agraharum had been attached 23 year[s ago in 1835 for arrears which were then small, but had since accumulated to Rupees 2,425-4-8, and

In Con. 13*th February* 1858, *No.* 4419. [dars and the Government Officers as to the amount

that the point at issue between the Agraharum[ed arrear was founded, had still to be settled.
of jodi properly claimable, on which the assert

	Rupees
Srotriyam	20[5]
Additional charges on Zamindárs' rent-free cultivation since transferred to the Agraharumdars.	[5]
Savarums	[7]
Quit-rent on Ináms	[8]
Ordinary Nuzzur	[8]
First ,,	[3]
Bonus for Dumbala	[2]
Taharir, or fee to Serishtadar	[3]
Total Rs.	3[-]

4. He stated that from 1832 the demand had been made annually at Rupees 323, composed as shewn in the margin, against which the Agraharumdars had constantly protested as excessive and unsupported by any official records. The difference, however, between this sum and that collected had been regularly charged against the village as an arrear, and thus the existing accumulation gradually accrued.

5. He appended a statement showing [he account for 22 years from Fasli 1244 to Fasli 1266, from which it appeared that the average [collections from the village during this series of years, throughout the whole of which the vi[age had been under attachment, and the whole assessment (not merely the favorable jodi,) [ollected on behalf of the Government, were no more than Rupees 232.

6. It will probably be admitted that th[natural inference, from the statement given above, would be, that the jodi of the Srotriyam was [ot Rupees 323, but something less.

7. The accounts according to the Colle[or's showing are most imperfect and confused, but according to them it appears that the collecti[s on this account varied from Rupees 40 in Fasli 1203, to Rupees 363 in Fasli 1237, the amou[varying in every year, and the Board are disposed to think that the entries have, to some extent been misunderstood.

	Pags.	F.	C.	P.	F.
Dowle Shist				118	22
Deduct.					
Srotriyam	25	0	0		
Savarum	6	9	0		
Additional demand for straw	0	18	0		
Quit-rent on Inám	7	22	10		
Fees to village Officials	2	18	0		
				41	31
Remainder				76	27
or Rupees				307	0

was Rupees 307, while to the Board it appears t
not the "Srotriyam jodi," but the full assessn
ráyats, while the demand against these last was R
was, on the contrary, their clear profits.

9. And here again the Board think that Pa
ing be assumed to represent the legitimate deman

10. The sannad conferring the village, whic
the amount of Srotriyam," as Mr. Cotton expres
annually. A dumbala issued in Fasli 1198, A. D
Pagodas, or 120 Rupees.

11. In the accounts of Fasli 1213, Pagodas 5
Srortriyam, with a remark that it is "independen
on stamped paper was furnished in 1819, under hi
to the Srotriyamdárs, and in this copy the above
does not state whether it bears any appearance of
ther in fact the duplicate examined is an original
in his letter, to be unauthenticated by any signatu
triyamdár, is signed by the Collector.

12. In a subsequent letter Mr. Wood, the
Agraharu
Dated 28th September, in Con. 28th December 1858, No. 4436. Sarishtada
jodi is giv
Srotriyamd
with the extract from the accounts which they pro

13. The whole estate of Chiikalurpad was
released in 1834, and in 1836 was sub-divided. In
the Colle
Dated 27th July, in Con. 11th August 1836, No. 2029. from Fasl
account t
shows the
which, as above pointed out, has since its atta
account of "Srotriyam jodi," but the object of th
each division of the estate was, and as the Board h
letter above quoted also remarks, it includes items
this last constituting only a part of the sum itself.

14. The Board trust that the foregoing rem
the proper amount of "Srotriyam jodi" being R
assumption created the arrear, that that sum was re
from the village during a series of 22 years, whic
that Rupees 200, which the Srotriyamdárs admitt

8. For instance, Mr. Cotton states that in the Demand, Collection and Balance statement for Fasli 1266, the demand is entered as Pagodas 118, and he seems to assume that in that year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs reached that amount, but he immediately afterwards gives a statement for Fasli 1232, as shewn in the margin from which he deduces that in the latter year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs prove that the above sum of Pagodas 118 was ent claimable by the Srotriyamdárs from the pees 167 at most, and not Rupees 307, which

odas 25, or Rupees 100, might without straining against the Srotriyamdárs for "Jodi."

h is dated more than 100 years back, "shows ses it, to have been 5 Pagodas, or Rupees 20 1788-89, by a former Collector, gives it at 30

50, or Rupees 200, is shewn under the head of of certain items," but of this account a copy s signature, by Mr. Oakes, the then Collector, quoted remark does not appear. Mr. Cotton being an interpolation in the original, or whe- at all. It appears, from a subsequent passage re, while the extract produced by the Sro-

Collector, reported that in a statement of the ns in the Chilkalurpad estate, furnished by the in the above year Fasli 1213, the Srotriyam en at Pagodas 50, (Rupees 200,) which the árs admit to be correct, and which corresponds luce.

under attachment for arrears in 1833, it was the accounts submitted on this last occasion by tor, the "*gross collections*" for seven years, 1235 to Fasli 1241, are shown, and in this e entry relating to the village in question, sum of Rupees 323, which is the amount, hment been assumed as the amount due on account was to ascertain what the rent roll of ve already observed, and as Mr. Wood in his which are additional to the "Srotriyam jodi,"

rks will serve to show that the assumption of pees 323, was probably incorrect, but this lly far more than the whole average collections were no more than Rupees 232 annually, d, and which both Mr. Wood and Mr. Cotton

appeared to consider correct, was probably the rate, it was not inconsistent with the resources long sequestration.

15. The point was still unsettled, and a was not clear, but balancing probabilities, the justly for all parties, and they beg to observe, judgment, rectified the decision arrived at by estate for an arrear based on a demand, which ne

From Head Assistant Collector in charge, dated 24th, in Con. 30th May 1859, No. 2449.

perhaps may be explained by the entire estat time. This decision, moreover, it is to be bo have carried it to its legitimate conclusion wou a date long anterior to the Board's interference district.

16. Should Government feel satisfied with Board beg to renew the application made in th authority to the Collector to write off from the and to refund to the Srotriyamdárs the sum of the Ráyats, in excess of the amount settled to h

(A tru

No. 55. ORDER THEREON, 6th

1. These Proceedings fully explain the c deemed it right to reduce the Srotriyam jodi in District. The particulars of the case are give recapitulation here.

2. It may be briefly remarked that the subject is the account
Paragraph 11. in 1819; and from this
Rupees 200. The Boa
and the explanation now submitted also shew doing.

3. With reference to paragraph 16 of the ment grant authority for writing off from the a and for refunding to the Srotriyamdárs the s amount now settled to have been due from the

oper amount of Srotriyam jodi, and that, at any the village, as evidenced by the results of the

cision had to be come to on it. The evidence oard decided, as they thought, and still think at, in doing so, they merely, to the best of their he Collector, when in 1834 he attached the ner did the Srotriyamdárs admit to be correct, the accounts justify, nor the authorities countenance so far as any records go to show, for no correspondence with the Board, relative to the attachment, seems to have taken place, which of Chilkalurpad being under attachment at the e in mind, was still in partial abeyance, for to l have involved resumption of the Srotriyam, at , at the request of the Officer in charge of the

the explanation which has now been offered, the ir letter of 19th October 1859, No. 4239, for counts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, Rupees 514-7-4 collected on their account from ve been due from them as "Srotriyam jodi."

Extract.)

Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

March 1860, No. 352.

rcumstances under which the Board of Revenue the Visvanátuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor at length by the Board, and do not require

ly authenticated document which bears on the furnished to the Srotriyamdárs by Mr. Oakes it appears that the Srotriyam was Pagodas 50 or d therefore were correct in fixing that amount, s that they did not exceed their authority in so

Proceedings under consideration, the Governcounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, n of Rupees 514-7-4, collected in excess of the as Srotriyam jodi.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Proceedings of the Madras G[o]ernment, Revenue Department, for the month [o]f *March* 1860.

No. 54. Read the following Proceedings o[f] No. 607.

Read the Proceedings of Government, dat[ed] [e] Board of Revenue, dated 4th February 1860,

(In Con. 17th Novem[ber] 16th November 1859, No. 1557, R. D.

[e]r 1859, No. 5766.)

In the above Proceedings of Government on the adjustment made by the Board, of the outstanding claim for jodi against the Srotriyan dárs of the Visvánatuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor district, it is observed, that in passing n order for the reduction of the jodi, the Board of Revenue exceeded their authority, and they re required to state the grounds of their opinion, that the proper amount of the jodi is Rupees 2[0].

2. The Board beg leave to observe that th[ey] are not sensible of having in any way assumed an authority not properly belonging to them, a[nd] they trust that the following explanation, even should it fail to satisfy Government of the co[r]ectness of the Board's opinion that the jodi properly chargeable is Rupees 200, will suffice to [s]hew that what the Board intended to do was to ascertain what the demand really should be, a [p]oint regarding which great uncertainty prevailed, great variety of practice appeared to have take[n] place, and on which the Board considered they were as competent to form an opinion, from t[he] materials before them, as the Collector of the district, on whose ruling apparently the arrear [h]ad been declared to exist.

3. In his letter of 3d November 1857, M[r]. R. Cotton, then Acting Collector of Guntoor, point[ed] out that the Agraharum had been attached 23 *In Con.* 13*th February* 1858, *No.* 4419. years ago in 1835 for arrears which were then small, but [h]ad since accumulated to Rupees 2,425-4-8, and that the point at issue between the Agraharumd[a]rs and the Government Officers as to the amount of jodi properly claimable, on which the asserte[d] arrear was founded, had still to be settled.

	Rupees.
Srotriyam	200
Additional charges on Zamindárs' rent-free cultivation since transferred to the Agraharumdars.	7[5]
Savarums	2[7]
Quit-rent on Ináms	8[3]
Ordinary Nuzzur	8
First ,,	[1]
Bonus for Dumbala	[1]
Taharir, or fee to Serishtadar	[1]
Total Rs.	32[1]

4. He stated that from 1832 the demand had been made annually at Rupees 323, composed as shewn in the margin, against which the Agraharumdars had constantly protested as excessive and unsupported by any official records. The difference, however, between this sum and that collected had been regularly charged against the village as an arrear, and thus the existing accumulation gradually accrued.

5. He appended a statement showing t[he] account for 22 years from Fasli 1244 to Fasli 1266, from which it appeared that the average [co]llections from the village during this series of years, throughout the whole of which the vill[a]ge had been under attachment, and the whole assessment (not merely the favorable jodi,) c[o]llected on behalf of the Government, were no more than Rupees 232.

6. It will probably be admitted that the [na]tural inference, from the statement given above, would be, that the jodi of the Srotriyam was n[o]t Rupees 323, but something less.

7. The accounts according to the Collect[or's] showing are most imperfect and confused, but according to them it appears that the collectio[n] on this account varied from Rupees 40 in Fasli 1203, to Rupees 363 in Fasli 1237, the amount varying in every year, and the Board are disposed to think that the entries have, to some extent, [b]een misunderstood.

	Pags.	F.	C.	P.	F.	C.
Dowle Shist.....				118	22	40
Deduct.						
Srotriyam.....	25	0	0			
Savarum.....	6	9	0			
Additional demand for straw....	0	18	0			
Quit-rent on Inám.....	7	22	10			
Fees to village Officials.....	2	18	0			
				41	31	40
Remainder...				76	27	0
or Rupees....				307	0	0

8. For instance, Mr. Cotton states that in the Demand, Collection and Balance statement for Fasli 1266, the demand is entered as Pagodas 118, and he seems to assume that in that year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs reached that amount, but he immediately afterwards gives a statement for Fasli 1232, as shewn in the margin from which he deduces that in the latter year the demand against the Srotriyamdárs was Rupees 307, while to the Board it appears to prove that the above sum of Pagodas 118 was not the "Srotriyam jodi," but the full assessment claimable by the Srotriyamdárs from the ráyats, while the demand against these last was upees 167 at most, and not Rupees 307, which was, on the contrary, their clear profits.

9. And here again the Board think that Pagodas 25, or Rupees 100, might without straining be assumed to represent the legitimate demand against the Srotriyamdárs for "Jodi."

10. The sannad conferring the village, which is dated more than 100 years back, "shows the amount of Srotriyam," as Mr. Cotton expresses it, to have been 5 Pagodas, or Rupees 20 annually. A dumbala issued in Fasli 1198, A. D. 1788-89, by a former Collector, gives it at 30 Pagodas, or 120 Rupees.

11. In the accounts of Fasli 1213, Pagodas 50, or Rupees 200, is shewn under the head of Srortriyam, with a remark that it is "independent of certain items," but of this account a copy on stamped paper was furnished in 1819, under his signature, by Mr. Oakes, the then Collector, to the Srotriyamdárs, and in this copy the above quoted remark does not appear. Mr. Cotton does not state whether it bears any appearance of being an interpolation in the original, or whether in fact the duplicate examined is an original at all. It appears, from a subsequent passage in his letter, to be unauthenticated by any signature, while the extract produced by the Srotriyamdár, is signed by the Collector.

12. In a subsequent letter Mr. Wood, the Collector, reported that in a statement of the Agrahar ms in the Chilkalurpad estate, furnished by the Sarishtadar in the above year Fasli 1213, the Srotriyam jodi is given at Pagodas 50, (Rupees 200,) which the Srotriyamdárs admit to be correct, and which corresponds with the extract from the accounts which they produce.

Dated 28th September, in Con. 28th December 1858, *No.* 4436.

13. The whole estate of Chilkalurpad was under attachment for arrears in 1833, it was released in 1834, and in 1836 was sub-divided. In the accounts submitted on this last occasion by the Collector, the "*gross collections*" for seven years, from Fasli 1235 to Fasli 1241, are shown, and in this account the entry relating to the village in question, shows the sum of Rupees 323, which is the amount, which, as above pointed out, has since its attachment been assumed as the amount due on account of "Srotriyam jodi," but the object of this account was to ascertain what the rent roll of each division of the estate was, and as the Board have already observed, and as Mr. Wood in his letter above quoted also remarks, it includes items which are additional to the "Srotriyam jodi," this last constituting only a part of the sum itself.

Dated 27th July, in Con. 11th August 1836, *No.* 2029.

14. The Board trust that the foregoing remarks will serve to show that the assumption of the proper amount of "Srotriyam jodi" being upees 323, was probably incorrect, but this assumption created the arrear, that that sum was ally far more than the whole average collections from the village during a series of 22 years, which were no more than Rupees 232 annually, that Rupees 200, which the Srotriyamdárs admitted, and which both Mr. Wood and Mr. Cotton

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, for the month of March 1860.

appeared to consider correct, was probably the proper amount of Srotriyam jodi, and that, at any rate, it was not inconsistent with the resources of the village, as evidenced by the results of the long sequestration.

15. The point was still unsettled, and a decision had to be come to on it. The evidence was not clear, but balancing probabilities, the Board decided, as they thought, and still think justly for all parties, and they beg to observe, that, in doing so, they merely, to the best of their judgment, rectified the decision arrived at by the Collector, when in 1834 he attached the estate for an arrear based on a demand, which neither did the Srotriyamdárs admit to be correct, the accounts justify, nor the authorities countenance so far as any records go to show, for no correspondence with the Board, relative to the attachment, seems to have taken place, which perhaps may be explained by the entire estate of Chilkalurpad being under attachment at the time. This decision, moreover, it is to be borne in mind, was still in partial abeyance, for to have carried it to its legitimate conclusion would have involved resumption of the Srotriyam, at a date long anterior to the Board's interference, at the request of the Officer in charge of the district.

From Head Assistant Collector in charge, dated 24th, in Con. 30th May 1859, *No.* 2449.

16. Should Government feel satisfied with the explanation which has now been offered, the Board beg to renew the application made in their letter of 19th October 1859, No. 4239, for authority to the Collector to write off from the accounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, and to refund to the Srotriyamdárs the sum of Rupees 514-7-4 collected on their account from the Ráyats, in excess of the amount settled to have been due from them as "Srotriyam jodi."

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Sub-Secretary.*

No. 55. ORDER THEREON, 6th March 1860, No. 352.

1. These Proceedings fully explain the circumstances under which the Board of Revenue deemed it right to reduce the Srotriyam jodi in the Visvanátuna Khandriká in the late Guntoor District. The particulars of the case are given at length by the Board, and do not require recapitulation here.

2. It may be briefly remarked that the only authenticated document which bears on the subject is the account furnished to the Srotriyamdárs by Mr. Oakes in 1819; and from this it appears that the Srotriyam was Pagodas 50 or Rupees 200. The Board therefore were correct in fixing that amount, and the explanation now submitted also shews that they did not exceed their authority in so doing.

Paragraph 11.

3. With reference to paragraph 16 of the Proceedings under consideration, the Government grant authority for writing off from the accounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2,560-8-8, and for refunding to the Srotriyamdárs the sum of Rupees 514-7-4, collected in excess of the amount now settled to have been due from them as Srotriyam jodi.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Revenue 1860 D Depart.
Pro- of Govt. 10 March
N: 352
Pro- of the Madras Govt.
d/ 6 March/60-

Granting authority for writing off the fictitious arrear of Rupees 2560-8-8- against the Shrotriyandars of Vinnamatuna Pilandrika in the late Guntoor district and for refunding to them Rupees 514-7-4- collected in excess of the amount now settled as Shrotriyam jodi-

N: 54 & 55