MADRAS RECORD OF

Government of Madras

Revenue DEPART

G.O. No. 352	Pr M
54-55	
Dated 6 - 3 — 186	

Not to be folded or roughly h

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

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.

	Rupees.
Srotriyam	200
Additional charges on Zamindárs' rent-free cultivation since transferred to the Agraharumdars.	75
Savarums	27
Quit-rent on Ináms	8
Ordinary Nuzzur	8
First ,,	3
Bonus for Dumbala	2
Taharir, or fee to Serishtadar	—
Total Rs.	323

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 10 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.	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 Rupees 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 Agraharums 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 Rupees 323, was probably incorrect, but this assumption created the arrear, that that sum was really 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

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.

IN CON. 30TH MAY 1859, No. 2449.

From C. G. MASTER, Esq., Head Asst. Collector in charge GUNTOOR,

dated Guntoor, 24th May 1859, No. 45.

With reference to para. 18 of Extract from the Board's Proceedings of the 18th March last, No. 930, I have the honor to state for their information that on reference to the Records of this Office, no correspondence appears to have taken place with the Board relating to the attachment of Visvanadooney Cundreca. A copy of the Sunnud in possession of the Shrotriumdars is enclosed as called for.

2. As regards the present condition of the family of the Shrotriumdars, I beg to forward a Memorandum shewing the number of partners and their respective dependants or relatives; and the extent and value of Inam lands in their enjoyment in other villages. The condition of the Shrotriumdars is stated to be of an ordinary kind.

ENC. 1.—Sunnud in Teloogoo.

ENC. 2.

ABSTRACT—Statement shewing the extent of Inams in the enjoyment of Visvanadooney Cundreca Agraharumdars.

Enclosure No 4 in the Board's Proceedings to the Chief Secretary to Government Dated 4th February 1860. No 607.

Encl. 2 to No 2.

Letter from the Collr of Guntoor to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 20th May 1859. No 214 regarding Pannikyam Mirasidars.

No 252

Proceedings of the Madras Government under date the 6th March 1860.

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Submitting explanation in the subject of the Sroteriyam Jodi of Visvanathum Kandrike in the late Guntur District.

} Received Feb. 4. 1860 No 607.

Chandrika Guntur

1. These Proceedings fully explain the circumstances under which the Board of Revenue thought proper to adjudge the Sroteriyam Jodi in the Visvanathum Kandrike in the late Guntur 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 by the Sroteriyamdars to Mr Oakes in 1819: and from this it appears that the Sroteriyam was Pagodas 50 or Rs. 200. The Board therefore were correct in fixing that amount, and their explanation now submitted also shews that they did not exceed their authority in so doing.

Para 11.

3. With reference to Para 16 of the Proceedings under Consideration, the Government grants authority for writing off from the accounts the fictitious arrear of Rupees. 2560-8-8, and for refunding to the Srotriyandars the sum of Rupees 574-7-4 collected in excess of the amount now settled to have been due from them as Srótriyam Jodi-

11 Copies to the Board of Revenue with the Collector's Dispatch
1 " " Accountant General
3 " " Civil Auditor