M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-8-37.

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Reference _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2374
266-267
Dated 24th December 1861.

Press
~~Mis.~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 266. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th November 1861, No. 6,076:—

Read the following letter from G. THORNHILL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated Masulipatam, 19th August 1861, No. 213.

SIR,

No. 1. Statement showing the assets of the Estates.
No. 2. Do. showing the old and newly created Zamíndáris.

1. With reference to the Proceedings of Board, 25th March last, No. 1,558, calling for certain information regarding the reversionary right to the Mokhassa villages in the old Zamíndáris of Masulipatam, I have the honor to submit the following information with the Statement called for in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Proceedings under reply.

2. The question relates especially to Nuzeed and Charmahall. The latter of these two is now wholly the property of Government, and of course no objection exists to the application of the Inám rules; and Nuzeed alone, therefore, remains to be noticed, there being but four Mokhassas in the other ancient Zamíndáris, and those charitable grants to Brahmins.

3. As pointed out by the Board in paragraph 3 of the Proceedings under reply, it was clearly contemplated by the Circuit Committee that the value of the Mokhassas in question should be included in the available assets of the Estates; that it was actually so included would appear equally certain from the Statement No. 4 A, which accompanied the extract from the letter of the Special Commission to Government,* forwarded to the Collector of Masulipatam with letter from the Secretary to the Committee; extract from which is also enclosed.

Copy annexed.

* 27th September 1802.

19th March 1803.

4. This Statement appears to be missing from the Board's records, and I hope, therefore, that it will be found to afford all the information required to enable the Board to determine the question that the Mokhassas were actually included in the assets of the Estate. The letter of Mr. Secretary Hodgson, which accompanied it conveys the sanction of Government to the adoption of the figures proposed in the Statement as the permanent assessment, and columns 1 to 4 show that these figures were based upon the accounts of the Circuit Committee, in which the Mokhassas were undoubtedly included. In the marginal Statement here given, the totals in columns 1 to 7 will be found to correspond with those of the Statement accompanying the Circuit Committee's Report of 9th February 1786, omitting Juncums or Sayer, &c. The figures in columns 8, 9 and 10 agreeing with those in the Statement A, No. 4 of Special Commission's letter of 27th September 1802.

Zamíndárs.	As per accounts of the Circuit Committee, 1st February 1788.												As per permanent settlement by the Special Commission.					
	Average of 8 years Gross collections.				Average of 8 years Nett collections.		Average of 8 years Agraharam payments.		Average of 8 years village charges reduced in the village collections.		Two-thirds of the gross revenue in column 7 deducting Sayer.		Deduct Gramakurchi or village charges, &c.		Proposed permanent Jumma by the Commissioners in perpetuity.	
	Total collections.		Star Pagodas.													
	Pagodas.															
1	2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9	
	P.	F. C.	P.	F. C.	P.	F. C.	P.	F. C.	P.	F. C.	S. P.	F. C.	S. P.	F. C.	S. P.	F. C.
Nuzeed. 1st or Ellapasion																
Nuzeed. 2nd or Condapully																
Charmahal	*83,[illegible]	41 57	50,276	0 0	18,610	25 01	1,986	46 47	6,038	27 15	61,263	0 0	33,521	0 0	61,933	0 0
	91,891	0 0	52,229	0 0	10,767	43 14	1,919	32 88	6,031	0 55	61,263	0 0	31,820	0 0	60,000	0 0
Deduct Sycr	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Remaining	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	27,022	28 58	*15,711	8 25	5,853	24 [illegible]	2,099	24 74	6,031	0 55	33,521	0 0	28,000	0 0	60,000	0 0
	42,275	28 16	30,531	9 11	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	31,820	0 0	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	3,030	27 69	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	.....	.....	*17,181	11 25	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

* Excluding Jungum Sayer, &c., and inclusive of village charges.

5. Copies of one or two of the Villagewar Statements of Mokhassas are also enclosed as specimens, although it is believed the originals are all in the Board's records.

Board's Proceedings, 20th June 1831, paragraphs 23 to 53.
Reply of Secretary to Government, 8th November 1831, paragraphs 3 to 7.

6. This question, as it regarded the Zamíndári of Charmahall, was fully entered into by the Board and Government in the correspondence noted, in the margin, to which I also beg to refer the Board.

7. The Board and Government were clearly of opinion that, even at that time, the Zamíndár possessed no right to resume those Mokhassas, or even to enhance the amount of their quit rent, much less then would he possess that right now, when a further period of 30 years' possession has been added to strengthen the titles of their holders.

8. At the same time, however, as the value of these lands was included in the assets of the Estate, it cannot be doubted that the reversionary right to them rests with the Zamíndár, and, not with the Government.

9. There is nothing on record that I can find, to show on what grounds Mr. Russell regarded the Mokhassadárs as liable to Police duties; but it is possible that there dependant Peons were employed generally by the Zamíndárs on Revenue and Police duties, when required to assist the Cuttubady Peons and Village Naikwadies, and were therefore put down as Police, without inquiry into the nature of the grants on which they held their lands.

10. The Mokhassa Sunnuds, as seen in the Villagewar Statement, show that in most instances the Mokhassadár was bound to keep up a certain number of Peons, and although the holders of the Sunnuds themselves may not have been liable to Police duty, it is not unlikely that their dependants may have been so employed upon occasion; and thus that the whole may have come to be looked upon as a Police body.

11. I may add that that portion of the Zamíndári now held by Sobhanadry Apparow in the Kistna District, consisting of the Purganahs of Weyore, Madur, Nunnastalam, Gollapully, Vejayarvy and Chatroy, bears a Peshcush of Rupees 97,700;* but that, so greatly has the Estate increased in value, that sum does not represent much more than one-half of the gross collections. Two of the six Purgaunhs are under the influence of the Kistna Anicut, and their value will, therefore, be still further augmented in the course of a few years.

	RS.
Peshcush	98,000
Deduct Cattle fines remitted.	300
Remaining...	*97,700

In Cons. 11th April 1861, No. 2,239.

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government, with reference to their Proceedings, dated 11th April 1861, No. 812, Revenue Department, on the Board's Proceedings, dated 25th March 1861, No. 1,558.

2. On re-consideration of the papers, extracts from which were appended to those proceedings, and comparing with them the papers submitted by the Collector, the Board see no reason whatever to doubt that the property of the Zamíndárs in the Mukhasas was recognized by the officers who valued the assets at the time of the permanent settlement, and that in those assets were included the full value of the Mukhasas at the time, although some portion of the revenues of the Mukhasa villages was retained by the Mukhassadárs, and in fact constituted the value of the grant.

3. Under this view the reversionary interest in these Estates vest in the Zamíndár and not in Government, although by reason of the long enjoyment of the grant by the grantees, the power which the Zamíndárs originally possessed of resuming or modifying the grants at pleaure may be very questionable.

See paragraphs 27—29 Board's Proceedings, dated 20th June 1831, No. 347, and paragraphs 6 and 7 letter from Government, dated 18th November 1831, No. 1,022, Revenue Department.

4. The Board, therefore, agree in opinion with the Inám Commissioner and the Acting Collector that the rules for the redemption of the reversion to Government cannot be applied to the Mukhasas in question.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

3/4-163
10-8-16

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 1861.

No. 267. ORDER THEREON, dated 1st October 1861, No. 2471.

1. In their Order of 11th August [illegible] 1835, the Government referred to the Board of Revenue for report a letter from the Inam Commissioner relating to the Mokhasa villages of the Zamíndáris in the old Madura District. Mr. Taylor was of opinion that these villages were not excluded from the operation of the Inam Rules, as had usually been supposed, and that therefore they would not come under their provisions.

2. The Board were at first disposed to dismiss the matter and resolved to refer the subject for report by the Collector. The result is now submitted with the proceedings recorded above.

Vide Government Order, 11th April 1861, No. 812.

3. Mr. Thornhill has conclusively shown that Mr. Taylor was correct in his surmise, and the Board now agree both with him and the Inam Commissioner that Government cannot claim the reversionary right to the villages, and therefore that the rules for redeeming that right are inapplicable to them.

4. In this view the Government concur.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

6 enclosures
Returned
D.B. 20/4/74

B D

Memorandum

The undersigned requests the Registrar Government Office Revenue Department will be good enough to return the Enclosures which accompanied Board's Proceedings of 6th November 1861 No 6076.

Revenue Board Office
Madras
18th April 1874

C. B. Naughton
Registrar

To The Registrar Govt. Office
Revenue Department

C/f. Returned

R. D.

No 2374

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 24th December 1861

Read the following Report

of the Board of Revenue

Submitting with their remarks a letter from the Collector of Kistna forwarding certain information regarding the reversionary right to the Mokhassa Villages in the old Zemindaries of Masulipatam

(Revenue Dept. dated 6th Nov. 1861 No 6076)

In their order of

11th August 1860 No 1335 the

Govt referred to the Board

of Revenue for report a letter

from the Asst Commissioner

relating to the Mokhassa Villages

of the Zemindaries in the old

Masulipatam District. Mr

Taylor was of opinion that the

villages were not excluded

from the assets of the estates

on

as had usually been supposed
and that therefore they would
not come under this exception.

2. The Board were at first doubtful on the matter and resolved to refer them subject for enquiry by the Collector. The result is now submitted with the Proceedings recorded above. Vide G.O. 11th inst.

3. My Thornhill has conclusively shown that the Govt was correct in his surmise & the Board now agree both with him and the Inam Commissioner that Govt cannot claim the ~~[illegible]~~ reversionary right & theirs, ~~[illegible]~~ villages & therefore ~~[illegible]~~ that the rules for deciding the right are inapplicable to the ~~[illegible]~~ case.

4. We will now issue the Govt orders.

14 Copies
To The Bd of Revenue Pl. 3/4
To Inam Commissioner &
with Bdl Pro.

C.W.W.

I.D.S.

Eugene Lellubo - England

8/2nd Aug R:20 1882

5/0/20

17-12-24

Pro No. 2-3

8-11-31

181-182

11-4-61

57 to Urg.

11/11/12

18/11/12

8-3-15

4.2.16.

60 3-17

21/6/17

7-11-18

24

15 Dec 1823

Regarding the Reversionary rights of the Mokhasa villages within the Zamindaries of Masulipatam.

Revenue 1861 Departt.

Pro: of Govt for December

No 2374.

24-12-1861

Pro: of the Madras Govt.

D/24 December 1861.

Concurring in the views of the Board regarding Reversionary Right to the Mokhasa Villages in the old Zamindaries of Masulipatam.

No 266 to 267.