

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 647	Press ~~Mis.~~
390.392	
Dated	24. 11. 18 62

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
24th March 1862.*

Read the following letters :—

No. 390. From G. N. TAYLOR, Esq., Inám Commissioner, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Chatterpore, 11th February 1862, No. 5.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to submit for the approval of Government drafts of the Instructions which I propose to issue to the Deputy Collectors employed in the Inám Settlement of the Districts of Vizagapatam and Ganjam.

2. Before my arrival in these Districts, I was apprehensive that an individual settlement with the Inámdárs would not find favor in the numerous private estates, and particularly in the large Zamíndári tracts of both Districts, where the claims of the Government to escheats had been rarely asserted and their right to the reversion of Ináms but little understood. I find, however, that the Zamíndárs, with scarcely an exception, are quite prepared for the proceedings of this Commission, and that the Inámdárs are, in general, most desirous of securing the benefits of the Settlement. After conferring with the Collectors of both Districts, I have therefore determined, with their concurrence, to adhere to the usual course of procedure, and under this view, the present Instructions have been prepared.

Vizagapatam.

3. There are but few points requiring notice in the Instructions relating to Vizagapatam. The Rájá of Vizianagaram, within whose Zamíndári, nearly one-half of the alienated lands of this District are included, has in a personal conference, promised me his best assistance in forwarding the enquiry: and I have no doubt that a settlement of all the special tenures in his estate will be concluded to the satisfaction of all parties.

4. For the settlement of the Ináms in the Zamíndári of Jeypúr, the Government will observe that there are no accounts whatever and no reliable information upon which the enquiry could be conducted. I propose, therefore, at any rate for the present, to avoid all interference with this estate. The Zamíndár has been requested to furnish all available accounts of the alienated lands in his territory, and a settlement or compromise may hereafter be effected, in consultation with the Governor's Agent, on the basis of the information thus supplied.

5. The orders of Government are specially required in regard to the treatment of the exceptional tenures, granted by the early chiefs in Council in the Proprietary estate of Waltair, proposed in paragraph 26 of my Instructions.

Ganjam.

6. As regards Ganjam, the settlement of the ordinary Inām tenures in this District, will be conducted with the same facility as in Vizagapatam, and there are no points in the Instructions to which I need specially request the attention of Government.

Jághirs or Mukhásas in ancient Zamindáris.

7. There is, however, one question in regard to which the decision and orders of the Government are necessary, viz., the treatment of the Jághir or Mukhása tenures in the ancient Zamindáris of this District. Discussions have arisen from time to time as to whether the reversion of these tenures belongs to the Government or to the Zamindárs, but the final settlement of the question is still in abeyance. The subject is one of considerable importance; the number of these Jághirs is large, and their present value cannot be less than one lac of Rupees. After going carefully into the details I have arrived at a different conclusion from that which has hitherto been adopted, and it will be necessary, therefore, to put the matter before the Government at some length.

8. The permanent settlement in Ganjam was not conducted on the same principle as in the other Districts of the Northern Sirkars. In Masulipatam, Rajahmundry, and Vizagapatam, the Peshkash of the several Zamindáris, having been calculated at two-thirds of certain fixed assets, it was easy to determine by reference to the detailed accounts, what items were, and what were not included in these assets. But in Ganjam there were no fixed assets. No proportion of the valuation of the gross jamma of each estate was adopted:—but the Peshkash was, in point of fact, fixed discretionarily by the Board of Revenue, on a review of all the accounts before them.

Board's letter to Government, 17th May 1864.

9. The documents referred to by the Board of Revenue, in proposing the permanent Assessment of the several Zamindáris, were—

See printed book comprising all papers connected with the Permanent Settlement.

- (1.)—Statement of the average value according to the accounts of the Circuit Committee, compiled from the actual revenues of the Zamindárs for the eight years immediately preceding 1788.
- (2.)—Statement of the value of the Zamindáris as delivered to Mr. Brown by the Zamindárs themselves in Fasli 1210 (A. D. 1800).
- (3.)—Statement of the average receipts of Government from the Zemindárs for a period of seventeen years prior to Fasli 1210.
- (4th.)—Idem for 34 years prior to Fasli 1230.

10. A careful examination of these papers, and of the detailed accounts from which they were prepared, proves beyond a doubt that the full value of the Mukhásas or Jághirs, in the

Zamindáris of this District, was included both in the valuation by the Circuit Committee and in Mr. Brown's account (Nos. 1 and 2). It is equally clear, on the other hand, that the full value of the Mukhásas could not have entered into accounts Nos. 3 and 4, because these accounts represent the average *Government receipts* from the Zamindárs for a series of years prior to the Permanent Settlement.

11. These two facts, as regards at least the Circuit Committee's accounts, and the annual collections of Government before the Permanent Settlement, appear to have been clearly kept in view by the local authorities of the time. In reply to a remark by the Board in 1790, that the

Letter from Chief in Council, dated May 1790
Paragraph 178.

Government demand was very low compared with the valuation of the Circuit Committee, (No. 1) the Chief in Council accounted for the difference by explaining that the Committee's account included the value of Mukhásas, upon which quit-rent alone was realized, and which were otherwise unproductive to the Zamindárs. This might be considered conclusive as respects the account of the Circuit Committee (No. 1) even without the additional proof afforded by the villagevar statements from which it was compiled. These statements give both the full value and the Kattubadi for each village, the full value including the Kattubadi being in every case brought to account by the Committee. If, therefore, the Permanent Peshkash had been fixed at two-thirds of the assets, as recorded by the Circuit Committee, the Government would unquestionably have no reversionary right in the Mukhásas.

12. The grounds for concluding that the figures, entered opposite the Mukhásas in Mr. Brown's account, represent the Khám or full value and not the Kattubadi only, are equally strong.

(1.) The Tafsil or detailed accounts from which Mr. Brown's statement was prepared, and the authenticity of which is undoubted, contain entries both of the full value and of the Kattubadi; the Kattubadi being usually one-half of the full value, and the figures in Mr. Brown's statement correspond exactly with the full value entered in these Tafsil accounts.

(2.) The present Kattubadi paid by the Mukhásadars, or that entered in the earliest Ināmati account (Fasli 1226) is, in almost every case, considerably less than the entries in Mr. Brown's account, though in some instances it is more than half the full value owing to subsequent unauthorized additions.

(3.) Though there are many Mukhásas held tax free, (Sarva or Darobast), i. e. paying no Kattubadi, the Khám or full value of all Mukhásas without exception is brought to account in Mr. Brown's statement: whereas, as respects Agraharams and Amanias or religious endowments, the Kattubadi alone is given, the word "Darobast" (tax free) being recorded opposite to those villages which paid no Kattubadi.

13. It is quite clear, therefore, that if the permanent Peshkash had been fixed at two-thirds of the valuation of the estates as given in Mr. Brown's statement, the reversionary right to the Mukhásas would vest in the Zamindárs and not in the Government. We may safely assume that it was not with any desire to swell the assets of their Zamindáris—a result which was amply provided against by giving in extremely low valuations of each village—that the Khám, or Rajahbhagam, of the Mukhásas was included in the accounts rendered by the Zamindárs. But the obvious reason for the entry is to be found in the precarious tenure of the Mukhásadars, over whose Estates, the Zamindár, in virtue of their being his tributary clansmen and dependents, was accustomed to exercise an arbitrary control: he assumed, in fact, the right of treating their Mukhásas in all respects like his own Zirayiti villages. This was not the case as regards Agraharams and villages of that class enjoyed by Bramins and religious institutions, from which the Zamindárs derived nothing more than the usual Kattubadi. Hence the difference of the entries in the columns of valuation in Mr. Brown's statement. In the case of Zirayiti villages and Mukhásas, which were treated and regarded very much in the same light, the full value was given, but for Agraharams and similar alienations the Kattubadi only.

4 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
24th March 1862.

N. B.—The detailed accounts do not appear to have been forwarded to the Board of Revenue by Mr. Cherry with his letter dated 30th November 1862.

14. The subject appears to have been hitherto misunderstood because the detailed accounts, from which this statement was compiled escaped attention; and it has been held by the local authorities, by the Board of Revenue and by the Government, that this account of Mr. Brown, which has usually been regarded as the standard of reference in questions connected with the permanent Settlement, and as the basis upon which the Peshkash was fixed, shows only the Kattubadi and not the full value of the Mukhásas, the reversionary right to which, it has been argued, consequently belongs to the Government.

15. The question has been prominently brought forward on two occasions. First, in 1852, in reference to three Jágghir or Mukhása villages in the Zamíndári of Tarla, which had been fairly purchased by the then holder, two from the Zamíndár, and the third from a Bramin to whom the Jágghir had passed. On the report of the Collector (Mr. Onslow) and the Commissioner for the Northern Circars (Mr. Elliot), the Government admitted the claim of the purchaser as against the Zamíndár, but asserted the reversionary right of the State on the ground of the villages being excluded from the assets at the permanent Settlement. Mr. Onslow, however, afterwards reported that from a careful scrutiny of the detailed accounts upon which the permanent Peshkash was fixed, he was convinced that the villages in question were included in the Zamíndár's assets, and that the interest of Government were in no way compromised by the sale. Mr. Elliot then entered at some length into the subject and finally recommended* that the matter might be left in abeyance, pending the issue of a suit which, it was understood, the Zamíndár had instituted in the Agent's Court against the alienee, for the recovery of two of the villages which had been confirmed to the latter by the Government. The case was tried by the present Agent Mr. Forbes, who threw out the Zamíndár's claim on the ground that the villages were entered as Mukhásas in the account of the permanent Settlement. The Zamíndár appealed to the Sudder Adalat and, on the requisition of that Court, the Agent explained the principles upon which the permanent Settlement was conducted, and stated in support of his view that the figures entered in Mr. Brown's account (No. 2) represented the Kattubadi, and not the full value of the Mukhásas.

Case of the villages in Tarla Zamíndári.
Collector's letter to the Commissioner, 25th January, 1850.
Commissioner's letter to Government, dated 25th September 1850.
Government Order, 9th November 1850.
Collector's letter dated 5th June 1852.
Mr. Onslow's letter, dated 7th December 1852.
Commissioner's letter to Collector, 22nd March 1853.
Collector's letter to the Commissioner, 27th May 1853.
Commissioner's letter to Government, 14th June 1853.
Government Order, 26th July 1853.
Commissioner's Proceedings 1st August 1853.
Collector's letter to Commissioner 29th August 1853.
Commissioner to the Collector, 28th September 1853.
Collector to the Commissioner, 16th November 1853.
Commissioner to Government, 27th March 1854.

* Sanctioned by Government, Order dated 24th April 1854.
Collector's letter to the Sudder Court, September 1861.

Case of the Hátghar Villages.

16. The interests involved in the second discussion of the same question were still more important. In the Zamíndári of Hátghar, there are 77 Jágghir or Mukhása villages, twenty-seven of which are still in the hands of the descendants of the original grantees, and the remaining fifty had passed long prior to 1854 into the hands of the Zamíndár, either by purchase or in the ordinary course of inheritance. In 1854, the estate was sold for arrears of Peshkash and purchased by the Zamíndár of the adjacent estate of Kallikota. The purchaser claimed the fifty Mukhásas as being part of the Hátghar Zamíndári. The ex-Zamíndár opposed the claim and urged his own right to the fifty villages on the ground of their value being excluded from the assets at the permanent Settlement. The purchaser contended that the entry in Mr. Brown's permanent Settlement account was the full value of the 50 Mukhásas; the ex-Zamíndár asserted that it represented the Kattubadi or quit-rent only. Everything

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 5
24th March 1862.

turned upon this point. If the former statement were correct, the villages were entirely lost to the ex-Zamíndár, if the figures represented the quit-rent only, he would retain the villages on payment of the amount to the purchaser. On the report of the present Collector, the Board of Revenue, assuming the valuation in Mr. Brown's account to be the quit-rent of the Mukhásas, forwarded their recommendation accordingly in favor of the Ex-Zamíndár. The Government adopted the same view, and under the impression that the Mukhásas were excluded from the assets, again asserted their reversionary claim as in the previous case of the villages in Tarla, and at the same time recognized the right of the ex-Zamíndár to the enjoyment of the villages on the original tenure of the Mukhásadars. On grounds of policy, however, they decided that the fifty villages in question should be made over to the purchaser, the present Zamíndár, on condition of his making an annual payment for them to the ex-Zamíndár. The sum of 5,000 Rupees, being very nearly the difference between the assumed quit-rent and the estimated present value of the villages, was ultimately fixed as the equivalent of their net value to the ex-Zamíndár, and this amount has accordingly been to the Peshkash of Hátghar, and has since been made payable to the widow of the Ex-Zamíndár who died before he could take advantage of the arrangement.

Collector's letter to the Board, dated 2nd September 1858.
Board's Proceedings, dated 10th November 1858.
Government Order 6th December 1858.
Collector's letter to the Board, 8th March 1859.
Do 2nd June 1859.
Board's Proceedings 4th July 1859.
Government Order 21st February 1860.

17. In the case of the villages of the Tarla Zamíndári, the Court of Sudder Adalat have, I believe, deferred judgment. Their decision must be mainly guided by correct information as to the true character of the permanent Settlement accounts, and the Agent will no doubt explain that his former opinion was based on assumptions which subsequent examinations have shown to be wrong.

18. As regards the fifty villages of the Hátghar estate, the arrangement has been concluded as between the present and the ex-Zamíndár; and as no other interests, than those of the Government are involved in the disposal of the villages in question, it may not be desirable that the matter should be re-opened. The actual quit-rent of those villages amounted in the aggregate to about Rupees 5,600. The precise sum cannot be ascertained because the details of twenty-one villages which were in the hands of the Zamíndár before Fasli 1226, are wanting. The quit-rent on the remaining twenty-nine villages, however, is entered in the first Izámáti account prepared in that year, at Rupees 3,226, whereas the value entered in Mr. Brown's account of these twenty-nine villages is Rupees 11,277. Had the plea of the present Zamíndár of Hátghar, viz., that the figures in Mr. Brown's permanent Settlement account represented the full value of the Mukhásas and not the Kattubadi, which is now found to be the correct view, been adopted in the first instance, the net value of the villages payable to the Ex-Zamíndár would have amounted to 19,862 instead of 5,000 Rupees. The reversionary right to these villages would in that case have remained a matter for discussion, as it still is as regards all other Mukhása villages in the Zamíndáris of the District, but it may now fairly be considered that the Government have sold their doubtful reversion into these fifty villages to the present Zamíndár for the addition of Rupees 5,000 to his annual Peshkash.

19. The treatment of the fifty Villages in Hátghar cannot, however, be taken as a precedent in determining the general question of the reversion of the Mukhása of this District. The Kattubadi paid to this day by those of the Mukhása of every Zamíndári who are still in possession of their villages, including the twenty-five individuals, who still hold their villages in Hátghar, is as before stated, considerably less than the Kham values entered in the detailed accounts of Mr. Brown's statement, and cannot of course be legally or justly enhanced. The fact must now be accepted that Mr. Brown's account included, among the assets of the Zamíndáris, the reputed full value of all the Mukhásas. This being the case, it remains to consider on what principle, the permanent Peshkash of the Zamíndáris of Ganjam was actually fixed. It was not two-thirds of the assets recorded by the Circuit Committee, nor was it two-thirds of Mr. Brown's calculation. In their letter to Government, the Board remarked that they considered the statement of the average receipts for the last 17 years to be the most eligible of the four accounts

* 17th May 1864.

6 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department*
24th March 1862.

specified above (paragraph 9) and professed to have been guided chiefly by it—but with due reference to the rest—in fixing the permanent assessment of each estate. In reference to this subject, the Commissioner for the Northern Circars (Mr. W. Elliot) wrote as follows, when reviewing the report of Mr. Onslow in the case of the Tarla villages above referred to: “No specification of two-thirds assets of the several estates was ever prepared in Ganjam. The Board professed to be guided chiefly by the average collections of 17 years, but in point of fact they appear to have been influenced by the current demand fixed by the Collector, Mr. Cherry, and to have derived a Peshkash from that by making considerable reductions upon it in every case.”

“Under these circumstances, it is impossible to tell what should be considered to be assets of the Zamindari settlement or how questions involving a right to escheat should be settled. It is however quite certain that all the three villages referred to in the present correspondence were held on Mukhása tenure anterior to the permanent Settlement.”

20. In the absence of any given data for determining the basis of the Board's calculations, it appears to me that we must estimate their proceedings in this District according to the liberal views and intentions they evidently entertained, as well as by the moderate standard adopted in the settlement of the permanent Peshkash elsewhere, and especially in the adjoining District of Vizagapatam. In considering all the accounts before them, they at once rejected the valuation of the Circuit Committee as being immoderately high, and they put aside the values furnished by the Zamindárs to Mr. Brown as being palpably understated; but keeping in view, it may be presumed, the fact that both accounts included the full value of the Mukhásas, they adopted with certain modifications, and deductions on account of Sáyer, Salt, &c., the Collector's current demand, which differs but slightly from the average receipts for 17 years. The Peshkash so fixed—though very much less than two-thirds of the valuation by the Circuit Committee is, in most instances, considerably more than two-thirds of the Zamindárs' assets as delivered to Mr. Brown; and was probably adopted as a fair proportion of the gross revenues of the Zamindárs to be paid to the Government in perpetuity. Though the value of the Mukhásas formed no part of the average collections, it may be inferred from the Board's silence on the subject that they contemplated the eventual reversion of these villages to the Zamindári. This view is strengthened

Printed book on permanent Settlement, page 16, paragraph 52 of Board's letter 17th May 1864.

by the fact that in the case of one of the Zamindáris, Kallikota, which was under assignment or attachment at the period of the permanent Settlement, the Board fixed the permanent Peshkash at two-thirds of the average Government receipts, which are stated to have comprehended Kattubadi, Máníems and extra revenues. It will be seen by reference to the appended Statement A, prepared in the Collector's office from the accounts of the permanent Settlement for each Zamindári, that the settlement of Kallikóta was much more favorable to that Zamindár than the terms allowed to the others. Another circumstance which is still more conclusive is, that the value of the Mukhásas or Jágghirs in Kallikota and Jallantra is entirely and undoubtedly omitted in all the accounts, Mr. Brown's included, and the reversion to these villages, therefore, clearly belongs to the Government.

21. As respects the other Zamindáris, with the further exception of Parla Kimidi, the detailed accounts of which are not before me I am of opinion for the reasons above given, that the Peshkash may fairly be considered to have virtually included the value of the Mukhása, or Jágghirs, and the Government must consequently relinquish their claim to the right of reversion in these tenures. As remarked on one occasion by Mr. Elliot, the Jágghirs have been alienated by the Zamindárs without scruple. The custom of the country has given to them the contingent remainder, and though hitherto considered to be properly escheats to the State, these villages have always lapsed to the Zamindárs. I find in fact that out of 250 Jágghirs

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 7
24th March 1862.

which existed at the period of the permanent Settlement, exclusive of those in Parla Kimidi, Kallikota and Jallantra, only forty-seven were registered in the Inám account of 1852, the rest being in the hands of the Zamindárs. Any interference with these villages after a permissive enjoyment for lengthened periods, would occasion much dissatisfaction, and the Government sacrifice little in foregoing their doubtful reversionary interest in the remaining forty-seven villages which are supposed to be still enjoyed by descendants of the original grantees.

22. Should the Government concur in the above views, the Mukhásas or Jágghirs in all the ancient Zamindáris of this District, except Parla Kimidi, Kallikóta and Jallantra, will be left out of the present settlement.

Hátghar.

23. In the Order of Government, dated 7th May 1860, No. 732, I am required to report upon the tenure of the villages in Hátghar, in lieu of which the annual allowance of 5,000 Rupees is continued to the widow of the ex-Zamindár. Adverting to what is stated above, in regard to these villages, I am doubtful whether it

Paragraphs 16 and 18.

would still be the wish of Government that I should take up the question at all; especially as I find that the Agent has since recommended that a portion of the allowance should be paid directly to the late Zamindár's step-mother.

24. The question of the treatment of the Ináms held by the Doratanam and Thanah Peons in the Parla Kimidi estate, is referred to me for report, in the Order of Government, Judicial Department, dated 4th July 1861, No. 863. The exact extent and value of these Ináms cannot be ascertained until the inquiry into each individual holding has been made by the Deputy Collector. The value of the Doratanam Ináms, as recorded in the Collector's account, is, as stated by Mr. Forbes, Rupees 9,496; from which the quit-rent of 1,996 being deducted, the net income is 7,500 Rupees. The entry in the statement of the Inspector General of Police, of 1,190 Rupees as the Kattubadi on these Ináms, is evidently a clerical error, his figures were all taken from the accounts in the Collector's Office. The detailed accounts of the permanent Settlement of this estate, which are not to be found among the records of the Collector, will be obtained from the Board's Office for reference by the investigating officer, but from the tenor of the correspondence, especially from Mr. Russell's report quoted by the Court of Wards, it seems quite certain that the value of Doratanam Ináms was excluded from the assets when the Peshkash was fixed. The Ináms will, therefore, be properly enfranchised on half assessment like those as of the Jangi Kattubadis in the Ceded Districts, and the proceeds credited to the new Police. The lapses which have occurred since 1856 are two, as shown in the margin, the aggregate net value being 650 Rupees. I recommend that the present holders be allowed to enfranchise at the same rate, viz., half assessment.

Name of deceased Dora.	Village held by him.	Particulars.				Heirs to the deceased.
		Extent.	Value.	Jódi.	Remainder.	
		Acres.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
Gopisetti Apparayudu.	Ulanabhadra and two hamlets.	106	600	120	480	Widow.
Dodla Narasimulu.	Somagandi and three hamlets.	64	200	30	170	Brother of 15 years.

Collector's order to the Manager, dated 15th October 1834.
Mr. Russell's report on Parla Kimidi 1st November 1834, paragraph 137, conclusion.
Jamabandi report on Parla Kimidi Estate, dated 12th December 1837, No. 5.

25. The Máníems of the Thana Peons in this estate are clearly recent grants, the reversionary right to which belongs to the Zamindár. Such Ináms are not usually interfered with by this Department, and the Zamindár ought fairly to be allowed, as recommended by the Court of Wards, the additional revenue which may be raised on these grants.

STATEMENT A.

Showing the figures upon which the Permanent Peshkash of the several Zamindáris was fixed.

Names of the Zamindáris.	Total of each Zamindári as per accounts given by the Zamindáris to Mr. Brown.	Average of 17 years' collections into the Government Treasury.	Jamma recommended by the Collector.	Deductions on account of Sayer, Salt, Abkárí, Mubturá, &c.	Permanent Peshkash.
Tarla...	7,370	5,219	4,000	400	4,000
Budársingi...	343	385	700	...	500
Javada...	4,323	2,726	2,000	400	2,000
Surangi...	5,516	5,932	4,000	500	3,500
Sérghar...	11,280	6,295	6,000	500	5,500
Pratapagiri...	25,401	17,987	22,000	2,000	20,000
Bodaga...	10,402	4,559	4,000	900	4,000
Pálúr...	5,838	2,390	2,000	800	1,200
Humma...	4,224	2,335	2,000	800	1,200
Beridi...	6,459	4,916	5,300	522	4,500
Dharakóta...	29,814	25,704	28,000	3,094	25,000
Mandasá...	20,527	12,761	15,000	1,000	14,000
Surada...	6,112	3,573	3,000	900	2,500
Vijayanagaram...	28,178	22,375	25,000	2,000	23,000
Hátghar...	68,899	43,588	58,000	3,000	55,000
Chíkati...	39,404	33,603	35,000	1,000	34,000
Kallikóta assigned villages...	28,728	33,609	30,000	...	19,000
Jallantra and assigned villages.....	9,727	7,639	7,500	500	7,000

Proceedings of the Inám Commissioner, dated Vizagapatam, 25th January 1862, No. 5.
Read the following letters from Deputy Collector B. Gopálaiya.

Preliminary Report on the Ináms of the District, dated 21st December 1861.
Supplemental Report on the same subject, dated 5th January 1862.

Letter dated 22nd January, supplying further information required by the Commissioner.

1. The District of Vizagapatam, together with the whole of Ganjam and a portion of Rajahmundry, is comprehended in the territory formerly known as the Chicacole Sirkár. It was granted to the British Government, with the rest of the northern Sirkárs, in 1765 by Sanad from the Moghul Emperor, and the grant was afterwards ratified in 1766 under treaty with the Nizam, Subadar of the Deccan, to whom the real power in the Sirkárs belonged. From the period of its cession until the permanent Settlement in 1802 and 1803, the Vizagapatam division of the

Sirkár formed two distinct Collectorates; one, consisting of the ancient Hill Zamindáris which paid to the Company, the tribute formerly levied by the Nizam, and the other; of the Haveli estates under the direct management of the Government. After the permanent Settlement these two divisions, with the addition of a third comprising a few estates belonging to Ganjam, were united under one Collector, and have so continued to the present time.

2. The first and third divisions comprised originally 34 estates, or Hundás; the second division included the 18 ancient Zamindáris. Eleven of the estates, and the Hill Zamindári of Gollgonda severally reverted to Government, from Fasli 1242 to 1254, in default of payment of large arrears; and now form with the purchased estate of Ráyanaram, the new Tálúq of Narsipatam. The Pálkonda Zamindári was forfeited to Government in 1843, by the rebellious conduct of its holder, and together with the Hunjeram estate now forms the Government Tálúq of Palkonda, held on lease by Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co. The present distribution of the Tálúqs and Police divisions is shown in the accompanying Statement A.

The names of the several Zamindáris and private estates are given below:—

Zamindáris	Proprietary Estates.
1. Vizianagram.	1. Kasimkota.
2. Mérangi.	2. Munagapáka.
3. Kurapám.	3. Ankapilli.
4. Sangamvalasa.	4. Mólupáka.
5. Chemudu.	5. Nakkapalli.
6. Páchipenta.	6. Surámpuram.
7. Sálúr.	7. Godicherla.
8. Mádugala.	8. Uratla.
9. Bobbili.	9. Panchadarla.
10. Andra.	10. Waltair.
11. Kásipuram.	11. Kintali.
12. Saripalli Bhimavaram.	12. Shármahammadpuram.
13. Jeypúr.	13. Kuppili.
14. Belgám.	14. Vungaráda.
	15. Siripuram.
	16. Kurtina.
	17. Mantina.
	18. Appigonda.
	19. Ránáda.
	20. Kurada Kondáyanalasa.
	21. Mípurupalli.
	22. Idalapákabhonagiri.
	23. Koenprolu.
	24. Peddagummalúr.
	25. Mamidivada.

3. In the hill Zamindáris, as well as in the private estates formed out of the Haveli division, the reversionary right in Inám tenures is reserved to the Government by the terms of the permanent Settlement; though the Kattubadi was included in the assets and is payable to the Zamindáris and proprietors.

4. Many of the Zamindáris have passed, from time to time and for longer or shorter periods, under the direct management of the Government, either in consequence of the minority of the heir to the last holder or from other causes. The circumstances of each estate being, therefore, well known, the same facilities exist for a satisfactory settlement of the Ináms in the several Zamindáris as in the Government estates.

5. Accompanying is a Tálúqwár statement obtained from the Collector's Office showing the value of all alienations in the District. The total amount is for minor Ináms, 6,48,818, and for whole villages 3,46,435. Nearly one-half of this amount belongs to the Zamindári of Viziana-

10 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
24th March 1862.

gram, about one-fourth to the two Government Tálucs, and somewhat more than one-fourth to the remaining Zamíndáris and estates. Jeypúr, regarding which little is known, is not included in this statement.

6. The principality of Vizianagram, which, with the exception of Jeypúr, is the largest and most ancient of the Zamíndáris, and by far the most important as regards Inám tenures of all descriptions, was transferred by the late Rájá, to the direct management of the Collector in 1827. The Rájá afterwards proceeded on a pilgrimage to Benares where he remained till his death; and the Zamíndári was delivered into the hands of his son the present Rájá in 1850, after an interval of twenty-three years, with greatly improved revenues.

7. Among other measures for the improvement of the revenue during the Government management of the estate, an inquiry was set on foot in 1835 into supposed recent encroachments, and alleged excesses in the area of Ináms entered in the permanent Settlement accounts, originally proposed* by the then Collector Mr. Freese, it was approved† by the Board of Revenue; and the result was the imposition of a quit-rent or Kattubadi, which varied according to the nature of the grant and amounted in some instances to very nearly the full assessment of the supposed encroachment. By Mr. Freese's successors, however, the measure was considered unnecessarily oppressive, and although the inquiry continued to be prosecuted until 1838, it was conducted in a more liberal spirit, in many cases the Kattubadi previously imposed was remitted‡, and doubts§ were subsequently expressed as to the possibility of the existence of so large an extent of recent encroachment as had been supposed by Mr. Freese. It was considered that the supposed excess might probably have arisen from the unfaithful nature|| of the entries in the estimate accounts of the permanent Settlement, in which the areas of Ináms were notoriously understated. This fact was also noticed that Ináms, contiguous to each other and altogether apart from Ziráyiti lands, in which no encroachment could possibly have taken place, were also subjected§ to the new Kattubadi.

8. The additional revenue secured by this measure amounted to more than 20,000 Rupees. With whatever severity the inquiry may have been conducted, the Kattubadi has been levied and paid on account of the Rájá for upwards of twenty-five years under the authority of the Government, and cannot now be remitted. Such of the Ináms as were suffered to continue in the uninterrupted possession of the holders, either as doubtful alienations or supposed encroachments will now be treated as Jódi Ináms. The entire extent including the excess, as recorded in the Inám accounts, being entered in the Register, and the quit-rent for enfranchisement calculated, as in the case of ordinary Jódi Ináms, upon the difference between the present quit-rent payable to the Rájá, and the full assessment.

9. There are also Ináms and whole Inám villages granted by the late Rájá, in exchange for old Ináms excluded from his assets at the permanent Settlement, which were likewise charged with a Kattubadi by the Committee of 1835. Such Ináms, the reversionary right to which belongs to the Government and not to the Zamíndár, ought clearly to have been left alone: but the Kattubadi then imposed has been paid to the Rájá for a quarter of a century and cannot, in the Commissioner's opinion, be now disturbed. These Ináms will be treated similarly to those noticed in the preceding paragraph. Any cases of a similar nature which have hitherto escaped inquiry, will now be settled as between the Government and the Inámдар.

10. Shortly after the late Zamíndár's death at Benares, in 1845, the Governor's Agent was directed to resume on behalf of the estate all Ináms and Agraharams granted by the deceased subsequent to the permanent Settlement. Accordingly a large number of tenures were placed under attachment. Some of which were subsequently** restored as granted

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11
24th March 1862.

of a date long anterior to the permanent Settlement, and which with many others unquestionably of old origin, missed registry in the estimates of that period in consequence of the absence of their owners. An inquiry into the remaining cases of alleged recent Ináms was suggested by Mr. Elliot and sanctioned by the Government: but it does not appear to have been completed, though cases of lapse were investigated occasionally by Collectors. Ináms of this class, still remaining undisposed of, will now be treated on their merits. Those which are clearly recent and not excluded from the assets in the permanent Settlement accounts will not fall under the present settlement; those which are undoubtedly of old date, will be confirmed to the holders under the present rules according to the terms of the grant.

11. As regards the Agraharams and Mukhásas villages of Vizianagram and other Zamíndáris. Another point to be noticed is the discrepancy* found to exist between the entries in the estimate accounts of the permanent Settlement and those in the Istimirar sanad. Owing to various causes, among which are cited carelessness of transcription and the fact of many Inám villages being under attachment at the period of the permanent Settlement, the lists given in by the several Zamíndárs contain a number of of Lákráz villages under the head of Séri, the value of which was excluded from the assets in the permanent Settlement accounts; and on the other hand, a few Séri or Ziráyiti villages, are entered as Mukhásas.

Paragraph 17 of Mr. Elliot's letter to Government, dated 17th September 1852.

† Mukhásas of Kottakkí Collector's letter to the Board, 27th October 1815.

Board's Proceedings, 3rd January 1816.

Mr. J. Smith,† an early Collector, notices the subject in reference to a case of a Mukhásas in the Zamíndári of Sálúr, and Mr. Elliot refers to it at length in his report above quoted. In such cases, the Deputy Collectors, assisted by the Vakils of the several Zamíndárs, will have no difficulty in determining by reference to the original accounts of the settlement, and by the present recognized tenure of the villages in question, whether they are Séri or Mukhásas and will decide accordingly.

Paragraph 7 of the Appendix to Mr. Elliot's letter to Government of 17th September 1852.
Paragraph 16, Proceedings of Government, 3rd paragraph of 1853.

12. Those of the Mukhásas excluded from the assets, and consequently within the control of Government, which have been improperly usurped by the Zamíndárs without detection on failure of heirs, will be confirmed to them, in consideration of long possession under Clauses 2 and 3 of paragraph 16 of the present Inám rules.

13. Though the District has never been surveyed, the accounts are numerous and in general sufficiently perfect for a satisfactory settlement of Inám titles. The permanent Settlement having been determined on the collections for different years prior to Fasli 1209, all Ináms that existed prior to that date come under the Present Settlement accounts.

I. The Gudikat accounts of the permanent Settlement are quite complete. In them are recorded individual lists of Ináms, their extent, Jódi and the names of their holders.

II. The subsequent Committee accounts prepared between Faslis 1213 and 1216 give simply for the Haveli division, the extent of land alienated in each village without individuals particulars; but for the Zamíndáris, details are given in separate books which describe also the nature of the grant.

III. Accounts prepared between 1814 to 1820, known as John Smith's Committee accounts, contain much useful information regarding the names of the grantee and grantor, the extent of Ináms, the difference, if any between it, and that entered in former Committee accounts, probably those drawn up at the time of the permanent Settlement, together with the valuation of those that were then under cultivation. But these accounts are not complete for the whole District.

IV. The Committee accounts of Messrs. Freese and Arbuthnot drawn between 1835 and 1836 for the Vizianagram Zamíndári, contain the old and the present area of Ináms and their valuation. But these are not complete for the whole estate: they extend to 600 villages.

V. The Bhuband accounts giving individual particulars of Ináms in the private estates of the first division taken at the period of their reversion to Government.

* Paragraph 3 of Mr. Elliot's letter to Government of 17th September 1852.

12 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
24th March 1862.

- VI. The Gudikat accounts of Faslis 1244 for Palkonda Zamindári.
- VII. Inám Hakikats and measurement accounts of the Hunjeram portion of Palkonda Taluq.
- VIII. The measurement accounts of Sarnasiddhi and Golugonda, portions of Narsipatam Taluq for Faslis 1247 and 1248 not quite complete.
- IX. Accounts of Fasli 1240, showing the recent Mukhásas, Agrahárams and Ináms in the Zamindáris of Mérangi and Kurpam.
- X. Inám forms of Sangamvalasa, Mérangi and Kurpam taken between Fasli 1249 to Fasli 1251.
- XI. The two Káni account for the whole District with the exception of Jeypúr and a few Hill Zamindáris prepared in 1853 and 1854.
- XII. The A Register of 1859 for the Government Taluq of Narsipatam.
14. In the Government Taluqs, Ináms not found in the permanent Settlement accounts, and not proved to be fifty years old, will be confirmed to the holders on the higher rate of quit-rent provided by the rules.
15. In the absence of a survey or of defined land measures of any kind, the area of both the Government lands and Ináms is estimated* by the quantity of produce and entered accordingly in the accounts. A vissam, which is in reality a measure of capacity, varies in extent according to the quality of the soil, from half an acre to as much as 15 acres. A garce, which is also in very general use, varies almost in the same proportion. Still the local measures in each estate or division of the District are well known, and the means of ascertaining their equivalents in acres are available here, to the same extent as in the Godavery and Kistna Districts. In checking the entries in the most recent accounts with those of the permanent Settlement, the Deputy Collectors, in consultation with the Vakíls of the Zamindárs, will adopt those which seem nearest the truth, and in making the commutation into acres, they will be guided by the length of the rod or Paggam adopted in each locality. Excesses in the Government Taluqs will be charged as directed in the Order of the Secretary of State; and in the private estates, the presence of the Zamindár's Vakíl will check the statements of the Inámdárs, and in all cases of long undisturbed enjoyment, when the excess is disputed by the Zamindár's Vakíl, the nature of his objection and the grounds for the Deputy Collector's decision, are to be fully recorded in the Register. The signature of the Vakíl is to be taken at the bottom of the Register of each village. A further check will be the known or recorded boundaries of the Inám, and the entries in the annual agreements between the Inámdár and cultivator. It is believed that if all the lands were measured, the excess found in the Séri land would be greater in proportion to that found in Inám land.
16. There is no fixed assessment in this District. Nor was there any valuation of the Ináms in the permanent Settlement accounts. In the accounts prepared between 1814 and 1822, the annual value of cultivated Ináms and Agrahárams is given, and the accounts of 1835 and 1838 contain the estimated value of the Ináms in 600 villages of the Vizianagram Zamindári. But the most complete standard of reference for the assessment of Ináms is the two Káni account of 1853-54. The prevailing rates of assessment of Government land are† high, the average being 4 Rupees an acre for dry land, and 8 Rupees for wet. These rates are certainly higher than in other Districts where the land may be supposed to be equally good, and it clearly arises from the real extent being understated. It will be desirable, however, to follow the two Káni account, whenever the entries therein do not greatly differ from those of the neighbouring Government lands, rather than adopt a new and arbitrary scale as proposed by Deputy Collector Gopálaiya. When the rates in the two Káni account are clearly inapplicable, reductions or additions can be recommended.

Area.

* Collector's letter to Government, 19th August 1860, paragraph 38.
Collector's letter, 13th November 1857.
Board's letter to the Collector, December 1856.

Assessment.

† Board's Jamabandi book for 1860.
Mr. Newill's letter to Government, 27th August 1859.

ceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 13
24th March 1862.

17. About one-half of the Ináms of the District are already charge with a fixed Kattubadi, payable to the Zamindárs in the private estates, which is heavy in many instances. There are a few Dévadáyam Mukhásas in the Kasimkota under management, which pay a grain Kattubadi fluctuating annually with the produce will now, with the consent of the Court of Wards, be commuted into a fixed money the similar imposts in the Godavery and Kistna Districts.

18. The only topes in the District are to be found in the ancient Zamindáris, wherever these are of the nature of Inám, paying a quit-rent which was included in the assets at the permanent Settlement, they will be brought present inquiry, where this is not the case, the topes are the property of the Zamindárs, left alone.

19. The Ináms and Inám villages held by the Hill chiefs and their armed retainers in the several Zamindáris still in private hands, as well as those which have reverted to Government, included from the assets of the Estates at the formation of the Permanent Settlement and fore, come under the present enquiry and settlement. The inutility of these large bodies of Military Police was forcibly brought to notice by the Chief in Council several years before the period of the permanent Settlement, but they were not disturbed, and they have continued present time in the hereditary enjoyment of their lands. On the organization of the services, which are described by the Inspector General as worse than useless, will be with, and their Ináms will be enfranchised accordingly under the Rules. The Inám and minor Ináms held for Military Police service by Sirdárs or Dorás and their Peons various designations of Doratanálu, Tirastulu, Désastulu and Talah Divánís will be on a quit-rent of one-half the full assessment, like the Jangi Kattubadies of the stricts and other similar classes. When the minor Ináms are held by the Peons within the village, the settlement will be made with the Sirdár of the village; the several Ináms of the Peons with their extent, value and quit-rent, being in detail in the Register. When the village is held in distinct shares, one settlement will be made with all the sharers.

20. The villages enjoyed by the Military Chiefs, and men of high position and influence known as Mukhásadárs, whose service tenure is of an honorary and almost nature, will be enfranchised on a quit-rent of one-fourth of the assessment, as sanctioned for similar tenures in Masulipatam and other Districts.

There are a few Mukhásas as per margin, entered in the list prepared by Mr. Smith in 1807 of alienated lands excluded from the Schedules of the permanent Settlement, which were granted to the clansmen and relations of the several Zamindárs. No condition of service was attached to these grants, which are held hereditarily and for subsistence only, and they will, therefore, properly be enfranchised at the rates applicable to personal grants.

Village Service Ináms.

Class No. 1.	Government Estates.	Private Estates.
Officers.	rs.	rs.
Servants.	20,400	80,042
Curnum.	4,158	13,512
.....	1,671	9,706
.....	5	405
.....	1,287	4,347
Servants.	2,248	11,200
.....	3,939	20,457
Bantumanás.	201	1,625
Artisans.	2,672	1,436
.....	271	702
.....	177	755
.....	2,053	10,522
.....	2,558	12,853
.....	87	40
.....	287	1,427
able to No. 3.	8,315	17,526
s of a private		

22. The annexed statement gives the estimated value of the several descriptions of village service Ináms in this District, both in Government and private Estates. The Ináms of the village servants in the Government Estates included under class 1, both Revenue and Police, will be brought on the service Register, and, if the measure be extended to this District, will, with the approval of Government, be enfranchised on five-eighths of the assessment. The Ináms of the village Artisans belonging to class 2, will be continued on their present tenure and entered in village Register No. 2. The condition of service attached to Ináms included in class 3, which are held by Palanquin bearers, Shikáris, suppliers of betel, Doctors, Schoolmasters, Paróhíts, Jugglers, Goldsmiths and the like, has long ceased to exist in most instances, and whenever it is preserved, it is merely nominal. Ináms of this class, in the Government Taluqs, will therefore be brought on the general Register and enfranchised at the rates applicable to personal Ináms.

14 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
24th March 1862.

23. The value of the village service Ináms of all kinds, in the private Estates, was excluded from the assets at the Permanent Settlement. The Ináms held by the Revenue servants in these Estates, belonging to class 1, will be left undisturbed on their present tenure, being simply recorded in the Register for future reference. Those of the Police servants will be brought on the service Register and enfranchised like the similar Ináms in the Government estates on five-eighths assessment. The Ináms of the village Artisans, included in class 2, will be left alone, and those included in class 3, held for the private services of the Zamíndár will also remain undisturbed, except in those instances in which the service has long ceased to be rendered and no objection exists to their enfranchisement.

24. The few Ináms held by tank-diggers, in the Government Tálucs for the repair of tanks and water courses, will be enfranchised as usual on one-fourth assessment, wherever these works have been undertaken by Government, and no objection exists to the commutation.

25. The treatment of the three Mukhása* villages enjoyed by the family of the ex-Zamíndár of Golconda will form the subject of a special reference to Government. The Commissioner's information regarding these villages is not yet complete, and their tenures for the present will be left undisturbed.

26. There only remains one special tenure requiring notice. Several years prior to the Permanent Settlement, certain grants of land in villages now forming the Proprietary Estate of Waltair, were made by the early chiefs in Council on behalf of Government, to a few individuals for building and garden purposes. The term of the grant is for 99 years; a small Kattubadi, or Royalty, not generally exceeding one Rupee, was fixed on each holding which has been paid to the present day, and it is a condition of the grant, either expressed or clearly implied, that, at the expiration of the lease, the land with all improvements thereon, however valuable, should revert to Government. Such an enforcement of rights and conditions would, however, be most unusual in this country, and it seems improbable that either the actual donors or the grantees ever contemplated the restoration of the lands with the benefit of improvements effected during an entire century, and it is doubtful if the Government even if the law allowed it, would be willing to enforce so hard a condition against the present holders at the expiration of the term of 99 years. The grants are for the most part dated in or about 1790, and the lease has still from 20 or 30 years to run. They are entered as Kattubadi Ináms in the accounts, the Kattubadi being included in the assets of the Estate and paid to the proprietor. It appears to the Commissioner that a fair compromise can be made with the present holders by the commutation of their tenures into Freeholds on a quit-rent of one-fourth or one-half of the improved value of the land. One-fourth, if the lease has still to run for 30 years or more, and one-half if the lease would expire in less than 30 years. In cases where portions of the land are occupied by buildings an addition of 5 per cent. of the present valuation of the buildings to be charged, once for all, on that account, in commutation of all future claims on account of Government. These terms will probably be accepted by the holders, who will be allowed the option of enfranchisement. The orders of Government are required upon this point before the new Registry of these grants.

27. The present instructions do not apply to the extensive Zamíndári of Jéyapur, regarding the Ináms in which little or nothing is known. The only information to be obtained from the records relates to the number of whole Inám villages, but even this is believed to be incorrectly given, and the various tenures of the villages, as well as the extent and value of the minor Ináms, are altogether involved in obscurity. Hitherto there has been no interference whatever with the Ináms in this immense tract of country, which is remote from Government observation and control, and for the present at least, it appears

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 15
24th March 1862.

to the Commissioner undesirable to disturb the existing state of matters by an enquiry into Inám titles.

Statement A.

Tálucs as per new arrangement sanctioned by Government in their order No. June 1861.		of Ancient Zamíndáris and proprietary Estates.	
1	Narsipatam...	...	Government Estate and Vinatla proprietary.
2	Palkonda...	...	Government Estate, portions of the Zamíndáris of Bobbili, Vizianagaram and proprietary Estates of Undarada, Siripuram, Kurtina and Mantina.
3	Vizianagaram...	...	Vizianagaram.
4	Gajapatinagaram...	...	
5	Bimlipatam...	...	
6	Srungavarapakotta...	...	
7	Pedagádi...	...	Vizianagaram Estate and proprietaries of Appikonda, Ravada, Kurada, Kondaya, Valasa, Chipurupalli and Idalapaka Bhonangi.
8	Vizagapatam...	...	Vizianagaram Zamíndári and Waltair Estate.
9	Vilravilli...	...	Vizianagaram and Mádugalu Zamíndáris.
10	Chípurupalli...	...	Vizianagaram Zamíndári and proprietary Estates of Shermohmampuram and Kuppli.
11	Yelamanchili...	...	Vizianagaram Zamíndári and proprietary estates of Kasimkóta, Melupáka, Anakapilli, Munagapáka, Godicherla, Surampuram, Koenprolu, Nakkapilli, Peddigunemlur and Mainidvada.
12	Salur...	...	Zamíndáris of Salur, Panchipetta, Andra, Saripalli, Bhunavaram, Chendu and part of Bobbili.
13	Parvatipuram...	...	Zamíndáris of Belgám, Mérlingi, Kurapám and Sangavalasa.
14	Jéyapur...	...	Zamíndári of Jéyapur, the two last being on this side of the Gháts.
15	Advarada...	...	
16	Gunupuram...	...	

Proceedings of the Inám Commissioner, dated Chetterpore, 5th February 1862, No. 6.

Read the following reports:—

From Deputy Collector A. Sudarsana Ráu, dated 1st January 1862, on the Ináms in the Government Tálucs of Ganjam.

From Deputy Collector P. Chentsal Ráu, dated 22nd January 1862, on the Ináms in the Zamíndáris and other private Estates of Ganjam.

Memorandum prepared by do. on the Ináms in the Government Tálucs of Ganjam.

1. The following instructions are laid down for the guidance of the Deputy Collectors employed in this District.

2. The District of Ganjam forms the northern portion of the ancient Chicacole Sirkár. It

Zamindáris.	Proprietary Estates.		
1 Daharakota.....	1 Utlam.	20	Karakavalasa.
2 Bodgada.....	2 Tekkali.	21	Talasamudram.
3 Hatghar.....	3 Sandam.	22	Santa Lakshmi.
4 Pálur.....	4 Tilar.		puram.
5 Humma.....	5 Chittivalasa.	23	Danta.
6 Prutapagiri.....	6 Jarjangi.	24	Aska.
7 Surangi.....	7 Akkayavalasa.	25	Kurla.
8 Mandasa.....	8 Gopalapuram.	26	Kurmari.
9 Biridi.....	9 Konsulakotura.	27	Haradabadra.
10 Jallantra.....	10 Tsakipalli.	28	Barava.
11 Budarasingi.....	11 Balamara-palava.		lasa.
12 Vizanagaram.....	12 Siddibehara		Kotturu.
13 Serghar.....	13 Susaram.		Malagam.
14 Jarada.....	14 Rajapuram.		Boddam.
15 Kallikotta.....	15 Boddam.		
16 Chikati.....	16 Zonnapadu.	17	Chinna Tungam.
17 Tarla.....	18 Pedda Tungam.	19	
18 Parlakimidi.....			
<i>Government Taluqs.</i>			
1 Chicacole.....			
2 Berhampore.....			
3 Gumsúr.....			

now consists of eighteen ancient Zamindáris, twenty-eight Proprietary Estates formed out of the Haveli division at the Permanent Settlement, and three Government Taluqs as specified in the margin. A Statement is appended showing the present distribution of the Taluqs and Police divisions.

3. The Permanent Settlement of this District was completed in 1804, and the Jumma fixed with reference to the different sources of collections up to 1803. In the Sanads of Milkiyat Istimirár, granted to Zamindárs and Proprietors, the reversionary right in Inám tenures in their Estates,

has been reserved to the Government, consequently all the Ináms in the Zamindáris and other private Estates which existed prior to 1803, come under the Settlement of the Inám Commission. Some of the private Estates and Zamindáris have lapsed to Government from various causes, in which, and in the other Government Taluqs, all existing Ináms will fall under the present enquiry.

Description of Inám.	Extent.	Assessment.	Jódi.
Religious endowments.....	Aeres.	Rs.	Rs.
Personal Ináms.....	22,544	49,348	8,641
Police Ináms.....	31,069	68,053	13,172
Ináms of Military retainers or Kattubadies.....	2,656	5,303	773
Other village service Ináms...	8,581	15,987	355
	23,768	60,896	30,526
Total...	88,618	1,99,587	53,467

4. According to the accounts available in the Collector's Office, the extent and the reputed value of Inám is shown in the margin.

5. The state of the accounts in this District is not satisfactory. Complete accounts do not exist for all the Estates. An attempt was made to prepare a complete register under Regulation XXXI of 1802, but it was not suc-

cessfully carried out; it contains only a small proportion of the Ináms. The accounts of the Permanent Settlement contain only the names of whole Inám villages; and in some, the total extent of Inám is given, but without individual particulars. The earliest account, which contain Asáminár particulars, and which is the only account of any importance, is that prepared in Fasli 1226. This account contains much useful information. It gives the extent of Inám, the date of the Sanad, the names of the grantor and grantee and the Jódi. It may be regarded as the standard for reference, though many Ináms have been omitted, and the entries are not always altogether reliable.

6. There is no complete Register of Ináms in the Zamindáris and private Estates other than the account of Fasli 1226. For many of the Zamindáris, however, accounts of existing Ináms were taken on occasions of temporary attachment for various causes, and in these, information is to be found as to when and by whom the Ináms were granted. These accounts do not clearly distinguish recent from old Ináms; but the entries regarding them will enable the Deputy Collectors, in consultation with the Zamindár's Vakils, to discover which are old, and which are recent Ináms.

7. For the Government Taluqs, a complete Register of Ináms was prepared in Fasli 1259 under the orders of the Commissioner of the Northern Sirkárs. It shows the name of the Inámdár, the extent of the Inám and Jódi with other useful information, and in the column of

Remarks, the age of the Inám is generally given. This account is complete in its nature, embracing all the existing Ináms. It was prepared by the Curnums under the orders of the Tahsildárs, but without other scrutiny at the time or since.

8. Investigations into Inám tenures were occasionally made in some of the lapsed Zamindáris and private Estates in the old Government Taluqs, and also in private Estates under temporary management. In the old Taluqs of Pabbakhanda, Wadáda and Ichchápúr, some of the Ináms were surveyed in Fasli 1229, and those supposed to be of defective title were subjected to a Jódi corresponding, as nearly as possible, with the Sirkár share; and the excess was similarly

charged wherever it was proved to be the result of encroachment. The detailed measurement accounts of Fasli 1229 are not complete, but the Ináms which were then charged with a Jódi can be easily traced. In Gumsúr, which lapsed to Government in Fasli 1243, an enquiry was held, and almost all Ináms, excepting service Ináms, were subjected to a Jódi.

In the lapsed Estates of Mohéri and Brámhanacháyi, an Inám enquiry was held in 1858, all invalid Ináms were resumed, some were confirmed as valid Ináms, and some for life. In some of the Zamindáris which have been under the management of Government, recent Ináms were resumed on behalf of the Zamindár—old Ináms being left alone.

9. Such being the state of the accounts, and such the circumstances of the District, the Commissioner directs that the following principles be observed in carrying out the present enquiry.

I. All Ináms entered in the earliest Inámati account of Fasli 1226, both in the Zamindáris and Government Taluqs, will be recognized as older than the Permanent Settlement, or as fifty years' old—unless the entry in the account or other satisfactory evidence shows cause to presume the contrary.

II. The entries in the accounts given in, subsequent to Fasli 1226, by Zamindárs or the Curnums acting under their influence, will also be taken in favor of the Inámdárs, and full consideration given to the different entries which show the date of origin. The presence of the Zamindár's Vakíl will remove any difficulty in the matter.

III. In the Taluqs which reverted to Government prior to Fasli 1226, all Ináms that are not entered in the account of that year, will be considered, fraudulent and be charged with, two-third or full assessment according to the circumstances of the case. Nobody was interested in omitting Ináms from the account in such Estates; but the rule will not apply to cases that escaped entry by sheer mistake, which can be ascertained from the Sanads or other documents produced by the Inámdárs and other attending circumstances.

IV. In the Government Taluqs which reverted to Government subsequent to Fasli 1226, Ináms which find no place in the account of Fasli 1226, will be confirmed on one-quarter or one-half assessment; one-half when the Inám is clearly recent, and one-quarter as sanctioned by Government for the Godavery District where there is no satisfactory evidence on either side and when the probability of prior enjoyment, is equal on both sides. The account of Fasli 1226 is not of such unquestionable authenticity, as would justify the presumption that the absence of an Inám in that account, is a sufficient proof of its non-existence at the time. It is only so as regards the existing Zamindáris or those which lapsed subsequent to Fasli 1226. The age of the Inám given in the account of Fasli 1259 or any other account prepared subsequent to Fasli 1226, will be a sufficient criterion of the liability of the Inám to be charged one-half or one-quarter. Ináms entered in the Curnum's account of Fasli 1259 as being older than fifty years but which do not appear in the account of Fasli 1226, will be charged one-quarter assessment, the date of the origin being doubtful.

V. All Ináms hitherto enquired into and confirmed by the Collectors as valid Ináms, or such Ináms as were charged with a Jódi for defect of title or on account of excess, will now be treated as valid Ináms.

VI. As respects the few villages which reverted to Government subsequent to the preparation of the account of Fasli 1259, the accounts filed after the reversion will be substituted for that of Fasli 1259.

10. In applying the above principles, the Deputy Collectors employed in the District will take care to notice all fraudulent Ináms, and give full consideration to the Sanads and documents produced by the Inámdárs. In Zamíndáris and other private Estates, any reliable accounts with the Zamíndárs or their Curnums can also be taken advantage, of provided the Zamíndár or his Vakíl raises no objection to the correctness of the documents. Wherever such accounts are received, full explanation regarding them should be given in the Register.

11. In the Government Tálúqs of Pabbakhanda and Ichchápúr, which were rented for a long time to one Major Evans, from whose hands they came back to Government in 1814, there are Ináms given by that gentleman, some of which escaped entry in the account of Fasli 1226. Subsequent accounts were taken specially for these Ináms which are all enjoyed to this day. Most of them are 50 years' old and will be confirmed accordingly under the present rules. Some fraudulent Ináms also seem to have been subsequently introduced into the accounts, under the plea that they were given by Major Evans. Care will be taken to distinguish such Ináms from those given by Major Evans before the expiration of his lease.

Area.

12. The land measures in this District are Garces and Bharanams. The area of both the Government and Inám lands was formerly estimated by the quantity of produce grown.

The garce is in reality a measure of capacity, and consequently fluctuates with the quality of the soil. An equivalent land measure is, however, recognized in every village, though seldom resorted to. It is greatly wanting in precision, being computed by ells, the standard of which is a man's arm from hand to elbow. The annexed table gives the length of the measurement rod used in Government Tálúqs, and the equivalent of the garces and Bharanams in acres. This information cannot be obtained for the Zamíndáris from the records of the Collector's Office. It will be ascertained by the Deputy Collectors during their enquiry. The extent entered in the earlier accounts appears to be much understated both as regards Inám and Ziráyati; the extent entered in the subsequent accounts being nearer the truth. The entry of the correct extent, in the Register and the Title Deed, is equally desirable for a fair calculation of quit-rent due to the Government, and for securing the just rights of the Inámdárs. The Deputy Collectors will therefore take great care to check the extent entered in the recent accounts with that in the earlier accounts, and in communication with the Zamíndár's Vakíl, adopt in the Register the entry in that account which may appear to be nearest the truth. In making the commutation into acres, the Deputy Collectors will be guided by the length of rod or Pagam in each locality; where long and undisturbed enjoyment of excess is disputed by the Zamíndár's Vakíl, his objections and the evidence he adduces to support his statements, should be clearly explained in the Register, with the opinion of the Deputy Collector, for the Commissioner's decision. The signature of the Zamíndár's Vakíl should always be obtained both on the Register and on the statement filed by the Inámdár, which will be a valuable document for reference, as it contains the acknowledged boundaries of the Ináms.

13. In the old Government Tálúqs of Pabbakhanda, Wadáda and Ichchápúr, and the recently annexed estates of Mohéri and Bramhanachayi, there is no uncertainty regarding the extent of Ináms. In the three first mentioned Tálúqs, all Ináms and Ziráyati lands were surveyed in Fasli 1252, and the measurement is supposed to be as accurate as the results of any of the unprofessional surveys in other Districts of the Presidency. The survey showed an excess over the extent usually recorded in the accounts, and even over the measurement of Fasli 1229, both on Ináms and Ziráyati. In the other two Tálúqs, all the excess above 10 per cent. over the recorded areas has been resumed under the orders of the Collectors, approved by Government. For the surveyed Tálúqs, the survey extent will be adopted, and in the other two Tálúqs the extent

Board's Proceedings 9th September 1858.

Do. 23rd July 1858.

confirmed by the Collector will be taken. For the other portions of the present Government Tálúqs, the extent in the account of Fasli 1259 will be adopted, as that is the latest account prepared with any amount of care; and for those Estates which have reverted subsequent to the preparation of the account of Fasli 1259, the entry in the account filed after the reversion will be adopted, any exceptional cases being dealt with on their own merits.

14. For Zamíndáris and Proprietary Estates, there is no account which gives the position or locality of the Inám. These must be taken from the Curnum's statements. For Government Tálúqs, the A Register prepared under the new Manual will supply the information.

Assessment.

15. The data for the valuation of Inám lands are extremely imperfect. There is no complete standard of reference. The two Káni account of Fasli 1263 was only prepared for Ináms below two Kánis. In the account of Fasli 1226, the value of the produce of the cultivated portion of the Inám is given. In the accounts filed by the Zamíndárs or their Curnums. Subsequently, the income of the Inámdár is entered, but without any fixed principle. The survey accounts of Fasli 1252 do not classify the lands. In a District like this, where the extent recorded in the accounts does not correctly represent the true area of the land, it is the preferable course to apply the rates prevailing on the neighbouring Government lands rather than adopt a new and arbitrary scale as proposed by Deputy Collector Sudarsavo Ráu. As far as practicable, the rates of the neighbouring Ziráyati or Seri land should be adopted; but a difficulty will be experienced for wet lands in Zamíndáris where the assessment on the land is in kind and not a fixed money payment. In all such cases, and where the neighbouring Government land bears no assessment, or where the soil of the Inám palpably differs from that of the neighbouring Government or Seri land, the Deputy Collectors will be guided by the general rules given for the guidance of the Deputy Collectors in the old Rajahmundry District. The reputed quality of the soil of the Inám, the general rates of assessment for Seri land of similar quality, the value entered in the different accounts; the rental of the Inám will all be taken into consideration and the assessment of the Inám determined. Wherever an average rate of assessment may be found practicable and desirable, by the circumstance of the Ináms being of uniform quality and of proportionate extent, the same can be recommended, full explanation being given at the commencement of the Register of each village.

16. The rates of Government lands in some places are very high, 10 and 16 Rupees an acre for wet, and 10 and 8 Rupees for dry. In some cases they are really heavy, and in others they simply appear to be so, from the real extent of the land being understated. It is impracticable to adopt any maximum rate of assessment except in those places where there is no uncertainty regarding the extent of land. In the surveyed Tálúqs of Government and in the other estates where there is no question regarding excess, a maximum rate of assessment can be fairly adopted at 8 Rupees an acre for wet and 3½ Rupees an acre for dry. A minimum rate of assessment may also fairly be adopted throughout the whole District, viz., 2 Rupees an acre for wet and 4 Annas an acre for dry. A second crop is seldom or never raised either in Inám or Ziráyati land and even when raised, no Fasal Jasti is collected. Where a second crop is annually raised in Inám land under a Government work of irrigation, the assessment should be increased by 50 per cent., unless the Inámdár prefers to give up his right to water for a second crop.

Kattubadi.

17. All the Ináms in Government Tálúqs and many in the existing Zamíndáris, are already charged with a fixed Kattubadi. In the Zamíndáris, there are some Ináms which pay a grain Kattubadi fluctuating annually with the produce. This must be now commuted into a fixed money payment to admit of the calculation of the new quit-rent, and the commutation will be permanent if the Inámdárs and Zamíndárs desire it. The Deputy Collectors will properly explain to the Zamíndárs and Inámdárs the advantages of the commutation of the Patta Kattubadi. The Jódi now paid does not in many instances correspond with that entered in the old accounts. As a rule the present Jódi will be left undisturbed, but any cases of disputed Jódi either on the part of the Zamíndárs or the Inámdárs, will be specially brought to the notice of the Commissioner.

Village Service Inams.
* Revenue Servants.
Curnums.
Nayudus or heads of the Village.
Sistler or Village Peons.
Bárákís.

Police Servants.
Kavalgárs.
Taliárs.
Dandásis.

Artisans.
Potter.
Washerman.
Barber.
Carpenter.
Smiths.
Boatmen.

Private Servants of the Zamíndár.
Door Peons.
Field Watchers.
Palanquin Bearers.
Domestic servants of the Zamíndár.
Samastánam Peons.

Pagoda Servants.
Dancing Girls.
Tomtom beaters.

the Ináms enjoyed by the person who actually renders the Police service, without reference to the designation of the office. When there is only one man who performs both the services and there is no other Revenue servant in the village, his Inám will be simply recorded in the village Register.

19. In the Government Tálúqs, the Ináms of the private servants of the late Zamíndárs will be confirmed on one-half or one-fourth assessment according to the nature of the service hitherto rendered, one-half when it is constant and active, and one-fourth when it was only occasional. The entry of the provision of the Inámdár does not necessarily show that the Inám was given for the service. The Inám might be personal and still the profession be entered in the accounts. The tenure of the Inám will be determined after ascertaining whether the service was actually performed or not.

Samastánam Peons.

20. Samastánam Peons in the Zamíndáris render revenue service and are also said to be under the obligation of performing Police service when called upon to do so. Generally speaking, however, they form the personal retinue of the Zamíndár, attending at his call on special occasions. Many of their Ináms were granted subsequent to the Permanent Settlement, and it seems undesirable to bring even the order once under the present settlement. Separate orders will, however, be issued regarding these Ináms after communicating with the Collector of the District. Samastánam Peons in the lapsed Zamíndári of Gumsúr formerly held whole village Ináms; some of which were resumed on the reversion of the estate when detached Ináms were given in lieu, on condition of performing general Police service which is rendered to this day. As their duties will now be undertaken by the new Police, these Ináms will be confirmed on one-half assessment to the present holders.

Whole Village Inams.

- † 1. Agrahárams.
2. Amaniya.
3. Doratanam villages.
4. Bissayis villages.
5. Mukhasa or Jaghírs,

and other private Estates, all the Agrahárams and Amaniya entered in the Permanent Settlement accounts will be confirmed on their present tenure or enfranchised at the option of the holders. In the Government Tálúqs, all the existing Agrahárams and Amaniya will be disposed of under the rules. In calculating their value, the Deputy Collectors will be guided by the rules laid down for other Districts.

18. The village service Ináms noted in the margin* will be found mostly in the existing Zamíndáris or those which have recently lapsed to Government. In the existing Zamíndáris and other private Estates, the Ináms of the Revenue servants, artisans and private servants will be confirmed on their present tenure and simply recorded in the service Register for reference. The village service Ináms will be confirmed on one-half assessment. In the Government Tálúqs, the Ináms of the Village Revenue servants will, in the first instance, be recorded in the Register and afterwards enfranchised at five-eighths assessment, if the measure is extended to this District. The Ináms of village Police servants will be similarly treated. In this District, Dandásis are said to be Police servants and Bárákís, the Revenue servants of the village. The contrary is the case in the District of Vizagapatam. The Deputy Collectors will carefully ascertain during the time of investigation and enfranchise

22. Dorás, who hold Ináms villages in the Zamíndári of Parla Kimidi, resemble the Jangi Kattubadies in the Ceded Districts; their duties were of a general nature, viz., to maintain the security of the country and prevent the incursions of the Sowras and other hill tribes. Their services being thus occasional and no longer required under the new arrangements, their Ináms will be confirmed on one-half assessment. The settlement will be made with the Sirdár or Dorá, and where minor Ináms are held by the Peons within the village enjoyed by the Dorá, their Ináms will be recorded in detail in the Register, but no separate settlement will be made with them. The sanction of Government will be obtained for the settlement of these villages, with reference to their Orders, dated 4th July 1861, No. 863.

23. Bissoyes are the hill frontier chieftains. The Government have ordered that there should be no interference with these men and their possessions beyond that of defining their limits and preventing encroachments. The latter work will be accomplished by the Demarcation Department, and the Deputy Collectors will not interfere in the matter.

24. Mukhasás and Jaghírs have the same meaning. In Ganjam, they comprehended not merely those granted to Peons and Military chiefs for service, but also grants for good service and distinction. Some of them are enjoyed by the relatives of the Zamíndárs and other dependents, who render no service whatever. When no condition of service is attached and when they are held hereditarily and for subsistence only, they will be treated as personal grants; when they are held by Peons who are liable for general service, they will be confirmed on one-half assessment; and when held by Military chiefs who render only occasional or nominal service, one-fourth will be the rate of enfranchisement.

25. The treatment of Mukhasás and Jaghírs, in the ancient Zamíndáris, will form the subject of a special reference to Government, and orders will be issued hereafter. For the present, the Deputy Collectors will dispose of such Mukhasás and Jaghírs only, as exist in the proprietary Estates and Government Tálúqs.

26. The topes in the Zamíndáris and proprietary Estates, which are not in their original nature Ináms, are not to be brought under the present settlement, the Government having no reversionary right in them. Most of the topes in the Government Tálúqs were entered under the head of Ináms in the account of Fasli 1259. As their tenure appears to be the same as that of the Asalminahá Gardens of Rajahmundry and the topes of Nellore, they will be disposed of on the same principles as were enunciated for the settlement of those tenures. Where the produce of the trees has been enjoyed by the holders for fifty years without restriction or liability to assessment when cultivated, they will be treated as personal Ináms, and in all the other cases, they will either be confirmed on one-half assessment or as rent free for the public benefit, according to the circumstances of each case.

27. Mazumdári and Kulkarini Ináms are those held by persons appointed by the Nawabs to superintend the work of the Curnums. These Ináms will only be found in the Government Tálúqs of Wadada, Pabbakhandia and Ichchápúr which formed the Haveli division of the District. Their offices were abolished on the assumption of the country by the British Government, the Russums attached to them being resumed. Considering the length of time their services have ceased to be performed, their Ináms will be treated as personal. The Deputy Collectors will be careful to distinguish the Kulkarini from the Karanikam Ináms, with which they are often confounded.

28. The fixed remissions in Ziráyati land known by the name of Sérivaza in this District, do not, as remarked by the Deputy Collector Chentsal Ráu, partake of the nature of an Inám

as in the case of Badibád lands in Rajahmundry, Bilmaktás in Nellore and Kattuguttás in Cuddapah. Lands enjoying the Sérivaza will not therefore be brought under the present settlement.

29. The Commissioner notices in conclusion that many Ináms and whole villages though excluded from the assets have improperly lapsed to the Zamíndárs, for want of heirs, without detection on the part of Government. In the case of minor Ináms that have lapsed to the Zamíndárs, it will be difficult to ascertain the exact locality of the Inám and its value. For the present, the Deputy Collectors will record at the bottom of their registers such Ináms as have so lapsed, with their extent and value if possible. In the case of lapsed Inám villages, they will be confirmed to the Zamíndárs in consideration of long possession under Clauses 2 and 3 of Section XVI of the present Inám Rules.

(Signed) G. N. TAYLOR,
Indm Commissioner.

Statement showing the present distribution of Tálugs in Ganjam.

Tálúqs as per new arrangement sanctioned by Government.	Government Tálúqs, ancient Zamíndáris and Proprietary Estates.
Gumsúr... ..	The Government Tálúqs of Gumsúr and Seerada, and the Zamíndári of Bodagada.
Barhampúr... ..	The Government Tálúqs of Pabbakhanda and Mohéri and the Zamíndáris of Pedda Kimidi, Biridi, Humma Palur, Kallikotta, Jallantra, Mauda, Budarsingi Tarla, and a small portion of the Hatghur Estate, as well as the Proprietary Estate of Barwa.
Chicacole... ..	The Government Tálúqs of Wadāda Polaki, Odyapod, Gutalavalasa, Kodur, Lakshemipur and Paltalagam, and all the Proprietary Estates in the District with exception of Barwa, Aska, Kurla, Kumari, and Haradabhadra.
Aska... ..	The Zamíndári of China Kimidi, Serghar Dharakota and a portion of Hatghur Zamíndári, also Proprietary Estates of Aska, Kurla, Kumari and Haradabhadra.
Parla Kimidi... ..	The whole of Parla Kimidi Zamíndári which is under the management of Court of Wards.
Purnaghada... ..	An extensive Khond tract above the Gháts.

STATEMENT No. 3.

Names of Tálugs.	Nature of land.	Name of the instrument formerly used in measuring lands.	Mode of measurement.				Acres.	Remarks.
			Length.	Breadth.	Square.	Country names of measurement.		
Wadáda ...	Dry and Wet land ...					Garce ...	2.00	There is no separate land measure for Garce. At the time of Survey, a Garce was arbitrarily supposed to be equal to two Garces.
Gumsár ...	Do. do.	With a stick of 16 cubits and 16 inches long.	5	5	25	1 Maund.	.40	
Pabbakhanda...	Wet land ...	With do. of 8 cubits...	10	5	50	Baranam.	.20	
	Dry do. ...	Do. of do.	10	10	100	Do.	.40	
Mohéri...	Wet do. ...	Do. of do.	10	5	50	Do.	.20	
	Dry do. ...	Do. of do.	10	10	100	Do.	.40	
Ichchápúr ...	Wet do. ...	Do. of 7½ do.	10	5	50	Do.	.17	
	Dry do. ...	Do. of do.	10	10	100	Do.	.35	
Parla Kimidi ...	Dry and wet land ...					Garce ...	2.00	

24 *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
24th March 1862.

No. 391. From G. N. TAYLOR, Esq., Inám Commissioner, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Camp Waltair, 22nd February 1862, No. 6:—

SIR,

1. Since my return to Vizagapatam, I have perused all the papers connected with the grant of the three Mukhása villages to the members of the Golconda family, referred to in paragraph 25 of my Instructions to the Inám Deputy Collectors in Vizagapatam, and I proceed to report the result.

Judicial Department.

To Government of India, 3rd January 1850.
From Government of India, 22nd February 1850.
To Government of India, 18th June 1850.
From Government of India, 2nd August 1850.
To Government of India, 28th October 1851.
From Government of India, 21st November 1851.
Order of Government to the Governor's Agent at Vizagapatam, 19th December 1851, No. 790.

2. The tenure upon which these Mukhásas were originally granted to Chinna Bhúpati and his brothers is described in the orders noted in the margin. At first restricted to the life time of the present holders, it was afterwards declared to be hereditary, but dependent on the good conduct of the family.

* Government Order, dated 8th August 1859, No. 1,066, Revenue Department.

† Paragraph 7, Government Order of 21st December 1859, No. 1,701.

3. On the occasion of the second Golconda disturbance, the villages were forfeited* to the State, Chinna Bhúpati and one of his brothers being convicted of fomenting rebellion. The sentence of the late Agent was subsequently revoke d† by the Government, and the villages restored to the family. In their Order of 24th March 1860, No. 364, Judicial Department, the Government observe, with regard to the shares of Chinna and Sanyási Bhúpati, "that the lands should be held under attachment, and "the proceeds paid to them for their support during their lives, and that on their deaths the "lands should be released from attachment and be made over to their heirs." The village of Gannávaram was left under the direct management of Víra Bhúpati, the third member of the family, whose loyalty was not called in question, and who pays a share of the proceeds thereof, through the Agent, to Sanyási Bhúpati.

4. For the present, therefore, the existing tenure cannot be disturbed, but after the death of the two brothers, now under surveillance, it may be considered whether enfranchisement may be allowed to their heirs, as in the case of other holders of similar grants.

No. 392.

ORDER THEREON, 24th March 1862, No. 647.

Ordered that the foregoing letters do lie over.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

Showing the figures up
of the several Zamináda

Names of the Zamináris	Total of each Zamináris as per accounts given by the Zamináris to Mr. Birnie	Average of 10 years Collected into a General Treasury	Agent's share of the Treasury	Postback
Turla	7,370	5219	400	4,000
Budarsingi	343	385	"	500
Avana	4323	2726	400	2000
Surangi	5516	5932	500	3500
Lighar	11,280	6295	500	5,500
Pratapagiri	25,401	17907	500	20,000
Bodaga	10,402	4559	500	4,000
Palur	5,838	2717	800	1,200
Venma	4,224	2717	800	1,200
Beidi	6,459	4000	522	4,500
Immakota	29,814	23000	3094	25,000
Mantasa	20,527	12701	5000	1000
Surasa	6,112	3570	3500	900
Vijaynagar	28,178	22700	5000	2000
Katghar	68,899	43500	10,000	3,000
Chikate	39,404	33,100	15,000	1,000
Kallikota	28,728	33,609	30,000	"
Assigned villages				
Vallantia	9727	7,639	7,500	500
Assigned Villages				

1862 Sepan
Govt- for March
N. 480

The Inam
Commissioner

The Secretary to
Government
Revenue Department
Madras

Dated 11th
Received 20th February
1862
Original of 5th April 1862 is 765
No. 5.

(Enclosure) 1

Submits for the
Approval of Govern-
ment draft of the
instructions proposed
to be issued to the
Deputy Collectors employed
in the Inam settlement
in the Districts of Vizag-
apatnam & Ganjam.

647-24 March

3-74
2/26

27-7-1

2-11-69

24-11-1

6-1-19

7/11/19

1-7-20

28-10-20

22-3-23

19-1-24 II ✓

1390 39