M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2250 Press ~~Mis.~~

172-173.

Dated 10-12-~~19~~1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 172. Read the following letter from E. B. FOORD, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Bezoarah, 3rd October 1863, No. 15:—

SIR,

1. With reference to the Orders of Government noted in the margin, on Petitions* No. 2,323 and 3,028 of 1862, and No. 2,057 of 1863, (herewith returned), I have the honor to subjoin a Statement showing the area, &c., of the Anumurlapudi Agraharum therein referred to.

* 27th April 1863, No. 726 and 22nd August 1863, No. 2,037.

Description of lands.	Area of land as entered in the old Ayacut accounts up to Fusly 1265.		Area as per Survey made in Fusly 1266 when the village was under Government management.				
			Classification.	Rate per Acre.	Land.		Sist.
	Acres.	G.		RS. A. P.	Acres.	G.	RS. A. P.
Dry	494	39	1	1 8 0	28	22	42 13 2
			2	1 4 0	38	5	47 10 6
			3	1 0 0	39	7	39 2 10
			4	0 12 0	52	25	39 2 6
			5	0 8 0	422	4	211 0 10
					580	23	379 13 10
Garden or Bagayet	7	17	1	4 8 0	3	21	15 14 0
			2	1 0 0	8	30	8 12 0
					12	11	24 10 0
Wet	61	14	1	5 0 0	7	15	36 14 0
			2	4 8 0	38	0	171 0 0
					45	15	207 14 0
Total fit for cultivation	563	30	...	... .	638	9	612 5 10
Add Porumbokes	35	32	...	... .	87	9	... ...
Total Seri land in the Aggraharum ...	599	22	...	... .	725	18	... ...
Add Inâms	25	22	...	... .	19	25	... ...
Whole Ayacut of the village ...	625	4	...	... .	745	3	... ...

2. The village in question was under the sharing system up to Fusly 1265, and from Fusly 1266, the rates of classification given in the above Statement have been introduced.

	Fuslies.	Collections. Rs.	A.	P.
Sharing system prevailed during these years.	1254	332	8	0
	1255	558	2	11
	1256	359	15	7
	1257	313	12	10
	1258	279	13	5
	1259	125	8	2
	1260	157	1	11
	1261	212	15	4
	1262	144	3	8
	1263	139	2	6
	1264	117	6	1
	1265	273	0	5
	Total..	3,013	10	10
	Average of 12 years ..	251	2	3
Vesabadi rates prevailed.	1266	261	0	10
	1267	249	1	1
	1268	269	4	6
	1269	326	7	6
	1270	373	4	5
	1271	457	1	1
	1272	429	6	4
	Total..	2,365	9	9
	Average for 7 years ..	337	15	1
	Average of 19 years ..	283	1	11

* "Remission grant."

3. The dry lands are of inferior quality and the wet are not provided with any permanent means of irrigation, but depend solely on rain. The marginal Statement shows the amount of cist collected every year since Fasli 1254 from which year only accounts are extant. The wet land cist has never been more than 100 Rupees except in Fuslies 1266 and 1271; and in some years there was no wet cultivation at all, under the foregoing circumstances the collections have always been less than the Jódi except in Fusly 1255, when the cist increased owing to very high prices.

4. The Agraharumdars state that the Jódi on the village prior to Fusly 1212 was 5 Pagodas only per year. In 1218 the then Zemindar increased it to 125 Pagodas or Rupees 497 per annum, but granted a "Moojara* Sunnud" in the same year to the effect that the excess above the original Jódi (5 Pagodas) would be remitted. Translation of the said Sunnud is enclosed, the Tahsildar having compared the copy with the original and filed it in the record in the year 1848.

5. The reason why the village has remained under attachment for so many years, instead of being resumed, is because the question of the augmentation of the Jódi, has never been decided by the authorities, and probably reserved for settlement by the Inám Commission. There were many more Agraharums and Ináms in the late Guntoor District, likewise attached for arrears of Bediga, the payment of which had been withheld by the Aggraharumdars on the plea that it had been subsequently increased unjustly by the Zemindars. The whole of the arrears on the same (*Vide* Board's Settlement Report for Fusly 1271 paragraph 42) including the arrears outstanding against the said Anumurlapudi Agraharum from Fusly 1243 to 1269 being Rupees 7,296-11-8 was remitted under the Order of Government, dated 30th April 1863, No. 744. The remaining amount due on this Agraharum for Fuslies 1270, 1271 and 1272 is Rupees 237-6-3, after crediting the collections of each year to the Jódi of the village.

No. 173. ORDER THEREON, 10th December 1863, No. 2,250

1. In this letter the Collector of the Kistna District replies to G. O. 27th April 1863, No. 726.

2. The report called for in that order was in reference to the Agraharum of Anumurlapudi, in the Guntoor Division of the Kistna District, which, having been placed under attachment in Fusly 1253 on account of the failure of the Agraharumdars to pay the prescribed Jódi, had, upon the Inám Commissioner's enquiry, been incorporated with the Government lands.

3. One of the reasons why the Agraharumdars did not pay the arrears was because, as they asserted, the Jódi was only five Pagodas annually, while the demand upon them was at the rate of Pagodas 125 per annum.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1863.

4. In reporting upon their complaint, Mr. Taylor expressed his opinion that the *larger* Jódi was *properly* retained in the accounts after the permanent reversion of the Zemindary to Government. This larger Jódi was, it appears, actually paid on a former occasion when the Zemindary was temporarily under Government management.

5. The Commissioner at the same time remarked that this Jódi, Rupees 497, considerably exceeded the average collections of the village under Government management, which only amounted to Rupees 300. This however could not, he thought, be considered a sufficient ground for its reduction. He proposed that the Agraharumdars should have the option of taking the village on its existing Jódi, free of all arrears, or of getting nothing.

6. Before passing orders on the Commissioner's proposal, the Government desired the Collector of the Kistna District to state, (1) the area, &c. of the village; (2) the reason why the collections have been so much less than the Jódi; (3) why the village has remained under attachment for so many years instead of being resumed; and (4) what is the amount of arrears outstanding against it.

	Acres.	Rs.
Dry	581	380
Garden	12	25
Wet	45	208
Cultivable	638	613
Porumboke	87	
Ináms	20	
Total Area	745	

* From Fusly 1254 to Fusly 1272.

7. Mr. Foord now reports that the total area of the village is, according to the Survey made in Fusly 1266, Acres 745, of which, exclusive of Porumboke and Inám, 638 Acres would produce a list of Rupees 613.

8. The collections for the 19* years during which the village has been under attachment amounted to Rupees 5,379-4-7, *i. e.*, have averaged per annum Rupees 283-1-11 (less even than the sum assumed by Mr. Taylor). The dry lands are stated to be of inferior quality, while the wet are not provided with any permanent means of irrigation. Only in *one* year out of the 19, viz., Fusly 1255, did the sist exceed the Jódi.

9. The reason why the village remained under attachment for so many years was because, the question of the alleged augmentation of the Jódi had never been decided upon by the authorities.

10. The amount of arrears actually outstanding is only Rupees 237-6-3 on account of Fuslies 1270—1272, the old balance of Rupees 7,296-11-8, for Fuslies 1243—1269 having been remittted under orders of Government passed on the Board's Settlement Report of Fusly 1271.

11. This remission was made, Mr. Foord observes, at the same time that a similar privilege was accorded to a number of other Agraharums and Ináms in the same District which had been attached on similar grounds because the proprietors had refused to pay what they styled unauthorized demands.

12. The cases of these Inám villages and Ináms are treated of in G. O. 5th November 1860, No. 2,045. Certain general rules for the settlement of these lands proposed by the Inám Commissioner therein received the approval of Government, and under the *fourth* of these rules, apparently, Mr. Taylor passed the decision which the Anumurlapudi Agraharumdars now complain of.

13. The Governor in Council considers that this is a case in which some allowance may fairly be made, though strictly speaking the Agraharumdars have forfeited their rights. Looking at the former collections, and to the account given by the Collector of the prospects of the village, he resolves to restore it to the former owners, subject to an annual payment of Rupees 250, all former arrears being remitted. This payment is of course exclusive of the usual water tax which will be leviable should the village hereafter come under the influence of a Government channel.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 10th December 1863.

14. The following endorsement will be passed on Petitions 2,323 and 3,028 of 1862 and 2,037 of 1863 :—

"Petitioners are referred to the Collector, to whom orders in their case will be transmitted "through the Board of Revenue."

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue,
" Inám Commissioner, } with No. 726.
" Accountant General.
" Civil Paymaster.
" Endorsement to Petitioners.

Exd. T. Dunn.

Translation

By the grace of Siva Gods.

Remission grant executed on Sunday the 15th increasing moon of Chaytram year Sukla to Janikiyala Rhagava Suriwaru Manikya Sourudeika Yajulu Garu, by Rajah Vaderedi Venkatadri Naidu Bahadar Mama Sultan Sir Dasa Mookhu Ramavar Sirkar Nor-Sojan Nagar and Mushafanagar, Bandar Machulipatam Sirkar Nizampatam, Kambhammet &c Fasli 1218

Whereas formerly granted to your Son Venkatapati Somayajulu, the Agraharam of Immerlapudi fixing thereon a Bilimakta Srotriyam Peruz of 5 Pagodas on all items, and caused a grant to be executed to that effect, which has been duly enforced upto last year; when an increased rate of assessment was being charged in this year on all the Agraharams in my Taluq, your village also was over-assessed. The said Venkatapati Somayajulu Garu therefore represented to me, that he performed Agnistomam this year after contracting a debt to a large amount; that this Agraharam was not granted as all the other Agraharams, that I

Signed Rajah Vaderedi Venkatadri Naidu Bahadar Mama Sultan Sur Dasa Mookhu Ramavar Sirkar Nor-Sojan Nagar and Mushafanagar, Bandar Machulipatam Sirkar Nizampatam, Kambhammet &c.

26th March 1839

Stipulated rent at a favorable rate.

A sacrifice to the God of fire.

washed his feet and granted it in gift
with golde and water, and that the additional
cess that might be collected on this should
not be taken by "you" (me). I therefore remitted
to him the money additionally collected in this
year on that village and entered into agreement
with your son the said Tenkatāhale Somaya-
-julu Garu, to say that I shall in future receive
only 20 Rupees (agreeably to the grant which I formerly
caused to be executed for the Bilmakūr Srotriyam)
out of the money that might be additionally
collected on that village hereafter every year,
and refund to him the remaining sum, that if the
tax now charged on your village, were removed
all the aggrahammulu used in the town
-ner request to remove the same. that I shall
continue granting to you (him) remission every
year of the money which might be additionally
realized over and above the 20 Rupees
until your village shall have been re-con-
-firmed to you on 20 Rupees; consequently
this Remission Grant is caused to be
executed and given to you.

Finis

Date as above.

True Copy of the Original
(Signed) P. Narayanarao
Tahsildar
True Translation
Illegible
Acting Collector

1863 Oct.

In a letter from the Dy. Collector of Kistna District dated 31st October 1863 No. 15

R 2527/63

Translation of Summons.

No 10 Dy/63
C.S. 2527
Rs 1/2

temporarily under Govt management.

5. The Commissioner at the same time remarked that the Jodi, Rs 497, considerably exceeded the average collection of the village under Govt management, which only amounted to Rs 300. This however could not be thought to be considered a sufficient ground for the reduction. The Govt have directed the Agrahara under which the village is held to take the village on the existing Jodi, free of all arrears, or of getting something.

6. Before passing orders on the Commissioner's proposal the Govt desire the Collector to furnish a detailed statement (1) the area of the village (2) the reason why the collection has been so much less than the Jodi; and (3) why the village has remained under attachment for so many years instead of being restored, and (4) what the amount of arrears on

(1) Standing against Rs. 497 in the Jodi was the total area of the village according to the Survey* made in Fasli 1266 amounting to 745 Gunthas, exclusive of Pormboke & Inams & 638 acres would produce a Jodi of Rs. 613 -

* From Fasli 1254 to Fasli 1272

(2) The collections for the 9 years during which the village was under attachment amounted to Rs. 3394-4-7 i.e. an average per annum of Rs. 283-11-7 (As even than has been assumed by the Taylor) The dry lands are stated to be of inferior quality but the best are not provided with any permanent means of irrigation. Only in the Fasli 1265 & 1269 Rs. 1125 did the collections exceed the Jodi.

(3) The reason why the village remained under attachment for so many years was because the question of the alleged augmentation of the Jodi had never been decided by the authorities.

10. The amount of arrears ac-

finally outstanding is only Rs. 237-6-3
on account of Fasli 1270-1272. The
old balance of Rs. 7296-11-8 for
Fasli 1243-1269 having been remit-
ted under orders of Government on
the Board's Settlement report of
Fasli 1271.

10. This remission was made, Mr.
Goode observes, at the same time
that a similar privilege was
accorded to a number of other
Agraharams & Inams in the same
District which had been attached
on similar grounds because the
proprietors had refused to pay
what they style) unauthorized
demands.

11. The cases of these Inam Vil-
lages & Inams are treated of in
G.O.S. November 1860. No. 2045.
Certain general rules for the
settlement of these Inams
proposed by the Inam Com-
missioner & received the
approval of Government,
and under these rules, as pre-
sented by Mr. Taylor passed the deci-
sion which the Ammanjapudi
Agraharamdars now com-
plain of.

in Petition 2323 of 1862 the
Agraharams are described
as having been under attachment
under similar circumstances
but released after enquiry had
shewn that the real quitrent
was much less than
that for the non payment of
which the original attachment
had been made.

The only one of these cases
in which a trace can be found
in the Coor Office is that of the
Viravandi Khandrika in the same
(Cuddapah) District. Finally orders
in this case were passed 6 March
1860. No. 352, and sanction accord-
ed to the Board's reduction of
the jodi from Rs. 323 to Rs. 200-
There is one point of similarity
between that village and the
one now under consideration.
The average collections from the
Khandrika for a series of years
had proved much less than the
supposed quitrent, and the Board
had therefrom drawn the inference
that the proper jodi must be some-
thing less than the average
collections. The same reasoning
might apply to the Ammanja-
pudi Agraharam. In the
former instance however

there were other reasons - and more weighty perhaps - for coming to the conclusion that the local authorities had under a mis-apprehension been demanding more than was due. These are wanting in the present case.

What orders then are to be passed in this case? The prayer of the Petitioners is that the Village may be restored on the Jaziree-rotigan of 5 Pagodas. Can this be granted? Mr Taylor's proposals stand. They should be acted upon. If he will take the village on the existing Jodi of Rs 497 free of all demands on account of back arrears, should this course be followed? or, under the circumstances of the case, the first proposition to be considered as unreasonable, & the second, could not some middle course, short of absolute remission, be adopted?

CGH
30/11/63 Looking

at what the Sheristadar Court says in his report of 9 April 1863 of the character of the title, I should say that Petrs would be liberally treated if they got the land at half its assessment - say Rs 300 - The average collections have been some what less - but they must increase it - a remission of 50 p.c which makes the assessment 8 annas per acre, all round, is liberal. Orders requested

L D L

gp

Revenue Department.

No. 2250.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.
Under date the 10th December 1863.

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Kistna District.

Submitting with reference to the orders of Government of 27th April 1863 No. 726 on certain Petitions, a report as to the Agraharam Grantoon Division. —

(Here enter 3rd Oct./63 No. 75.)

1. In this letter the Collector of the Kistnah District replies to G. O. 27th April 1863 No. 726.

2 The report called for in that order was in reference to the Agraharam of Ammarlapudi, in the Grantoor Division of the Kistna District, which having been placed under attachment in Fusly 1253 on account of the failure of the Agraharamdars to pay the prescribed jodi, had, upon the Inam Commissioner's

enquiry,

enquiry, been incorporated with the Gouernment lands.

3. One of the reasons why the Agraharamdars did not pay the arrears was because, as they asserted, the Jodi was only 5 Pagodas annually, while the demand upon them was at the r.te of Pagodas 125 per annum.

4. In reporting upon their complaint Mr. Taylor expressed his opinion that the longer jodi was properly retained in the accounts after the permanent reversion of the Zemindari to Gouern:ment. This longer jodi was, it appears, actually paid on a former occasion when the Zemindari was temporarily under Gov.t management.

5. The Commissioner at the same time remarked that this jodi, Rs. 497, considerably exceeded the average collections of the villages under Gouernment management, which only amounted to Rs. 300. This however could not, he thought, be considered a sufficient ground for its reduction. He proposed that the Agraharamdars should have the option of taking the village on its existing jodi, free of all arrears, or of getting nothing.

6. Before passing orders on the Commissioner's proposal the Gouernment desired the Collector of the Kistna District to state (1) the area &c of the villages (2) the reasons why the collections have been so much less than the

the jodi; (3) why the village has remained under attachment for so many years instead of being resumed, and (4) what is the amount of arrears outstanding against it.

7. Mr. Foaid now reports that the total area of the village is- according to the Survey made in Fasly 1266 - acres 745 of which, exclusive of the Pormboke and Inam, 638 acres mouts

	Acres	Rs.
Dry	581	380
Garden	12	25
Wet	45	208
Cultivable	638	613
Pormboke &c	87	
Inams	20	
Total Area	745	

mouts produce as a list of Rs. 613-

8. The collections for the 19 years during which the village has been under attachment amounted to Rupees 5,379-4-7 i.e. have averaged per annum Rs. 283-1-11 less

× From Fasli 1254 to Fasli 1272.

(less even than the sum assumed by Mr. Taylor.).

The dry lands are stated to be of inferior quality while the meth^ds are not provided with any permanent means of irrigation. Only in one year out of the 19 - viz - Fasly 1255. did the sist exceed the Jodi's.

The

9.- The reason why the village remained under attachment for so many years was because the question of the alleged augmentation of the jodi had never been decided upon by the authorities

10.- The amount of arrears actually outstanding is only Rs. 237-6-3 on account of Faslis 1270—1272 - the old balance of Rs. 729-6-11-8 for Faslis 1243 - 1269 having been remitted under orders of Govt. passed on the Boards settlement report of Fasli 1271.—

11. This remission was made, Mr. Fonod observes, at the same time

time that a similar privilege was accorded to a number of other Agraharams and Inams in the same District which had been attached on similar grounds because the proprietors had refused to pay what they styled unauthorized demands. —

12. — The cases of these Inam villages and Inams are treated of in G. O. 5th November 1860 — No. 2045. Certain general rules for the settlement of these lands proposed by the Inam Commissioner therein received the approval of Government, and under the fourth of these rules, apparently, Mr. Taylor passed the decision which the Anumanlipudi Agraharamdars now complain of. —

13. — The Governor in Council considers that this is a case in which some allowance may fairly be made though strictly speaking the Agraharamdars have forfeited their rights by lacking at the former collections, and to the recount given by the Collector of the proceeds of the villages, he resolves to restore it to the former owners subject to an annual payment of Rs. 250 — all

all former arrears being remitted. This payment is of course exclusive of the usual water-tax which will be leviable should the village hereafter come under the influence of a good channel.

14— The following endorsement will be passed on Petitions 2323 and 3028 of 1862 and 203 of 1863:—

"Petitioners are re-
"ferred to the Collector
"to whom orders in their
"favor will be transmitted through the
"Board of Revenue.

Sgd

14.— The Board of Revenue
½ — The Inam Commissioner } 27th No. 726 Capt. Wilcox
5 — Accts Genl's
3 — Civil Auditor's"

1 Copy to the Petitioners
Genl's & Petitions &c.

Revenue 1863 Dec/ 10th
Pro: of Govt for December

Pro. No. 247-248
27-4-63
" 280-281
30-4-63

No 2250.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 15th December 1853.

From the Ag Inam Commr
Dt 13th May/64. C. 1169.

Pro: Board of Revenue
submitting the reply of the
Collector of Kistna to cer-
tain queries regarding
the area &c of the Anu-
mumlapudi & Agraharam
villages District with orders
thereon.

No 172 & 173.