M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2262 Press ~~Mis.~~

157 158

Dated 11—12- 1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11th December 1863.

No. 197. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th November 1863, No. 7,437 :—

Read the following letter from H. MORRIS, Esq., Acting Collector of the Golavery District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Coconada, 30th October 1863, No. 368.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,001 of 1863, said to have been presented to the Board by Parvata Gumvayya, Moonsiff of Shankaveram, and Ankam Reddi Krishnamma, Moonsiff of Mulagapudi in the Estate of Totapilly.

2. The Writers of the Petition complain of the Munsubdar collecting Moturpha and Sayer in his Estate.

3. On inquiry it appears that no Moturpha has been collected by the Munsubdar: but he has always had the right of collecting Sayer. The earliest mention of the subject in the records of my Office is in a letter from Mr. Crawley to the Board, dated 3rd October 1831, who, on assuming charge of the Estate for a time, asked for instructions whether he should continue to collect it and carry it to the account of the Estate. The Board gave no reply to this question in their letter of 13th October 1831, and Sayer has ever since been collected in accordance with immemorial custom.

4. The item of Sayer was included in the assets on which the Peshkush of the Estate was calculated in 1859.

Vide Proceedings of Government 10th, received with the Board's Proceedings, 13th October 1859.

5. The person whose name appears as first Petitioner, denies having addressed it to the Board. The second does not exist, the Moonsiff of Mulagapudi having another name.

6. Petition No. 3,001 of 1863 is herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. The Petition reported on in the above letter, being virtually anonymous, will be recorded, but the Board observe that the collection of Sayer duties by the Munsubdar is altogether illegal, as was noticed upwards of thirty years ago by the then Collector of the late Rajahmundry District.*

* Vide his letter dated 3rd October 1831.

2. If such an item of revenue was included in the assets of the Estate in the accounts submitted by Mr. Prendergast in 1851, or by Mr. Purvis in 1859, it must have been the result of an oversight on the part of these gentlemen, and though the Board recommended that the Peshkush should be fixed at one-quarter of the assets, as estimated by Mr. Prendergast, the Government, in accepting the sum proposed by the Board, evidently viewed it as an equivalent for service no longer required, and not as any specified portion of the assets of the Estate.

3. There is no reason whatever, therefore, for treating the Sayer duties in a different manner from the Abkarry collections. The revenue derived from the latter source was for a long time collected by the Munsubdar without any authority, but in their Order quoted in the margin, the Government directed the resumption of the Abkarry without compensation, as it was an inalienable item of public revenue. The Sayer duties equally with the Abkarry were specially reserved to Government at the time of the permanent settlement.

Extract Minutes Consultation 25th April 1857, No 376.

No. 198. ORDER THEREON, 11th December 1863, No. 2,262.

The collection of Sayer by the Munsubdar must cease.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 7,437.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 24th November 1863.

Read the following letter from H. MORRIS, Esq., Acting Collector of the Golavery District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 30th October 1863, No. 368 :—

1. I have the honor to report on Petition No. 3,001 of 1863, said to have been presented to the Board by Parvata Gumvayya, Munsiff of Shankaveram, and Ankam Reddi Krishnamma, Munsiff of Mulagapudi in the Estate of Totapilly.

2. The writers of the Petition complain of the Munsabdar collecting Moturpha and Sayer in his Estate.

3. On inquiry it appears that no Moturpha has been collected by the Munsabdar : but he has always had the right of collecting Sayer. The earliest mention of the subject in the records of my Office is in a letter from Mr. Crawley to the Board dated 3rd October 1831, who, on assuming charge of the Estate for a time, asked for instructions whether he should continue to collect it and carry it to the account of the Estate. The Board gave no reply to this question in their letter of 13th October 1831, and Sayer has ever since been collected in accordance with immemorial custom.

Vide Proceedings of Government 10th, received with the Board's Proceedings 13th October 1859.

4. The item of Sayer was included in the assets on which the Peshkush of the Estate was calculated in 1859.

5. The person whose name appears as first Petitioner, denies having addressed it to the Board. The second does not exist, the Munsiff of Mulagapudi having another name.

6. Petition No. 3,001 of 1863 is herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. The Petition reported on in the above letter, being virtually anonymous, will be recorded, but the Board observe that the collection of Sayer duties by the Munsabdar is altogether illegal, as was noticed upwards of thirty years ago by the then Collector of the late Rajahmundry District.*

* Vide his letter dated 3rd October 1831.

2. If such an item of revenue was included in the assets of the Estate in the accounts submitted by Mr. Prendergast in 1851, or by Mr. Purvis in 1859, it must have been the result of an oversight on the part of these gentlemen, and though the Board recommended that the Peshcush should be fixed at one-quarter of the assets, as estimated by Mr. Prendergast, the Government, in accepting the sum proposed by the Board, evidently viewed it as an equivalent for service no longer required, and not as any specified portion of the assets of the Estate.

3. There is no reason whatever, therefore, for treating the Sayer duties in a different manner from the Abkarry collections. The revenue derived from the latter source was for a long time collected by the Munsabdar without any authority, but in their Order quoted in the margin, the Government directed the resumption of the Abkarry without compensation, as it was an inalienable item of public revenue. The Sayer duties equally with the Abkarry were specially reserved to Government at the time of the permanent Settlement.

Ex. Mins. Cons. 25th April 1857, No. 376.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. Walyell
Sub-Secretary.

To H. Morris, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District.
Copy to J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Exd. J. Wright.

B. 2262

The collection of

Sayer by the Inamdar

must cease.

Govt. Ho. Geo.
11th March 1863.

11 Copies to the Bd. of Rev. Cons. 18th Inst.

28 April / 57 No 16 25
10 October / 57 — 52-58
No 2416/62

not coming within
the scope of Reg XXV
of 1802. The question
however has been
considered & decided
settled & decided by the Madras Govt
Govts & Superiors
therefore that the
following order must
issue —

"The collection of
Sayer & Mokturpha
by the Munsubdar must
cease."

2 Dec 62 Regd No 197 & 198.

Rev. 1863. Department.
Pro. of Govt for December

No. 2970.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 24th November 1863.
Desp 27.
Rec 30.

Pro Bd of Rev. 10 March 62 C 268

No. 7,437.

No 2262 — 11 Dec

Recording with observations Petition No. 3,001 of 1863, complaining of the Munsabdar collecting Moturpha and Sayer on Petitioner's Estate.

With an order

Recommended

Note — The pet / Enc 25 April 57
No 376 / recommend the allowance
the Estate without compensation
as an inalienable right of the
paramount power — The Home pet
opposed of this — Desp: 5 May / 58. No 5.

The Sayer & Mokturpha
come under the same category
and their discontinuance
contemplated by the Resn. Bd — is therefore
correct — The Estate pays no
Peshcush — the payment alluded
to being in commutation of Service
by supplying 700 peons when required
My own opinion is that compen-
-sation is due — the Estate being a
very old one & not paying no Peshcush