

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 991	Press
117-118	Mis.
Dated	10 - 6 - 1918 186.4

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th June 1864.*

No. 117. Read the following Petition from TALLAPRAGADA RAMANAH and others, Mokhasadars of Kendopadoo in Pentapaud Parganah of Tanukoo Talook, Godavery District, to the Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Cocanada, 6th May 1864:—

MOST HONORED SIR,

We had presented before your Honor our Appeal Petition (in triplicate) for transmission to the Secretary of State for India, seeking for redress against the grievances we have been exposed to regarding our village. We have since found it expedient to add certain material circumstances, and accordingly have prepared, and herewith forward, a Memorandum of the same in triplicate, which we respectfully pray your gracious Honor, will be pleased to submit as a portion of the record we hitherto sent in, accompanied with your favourable recommendation to the Secretary of State for India.

For such act of favour and justice we shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

No. 118.

ORDER THEREON, 10th June 1864, No. 991.

Miscellaneous.

One copy of the supplemental Memorial received with the foregoing letter will be forwarded through the Board of Revenue to the Collector of the Godavery District, with reference to G. O. 24th December last, No. 2,371.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

In No. 149 of 1864

In No. 1344 of 1864
Copy in letter to Eng
of 3 July/65 MS. 111

3

The Right Honorable
Sir Charles Wood K. C. B.
Secretary of State of India

The humble petition of
Tallapragada Ramanna
Pauperaize, Sarabaraize,
and Kanakaraize, as well
as others the Ellokhasa
of Kondopandi Village
in Pentapondra Pargana
of Santhor Taluk Godavari
District Madras

May it please your Excellency -

With reference to our petition
of the 11th November 1863, to your Excellency
touching the grievances of being ejected
illegally from the possession of
our Ellokhasa Village by the decisions
of J. B. Ballard Esq^r late Special
Assistant Collector of Masulipatam
and of the Madras Government
in appeal, we humbly beg to
submit

Submit herewith a Memo of
certain facts material to our case
which were not stated in the petition
and pray your Excellency to take it
into your favorable consideration
as a supplement to the petition
above specified. For such act of
Justice we shall as in duty
bound. Ever pray -

Cocanada
6 May 1864

3
Memo of the facts and reasons indicated of
the injustice done to the "Mokasadars" of
Hondopadri Villages attached to Januko
Taluk Godavari District Madras.

* Arrears of
Revenue.
1 There was a balance of 12500 Rs
under the Head "Bakaya" against
the Village upto Fasli 1260. This
had not arisen from our fault, but
partly owing to the Zamindar of
Nedadarolu Estate (to which the
Village appertains) having arbitra-
rily deducted for underr heads
such as "Nazarana" & part of
the money paid by us in satisfaction
of the list, and partly to the Zafteer
officers appointed by Government
during the period of attachment
having not properly attended to
the business of settlement & revenue
collection -

2 In Fasli 1253 the Zamindari Estate
of Nedadarolu, consisting of 4 Parganahs vizt
1 Pentapadu (which includes the Village
under reference) 2 Gundogollar, 3 Nedadarolu
and

and 4. Bahajally was sold by public
auction on account of the arrears of
Pishkush then outstanding, to an amount
of 5 Lacs of Rupees, and purchased
in by Government who held it under
them any for some years, and then were
so kind as to remit the balance on the
whole Estate, and make it over to the Ja-
meendar himself with the exception of
certain Estates which were given to the
Jameendar of Nozeds in liquidation of
a debt due by the former to the latter
Jameendar. As the sum of 9500 Rupees
which was the amount of arrears outstand-
ing against our Village upto Tasli 1253 (during
which this proceeding took place) formed
a portion of the 5 Lacs of Rupees being the
whole amount struck off by Government
our liability to pay it has virtually
ceased. By the same reason late
Jahangir of Palung Talook, Meerut
stated

4
stated in his report made in Tasli 1260
on Bahaja or arrears of Revenue, that
the Bahaja against our Village should
not further be levied.

3 The Government has established
taken at the consent of the Jameendars
two Parganas of the Jameendary
Estate as equivalent to the arrears
of 12 Lacs of Rupees of Pishkush which has
then been against it. They exonerates
from the liability to the remaining
portion of the Jameendary which was
left to the Jameendar. In Tasli 1264 J. Ballou
Esq. was appointed as special
Assistant Collector with commission
to enquire into the circumstances of
Bahaja or arrears of revenue in
Masulipatam District. The
Authority admitted arrears to an
amount

and 4 Bahayally was sold by public
auction on account of the arrears of
Peishch then outstanding, to an amount
of 5 Lacs of Rupees, and purchased
in by Government, who held it under
them any for some years, and then were
so kind as to remit the balance on the
whole Estate, and make it over to the za-
meendar himself with the exception of
certain Estates which were given to the
zameendar of Nozeds in liquidation of
a debt due by the former to the latter
zameendar. As the sum of 9500 Rupees
which was the amount of arrears outstand-
ing against our Village upto Tasli 1253 (during
which this proceeding took place) formed
a part of the 5 Lacs of Rupees being the
whole amount struck off by Government
our liability to pay it has virtually
ceased. By the same reason late
Jahangir of Rahang Talook, Muziris
stated

4
stated in his report made in Tasli 1260
on Bakaya or arrears of Revenue, that
the Bakaya against our Village should
not further be levied.

3 The Government has ~~in Tasli 1254~~
taken at the consent of the zameendar
two Parganas of the zameendary
Estate as equivalent to the arrears
of 12 Lacs of Rupees of Peishch which has
then been ~~paid~~ against it. They exonerates
from ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{the} remaining
portion of the zameendary which was
left to the zameendar. In Tasli 1264 J. Ballantyne
Esq^r was appointed as special
Assistant Collector with commission
to enquire into the circumstances of
Bakaya or arrears of revenue in
Masulipatam District. The
authority & settled arrears to

1799

amount of 23775 Rupees then outstanding
against certain Inams and Mofkhar
Aghahams of Pentapander Purganah
and other Estates, notwithstanding the
admission by the holders of their liability
~~to pay the same in full to the Government~~
continue in the enjoyment of the holders
But his proceeding in the case of our
Village under reference was quite contrary
and illegal. The Authority ousted us
from the possession of our Village without
taking into consideration the facts stated
in paras. 1, 2 and 3 of the Memo, and
observing the legal formalities (as provided
for by legislative enactments for
disposing lands) such as taking
written consent of the holder, or selling
by public auction, just giving publicity
by affixing ~~notice~~ ^{posting} and ~~advertisement~~ ^{notice} the
struck off the balance due to us by
the under Ryots of the Village. The
Village of Namarpur taluk of
Gundigoller Purganah, which stands
in

2
in the same position as our Village
in point of arrears, was released from
attachment, and put in possession of
the owners, absolving them from
the liability of the balance against
it. With a view that he may use
the same equanimity towards our
case, we addressed the gentleman
an Arjee complaining of the illegal
treatment we met with in the case of
our Village. But it was endeavored
to say that as the Village has been
under attachment from a prolonged
period, and as the outstanding balance
was undisputed, report was made
to Government for resuming the
Village under Jeroztee -
5 Afterwards we represented to
the injustice to Mr. Fraser, the then
Acting Collector of Masulipatam
who

who upon due consideration of the merits
of our case was of opinion that Mr Ballard's
proceeding regarding the matter of our Village
was not justified with reasonable grounds,
and was so good as to adopt an arrangement
by which of the 12500 Rs being the aggregate
amount of the balances against our Village
upto Tasli 1260, the sum of 9500 Rs which
formed a portion of the 5 Lacs of rupees
written off by Government in favor of
the Zamindar in Tasli 1253, as above
stated, were to be remitted to us, and we
have to pay the remainder 3000 Rupees
within 10 years by two equal instalments
at 300 Rs per Annum together with the
Cist of the Village Rs 1432, and it should
be placed in our possession. So, this
arrangement we accepted, and presented
an Arjee to the gentleman, who made an
report to the Government. The subject
Even the latter amount of 3000 Rupees
was not legally fit to be levied from us
because

because the 2 Lacs of Rupees being the
amount of arrears against the whole
Estate remitted in Tasli 1260 by
Government to the Zamindar embraced
this amount too. Yet the Acting Collector
fixed it so, on the ground of a slip
in the document executed by Nojeed
Zamindar, stating that Government
may deal according to their discretion
with the balances due by the Ryots
of Pentapadu and Gundogollu Parganahs
to certain Subsequent Inames given
out of Juytee lands by late Zamindar
Rajah Venkata Narasimha Apparao Bahadur
were decided by Mr Ballard in Tasli
1264 to be resumed under Juytee.
But the Government, at the recom-
mendation of the Collector placed the
lands in possession of Sasundar
for Juytee Cist. In Tasli 1266, certain
Inames (in Gundogollu and Petaampitta
Gundogollu Parganahs) which were resumed
under

under Jerytes, were settled to other Rs as
in prejudice to the Inamdar who
complained against this proceeding
during Jamabundy settlements for
the Jasi to Mr Chae the then
Deputy Assistant Collector who made
over those lands to the Inamdar
themselves. This fact will be proved
on reference to the Hukumi orders
to the Tahasildars of Pentapadu
touching the Jamabundy settlements
for Jasi 1266.

7. With hopes to be placed in possession
of the Mochasa Village, even after the
Joint Act until we get redress against
the illegal proceeding of the special
Assistant we offered to pay for the
Village the Joint Act of 1551 Rupees,
but the Masulipatam Collector unjustly
declined to grant it.

8. This Mochasa Village has formerly
been granted to an ancestor by
Mohammedan

3
Mohammedan Rulers, and ever since
been continually enjoyed by our
family. Although we offered to pay
Mochasa Act 1432 Rs a Joint Act
Rs 1551 as well as the 300 Rs in satisfaction
of arrears, yet it was given to others
for 1338 Rs Act which is below the
foregoing two offers by us.
It can therefore be easily considered
by your Excellency, how great an
illegal proceeding is this.

9. We addressed to Government an
Appeal petition complaining of all
the grievances, and praying for redress,
but they returned it with an endorsement
stating that the cause to put
in possession of the petitioners (ourselves)
the Village must revert to Government
under their instructions. For this we
beg to represent as follows.

Ln 21

In Tashi 1261 Nedadaroli, and Bahayally
Parganahs were sold in public auction
on account of balances & advances of
Peishwah due for Tashi 1261 and
purchased by Government, who held the
Estates under "Ammam" for 8 years, and
they made over them to the Zamindars
with profit for past services.
The District Muzdar Zamindars
belonging to Masreddywar, was also sold
in the same manner, made over to the
Zamindar with a reduction of past
Peishwah. The Village was not put to
auction, nor has our consent been obtained
as provided for in Regulations. We were
unjustly deprived of the possession of the
Village upon mere ungrounded recom-
mendation of the special assistant.
We therefore have taken this opportunity
of laying our case before Your Excellency
with belief that you can be seen with eye
of compassion, and be relieved from
the ocean of grievances, which we have
been plunged in.

10 It has been usual in the British
Government.

Government for aggrieved parties, to
get redress by higher authorities in
appeal. With anticipation of such
Justice we have recourse to the channel
open for aggrieved.

11 In conclusion we most
humbly pray Your Excellency
out of compassion on our indigent &
numerous families depending on the
Village for food, render us redress,
and issue instructions to the Govern-
ment Madras, to adopt necessary
measures that we may be
in possession of our Mochasa Village
on condition of our paying to Government
annual Aist of 1432 Rs. and 300 Rs. in
liquidation of the 3000 Rupees the
arrears of Aist in accordance to the
arrangement by order and looked
to Government by Mr. Tracer the
then Acting Collector of Masulipatam
as above stated.

The following are proofs
and

and instances material to our case,
which we respectfully call your Excellency's
kind attention to during the consideration
of our petition.

1 That the Government restored to
the Zamindar the Estate of Nedadavolu
which had been purchased by Government
in 1852, on account of the arrears
of Peishcash.

2 The endorsement which forms part
of the record, given by Mr Ballard, and
which was submitted to the Sub Collector
Godavari District by Sanukor Sahasiddan.
The endorsement shows that either the
Special Assistant or Collector of the
District has never taken our written consent
for giving the Village to others for either
Joint or Elotchasa Cist, nor has it been
sold in public auction.

3 That Mr Ballard's remitted the
arrears due by the holders of certain
Brahmanes, tho they have admitted
their liability to pay the balance,
and passed them a proceeding quite
contrary to what has been done in the
case of our Village.

that

4 That the Elotchasa Village of
"Gamarapurtah" in Gundogolli
Parganah, which had been under attachment
for some periods in common with our
Village, was restored to the owner,
freeing them from arrears.

5 The report made to Government
by Mr Treason then Acting Collector
of Masulipatam District, upon
taking an Arzee from us for
paying 3000-Rs of arrears by ten
years instalments.

6 That our Motchasa Village
was given to others, without our consent,
for lower Cist of Rs 1338, while we
offered to pay Joint Cist of 1557 Rs
apart the 300 Rs for arrears.

7 That the Government restored
to the Zamindar of Nedadavolu,
his Estate, together with past years'
profit 8 years after having purchased
it in public auction under their
own

and instructions

Canada }
6 May 1864 }

W 991-

One copy of the supplement-
tal Memorial received
with the foregoing letter will
be forwarded through the
Board of Revenue to the
Collector of the Godavery
District with reference to
G.O. 24 December last.
No 2371-

Fort St. George }
June 1864 }

cgll

Letter B of Rev. with
Memorial } P. H. Lums

containing certain
fresh & material
circumstances and
pray for the trans-
mission of the same
as a portion of the
Record to the said
authority.

Copy in a letter to Engr
of 3 February 1865 No 5th Muz

N. 117 & 118.

Rev 803rd Sep 5th
Pro: of Govt of Madras
No 1344 of 1864

From Tallapragada Ru-
manah and other Moha-
saders of Tandapadu in
Peratapand Parganah
of Tanukoot Talug Go-
davar District, Can-
nada.

Dated 6

Recd 27th } 3 May 1864.
8th June.

With 3 Enclosures

J. No 991-10 Cime
In connection with
their former Memorial
addressed to the Right
Honorable the Secretary
of State for India re-
garding their village
submit herewith a
Memorial in triplicate.