M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-6-34

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1394 Press ~~Mis.~~

459-462

Dated 21 - 6 - 1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following:—

No. 459. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th March 1862, No. 2,025.

Read again letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated 9th August 1861, No. 862.

(In Cons. 17th August 1861, No. 5,239.)

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 22nd November 1861, No. 1,135:—

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings, dated 19th October 1861, No. 5,761.

2. In reply to the remarks contained in paragraphs 1 and 2, I beg to refer the Board to Mr. Smollett's letter, No. 131, dated the 21st September 1855, in which that gentleman stated in reply to paragraph 5 of the Extracts from Minutes of Consultation, dated 23rd June, that it was a mistake to say that of the estates of the first Division of Vizagapatam, Cassimcottah alone remained unresumed that of the original 17 Estates, Oopadah had been transferred to Rajahmundry, and the remaining 16 original Estates had been so sub-divided that they now comprise 27; that only a portion of the lands have been acquired by Government, and that the Moturpha compensation due to the proprietary Estates, in the event of resumption, would be Rupees 1,735-2-1.

Paragraph 5

3. Since then the Moturpha of the Estate of Waltair only, amounting to Rupees 824-2-10 was resumed, leaving Rupees 910-15-3, the amount now applied for.

4. Mr. Smollett's letter above-mentioned is so explicit, that I need not dwell further on the matter.

5. I would, however, here explain that the amount of Rupees 3,476-11-0, set down by Mr. Collector Smith in his letter of the 21st November 1821, as being the compensation claimable, is apparently a mistake, as the amount includes the Proprietor's share of the profits excluded at the time of the Permanent Settlement.

The following abstract Statement will shew at a glance how the account really stands:—

Particulars.				Amount.		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
Amount of Moturpha Collections of the 1st Division according to Mr. Alexander's Statements, forwarded with his letter of the 30th April 1802	...		...	3,176	11	0
Deduct.						
Amount of Moturpha belonging to Government Estates since acquired by Government...	729	5	6			
Moturpha of Punchadarla and other villages formerly belonging to the 1st Division, but subsequently incorporated in the Zemindary of Vizianagrum	64	0	0			
Do. of Oopadah transferred to Rajahmundry	455	7	0			
				1,248	12	6
				1,927	14	6
Deduct.						
Proprietor's profit as per Settlement account				192	12	5
				1,735	2	1
Deduct.						
Waltair Moturpha already resumed				824	2	1
Compensation now applied for ...				910	15	3

1. Ordered that the above papers be submitted to Government, in continuation of the Board's Proceedings, No. 4,625, dated 26th August 1861, paragraph 18, which are now before Government.

2. The only difference between the Board's former Statement, and the adjustment which the Collector shews to be necessary, is that the sum of Rupees 910-15-3, for which compensation will have to be made by a reduction of Peishkush, is divisible among several estates including Cassimcottah, and is not due to that Estate alone, as the Board were led to suppose.

No. 460. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th September 1864, No. 6,419.

Read the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 31st August 1864, No. 484:—

SIR,

1. In reply to Miscellaneous Circular, No. [illegible], dated 15th instant, I have the honor to inform you that no item, formerly charged as Moturpha, is now collected and credited in my accounts.

2. I would once again draw the attention of the Board to the fact that the Moturpha tax in this District was resumed* in Fusly 1271; but, up to the present time, none of the Proprietors who have a claim to compensation have received any thing on that account.

* To Board, 9th August 1861, No. 862.

3. I have good reason to believe that one of the proprietors is about to sue me, as the representative of Government. Is it not desirable to avoid this kind of thing?

---

1. Ordered that the above letter be submitted to Government, with reference to the Collector's remarks in paragraph 2, and to the Board's Proceedings, dated 26th August 1861, No. 4,625, and 27th March 1862, No. 2,025, on which Proceedings no orders have yet been passed by Government.

2. The amount of remission in the form of a reduction of Peishkush that is necessary in Vizagapatam, is Rupees 910-15-3, with arrears from Fusly 1271.

No. 461. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th June 1865, No. 3,069.

Read again letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated 7th March 1863, No. 15, recorded in the Board's Proceedings, dated 12th September 1864, No. 5,958.

Read also the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 15th October 1864, No. 593:—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings, No. 5,985, dated 12th September last, and to submit the following explanation in reference to the remarks contained in paragraphs 3 and 5.

" Paragraph 3."

2. The sum of Rupees 1,674-10-1 comprise three items, viz., (1) Rupees 1,580-10-1; (2) Rupees 133-8-0; and (3) Rupees 15-8-0.

The first was sanctioned in Government Order, dated the 16th March 1824, and the third in Government Order, dated 27th March 1840. Regarding the second item, the then Collector of Vizagapatam, under date the 21st August 1833, applied for a remission of Rupees 138-8-0, on account of certain lands in the village of Dibbalapalem in Waltair, taken up for Military purposes, viz., 133-8-0, as an *annual remission*, and Rupees 5 as compensation to a Ryot to hedge off his land.

3. The Board, in sending up the application to Government in February 1834, made a mistake in stating that only 35 Rupees of this money was an annual remission, and sanction was granted in the terms of the Board's recommendation, in Government Order, dated 4th March 1834. From that time, however, the sum of Rupees 133-8-0 was annually charged in our accounts to the Military Department, and passed without objection (under the authority quoted) up to 1860. From that year, the amount has been paid by the Military Paymaster, as per instructions

received from the Accountant General, dated 26th January 1860. No provision is therefore made in the Revenue Budget for this charge.

4. The cause of the difference here referred to is owing to the items referred to having been omitted in the present Return. The first three were left out, as the lands on which the road runs have become the property of Government, having lapsed from Zemindary.

" Paragraph 4."

5. The difference of Rupees 23-1-5 in Ankapilli is not a mistake. The annual remission is correctly Rupees 22-6-7, the "difference" being compensation for a house which had to be removed on account of the road.

6. Jagannadapuram is an estate sub-divided from the Madgole Zemindary. The Gumashtas who first prepared the compensation accounts, submitted in 1862, included the whole remission under Madgole. This was subsequently discovered when deducting the respective sums from the Peishkush of the estates concerned, hence the difference.

" Paragraph 5."

7. The Order of Government dated 25th September 1862, having been received after the despatch of the Budget, the sum for Fusly 1272 was not deducted from the Peishkush as therein directed, but was subsequently paid from the Treasury, under instructions from the Board of Revenue, dated 15th January 1864. But from Fusly 1273, due provision has been made by deducting the sum due to each estate as directed.

---

1. Resolved that the foregoing letters be submitted for the Orders of Government.

2. In reply to the Board's inquiry in their Miscellaneous Circular, No. V., dated 20th January 1863, the Collector of Vizagapatam submitted with his first letter above recorded, a Statement shewing the amount of compensation annually paid to the owners of certain Estates in his District, for lands taken up for public purposes in former years. On an examination of the Statement, however, certain discrepancies and omissions having been discovered the Collector was called upon to explain them, and this Mr. Carmichael has done in the second letter above recorded.

3. Of the aggregate amount of compensation (exclusive of that on account of Moturpha resumed) entered in the Collector's Statement alluded to above, viz. Rupees 5,217-7-9, a sum of Rupees 2,398-11-5, being the remission on account of lands taken up for cross roads has already been deducted from the Peishkush payable by the Estates concerned under the Orders contained in the Proceedings of Government, dated 25th September 1862, No. 2,088. The amount which is still to be deducted is therefore Rupees 2,818-12-4 only as particularized below:—

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Deduction to be made from the Peishkush of the Vizianagrum Estate in lieu of the compensation now paid annually for lands occupied by Cantonments, under the Orders of Government, dated 16th March 1824 and 27th March 1840	1,596	2	1
2.	Do. do. of the Waltair Estate in lieu of do. do. under Government Order, dated 4th March 1834	78	8	0
3.	Do. do. from the Peishkush of certain Estates including Vizianagrum, in lieu of the compensation paid for lands taken up for roads under Government Order, dated 30th May 1826	1,144	2	3
	Total...	2,818	12	4

4. The first of the above items requires no explanation. As regards the second item, it will be observed from paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Collector's second letter above recorded, that he accounts satisfactorily for the difference between the amount of compensation as actually paid and that sanctioned in Government Order, dated 4th March 1834. The amount of compensation recommended by the Collector in his letter, dated 21st August 1833, and annually charged in the accounts since 1834 is Rupees 133-8-0, of which Rupees 78-8-0 only is payable to the Proprietor of the Waltair Estate, and the remaining (Rupees 55) is payable to certain

Pagodas as compensation for a portion of their land endowments. Should the adjustment of the Peishkush of the Waltair Estate be carried out, as proposed, the payment of this sum to the Pagodas in question will still therefore be necessary; but the Collector will be called upon to report whether the payment cannot be commuted for a grant of land revenue under the recent Orders. It appears that both the payment to the Waltair Proprietor, and that to the Pagodas, have been hitherto paid by the Military Paymaster, under instructions received from the Accountant General, under date 26th January 1860, so that information should be given to that Officer as to the commutation of both payments, should it take place.

5. The third item, Rupees 1,144-2-3, is less than the amount sanctioned in Government Order, dated 30th May 1826 by Rupees 209-8-0, and this difference is owing to three of the Estates, to which compensation was payable, having been since incorporated with Government lands, and to the amount sanctioned for the Ankapully Estate having included Rupees 23-1-5, the compensation for the value of a house which was removed.

6. The sanction of Government will now be requested to the proposed deductions from the Peishkush payable by the several Estates, as shewn below:—

Estates.	Peishkush as entered in the accounts of Fusly 1273.			Amount of deduction proposed to be made.			Future Peishkush.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1. Vizianagrum	4,98,823	11	0	2,293	8	4	4,96,530	2	8
2. Waltair	4,651	15	7	78	8	0	4,573	7	7
3. Ankapilly...	30,588	7	2	22	6	7	30,566	0	7
4. Godicherla	17,400	0	0	122	4	6	17,277	11	6
5. Pothagumulur	3,794	2	1	32	12	8	3,761	5	5
6. Cassimcottah	14,006	8	6	45	9	10	13,960	14	8
7. Mallupaka	19,500	0	0	6	14	7	19,493	1	5
8. Nakkapully...	5,606	0	0	170	14	6	5,435	1	6
9. Kuppuli	8,457	0	0	27	14	3	8,429	1	9
10. Sharemahamedpuram	19,343	0	0	17	15	1	19,325	0	11
Total...	6,22,170	12	4	2,818	12	4	6,19,352	0	0

7. The Board resolve to draw the attention of Government to their Proceedings noted in the margin, and to request that early orders may be passed on them, as a long time has elapsed since the claims for remission on account of the resumption of the Moturpha were made. The remission of Peishkush, rendered necessary by this resumption, amounts to Rupees 910-15-3, as originally recommended. Of this sum, however, only that portion due to the Proprietor of the Chepurapally Estate, amounting to Rupees 472-4-5, was sanctioned by Government in their Order dated 22nd April 1865, No. 833. In regard to the remaining 16 Estates, no Orders appear to have been passed.

Board's Proceedings, dated 27th March 1862, No. 2,025.
Do. do. 29th September 1864, No. 6,419.

No. 462. ORDER THEREON, 21st June 1865, No. 1,394.

Land Revenue.

The Board will be requested to submit a detailed Statement shewing the name of each Estate of which the Peishkush is to be reduced, the amount of present Peishkush, the amount by which it is to be reduced on account of Moturpha resumed or land occupied for public purposes respectively, and the reduced Peishkush to be levied hereafter.

2. On receipt of this Statement sanction will be given for the reduction.

3. Where the reduction is to have retrospective effect, the amount to be refunded should also be stated for sanction.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Acting Secretary to Government.

No. 3,069.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 7th June 1865.

Read again letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated 7th March 1863, No. 15, recorded in the Board's Proceedings, dated 12th September 1864, No. 5,958.

Read also the following letter from D. F. CARMICHAEL, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 15th October 1864, No. 593:—

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings, No. 5,985, dated 12th September last, and to submit the following explanation in reference to the remarks contained in paragraphs 3 and 5.

"Paragraph 3."

2. The sum of Rupees 1,674-10-1 comprise three items, viz., (1) Rupees 1,580-10-1; (2) Rupees 133-8-0; and (3) Rupees 13-8-0.

The first was sanctioned in Government Order, dated the 16th March 1824, and the third in Government Order, dated 27th March 1840. Regarding the second item, the then Collector of Vizagapatam, under date the 21st August 1833, applied for a remission of Rupees 138-8-0, on account of certain lands in the village of Dibbalapalem in Waltair, taken up for Military purposes, viz., 133-8-0, as an *annual remission*, and Rupees 5 as compensation to a Ryot to hedge off his land.

3. The Board, in sending up the application to Government in February 1834, made a mistake in stating that only 35 Rupees of this money was an annual remission, and sanction was granted in the terms of the Board's recommendation, in Government Order, dated 4th March 1834. From that time, however, the sum of Rupees 133-8-0 was annually charged in our accounts to the Military Department, and passed without objection (under the authority quoted) up to 1860. From that year, the amount has been paid by the Military Paymaster, as per instructions received from the Accountant General, dated 26th January 1860. No provision is therefore made in the Revenue Budget for this charge.

"Paragraph 4."

4. The cause of the difference here referred to is owing to the items referred to having been omitted in the present Return. The first three were left out, as the lands on which the road runs have become the property of Government, having lapsed from Zemindary.

5. The difference of Rupees 23-1-5 in Ankapilli is not a mistake. The annual remission is correctly Rupees 32-6-7, the "difference" being compensation for a house which had to be removed on account of the road.

"Paragraph 5."

6. Jagannadapuram is an estate sub-divided from the Madgole Zemindary. The Gumastahs who first prepared the compensation accounts, submitted in 1862, included the whole remission under Madgole. This was subsequently discovered when deducting the respective sums from the Peishkush of the estates concerned, hence the difference.

7. The Order of Government dated 25th September 1862, having been received after the despatch of the Budget, the sum for Fasli 1272 was not deducted from the Peishkush as therein directed, but was subsequently paid from the Treasury, under instructions from the Board of Revenue, dated 15th January 1864. But from Fasli 1273, due provision has been made by deducting the sum due to each estate as directed.

---

1. Resolved that the foregoing letters be submitted for the Orders of Government.

2. In reply to the Board's inquiry in their Miscellaneous Circular, No. V, dated 20th January 1863, the Collector of Vizagapatam submitted with his first letter above recorded, a Statement showing the amount of compensation annually paid to the owners of certain Estates in his District, for lands taken up for public purposes in former years. On an examination of the Statement, however, certain discrepancies and omissions having been discovered the Collector was called upon to explain them, and this Mr. Carmichael has done in the second letter above recorded.

3. Of the aggregate amount of compensation (exclusive of that on account of Moturpha resumed) entered in the Collector's Statement alluded to above, viz., Rupees 5,217-7-9, a sum of Rupees 2,398-11-5, being the remission on account of lands taken up for cross roads has already been deducted from the Peishcush payable by the Estates concerned under the Orders contained in the Proceedings of Government, dated 25th September 1862, No. 2,088. The amount which is still to be deducted is therefore Rupees 2,818-12-4 only as particularized below:—

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Deduction to be made from the Peishcush of the Vizianagrum Estate in lieu of the compensation now paid annually for lands occupied by Cantonments, under the Orders of Government, dated 16th March 1824 and 27th March 1840...			
2.	Do. do. of the Waltair Estate in lieu of do. do. under Government Order, dated 4th March 1834...	1,696	2	1
3.	Do. do. from the Peishcush of certain Estates including Vizianagrum in lieu of the compensation paid for lands taken up for roads under Government Order, dated 30th May 1826...	78	8	0
		1,144	2	3
	Total...	2,818	12	4

4. The first of the above items requires no explanation. As regards the second item, it will be observed from paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Collector's second letter above recorded, that he accounts satisfactorily for the difference between the amount of compensation as actually paid and that sanctioned in Government Order, dated 4th March 1834. The amount of compensation recommended by the Collector in his letter, dated 21st August 1833, and annually charged in the accounts since 1834 is Rupees 133-8-0, of which Rupees 78-8-0 only is payable to the Proprietor of the Waltair Estate, and the remaining (Rupees 55) is payable to certain Pagodas as compensation for a portion of their land endowments. Should the adjustment of the Peishcush of the Waltair Estate be carried out, as proposed, the payment of this sum to the Pagodas in question will still therefore be necessary; but the Collector will be called upon to report whether the payment cannot be commuted for a grant of land revenue under the recent Orders. It appears that both the payment to the Waltair Proprietor, and that to the Pagodas, have been hitherto paid by the Military Paymaster, under instructions received from the Accountant General, under date 26th January 1860, so that information should be given to that Officer as to the commutation of both payments, should it take place.

5. The third item, Rupees 1,144-2-3, is less than the amount sanctioned in Government Order, dated 30th May 1826 by Rupees 208-8-10, and this difference is owing to three of the Estates, to which compensation was payable, having been since incorporated with Government lands, and to the amount sanctioned for the Ankapully Estate having included Rupees 23-1-5, the compensation for the value of a house which was removed.

No. 5,761.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 19th October 1861.

Read the following letter from E. G. R. FANE, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Chepauk, dated 9th August 1861, No. 862:—

1. Referring to the Circular Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd April 1861, I have the honor to forward herewith a Statement showing the Moturpha collections of the several Zemindaries and proprietary Estates in this District during Fasli 1270, as also the amounts of compensation payable to certain Proprietors, in the assets of whose Estates the Moturpha was included at the Permanent Settlement. This amounts in the aggregate to Rupees 910-15-3, being only Rupees 269-10-11 below the sum now collected by the Proprietors and others.

2. The Moturpha of those Estates which have already been resumed is entered in red ink for easier reference.

3. Due publicity of the orders of Government intimating the resumption of Moturpha tax from Fasli 1271, has been given throughout the District in the Gazette of this Collectorate, as also by letters to the parties chiefly concerned.

Enclosure No. 1.

Abstract.—Statement showing the amount of Moturpha Revenue collected by the Zemindars and Proprietors of the Vizagapatam District during Fasli 1270, and the amount of compensation due to each as per Permanent Settlement accounts, the tax having been resumed by Government under their orders, dated 9th February 1861, No. 318.

---

1. The Board are unable to reconcile the facts shown in the Statement submited by Mr. Fane with those given in the correspondence quoted in paragraphs 14 to 18 of their Proceedings, dated 20th August 1861, No. 4,655, of which copy was communicated to the Collector on 6th September 1861. It was therein shown that Cassimcottah alone remained unresumed out of the 17 Estates in the old 1st Division of Vizagapatam in which the Moturpha was originally included in the assets, and in which consequently compensation could be claimed, and the amount of compensation to be awarded was stated at Rupees 1,735-2-1, in the Government Proceedings of 23rd June 1855.

2. Mr. Fane's present Statement exhibits 17 Estates as qualified to claim compensation to the aggregate amount of Rupees 910-15-3.

3. The Board resolve to call on the Collector for further explanation of this apparent discrepancy.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To E. G. R. Fane, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam.

Exd. J. Wright.

1861 Department.

No:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 19*th October* 1861.

Rev: 971/62

No. 5,761.

Requesting further explanation on certain discrepancy in his statement showing the Moturpha collections of the several Zemindaries and Proprietary estates in the district during Fusly 1270.

Statement shewing the amount of Kistna pha Revenue Collected by the Zemindars and Proprietors of the Vizagapatam District during Fusly 1270 and the amount of Compensation due to each as per Permanent Settlement accounts, the same having been resumed by Government under their Orders dated 14th February 1861 — 3318-

No.	Estates	Demand	Collection	Amount shewn rendered by Zemindars and Proprietors for Fusly 1270	Amount included in the Permanent Assets	Remarks
	1	2	3		4	5
	Zemindaries					
1	Salur	941 4 8	941 4 7			
2	Andra	— — —	— — —			
3	Saiphillibhumavarum	27 12 -	27 12 -			
4	Maringhi	503 15 -	465 10 -			
5	Jeanguinvulsa	174 5 -	174 5 -			
6	Belgam	857 - 11	593 5 11			
7	Gorsham	565 10 5	544 4 5			
8	Chamudu	111 5 7	111 5 7			
9	Patchipenta	484 4 -	484 4 -			
10	Madgole	2739 7 11	2646 11 -			
11	Chedicada Jaganatharavarum	99 8 -	99 8 -			
12	Jeypore	16881 15 -	16592 12 7			
	Total	23385 10 11	22701 3 1			
	Proprietary Estates					
1	Peddagumlam	— — —	— — —			
2	Cassimcotta	1 8 -	1 8 -			
3	Mallisaca	20 8 -	18 12 -		64 11 -	The Amount Entered in the Assets included in the Assets
4	Muruttla	318 14 -	277 15 -		50 3 -	The amounts here given are those
5	Gedichetla	159 6 -	— — —		49 9 10	entered in the Settlement accounts, and
6	Anhapilli	146 12 -	143 7 -		23 9 6	to this extent all Zemindars the Proprietors
7	Mungapatha	12 - -	3 12 -		97 6 10	to be Compensated (as for instance the
8	Bhimunum	— — —	— — —		5 - 10 -	Case with Mallavadapalem) Also see
9	Corupolu	53 4 -	53 4 -		— — —	Note No 19 Pages 24 & 25 of the Circular
10	Bherampurum	145 - -	7 8 -		16 5 11	Order Book of the Board of Revenue
11	Nuckapilli	— — —	— — —		92 - 5	for 51 - 52 - 53 -
12	Cheepurupilli	608 2 2	590 - 2		26 1 7	
13	Ajjeemada	81 8 -	81 8 -		472 4 5	
14	Echelapaca Lemungi	— — —	— — —		11 11 2	
15	Parada	— — —	— — —		— — —	
16	Peruda Cudiamulsa	3 4 -	3 - -		1 5 7	
					— — —	

6

Statement shewing the amount of Melurpicha Peishcush Collected by the Zemindars and Proprietors of the Vizagapatam District during Fusly 1270 and the amount of Compensation due to each as per Permanent Settlement accounts, the same having been resumed by Government under their Orders dated 14th February 1861 — 2318-

No.	Estates	Demand	Collection	Amount rendered by Zemindars & Proprietors for Fusly 1270	Amount included in the Permanent Effect-	Remarks
	1	2	3	4	5	
17	Mamidivada					
	Total-	1550 2 2	1180 10 2	910 13 3		
1	Walta	611	511	224 11		The Melurpicha of Walta was resumed by Government in 1855 under Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 23rd June 1856 No. 762, no Compensation for this Estate is therefore now applied for-
2	Vizianagrum Zemindari					The Melurpicha of these Zemindaries was resumed in 1856 in under Extract Minutes of Consultation dated 4th December No Compensation is allowed
3	Bobily do					
4	Seripurum Proprietary Estate					
5	Kintali do					
6	Muntana do					
7	Woongarada do					
8	Cossili do					
9	Shaimahamudsurum do					
	Grand Total	56581 42	48806 131	17351 2		

Vizagapatam Collector's Agent's Office
9th August 1861

S. Lewis
Collector & Agent to the Governor

Revenue Department

No. 1394.

Proceedings of the Madras Government under date the 21st June 1865.

Read ~~again the~~ the following
Pro: of the Bd of Revenue
~~Bd's Pro: dated~~
~~27th March 1862, No 2025, and~~
~~29th Septr 1864, No 6419.~~

Submitting in continuation of Pro: No 4626, 26th Augt 1861 letters from the Collr of Vizagapatam regarding compensation for Mohturpha collections in Vizagapatam.
(Here enter 27th March 1862 No 2025.)

~~Read also the following Pro: of the Bd of Revl dated 7th June 1865.~~

Submitting letter from the Collr of Vizagapatam, informing that no item formerly charged to Mohturpha, is now collected and credited in the accounts, and that no compensation has as yet been paid to any of the Proprietors on that account.
(Here enter 29th Septr/64, No 6419.)

Submitting letters from the Collr of Vizagapatam on the subject of the compensation annually paid to the owners of certain Estates in the Dt for lands taken up for public purposes requesting sanction for the deductions proposed by the Collector from the Peshcush of those Estates, & soliciting early orders on Bd's Pro regarding the claims to remission of Peshcush on account of the resumption of the Mohturpha tax.
(Here enter 7th June 1865, No 3069.)

The Board will be requested to submit a detailed statement showing the name of each Estate of which the Peshkush is to be reduced, the amount of present Peshkush, the amount by which it is to be reduced on account of Mohturpha resumed ~~or~~ or land occupied for public purposes respectively, and the reduced Peshkush to be levied hereafter.

On receipt of this statement

Revenue Dept.
1861
i.e. letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam dated 9 August 1861 No 862.
Rev: 97/62.

statement sanction will be given for the reduction.

Where the reduction is to have retrospective effect - the amount to be refunded should also be stated for sanction.

MD

14 Feb 02 Board Min no 33 ff...

Revenue 1865 Sept.
Pro: 9th Oct. for June
No. D 1394.

From the Madras Govt.
Dt. 21st June 1865

Rec. Board of Revenue 15th August 1865 No 2272

Pro. No. 41-22
23-6-1858
" 12-14
4-12-1858
" 120-121
9-2-61
" 246-252
22-4-65
From Bd. of Rev. 26-8-61
C. No. 2081 in Pro.
Nos 459 & 462.
C. No. 971/62
2576/64

Board of Revenue to submit a detailed statement showing the names of Estate &c in Vizagapa. from whom the Peishcush of which is to be reduced on account of Mokhurpha collections.

L