

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2961	Press Mis.
592.593	
Dated	28 — 11 — 1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th November 1865.*

No. 592. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th November 1865,
No. 7,406.

Read the following papers :—

Board's Proceedings, dated 15th June 1865, No. 3,238.

Do. do., dated 18th July ,, , 4,135.

Read also the following letter from the Collector of Kurnool, to the Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue, dated 18th September 1865, No. 132 :—

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 18th July 1865, No. 4,135, requesting further information regarding the gardens possessed by the late Nawabs of Kurnool, I regret that I am unable to supply the definite information called for, as to what would be the sale value of each garden charged with the rates fixed by the Settlement Department, and without the improvements effected since they were rented to the parties now holding them.
2. There is no similar property in the neighbourhood, of which sales have taken place, as these are the only gardens in this part of the District.
3. Strictly speaking these gardens were not saleable, as can be seen by a reference to the fixed Puttah on which they are held, copy of which was forwarded to the Board, but as reported in paragraph 5 of my letter of the 29th April 1865, the Puttah holders have in some cases sold, or mortgaged such rights as they possess, or made them over in liquidation of debt.
4. The garden of ten acres, held in the name of Assedaly Khan Esophzy, was sold on the 30th September 1861, to Shroff Venkatesam for Rupees 429-1-4. The garden of 163 acres held by Mahboob Khan Janozy was taken over by him from its former holder on the 7th June 1861, for a debt of Rupees 3,600, due to his brother Goolam Moideen Khan Janozy.
5. The garden of about thirty-three acres, held by Goolab Sing, was purchased by him from the former holder, Fattoo Bhye, on the 11th August 1863, for Rupees 600, Goolab Sing leaving three acres in the possession of Fattoo Bhye for his own use, for life.
6. The above transactions were unauthorized, as in the title on which the gardens are held, the right of sale or mortgage is strictly precluded, of which the parties entering into the above arrangements were perfectly aware.
7. In fact the transactions were not regular sales, but agreements entered into as the best or only mode of realizing debts. I have no doubt that in the eventuality of an open sale, on the present holder refusing the condition proposed by me in paragraph 14 of my letter of the 29th April last, a much larger sum would be realized for each of the gardens alluded to above.
8. I am also directed to report the rate of quit-rent per acre, which it is proposed to place on the gardens.
9. I did not contemplate in my proposal that a quit-rent should be fixed on these gardens. In paragraph 6 of my letter of the 29th April, I reported that the Settlement Department were fixing dry rates for the gardens, the rates being based solely on the intrinsic value of the soil regardless of the value of the trees and garden produce.
10. In the Statement shewing the extent of garden lands, which was an enclosure to my letter, the dry rate fixed by the Settlement Department was entered in all cases where their settlement was completed.
11. On the introduction of the new settlement, these gardens will be held on ordinary Puttah, on payment of the rates fixed.
12. They are now held on a permanent Puttah, distinctly stipulated to lapse on the introduction of the new settlement.
13. As the present holders have merely the usufruct of the trees, which, under the new settlement, will become the property of the Puttahdars, my proposal was made in order to leave the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th November 1865.*

present holders in possession, without requiring them to purchase at public auction the Government trees upon the land.

14. The arrangement by which they were to obtain a perfect title to the gardens, and full propriety in the trees and buildings upon them, by paying down twenty times the difference between the existing rents, and the future rates would, I believe, be gladly acceded to by all the present holders, and be considered a liberal settlement of the question.

15. I have delayed in replying to this reference, on account of a claim brought forward, since the date of my letter, dated 21st June 1865, by Razdar Khan Nagud, to the garden of twenty-one acres, at present held on permanent Puttah by Goolab Khan Nagud, in the village of Chinna Takoor.

16. Razdar Khan Nagud, states that this garden was made at his private cost, by his father Goolam Hoossain Khan Nagud, elder brother of the Dewan Namdar Khan.

17. Goolam Hoossain Khan managed a Talook under the late Nawab, and having died four years previously his eldest son, Nawaz Khan Nagud, held the garden at the time of the assumption of the British Government. He made no claim to the garden, however, which was entered in the accounts as Sirkar, was at first managed on account of Government, then rented out yearly, and finally given on permanent Puttah to the present holder, Goolab Khan Nagud, in the year 1852-53.

18. Nawaz Khan Nagud died within a year of our assumption of the Government, without making any claim to the garden, and his younger brother, Razdar Khan Nagud, late a Jemadar in the Kurnool Rissala, brought forward no claim until 1859, after Kurnool had become a Collectorate.

19. On referring to the records of the inquiry then held, I find that his claim was neither rejected, nor affirmed, and he himself let the matter in abeyance, until, on hearing that the settlement of these gardens was under consideration, he brought forward his claim before myself for the first time on the 28th August 1865.

20. Goolab Khan Nagud, the present holder, asserts that Goolam Hoossain Khan Nagud being in the employ of the Nawab, created the garden out of the revenues of the Talook, which he managed, and that it was, therefore, entered as a Sirkar garden in the accounts, to which at the time Goolam Nawaz Khan Nagud made no objection.

21. It is impossible, at this distance of time, to institute any satisfactory inquiry as to the funds with which Goolam Hoossain Khan Nagud made the garden. It was unquestionably in the private enjoyment of his son, Nawaz Khan Nagud, before our own assumption of the District, when it was included among the Khas Bhags, and given out, on behalf of Government, upon a yearly rent.

22. The present holder, Goolab Khan Nagud, has no peculiar claims upon the property, as he merely holds it on rent, and from an order issued by Mr. Thornhill, in February 1860, it appears that he had so neglected to maintain the garden at that period, that it was in contemplation to deprive him of his rented tenure on the ground of that neglect.

23. I consider that it will be right for Government to give up their claim to this garden, and to consider it as the property of Razdar Khan Nagud, to be held by him on Puttah, and payment of the rates fixed by the Settlement Department. He must be referred to the Civil Courts to obtain possession, if the present holder, Goolab Khan Nagud, refuses to give up his possession, unless compelled in due course of law.

1. Resolved that the foregoing papers be submitted for the consideration and orders of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

2. The gardens referred to by Mr. Minchin were the State property of the late Nawabs of Kurnool, and lapsed to the British Government on the assumption of the country. They are now held by private individuals under "fixed Puttahs" or leases which stipulate, among other conditions, that the annual rental, fixed at the time of their transfer to the present holders, shall

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th November 1865.*

be subject to revision at the new settlement, and that the right of the renters (which was not to be sold or mortgaged) shall extend only to the yearly produce of the gardens, and not to the trees or bungalows in them, all right of property in which was reserved strictly to the Government.

3. It appears, however, that the present holders of these gardens have been a long time in possession, and despite the terms upon which they hold them, have, in some cases, disposed of their interests by mortgage and sale, and in others have considerably added to the value of the properties by the outlay of private capital. The rents that they now pay, Mr. Minchin considers to be the full annual value of the gardens; and the new assessment, which is based merely on the character of the land, irrespective of the value of the trees and garden produce, is far lower than the present rents paid for those gardens, the lands of which have been classified.

4. Under these circumstances, and to avoid the alternative of requiring the holders to purchase at public auction the trees, and in some cases the bungalows, which are stated to be of little value, Mr. Minchin proposes to give them the option of purchasing the Government right in the trees and bungalows, by a single payment of twenty times the difference between the existing rents and the new rates to which the gardens will still be subject under the settlement now in progress.

5. The Board approve of the above proposition, the effect of which, as it regards the public revenue, will be to secure a capital, which, at five per cent. per annum, will yield an amount equivalent to the portion of rent which must be relinquished under the new settlement; but at the same time, the Board would recommend that the rate of purchase should be fixed at twenty-five times the difference between the present rents and the new rates, that being the number of years purchase, which, under recent orders, has been fixed for the redemption of the Land Revenue in those cases in which it is allowed.

6. Should any of the present holders of the gardens decline to accept these terms, (of which Mr. Minchin entertains no fears,) the gardens should be sold at public auction, subject to the annual payment of the settlement rates, as proposed by the Collector.

7. The following is an abstract of the statement forwarded by the Collector, shewing the extent, &c., of the gardens in question :—

Name of the present holder.	Extent.			Present rent.	Assessment under new settlement.	Remarks.
	Acres.			RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	
1. Fakoorodeen	...	22	4	9 0 0	...	Only trees, 836 in number.
2. Goolab Khan Nagud...	21	28	9	255 0 0	...	More than 4 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
3. Ally Khan... ..	13	9	9	150 0 0	65 14 0	More than 3 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
4. Assadoolla Khan ...	8	6	13	63 0 0	20 6 0	More than 6 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
5. Esoph Khan Zanoogi...	25	23	14	170 0 0	57 9 0	More than 7 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
6. Goolab Khan Nagud...	12	8	11	210 0 0	49 2 0	More than 5 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
7. Mahboob Khan Zanoogi.	162	24	13	360 0 0	196 5 0	More than 134 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
8. Goolab Sing	28	2	7	165 0 0	59 15 0	More than 8 acres of cultivation.
9. Tota Veeranna	4	10	...	200 0 0	...	Betel garden and trees.
10. Russool Khan... ..	43	31	10	355 0 0	...	More than 24 acres of cultivation, besides trees.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23th November 1865.*

8. In paragraph 15 *et seq.* of his last letter above recorded, the Collector brings forward his claim of Razdar Khan Nagud to the garden No. 2 in the preceding abstract. It appears that the garden was made by his father, and was his father's private property. That at the time of the British assumption of the province, the garden was in the enjoyment of his eldest brother, but was subsequently included in the public accounts as one of the Khas Bhags, and was taken charge of by the Government Officers and rented out on behalf of the State. That his eldest brother died within a year after the assumption of the province without making any claim, and that the present claimant made a representation to the local authorities in 1859, on which although an inquiry was held, no final settlement was made.

9. The Collector states that it is impossible, at this distance of time, to find out, with certainty, whether the garden was originally made from the private funds of the present claimant's father, or from the public revenue, as alleged by the present holder, the opponent of the present claimant, but that there is no doubt that it was in the private enjoyment of the present claimant's eldest brother at the time of the British assumption of the province.

10. Under the above circumstances, the Board support the Collector's recommendation that the right of Government to the garden be relinquished in favor of Razdar Khan Nagud, to whom a Puttah will, in such case, be granted, requiring only the annual payment to Government of the rates fixed by the Settlement Department.

11. In the event of the present holder refusing to give up possession, the Puttahdar might be referred to the Civil Courts to obtain possession, as observed by Mr. Minchin.

12. The following Endorsement will be passed on Petition No. 2,986 of 1865 from Goolab Khan Nagud:—

"The Petitioner is informed, that the matter referred to in this Petition has been submitted for the orders of Government, whose decision will be duly communicated to the Collector."

No. 593.

ORDER THEREON, 28th November 1865, No. 2,961.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government approve and sanction the proposed arrangement for making over the gardens in question in proprietary right to the present holders at the difference between the existing and revised assessment, in such instalments as the Government, on the Collector's recommendation, may sanction—the Government in each case retaining a lien on the garden till the whole be paid.

2. In the event of these terms not being accepted in any case, the garden should be sold by public auction after due notice, subject only to the revised assessment.

3. In the matter of Razdar Khan Nagud's claim, the Government observe that it was not preferred till some twenty years after the death of his brother, and six or seven years after the present holder obtained the lease of the garden.

4. He should be required to explain his delay, and the Collector will at the same time report whether the present holder, Goolab Khan Nagud, is a member of the family of Ghoolam Hussain Khan Nagud, and whether since 1860 he has properly managed the garden.

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

conditions, that the annual rental, fixed at the time of their transfer to the present holders, shall be subject to revision at the new settlement, and that the right of the renters (which was not to be sold or mortgaged) shall extend only to the yearly produce of the gardens, and not to the trees or bungalows in them, all right of property in which was reserved strictly to the Government.

3. It appears, however, that the present holders of these gardens have been a long time in possession, and despite the terms upon which they hold them, have, in some cases, disposed of their interests by mortgage and sale, and in others have considerably added to the value of the properties by the outlay of private capital. The rents that they now pay, Mr. Minchin considers to be the full annual value of the gardens; and the new assessment, which is based merely on the character of the land, irrespective of the value of the trees and garden produce, is far lower than the present rents paid for those gardens, the lands of which have been classified.

4. Under these circumstances, and to avoid the alternative of requiring the holders to purchase at public auction the trees, and in some cases the bungalows, which are stated to be of little value, Mr. Minchin proposes to give them the option of purchasing the Government right in the trees and bungalows, by a single payment of twenty times the difference between the existing rents and the new rates to which the gardens will still be subject under the settlement now in progress.

5. The Board approve of the above proposition, the effect of which, as it regards the public revenue, will be to secure a capital, which, at five per cent. per annum, will yield an amount equivalent to the portion of rent which must be relinquished under the new settlement; but at the same time, the Board would recommend that the rate of purchase should be fixed at twenty-five times the difference between the present rents and the new rates, that being the number of years purchase, which, under recent orders, has been fixed for the redemption of the Land Revenue in those cases in which it is allowed.

6. Should any of the present holders of the gardens decline to accept these terms, (of which Mr. Minchin entertains no fears,) the gardens should be sold at public auction, subject to the annual payment of the settlement rates, as proposed by the Collector.

7. The following is an abstract of the statement forwarded by the Collector, showing the extent, &c., of the gardens in question:—

Name of the present holder.	Extent.			Present rent.		Assessment under new settlement.		Remarks.
	Acres.			RS.	A. P.	RS.	A. P.	
1. Fakoorodeen ...	22	4		9	0 0	...	...	Only trees, 836 in number.
2. Goolab Khan Nagud...	21	28	9	255	0 0	...	...	More than 4 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
3. Ally Khan ...	13	9	9	150	0 0	65	14 0	More than 3 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
4. Assadoolla Khan...	8	6	13	63	0 0	20	6 0	More than 6 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
5. Esoph Khan Zanoogi...	25	23	14	170	0 0	57	9 0	More than 7 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
6. Goolab Khan Nagud...	12	8	11	210	0 0	49	2 0	More than 5 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
7. Mahboob Khan Zanoogi...	162	24	13	360	0 0	196	5 0	More than 134 acres of cultivation, besides trees.
8. Goolab Sing ...	28	2	7	165	0 0	59	15 0	More than 8 acres of cultivation.
9. Tota Veeranna ...	4	10	...	200	0 0	...	...	Betel garden and trees.
10. Russool Khan ...	43	31	10	355	0 0	...	...	More than 24 acres of cultivation, besides trees.

Handwritten notes and calculations at the bottom of the page, including totals and individual assessments.

No. 3,238.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 15th June 1865.

Read the following letter from J. I. MINCHIN, Esq., Collector of Kurnool, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Yerrachelmah, 29th April 1865, No. 55 :—

1. I have the honor to address the Board on the subject of certain Royal gardens, or Khas Baghs, at present held by various parties on what is called a Khayam, or fixed Puttah, the peculiar tenure of which, the approaching introduction of the Revenue Settlement renders it necessary to take under consideration.
2. These gardens were the private property of the late Nawabs of Kurnool, and on our assumption of the District were rented either by the year, or on short leases, being put up to auction, and made over to the party offering the highest rent.
3. In Fasli 1263, the system of short leases was abandoned, and the gardens were granted on the present fixed Puttahs, which were to remain undisturbed until the introduction of a new settlement, the amount of rent being determined as before by public competition.
4. A translation of one of the Puttahs is herewith forwarded, which it will be seen reserves strictly to the Government all right of property in the trees, and only grants to the renter the yearly produce. In the closing paragraph of the Puttah, the right to sell or mortgage the Renter's property in the garden, is strictly precluded.
5. The stipulation concerning the Government property in the trees has been upheld, but the Puttah holders have in some cases, sold or mortgaged such rights as they possess in the gardens, or made them over to other parties in liquidation of debt.
6. The Settlement Department have not completed the assessment of all the gardens, but they have fixed their rates in many instances, such rates being based solely on the intrinsic value of the soil, regardless of the value of the trees and garden produce. The new assessment will consequently be always far lower than the existing rents.
7. It will be impossible also, under the new settlement, to continue the existing stipulations as to the Government property in the trees, which should, in future, be made over to the parties who may hold the gardens on Puttah, and this change will also enhance the value of their possession.
8. As the property in the trees has hitherto been strictly reserved to Government, and the duration of the fixed Puttah specially limited to the introduction of a general settlement, there is nothing to prevent the resumption of the gardens at that period, and their sale by auction subject to the payment of the new light assessment.
9. While the legality of such a measure must be admitted, I do not advocate it, as in many instances it would undoubtedly fall with great hardship. The gardens have generally been greatly improved by the present holders; in some cases large plantations have been added to the original orchards, and there would be a difficulty in separating what is undoubtedly Government property, from that which has been created by private individuals.
10. The length of time for which the present lease has lasted, has given the holders a feeling of ownership, and, in direct contravention doubtless to the terms of the Puttahs, sales for large sums of money have been in some cases effected.
11. On broad principles of policy, I would recommend that the present ownership of the gardens be respected, and that they be granted on Puttah to those parties under the new settlement, subject to the payment of such a sum as may represent their enhanced value.
12. I consider that these gardens are at present rented for their full value; that the stipulations, reserving the Government property in the trees intended as a protective measure, is no longer necessary, and that they might be unreservedly made over to their holders, on payment of the existing rent.

8. In paragraph 15 *et seq.* of his last letter above recorded, the Collector brings forward the claim of Razdar Khan Nagud to the garden No. 2 in the preceding abstract. It appears that the garden was made by his father, and was his father's private property. That at the time of the British assumption of the province, the garden was in the enjoyment of his eldest brother, but was subsequently included in the public accounts as one of the Khas Baghs, and was taken charge of by the Government Officers and rented out on behalf of the State. That his eldest brother died within a year after the assumption of the province without making any claim, and that the present claimant made a representation to the local authorities in 1859, on which, although an inquiry was held, no final settlement was made.

9. The Collector states that it is impossible, at this distance of time, to find out, with certainty, whether the garden was originally made from the private funds of the present claimant's father, or from the public revenue, as alleged by the present holder, the opponent of the present claimant, but that there is no doubt that it was in the private enjoyment of the present claimant's eldest brother at the time of the British assumption of the province.

10. Under the above circumstances, the Board support the Collector's recommendation that the right of Government to the garden be relinquished in favor of Razdar Khan Nagud, to whom a Puttah will, in such case, be granted, requiring only the annual payment to Government of the rates fixed by the Settlement Department.

11. In the event of the present holder refusing to give up possession, the Puttahdar might be referred to the Civil Courts to obtain possession, as observed by Mr. Minchin.

12. The following Endorsement will be passed on Petition No. 2,986 of 1865 from Goolab Khan Nagud :—

"The Petitioner is informed that the matter referred to in this Petition has been submitted for the orders of Government, whose decision will be duly communicated to the Collector."
(A true Copy and Extract.)

To W. Hudleston, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, R. D.,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 15th June and 18th July 1865,

Copy to J. I. Minchin, Esq., Collector of Kurnool.
MS. copy of Endorsement to Petitioner.

Acting Secretary.
Nos. 3,238 and 4,135.

Exd. J. Wright.

Recommending that the present holders of the gardens of the late Nawabs of Kurnool be allowed to purchase the Government right in the trees and bungalows by a single payment; and passing endorsement on Petition No 2986 of 1865 claiming one of those gardens as the private property of Petitioner's father.

Dated 18th November 1865.
No. 7,406.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

No. 3,238.

Department.

13. It is contrary to the principles of the settlement about to be introduced, to fix an enhanced assessment on account of the value of the produce, and I do not propose that an exception should be made in the present instance.

14. I recommend that the present holders be continued in possession, on the rates fixed by the Settlement Department, on condition of their paying down twenty times the difference between the settlement rates, and the present rent. On any present holder declining to accept this composition, such garden should be sold by auction, subject to the payment of the assessment fixed by the new settlement.

15. I believe that this arrangement would be generally accepted as a fair compromise; it is simply capitalising a portion of the present rent, while the sums that will have to be paid by the present holders are far less than would be realized for Government by the sale of the gardens at auction subject to the payment of the new rates.

16. I would add that the small Bungalows which exist in some of the gardens are of little value, and may reasonably be made over with the properties.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Puttah granted to Mr. J. C. Campbell, Durbar Surgeon at Mysore.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Statement showing the extent of garden lands, with the trees thereon, in the Kurnool District.

The Collector is requested to report whether these topes, as part of the private property of the late Nawabs of Kurnool, were confiscated when the country was assumed; and if not, whether any descendants of the original holders are forthcoming who may have claims deserving of consideration.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary.

To J. I. Minchin, Esq., Collector of Kurnool.

Exd. J. Wright.

Requesting to report whether the Khas Bhags in the District were confiscated when the country was assumed, as being part of the private property of the late Nawabs of Kurnool; and if not, whether there are any descendants of the original holders who lay claims to them.

No. 3,238.

Dated 15th June 1865.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

No.

1865.

Department

No. 3,238/65

Enclosed are the original papers of the late Nawabs of Kurnool, and the original papers of the late Nawabs of Kurnool.

No. 4,135.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 18th July 1865.

Read again letter from the Collector of Kurnool, dated 9th April 1865, in Board's Proceedings 15th June 1865, No. 3,238.

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 21st June 1865, No. 86 :—

1. With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 15th June 1865, No. 3,238, requesting me to report whether the gardens, as part of the private property of the late Nawabs of Kurnool, were confiscated when the country was assumed, I have the honor to state that these gardens were always considered State property, and lapsed to the Government on the assumption of the country.

2. With the exception of the present holders, there are no persons who have any claims to their possession.

The Board are not quite satisfied that Mr. Minchin's proposal is a sufficiently liberal one. Though the gardens at the period when they were leased by auction may have been quite worth the rent offered, it does not necessarily follow that the trees then rented are still of the same value, for after a certain age trees partly deteriorate and become less fruitful. Mr. Minchin will accordingly be requested to report, after further inquiry, what would be the sale value of each garden charged with the quit-rent which Mr. Minchin supposes will be imposed on them with and without the improvements made to them since they were rented by Government. An approximate estimate can probably be obtained from any sales of similar property in the neighbourhood which may have recently taken place. The rate of quit-rent per acre which it is proposed to place in the gardens should also be reported.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary.

To J. I. Minchin, Esq., Collector of Kurnool.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 2961-

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 28th November 1865.

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Recommending that the
present holders of the gardens
of the late Nawabs of Kurnool
be allowed to purchase the
Govt right in the trees and
land also by a single payment,
and passing endorsement in
Petition No 2986 of 1865 claiming
one of those gardens as the private
property of Petitioner's father.

(Here enter 18th Nov 1865)
12/11/65

The Govt approve
and sanction the proposed
arrangement for making over
the gardens in question in
proprietary right to the present
holders at the new settlement
rates on condition of their
paying 25 years purchase of
the

[Handwritten signature]

For the Board of Revenue
Revenue Secretary
to the Board of Revenue
1865. Department
No. 3385/65

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 18th July 1865.

No 4135.

Requesting further information regarding
the gardens possessed by late Nawabs of Kur-
nool and confiscated on the assumption of the
Country by Government.

the difference between the existing and revised assessment, in such instalments as the Govt. or the Collector's recommendation may sanction. The Govt. in each case retaining a lien on the garden till the whole be paid.

In the event of these terms not being accepted, in any case, the garden should be sold by public auction after due notice subject only to the revised assessment.

In the matter of Razdar Khan Bagud's claim the Govt. observe that it was not preferred till some 20 years after the death of his brother, & 6 or 7 years after the present holder obtained the lease of the garden.

He should be required to explain his delay, and the Collector will

will at the same time report whether the present holder Goolab Khan Bagud is a member of the family of Ghoolam Husain Khan Bagud, and whether since 1860 he has properly managed the garden.

L.B.

14th Dec 1860 to the Board of Officers 5th Dec

W. B. Hall

Received 1865 Aug 10.
no. 100 for 1000

1865.

To: of the 1000 for 1000.

1865. 1000/1000

Pro. 100. of 1000. 1000. 1000.
1865. 1000. 1000.
Pro. 100. of 1000. 1000. 1000.
1865. 1000. 1000.

Containing the
arrangement of the
by the 1000 for 1000.
disposal of the 1000.
1000. 1000.

1865. 1000.