

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1734

Press
~~Mis.~~

255-256

Dated 12-7-1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th July 1866.*

No. 255. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1866, No. 4,477.

Read the following :—

Board's Proceedings, dated 28th April 1863, No. 2,461.

Board's Proceedings, dated 14th November 1864, No. 7,409.

Letter from the Officiating Inám Commissioner, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Coimbatore, 13th June 1866, No. 18.

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board, dated 28th April 1863, No. 2,461, and 14th November 1864, No. 7,409, I have the honor to state that the one and half Putti, or twelve acres of land referred to by the Collector, Mr. Purvis, as having been improperly subjected to full assessment by the village Officers, has been confirmed by this Department as valid Inám, and that I, therefore, see no objection to the sanction of Government being obtained to the refund of the assessment collected from the Inámdar.

Resolved that the foregoing papers be submitted to Government, with the Board's recommendation that the refund of Rupees 282-2-0, erroneously levied on twelve acres of Inám land belonging to Palavarti Venkanna, be sanctioned.

No. 256. ORDER THEREON, 12th July 1866, No. 1,734.

Land Revenue.

Sanctioned, Rupees 282-2-0.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant General.

Exd. S. T. Augustin:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 28th April 1863.

Read the following letter from A. PURVIS, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ambajepeta, 27th March 1863, No. 66:—

1. I have the honor to report on the Petition No. 2,752 of 1855, presented to the late Commissioner Northern Circars by one Pulavarti Venkanna of Velampalem in the Taluk of Ramachendrapuram.

2. The Petitioner complains that assessment has been, since Fasli 1261, levied on two portions of certain Inams purchased by him in the village in question on the false representation of the Kurnum that the above portions were Ashalminaha or Porumboke.

3. With respect to the first bit assessed as Ashalminaha land, it appears that a Kattubadi Inam belonging to one Angara Venkiah Pantulu in the village of Velampalem, consisting of several fields, was put in possession of the Petitioner and some others

under an order of the Civil Court. The extent made over to the Petitioner was A. 89, K. 30 according to the conditions specified in the two Razinamahs dated 30th January 1842, filed in the late Masulipatam Zillah Court in Suits Nos. 800 and 801 of 1841, by the Petitioner and the aforesaid Angara Venkiah in consideration of the sums of Rupees 975 and 425, respectively due by the latter to the former.

4. The land as per Razinamah in Suit No. 800 is A. 57, K. 20 in extent, and the other as per second Razinamah in No. 801, A. 32, K. 10 in extent, making a total of A. 89, K. 30. These lands were made over by the Kurnum and Puttaldar of the village to the Petitioner in conformity with the order of the Court, and according to the limits specified in the Razinamahs, and the circumstances reported by them to the Zillah Court on the 5th January 1843.

5. The Kurnum, in preparing an account of Ashalminaha lands in Fasli 1261, in which year the estate in which the village is situated reverted to Government, included 10 acres from the field No. 1, and the full field No. 6 of 2 acres of the first mentioned Inam of A. 57, K. 20 as Ashalminaha. This extent of 12 acres was accordingly assessed with the rest of the Ashalminaha lands in Fasli 1261, and the sum so assessed was included in the joint rent Beriz.

6. The Kurnum, on being called upon to explain the cause of his including the Petitioner's Inam as Ashalminaha, while he reported to the Court that the Inam, including the land in question, had been made over to the Petitioner without objection, declares that, in the former accounts, 55 acres of land were entered under the head of Ashalminaha gardens; that the same was enjoyed by the then Zemindar and some Inamdars; that on his (the Kurnum's) grandfather reporting the circumstance to the Court on one occasion, an order was passed in 1814 stating that those who sustained loss should bring their claim to the notice of the authorities, but that he (the Kurnum) had nothing to do with the matter; that the said a Venkia Pantulu having enjoyed the Inam, including the portion of the above Ashalminaha land, as Inam for a long time, he made over the whole extent to the Petitioner and prepared the report to the Court to that effect, and that subsequently, in distinguishing the several fields of the whole Inam, the Ashalminaha portions were distinctly shown and the other fields of the Inam were altered and inserted in the accounts as the total extent of Inam in the enjoyment of the holder.

7. It clearly appears that the extent of 12 acres, which the Kurnum reported to be Ashalminaha was enjoyed by the original holder and the Petitioner for a long time, and that the same formed part of the total extent transferred to the Petitioner by sale. It was made over in accordance with the orders of the Court, but was subsequently assessed to the revenue in consequence of the Kurnum having entered the same in the account as Ashalminaha.

8. The whole of the Inam formerly enjoyed by Angara Vankia Pantalo, including the portion assessed, has been measured, and the result is as follows:—

	As per account.	As per measurement.
Field No. 1 including the portion assessed as Ashalminaha..	A. K. V. 20 0 0	A. K. V. 17 23 4
Do. do. No. 6...	2 0 0	2 26 0
The other whole fields..	74 10 0	80 12 4
Total...	96 10 0	100 21 8

From the above it will be seen that an excess of A. 4, K. 11, V. 8, was found in comparison with the extent entered in the permanent account, and the Razinamah executed between the parties as stated in paragraph 3 and the two fields, part of which was assessed as Ashalminaha, have been found to contain A. 20, K. 9, V. 4, whereas the area was entered in the Razinamah and the Kurum's report as 22 acres. Out of the total extent (as per measurement) of A. 100,

K. 21, V. 8, it appears that A. 3, K. 8 of land are now occupied as a pathway, and are not in the enjoyment of the Petitioner. There remains therefore A. 97, K. 13, V. 8; the increase being but A. 1, K. 3, V. 8, which cannot under the circumstances be considered excessive.

9. I annex a Statement showing the assessment levied from Fasli 1261 on the above extent of 12 acres created as Ashalminaha:—

Faslis.	Assessment.
	RS. A. P.
1261.....	11 5 10
1262.....	25 5 8
1263.....	24 15 4
1264.....	24 15 4
1265.....	24 15 4
1266.....	24 15 4
1267.....	24 0 10
1268.....	24 15 4
1269.....	24 0 0
1270.....	24 0 0
1271.....	24 0 0
1272.....	24 0 0
Total.....	282 2 0

10. Under the circumstances it appears the Petitioner is justly entitled to exemption from the assessment imposed on the 12 acres of land, which is clearly shown to be a part of the Inam made over to him in accordance with the orders of the Court. The whole Inam was inquired into by the Officers of the Inam Commission, but no Puttah has yet been issued.

11. With respect to the second point alluded to in the Petition, viz., that a sum of Rupees 1-3-0 was levied on a portion of 4 acres of Inam (which forms part of one Putti, or 8 acres, purchased by the Petitioner from one Pilkhana Latchmabayamma, as per bill of sale dated 24th November 1842) it appears that the above portion of 12 Kuntas forms part of a field No. 48, entered in the accounts under the head of Tanks. Of the whole extent so entered, A. 7, K. 20, having been included in certain Inams, and improperly enjoyed by the holders free of tax were fully assessed in Fasli 1261 when the estate reverted to Government. The Petitioner says that

the above 12 Kuntas form part of his Inam of 8 acres purchased by him as above stated. This Inam as well as the 12 Kuntas were measured, and the extent found to be A. 11, K. 24, V. 3. The above 12 Kuntas form part of a separate field of A. 1, K. 20, No. 48 as above stated, which having been in the possession of three persons free of tax, as noted in the margin, was assessed in Fasli 1261. It has no connection with the 8 acres of Inam purchased by the Petitioner and now held by him.

	A. K. V.	Extent.	Assessment.
Inam of 8 acres..	10 1 8		
Disputed portion of 12 Kuntas	1 22 11		
Total.....	11 24 3		
		A. K. V.	Rs. A. P.
P. Setana		0 36 0	4 0 0
P. Setapati.....		0 12 0	3 0 0
P. Venkara, the Petitioner.....		0 12 0	1 8 0
Total.....	1 20 0	8 8 0	

12. Under these circumstances the Petitioner has no grounds of complaint on this point.
13. The Petition No. 2,752 of 1855 is herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

1. The Board concur in the view taken of Petitioner's case by Mr. Purvis, and he is authorized to grant the relief prayed for in the first portion of the Petition. The Inam Commissioner will be requested to inform the Board what action has been taken by his Department in Petitioner's case.

2. The delay in the disposal of this claim, made as far back as December 1855, is very much to be regretted.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To A. Purvis, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District,
„ W. T. Blair, Esq., Acting Inam Commissioner.

Exd. J. Wright.

Passing orders on Petition No 2752 of 1863.

No. 2461

Dated 28th April 1863.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

No.

1863. Department

Rev-1983/100

For the purpose of the petition, the sum of Rs. 232-2-0 is to be refunded to the petitioner.

No. 7,409.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 14th November 1864.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Officiating Collector of the Godavery District, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 18th October 1864, No. 265:—

1. I have the honor with reference to the Petition noted in the margin to refer the Board to Mr. Purvis's letter to them, No. 66, dated 27th March 1863, and their own order thereon. Mr.

Purvis clearly shows that ever since Fasli 1261, twelve acres of the Petitioner's Inam have been unlawfully assessed in consequence of a fraudulent or erroneous entry by the village Kurnum. The sum so collected is, as per enclosed Statement, Rupees 232-2-0, to the refund of which the Petitioner is justly entitled. Mr. Morris refused this solely because it had been already carried to the credit of Government, a strange reason to give certainly.

2. Provision for such refunds has been made in the Budget under A, Allowances for Refunds and Drawbacks.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Statement showing the assessment levied from Faslis 1261 to 1272 on twelve acres of Inam belonging to Palavarti Venkataramanna of Vellampallem, Godavery District.

ENCLOSURE No. 2. Petition.

Before requesting the sanction of Government to the refund, the Acting Inam Commissioner will be requested to reply to the Board's Proceedings quoted by the Collector, in which information was applied for regarding the manner in which Petitioner's case had been disposed of in the Inam Department.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To W. T. Blair, Esq., Acting Inam Commissioner.

Copy to J. Fraser, Esq., Officiating Collector of the Godavery District.

Exd. J. Wright.

Rev. 1866. Department
No. of Govt. for July

No. 1985
PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 2nd July 1866.

By P. G. ...
22.7.66

No. 4,477.

Recommending refund of Rupees 282-2-0 erroneously levied on twelve acres of Inam land belonging to Palavarti Venkanna in the Godavery district.

W. 1734-
Sanctioned
Rs. 282-2-0.
12th July 1866.

For the ...

N. 255-256.

End in the ...

1864. Department.
No. 1985/105.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 14th November 1864.
2.10.64

No. 7,409.

Requesting the Inam Commissioner to reply to Board's Proceedings dated 28th April 1863, No. 2116, in which information was requested as to how the case of Petitioner in No. 2816 of 1861 had been disposed of in the Inam Department.

1863 ...