vernment, Revenue Department,
ry 1866.

h No

M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 177

Press
~~Mis.~~

349. 350

Dated 22- 1- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd January 1866.

No. 349. Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 14th November 1864, No. 7,418, recorded in Proceedings of Government, dated 22nd February 1865, No. 382.

Read also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st August 1865, No. 5,067.

Read the following letter from the Collector of the Godavery District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 28th July 1865, No. 158 :—

1. With reference to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Government Proceedings, dated 22nd February 1865, No. 382, communicated with the Board's Proceedings of the 28th idem, No. 1,193, I have the honor to submit herewith a list marked A., shewing from what sources, and how, the so-called Sayer has been realized in the Rumpa country. It is a translation of a Telugu list presented by the Mansabdar through his authorized agent, admitting that he collects a transit duty on the articles mentioned at the rates specified in it on their transit from and to the Rampa country. It does not appear that any portion of the collections alluded to is derived from a tax on fruit trees, or similar items, properly of the nature of Land Revenue. The Mansabdar has also given a statement,* through his authorized Vakeel, in which he states that the collections under the name of Sayer referred to do not include any tax derived from fruit trees, as alleged by his Vakeel in Madras.

2. The accompanying statement marked B. shews the average receipts of Sayer and Abkarry of the last five years, amounting to Rupees 2,192-11-3, from which Rupees 1,458, being one-third of the cost of the Police force employed in Rampa being deducted, there remains the round sum of Rupees 735, which should be disbursed annually to the Mansabdar.

3. The collection of Sayer and Abkarry have been discontinued, the former from 15th March 1865, and the latter from 11th August 1864. The Mansabdar will have to receive Rupees 304-7-5 on account of compensation for Fusly 1274, as mentioned below :—

Items.	For how long.		At what rate per annum.			Amount.			Deduct Police cost.			Balance to be paid to the Mansabdar.		
	M.	D.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1. Sayer...	3	15	1,742	8	9	508	3	10	337	14	10	170	5	0
2. Abkarry	10	20	450	2	6	400	2	3	265	15	10	134	2	5
Total...	...	...	2,192	11	3	908	6	1	603	14	8	304	7	5

---

* Copy and English translation herewith sent.

Enclosure No. 1.

Abstract.—List shewing from what sources, and how, the Sayer has been levied in Rampa country.

Enclosure No. 2.—Telugu document.

Enclosure No. 3.

Abstract.—Translation of the Statement given by the Vakeel of the Mansabdar of Rampa Talook.

the records of the "Khalsa"
or Ryots

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd January 1866.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

ABSTRACT.—Statement shewing the average receipts of Sayer and Abkarry, from Fuslies 1269 to 1273, in Rampa country.

Submitted to Government with reference to the Order quoted by the Collector. It will be observed that the Mansabdar's assertion, that the tax upon fruit trees was included in the "Sayer" or Octroi collected by him, was based on the fact of a tax having been levied on tamarinds and other fruits. His Vakeel's statement, however, shews that this exaction forms no part of the Land Revenue of his Talook.

No. 350. ORDER THEREON, 22nd January 1866, No. 177.

Separate Revenue, No. 15.
Abkarry.

1. The Governor in Council has carefully considered the questions involved in these Proceedings.

2. He observes that the Rumpa Munsubdars have been allowed to levy Sayer duties in the Rumpa territory from the time when the English Government first obtained possession of the country, and that the collection was carried on for a few years by the direct agency of Government officials.

3. Hence, although the Munsubdar pays no Peshcush to Government, and any compensation which may be determined on must be paid from the Imperial Revenue, he agrees with the Board in considering that such compensation is due for the resumption of the Sayer as well as for the resumption of the Abkarry.

4. An annual payment of Rupees 735, calculated in the manner shewn in the Board's Proceedings, will accordingly be made to the Rumpa Munsubdar, and payment of Rupees 304-7-5, being the arrears of compensation due for Fusly 1274, is also sanctioned.

5. The Accountant General will instruct the Collector how to debit these charges.

6. The Collector will satisfy himself that the resumption has been carried out *bonâ fide*, and that no exactions in the name of the Munsubdar are continued.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant General.
,, the Judicial Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Memo:

(Consult files)

This paper is prepared in consequence of orders in Council when the Bd. Rev. of 21 Augt /65 proposing payt. of an allowance to the Rumpa Munsubdar in compensation for Sayer & Abkary resumed were under consideration.

H.E. the Govr. was of opinion that the political status of the Munsubdar should be carefully considered before the Govt. admitted his right to such payt. of compensation.

The difficulty of obtaining any exact information as to the former history of Rumpa has caused the delay in submission of this paper.

28. Oct. 65. [illegible]

Precis Proceedings

On Rumpa affairs

The earliest mention of Rumpa that I have found is in Grant's Political Survey of the Northern Circars (App. 5th Report) of 1784. in wh. the following incidental allusions to it occur.

Page 633.

"About the period we have just mentioned (the death of Alumgir in 1707) from as unsubdued state of the different and distant parts of the kingdoms of Hydrabad & Bejapoor, then recently formed into Soubahs or provinces of the Mogul Empire – a variety of native landholders – some of them wholly independent or in different degrees of subordination to the new Mussulman conquerors – became first known in Hindostan and distinguished in the records of the "Khalsa" [illegible] or Ryots

ch are all the former class:
ntirely free, the petty Rajahs of
Malabar in the Southern extremity
of the peninsula, and those of Rumpa
and Bustar among the high unhealthy
anges of mountains W. separate
the maritime circars north of the
Godavery from the Soubah of Berar"
and such were of the latter designation"
imperfectly reduced or subject to a certain"
tribute. the Ranis of Bednore, with the Rajahs
of Sugore & Tanjore, which served as barriers
to the unconquered country of Malabar in like
manner as the nearest hilly districts of
Pollavaram Cottapilly and Totapilly under
the Zemindars of Rajahmundry, or those of
oor &c. dependent on another branch of
gal family of Orissa settled in Chicacole
only partially subdued — secured
perfect freedom of the more interior
untainous regions of Rumpa & Bustar
ruled by the Coyas and Goundwana
Rajahs &c"

Page 685 describing the Pollavaram Zemindary
he says it is "bounded on the north and"
west by Rumpa the territory of Rambopetty"
a perfectly independent Rajah of the Coyas"
or savage mountainous tribe of Hindus".

Page 688. describing the Jegepore Zemindary
says: "To the South it borders on Rumpa

Page 689. describing the intermediate tract
ween Jeypore & Chicacole on the one side &
ole &

"as divided longitudinally [illegible] are
"high impassable ranges of hills, form
"a great number of valleys under
"their respective chieftains of the
"warrior Coyas or Goundwana
"tribe, alias the Rajpoot or Khetri
"caste, among which those
"of Kalahandi, Bustar, and
"Rumpa, entirely free, towards
"the frontier of the Mahrattas; and
"of Kimedy, Gundapore, Golgonda
"and Cottapilly partially subjected
"to the English Govt. are the most
"considerable".

The Rumpa country is described
in the Revd. Proc: 24. Augt. 48. as
"an extensive tract of hill and
"jungle stretching from the Cotta
"pilly Taluk or about 30 mile
"North of Rajahmundry to the
"borders of the Golgonda Zemin
"dary in the Vizagapatam Dt.
"and on its western frontier
resting upon the Nizams territory

At para 11. of the Report of
the Circuit Committee of 15 Feb.
1787. on the Rajahmundry Circar
the following occurs in connec
tion with the description of the Corest
of depredations

people dependant on Rumpa" oblige this Zemindar of Rumpa much larger military force than is necessary for the collection of the revenue. The villages of Vastingapilly and Juntapilly once belonged to this Zemindary, but were given as Mokasahs many years since to the Rumpa Rajah as an inducement to restrain his people from plundering the country. The Zemindary of Rumpa we understand belongs to this Circar though neither the Company nor the Zemindar receives tribute from it. The country is represented to be extremely mountainous & full of Jungle – the natives rude and uncultivated. frequently making incursions on the adjacent countries plundering the villages during the harvest and driving off the Cattle. Small quantities of pepper are produced in Rumpa, some of which is brought for sale to the weekly market of Corondah, but it is of inferior quality to that imported from the Malabar coast and the Eastward" —

The next trace that I can find of the Rumpa name is from the Enclosures to letter from the Magte. of Rajahmundry 8 Oct. 1813. From which it appears that in 1812 (January) the Rajah ~~[illegible]~~ visited the [illegible] of Cottapilly [illegible] took

possession of the ~~forts of the~~ Country belonging to the Cottapilly & Corondah pergunnahs "is now possessed by one of the Rebels Rumpa Rama Bhupaty and Carnam Sundar Dora" These Cottapilly villages we understand to have been Veerampollam, Kellapoody, Yelumkurpilly and Juntapilly.

On 28 June 1813 the Magte. at Rajahmundry reported that the notorious hill thief "Sundar Dora had a few days before been "put to death by "the order of Rama Bhupaty "who styles himself "the Zemindar or Rajah "of Rumpa". Govt. under A.G. the Govr. in Council received with "very great satisfaction" —

On 28th Sept 1813 the Mag^t. reported that "Ram Bhupaty having thus virtuously freed himself from bad company had expressed his wish to live in obedience & peace with the Company and praying for the restoration of his villages and rights of wh. he has recently been deprived"

The Coll^r. further states that altho' Rumpa appeared to form part of the Company's territory still "whether from its mountainous or unhealthy situation the ancestors of the present Rajah have till now been in possession of Rumpa and the villages mentioned as per margin without rendering account to any one".

The ~~Coll~~ Mag^t. recommends that the Gov^t. be pleased to restore the villages, Ram Bhupaty being required to enter into engagements acknowledging the authority of the Company, agreeing to attend in all [illegible] and to relinquish his [illegible] dues to levy the extraordinary

Villages situated in [illegible]
Cottapilly with [illegible] Pag^s.
Yerrumpollam — 450
Kekapor — 300

Villages sit^d. in Corondah not mentioned
by the Mag^t.
Yerlunkapilly
Gutapilly

The Gov^t. (8 Oct. 1813) approved the restoration of the country of Rumpa to Ram Bhupaty the former Mansubdar on the conditions specified — altho' it does not appear that Ram Bhupaty had ever lost possession of the Rumpa country but only of the Mokhasa villages in the plains the grant of wh. had seemingly been extorted from the fears of the Cottapilly & Corondah Zemindars in former times.

On 22nd Nov. 1813 the Mag^t. reported that Ram Bhupaty had executed the agreement wh. he forwarded copy & been replaced in possession of his villages the agreement states that "Whereas of old the Taluk of Kumpa formed part of the Company's territories, and whereas the Govt. has of their favor restored the Kunkhosa villages — Ram Bhupaty binds himself & his heirs for ever

1. to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Company —

2. to resign all right or pretensions to levy duties on the River Godavery

3. to seize & bind in all suspicious persons - thieves & enemies of the State.

and so long as the conditions were fulfilled - to enjoy the Taluk & the protection of the Compy's laws but in case of failure to be dealt with as Rebels.

It appears that an origl. & counterpart - corresponding with a Sunnud & Kabuliat - were executed by the Magt. on behalf of Govt. & by Ram Bhupaty respectively. and that each retained the paper executed by the other.

Ram Bhup[illegible] died on 12 March 1835

leaving a daughter & [illegible] an illegitimate son who is the present Zemindar & who has utterly exhibited his incapacity to manage the country - & his inability to fulfil the conditions of the agreement above recorded.

The legitimate daughter was the heir & succeeded her father - but after some time the Mootahdars of the Kumpa Taluk finding or suspecting that her conduct was incorrect expelled her & her half brother from the country, & since they have never returned - unless for very hurried visits and an experiment on the temper of the people - from which the return has been speedy & precipitate

The Revenue of the present
Zemindar Holder was estimated
by the Collr. at Rs. 15374. ~~[illegible]~~
as shown in margin –
& this has since been
much reduced

Collr.'s Letter of 4 Oct. 39.	Rs.
Land Revt.	12307
Sayer	2528
Abkary	330
Opium	100
"Yellow Commodity"	40
Servants fees	42
	15374.

The present Zemindar
or Talukdar was put in
his possession from [illegible]
in 1839. & in 1840 the Collr.
assumed Charge of the
country on behalf of the Govt.
& proposed for the then minor
but it was not till 1848
that the Collr. was able to
submit any definite proposals
for the settlement of affairs
the arrangement was as follows

The Mootahdars agreed to recognise
the authority of the Talukdar & to
pay him certain defined
shares an annual "Sibt" of
Rs. 1000. & to attend with their
followers at his requisition
for the maintenance of the
public peace.
His half-sister (the legitimate
[illegible] of the origl. Zemindar holder)
and to surrender all her
[illegible] to her brother. [illegible] ed on
the latter [illegible]

Collr. exact from the Zemin-
-dar in excess of the above Sibt
and to maintain peace &
good order – one in default
to forfeit first his villages
in the low country &
Subsequently his share.
[illegible] rec'd from Govt.
such share income as
allowed [illegible]
[illegible]
The 'Sibt' of the village
in the plains was then
(1848) stated to be Rs. 1985
for that Taluq.
The Govt. in deciding of
this report observed that
the Collr. submitted for
consideration whether the
Zemindar of the Taluq
afterwards continue the
levy of Sayer Customs
on Zemindars & other
articles brought by
hill country to the plains
and they recommended
that the Collr. not to be
interfered with in the
[illegible]
a considerable
proportion of the [illegible]
[illegible] and [illegible]

averaged Rs. 1312. yearly in
the Fuslies 1254 to 57. after
tranquillity had been restored –
I quote the Collr.'s remarks on
this subject.

"In the latter (the Hill country)
there is but little Land Revt. – for
it is a wild tract of Hill &
Jungle – but Sayer Russooms
are collected upon the Tamarinds
and other articles brought down
to the low Country to the amount
of about Rs. 1800 per annum
but nothing is levied upon the produce
of the Lowlands when carried
to Rumpa. If the Bd. think
proper to deny the Zemindar the
privilege of collecting these Sayer
Russooms, he will derive but
little benefit from being re-instated
in his Taluk. They have been levied
it appears from time
immemorial upon the Lumbadies
&ca. who come from Bustar
and other parts of the Hyderabad
country into the Company's territory.
They are also collected by the
[illegible] and [illegible] indeed
[illegible] be [illegible] country
the latter [illegible]

Fr: Coll. of Rajahy. to Bd.
of 22 June 48.
24. Augt.

4.

70

9

the Whickany traffic
passes" ——

In the Zemindar's
undertaking Dr. premises
as annexure to the
Collr.'s letter the following
passage occurs.

"Still levying as before
" from the Zemindari Cist
" and abkarry of the
" six plain villages named
" [illegible] Vastunka
" palle [illegible] Yellampet
" [illegible] and Ravulunka
" Also the Hill Sayer duty
" upon Tamarinds &c
" coming from the Hill
" country, on which that duty
" has hitherto been levied
" as Russooms."

Encl: of 20 Oct. 48
No. 1149. Rev: Dept.

The Bd. authorised
the restoration of the
Country to the Zemindar
and declared its opinion
that he "should not be
" obstructed in the collection
" of the customary Sayer

Kustoorus :

Rev. Cont. of 1. Decr. 62
No. 1960 [illegible]

It appears that the Colr.'s anticipations that the Zumeendar would be able to restore his authority in the country were not realized.

He continued to live in one of his villages in the plains where he had taken refuge when expelled in 1839. Seldom visited the hill country and seems never to have had any authority there —

In 1858 the feeling agst. him in the country became more decided & the Colr. on his complt. attempted to effect a settlement which had probably little effect.

In 1861. a more marked demonstration seems to have been made agst. him on the occasion of his visiting [illegible] with his half sister. When he declared that he had been fired upon.

In 1862. disturbances broke out and the Govt. were obliged to interfere for the maintenance of order.

When order had been restored the Colr. addressed the Bd. as to [illegible] his administration

86

of the country and recommended that Govt. should assume it, the Zumeendar being left in possession of so many of the villages in the plains as would give him an income of Rs. 200 monthly. He went on thus

Land Rev.	Abkari
Rs. 578	Rs. 70
604	22
604	16
400	22
504	32
524	37
3214	199

"The income of these 6 villages according to the Zumeendar's statement is shown in the margin. It will be seen that he has hitherto retained the Abkari of the villages in question. This arrangt. is opposed to Regn. 1. of 1820. but was not objected to when the villages were put in possession of the present Zumeendar.

"The Sayer is not as old appears to have been formerly supposed simply a Tax on certain articles in transit thro' the country, but is

levies a Tax on every kind "
of produce brought to the "
markets adjoining the country"
for sale. The Tax is levied "
at the weekly markets at "
the places named in the "
margin all without the "
Zemindary limits on behalf "
of the Zemindar or rather "
the Renter for he generally "
farms the tax out to others"
It is now understood "
rented for 5 years from "
S. 1270 at Rs. 1600 per annum."

Tekavurum
Saleshwaram
Sitanagarum
Polavarum
Kotapilli
Juggumpetta
Ramampollem
Lemedipollem.

The Bd. supported the recommend.n for the resumption of the admin.n of the country, reserving to the Zemindar a maintenance of at least Rs. 200 monthly but whether in the manner proposed by the Coll.r or otherwise they left to the consid.n of Govt. They recommended that in any case the Abkary shd. be reserved to Govt. & the Sayer & Octroi abolished.

The Govt. desired that the Zemindar shd. have an opportunity of making any representation on the subject that he desired. and eventually decided not to resume the country & deferred for further consid.n in the Rev. Dept the subject of the Abkary & Sayer.

On 22 March 64 the Bd. recommended that the average collns. from the two sources of Revn. shd. be ascertained and an allowce. made to the Zemindar "in the shape of a reduction of his Peishcush" in consid.n of the facts that in 1848 the Govt. had specially sanctioned the collection of the Sayer & that both the items had been collected by the Govt. officers on the Zemindar's behalf during the 8 years that the Estate was in charge of the Ct. of Wards.

The Govt. (G.O.) 13 Apr. 64
(No. 628. L.D.)

sanctioned the proposed arrangement & directed that an early report sh'd be made as to the amt. of the compensation to be allowed.

On 16 Nov. 64. the Bd. reported (Rev: Bd. 7418) that they had thro' inadvertence recommended that the compensation sh'd be given in the form of a reduction of Peshkush - as the Zemindar paid nothing to Govt. - but they considered that as he was on the terms of his tenure responsible for maintaining the peace of the country in w'h he had signally failed - they held that he might fairly be charged with a proportion of the ~~cost~~ expense of the Police w'h the Govt. now had to incur

They further reported that the annual Coll'ns. from Sayer & Abkary averaged Rs. 805 during the nine years that the Estate was in ward. and Rs. 2251 per annum? from F. 1268 to F. 1272 according to the Zemindar's account.

From the same information (whatever its value) it appeared that the Zemindar's income from these sources averaged Rs. 2310 yearly from 1848 to 1857. and that at the date of writing they had been farmed out for Rs. 2233 yearly - with a covenant for remission of the greater part of the farm should the items be resumed by Govt.

The Coll'r. observed that the Police estab'd by Govt. had to detect & repress crime as well as to maintain the peace w'h. [illegible] scale that the Zemindar was liable for. & that its cost (Rs. 4374 yearly) was greater than necessary for this last purpose. He proposed that the Zemindar sh'd be charged with one half of the cost.

and the Bd. recommended that he sh'd be debited with one-third of the cost & allowed Rs. 775 yearly in compensation for the sources of income resumed

	Rs.	Rs.
Cost of Police	4374 ÷ 3 =	1458
Rent of Abkary & Sayer —	Rs. 2233	
Deduct.	1458	
Bal'ce	775	

The Govt. (22 Feb. 65 No. 382 R.D)
directed that the collection of Sayer & Abkarry revt. by the Munsubdar shd. be immediately discontinued. that he shd. be charged one third of the cost of the Police employed in Rumpa & that the compensation to be paid him shd. be calculated on the average of the last 5 years.

The Collr. was to report the exact sources from wh. the so-called Sayer had been realized & if it included any such items as Taxes on fruit trees as stated by the Munsubdar's vakil these shd. be left to him & a corresponding reduction made in the compensation.

It is the reply to this last order wh. has now to be disposed of by Govt. The Collr. reports that the annual average receipts in the last 5 years have been Rs. $2192\frac{3}{4}$ from wh. deducting Rs. 1458 being $\frac{1}{3}$ cost of Police there remains Rs. 735 to be paid yearly to the Munsubdar.

And that there are no such unobjectionable items included in the Sayer as stated by the Vakil.

He also reports that on the above calcul.n Rs. $304\frac{1}{2}$ is due to the Munsubdar for part of F. 1274.

Orders are requested

11 Dec/65 No. 8 Rey. R15

Precis for orders

Proof for Chief Secretary
3/8/79

Rev G.O. 22d Jany 1866
No 177

13

Memo: Board in Council. that the Political status of the Munsubdar be considered with refce. to the former corresp.ce to determine how far he has any right to these items & provide the compensation for their loss.

No. 5,067.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st August 1865.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, to R. A. DALYELL, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 28th July 1865, No. 158:—

1. With reference to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Government Proceedings, dated 22nd February 1865, No. 382, communicated with the Board's Proceedings of the 28th idem, No. 1,193, I have the honor to submit herewith a list marked A. showing from what sources, and how, the so-called Sayer has been realized in the Rampa country. It is a translation of a Telugu list presented by the Mansabdar through his authorized agent, admitting that he collects a transit duty on the articles mentioned at the rates specified in it on their transit from, and to the Rampa country. It does not appear that any portion of the collections alluded to is derived from a tax on fruit trees, or similar items, properly of the nature of Land Revenue. The Mansabdar has also given a statement,* through his authorized Vakil, in which he states that the collections under the name of Sayer referred to do not include any tax derived from fruit trees, as alleged by his Vakil in Madras.

2. The accompanying Statement marked B, shows the average receipts of Sayer and Abkarry of the last five years amounting to Rupees 2,192-11-3, from which Rupees 1,458, being one-third of the cost of the Police force employed in Rampa being deducted, there remains the round sum of Rupees 735, which should be disbursed annually to the Mansabdar.

3. The collection of Sayer and Abkarry have been discontinued, the former from 15th March 1865, and the latter from 11th August 1864. The Mansabdar will have to receive Rupees 304-7-5 on account of compensation for Fasli 1274, as mentioned below:—

Items.	For how long.		At what rate per annum.			Amount.			Deduct Police cost.			Balance to be paid to the Mansabdar.		
	M.	D.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1. Sayer...	3	15	1,742	8	9	508	3	10	337	14	10	170	5	0
2. Abkarry... ...	10	20	450	2	6	400	2	3	265	15	10	134	2	5
Total ..	...	...	2,192	11	3	908	6	1	603	14	8	304	7	5

* Copy and English translation herewith sent.

Enclosure No. 1.

Abstract.—List showing from what sources, and how, the Sayer has been levied in Rampa country.

Enclosure No. 2.—Tamil document.

Enclosure No. 3.

Abstract.—Translation of the Statement given by the Vakil of the Mansabdar of Rampa Taluk.

Enclosure No. 4.

Abstract.—Statement showing the average receipts of Sayer and Abkarry, from Faslis 1269 to 1273, in Rampa country.

Submitted to Government with reference to the order quoted by the Collector. It will be observed that the Mansabdar's assertion, that the tax upon fruit trees was included in the "Sayer" or Octroi collected by him, was based on the fact of a tax having been levied on tamarinds and other fruits. His Vakil's statement, however, shows that this exaction forms no part of the Land Revenue of his Taluk.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

R. A. Dalyell
Acting Secretary.

To W. Hudleston, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, R. D.,
with four enclosures.

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

Exd. J. Wright.

P. No. 22nd Feby/65 No 408

Rev = 1865. Department.

Pro: of Govt for Jany/66

No. 2333.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 21st August 1865.

Despd 23 do

Recd 24 do

C 4 - O.G. Ptd

No. 5,067.

L. G. No 177 - 26 Jany

Submitting with remarks letter from the Collector of the Godavery District forwarding lists showing from what sources, and how, the Sayer has been realized in Rampa country, and the average receipts of Sayer and Abkarry for the last five years.

No 349.

With order

Why is the Govt to pay 735 R annually to this man - I can understand that a deduction might be made from the peshcush if he had been allowed to include the two items of Sayer & Abkarry as part of the Land Revenue - but I cannot understand why we are to pay him anything

WW

The Govt sanction the payt of Rs 735 yearly to the Rumpa Munsubdar being compensation for his net loss of income on the average of the last 5 years by the resumption of the Sayer & Abkary in his Munsubdary, after debiting him with one third of the cost of the Police force now maintained there. Payt of Rs 304.7.5 arrears due for Fusly 1274 at the above rate is also sanctioned.

The Acct. Genl. will instruct the Collr. Godv. to debit these charges.

The Collr. will take care that the resumption is bona fide carried out - & that the exactions in the Munsubdar's name are discontinued.

C.H.

Govt order Collr to notify thro' the local people in the most public manner possible that the Munsubdar's right has ceased & that nothing of the kind in future should hereafter be paid

11 Dec/65 No 1 Rev R 15

Bds pros: 21 Augt 1865. No 2333. 14

The right to realize, under the designation "Sayer", the petty; vexatious, trumpery, taxes shown in the Enclosure to the letter from the Collector which the Board now send up has been conceded to the Munsubdar indirectly, since 1848. Moreover, during a period of eight years, the Govt representative on the spot, had charge of the Rumpah Estate; and no impediment to the privileges of the Munsubdar was even then raised. There has, thus, been long, tacit acquiescence of the Govt in the man's right to raise revenue through the medium of the so designated "Sayer", and I do not therefore think that, at this period of time, the proprietor can justly be prohibited from continuing to raise it in the manner long followed, without compensation. Should this be refused, he will of course try the question in the Courts; and I much doubt whether the Govt. will, in such case, be able successfully to resist his claim. No doubt it rather grates on one's feelings to find oneself under the necessity of securing what will be a sizable, clear income of Rs. 735 to a person whose claims on the Govt. are nil, and who, otherwise seems so little worthy of indulgence consideration. But there stands the awkward fact, that — whether by neglect on the part of the local officers or not — the Mansabdar did collect this tax as an item of his ordinary revenue, & what is still more in his favor, that the Govt. Collector for some years, collected it for him.

I am therefore unable to see any way out of the difficulty wh. in these circumstances has arisen, unless compensation be granted. We cannot now go back and permit the man to collect as he was collecting prior to the

determination arrived at by Govt. in 1864, that he should no longer be allowed to collect.

6.1.66.

Considering that Sayer has been collected in the Rumpa Country from time immemorial with the tacit sanction of the Madras Govt. and for some time by their direct agency, we ought not I think now deprive the Munsubdar of it without compensation. I would allow him the Rs 735 annually and pay him what is due for F 1274.

Very well

Revenue Department

No. 177.

Proceedings of the Madras Government Under date the 22d January 1866.

Read again Bd's. Pro: of 14th Novr./64 No. 7418, recorded in Pro: of Govt. dated 22nd Feby. 1865 No. 382.

Read also the following Pro: of the Board of Revenue.

Submitting with remarks, letter from the Collr. of the Godavery Dist. forwarding lists showing from what sources, & how, the sayer has been realized in the Rampa country, & the average receipts of sayer & Abkarry for the last five years.

(Here enter 21st Augt./65 No. 5067)

The Governor in Council has carefully considered the questions involved in these proceedings.

He observes that the Rumpa munsubdars have been allowed to levy sayer duties in the Rumpa territory from the time when the English Govt. first obtained possession of the country, and that the collection was carried

on

on for a few years by the direct agency of Govt. officials.

Hence, although the munsubdar pays no peshcush to Govt. and any compensation which may be determined on must be paid from the Imperial Revenue, he agrees with the Board in considering that such compensation is due for the resumption of the Sayer as well as for the resumption of the abkarry.

An annual payment of Rs. 735 calculated in the manner shewn in the Board's proceedings will accordingly be made to the Rumpa munsubdar, and payment of Rs. 304-7-5, being the arrears of compensation due for F1274 is also sanctioned.

The Accountant General will instruct the Collector how to debit these charges.

The Collr. will satisfy himself

himself that the resumptio has been carried out bonâ-fi and that no exactions in th name of the munsubdar are continued.

J. E.

14 To the Board of Revenue Dec 25 Jany
6 " the Accountant General
5 " the Judicial Dept

Revenue 1866 Depptt.
Pro: of Govt for Jany:

No. 177.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
D/22d Jany: /66.

Sanctioning compen-
-sation for the resumption
of the Collection of Sayer and
Abkarry by the Munsubdar
of Rumpa-

X

No. 349 & 350