M.R.O. 14-5,450—22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1374	Press Mis.
394-95 Dated	16-5-	1868.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 16th May 1868.

No. 394. Read the following letter from the Sub-Secretary to the Board of Revenue, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 12th August 1867, No. 5,195 :—

1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit a report upon Government Petition No. 3,156 of 1863, forwarded to them for that purpose.

2. Rajah Jagapathy Rauze, the Zemindar of Peddapore, which at that time included Cotaum, died in 1804, leaving three widows, sisters, and an adopted son, a minor. The latter succeeded to the Zemindary, and died in 1808, when Vatsavoy Jaganada Rauze, the father of the petitioner, succeeded. His right was contested by the widows of the late Zemindar Rajah Jaganada Rauze, who filed a suit in the Civil Court to recover the property. This suit was compromised in 1810 by the separation of Cotaum from the parent Zemindary, and its assignment to Rajah Vatsavoy, and the assumption of the Peddapore estate by Latchminarsiah, the eldest of the widows, for her life, with remainder to Rajah Vatsavoy. Latchminarsiah died in 1814, when the second widow put forward a claim to succeed her. She appealed to the Courts and obtained the estate. On her death the third widow succeeded. The latter died in 1838, when Peddapore was taken under management, pending the decision of Government on the subject of a succession. This question was towards the end of the year settled in Rajah Vatsavoy's favor, but as he had demised sometime previously, Peddapore was made over to his son, the present petitioner.

Principal Collector's letter, dated 30th April 1804, to Board.

Razinamah in O. S., dated 12th October 1810.

From Collector, 13th April 1814.

From Collector, 10th November 1838.

Procs. of Govt. dated 21th October 1839.

3. During all these years subsequent to 1810, no question had been raised respecting the right of Rajah Vatsavoy to Cotaum. When the Rajah obtained this estate, finding himself beset with pecuniary difficulties he mortgaged it under the guise of a sale to an uncle named Rajah Kakerlapoody, and put him in possession, but soon afterwards tried to recover it, and filed a suit in the Civil Court with this object. The suit was finally disposed of in favor of the plaintiff by the Privy Council in 1838. Under that decree Cotaum, which was then styled the Cotaum Mootah, was made over to the petitioner in the place of his father who had intermediately, as stated above, died. The surrender was made by the Court of Wards, under whose management the Mootah had been taken for arrears due on *other land* by Rajah Kakerlapoody.

See Vol. II, page 1, Moore's Indian Appeal Cases.

4. The investigations of the Circuit Committee into the resources and revenues of the Zemindaries in the Masulipatam Circars were embodied in their report to Government, dated 15th February 1787. In calculating the assets of the estates, the Committee took into consideration the Moturpha collections, basing their conclusions on the profits arising from "Government's share of the produce, *tax on Artificers*, "tax on Inams, Customs, Salt, &c."

Paragraph 39.

5. These calculations were revised by the Special Commission sitting in 1802, who excluded from the peshcush they recommended should be placed on the various properties "Loom tax," leaving untouched the other Moturpha items. In their report they state, "It "has been usual to levy the Moturpha tax on looms not working for the Company." "If it had not been resolved to abolish all taxes on weavers, we should, on general "principles, have recommended the commutation of the Loom tax into a well "defined house-tax, as a quit-rent for the ground."

Special Commission's Report, 1802, paragraphs 15, 75, and 101.

Paragraph 15.

6. This report was adopted at the close of 1802. The Zemindars, however, continued to collect Moturpha as usual, inclusive of the Loom tax on the *independent* weavers. The Loom tax due from the Company's weavers residing on their properties was paid them by the commercial resident at Ingeram.

G. O., 13th December 1802.

7. This arrangement lasted two years, at the end of which period the Government having in view the restrictions imposed on Zemindars with respect to the collection of Moturpha by Regulation XXV of 1802, directed them to cease levying Loom tax, and to substitute for this source of Revenue a tax on the house-grounds of weavers. The Zemindars had previously been similarly instructed by the Special Commissioners.

Letter from Mr. Secretary Keble to Board of Trade, dated 3rd November 1804.
Board's Procs. 9th March 1826, paragraph 11.

8. It is presumable that the other items of Moturpha continued to be levied as usual, and it seems not improbable that ALL the Moturpha items were realized by the Zemindars from 1804 to 1820. In the latter year the attention of Government was again attracted to the subject, and Zemindars were prohibited from collecting Moturpha, compensation being promised them for the abolition of this source of their income. The amount of compensation was fixed finally in 1838. It consisted of a reduction of the peshcush of each property, with back payments from 1804, was stated to be "*an act of grace*," and was confined entirely to the ancient families who had been in possession of their estates from prior to the Permanent Settlement, being expressly withheld from those proprietors who had acquired their properties by *sale or transfer* subsequent to that epoch.

G. O. 8th July 1826, No. 474.
G. O. No. 1,592, 11th December 1838.

9. Peddapore was one of these ancient estates. The Mootah of Cotaum having been separated subsequent to the Permanent Settlement, was not included in the compensation arrangements, and received no remissions on account of Moturpha. The petitioner basing his claim on his relationship to the Zemindar who demised in 1804, and his having become the head of the family, and succeeded to Peddapore, sought, in 1842, to recover Moturpha compensation for the Mootah.

10. His claim was rejected by the Board in an endorsement on Board's Proceedings, No. 1,923 of 1842, in which it was stated, "Petitioner is informed "that the compensation granted by Government on account of the resumed "Moturpha has been confined strictly to the ancient Zemindaries of the Rajahmundry district, and does not extend to the proprietors of those estates which "have been acquired by purchase or transfer subsequent to the conclusion of the "Permanent Settlement. Petitioner's "claims are consequently inadmis-"sible;" and this decision was afterwards confirmed by Government who concurred in the view taken by the Board.

Government Proceedings No. 941, 14th September 1844.

11. From these endorsements it would seem that the exclusion of Cotaum was entirely owing to its having been transferred to the petitioner's father in 1810. Petitioner's claims have remained in abeyance ever since. He now again brings them forward, and prays that compensation may be awarded for the Cotaum Mootah; that two villages, which were withheld when the Mootah, which was then under Government management, was made over, may be restored to him; and that compensation may be granted him for land taken up for the construction of a public road when the Mootah was under management.

12. The Board are sensible of the inexpediency of re-opening questions that have been once settled by Government, but the *majority* are of opinion, that under the peculiar circumstances now disclosed, the transfer of Cotaum was merely a family arrangement, and as the whole estate was re-united in the possession of petitioner as the legal heir of all, there are grounds for reconsidering petitioner's case, and they beg to recommend it to the Government accordingly. The proportion of the peshcush of the Mootah founded on Moturpha assessment appears not to be 1,035 Rupees as stated by the Collector, but Rupees 924-4-8 only. With regard to petitioner's other requests, there seems no doubt that the Mootah properly consists of 38 villages; two of them were withheld on the surrender of the estate in 1838, on the ground that the revenue they afforded consisted entirely of Moturpha items.

Statement C, Collector's report to Board, 30th December 1837.
Statement A, in a letter from Collector, dated 14th September 1810.

13. Petitioner's request for compensation for land taken up for a public road has been negatived, on the ground that the construction of the road which it was stated ran for the most part through his "Asalminha lands already excluded from those on which the peshcush of his estate was formed," had been of great benefit to his property. In former days it was quite unusual to grant compensation for land required for roads, as the roads were formed entirely at the expense of the State and materially benefited the estates they passed through. The Board see no reason for reconsidering petitioner's request upon this point.

Board's Proceedings 6th January 1845.

14. The member who dissents from the above views has recorded his opinion upon the subject.

No. 395. ORDER THEREON, 16th May 1868, No. 1,374.

Land Revenue.

1. The Government have gone carefully into the past history of this case, and although they do not allow that petitioner has any *claim of right* to the concession he seeks, they resolve to accept the Board's recommendation that viewing the assignment to petitioner of the

22581 - 10-4

13. Petitioner's request for compensation for land taken up for a public road has been negatived on the ground that the construction of the road which it was stated ran for the most part through his "Asalminha lands already excluded from those on which the peishcush of his estate was formed," had been of great benefit to his property. In former days it was quite unusual to grant compensation for land required for roads, as the roads were formed entirely at the expense of the State and materially benefitted the estates they passed through. The Board see no reason for reconsidering petitioner's request upon this point.

Board's Procs., 16th Jan. 1845.

14. The member who dissents from the above views has recorded his opinion upon the subject.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

H. C. Cartledge

Sub-Secretary.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE,
Madras,
12 13th August 1867.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with petitions and copies of Board's Proceedings,
dated 15th December 1865, No. 8,041, and 17th November 1866, No. 8,321.

Copy to the Collector of the Godavery district.

Exd. T. Cartledge.

22581-10-4

Kottám Mutah as a purely family arrangement, the grace shall be extended to him which was conferred on the former holder of the rest of the Peddapore estate, and compensation for the resumption of the Mohturpha made to him by a refund of the two-thirds of the value of the asset which was included in the Peshcush, and the reduction of the annual amount of Peshcush henceforward by this amount.

2. The refund will be made in arrears from 1810, up to which date it was formerly made to the Zemindar of Peddapore before the separation of Kottám from the original estate to which it is now re-united, and the Board will report what the aggregate amount will be, and by what sum the Peshcush has to be reduced in future.

3. Whether the two Mohturpha villages should be restored, must depend on whether they are now paying to Government any such revenue (exclusive of Mohturpha) as they were legally liable to pay to the Zemindar (as the representative of Government and entitled to receive their dues) at the time of the Permanent Settlement. It does not appear that this can be the case, but enquiry should be made on the point, and the result reported.

4. The Government decline to entertain the petitioner's application for compensation for land occupied for a road prior to 1843.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" Accountant General.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

22581 - 10-4

Copy of Para 12 of the Jamabandi Report of the Estate of Cattam for Fasli 1247. 1837.

The surplus in favor of this Estate
Rs ap
on the close of the Fasli 1246 was. 22467-13-9

Add new Collections within Fasli 1247 } 34891-2-10

D°. D°. to 14th Septr 1838 — 843-4-2

Making a total of Rupees — 58202-4-9

From which must be deducted
as follows.-

	Rs ap	Rs ap
Balance of Peshkash of Fasli 1246	151-14-9	
Peshkash of Fasli 1247 —	27163-8-"	27315-6-9
Charges belonging to Fasli 1247 Servants wages &c &c forward	3408-11-7	
Commission drawn by Mr Lewin on account of part of Fasli 1245 up to 20th March 1836 vide Board's order of 5th May 1836 —	321-5-2	
Commission carried to the account of Govt. on account of Fasli 1245 and in full of Fasli of 1246 —		
Fasli 1245 — 143-8-3		
" 1246 — 409-3-8	552-11-11	874-1-1
Refunds of deposit made at the expiration of the Rent	411-13-4	
Takkavi (advance)	186-"-"	
Repairs	46-3-"	4924-13-"
Charges on advance for Fasli 1248		
Takkavi advanced in Fasli 1247 on account of Fasli 1248 —	2000-"-"	
Repairs do do —	700-"-"	
Servants wages &c up to 14th September 1835	678-6-8	
Amount carried to the account of Peshkash of Fasli 1241 —	2-"-"	3380-6-8
		35620-10-5

Leaving a surplus of Rs to } *22581-10-4

*Fasli 1247 .
Collection on account of the current Settlement } Rs ap 29992-5-8
Do on account of Arrears realized in this Fasli } ....

*Vide Sadr Adawlut Rs ap
Accountant Genl. 13241-"-"
Ready money 9226-13-9
113-12-7
22581-10-4

Rev. 1867. Department.

Rpt of Govt for May

No. 2179.

From the Sub Secretary to the Board of Revenue,
To the Secretary to Government, R. D.

Dated 12th August 1867.

No. 5,195.

Submitting for favorable consideration claim of Government Petitioner in No 3156 of 1863 to compensation on account of abolition of Moturpha in Cotaum Mootah, Godavery district, and to restoration of two villages withheld when the Mootah was made over to him.

to be made over to the Proprietor with the exception of a charge of Rupees 430 on account of Commission for Fusli 1247- Since the Estate was made over the Zemindar has fulfilled his Engagements regularly.

Rajahmundry Zillah
Collector's Circuit Cutchery
Sammulcottah
4th February 1839

(Signed) G. A. Smith
Collector

True Copy
J. Fraser
Collector

1867 Resp
Inabilities from the
Collector Godavery Dt.
To the Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras
Dated 18th July 1867
Recd
No 30

Rev. From 16th May 1868 Ld 394

Copy of Para 12 of the
Jumabandi Report of
Cattam Estate for Fasli 1247

Sub Genl Rd 7/11/67

P 16th Nov 68
13 Sec 395

A

Statement shewing the Motturpha Collections of Cottam Plate included in the Assets of the Committee of Circuit

Names of Villages	A.D. 1777		A.D. 1778		A.D. 1779		A.D. 1780		A.D. 1781		A.D. 1782		A.D. 1783		A.D. 1784		Remarks
	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	M.P.	F.	
1 Cottam									3		3	46			14	24	Total Collections of 8 years M.P. F.
2 Kakoshinipuram	19	6	10		13	36	9	36	3		3	24	3	24	4	36	ie. from A.D. 1777 to 1784 inclusive
3 Chinnayapalem & Annamalapuram	3	24	3	24	4		3	24	4		8	36	9	12	5	24	of M.P. 600 at 150 per Annum from
4 Inungapalli	7	15	5	45	6	24	7	30									1777 to 1784 of the village No. 30 of
5 Billa Nandurru									6		6		6		6		which were stated as Bilmaeta — 2055 — 11 20
6 Cota Nandurru	2	45	3	12	2	36	4	30									Average ——— 256 — 43 — 32
7 Mallavarum	18	1120	30	1930	19	24	20	36	28	10	19	23	17	35	62	30	Rupees ——— 987 — 2.
8 Artamuru																	* The heading of village No. 30 was
7 Kakoshinidevipeta																	shewn Motturpha or Tax on
10 Allipuri															4	12	Artificers in 8 Small Atlas
11 Kakarapalli		24							2		2	12	2	42	7	2540	or Villages "In particularizing
12 Tadipaka	3		2	12	2	6	3	18	1	42	5		3	45	6	24	the Collections of M.P. 600 at
13 Kaigatlavari Annavaram	1	24															150 per Annum for 4 Years from
14 Korupolu Mallavaram									2	12	2	12	2		2		1777 to 1784. they were shewn
15 Rapaka			5	21					5		3	36	4	42	7		under "Bilmaeta" If this
16 Kolnuru										24		24		24		24	Land is Conscious Land
17 Polavaram		36	8	32	4	24		24	2		3		3		3		Revenue the Amount of M.P. 600
18 Dondavaka	2		2		2	24	2		4	36	4	36	5		4	36	will then be excluded from
19 Atchanamipalem	1	22.10	4	46.40	1		3	24									Motturpha Collections & the
20 Bodavaram									2	24	3	18	5	21	3	24	Net Total of 8 years as above
21 Annru	1	12	2		2												shewn will be ——— 1455 — 11 — 20
22 Vallum Puffalapudi							2	1340	6		7	45	9	2840	9	3740	Vide particulars on the
23 Pekanamipalem	4		5	24	5	33											back of this Statement.
24 Viravaram & Konlapadu									1		1		1		1		Average per Annum 181 43-32
25 Marunadu	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	4	30	4	30	4	30	4	30	or Rupees 700-4-2-
26 Annavaram																	
27 Annavaram																	

A

Statement shewing the Motarpha Collections of Cottam Estate included in the Assets of the Committee of Arbitration

Name of Village	A.D. 1777		A.D. 1778		A.D. 1779		A.D. 1780		A.D. 1781		A.D. 1782		A.D. 1783		A.D. 1784		Remarks
	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	Mo	Fs	
29 Jallur	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	
30 Motarpha in 8 small villages or Patas	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	68	6	143	12	148	24	149	"	
31 Sooramurum & Annamarum	1	24	1	24	1	24	1	24	2	"	2	"	2	"	2	"	
32 Tanie	3	"	3	"	3	"	3	"	3	"	3	"	3	"	3	"	
33 Cottur	1	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	
34 Bhimavarapu cota	20	"	20	"	20	"	20	"	20	"	20	"	20	"	20	"	
Total	110	33	60	115	46	70	195	24	-	101	140	163	43	10	29	12	020	25	53	39	60	32	2	42	"	
Particulars of Motarpha of 8 small Petas of No 30																	
Belnakta	150	"	150	"	150	"	150	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	This was shewn as Motarpha
Tax on 30 banion houses	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	15	24	31	"	33	"	33	"	Tax on artificers
Do on 6 Oil Mongers	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3	24	7	"	7	"	7	"	Names of 8 Petas
Do on 78 Weavers Do	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	38	6	73	"	70	"	70	24	1 Boyanakandupeta
Do on 30 Traders Do	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	11	"	22	"	22	"	22	"	2 Ballaputharajupeta
Do on Cotton Dealers	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	3	36	5	"	5	"	3 Kommanaripeta
Belnakta on fish mongers	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	1	24	1	24	1	24	4 Timmarajupeta
Do on Arrack sellers	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	5	"	10	"	10	"	5 Kottapeta
Total	150	"	150	"	150	"	150	"	68	6	143	12	148	24	149	"	6 Papammapeta
																	7 Jogirowpeta
																	8 Jagannadharajupeta

Godavery District
Collector's Office
Bandarlanka
Amalapur Taluk
18th February 1867

J. Fraser
Collector

A

Statement shewing the Malarpha Collections of Cottam Estate included in the Assets of the Committee of Circuit 4

Names of Villages	A.D 1777		A.D 1778		A.D 1779		A.D 1780		A.D 1781		A.D 1782		A.D 1783		A.D 1784		Remarks
	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	Mds	Fs	
2																	
3																	
3																	
3																	
3																	
3																	

8

1867 Dec 5th
Inclosed from the
Collector Godavery Distt.
To the Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras
Dated 18th May 1867
Read
No. 30

Rev. Pros. 18 May 1868 No 2 394

A

Statement showing the
Mahrattha Collections of
Cattami rents included
in the Assets of the Circuit Com-
-mittee.

Judl Con No 711 Dec 6
R. 18th May 63
D 394-395

No. 8,041.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 15th December 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 October 1865, No. 269 :—

1. With reference to the Board's endorsement, dated 19th July 1864, on the Petitions, Board's Nos. 289 and 305 of 1864, and 117 of 1865, addressed to Government by S.i Rajah Vatsuvoy Suria Narayana Jagupatirazu, Bahadur, Zemindar of Cottam Mootah in this District, I have the honor to report as follows. The Petitioner's complaints are the following :—

First.—That when the Cottam estate was restored to him in the year 1838 only thirty six villages were made over to him, instead of the thirty-eight of which the estate is comprised, and that the Peishcush fixed upon the assets of the entire estate is levied from him. He requests that those two villages may be assigned to him, and that the amount of quit-rent of the two villages included in the assets, as per margin, which was formerly collected from the inhabitants upon their dwelling sites given to them from arable lands may be refunded to him.

	Pagodas.
Tunipeta...	175
Setipeta...	4

Second.—That remission on account of the abolition of the Moturpha collections made by the Zemindar in his estate was not granted to him, although it is an ancient Zemindary which he inherited ; while such remissions were granted in the other ancient Zemindaries throughout the District. He requests that a refund of the Moturpha collections of his estate may be granted from the date of its abolition, and that the same may be reduced from his Peishcush henceforth.

[illegible] to Her Majesty the Queen in Council, the decision of the Sudder Adawlut was confirmed, and agreeably thereto, the estate was made over to the Petitioner in September 1838, his father having died previously. Moturpha collections by the Zemindars and Proprietors having been discontinued before the estate was made over to him in 1838, and the so-called shist of the two villages claimed being only Moturpha, thirty-six villages only were made over to the Petitioner. I am of opinion that these two villages originally belonged to the Kattam Muttah, and I think the Petitioner has a good claim to them.

3. Under the foregoing circumstances, I beg that the Board will consider and decide whether the Kottam estate is a proprietary one, or an ancient Zemindary, and whether the petitioner is entitled to the remission and reduction which he claims.

Reply III.

4. The petitioner's claim for compensation of lands which were taken up under the high road, &c., in the estate of Kottam has been rejected by the Board, for reasons stated by Sir H. C. Montgomery, the then Commissioner in charge of the District and the Acting Collector Mr. Bird—*Vide* correspondence noted in the margin on the subject.

1. Vide endorsement of Sir H. C. Montgomery, Bart, late Commissioner in charge of the District, dated 22nd December 1843, on Petition No. 1,506 of 1842, presented to the Board of Revenue by the Petitioner.

2. Acting Collector's report, dated 24th December 1844, No. 135, to Board.

3. Board's Proceedings, 16th January 1845.

5. As all the circumstances connected with this complaint have been fully detailed in the above correspondence, and after much consideration the case was decided by the Board, I do not think it necessary to re-open enquiry into the same matter and report again.

6. Petitions Nos. 289 and 305 of 1864, and 117 of 1865 are herewith returned.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1, 2 and 3.—Petitions.

B

Statement showing the Moturpha collections in the Cuttum Estate during the last 3 years of the Government Management of the Estate.

No	Clapes of people	Years A.D 1836 Rs	A.	A.D 1837 Rs	A.	A.D 1838 Rs	A.	Total Rs	A.	Average Rs	A.	P.
1	Banians	461	6	475	15	469	7	1406	12	468	14	8
2	Weavers	349	4	390	6	392	15	1132	9	377	8	4
3	Cotton cleaners	126	4	119	13	114	9	360	10	120	3	4
4	Goldsmiths	57	4	69	2	59	12	186	2	62	"	8
5	Shepherds	59	5	64	6	61	8	185	3	61	11	8
6	Oil man	82	4	81	3	76	6	239	13	79	15	8
7	Gamalla people - a sect of Toddy drawers	4	"	6	"	6	"	16	"	5	5	4
8	Indra people - a different sect of do do	15	8	13	6	12	10	41	8	13	13	4
9	Braziers	3	"	3	8	7	"	13	8	4	8	"
10	Tobacco Merchants	5	12	4	"	3	12	13	8	4	8	"
11	People who carry grain &c by packs on bullocks &c	1	4	"	12	"	12	2	12	"	14	8
12	Perfume makers	1	8	1	8	3	"	6	"	2	"	"
13	Confectioners	2	"	2	8	2	8	7	"	2	5	4
14	Cotton dealers	4	8	5	"	4	"	13	8	4	8	"
15	Sawyers	14	"	10	"	8	4	32	4	10	12	"
16	Painted box makers	"	8	"	8	"	8	1	8	"	8	"
17	Fishermen	8	4	8	4	11	"	27	8	9	2	8
18	Men Dying cloths	3	8	4	"	3	8	11	"	3	10	8
19	Betel leaves Merchants (Pandas)	74	4	72	12	67	8	214	8	71	8	"
20	Medara people (Bamboo Basket makers)	1	"	1	8	1	8	4	"	1	5	4
21	Yeratala people (Basket makers)	"	8	"	10	"	8	1	10	"	8	8
22	A particular tribe of Scavengers who sell Vegetables &c	1	10	3	1	2	12	7	7	2	7	8
23	Glass Bracelet makers	"	"	5	"	3	8	8	8	4	4	"
24	Masons	"	"	2	8	"	"	2	8	2	8	"
25	Butchers	"	"	1	8	1	8	3	"	1	8	"
26	Bricklayers	"	"	5	8	"	"	5	8	5	8	"
27	Tailors	"	"	"	8	"	2	"	10	"	5	"
28	Grain Merchants	"	"	"	"	1	"	1	"	1	"	"
	Total	1276	13	1353	2	1315	13	3945	12	1323	4	4

Godavery District
Collectorate Bandarlanka
Amulapur Taluk
18th February 1867.

P. Cator
Collector

No. 8,041.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 15th December 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 October 1865, No. 269 :—

1. With reference to the Board's endorsement, dated 19th July 1864, on the Petitions, Board's Nos. 289 and 305 of 1864, and 117 of 1865, addressed to Government by Sri Rajah Vatsuvoy Suria Narayana Jagupatirazu, Bahadur, Zemindar of Cottam Mootah in this District, I have the honor to report as follows. The Petitioner's complaints are the following :—

First.—That when the Cottam estate was restored to him in the year 1838 only thirty-six villages were made over to him, instead of the thirty-eight of which the estate is comprised, and that the Peishcush fixed upon the assets of the entire estate is levied from him. He requests that those two villages may be assigned to him, and that the amount of quit-rent of the two villages included in the assets, as per margin, which was formerly collected from the inhabitants upon their dwelling sites given to them from arable lands may be refunded to him.

	Pagodas.
Tunipeta...	175
Setipeta...	4

Second.—That remission on account of the abolition of the Moturpha collections made by the Zemindar in his estate was not granted to him, although it is an ancient Zemindary which he inherited ; while such remissions were granted in the other ancient Zemindaries throughout the District. He requests that a refund of the Moturpha collections of his estate may be granted from the date of its abolition, and that the same may be reduced from his Peishcush henceforth.

2. [illegible] Her Majesty the Queen in Council, the decision of the Sudder Adawlut was confirmed, and agreeably thereto, the estate was made over to the Petitioner in September 1838, his father having died previously. Moturpha collections by the Zemindars and Proprietors having been discontinued before the estate was made over to him in 1838, and the so-called shist of the two villages claimed being only Moturpha, thirty-six villages only were made over to the Petitioner. I am of opinion that these two villages originally belonged to the Kattam Muttah, and I think the Petitioner has a good claim to them.

3. Under the foregoing circumstances, I beg that the Board will consider and decide whether the Kottam estate is a proprietary one, or an ancient Zemindary, and whether the petitioner is entitled to the remission and reduction which he claims.

Reply III.

4. The petitioner's claim for compensation of lands which were taken up under the high road, &c., in the estate of Kottam has been rejected by the Board, for reasons stated by Sir H. C. Montgomery, the then Commissioner in charge of the District and the Acting Collector Mr. Bird—*Vide* correspondence noted in the margin on the subject.

1. Vide endorsement of Sir H. C. Montgomery, Bart, late Commissioner in charge of the District, dated 22nd December 1843, on Petition No 1,506 of 1842, presented to the Board of Revenue by the Petitioner.

2. Acting Collector's report, dated 24th December 1844, No. 135, to Board.

3. Board's Proceedings, 16th January 1845.

5. As all the circumstances connected with this complaint have been fully detailed in the above correspondence, and after much consideration the case was decided by the Board, I do not think it necessary to re-open enquiry into the same matter and report again.

6. Petitions Nos. 289 and 305 of 1864, and 117 of 1865 are herewith returned.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1, 2 and 3.—Petitions.

1867 Dec 1

In a letter from the
Collector Godavery Dt.
To the Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras
Dated 18 Octr 1867
Rect
No 30

Rec. Fromth May 1868 to 1894

B

Statement shewing the
Malikhana Collections in
the Cottaum Estate during
the last 3 years of the Court
Management.

Dis Genl B No 711 Dated
1st 16th Nov 1868
B 394-395

prepared and forwarded by the Collector with his

The Board resolve, before submitting this matter for the consideration of Government, to request that Mr. Fraser will furnish full information, as soon as possible, upon the following points :—

First.—Whether the *loom tax* is included in the Moturpha of the Cottam estate, and whether, in the event of the Petitioner's solicitation for the deduction of two-thirds of the Moturpha collections being granted, this item should formpart of the concession. The Board observe, that from paragraph 110 of the Report of the Special Commissioners, the settlement was made "exclusively of Sayer, salt, saltpetre, *loom tax*, and alienated lands;" to grant Petitioner's request would be apparently to deduct this loom tax asset twice.

Second.—What were the component items in the Moturpha levied in the thirty-eight villages of the Cottam estate. A Return showing the amount of each item as levied in each of these villages should be submitted. As the estate was so many years under Government management, the Board presume there can be no difficulty in furnishing these details for the last three years of Government administration.

Third.—The Collector affirms that the Moturpha collected in the two excluded villages of Punipeta and Seetiapeta "is not the quit-rent of dwelling sites;" but the Board believe that in this item of "Moturpha" were included fisheries, ground-rents, and various realizations from other than purely professional sources. Mr. Fraser is requested to give full information on this point, and to state whether these Moturpha collections ceased in 1860 throughout these thirty-eight villages.

Fourth.—Why the Cottam Zemindar has delayed for so many years representing his claims to the Board and Government, and thus remained apparently contented with the arrangements made.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. [illegible]

Acting Sub-Secretary.

To J. Fraser, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District.

Exd. R. H. Lee.

prepared and forwarded by the Collector with his letter, dated 30th December 1837, and the same was sanctioned by Government in their Proceedings, dated 11th December 1838, received with the Board's Proceedings, dated 24th idem. In this Statement, the estate of Kottam was not included; but the cause is unknown. From the former correspondence it seems to me that it was not included in the above Statement, because at that time the estate was under attachment for the following reasons:—

The Cottam Muttah was part of the ancient Zemindary of Peddapoor. On the death of the Zemindar of Peddapoor in 1804, a dispute arose between his widow and the Petitioner's father, and according to a Razinamah filed in the Court by both parties, the Peddapoor estate was subdivided, and the Muttah of Cottam was placed in possession of the Petitioner's father in the year 1810. This was approved of by Government in their Proceedings, dated 2nd November 1810. In the year 1812, the estate fell into arrears, for which a sale of it was threatened by Government; but the Petitioner's father sold it to one Kakarlapudi Jagannadharazu, Zemindar of Kota, for Rupees 31,308, executed a Deed of sale, and requested the Collector to register the estate in his name, arrears having been paid to the Circar, the sale of the estate by it was stopped. He afterwards wrote an Arzi to the Collector objecting to the registry of the estate in the name of the purchaser under some conditions of an agreement which took place between themselves. All these circumstances have been reported to the Board by the Collector Mr. Blake, in his letter, dated 7th November 1812, and translations of all documents were submitted therewith. Upon which, the Board have directed in their answer, dated 19th idem, that the estate should be registered in the name of Kakarlapudi Jagunnadharazu, and he should be made a proprietor of the estate, leaving the Petitioner's father to prosecute his claim to the estate in the Courts. He accordingly filed a suit against K. Jagunnadharazu in the Northern Division Provincial Court who decreed in favor of K. Jagannadharazu. This decree was reversed on appeal by the Sudder

Third.—That [illegible] arable lands of his estate, of the annual value of Rupees 210, were taken up for the Northern Trunk Road, by the planting of trees on its sides, and by the erection of Tappal Runner's huts, without any compensation being given, and requests that compensation, to the above annual amount, may be granted to him from the time of the occupation of the land, and that a reduction of the same may be made from his Peishcush hereafter.

Replies to I. and II. complaints.

2. It is true, as the Petitioner states, that the estate of Cottam comprised thirty-eight villages mentioned in the list No. 1 which accompanied the Petition under reply. The revenue of these thirty-eight villages was included in the assets when the Cottam Muttah was separated from the Peddapoor Zemindary in 1810, and the permanent Jummah was fixed. The revenue of the two villages complained of is not the quit-rent of dwelling sites, as stated by the Petitioner, but it was an item called Moturpha, as mentioned in the margin. This amount was included in the assets of the estate. It does not appear from any accounts that it was collected in the shape of quit-rent on the dwelling sites which were given to the inhabitants of those villages. The collections of Moturpha by the Zemindars and Proprietors were abolished by Government from Fasli 1230, under the Board's Standing Orders, dated 7th August 1820, No. 4, and it was directed by the Board in their Proceedings, dated 21st April 1836, No. 219, that two-thirds of the collections of Moturpha, which were included in the assets, should be refunded and reduced from the Peishcush to the ancient Zemindars only and not to proprietors, according to which a final statement of the ancient Zemindaries in this District, for which the remission was requisite, was

	Moturpha.	
	Pagodas.	Co's. Rs.
Tunipeta	175	612½
Seetiapeta	4	14

Encl: 1 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government C&Q. dated 12th August 1867 No 3795.

1865. Department

Rec: 2179/67.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 15*th December* 1865.

From 11 May 1865 No 2594

No. 8,041.

Requesting further information on Petitions Nos. 289 and 305, of 1864 and 117 of 1865 regarding certain complaints made by the Zemindar of Cottam Estate.

No. 8,321.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th November 1866.

Read the following letter from J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavery District, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 12th June 1866, No. 131:—

1. As directed by the Board of Revenue, in their Proceedings dated 15th December 1865, No. 8,044, I have the honor to submit the following information upon certain points connected with the application of the Zemindar of the Cottam Estate, for remission of two-thirds of the Moturpha collections of his Mutah.

2. Cottam Mutah is a portion of the former Peddapore Zemindary. The permanent settlement of this estate was made in the year 1802. In the assets of the Cottam Mutah, the Moturpha collections, including the loom tax, to the amount of Rupees 1,035-5-0, were included.

3. In the year 1810, the Zemindary of Peddapore was sub-divided, and the division of Cottam separated from it was made over to the father of the petitioner. In the assets of the sub-division accounts, upon which the peishcush was fixed, the loom tax and the Moturpha were included in the manner above stated. The Zemindars were restrained from collecting the tax on the looms of the Company's weavers since Fusly 1212, and they were compensated for it, by the Commercial Residents, for Fuslies 1212 and 1213. In Fusly 1230, the collection of Moturpha, by the Zemindars, was discontinued by the ~~Order of Government~~ Board's Circular, dated 20th August 1820.

4. Two-thirds of the amount of loom tax, in the Peddapore Zemindary, was paid by Government, to the Zemindar of Peddapore, from Fuslies 1214 to 1229. It appears that the amount of loom tax, payable on the Cottam Mutah, was also paid to the Zemindar of Peddapore from Fusly 1214, to Fusly 1219, when this Mutah was separated from the Zemindary, and delivered to the petitioner's father.

5. Compensation for two-thirds of the amount of the entire Moturpha tax including looms, as [illegible], according to the Circuit Committee accounts, was granted to the Zemindar of Peddapore, from Fuslies 1230 to 1247, and deduction of it was made from peishcush, for and from Fusly 1248, only on the estates which were then in his possession, but not on the Cottam Mutah, because it was possessed by petitioner's father in Fusly 1220. For full particulars on this account, I beg to refer you to the correspondence noted in the margin.

Collector's letter to Board, dated the 30th December 1837, No. 207.
Board's Proceedings, the 24th December 1838, conveying Extract from Minutes of Consultation, 11th idem.

6. Paragraph 110 of the Report of the Special Commissioner, referred to by the Board, is not to be found among the records in my office.

7. A Return shewing the amount of each item as levied in each of the thirty-eight villages of the Cottam Mutah, is herewith submitted. These details are given for the last three years of Government Administration, viz., Fuslies 1266, 1267, and 1268, Moturpha collections having ceased in Fusly 1270. The various professions upon which the Moturpha was collected in the village of Tunipetalu, are mentioned opposite to that village, No. 20, in the above Return. The amount of Moturpha entered in the assets of the village of Sitayapetta, when the permanent assets of the Cottam Estate was fixed in 1810, was 4 pagodas or Rupees 15-6-8; but it does not appear, from the subsequent accounts, that any Moturpha was demanded on, or collected from, this village. It is presumed, that this must have been the tax on looms and other professions, and terminated in that village afterwards, or the Moturpha of Sitayapeta might have been included in Tunipeta, both of them being hamlets of Tuni.

8. From the foregoing circumstances, I trust that the Board will observe that the Moturpha collected in those two villages is not quit-rent, as alleged by the petitioner. The Moturpha collections ceased in 1861 throughout the estate, in the same way as in all parts of the district.

9. In reply to the concluding paragraph of the Board's Proceedings, asking why the petitioner has delayed, for so many years, to represent his claims to the Board and Government, I beg to inform you that, in the year 1820, the Moturpha collections were discontinued. In the same year petitioner's father having died, and the petitioner being a minor, the estate was brought under the management of the Court of Wards: during that time the petitioner had nothing to do with it. In the year 1839, the estate was made over to him. The petitioner states that, in the year 1840, he presented a petition to the Collector, claiming remission of Moturpha, and that he obtained no answer. He sent a petition to the Board, on the 12th December 1842, on the same subject. It was numbered 1,923 of 1842, and referred to the Collector with Board's endorsement, dated 30th May 1843. A report was forwarded on it by the then Collector, Mr. Smith, on the 29th July 1843, No. 109. Upon this, the Board passed an endorsement on the petition, stating that compensation on account of Moturpha was confined strictly to the ancient Zemindars, and not to the proprietors of those estates which have been acquired by purchase or transfer subsequent to the conclusion of the permanent settlement. This was conveyed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 5th October 1843.

10. The petitioner has again addressed several petitions to the Government as per margin, and the Government have finally decided that his claim for remission of Moturpha was inadmissible. This fact has been made known to the petitioner by an endorsement of Government, dated the 14th September 1844. After this, the petitioner addressed a petition to the Commissioner of the Northern Circars, who gave an endorsement on the 27th April 1854, stating that petitioner's claim to remission, on account of Moturpha tax, had already been decided by Government to be inadmissible.

Nos. 14, 498, 665, and 731 of 1844.

11. Petitions Nos. 2,534 of 1865, and 273 and 364 of 1866, are herewith returned.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Statement shewing the annual Collection and Balance of Moturpha tax, levied from different classes of people, in the villages of Cottam Estate, for Fuslies 1266, 1267, and 1268.

ENCLOSURES NOS. 2 to 7.—Paper.

---

1. The disposal of the foregoing letter has been some time delayed in the Board's office, as a reference to several of the Board's records has been found necessary.

2. The Special Commission, in their Report to Government dated the 27th September 1802, distinctly state that the permanent settlement which they then recommended for the late Fourth Division of Masulipatam, and the whole of the Zemindaries in the Masulipatam Circars, was made exclusive of the revenue from Sayer, Salt, Saltpetre, *Loom tax*, and alienated lands. This remark is made in paragraph 109 of their Report, and not in paragraph 110, as misquoted in the Proceedings to which the Collector replies in the foregoing letter. Again, in paragraph 75 of the same Report, the Commission deduct, from the assets of the Peddapore Zemindary, Star Pagodas 7,000 "on account of Sayer, including Arrack and licenses resumed."

3. In their Order, dated 15th December 1802, the Government confirmed the proposals of the Special Commission, and, as observed by the Collector in his letter recorded at the head of these Proceedings, only two years afterwards, or in Fusly 1214, (1804-5,) compensation was given to the Peddapore Zemindar for the loom tax. And again, in 1836, when the question of compensation for resumed Moturpha was raised, it was distinctly reported that the Moturpha and loom taxes had been included in the assets of the permanently settled estates when the peishcush was fixed.

4. At the same time it is observed that many of the items given in the enclosure of the Collector's letter, as being the Moturpha collected in the Cottam Mutah, are apparently of the nature of a loom tax. It is, therefore, as well that this apparent discrepancy should, if possible, be cleared up; and Mr. Fraser is requested to endeavour to do so.

5. There are other points connected with the Cottam Zemindar's case which need elucidation. In paragraph 5 of Mr. Fraser's letter it is stated that the Peddapore Zemindar received as compensation two-thirds of the Moturpha of his *entire* estate, apparently including Cottam, between 1820-21 and 1837-38. If so, it should be reported what portion of this Moturpha revenue was entered as derived from the Cottam Estate, as apparently two-thirds of *this* sum should have been deducted from the peishcush payable by the Cottam Estate in the following years.

6. Information should also be submitted as to the financial position of the Cottam Estate in 1857, as it is observed that compensation for the loss of Moturpha was accorded to the proprietors of the other estates in consideration of their distressed circumstances.

7. It should also be reported what arrangements were made when the Cottam Mutah was separated from the Peddapore Zemindary, *i. e.*, what amount was entered in the accounts of each sub-division as the collections of the estate with the amount of Moturpha and loom tax included in these collections.

8. The amount collected as Moturpha during the last three years of the Government management of the estate of Cottam should have been stated, and not the collection on this account during the three years previous to the abolition of the tax. Mr. Fraser is accordingly requested to submit this information when replying to these Proceedings.

9. As much delay has already occurred in the disposal of the case, the Board rely on Mr. Fraser to lose no time in forwarding the information requisite, to enable the Board to submit the matter in a complete form for the decision of Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of the Godavery District.

Exd. J. Wright.

12

Encl: No 2 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government R.C. dated 12th August 1867 No 6795.

1866. Department.

Rev. 2179/65.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 17*th November* 1866.

Rec: 16th May 68 Ins Ls 394

No. 8,321.

Requesting further information from Collector of Godavery district in connection with claim of Zemindar of Cottam Estate to compensation on account of abolition of Moturpha tax.

From J. FRASER, Esq., Collector of the Godavery district, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Bandarlanka, Amalapur taluk, 18th February 1867, No. 30.

1. In reply to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th November 1866, No. 8,321, I have the honour to report on the various subjects therein alluded to.

2. In paragraph 2 of the above Proceedings, the Board refer to the remark made by the Special Commission in paragraph 109 of their Report to Government, dated 27th September 1802. I beg to inform you that that paragraph of the Special Commission was not communicated to this office. Paragraphs 73 to 81 of their report which relate to the permanent Settlement of the Peddapur and Pittapur Zemindaries, comprising the first division of the Masulipatam Circars, were furnished to this office by the Secretary to the Special Commission, with his letter under date the 8th December 1802.

3. In paragraph 3 of the Special Commission's Secretary's letter, he distinctly stated that "the Commission rely on your explaining to the Zemindars the principle on which revenue derived from Salt, Saltpetre, Sayer, the tax on Looms and on the sale of spirituous liquors have been excluded from the Land Assessments of the Zemindars of Peddapur and Pittapur." From this quotation it appears that the Loom tax was excluded from the permanent assessment of the said Estates. In order to ascertain its truth, I have gone through the whole of the correspondence and the accounts connected with the permanent Settlement, and found that the Special Commission formed the permanent Settlement of the Peddapur and Pittapur Zemindaries according to the assets which were based on the average collections of 8 years from 1777 to 1784, and entered in the accounts of the Circuit Committee prepared in 1786. In these average collections the revenue derived from Moturpha was included, but it is not practicable to know whether or not the tax on Looms formed part of the said Morturpha. It would be easy to ascertain the component items included under the head "Moturpha," had the detailed accounts which were prepared by the Circuit Committee for fixing the Revenue of each village, been in my office. They seem to have been forwarded either to the Presidency office or to Masulipatam, because the Committee requested instructions of the Board at the concluding part of their Report, dated 18th December 1786, as to whether the above accounts which were voluminous should be sent to the Presidency or Masulipatam. But the Board's answer to that request is not on my records. For the same reason, I believe, the former Collectors Messrs. Anstry and Robertson stated, respectively, in their reports dated 31st December 1828, paragraph 4, and 8th September 1820, paragraph 2, that the Circuit Committee accounts do not furnish the necessary details of the items composing the Moturpha revenue.

4. The circumstances which rendered it difficult to distinguish the loom tax from Morturpha having been fully explained above, I now proceed to detail briefly the mode in which the permanent Settlement was made by the Special Commission for the Peddapur Zemindary.

5. The amount of permanent assets according to the accounts of the Circuit Committee is 2,65,402 Madras Pagodas, which were subsequently converted into 2,91,942 Madras Star Pagodas by

the Special Commission by adding 10 per cent. being the difference of exchange between the Madras Pagodas and Madras Star Pagodas. From the latter sum, Star Pagodas 7,764* were deducted on account of "Sayer" or Land Customs. Of the remaining 2,84,178 Star Pagodas, 94,726 being one-third allowed to the Zemindars were deducted, and 1,89,452 were assessed as permanent Jama on the Estate, from which Star Pagodas 1,622 were again deducted as one-third of the average Revenue derived from salt in four years as stated in paragraph 74 of the Report of the Special Commission dated 27th September 1802. To the net amount of permanent Jama which stood at 1,87,830 Star Pagodas, 420 being the amount of Rozinas or daily allowances, and 2,555 being that of allowances to Disapandias granted in lieu of their Inams incorporated with Ziroyti were added, and the total peshcush was fixed at 1,90,805 Star Pagodas. This is exactly the amount entered in the Sannad-i-Mulkeut Istimirar granted to the Zemindar under date the 8th December 1802, and paid by him annually.

	Star Pagodas.
* Amount of Land Customs included in the assets of the Circuit Committee	7,059
Add 10 per cent. since adopted by the Special Commissionor ...	705
Total...	7,764

6. From the foregoing particulars it is evident that the 7,000 Star Pagodas stated to have been deducted by the Special Commission in paragraph 75 of their Report, which is alluded to by the Board in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings under reply, was not the actual sum deducted from the assets of the Peddapur Zemindary on account of "Sayer including Arrack and licenses resumed." It seems that the said sum was merely shown as the estimated revenue of the Sayer, &c., and included in the total amount of estimated future revenue both in the Memorandum appended to paragraph 75 above alluded to, and in column 13 headed "Estimated Sayer and licenses in Amany "viz., Sea and Land Customs," of the Statement which accompanied the Report of the Special Commission.

7. The columns and headings of the Statement which accompanied the Special Commission's report were adapted so that as to be suited both for the Peddapur and Pittapur Zemindaries up to the time of the Circuit Committee; there was neither Sea Customs nor Salt in the Peddapur Zemindary, but it having appeared to the Special Commission from the correspondence noted in the margin of paragraph 74 of the Special Commissioner's Report of 27th September 1802, that there were some collections of Salt Revenue subsequently during four years, as mentioned in paragraph 4 of this Report. They allowed one-third† of the Salt Revenue to the Zemindar, while admitting in paragraph 74 of their report that nothing of this revenue was included in the assets of the Circuit Committee accounts, which were taken as the basis of the permanent settlement.

† 1,622 Star Pagodas, as shown in paragraph 4 of this Report.

8. I shall now proceed to elucidate the manner in which Moturpha remission was granted to the Zemindar.

At the beginning of the year 1802, (Fusly 1810-11,) the collection by Zemindars of Moturpha from weavers working for the Company was stopped at the request of the Commercial Resident, Mr. R. Fullerton, and a remission of 3,500 Star Pagodas was made on that account to the Zemindar of Peddapur for Fuslies 1211 and 1212. But there are no accounts to show the data on which this amount was calculated. After the completion of the permanent settlement, all taxes, personal and professional, were ordered to be converted into a quitrent to be collected on the ground occupied under shops and houses by those persons who were formerly paying the Moturpha, and that the amount of quitrent on the houses occupied by weavers should be paid by Commercial Residents to the Zemindars from the termination of the permanent settlement. The Zemindars of this district readily adopted this arrangement, and Mr. Fullerton after having seen the Kowls and Muchilkas exchanged between them and the weavers, paid to Zemindars the amount of quitrent for Fusly 1213. The engagements were executed for a term of twenty-one years from the said Fusly. But in the year 1805, the suit filed by the Zemindar of Vizianagram against the Commercial Residents at Vizagapatam for the recovery of his demand upon weavers was dismissed, and that decision was finally confirmed by the Court of Sudder Udalut—*Vide* copies of decrees forwarded with Mr. Robertson, the Collector's letter of the 8th September 1820, upon which the Commercial Resident withheld the above payment from Fusly 1214 under orders of the Board of Trade, dated 17th March 1806.

Vide paragraph 10 of Mr. Robertson's letter to the Board, 8th September 1820.

From Board, 7th August 1820.
To do. 8th September ,,
From do. 25th January 1821.
To do. 5th March ,,
From do. 2nd August ,,
From do. 10th December ,,
Do do. 11th March 1822.
Do. do. 31st ,, 1828.
To do. 13th May ,,
From do. 22nd ,, ,,
To do. 31st December ,,
From do. 7th January 1830.
To do. 21st April ,,
To do. 30th August ,,
From do. 13th September ,,
From do. 7th October ,,
To do. 25th January 1831.
From do. 3rd February ,,
To do. 28th April ,,
From do. 2nd June ,,
To do. 2nd December ,,
From do. 5th March 1832.
To do. 21st May ,,
From do. 31st ,, ,,
To do. 4th August ,,
To do. 22nd November ,,
From do. 5th March 1835.
To do. 30th ,, ,,
To do. 31st August ,,
To do. 11th September ,,
To do. 24th ,, ,,
To do. 27th November ,,
From do. 21st March 1836.
To do. 2nd April ,,
From do. 21st ,, ,,
With Minutes of Consultation, 19th May and the Board's further Proceedings, 26th May 1836.
To Board, 27th June 1836.
From do., 22nd August ,,

9. In reply to paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings, I beg to inform you that the Order of Government of date the 15th December 1802, referred to by the Board, is not to be found in my records; but from the correspondence in my office on the subject, I have gathered the following information. The Zemindar of Peddapur received compensation for the Loom tax on account of Fuslies 1211, 1212, and 1213 from the Commercial Residents. In Fusly 1230, the Government having resumed Moturpha in the Zemindaries, the Collector, Mr. Smith, after a long correspondence as per margin, finally reported on the 30th December 1837, No. 207, that compensation for Loom tax from Fusly 1214 to Fusly 1229, amounting to Rupees 64,042-4-4, and for Moturpha exclusive of tax on Palmyra trees from Fusly 1230 to Fusly1246, amounting to Rupees 56,742-15-10, should be granted to the Zemindar of Peddapur, and accordingly the total sum of Rupees 1,20,785-4-2 was sanctioned by Government in their Minutes of Consultation, dated 11th December 1838, upon the recommendation of the Board in paragraph 16 of their Proceedings of the 25th October 1838, No. 4,078. It appears that the amount of Loom tax was calculated with reference to the sum of Rupees 8,515-12-4, which seems to have been paid by the Commercial Department on the whole Zemindary estate for Fusly 1213. The particulars of the mode in which the Loom tax and Moturpha remissions were calculated are given below :—

Loom tax.	Per annum.	For sixteen year, from Fusly 1214 to 1229.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
On the Estates which were in the Zemindar's possession in 1837, as per Statement B. submitted with the Collector's letter, dated 30th December 1837...	3,355 0 3	53,730 15 0
Deduct amount advanced by the Commercial Department in Fusly 1214	... ...	5,000 0 0
Remainder...	3,355 0 3	48,730 15 0
Deduct one-third allowed to the Zemindar	... ...	16,243 10 4
Balance two-third...	3,355 0 3	32,487 4 8
Add Loom tax on the Estates separated from the Zemindary prior to Fusly 1229, in consequence of sale, &c., as per Statement C. forwarded with the above letter	5,160 12 1	31,554 15 8
Total...	8,515 12 4	64,042 4 4
Moturpha exclusive of tax on Palmyra trees on the Estates which were in possession of the Zemindar in 1837 from Fusly 1230 to Fusly 1246, being seventeen years...	5,006 11 9	85,114 7 9
Deduct one-third	... ...	28,371 7 11
Remainder...	5,006 11 9	56,742 15 10
Grand Total...	13,522 8 1	1,20,785 4 2

10. The sanctioned sum of Rupees 1,20,785-4-2 was paid to the Zemindar of Peddapur, and the necessary reduction from his peshcush was effected for and from Fusly 1248.

11. From the above explanation it will be observed that the Moturpha remission granted to the Zemindar, and the reduction made on that account from his peshcush were correct, the amount so remitted being only for the two-thirds included in the assets upon which the peshcush was fixed.

the two unrestored villages should be given up

12. Reply to paragraph 4.—As observed by the Board in paragraph 4 of their Proceedings under reply, it is true that many of the items given in the enclosure of my letter recorded in the above Proceedings, as being collected in the Cottam Mutta, are of the nature of the Loom tax, because they were taxes levied from weavers. The Zemindars were formerly in the habit of collecting Moturpha tax from all classes of artificers including weavers up to the year 1820, in which the tax was stopped from being collected by them.

13. Reply to paragraph 5.—I beg to point out to the Board that in paragraph 5 of my letter, recorded in the Board's Proceedings under reply, I have distinctly stated that compensation on account of Moturpha tax was granted to the Peddapur Zemindar from Fusly 1230 (1820-21) to Fusly 1247 (1837-38), and deduction of it was made from the peshcush only on the Estates which were then in his possession, but not on the entire Estate including the Cottam Mutta as the Board have observed. The said Mutta was separated from the Estate and possessed by the petitioner's father in Fusly 1220, (A. D. 1810,) or long before the Government resumed the Moturpha, and no consideration seems to have been given to the subject of compensation for the Cottam estate. It will be clear to the Board from the particulars given at the concluding part of paragraph 9 of this Report, that the Zemindar of Peddapur received compensation for Loom tax on the whole Estate including Cottam only up to Fusly 1219, and for the other period, viz., from Fusly 1220 to Fusly 1229 only for that portion of the Estate which was in his possession during that time. This fact is stated in paragraph 4 of my letter recorded in the Board's Proceedings under reply.

14. Reply to paragraph 6.—Regarding the financial position of the Cottam estate, I beg to enclose copy of paragraph 12 of the Jummahbundy report, dated 4th February 1839, No. 20, on the above Estate for Fusly 1247, with which the management of that Estate by the Court of Wards ceased. The Estate was made over to the petitioner on the 14th September 1838, with a surplus of Rupees 22,581-10-4, then remaining on hand both in cash and in Government securities. A Statement A, showing the particulars of villages composing the Cottam estate when the permanent settlement and Sub-division were made, and the collection of Moturpha for those villages as entered in the Circuit Committee [illegible] the permanent [illegible] by the Special Commission is herewith submitted.

15. Reply to paragraph 7.—When the Cottam was subdivided from the Peddapur Zemindary in 1810, detailed accounts showing the collections for a period of seven years prior to Fusly 1219 seem to have been prepared, and the peshcush apportioned accordingly as reported by the Collector to the Board on the 12th October 1810, and sanctioned by Government in their Order dated 2nd November 1810. But as the above accounts are not to be found among the records of my office, I regret that I am unable to give the information required by the Board as to the arrangements made when the Estate was separated from the Peddapur Zemindary.

16. Reply to paragraph 8.—As required by the Board I beg to submit a Statement B, showing the amount of Moturpha collected in the Cottam estate during the last three years of the Government management of the Estate or from 1836 to 1838, the Estate having been made over to the petitioner in 1839.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Statement showing the Moturpha collections of Cottam estate included in the assets of the Circuit Committee.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

ABSTRACT.—Statement showing the Moturpha collections in the Cottam estate during the last three years of the Government management.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

ABSTRACT.—Copy of paragraph 12 of the Jummahbundy Report of Cottam estate for Fusly 2147.

Sunday
Tuesday 15

My dear Sudeshon, Taken
herewith the Kolamu-
I cannot be a party to
the course now proposed
to be taken.....
laying them before
Council again on Tuesday
pray would kindly say
who were the Members in
1864 when Mr. Robertson
was distinctly rejected?
Yours faithfully
Wodeyar

Grants by
Ws Wilkinson

Petitions- Nos: 3156 & 3220 of 1863.
Nos 2534 ~~of 1865~~ & 917 of 1865
Nos 293 & 2833 of 1866.

10

Jagapatty Razoo

Razumiah in O.S. dated 12th Oct. 1870.

Principal Coll's letter to Bd 30th April 1804.

Pet.r is the son of Narsavoy Jaganada Raz who in 1810 obtained from the widows of Rajah Jaga:patty Raz, Zamindar of Peddapur (who had died in 1804) the Mutah of Kotaum, which formed part of that Zamindary. Jaganada Raz mortgaged the estate to an uncle, under whose management it got into arrears & was attached in 1874. Before Subse:quently Jaganada Raz filed a suit to recover the Mutah from the Uncle. This suit was finally decided by the Privy Council in 1838 in favor of the Plaintiff, but as Jaganada Raz had died, previ:ously Pet.r was put in possession.

Vol. II. p.1. Moores Indian appeal Cases.

In the petitions above recorded Pet.r brings forward 3 Claims:—

Impeta
Sitigapeta

1st Complaining that when put in possession of the Mutah in 1838, only 36 villages were made over to him instead of the 38 villages of which the estate is com:prised, he requests that these 2 villages may be assigned to him & the amount of quit-rent refunded.

Bds C.O. 7th Augt 1820

The Kotaum Mutah did originally comprise 38 villages, & the revenue of 38 Villages was included in the assets when the permanent Jumma of Cotaum was fixed in 1870. The revenue of these two villages was an item called Inotrapka (& not as Pet.r says quit-rent) & as the ~~not~~ collection of Inotrapka by Zamindars ~~was~~ had been put a stop to in 1820, these villa:ges were not restored with the rest of the estate in 1838. The Board observe that there is no doubt that the Mootah properly consists of 38 villages, & though they don't say so, seem to to imply that the ~~two~~ unrestored villages should be given up.

2nd He claims compensation for certain lands taken up for public purposes.

This claim he put forward in 1845 viz was rejected both by the Board & Govt on the ground that the road runners' lands excluded from those on which the Peshcush was formed, & that it had been of great benefit to his property. The Board see no reason for reconsidering this request.

Ext. of Lr H Montgomery Commr dated 22nd Dec 1843 on B.O.R. petition

Bds Pro. 16th Jan 1846.

3rd Complaining that no compensation or reduction of Peshcush was granted to him as to other Zamindars, prays that he may receive compensation & that his Peshcush may be reduced.

The Circuit Committee who in 1793 estimated the resources & resevues of the Masulipatam Zamindaries, in calculating the assets of these estates, took into consideration the Motorpha collections as forming parts of the assets. Their accounts formed the basis of the permanent settlement.

Report to Govt 15th Feb 1793 para. 39.

In 1802 the Special Commission in their report to Govt remark as follows: With reference to the Peddapore Zamindary it has been resolved to fix the permanent Settlement at 2/3 of the gross value (deducting sair) as stated by the Circuit Committee"; nor does it appear from the other sections relating to this Zamindary that the Loom. Tax was excluded, although they remark generally in para 116 that "the proposed Settlement is made exclusively of Sayer, Salt, loom. tax etc. The B.O.R. are of opinion that the loom. tax was excluded.

Spec. Comm. Report 1802 para. 73

73-76

§110

This settlement received Govt sanction late in the year.

G.O. 13th Dec. 1802.

In 1802 the collection of Motorpha by the Zamindars from the Complaining weavers was prohibited & the Zamindars received compensation.

After the permanent settlement was completed the Motorpha was converted (by order of the local authorities) into a quitrent

Bds Pro. 9th March 1826 para 11.

on the ground occupied by those who formerly paid that tax.

The next time this tax attracted notice was in 1813 when the Judge of Masulipatam reported to Govt that in defiance of Reg. XXV of 1802 the Zamindars frequently collected the Motorpha Tax. The Colrs were called on to report but nothing more was done till 1820 when all Colrs in Zamindary districts were ordered to resume the Motorpha at once & to report what Zamindars were entitled to reduction of Jumma.

From a report submitted in 1826, it appears that the Bd were of opinion that the Motorpha had been included in the assets but that generally & specially in the case of Peddapore, the accounts did not show what items were so included.

In L. M. C. under date the 19th May 1836 Govt remark that "the admission of claims to compensation for Motorpha must be considered rather as an act of grace & policy than as matter of right," and as the Board will bear in mind that such claims are to be admitted only in the case of such Ancient Zamindaries as stand in need of the Remission.

Ltr to place them in comfort & respectability.

It appears from the papers put up that many of the Zamindars were heavily involved just then & this remission put them on their legs again, whereas the Rotanum Mutah was made over to Govt in 1838 with a surplus of Rs 22,587-10-4 remaining on hand after the Govt management.

Rs 5,195, 12th Aug. 1869 para 8.

The Bd add that the compensation was expressly withheld from those proprietors who had acquired their properties by sale or transfer subsequent to the Permanent Settlement, but I cannot find this order among papers put up.

L. in C. 11th Dec. 1838. The Peshcush was also reduced on the ground that the Motorpha had been included in the assets on which the permanent Jumma was fixed.

i.e. the Zamindar received compensation for the whole estate including Rotanum up to 219 F. & on the estate minus Rotanum from F 220 to F 1229.

Peddapore was an ancient Zamindary & its compensation was granted in 1839. As Cotanum was separated subsequent to the Permanent Settlement the Zamindar of Peddapore received no compensation for it after Fasli 1219 (1809-1810)

In 1842 Govt sought to recover Motorpha compensation for the Mootah, but his claim

was rejected both by the Board & Govt on the ground that "compensation for resumed Moturpha has been confined strictly to the ancient Zamin=dars, & does not extend to the proprietors of estates acquired by purchase or transfer subsequent to the Permanent Settlement."

Govt Pro. No 941. 14th Sept. 1844

The majority of the Bd while aware of the inexpediency of re-opening questions that have been once settled by Govt are of opinion that as the transfer of Kotamm was merely a family arrangement, & as the whole estate was remitted in the possession of Pet: as the legal heir of all, his claim is worthy of consideration.

The 3rd Member of the Bd dissents from this opinion on the ground that contrary to Regulation 1 Sumud the Zamindars had upto 1820 illegally collected Moturpha, that 2nd in granting compensation before, Govt admitted no obligation (in fact denied any obligation) but merely conferred an act of grace on an unthrifty race of ancient needy landholders, & 3rd the present claimant urges no pecuniary difficulties.

The points to be noted are:

The non-restitution of 2 villages to Pet: in 1838 on the ground that the Revenue derived therefrom was entered in the accounts as Moturpha, the collection of which by Zamindars was stopped in 1820.

The illegal collection of Moturpha by Zamindars up to 1820. Reg. XXV of 1802. §4.

The subsequent compensation granted to them for its resumption, & reduction of quit-rent, because that item had been included in the assets of each estate by the Circuit Com^rs

The grant was only to ancient Zamindars who were mostly in arrears & debt.

The flourishing state of the Mutta when handed over to Pet: in 1838.

The rejection of his claim by Govt in 1844.

S.R.W

Letter from Govt to Bd of Rev: dated 27th Sept 1844 with the claim of Pet: for the resumption of the Moturpha in account of the Cattack Mutta &c &c

Govt Pro. No 941. 14th Sept. 1844

Considerable difficulty in taking up & disposing of this case. Having finally come to the conclusion that the decision of Govt in 1844 declining to entertain the claim was right & proper I directed

As regards the general question I beg to observe I do not think the Circuit Committee did in their Report of the 9th March 1822 para 56. recommend the permanent alienation of the Moturpha of the Zamindars, but merely the relinquishment of the Govt demand on the Zamindars certainly was the Circuit Committee's valuation of assets as the basis for their calculations in cases in which a reduction of the Jumma of the Zamindars was sanctioned.

See para 3. of Govt Letter to Bd of Rev: of 9 March 1826. para 56. Enclosed for Govt Report of the Circuit Committee in 1822 23. dwelling

V

the Zemindar of Ramnad
on account of the resumption
of the Pershkash - Decided
the Privy Council Zemindars do
derive any right, conferring
the Proprietary rights over
land assessed - The Govt.
in para 6. of the letter to the
Bd. of 10 July 26. distinctly
appeared the Govt. decision
observing that the question of the
effect of the resumption of the
claim of Pershkash in the Zemy.
valuation of the assets of the
Estates depended "entirely upon
the Judicial interpretation of the
Sanad of the Zemindars when the
conferring Engagements were
entered into" - How on the contrary
pretend the inclusion of Pershkash
in the calculation by wh. the
assessment of the Zemindaris
was supposed to have been
determined - Even if it had
appeared - wh. it did not -
that the actual Realizations
Exhibited by such Calculation".

Ask the Govt. to reconsider
& rescind that Resolution as
to amount to a Decision that
Pershkash is not to be
brought into account -

It will be remembered

Govt. This view does
not always obtain
but may maintain
but Exceptions
have come to Govt notice
of the existence of the
time of the Perm. Settlt.
than later opinions
are likely to be.

that the Estimated Income
of the Year of 1802. decided
against the Pershkash Zemindars
for Govt. - Different Zemindars
& that the Judicial Committee
valuations were used as
the earliest available data
of any kind for estimating
approximately the value of
the Estates - In most cases
pleading for the Exemption
by the details. I have no
doubt myself that Considering
it material to the Govt.
Circuit Com. and Judicial
this was the only practicable
way to ensure their claim
from this point of view
than I see no reason to
admit the present claim
as just &c.

The Govt. however
adverse it - on the ground
that the Collector should
not have found apart of the
Pedda Poor Zemindari free
from the compensation for
Pershkash was allowed after
the separation of the Pershkash
Lands from the Zemindari
Lit. by the Commission

of the Ct. of the Log. Estate in 1838.
at the death of the last of the
Sisters of the Zemindar who
died in 1806. & that the
Separation of the Shotah in 1810.
in consequence of the Ct. of
Wards rejected the present claim
on the score that the whole
Estate was then an ancient
Zemindary & was a family
family arrangement.

Statement admitted
but that this was the case.

When the Zemindar died in
1806. he left 3 Sisters & an
adopted son. This son succeeded
& died in 1808. & then the father
of the present Petr. claimed the
Goldsboro Estate as the adopted Son
of the Sisters.

The Sisters & disputed
the claim in the Courts. & eventually
the suit was compromised in
the appeal Ct. (the right Heirs having
awarded the Estate to the Sisters)
Jaksi nama
making over the Collam-Rendah
as a separate Estate to the
present Petrs father — and
a tract formerly of the annual
value of Sicca Rupees 2000 to the
eldest Sister as her absolute exclusive
right & property disposable according to

family it was a family
arrangement in this
sense — viz that it was
an arrangement entered
into by the members
of the same family
& not carried out
by the orders and
decrees of the Courts.

The Moodah of Kolaum
had been assigned by the two
Sisters to their father in
1810. long before the action
the Court was brought by the
said father. WM

pleasure — and after
that the Goldsboro Zemindary
& the Estate fell to
the adopted Son.

It remains that
this Registration
Goldsboro afforded
& the immediate Heirs
has not a fair family
arrangement between
the contending parties
& the Sisters — &
the Court cannot have
considered it so for on the
death of the first Sister
the Court admitted the claim
to a portion of the second
Sister — it was only after
the death of the third &
last Sister that the present
Petr (his father having died
in the interval) succeeded
in his claim.

There is no doubt that
the father & Collam
as his absolute property
& the Petr discriminates his Petn
suit — shows this — & the
Magistrate for adjusting

as to the last ground
by observing as a "most
familiar principle" that
bodies having like an interest
concession, the right representative
of the family from the bidders
deserves a preference in possession.
(The papers do not show that the
degree of relationship between the
Petr. father - & the husband of the
bidder was. but it must have
been distant I think - & after
the Court upholding the bidders
supposed right to succeed
an ancient Zemindari.)

Rob. the foregoing grounds
do not recommend that the grant
in favor of the Petr. claim &
petition for confirmation by
further enquiry & refund be
upheld.

As the said grounds & Petition
the claim & the two Kistnapolen
villages rights in dispute Cottam
etc 36 Rups. but not entered
with the rest of the Peishcush under
the S.C. Burrin the mortgage
deed should be rejected - as being

Apart from the general
ground of the extreme incon-
venience of reviving old
questions long settled &
concerning the Revenue Settlement
shown many good special grounds
for rejecting the one raised
in Lopchaly Nagoor Petition.
WDM

Mark 20 WDM

As considered General Rules.
as the Govt long ago decided
that Zemindars had no right
to any description of Rent
Govt was not due to Govt at
the time of the Perm. Settlt.

Suppose in like manner
prospective increase
that revenue may have been
abstracted from Govt on account
of rent-free & waste lands - Upon
such revenue was not the subject
to make an offset for the Petr.
WDM

This should be
ascertained
by

Should any of the
Kistnapolen villages
as if to the Zemindar
entered for permanency
liability to the Zemindar
on account of Kistnapolen

Should any of the
Petr. Kistnapolen
is now from time
as if they pay any land
Govt by Govt to the
Zemindar for from any
liability on account of
Kistnapolen. Rent free Land
Rev. the villages of Kistnapolen
the Rental are legitimate
objects for deduction.

2nd Jurisdiction -

The claim for compensation for land occupied by a road Wks was rejected on 9 June 1865. Leave given to Bd in writing again.

Signed the decision of Surv. Gen. 30 Nov. 1865.

The Kirkwood Station Murchison Dt Bd has entered its opinion in the Minority Book of Dt's claim.

[illegible]

It appears that the majority of the Board are right but the Dt. ought to have given notice and ought now to be refunded as the proprietor of an Eminent Domain agreed to in this case and that consequently the majority of the Board recommend the compensation claimed by the minority of the Board recommend. The assessment amount of such compensation is not claimed in the Statutory provision for the Board's [illegible] in this case amounted to pounds 12. [illegible]

I do reject it. We have been liberal in cases of the kind. The advantages to the owners of the land have entirely been included from consideration

WDM

The departure Timber seems done to take out an Eminent road case

WDM

I adhere to the opinion of the
Majority of the Board of
Mr. Architect.

For orders.

Revenue Department.

No. 1374.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 16th May 1868.—

Read the following letter from the Sub Secretary to the Board of Revenue.—

Submitting for favourable consideration claim of Petr. Petitioner in No. 3156 of 1863 to compensation on account of alienation of Mokurpha in Cotaconum Mootah, Tjadaneery Distt., and to restoration of two villages with held when the Mootah was made over to him.—

Rec'd enter 15th Augt. 67 No. 5195

The Government have gone carefully into the past history of this case and altho' they do not allow that Petitioner has any claim of right to the concession he seeks, they regard [illegible] acceptance as a recommendation that

that meaning the assign-
ment to Petitioners of the
Kattam Mutah as a
purely family arrange-
ment, the grace shall be
extended to him which
was conferred on the
former holders of the rest
of the Peddapore Estate
and compensation for the
resumption of the Moh-
turphas made to him by a
refund of the two-thirds
of the value of the asset
which was included in the
Peishkush - and the reduction
of the annual amount
of Peishkush hereafter
by this amount -

The refund will be
made in arrears from 1810,

up to which date it was
formerly made to the
Zemindars of Peddapore
before the separation of
Kattam from the origina
Estate to which it is now
re-united - and the Boa
will report what the aggr
gate amount will be - an
by what sum the Peish-
kush has to be reduced
in future -

Whether the two Moh
turphas villages should be
restored must depend on
whether they are now pay
ing to Govt any such
revenue (exclusive of
Mohturphas) as they were
legally liable to pay to the
Zemindar (as the representative

of Govt. and entitled to receive their dues) at the time of the Permanent Settlement. It does not appear that this can be the case. but enquiry should be made on the point and the result reported.

The Government decline to entertain the Petitioner's applications for compensation for lands assessed for a road prior to 1843. —

11 Copies Tahsil Bd of Rev Despatch 18
6 — Advocate Genl
1 — Sd. Collector of Salem & Collector No 3156/69. 3220/69. 917/69 & 273/66
Copy of G. O. to S. S. Jagaparthi Row
V. Instr. Cons. 2535/68. of 24 Nov 68.
1 — do — 134/69 — 11 July 69.

Reported to England
D/ 23rd March No. 2 of 1869
Land Revt

Revenue 1868 d. 25th
Proof Court of on Mary

No. 1374

Proof the Madras Court
d/ 16 May 1865.
Form Bof Revd / 27 Jany / 67
Co. No. 366.

V Cr. 287/1/73

Rec. 394-395