No. 82. Read the following letter from the Officiating Inam Commissioner, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 24th June 1872, No. 22:—

I HAVE the honour to request the orders of Government on the following matter.

2. Early in 1870 petitions were received in this department from two Inamdars of the Trichinopoly District, complaining that the classification of their Inam lands as single crop and double crop had been incorrectly made. These petitions were forwarded by Mr. Robinson to the Collector for inquiry and report with his Memorandums dated 9th March and 24th May 1870, Nos. 474 and 894.

3. The then Collector of Trichinopoly, Mr. Cadell, reported on the first case on the 7th July 1870. He explained that the Umayapuram Shrotriem consisted of cawnies 84 and gulis 78¼ of nunjah and cawnies 22 and gulis 74⅜ of garden-land; but that only cawnies 18 and gulis 78¼ had been entered in the Title-deed as double crop land, whereas the Dowle Account of Fasli 1223 showed cawnies 47 and gulis 37½ as double crop land. It appeared that certain examinations instituted by Mr. Banbury had led to its being ascertained that double crops were largely raised in this Shrotriem, and a demand was accordingly made for water-rate on such lands as had not been registered as double crop at the Inam inquiry; and that out of this demand had arisen the Shrotriemdars' complaint of incorrect registration by the Inam Department. Mr. Cadell also pointed out that the garden-rate of assessment per acre, on which the Inam Deputy-Collector had fixed the quit-rent of the Shrotriem, was the average garden-rate of both double and single crop garden-lands. He accordingly submitted a revised Inam settlement, allowing the Inamdar to raise double crop on all his garden-lands, and upon cawnies 47 and gulis 37½ of his nunjah land without charge for water, and raising the quit-rent on his Shrotriem by Rs. 9-6-3. This revised settlement was approved by Mr. Robinson in his Memorandum dated 15th August 1870, No. 1,259, and a fresh Title-deed issued and forwarded to the Collector in January 1871.

4. On the 23rd February 1871 Mr. McQuhae, the then Collector of Trichinopoly, reported on the second case. He pointed out that the Inam village of Shemayavaram consisted, according to the Inam Register, of acres 57·47 of single crop nunjah, acres 237·98 garden, and acres 733·62 dry land; and that on the inquiry instituted by Mr. Banbury, the charges noted in the margin had been made for the use of Government water. That thereupon the Inamdar had complained and stated that he was entitled to the water free, and that the Inam registry of the lands in 1864 was the result of enmity. It appeared, however, that the accounts produced by the Inamdar were not reliable; but the Collector was of opinion that as the Deputy-Collector had taken Rs. 6 per acre as the nominal assessment of the

	ACRES.	RS.	A.	P.
1. For dry converted into nunjah	9·76	39	1	0
2. For do. into garden	61·33	140	12	0
3. For second crop in nunjah	12·22	29	2	0
4. For do. in garden	128·30	285	1	0
	211·61	494	0	0
The same items for Faslies 1276 and 1277 ...	...	988	0	0
Total now due	...	1,482	0	0

garden-land which was the average assessment of both double and single crop land in the neighbourhood, no charge for second crop could at any rate fairly be demanded on any of the *garden*-land.

5. The Collector was thereupon requested by the Inam Commissioner to report what quantity of double crop land was entered in the Dowle Account of Fasli 1223, and what oral evidence was available in support of the Inamdar's claims.

6. In reply to this call the Collector reported on the 19th May 1871 that apparently the Inam registry had been made without reference to the Inamdar; that the ryots of the lands in question and the residents in the neighbourhood asserted that nearly all the lands charged with water-rate were entitled to water either for one or two crops, and had been always so supplied, with the exception of acres 5·25 of dry land which had been recently converted into wet.

7. On receipt of this letter Mr. Robinson appears to have consulted Mr. Banbury, and prepared a memorandum, copy of which is herewith forwarded, declining to interfere with the Inam settlement, but on further reflection he desired that the matter should lie over.

8. On reference to the Inam Register of this village I find that though the average assessment of garden-land in the neighbourhood was Rs. 6 per acre, the Collector is incorrect in stating that the Inam Deputy-Collector fixed the nominal assessment of this village at Rs. 6 per acre. The assessment appears in the Register at Rs. 4½ per acre only. It is also to be observed that inasmuch as no quit-rent was chargeable in this village the Inamdars could have had no object in misrepresenting the classification of their lands as wet, dry, and garden, as might have been the case had such a course had the effect of reducing the quit-rent, so that there is every probability that the classification as entered in the Register was correct at the time.

9. Under these circumstances I am of opinion that it is not desirable to interfere with the Inam settlement of this village after so great a lapse of time, and I request the permission of Government to issue orders in accordance with the opinion expressed in Mr. Robinson's draft memorandum disposing of the case omitting, however, the reference to supposed fraud on the part of the Inamdar.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Memorandum.

THIS claim has no doubt arisen out of the unfortunate precedent of altering the Inam settlement into which the Inam Commissioner was led by the late Acting Collector in the Umayapuram case.

2. After careful investigation by the Inam Deputy-Collector, based on the statement of classification of land *presented by the Inamdars*, the true proportion of each class was settled and the Title-deed issued years ago.

3. As remarked by Mr. Puckle these Inamdars had been helping themselves to State water for years, but then the true condition of the Inam was ascertained and registered. It is not, however, improbable that the existing state of irrigation was from fraudulent motives misrepresented by the Inamdars and connived at by the Curnams in order to evade water-rate, but for years the settlement was acquiesced in by all parties and the surruptitious use of water has continued.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
15th July 1872.

4. In 1867 Mr. Banbury carried the settlement of (Tirva Jasti) water-rate on excess cultivation (with State water) into effect, and in this settlement the Inamdar's lands registered as dry became involved. This Inamdar now seeks to avoid the settlement and get more land registered as mamul wet, and seeks to refute what was the result of careful investigation and his own representation. This settlement was readily acquiesced in by him until he felt the effect of discovery of the fraud.

This settlement will stand.

(Signed) W. ROBINSON,
Inam Commissioner.

12th June 1871.

No. 83. ORDER THEREON, 15th July 1872, No. 1,049.

Miscellaneous.

THE Officiating Inam Commissioner's proposals are approved and sanctioned.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Officiating Inam Commissioner.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Rev.: 1872 Dept.
No. 2183.

From
The Offg. Asstt. Commissioner

To The Secretary to Govt.
Revenue Department

Dated 24th } June 1872.
Received 29th }
No. 1049 - No. 15 - July 1872.
22

Enclosure 1.

Requesting the permission of Government to issue orders in accordance with the opinion expressed by Mr. Robinson in the enclosed memo regarding the classification of lands in the village of Shemayavaram Taluq Trichinopoly.

Witto Adler

To the Offg. Asstt. Commissioner S. Arcot
14 " Head Q. Revenue

No. 1049
Offg. Asstt. Commissioner's Office
Trichinopoly 15th July 1872.

Sir,

In the Despatch noted in the margin I have the honor to request that you will issue orders in accordance with the opinion expressed by Mr. Robinson in the enclosed memo regarding the classification of lands in the village of Shemayavaram Taluq Trichinopoly.

I have &c.
Witto Adler

C 12th July 1872 R 15: July