No. 4. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th September 1873, No. 1,811 :—

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 18th July 1873, No. 238.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a petition presented to me by the Zemindar of Kottam, together with its enclosures, requesting that the moturpha assets included in the peishcush of his estate on account of the two villages of Jetagunta and Ayyaparazekattapilly may be deducted from the peishcush for the future, and that the amount so included for the past years may be refunded to him.

2. The Zemindar's claim to the refund of moturpha of the whole estate was allowed by the Government in their order, dated the 16th May 1868, No. 1,374; but the Collector, in calculating the aggregate amount to be refunded, was guided by the accounts of the Circuit Committee, in which the two villages in question were included not under Kottam but under Isakapalli Mutta. Both these muttas originally formed part of the Peddapur Zemindari.

3. The two villages were in 1805 included under the Kottam Mutta by Mr. Hodson in his report on the Peddapur Zemindari, and were so registered in 1810 when the Peddapur Zemindari was, for the first time, sub-divided.

4. The refund of the moturpha for the whole Kottam estate was allowed by Government; but these two villages were not taken in, as the amount to be refunded was calculated from the list of villages made by the Circuit Committee in A.D. 1787, in which list these villages do not appear under Kottam Mutta. The amount should have been calculated from the list made in 1810, where the villages appear as part of Kottam.

5. It seems clear, therefore, that the moturpha collections of these two villages should be refunded to the Zemindar like those of the remaining estate, and I, therefore, beg to recommend the refund of Rupees 4,734-8-3, the amount of the moturpha collections from fasli 1220 to 1282, both inclusive, as shown in the accompanying statement, and the reduction of peishcush by Rupees 75-2-5 from and after fasli 1283.

6. The amount provided under "Refunds, Land Revenue," will not suffice, and I trust the necessary provision will be made in the Board's office as the budget of 1873-74 has not yet been passed.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Petition.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Statement.

SUBMITTED for the sanction of Government, with reference to G. O., dated 26th February 1869, No. 512.

2. The Zemindar's general claim to the compensation has been already allowed by Government, and the villages now in question were omitted by mistake when the compensation was computed.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
3rd November 1873.

No. 5. ORDER THEREON, 3rd November 1873, No. 1,231.

Land Revenue, No. 9.

HIS Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to sanction the refund of Rs. 4,734-8-3 and the reduction of the annual peishcush of the Kottam estate by Rs. 75-2-5.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. STURROCK,
Acting Under-Secretary to Government.

Revenue Department

Memorandum on
No. 2877.

The Government
in their order dated 16th
May 1868 No. 1374
remarked that "they
do not allow that
the claims must be admitted
& the same sanctioned with reduction
of Peishcush
21/10

Petitioner (Zemindar
of Kottam) has any
claim of right to the
concession" (compensation
for the resumption of the
Moturpha) but as a matter
of "grace" sanctioned a refund
(in arrears from 1810, Rs. 36069

Whether necessary sanction
the refund and
reduction, as proposed
by the Collector.
1st Oct 24/73

of the two thirds of the valua
of the asset which was includ-
ed in the Peishcush, and the re-
duction of the annual amount of
Peishcush by that amount
(Rs: 610)-(A precis of the
case is attached to the
order dated 16th May 1868)

2. The Secretary of State
to whom the above Proceedings
were reported remarked as e-
follows in his Despatch dated
24th June 1869 No 23.

"Although I am more
than doubtful of the propriety
of reopening a question which was
settled so long ago as 1842, on what
the Govt then considered to be
sufficient grounds, no new cir-
cumstances having in the interval
been brought to your notice,
I shall not withhold my
sanction from the decision

at

at which you have arr-

3 The Collector
of the Godavery District
now reports that the Ze-
mindar's "claim" to the re-
fund of the Moturpha of
the whole estate was allowed
by Government in their
order of 1868 but that two
villages which properly
belonged to the Kottam e-
Inuttah were omitted from
the calculations as to re-
fund and reduction of
Peishcush then made, and
recommends the refund of
Rs 4,734-8-3 the amount
of moturpha collections
from Fusly 1220 to 1282
both inclusive, and the re-
duction of the Peishcush
by Rs 75-2-5 from and

after

after July 1283. The
mission of the two villages
from the account pre-
pared in 1868 is stated
to have occurred by a
list of the villages made
in 1787 having been taken
for guidance instead of
one prepared in 1810. The
Board submit the Collector's
letter for sanction with the
remark that the Zemindars
"general claim" has been
already allowed by Govt.
and that the villages now
in question were omitted
by mistake when the com-
putation was computed.

Orders are requested.

17/10/73

G.O 16 May 68 N° 394-95.
26 July 69 — 514-15

Rec'd 18th Sept.
N° 2877

1873.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 12TH SEPTEMBER 1873, No. 1,811.

Dup 15 Sept 73.

Encl. 2
Rent.

No 1231 - 3 Nov.

Received 17 Sept 73

SEPTEMBER.

No. 1,811.

Peishcush of Kottam Zemindari—in Godavery District.—Sanction of Government requested for reduction of Rupees 75-2-5 from — and refund of Rupees 4,734-8-3 to Zemindar on account of assets of two villages having been overlooked when compensation was settled for abolition of moturpha-tax in Zemindari.

With order

H.S. the Govr. in Council is solicited to sanction the refund of Rs 4,734-8-3 & the reduction of the annual Peishcush of the Cottam Estate by Rs 75-2-3

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

3 Nov 73

Recd 13 Nov

c. 21 Oct 22 Oct 24/10 24/10

N° 1231.