

(1) Number of Pages.....16.
(2) Date of repair.....15-6-66
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....*CH*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	214	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	12. 2	1984.
		1984.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....16.
(2) Date of repair.....15-6-66
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....*CH*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	214	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	12. 2	1984. 1984.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 142. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th February 1874, No. 250:—

Read the following letter from G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Vinukonda, 28th January 1874, Extra No. 4:—

I HAVE the honour to request a more detailed order than that in G. O., dated 12th December 1873, No. 1,407, R. D., for my guidance.

2. Is it intended that where the demand on a field is over 100 per cent., favour is to be shown? or where the whole demand payable by any ryot is increased to that extent?

3. If the former, are the causes of increase to be taken into account which are, first, increased rate charged; second, increased area discovered. As an instance, I found yesterday a ryot's demand increased from Rupees 2 to Rupees 9, because his holding was found to be 9 instead of 2 acres. Should he be shown the same favour as one whose holding remains still the same in extent, but whose rate has been raised? I am inclined to think his case is not so deserving, the more so, because improvements to land made by the ryot by good manuring and careful cultivation, have not been taken into consideration in re-classifying his land.

4. At the same time, with much deference, I would beg permission to represent my opinion that the present order comes too late to stop relinquishments in any but the three Taluqs of Narasarowpet, Vinukonda, and Palnad, where they will be inconsiderable.

5. By the orders that have been already passed during the year, and which are well known to them, all ryots who have not already relinquished their fields (save in the three taluqs abovementioned) are bound to pay the full settlement rate for the year; those, who have relinquished, have done so under the belief that the Government Orders would be carried out; those who have retained their fields, have done so with their eyes open; and I think it may be assumed that they will not now relinquish them. But if they have that intention, I fail to see any cause for assurance that they will not still do so at some time before the full excess is reached.

6. The relinquishments that have been made must stand for this year's settlement; for the lands are either waste, in which case the old cultivators cannot be asked for silt, or have been re-taken up by themselves or by new cultivators, in which case they do not seem to me to require the favour proposed by Government.

7. In these cases, however, I would ask for instruction whether such persons should be made to pay the increased rate by degrees or not; it would undoubtedly save confusion in the accounts, and render fraud more difficult if the same rule applies to everybody, and no doubt the man who gave up his land under the supposition that the full rate was to be charged, would have a right to feel discontented if he found his disbelieving neighbour was treated with greater consideration than himself.

8. In regard to the three taluqs already mentioned, as the ryots have given notice of relinquishment only, and will not be called upon to give up their lands

*Proceedings of the Madras Government Revenue Department,
17th February 1874.*

until the beginning of next cultivating season, the notices can be cancelled without difficulty if the ryots choose to retain their lands on the terms offered by Government.

9. I would beg for an early answer to this letter, as I expect the settlement of Repalli and Bapatla will both commence by the middle of next month.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government, with the request that the matter may be disposed of as soon as possible because the Jummalbandi is about to commence.

2. In their Proceedings, dated 12th December 1873, No. 1,407, Government directed that in order to avert anticipated relinquishments, the Collector should, where the increase was excessive, distribute the enhancement over three or five years.

3. Mr. Leman shows that in those taluqs* where relinquishments might have been prevented, the order comes too late. In fact the relinquishments have been tendered and accepted and the relinquished lands have in many cases been taken up either by the former holders, or by others.

4. The Board submit, therefore, that it will be best to leave things as they are in these three taluqs.

5. It will however be a matter for the consideration of Government whether an indulgence should be permitted in ~~Vinnagonda, Narsarawpet and Palnad~~ which has not been allowed in the case of the other taluqs. The increase in the assessment of these taluqs is very moderate so that there is even less need of the concession and the difference in treatment may seem unfair.

6. The Collector might however be instructed to consider, for the present, the claims of former holders superior to those of others when durkhasts are submitted for lands relinquished in consequence of the introduction of the new settlement. The minor points touched upon by the Collector can be disposed of by the Board after they have received the orders of Government upon this reference.

No. 143.

ORDER THEREON, 17th February 1874, No. 214.

Land Revenue, No. 4.

THE Board's views are approved.

2. The recent orders of Government should be carried out in the three taluqs yet to be settled, and also in the other taluqs in regard to the lands (of which the Collector says there are some) which have been relinquished but not taken up.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated February 17th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 17th February 1874, No. 214.

FEBRUARY.

Nos. 142-143.

New settlement of Guntur Division —
Approves Board's views regarding the — with
remarks.



Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 5 February 1874, No. 214

Extract No. 4 Read the following

From,

G. D. Leman Esquire
Collector of Krishna District

To,

J. Grose Esquire
Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

I have the honor to request
a more detailed order than that
in G. O. dated 12 December 1873 No.
1407. R. D. for my guidance.

2. Is it intended that where
the demand on a field is over 100
per

per cent, favor is to be shown? or where the whole demand payable by any ryot is increased to that extent?

3. ... If the former, are the causes of increase to be taken into account which are, first increased rate charge, second, increased area discovered.

As an instance, I found yesterday a Ryot's demand increased from Rupees 2 to Rupees 9, because his holding was found to be 9 instead of 2 acres. Should he be shown the same favor as one whose holding remains still the same in extent, but whose rate has been raised? I am inclined

4
216

to think his case is not so deserving, the more so because improvements to land made by the ryot by good manuring and careful cultivation, have not been taken into consideration in re-classifying his land.

4. At the same time, with much deference, I would beg permission to represent my opinion that the present order comes too late to stop relinquishments in any but the three Taluqs of Narasarpett, Vinnkonda and Palnad where they will be inconsiderable.

5. By the orders that have been already passed during the year

year, and which are well known to them, all ryots, who have not already relinquished their fields (save in the three Taluqs above mentioned) are bound to pay the full settlement rate for the year; those, who have relinquished, have done so under the belief that the Government Orders would be carried out; those, who have retained their fields, have done so with their eyes open; and I think it may be assumed that they will not now relinquish them. But if they have that intention I fail to see any cause for assurance that they will not.

Here the full
settlement
is reached

not still do so at some time before the full excess is reached.
6. The relinquishments that have been made, must stand for this year's settlement; for the lands are either waste in which case the old cultivators cannot be asked for silt, or have been re-taken up by themselves or by new cultivators, in which case they do not seem to me to require the favor proposed by Government.

7. In these cases, however, I would ask for instruction whether such persons should be

lie made to pay the increased rate by degrees or not; it would undoubtedly save confusion in the accounts, and render framed more difficult if the same rule applies to everybody and no doubt the man who gave up his land under the supposition that the full rate was to be charged, would have a right to feel discontented if he found his disbelieving neighbour was treated with greater consideration than himself.

8. In regard to the three Taluqs already mentioned, as the ryots have given notice of

Not a single
man has
acc.

of relinquishment only, and will not be called upon to give up their lands until the beginning of next cultivating season, the ryots can be called without difficulty if the ryots choose to retain their lands on the terms offered by Government.

9. I would beg for an early answer to this letter as I expect the settlement of Repalli and Bapatla will both commence by the middle of next month.

Heister & Collectors
Circuit Kachery at Muppalla
Vinnikonda Taluk
28th January 1874

I have seen
(Signed) G. D. Luman
Collector
Submitted

Submitted for the
orders of Government, with the
request that the matter may
be disposed of as soon as possible
because the Jummabundy
is about to commence.

In their Proceedings dated
12^d December 1873 N^o 1407 Govern-
ment directed that in order
to avert anticipated relinquish-
ments, the Collector should,
where the increase was ex-
cessive, distribute the enhance-
ment over three or five years.

Mr. Leman shows that in
those Taluqs where relinquish-
ments might have been prevented
the order comes too late. In
fact

Repalli
Bapatla
Guntur
Lattera
Maddur
Maddur

²⁴⁴
fact the relinquishments have
been tendered and accepted
and the relinquished lands
have in many cases been
taken up either by the former
holders or by others.
The Board submit there-
fore that it will be best to
leave things as they are in
these three Taluqs.
It will however be
a matter for the consideration
of Government whether any
indulgence should be per-
mitted in Vinkonda, Nar-
saroupett and Pehad which
has not been allowed in the
case of the other Taluqs. The
increase

increase in the assessment
of these Talooks is very moderate
that there is even less need
of the concession and the dif-
ference in treatment may seem
unfair.

The Collector might
however be instructed to con-
sider, for the present, the
claims of former holders su-
perior to those of others when
durkhasts are submitted
for lands relinquished in
consequence of the introduc-
tion of the new Settlement.
The minor points touched
upon by the Collector can be
disposed of by the Board after
they

they have received the orders
of Government upon this
reference.

(a True Copy & Extract)

J. Grose
Secretary
To, The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

W. H. Locker

M. Narasimha Chetty

2012 December 1938-189-60

Yes
+ ~~James~~ and also in the other
Jalisco in regard to the land (of
which the collector says there are some
which have been relinquished but
not taken up. Now is it that we
are too late ~~here~~ in this case? If
possible, it ought not

to move upon
Boardings of the
Board of Revenue
dated 7th February 1874
Dec 27th —
Recd 29th —

Submitting for orders
of Government with remon-
stration from Collector of Jalisco
requesting detailed
instructions in regard
to new settlement of Span-

Adm-
The record order of the
at the collector's office
3 miles per day
13/2 14 2-14 3
14 18. 19 Rev. Dec 19 1874
See note No 11: 74 1874
an affidavit of 9/1
See note No 11: 74 1874