

554,

M.R.O. 1-20,002-12-3-65.

(1) Number of Pages..... 94  
(2) Date of repair..... 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Aug  
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

*Revenue* DEPARTMENT

|          |                |       |
|----------|----------------|-------|
| G.O. No. | 554,           | Press |
| B.P. No. | Back 73-75,    | Mis.  |
| Dated    | 5. 5. 1874-196 |       |

Not to be folded or roughly handled



119

---

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
5th May 1874.*

---

Read the following:—

No. 73. } Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 24th March 1874,  
              } No. 665.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also 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 Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,591, dated 16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of 7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that the Mansubdar should not have any water.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October 1873, No. 2,099.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd September 1873, No. 383.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English translation.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 28th January 1874, No. 25.

—

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.



*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.*  
5th May 1874.

CERTAIN villages belonging to the Rampah Mansubdar and certain villages belonging to Government obtain water from the Buradaculva and it has been decided that the Mansubdar has a right to "a sufficient" quantity of water for his tank, but cannot obtain it by damming the stream above the Government villages.

2. The Mansubdar threw a bund across the stream in 1868, and the Sub-Collector in deciding that he had no right to do so directed him to get his water "as heretofore from a channel taking off from the Buradaculva above the Puttamamimidoddi anicut."

3. When the case was first reported to the Board it was represented that the Mansubdar had been in the habit of getting his water by throwing a bund across the stream, and that when this was prohibited he was promised the use of the old channel as a kind of compensation. Both these points are now disputed but the papers leave no room for doubt that the Mansubdar had often thrown a temporary dam across the stream, and that when his right to erect a substantial dam was decided against he was induced to believe that "a sufficient" supply of water would be secured in some other way. It appears that the old channel in its present state does not convey enough water to the Mansubdar's tank, and that the District Engineer has told the Mansubdar not to deepen or widen it because he will injure land belonging to the village of Kottapally, through which the channel passes, in doing so, and has pointed out to him another line. The Mansubdar objects to this other line as too expensive, but is ready to pay compensation for land taken up in widening the old channel.

4. So far as the Board can judge the Mansubdar has a right to get water from the old channel, and Government ought in good faith to help him. The Collector and District Engineer should endeavour to arrange the matter in some way. If possible the old channel should be made serviceable and the supply to the Mansubdar and Kottapally distributed by regulating sluices. If not the new line should be surveyed and marked out, but the Mansubdar must supply the necessary funds.

5. The Board resolve to report the conduct of the Range Officer Mr. Hannan for the notice of Government. When he was removing the bund above referred to, the Mansubdar's Vakeel presented an order which the Tahsildar had issued allowing the bund to be raised. This order was the result of an error of judgment, but there was no need on that account to show discourtesy to the officer who issued it. Mr. Hannan took the paper and tore it in two. The Mansubdar then wrote and asked for his reasons. Mr. Hannan replied that he tore up the document because the power of settling irrigation disputes belonged to Range Officers and the Public Works Department and not to the Collector or Tahsildar, neither of whom had any such authority. When called upon for explanation Mr. Hannan explained the tearing up of the document to some extent by stating that the Mansubdar's agent who gave it to him was impertinent and he was much provoked, but his only explanation about his most improper letter to the Mansubdar is contained in these words addressed to the District Engineer:—"The Mansubdar wrote to me some time afterwards to know why I destroyed this document and the original letter forwarded with your Memorandum

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.*  
5th May 1874.

under reply was my answer, a translation of which Mr. Foster sent to the Board of Revenue. I am unable to state whether it was a correct one or not as it was not sent to me.

No italicised original.

No. 74. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSS, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 2nd July 1873, No. 214.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith a copy of Acting Head Assistant Collector (in charge of Sub-Collectorate) letter of the 19th May, No. 173, with its enclosures, copies of correspondence between that officer and the Department of Public Works relative to the repair of an irrigation channel which supplies water to the tanks of the Mansubdar of Rampah in Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages, in the Mansubdari in the Kottapalli Division.

2. It will be seen that Buradaculva, a hill stream, supplies water to the Mansubdari villages named, as also to some Government villages. The Mansubdar appears to have been in the habit of throwing a mud anicut across the culva near the entrance of his supply channel, and carry the water to his tanks. The Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, and the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, were of opinion that an anicut so thrown was improperly put up, removed it, and allowed the Mansubdar to repair and use an old irrigation channel close by. The Department of Public Works, including the District Engineer, first expressed their willingness to mark out and repair the channel so as to secure a sufficient supply of water to the Mansubdar's fields, but they latterly declined to do anything with it. Rightly or wrongly, the Mansubdar was promised the use of the old irrigation channel, and I beg to recommend that the promise be fulfilled. I therefore request the Board's sanction to this course.

3. The original award of arbitration referred to in Mr. Pearce's letter, paragraph 7, is not to be found on record, probably having been destroyed with the old records.

4. The Department of Public Works seem to think that disputes as to the irrigating of land are not cognizable by the Revenue authorities. I beg to enclose translation of Mr. Hannan's reply to the Thanedar of the Mansubdar, dated the 19th August 1869, No. 73, and the Board will notice that he has confessedly destroyed certain documents issued by the Revenue Department in regard to irrigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. L. PEARSE, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 19th May 1873, No. 173.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith, for your perusal, copies of correspondence which took place between this Office and the Department of Public Works on the subject of the Vernacular record, as per accompanying list enclosed.



*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
5th May 1874.*

Rampah Mansubdar being allowed to repair an old channel from the Buradacalva, a hill stream situated in the Rajahmundry Taluk, near the village of Kottapalli, and request your instructions on the subject.

2. The above Buradacalva takes its rise from the ~~mountain~~ <sup>country</sup> of the Rampah country. The irrigation tanks of Yerrampalem, Fentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages belonging to the Mansubdar, and those of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Strerangapatnam, etc., Government villages, are dependent on this channel for supply of water.

3. In 1868 the Mansubdar of Rampah ran a ~~high~~ <sup>high</sup> bund of a permanent nature across the said calva so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy-Tahsildar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper, as the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Mansubdar, while the Tahsildar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages; whereupon Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, and Mr. Hannan, the Range Officer, inspected the channel and the bund, and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr. Horsfall directed the Mansubdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply channel, by which certain lands of Kottapalli village are watered, and which commences from the river a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, one of the anicuts across the river.

4. The Mansubdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply channel in question, Mr. Horsfall stated, in his letter to Mr. Hannan, No. 5, dated 20th February 1871, that he was satisfied, from personal inspection, that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Mansubdar with the required quantity of water, whilst the lands of Kottapalli and other Government villages were also irrigated from that channel, and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this, Mr. Hannan, in his letter, No. 43, dated 6th May 1871, declared that he had no objection to the Mansubdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr. Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth and breadth of the channel and fall of water. Mr. Gribble permitted the Mansubdar to repair the channel in question, subject to the conditions proposed by the Range Officer, and requested Mr. Hannan to see if the Mansubdar conformed to the conditions laid down by him. Then the Mansubdar requested Mr. Gribble to have the line of the channel marked out by the Department of Public Works, and was, in reply, directed to apply to the Range Officer himself. He also petitioned the Superintending Engineer to have the channel repaired by the Department of Public Works, agreeing to bear all costs himself, and was informed by that officer that instructions had been sent to the Range Officer to order the Overseer to carry out the repairs.

5. When Mr. Stuart was at Kottapalli last year the Mansubdar's son produced before him an order from the Overseer. Finding its purport to be at variance with the Inayatnamas issued to the Mansubdar by the Superintending Engineer and Messrs. Horsfall and Gribble, he wrote a letter to Mr. Hannan on the 1st December 1871, stating that when the bund constructed by the Mansubdar was removed permission was granted to him to widen the said channel near Puttamamididoddi anicut, and that this promise should be kept if possible. He further stated that the Mansubdar was ready to pay compensation for any land required in Kottapalli for the purpose; that there was no reason to think that the widening of the channel would injure the Kottapalli lands in any appreciable degree; and that the Mansubdar would be instructed to understand that his right to the water would only commence after the want of the Kottapalli people was satisfied. The Range Officer replied on the 13th of that month that, as the channel passes through the Kottapalli lands, it is, from its head until it leaves Kottapalli lands, the property of the Kottapalli ryots, and that the Mansubdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kottapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer (*vide* translation of Mr. Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer).

6. The Mansubdar having again applied to this Office, Mr. Stuart wrote to Mr. Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for by the Mansubdar

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
5th May 1874.*

marked out, and was, in answer, informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer, who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Mansubdar is entitled only to water drained off Kottapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Mansubdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the bund removed by the Range Officer. He has ten tanks in three villages, the main supply of which he states to be from this river. One of the documents produced is an unauthenticated copy of the decision of a Panchayet convened in 1852 under orders of the Collector. From this it appears that the water brought down by the supply channel carried from the main channel should be shared equally by the Mansubdar and the Kottapalli ryots after certain other lands of Kottapalli were irrigated. The other document is a letter addressed in 1863 to the Mansubdar by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry communicating the permission of the Supervisor to the Mansubdar to repair a certain anicut and to take water to his tanks. One of these anicuts, called Peddakurimidi, is said by the Mansubdar to be across the main channel and the same that was removed by Mr. Hannan; but the Kottapalli people say that this anicut is one across the supply channel.

8. Whatever the previous right of the Mansubdar may be, Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Hannan gave him permission, when the bund put up by him was removed, to take water through a channel dug from the main channel a little above the Puttamamididoddi anicut, and Mr. Stuart sees no reason to withdraw that permission. It is most probable that it was usual to put a small temporary sand or mud dam across the river at the entrance of the supply channel leading from the river to the Mansubdar's tanks, and that the Mansubdar, by making this bund so large and strong as to turn all the water, brought upon himself a prohibition from Mr. Horsfall which was more sweeping than right to have been. Mr. Stuart thinks that the Public Works Department should abide by the terms then promised to the Mansubdar by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam at this point, and should assist him in any way they can to widen the Kottapalli channel as he proposes to do.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 9.—Copies of Correspondence.

THE Board are of opinion that the promise made to the Mansubdar ought to be fulfilled if possible. They desire that the Collector will communicate with the District Engineer, and, when advised by him, report by what means it is possible to afford the Mansubdar a supply of water while the interests of the Kottapalli ryots are respected.

2. The Collector will also forward the letter (herewith returned) of the Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, to the District Engineer, and request him to obtain information from the Assistant Engineer as to whether he acknowledges that letter to be a true copy of one written by him, and whether he wishes to offer any explanation thereof.

No. 75.

ORDER THEREON, 5th May 1874, No. 554.

Miscellaneous.

THE Mansubdar is clearly entitled to water, and measures should be adopted at once to determine the quantity and supply it or enable him to procure it.



*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,  
5th May 1874.*

2. The subject of paragraph 5 will be considered in the Public Work Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,  
*Acting Secretary to Government.*



PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 16th August 1873.

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, 2nd July 1873, No. 214 :—

I HAVE the honour to forward, herewith, copy of Acting Head Assistant Collector (in charge of Sub-Collectorate) letter of the 19th May, No. 173, with its enclosures, copies of correspondence between that officer and the Department of Public Works, relative to the repair of an irrigation channel which supplies water to the tanks of the Mansubdar of Rampah in Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli Villages, in the Mansubdari in the Kottapalli Division.

2. It will be seen that Buradacalva, a hill stream, supplies water to the Mansubdari villages named, as also to some Government villages. The Mansubdar appears to have been in the habit of throwing a mud anicut across the Calva near the entrance of his supply-channel and carry the water to his tanks. The Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, and the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, were of opinion that an anicut so thrown was improperly put up, removed it, and allowed the Mansubdar to repair and use an old irrigation channel close by. The Department of Public Works, including the District Engineer, first expressed their willingness to mark out and repair the channel so as to secure a sufficient supply of water to the Mansubdar's fields, but they latterly declined to do anything with it. Rightly or wrongly, the Mansubdar was promised the use of the old irrigation channel, and I beg to recommend that the promise be fulfilled. I therefore request the Board's sanction to this course.

3. The original award of arbitration referred to in Mr. Pearse's letter, paragraph 7, is not to be found on record, probably having been destroyed with the old records.

4. The Department of Public Works seem to think that disputes as to the irrigating of land are not cognizable by the Revenue authorities. I beg to enclose translation of Mr. Hannan's reply to the Thanedar of the Mansubdar, dated the 19th August 1869, No. 73, and the Board will notice that he has confessedly destroyed certain documents issued by the Revenue Department in regard to irrigation.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From E. L. PEARSE, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 19th May 1873, No. 173.

I HAVE the honour to forward, herewith, for your perusal, copies of correspondence which took place between this office and the Department of Public Works on the subject of the Rampah Mansubdar being allowed to repair an old channel from the Buradacalva, a hill stream situated in the Rajahmundry Taluq, near the village of Kottapalli, and request your instructions on the subject.

2. The above Buradacalva takes its rise from the mountains in the Rampah Country. The irrigation tanks of Yerrampalem, Pentapalli, and Irlankapalli villages belonging to the Mansubdar, and those of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Streerangapatnam, etc., Government villages, are dependent on this channel for supply of water.

Oct. of 1874

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Secy., Secy., Secy.

Dated May 5th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. No. 1874, No. 304.

MAY.

No. 73-75.

Water Supply from Buradacalva, Godavery District.—Considers that Mansubdar of Rampah is entitled to — requests immediate adoption of measures for determining quantity of water, and for its supply, and directs that the conduct of the Range Officer, Mr. Hannan, be considered in the Public Works Department.





3. In 1868 the Mansubdar of Rampah ran a high bund of a permanent nature across the said Calva so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy Tahsildar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper as all the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Mansubdar, while the Tahsildar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages, whereupon Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, and Mr. Hannan, the Range Officer, inspected the channel and the bund and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr. Horsfall directed the Mansubdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply-channel, by which certain lands of Kottapalli village are watered, and which commences from the river a little above the Puttamamidoddi Anicut, one of the anicuts across the river.

4. The Mansubdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply-channel in question, Mr. Horsfall stated, in his letter to Mr. Hannan, No. 5, dated 20th February 1871, that he was satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Mansubdar with the required quantity of water whilst the lands of Kottapalli and other Government villages were also irrigated from that channel, and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this, Mr. Hannan, in his letter, No. 43, dated 6th May 1871, declared that he had no objection to the Mansubdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr. Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth and breadth of the channel and full of water. Mr. Gribble permitted the Mansubdar to repair the channel in question subject to the conditions proposed by the Range Officer, and requested Mr. Hannan to see if the Mansubdar conformed to the conditions laid down by him. Then the Mansubdar requested Mr. Gribble to have the line of the channel marked out by the Department of Public Works, and was in reply directed to apply to the Range Officer himself. He also petitioned the Superintending Engineer to have the channel repaired by the Department of Public Works, agreeing to bear all costs himself, and was informed by that officer that instructions had been sent to the Range Officer to order the Overseer to carry out the repairs.

5. When Mr. Stuart was at Kottapalli last year the Mansubdar's son produced before him an order from the Overseer. Finding its purport to be at variance with the Inayatnamas issued to the Mansubdar by the Superintending Engineer and Messrs. Horsfall and Gribble, he wrote a letter to Mr. Hannan on the 1st December 1871 stating that when the bund constructed by the Mansubdar was removed permission was granted to him to widen the said channel near Puttamamidoddi Anicut and that this promise should be kept if possible. He further stated that the Mansubdar was ready to pay compensation for any land required in Kottapalli for the purpose; that there was no reason to think that the widening of the channel would injure the Kottapalli lands in any appreciable degree; and that the Mansubdar would be instructed to understand that his right to the water would only commence after the want of the Kottapalli people was satisfied. The Range Officer replied on the 13th of that month that, as the channel passes through the Kottapalli lands, it is, from its head until it leaves Kottapalli lands, the property of the Kottapalli ryots and that the Mansubdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kottapalli lands into his own channel lower down. This officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer (*vide* translation of Mr. Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer).

6. The Mansubdar having again applied to this office, Mr. Stuart wrote to Mr. Hannan on the 10th August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for by the Mansubdar marked out, and was in answer informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer, who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Mansubdar is entitled only to water drained off Kottapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Mansubdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the bund removed by the Range Officer. He has ten tanks in three villages the main supply of which he states to be from this river. One of the documents produced is an unauthenticated copy of the decision of a Panchayet convened in 1852 under orders of the Collector. From this it appears

that the water brought down by the supply-channel carried from the main channel should be shared equally by the Mansubdar and the Kottapalli ryots after certain other lands of Kottapalli were irrigated. The other document is a letter addressed in 1863 to the Mansubdar by the Tahsildar of Rajahmundry communicating the permission of the Supervisor to the Mansubdar to repair a certain anicut and to take water to his tanks. One of these anicuts, called Peddakurimidi, is said by the Mansubdar to be across the main channel and the same that was removed by Mr. Hannan; but the Kottapalli people say that this anicut is one across the supply-channel.

8. Whatever the previous right of the Mansubdar may be, Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Hannan gave him permission, when the bund put up by him was removed, to take water through a channel dug from the main channel a little above the Puttamamidoddi Anicut, and Mr. Stuart sees no reason to withdraw that permission. It is most probable that it was usual to put a small temporary sand or mud dam across the river at the entrance of the supply-channel leading from the river to the Mansubdar's tanks and that the Mansubdar, by making this bund so large and strong as to turn all the water, brought upon himself a prohibition from Mr. Horsfall which was more sweeping than right to have been. Mr. Stuart thinks that the Public Works Department should abide by the terms then promised to the Mansubdar by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a dam at this point and should assist him in any way they can to widen the Kottapalli Channel as he proposes to do.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,  
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 9.—Copies of Correspondence.

THE Board are of opinion that the promise made to the Mansubdar ought to be fulfilled if possible. They desire that the Collector will communicate with the District Engineer, and, when advised by him, report by what means it is possible to afford the Mansubdar a supply of water while the interests of the Kottapalli ryots are respected.

2. The Collector will also forward the letter (herewith returned) of the Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, to the District Engineer and request him to obtain information from the Assistant Engineer as to whether he acknowledges that letter to be a true copy of one written by him, and whether he wishes to offer any explanation thereof.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. ST. A. GOODRICH,  
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Acting Collector of the Godavery District,

with copy of letter of Assistant Engineer, dated 19th August 1869, No. 73.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.



123  
No. 665.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 24th March 1874.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591.

Read also 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 Tanuku, 31st January 1874, No. 21:—

WITH reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,501, dated 16th August 1873, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 2,099, of 7th October 1873, from the District Engineer, together with its enclosure, the letter from the Range Officer.

2. I would propose that a survey be made, as suggested by the District Engineer, and then that a channel should be cut so as to give the proper share of water to the Mansubdar as well as the Government villages. The Public Works Department should point out the course which they think the channel should take, but it should not be left to them to decide whether justice is done both to the Government and the Mansubdar by the course they propose to adopt. The channel must give the proper share of water to each party. The Mansubdar is not entitled to all the water, but then neither are Government villages.

3. I send the original letter (to be returned) from the Range Officer to the Tanadar. I sent this to the District Engineer, and the Range Officer acknowledges that he did send it. I did not see the necessity for sending my translation of it to him: he appears to insinuate that the translation may not be correct. Such insinuations would not be tolerated in private life, and they ought not to be allowed in public correspondence. The Board can judge for themselves whether the translation is right.

4. I also enclose copy of a letter (with enclosures) from the Sub-Collector, Mr. Horsfall, on the subject. It was he who examined the land in the first instance, and he agreed in the removal of the bund. But he did not mean that the Mansubdar should not have any water.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of letter from District Engineer, to Collector, dated 7th October 1873, No. 2,099.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Range Officer's letter to District Engineer, dated 23rd September 1873, No. 383.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Letter in Telugoo from Range Officer to the Tanadar with English translation.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Copy of Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 28th January 1874, No. 25.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Copies of correspondence alluded to in the Sub-Collector's letter.

any further action in future. 040

1873.  
BOARD of REVENUE,  
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 16th AUGUST 1873, No. 1,591.

Encl.

Received

No. 1554/74

AUGUST.

No. 1,591.

Mansubdar of Rampah—in Godavery District.—Collector to report, after communicating with District Engineer, how a supply of water can be afforded to—without injuring interests of Kotapalli ryots, and to obtain certain information through that officer regarding a letter addressed by Assistant Engineer with reference to irrigation of Mansubdari.



CERTAIN villages belonging to the Rampah Mansubdar and certain villages belonging to Government obtain water from the Buradaculva and it has been decided that the Mansubdar has a right to "a sufficient" quantity of water for his tanks, but cannot obtain it by damming the stream above the Government villages.

2. The Mansubdar threw a bund across the stream in 1868, and the Sub-Collector in deciding that he had no right to do so directed him to get his water "as heretofore from a channel taking off from the Buradaculva above the Puttamammidoddi anicut."

3. When the case was first reported to the Board it was represented that the Mansubdar had been in the habit of getting his water by throwing a bund across the stream, and that when this was prohibited he was promised the use of the old channel as a kind of compensation. Both these points are now disputed but the papers leave no room for doubt that the Mansubdar had often thrown a temporary dam across the stream, and that when his right to erect a substantial dam was decided against he was induced to believe that "a sufficient" supply of water would be secured in some other way. It appears that the old channel in its present state does not convey enough water to the Mansubdar's tank, and that the District Engineer has told the Mansubdar not to deepen or widen it because he will injure land belonging to the village of Kottapally, through which the channel passes, in doing so, and has pointed out to him another line. The Mansubdar objects to this other line as too expensive, but is ready to pay compensation for land taken up in widening the old channel.

4. So far as the Board can judge the Mansubdar has a right to get water from the old channel, and Government ought in good faith to help him. The Collector and District Engineer should endeavour to arrange the matter in some way. If possible the old channel should be made serviceable and the supply to the Mansubdar and Kottapally distributed by regulating sluices. If not the new line should be surveyed and marked out, but the Mansubdar must supply the necessary funds.

5. The Board resolve to report the conduct of the Range Officer Mr. Hannan for the notice of Government. When he was removing the bund above referred to, the Mansubdar's Vakeel presented an order which the Tahsildar had issued allowing the bund to be raised. This order was the result of an error of judgment, but there was no need on that account to show discourtesy to the officer who issued it. Mr. Hannan took the paper and tore it in two. The Mansubdar then wrote and asked for his reasons. Mr. Hannan replied that he tore up the document because the power of settling irrigation disputes belonged to Range Officers and the Public Works Department and not to the Collector or Tahsildar, neither of whom had any such authority. When called upon for explanation Mr. Hannan explained the tearing up of the document to some extent by stating that the Mansubdar's agent who gave it to him was impertinent and he was much provoked, but his only explanation about his most improper letter to the Mansubdar is contained in these words addressed to the District Engineer:—"The Mansubdar wrote to me some time afterwards to know why I destroyed this document and the original letter forwarded with your Memorandum

under reply was my answer, a translation of which Mr. Foster sent to the Board of Revenue. *I am unable to state whether it was a correct one or not as it was not sent to me.*

Not italicised original.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

*J. G. M.*  
Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,  
with Board's Proceedings, dated 16th August 1873, No. 1,591,  
with its original enclosures, and five original enclosures  
to Collector's letter of 31st January 1874, to be returned.  
.. the Acting Collector of the Godavery District, with Range Officer's telugoo letter, returned.  
Copy to the District Engineer, Godavery District.



S.O. No. 554 - 5 May 1974 -

a petition received from the  
Rampa regarding the supply channel  
from the Bunda calva. You will rec  
the Mundbar had an authorized  
across the above calva & diverted  
of the water to his lands and that  
was cut by you in 1868. and the  
Further prohibited by me,  
any such kind in future. Opp  
that he can get no water at all,



exaggerated statement of the case. I am  
satisfied from personal inspection that  
existing channel is quite insufficient to  
supply the Munsabdar with the required  
quantity of water. <sup>Whilst</sup> at present the lands  
of Chapilly and other Government villages  
are irrigated from this channel. I  
therefore that you will have the channel  
deepened and widened as early as possible.  
I believe the Munsabdar is ready to have  
necessary work executed at his own  
expense and see no objection to his doing  
under such restrictions and supervision  
as may deem necessary. In any case  
work should be completed before the  
rainy season commences. I have signed

Signed / J. C. Worofall  
Acting Sub Collector.

(True copy)

Obtained  
by 14th Feb. 1868  
J. C. Worofall

Ms. No. 3868/10

Godavery  
Samud  
19.3

From  
The Assistant En  
No. 6 Range

The Acting Sub Co  
Godavery

Ms. No. 3868/10

Sir  
In reply to your letter of the  
instant I have the honor to  
see no objection to the Munsabdar  
deepening and widening the channel  
at his own cost as proposed by  
in his letter No. 5 dated 20th Jan.  
In my opinion the width of the  
should not exceed 5 yards. The  
channel at head should be the  
as deep bed of river at that point  
carried away with a fall in



I have the honor to acknowledge  
Sir.

Your most obedient servant.

Signed / J. Spangman.

Assistant Engineer Gody.

(True copy)

I Enclose

By 142 State Collection  
in charge

Ms 11/13868

No 49.

Godavery

Sub Coll

21/3

Payab

23/3

From

The Acting Sub Coll

Godavery Dist

To

The Officer in Charge

No VI Range.

Samulattah.

Ms 11/13868

Sir

In reply to your letter  
of the 6th instant, I have the honor  
to inform you that I have issued orders  
to the Munsabdar of Rampur to report  
in question and request that you  
if the Munsabdar conforms to  
laid down in your letter under

I have the

Signed /

(True copy)

Enclose

By 142 State Collection



Richardson

Referring to the Correspondence noted in the Margin, I have the honor to state that the Munsabdar of Rampur asks that lines may be marked out where he may dig a channel to feed his tanks. The petition of the Munsabdar and its enclosures are herewith forwarded for your perusal and return. I request that you will let me know if you can have the lines



The enclosures of your letter are herewith  
returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

Signed/ J. P. Munnam.

Assistant Engineer G.D.

True Copy

Ednaise

in charge

Ms. No. 295 through  
Ms. No. 1154/73  
Ms. No. 1154/73  
Ms. No. 1154/73  
Ms. No. 1154/73

No. 125  
22<sup>nd</sup> July 1884  
Papanumy.

I From

21.3

The Sub Collector

Godavery District.

To

The Officer in charge

No. 6 Range.

Samul Cotta.

Sir

in forwarding the enclosed

I have the honor to request that

you will be good enough to inform me

if the statement therein made that

the Tanks of Yessampalem and two

other villages in the Rampa Munsifdar's

Estate have received no supply of

water and that water cannot flow

from Puttanamidi-doddi. Amak



three tanks is true.

Signed J. G. Hornefall

By Sub Collector

True Copy

J. G. Hornefall  
Sub Collector

No 253

XII Range Office

Samuelcottah

16<sup>th</sup> September  
1873

323

From

J. G. Hornefall Esqre  
Asst Engineer

To

J. G. Hornefall Esqre  
Sub Collector Godavery

I have the honor to request  
you will be good enough to return  
me this office letter No 519 dated  
31<sup>st</sup> August 1870 as I find on  
further enquiry that the statements  
therein made are not quite correct.  
There is a channel above the  
Pottamamede Doory anicut  
by which water can and has  
hitherto been supplied to the  
Rampa Moonsubdar's tank. This  
channel also supplies some  
Government



government Tanks. Whether the  
channel requires to be repaired or  
not, I do not know. Since I  
wrote the above letter, the Rampha  
Moonsubdar's upper tank has  
received a supply. There has  
been as yet but very little water  
in the Kottapilly River and it  
is only the upper or Kottapilly  
Tanks that have up to the present  
received any water. - the Government  
Tanks lower down have received  
no supply and the land holders  
under them have more reason to  
complain than the Moonsubdar.

I have the honor to be  
Sir  
your most obedt servt

(Signed) J. Hannan

Asst Engineer

No 6 Range Godavari  
District

J. G. Horsfall  
Sub Collector

No 161

35 3

To J. Hannan Esquire  
Asst Engineer  
No 6 Range

21<sup>st</sup> September 1870  
Coacanada

Subject.

your letter No 253 of the 16<sup>th</sup>  
Instant.

Returns the letter No 219 of  
the 31<sup>st</sup> ultimo as requested  
in the letter above referred to.

(Signed) J. G. Horsfall  
Ag Sub Collector

(True Copy)

J. G. Horsfall  
Sub Collector



Gokhavanur.

No. 5 in 1868 20th February 1871.

From 37.3

The Sub Collector  
Godavari District.

To The Officer in charge  
No 6 Range. Samalkotta.

Sir  
I have the honor to forward  
herewith a petition received from  
the Munsabdar of Pampa regarding  
the supply channel to his tanks from  
the Bimada Talava. You will remember  
that the Munsabdar had unauthorizedly  
run a bund across the Talava  
and diverted the whole of the water  
to his lands and that this bund was  
cut by you in 1868 and the Munsabdar  
was further prohibited by me from



raising any such fund in future.

He now complains that he can get no water at all, and though this is an exaggerated statement of the case,

I am satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel is quite insufficient to supply the

Mumbar with the required quantity of water. <sup>while</sup> what at present the lands

of Cottapalle and other Government villages are also irrigated from this channel. I beg therefore that you will have the channel deepened and widened as early as possible.

I believe the Mumbar is ready to have the necessary work executed at his own expense, and see no objection to his doing so under such restrictions and supervision

39 F  
as you may deem necessary.

In any case the work should be completed before the ensuing rains commence.

Signed / J. S. Horsfall  
By Sub Collector

(True Copy)

J. S. Horsfall  
Sub Collector



No 39

H. G. Rajahmundry.

2<sup>nd</sup> May 1871

From

The Ag. Sub Collector  
Godavery District

To

The Officer  
in charge No 11 Range  
Samulcotta.

Sir

In forwarding herewith  
a petition presented by the  
Munsabdar of Rampa Country  
regarding a supply channel  
to his tanks from the P. H. the  
palli channel, I have the  
honor to request that you will  
be good enough to send me  
an early answer to Mr. Horsfall's  
letter



letter no 5 dated 20<sup>th</sup> February  
last.

(Signed) J. D. B. Gribble  
Ag Sub Collector

(True Copy)

J. G. Horsfall  
Sub Collector

No 43

No VI Range Office  
Godavery District  
Samulettah  
6<sup>th</sup> May 1871

From The Assistant Engineer  
No 6 Range Godavery  
District

To The Ag Sub Collector  
Godavery District

Sir,

In reply to your letter no 39  
dated 2<sup>d</sup> Instant, I have the  
honor to state that I see no  
objection to the Rumpu Moonsab-  
dar's deepening and widening the  
channel in question at his own  
cost as proposed by Mr. Horsfall  
in his letter no 5 dated 20<sup>th</sup>  
February last. In my opinion the



the width of the channel should not exceed 5 yards. The bed of channel at head should be the same level as deep bed of river at that point and be carried away with a fall not extending 1 foot per mile.

I have the honor to be  
Sir

your most obed<sup>t</sup> servant.

(Signed) J. Hannan  
Asst Engineer Godavery

(True Copy)

J. S. Simola  
Sub Collector

453  
No 49  
23<sup>rd</sup> May 1871  
Rajahmundry.

From

The Sub Collector  
Godavery District

To

The Officer in Charge  
No VI Range  
Samulcottah.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No 43 dated 6<sup>th</sup> Instant, I have the honor to inform you that I have issued orders permitting the Mansabdar of Rumpfa to repair the channel in question; and request that



1871 to the Munsabdar and  
to an order on the same subject  
issued by Mr. Horsfall.

2 It appears that permission  
to widen a certain Government  
channel and to make use of it  
was granted to the Munsabdar  
when a bar constructed by him  
across the river at Kottapally  
was removed by Mr. Horsfall  
and the Range Officer, but  
that the Kottapally Villagers  
object and that another and  
longer line is now proposed.  
I am of opinion that the  
promises made to the Munsabdar  
should be kept if possible  
and that he should be aided  
in widening the Kottapally  
channel

49.8  
Channel. He is ready if ne-  
cessary to pay Compensation  
for any land required in Ko-  
ttapilly for that purpose and  
I see no reason to think that the  
widening of the channel will  
injure the Kottapally lands in  
any appreciable degree: of course  
the Munsabdar must under-  
stand that the Kottapally  
people have the first right  
to the water and that his  
right will only commence when  
their wants have been satisfied.  
I request you will be so good  
as to let me know if you find  
such objections to the plan  
proposed as would in your  
opinion justify the withdrawal  
of



of the permission already  
granted to him to which he  
now seems to me to have a good  
claim.

(Signed) A. J. Stuart  
Ag Sub Collector

(True Copy)

J. S. Ansfale  
Sub Collector.

519  
Copy of ~~the~~ verbal instructions  
of the Range Officer.

The channel which is to be  
marked out for the Rumpu  
Mantabdar is to branch off  
from Kottapally river north of  
Puttamamidi duddy anicut, and  
is to run along the boundary of  
Kottapally lands and to cross  
the Jaggampetta Road about  
 $\frac{3}{4}$  mile east of Puttamamidi  
duddy anicut and to terminate  
at the head of feeding channel  
which supply Drampalem Tank.

Kottapally } (True copy)  
26<sup>th</sup> November }

D. W. Spencer  
Taluk Officer.

(True copy) (True copy)  
J. S. Ansfale (Signed) A. J. Stuart  
Sub Collector Ag Sub Collector



No 312

No 6 Range Office  
Samuelcotta.

529 13<sup>th</sup> December 1871

From The Assistant Engineer  
in charge No 6 Range Godavery

To The Ag Sub Collector  
Godavery District.

Sir,  
In reply to your letter No 148  
dated 1<sup>st</sup> Instant I have the  
honor to inform you that I consider  
it objectionable to allow the Pumper  
Moonsubdar to deepen and widen  
the channel in question which  
passes through the Kottapilly  
lands, this channel from its  
head until it leaves their lands  
is the property of the Kottapilly  
Ryots; the Moonsubdar is only  
entitled



entitled to the water that drains  
off their lands into his own channel  
lower down. The object of the  
Mansubdar in asking to be  
allowed to deepen and widen  
the above channel is of course,  
to drain off more water. The  
question then is, will this injure  
the Kottapilly lands, the Ryots  
say it will and that the Moun-  
subdar already gets all the water  
they can spare which is all he  
is entitled to.

I have the honor to be  
Sir

your Most Obedt<sup>t</sup> St<sup>t</sup>  
(Signed) J. Hannan

Asst. Engineer  
(True Copy)

J. S. Annala  
Sub Collector.

1. Sub Collector's Letter Nos 548/148

of the 20th February and 1st December 1871

respectively.

2. Your replies Nos 4383/12 of the 6th May

and 13th December respectively.

101

10-8-72

See answer

55.9

From

The Sub Collector  
Godavari District.

To

The Officer in charge  
P. B. Range.

Sir,

Referring to the correspondence  
noted in the margin, I have the  
honor to state that the Munsubdar  
of Pampa asks that lines may be marked  
out where he may dig a channel to  
feed his tanks. The petition of the  
Munsubdar and its enclosures are here  
with forwarded for your perusal  
and return, and I request that you  
will let me know if you can have



lines asked for, marked out.

0-8-72

(Signed) A. J. Stuart.  
H. Sub Collector.

(True Copy)

J. G. Ansford  
Sub Collector.

No. 6 Range Office G.D.

No. 206

Samuelotta

17<sup>th</sup> August 1872

From

The Assistant Engineer  
in charge No. 6 Range G.D.

To  
The Acting Sub Collector  
of Godavari District

Sir

With reference to your letter of the  
10<sup>th</sup> instant No. 101. I have the

157.9  
101.1  
to inform you that I cannot mark out  
the channel asked for by the Rampa  
Munsubdar, unless directed to do so  
by the Superintending Engineer who has  
already instructed me not to do so.

The channel, if dug, will deprive good  
lands of water and may throw them out  
of cultivation. The enclosures of your  
letter are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir



Your most obedient servant

(Signed)

J. Hannon.

Assistant Engineer

(True Copy)

S. S. Hoffman

Sub Collector

1874. In a letter from the  
Collector Godavari  
District.

To the Secretary to the  
Board of Revenue  
Chennai

Dated 31<sup>st</sup> Jan'y/74

Received

N<sup>o</sup> 21.

Encl. No 6/74

Copies of copies

- of documents referred

to in the Sub Collector's

letter.

Rev. 1154/74

P. W. 2996/74.

Pl. 75 May 7/74

En 13 N<sup>o</sup> 73.

No 73

59

To Malleyala Venkayya gar

Tanadar Surma Kuchya  
on behalf of the Tanadar  
dar of Rampah Estate

In reply to your letter of  
12<sup>th</sup> Instant, I have to state as  
follows.

The authority for settling  
the irrigation affairs (disputes)  
is vested in the Range officers  
of the Public Works Department; but,  
neither the Collector nor the Tanadar  
has any such authority. The documents  
executed by them (or orders  
issued by them) for the purpose  
have therefore been destroyed.

Office of the 6<sup>th</sup> Range (Sd) J. Hannon  
Camp Samantata Assistant Engineer  
19<sup>th</sup> August 1869. To VI Range. Godavari

(True Translation)

W. Foster  
Ag, Collector



Godavery District  
Subcollector's Office  
Rajahmundry  
19 May 1873.

No 173

From

E. L. Pearce Esquire  
Agent & Asst. District  
Collector in Charge.

To

H. S. Foster Esquire  
Agent Collector

Sir

I have the honor to forward here-  
under for your perusal copies of  
correspondence which took place  
between this office and the Depart-  
ment of Public Works on the subject  
of the Pampa Munsifdar being  
allowed to repair an old channel  
from the Burada Calwa, a hill  
stream situated in the Rajahmundry  
dy Saluk near the village of Kottapalli  
and request your instructions on the  
subject. The above Burada Calwa  
takes its rise from the mountains  
in the Pampa Country. The irrigation  
tanks of Gerrampalem, Dentapalli  
and Inlankapalli villages belong-  
ing to the Munsifdar and those  
of Kottapalli, Kapavaram, Sree-  
rangapatnam &c Government villages  
are

Enclosed

From

The Agent Collector

of Godavery District

to the Agent Collector

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division

of the Pampa

Revenue Division

of the Rajahmundry

Division



are dependant on this channel for supply of water.

3 In 1868 the Munsabdar of Rampur ran a high bund of permanent nature across the said Calwa so as to take all the water to his tanks. The Deputy Tahsil dar reported that the putting of this bund was unusual and improper as all the water would be diverted to the tanks of the Munsabdar while the Tahsil dar reported that the putting of the bund would not cause loss to the Government villages, where upon Mr Horsfall the late Subcollector and Mr Hauman the Range Officer inspected the channel and the bund, and were of opinion that the bund had been improperly raised. The bund was destroyed by them. Mr Horsfall directed the Munsabdar to take water to his tanks through an existing supply channel, by which certain lands of Kottapally village are watered and which commences from

from the river a little above the Putta  
Inamidoddi ancient one  
62 of the ancient across the river.  
4 The Munsabdar having complained that he could get no water at all through the supply channel in question Mr Horsfall states in his letter to Mr Hauman No 5 dated 20 February 1871, that he was satisfied from personal inspection that the existing channel was quite insufficient to supply the Munsabdar with the required quantity of water, whilst the lands of Kottapally and other government villages were also irrigated from that channel and requested him to have the channel deepened and widened. In reply to this Mr Hauman in his letter No 43 dated 6 May 1871 declared that he had no objection to the Munsabdar's deepening and widening the channel as proposed by Mr Horsfall with certain restrictions as to the depth & breadth of



of the Channel and fall of water  
Mr Gribble permitted the Munsabdar  
to repair the Channel in question  
subject to the Conditions proposed  
by the Range Officer, and requested  
Mr Humeau to see if the Munsabdar  
conformed to the Conditions laid  
down by him. Then the Munsab-  
dar requested Mr Gribble to  
have the line of the Channel  
marked out by the Department  
Public Works and was in reply  
directed to apply to the Range  
Officer himself. He also  
petitioned the Superintending  
Engineer to have the Channel  
repaired by the Department  
Public Works agreeing to bear  
all costs himself and was informed  
by that officer that instructions  
had been sent to the Range Officer  
to order the overseer to carry out  
the repairs.

5 When Mr Stuart was at  
Kottapalli last year, the Munsabdar's  
Son

159  
Son produced before him an order  
from the overseer. Finding its  
purport to be at variance with  
the Quaiyatnamas issued to the  
Munsabdar by the Superintending  
Engineer and Inspector of fall and  
Gribble he wrote a letter to Mr  
Humeau on the 1st December  
1891 stating that when the bund  
constructed by the Munsabdar  
was removed, permission was  
granted to him to widen the said  
Channel near Puttanamudidodi  
Aricut and that this promise  
should be kept if possible.  
He further stated that the  
Munsabdar was ready to  
pay compensation for any land  
required in Kottapalli for the  
purpose, that there was no reason  
to think that the widening of the  
Channel would injure the Kottapalli  
lands in any appreciable degree  
and that the Munsabdar would  
he



he instructed under stand  
that his right to the water <sup>lands</sup>  
only commence after the want  
of Kattapally people was  
satisfied. The Range officer re-  
plied on the 13<sup>d</sup> of that month  
that as the channel passes through  
the Kattapalli lands, it is from  
its head until it leaves Kattapalli  
lands, the property of the Kattapally  
Ryots and <sup>that</sup> the Munsabdar is only  
entitled to the water that drains  
off Kattapalli lands into his  
own channel lower down. His  
officer expressed the same opinion  
to the Superintending Engineer in  
reply to his letter directing him  
to have the channel repaired by  
the Overseer. The translation of  
Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending  
Engineer  
6. The Munsabdar having again  
applied to this office, Mr Smart,

57.9  
wrote to Mr Hannan on the  
10<sup>d</sup> August last requesting him  
to have the hies of the channel  
asked for, by the Munsabdar,  
marked out, and was in answer  
informed that he could not  
mark out the channel unless  
directed to do so by the Superin-  
tending Engineer who had  
already instructed him not to  
do so.  
7. The question is whether  
the Munsabdar is entitled only  
to water drained off Kattapally  
lands or to the water of the main  
river carried through an irrigation  
channel. The Munsabdar says  
that he is entitled to half the  
water brought down by the  
channel formerly supplied by  
the land purchased by the Range officer.  
He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the  
main supply of which he states  
to be



he instructed <sup>understand</sup> that his right to the water <sup>lands</sup> only commence after the want of <sup>the</sup> Kattapally people was satisfied. The Range officer replied on the 13<sup>d</sup> of that month that as the channel passes through the Kattapalli lands, it is from its head until it leaves Kattapalli lands, the property of the Kattapally Ryots and <sup>that</sup> the Munsahdar is only entitled to the water that drains off Kattapalli lands into his own channel lower down. His officer expressed the same opinion to the Superintending Engineer in reply to his letter directing him to have the channel repaired by the Overseer. Vide translation of Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending Engineer.

6. The Munsahdar having again applied to this office, Mr Smart,

67.9  
wrote to Mr Hannan on the 10<sup>d</sup> August last requesting him to have the lines of the channel asked for, by the Munsahdar, marked out, and was in answer, informed that he could not mark out the channel unless directed to do so by the Superintending Engineer who had already instructed him not to do so.

7. The question is whether the Munsahdar is entitled only to water drained off Kattapalli lands or to the water of the main river carried through an irrigation channel. The Munsahdar says that he is entitled to half the water brought down by the channel formerly supplied by the land purchased by the Range officer. He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the main supply of which he states to be



he instructed under that  
that his right to the water <sup>land</sup>  
only commence after the want  
of Kattapally people was  
satisfied. The Range officer re-  
plied on the 13<sup>d</sup> of that month  
that as the channel passes through  
the Kattapalli lands, it is from  
its head until it leaves Kattapalli  
lands, the property of the Kattapalli  
Ryots and <sup>that</sup> the Munsabdar is only  
entitled to the water that drains  
off Kattapalli lands into his  
own channel lower down. His  
officer expressed the same opinion  
to the Superintending Engineer in  
reply to his letter directing him  
to have the channel repaired by  
the Overseeer. Vide translation of  
Mr Hannan's letter to the Superintending  
Engineer  
6. The Munsabdar having again  
applied to this office, Mr. Smart,

67.9  
wrote to Mr Hannan on the  
10<sup>th</sup> August last requesting him  
to have the lines of the channel  
asked for, by the Munsabdar,  
marked out, and was in answer  
informed that he could not  
mark out the channel unless  
directed to do so by the Superin-  
tending Engineer who had  
already instructed him not to  
do so.

7. The question is whether  
the Munsabdar is entitled only  
to water drained off Kattapalli  
lands or to the water of the main  
river carried through an irrigation  
channel. The Munsabdar says  
that he is entitled to half the  
water brought down by the  
channel formerly supplied by  
the land removed by the Range officer.  
He has 10 tanks in 3 villages, the  
main supply of which he states  
to be



This land so large and strong  
as to turn all the water brought  
upon himself, a prohibition  
from Mr Horsfall which was  
more sweeping than right to  
have been. Mr Stuart thinks  
that the Public Works Department  
should abide by the terms  
then promised to the Munsheer  
by way of compensation for  
the loss of the right to make  
a dam at this point and should  
assist him in any way they can  
to widen the Kattapally channel  
as he proposes to do.

I have seen

(Signed) E. L. Pearce  
Asst. District Collector  
in charge.

(True Copy)

W. Foster  
Asst. Collector



Nº 5 Range Office  
Samuelcotta  
23<sup>rd</sup> September 1873.

Nº 383.

729

From

The officer in charge

To

Nº 5 Range, Godavery District

The District Engineer

Godavery District.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter Nº 1918 of 18<sup>th</sup> Instant and the enclosures as per 13<sup>th</sup> Pro: 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> margin which accompanied it, and in reply beg to state that the Rampa Moonisda's tank can be supplied with water by a channel dug from the Kottapilly river, above the Pota-mamedoddee anicut. The interests of the Kottapilly ryots as well as of the ryots of half a dozen other villages will of course suffer in consequence especially in bad seasons like the present when the water brought down by this river is insufficient for the wants of those villages which have an established right to it. 2. With reference to the proceedings which

144. 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1874  
In H. 10:73.

Mailler

From the AG Collector  
of Godavery  
District

To the Secretary to  
the Board of Revenue  
Madras

Re No 22248/1873

No 214 7

Rev. 1154/74

Copy of the

Agenda for the

letter & copies

of correspondence

which accompany  
it. D. 11/11/73  
J. H. 2998/74



Nº 5 Range Office

Nº 383.

Samuel Cotta

23<sup>rd</sup> September 1873.

From

The officer in charge

To

Nº 5 Range, Godavery District.

The District Engineer

Godavery District.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter Nº 1918 of 18<sup>th</sup> Instant and the enclosures as per B. Pro. 1<sup>st</sup> class letter margin which accompanied it, and in reply beg to state that the Rampa Moosapada's tanks can be supplied with water by a channel dug from the Kottapilly river, above the Pota named ~~odde~~ amicut. The interests of the Kottapilly ryots as well as of the ryots of half a dozen other villages will of course suffer in consequence especially in bad seasons like the present when the water brought down by this river is insufficient for the wants of those villages which have an established right to it. 2. With reference to the proceedings which

Shall be

From the Collector

of Godavery District

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue

Madras

Dated 22<sup>nd</sup> Sept 1873

To 2/4

Rev. 11/54/74

Copies of the

letter & copies

of correspondence

which accompany

it. 2/4/74

M. 2/5 Aug 1/74  
L. 13/10/73.



which accompanied your Memoirs? Foster  
in his letter to the Board of Revenue  
states that the Moonsifdar was in  
the habit of throwing a ~~small~~ <sup>large</sup> ~~land~~ <sup>land</sup>  
across the Kottapilly river, this is  
incorrect. Since the Amicus were  
built some 15 years ago no land  
have been put up across the river.  
It was only in 1858 that <sup>with</sup> the permission  
of the Revenue authorities the Zamindar  
threw up a land some 5 or 6  
yards high and diverted the entire  
stream into his Estate. Immediately  
I heard that he had done so, I pro-  
ceeded to the spot and had the  
land removed this land not only  
cut off the water supply from some  
six or eight Gove ~~summit~~ <sup>summit</sup> villages but  
seriously endangered the safety of  
two of the masonry Amicus below  
it. While engaged in removing the land  
the Rampa Moonsifdar's ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~keel~~ <sup>keel</sup> prevented  
himself and was exceedingly imperti-  
nent and defied me to remove it he  
at the same time produced a ~~telugu~~ <sup>telugu</sup>  
letter which he said was a permission  
from

753  
from the Tabildar to put up the land,  
I then informed him that neither the  
Tabildar nor the Collector had any  
authority to interfere with irrigation  
works under my charge and without  
any reference whatever to me, and  
that I did not mean to see the Tab-  
ildar's permission as he persisted  
however on my taking the letter although  
I had several times refused to do so  
being considerably provoked I at  
last took it from him tore it in two  
and handed it back. The Moonsifdar  
wrote to me some time afterwards  
to know why I destroyed this docu-  
ment and the original letter forward-  
ed with your Memoirs under reply was  
my answer, a translation of which  
Mr. Foster sent to Board of Revenue.  
I am unable to state whether it was  
a correct one or not as it was not  
sent to me. I beg to express my regret  
for having torn the document in  
question the circumstances under  
which I did so will I trust be  
considered



which accompanied your Memoirs Foster  
in his letter to the Board of Revenue  
states that the Munsifdar was in  
the habit of throwing a mud bund  
across the Kottapilly river, this is  
incorrect. Since the Amicus was  
built some 15 years ago no bunds  
have been put up across the river.  
It was only in 1868 that <sup>with</sup> the permission  
of the Revenue authorities the Zamindar  
threw up a bund some 5 or 6  
yards high and diverted the entire  
stream into his Estate. Immediately  
I heard that he had done so, I pro-  
ceeded to the spot and had the  
bund removed this bund not only  
cut off the water supply from some  
six or eight Gousamuch nullages but  
seriously endangered the safety of  
two of the masonry Amicus below  
it. While engaged in removing the bund  
the Pampa Munsifdar's Vaheel presented  
himself and was exceedingly importu-  
nent and defied me to remove it he  
at the same time produced a telegram  
letter which he said was a permission  
from

158  
from the Zabiidar to put up the bund,  
I then informed him that neither the  
Zabiidar nor the Collector had any  
authority to interfere with irrigation  
works under my charge and without  
any reference whatever to me, and  
that I did not want to see the Zab-  
-sildar's permission as he persisted  
however on my taking the letter although  
I had several times refused to do so  
being considerably provoked I at  
last took it from him tore it in two  
and handed it back. The Munsifdar  
wrote to me some time afterwards  
to know why I destroyed this docu-  
-ment and the original letter forward-  
-ed with your Memoirs under reply was  
my answer a translation of which  
Mr. Foster sent to Board of Revenue.  
I am unable to state whether it was  
a correct one or not as it was not  
sent to me. I beg to express my regret  
for having torn the document in  
question the circumstances under  
which I did so will I trust be  
considered



considered some expense.

3. In para 8 of Mr. Pearce's letter in the proceeding under reference it is stated that Mr. Hovefall and myself gave the Moonsifdar permission when the bund was removed to take water through a side channel dug from the main channel this is incorrect as far as I am concerned I gave no permission and had no authority to do so. In the same para it is stated that "Mr. Stuart thinks that the D.P.W. should abide by the terms then promised to the Moonsifdar, by way of compensation for the loss of the right to make a Dam." I beg to state that the D.P.W. promise no terms whatever, and further that the Moonsifdar never had any right to make a dam and that the only dam he put up was immediately removed. It is true that in my letter #43 of 6 May 1871 in answer to Mr. Hovefall's letter #5 dated 20 February 1871 I stated that I saw no objection to the Moonsifdar's deepening

deepening and widening a certain channel but on inspecting it and from enquiry I afterwards ascertained that there were very considerable objections to so doing and reported them accordingly to you.

I have the honor of the  
Sir

Yours most obedient servant

[Signed] J. Hammond

Assistant Engineer

[True Copy]

[Signed] J. H. Fisher Esq. Col. R.E.

District Engineer

[True Copy]

W. S. Foster

Collector



No 2099.

79.3

Godaverry District  
District Engineer's Office  
Daukharum 7 October 1873

From

The District Engineer

Godaverry District

To  
The Collector of Godaverry  
Sir,

Encls. 3.

1 Copy of the 13th

Pro. No 1591

dated 16 Aug 1873.

1 Telugu letter

1 Copy of letter from

Mr. Hannan

No 383 dated

23 Sept 1873

3

Adverting to your letter of the 11<sup>th</sup> September 1873 No 129, I have the honor to return the document sent to me together with the copy of Mr. Hannan's explanations.

2 As Mr. Hannan with Mr. Howfall acted in perfect good faith for the preservation of Government rights, and Mr. Hannan tenders an apology for having in the excitement of the moment, torn up some document presented to him, I trust the Board will be satisfied so far as this complaint is concerned.

3 It was fortunate that Mr. Hannan did remove the Dam at once as there was such a flood in the river all the Muncabdar's tanks would have been breached and considerable damage done to many villages in the neighbourhood.

4. As regards myself, I personally showed the Muncabdar's Vakeel the line he proposed to take could not be allowed as it destroyed some valuable wet cultivation, and pointed out another

1874. 10th Oct

In a letter from the

Collector Godaverry

to the District Engineer

re: the 13th Pro.

No 1591 dated 16 Aug 1873.

1 Telugu letter

1 Copy of letter from

Mr. Hannan

No 383 dated

23 Sept 1873

3

Copy of the 13th

Pro. No 1591

dated 16 Aug 1873.

1 Telugu letter

1 Copy of letter from

Mr. Hannan

No 383 dated

23 Sept 1873

3

Copy of the 13th



line which could be cut without  
doing any damage, this they are  
determined not to take as these Zemindars  
appear to consider that the destruction  
of their neighbours property enhances  
the value of their own.

5. With reference to Part of the  
Benares' Panchajanya No. 1591 dated 16<sup>th</sup> August  
1873, I would advise a survey of the  
locality being made to let them see what  
is proposed to be done, and this I could  
get done for a small sum if placed at  
my disposal; as to promises I do not recollect  
ever giving any and before any stress  
was laid on the assertions of these people,  
they should be called upon to produce  
written documents to the purpose.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant.

(Signed) Jno. F. Fisher Esq. M.A.

District Engineer Patna

(True Copy)

W. S. Foster

Ag. Collector

his supply through one channel or  
another is a matter of indiffe-  
rence so long as the interests of

87.9 Government are not neglected. I  
trust therefore that arrangements  
may be made at once for affording  
him a fair supply of water and  
that the necessary work may be  
completed this year before the  
commencement of the rains.

I have &c &c

/Signed/ J. G. Hoarefall  
Sd/- J. G. Hoarefall

/True Copy/

W. S. Foster

Ag. Collector.



To

Shir

S. M. 2996/74



-apprehension as to the history of  
the case briefly to reiterate the facts.  
In 1868 the Deputy Tahsildar re-  
-ported that the Munsuldar had  
improperly raised a bund across  
the Barada Calua and thereby di-  
-rupted the entire supply of water  
to his own tank depriving numerous  
Government villages of the supply  
to which they were entitled. Petitions  
of Complaint were received from the  
ryots of Government villages and  
enquiry made through the Tahsildar,  
and finally being dissatisfied with  
the different and contradictory  
reports I had received, I personally  
proceeded to the spot and inspected  
the Barada Calua for miles both  
above and below where the bund  
had been placed, and after careful  
enquiry arrived at the conclusion  
that the Munsuldar had no right  
whichever to erect the bund in  
question and that its erection had  
seriously affected the Government  
villages which depend upon the Barada  
Calua

Is not  
this  
the  
promise  
YB

85.3 Calua for their supply of water.  
3. Before I arrived however  
Mr. Hamman had cut the bund,  
I approved of what he had done  
and to shade its recreation by the  
Munsuldar directing him in future  
to take water to his villages as  
heretofore from <sup>a</sup>the channel taking  
off from the Barada Calua above  
the Putta Maundi ancient.  
4. I declined altogether to recognize  
the authority of the overseer to  
grant permission to the Munsuldar  
to erect a bund across the Barada  
Calua, as I did not think that  
an overseer had power to issue  
such an order, when the interests  
of Government are materially af-  
-fected thereby. I also rejected the  
so called Panchayat decision which  
had never been accepted by the  
Collector under whose orders the  
Panchayat was convened, and as  
an agreement between certain ryots  
of one Government village and  
the



the Munsabdar, could not be allowed to injuriously affect other Government villages.

5. The question there in dispute and the only one decided by me was whether or not the Munsabdar was entitled to erect a substantial bund across the Barada Canal whenever he chose and thereby deprive certain Government villages of their fair supply of water, and this I decided against him, issuing a prohibition which I submit was imperatively called for and by no means "more sweeping than it ought to have been."

6. It was never contended before me that the Munsabdar had no claim to a supply of water for his tanks and it is only recently and subsequent to my departure from the District that such a theory has been advanced by the officers of the Public Works Department whether or not he gets his



Revenue Department.

Memo. for Order.

89 9

Pro. Board of Revenue, bringing  
to notice of Govt. conduct of Range  
Chief Mr. Hammar in tearing up  
an order issued by the Tahsildar  
the subject of the water supply  
from Bhuradaculoo in Godavary

(H.E. 24 March 1874 N. 665)

The Board have sent up all the correspondence about this matter, but it does not seem that any orders are required on the question of the Tahsildar's right to water. The conclusion to be determined is the grant which they have come in and to reply it - or paragraph 4 of their Proceeding No. 665 seems all that is required. The Board have

1874 M.C. I  
In a letter from the  
Collector of Godavary to  
the Secretary to the  
Board of Revenue  
Dated 31 Jan'y 1874  
Recd  
No 21

Copy of the Resolution  
Engineers' & the  
the Collector  
Dated 11/5/74  
J. M. 2996/74  
Dated 13/5/74  
Dated 13/5/74



is necessary. Perhaps the Government will express concurrence in the view which they have taken.

The point on which precise orders are wanted is that summarized in paragraph 5 of their Proceedings above mentioned.

C.H.

to Mr. Hannan  
I should be trans-

-ferred to the DM.

He should I think  
be sent out of the  
District at once.

He seems to me to  
out that he took  
up the Sahib's  
letter in a moment  
of irritation. But

it will be seen  
that he wrote &  
let the members  
that the R. & A.

-The writer had no  
jurisdiction in the  
matter & therefore  
there can be no

had been destroyed!

His tact in reim-  
ster that the Colon  
may have forwarded  
an incorrect trans-  
lation of this letter  
is an aggravation of  
his conduct. Col  
Fisher is to blame  
for not having rebuked  
him in his private  
his press & counter  
impertinence.

I think transfer  
to him the District  
is the lightest & best  
remedy that can  
be made - but I  
-for he will, he can  
I do not know whether  
Mr. Hannan is a good

91.3  
officer & has done  
good work.

L. P.  
25/4.

James  
5/4. M.B.



PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 5<sup>th</sup> May 1874.

READ the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Regarding claims of the  
sub-dar of Rampah and  
Kottapally ryots to water-  
supply from Buradacube  
in Godavary District, and  
order of Range Officer No. 1.

G. O. No. 24<sup>th</sup> March 1874, No. 665.

The Mansub-dar is  
clearly entitled to water,  
and measures should be  
adopted at once to deter-  
mine the quantity, and  
supply it or enable him  
to procure it.

The subject of para-  
graph 5 will be con-  
sidered in the Public  
Works



Works Department.

QML

14 To the W of Rm 210 May 17/4  
21. Public Works Dept. —



ages 32  
16-2-1966  
Referencer the

OFFICE

LADRAS

EPARTMENT

Press  
Mis.  
74.  
6.

led

13-75

76



(1) Number of Pages 32  
(2) Date of repair 16-2-1966  
(3) Initials of the Referencer AK

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

|          |      |                 |
|----------|------|-----------------|
| G.O. No. |      | Press           |
| B.P. No. | 555  | <del>Mis.</del> |
| Dated    | 5-5- | 1874<br>196     |

Not to be folded or roughly handled