

(1) Number of Pages 24
(2) Date of repair 18-8-67
(3) Initials of the Referencer S.S.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>77</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.

Dated 14-1-1875 196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 161. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th December 1874, No. 3,517, Forest No. 232:—

Read the following letter from C. T. LONGLEY, Esq., Collector of Salem, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th November 1874, No. 422:—

WITH reference to the G. O., dated 29th May 1874, No. 548, Forest No. 9, Board's Miscellaneous No. 3,572, dated 12th June 1873, I have the honor to report that on receiving information that the Puttaghar of the Chinna Kulroyen Jaghire had been clandestinely taken to Madras by Subramania Chetty and Kristna Chetty of Yethapur in order to effect the registry of a Deed obtained by them from the Puttaghar leasing the Jaghire to him for 50 years for the paltry sum of Rupees 10,000, I at once adopted measures by which the Puttaghar, who has for so many years been concealing himself at the instigation of these Chetties, was traced and brought to Salem on a warrant which was issued in a criminal case some three years back.

2. The Puttaghar appeared before me and stated that he would readily lease the Jaghire to Government, as his neighbour the Peria Kulroyen had done, rather than to the rapacious Chetty, who, he knew, was cheating him. I offered Rupees 2,000 a year, which he accepted and executed a Deed of permanent lease, a translation of which is enclosed for the Board's information. He also selected three villages containing about ninety acres, which he is to have rent-free for his home-farm in the same manner as the Peria Kulroyen Puttaghar. Considering that the forests of the Chinna Kulroyen are more valuable than those of the Peria Kulroyen, the sum offered is, I consider, fair both to Government and to the Puttaghar, and I trust that the Board will be pleased to ratify my proceedings in the matter.

3. The forests of the Chinna Kulroyen are, as the Board are aware, under lease for twenty years to one Subramania Chetty for the nominal sum of Rupees 1,000, which is alleged to have been paid by the Chetty to the Puttaghar. The latter, in a statement which he made before me, states that he simply signed the deed of lease, as he was told to do so by the Chetty, and that he received *no consideration whatever for it*. I have sent for the Chetty and shall endeavour to obtain the surrender by him of the lease to Government.

4. I should add that three of the villages belonging to the Jaghire have been advertized by the District Munsif of Salem for sale at the instance of one Moothoosami Chetty, in satisfaction of a debt which the Puttaghar is alleged to have contracted. I have instructed the Government Vakil to appear before the District Munsif and object to the sale of the villages, on the ground that the Jaghire is a rent-free Inam and, as such, is not, under Regulation IV. of 1831, within the cognizance of any Civil Court without the previous written authority of Government. The Jaghire is an unenfranchised Inam, and the Puttaghar has no power of alienation whatever. The objection is therefore a valid one, and ought to be allowed by the Court.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th January 1875.*

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. In 1867 it was pronounced to be desirable to obtain leases from the Poligars of the Peria Kulroyen and Chinna Kulroyen, chiefly to secure unity of forest management. Two difficulties were found to exist: both the Poligars had leased out their forests to a contractor Kristnama Naidu, and the Poligar of the Chinna Kulroyen could not be got at. The Poligar of the Peria Kulroyen was ready to grant a lease from the first, but Government objected on account of the difficulty about the Chinna Kulroyen and the lease of the forests. Ultimately, however, Government consented to waive this objection, and in the end a lease was obtained for Rupees 1,500 a year and the forest contractor, whose lease had seventeen years to run, was immediately afterwards bought out for Rupees 5,600.

3. The Collector of Salem now reports that he has succeeded at last in communicating with the Chinna Kulroyen Poligar; that he has offered Rupees 2,000 a year for a lease of the estate, and that the offer has been accepted, subject to the condition that the Poligar retains three villages containing about ninety acres rent-free. A similar condition was allowed in the case of the Peria Kulroyen lease.

4. The Collector gives no information as to the probable receipts from the Chinna Kulroyen. The forests are said to be more valuable than those of the Peria Kulroyen, but the forest receipts in that estate were, in Fasli 1279, only Rupees 538, whilst the demand from land revenue and tree-tax was Rupees 2,078. Moreover, it is still uncertain whether the Lessee of the forests can be bought out. From a register prepared in the Inam Commissioner's Department when the enfranchisement of this Inam was under consideration, it appears that the average income from ploughs and hoes in 1871 was estimated at Rupees 1,513. Nevertheless, the Board think the agreement to pay Rupees 2,000 per annum should be sanctioned. The object is not so much to obtain possession of property as to check smuggling and prevent the forest contractor from using his position to cover illicit raids into the neighbouring forests of Government. Moreover, from paragraph 1 of Mr. Longley's letter, it appears that if Government do not get the lease, some one else probably will.

5. The present forest contractor is called Subramania Chetty. His lease is for twenty years. Nothing is said as to how many years of the lease have still to run, but as the previous contractor's lease came to a close in 1869, there must be at least fifteen. Mr. Longley has sent for the man and will try to get him to surrender the forest lease, but apparently knows nothing about the terms on which he will consent to do so. In December 1873, the Board were informed (demi-officially) by Mr. Price, who was then Acting as Collector of Salem, that the contractor demanded Rupees 18,000, and that the Deputy-Conservator of Forests valued the surrender at Rupees 8,000, and estimated the income which would be yielded by the forests at Rupees 700 a year now and more hereafter.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
14th January 1875.*

6. The objection to the sale of some of the Chinna Kulroyen villages under Decree of Court, which is adverted to in paragraph 4, should be put in, but the Act quoted should be the Pensions Act XXIII of 1871, not Regulation IV. of 1831, which has been repealed.

(A true Copy and Extract)

(Signed)

J. GROSE,

Secretary.

No. 162.

ORDER THEREON, 14th January 1875, No. 77.

Forests, No. 8.

THE Governor in Council approves of the action of the Collector in the matter of the lease obtained from the Poligar of Chinna Kulroyen and, as recommended by the Board, sanctions the annual payment of Rs. 2,000.

2. It is obviously necessary that the negotiation for buying out the contractor should be speedily set on foot. A further report on this subject is awaited.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

C. G. MASTER,

Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant-General.
„ the Inspector of Forests.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

A. 422.

From
S
The Collector of Salem
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Madras.

Sir;

With reference to the Government Order, dated 29 May 1873, No 549, House Number 9, Board Miscellaneous No 3572 dated 12 June 1873, I have the honor to report that, on receiving information that the Pottaghar of the Chinnna Pulrojan Jashire had been clandestinely taken to Madras by Subramanya Chetty and Krishna Chetty of Yithapur in order to effect the registry of a Deed obtained by them from the Pottaghar leasing the Jashire to him for 50 years for the paltry sum of ten thousand Rupees, I at once adopted measures by which the Pottaghar, who has for so

many years been concealing himself at the instigation of these chetties, was traced and brought to Salem on a warrant which was issued in a Criminal case some three years back.

2. The Puttaghar appeared before me and stated that he would readily lease the Jaghire to Government, as his neighbor the Peria Kubroyan had done rather than to the rapacious chetty, who, he knew, was cheating him. I offered 2,000 Rupees a year, which he accepted and executed a deed of permanent lease, a translation of which is enclosed for the Board's information. He has selected three villages containing about 90 acres, which he is to have rent free for his home farm in the same manner as the Peria Kubroyan Puttaghar. Considering that the forests of the Chinna Kubroyan are more valuable than those of the Peria Kubroyan, the sum offered is

I consider fair, both to Government and to the Puttaghar, and I trust that the Board will be pleased to ratify my Proceedings in the matter.

3. The Forests of the Chinna Kubroyan are, as the Board are aware, under lease for 20 years to one Subramania Chetty for the nominal sum of Rupees one thousand, which is alleged to have been paid by the Chetty to the Puttaghar. The latter, in a statement which he made before me, states that he simply signed the deed of lease, as he was told to do so by the Chetty, and that he received no consideration whatever for it. I have sent for the Chetty and shall endeavour to obtain the surrender by him of the lease to Government.

4. I should add that three of the villages belonging to the Jaghire have been advertised by the District Munsiff of Salem for sale at the instance of one

Kootthoosami

77/5

Moorthosami Chetty, in satisfaction of a debt which the Puttaghar is alleged to have contracted. I have instructed the Government Advocate to appear before the District Moonsiff and object to the sale of the Villages on the ground that the Jaghire is a rent-free Inam and, as such, is not, under Regulation IV of 1831, within the cognizance of any Civil Court, without the ^{written} previous authority of Government. The Jaghire is an unfranchised Inam, and the Puttaghar has no power of alienation whatever. The objection is, therefore, a valid one and ought to be allowed by the Court.

I have &c.
1827 C. J. Longley
Collector.

1 True Copy

J. G. G. G.
Secretary

C. J. Longley

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 4th December 1874

AP. 3517
7.42.232

Read letter from the Collector of Salem dated 12th November 1874, No. 422, requesting that Proceedings of Collector regarding certain acts in connection with the Chinna Pulayya Puttagar may be ratified.

Submitted for the orders of

Government.

In 1867 it was pronounced to be desirable to obtain leases from the Polygars of the Perea Taluq and Chinna Taluq, chiefly to secure unity of forest management. Two difficulties were found to exist: both the polygars had leased out their forests to a Contractor Krishnam as Naidu and the polygar of the Chinna Pulayya could

G.O. 14th Decr
1867. No. —
2977 —

Enclosed in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Dy. Secy to Govt Revenue Deptt, dated 4th December 1874.

AP. 4273/74

Copy of Collector's letter dated 12th Novr 74 No. 422 requesting that Proceedings of Collector regarding certain acts in connection with the Chinna Pulayya Puttagar may be ratified.

could not be got at. The Polygar of the
Peria Kalroyen was ready to grant a lease
from the first, but Government objected
on account of the difficulty about the
Chinna Kalroyen and the lease of the
forests. Ultimately, however, Government
consented to waive this objection, and, in
the end, a lease was obtained for Rs.
1500 a year and the forest Contractor
whose lease had 17 years to run was
immediately afterwards bought out for
Rupees 5600.

The Collector of Salem now reports
that he has succeeded at last in com-
municating with the Chinna Kalroyen
polygar, that he has offered Rs. 2000
a year for a lease of the estate, and that
the offer has been accepted, subject
to the condition that the polygar
owns 3 villages containing about 90 acres
rent

G. O. 14th
August 1868
No. 2166--

G. O. 11th Nov.
1868 No. 2821.

G. O. 10th
November 1869
No. 2942--

G. O. 31st
August 1871
No. 1488.

22
rent free. A similar condition was allowed
in the case of the Peria Kalroyen lease.
The Collector gives no information
as to the probable receipts from the
Chinna Kalroyen. The forests are said
to be more valuable than those of
the Peria Kalroyen, but the forest
receipts in that estate were in 1871
1279 only Rs. 536 whilst the demand
from land revenue and tree tax was
Rs. 2078. Moreover it is still uncertain
whether the Lessee of the forests can
be bought out. From a Register prepared
in the Inam Commissioner's Depart-
ment when the enfranchisement of
this inam was under consideration
it appears that the average income
from ploughs and hoes in 1871 was
estimated at Rs. 1513. Nevertheless
the Board think the agreement to
pay Rs. 2000 per annum should be
sanctioned

Sanctioned.

The object is not so much to obtain possession of property as to check smuggling and prevent the forest Contractor from using his position to cover illicit raids into the neighbouring forests of Government. Moreover from para 1 of Mr. Langley's letter it appears that if Government do not get the lease some one else probably will.

The present forest contractor is called Subramana Chetty. His lease is for 20 years. Nothing is said as to how many years of the lease have still to run, but as the previous contractor's lease came to a close in 1869 there must be at least 16. Mr. Langley has sent for the man and will try to get him to surrender the forest lease, but apparently knows nothing about the terms on which he will consent to do so. In December 1873 the Board were informed

informed (demi-officially) by Mr. Price, who was then acting as Collector of Salem that the Contractor demanded Rs. 18,000, and the Deputy Conservator of Forests valued the surrender at Rs. 8,000 and estimated the income which would be yielded by the forests at Rs. 700 a year now and more hereafter.

The objection to the sale of some of the Chiima Kulroyer Villages under Decree of Court, which is adverted to in para 4 should be put in, but the Act quoted should be the Pensions Act, XXIII of 1871, not Regulation IV of 1831 which has been repealed.

(True extract)

J. G. Rose
Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
with one original enclosure
to be returned, and copy of
Collector's letter

E. M. M. M.

cap
M. M. M. M.

82 77 R.D.
 Pres. of the Madras Govt. 77/45

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 4278.

From B^d of Rev. Dated 4 December 1874.

FOR ORDERS.

It is the order for
 Chinn - Kurling should
 be sanctioned - & kept in
 set on foot for buying up
 the estate J.D.S.

107 12
 I am sure - I doubt the position
 taken of the Rev. as the power to

Habroyen and, as re-
 commended by the
 Bd, sanctions the
 annual payment
 of Rs. 2000.

22 November 1874
 29 Aug 1873 - 1874
 272

82 4278
 Revenue 1874, 1875
 Proceedings of the

Board of Revenue
 20th 14 January 1875
 dated 4 1/2 December 1874
 20th 14 January 1875
 1875

Submitting for order
 of Govt. with certain
 remarks, with from
 C.M. of Salem, Mysore
 that the proceedings of
 the regarding estate
 acts in connection with
 the Chinn. Talangar
 Puthapur may be
 notified.
 For orders

20/10/74. R.D. 1/12/74
 B-161

20/12/74. R.D. 21/12/74.

18-161

For orders -

FOR ORDERS.

Chinnai Kattayam
Kottayam, Salem Dist.

27/12/74. At 21/12/74.

From

N^o 77

R.D.

Pros. of the Madras Govt.
Under date the 14th Jan^y 1875

Read the following
Pros. of the Bd. of Rev.

Submitting for orders,
with certain remarks, letter
from Col^l of Salem requesting
that the Col^l's proceedings
regarding certain action
connection with the Chinnai
Kattayam Kattayam may be
ratified.

H.E. 4th Dec^r 74
N^o

The Govt. in Council approves of the
action of the Collector
in the matter of the
lease obtained from
the Polygar of Chinnai
Kattayam and, as re-
commended by the
Bd., sanctions the
annual payment
of Rs. 2000.

2. It is obviously
necessary that the
negociation for buy-
ing out the contrac-
tor should be spee-
dily set on foot.
A further report
on this subject
is awaited. —

QW

1. To the Board of Ordnance
2. The Accountant General
3. The Inspecting General

List from
Orders

1877