

(1) Number of pages 10
 (2) Date of repair 24. 3. 79
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

DEPARTMENT

Revenue

G.O. No.	2636	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	4. 9. 1877	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

28636

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

4th September 1877, No. 2,636.

Read the following papers :—

No. 35. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd May 1877, No. 2,335.

Read the following letter from Major A. DE C. SCOTT, R.E., Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chennai, 7th May 1877, No. 1,464-47.

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,732, of the 19th April 1877, I have the honor to forward correspondence as per margin, from which it will be observed that the operations of this department in surveying unknown localities in the Town of Madras are at a stand-still, owing to the fact that the means of identifying the localities are not forthcoming in the office of the Collector.

2. The case is fully explained in the letter of the Deputy Collector of the 19th April 1877, No. 634. The certificate numbers of the "unknown" holdings have not been connected with survey numbers. Inquiry into ownership does not appear to have been complete at the time of survey, and there was apparently no regular demarcation (vide Proceedings, Board of Revenue, No. 2,602, of 17th September 1875).

3. It seems to me that unless further and better documentary evidence can be produced, identification is almost hopeless.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Major A. DE C. SCOTT, R.E., Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated St. Thomas' Mount, 30th April 1877, No. 353-168.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 1,288-111, of 21st April 1877, communicating copy of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,732, of 19th April, and requesting to be informed when the survey of the "unknown localities" in the Town of Madras will commence and be completed.

2. On receipt of your letter, No. 789-63, of 7th March, forwarding the Government Order on the subject, and directing me to undertake the work, I put myself in communication with the Collector, and requested him to depute a Revenue Inspector to accompany the Deputy Surveyors I had detailed for the work, and assist them in identifying the localities.

3. Accordingly, on the 6th April a Revenue Inspector attended at my office, and as I had only been supplied with the maps of Tondiarpet and Black Town, I directed the Surveyors to commence the work in Tondiarpet.

4. They, however, returned without being able to identify a single locality, in consequence of the survey numbers not being entered against the certificates given in the list of unknown localities.

5. I then directed them to take the registers, the list of certificates, and the survey map, and to go through each survey number and note down the certificated numbers which were contained in each.

6. Out of the sixty-one certificates in the 8th Division, Tondiarpet, only eighteen were found to be entered in the registers of the survey.

7. I directed the Surveyors to proceed to the ground and report if they could identify these eighteen numbers; but they were unsuccessful, and gave as the reason for their failure that the certificates entered in the registers did not correspond with the ground or with the certificates of the number entered in the list of unknown localities.

8. I enclose a letter* from the Deputy Collector which explains how the discrepancy arises.

9. As there appears to be no means of identifying the unknown localities, the work of surveying them deputed to me cannot be commenced, and I therefore await further instruction on the subject.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From C. CUNDASAWMI MUDALI, Acting Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, No. 5, St. Thomas' Mount, dated 19th April 1877, No. 634.

I HAVE the honor to inform you that Revenue Inspector Masilamoney Moodelhar of this office and N. Soobaramiah deputed by you have been trying together for the last few days to find out the unknown localities in the Madras District, for the identification of which Government, in their Order, No. 413, dated the 30th January last, sanctioned the entertainment of a small temporary establishment under your control.

The divisions selected by you for identification were Tondiarpet and Black Town, and of these the former is the only place where attempts have been made to trace out unknown holdings.

3. In the district of Madras, from and after the year 1801, lands have been distinguished by (1) grant and (2) ungrant numbers, (3) old form certificate numbers, (4) new form certificate numbers, (5) old form bill of sale numbers, (6) new form bill of sale numbers, (7) choultry bill of sale numbers, (8) A form certificate numbers, and (9) uncertificate numbers, and the numbers have been continued commencing from No. 1 under each form during the period in which that particular form was in force; so that when a particular number is taken under any of the aforesaid forms, the same number will, of course, occur under each of the remaining forms, the property in each case being different from one another.

4. Previous to the survey of Madras the numbers of the aforementioned forms had not their corresponding survey numbers given to them.

5. During survey operations a few of the landholders appeared before the Survey Officers and registered against some of the survey numbers the particular forms of certificates held by them for the lands; and wherever this information is registered, this office has had no difficulty whatever in identifying the locality.

6. Many of the landholders, however, held back this information from the Survey Officers, and their properties being distinguished only by the numbers of the different forms of certificates, without any corresponding survey numbers, their identification by the help of the survey records, especially in the case of waste or unoccupied lands, has become one of the extreme difficulty if not impossibility, and it is this work which has been by Government Order assigned to the Survey Department. In consequence of this, the numbers of the different forms of certificates enumerated above; and wherever the corresponding survey numbers are unknown, this department has been unable to attach and sell the lands in realisation of arrears of revenue.

8. With the foregoing preface I beg to point out how utterly helpless the combined efforts of the Revenue Inspector and Deputy Surveyor are in identifying the unknown localities in Tondiarpet Division.

9. Of the sixty-one unknown localities in Tondiarpet Division No. 8, it was found from a careful examination of the survey records that eighteen of them have the survey numbers given them. On a closer examination, however, it is found that the certificate numbers given against the survey blocks are in forms different from those under which the unknown localities are, and the work of identification has, therefore, come to a stand-still.

10. The accompanying statement has on its left side unknown localities in Tondiarpet under different forms of certificates, and on its right side the survey numbers given apparently to the same certificate numbers; but comparing columns 2 and 4 on the left side with 10 and 12 on the right side, you will find that while the number we seek is in Attapallym, the number given

by the Surveyor is in Royapuram, a totally different village. This latter property is known, and its quit-rent is being collected.

11. The above is the first number in the list, and I shall take one more instance to show you how the certificate form numbers given in the survey records against survey numbers belonging to a piece of land covered by old form certificate No. 4,683 of 1st May 1804 in Tondiarpet. In survey records survey No. 1,964 is marked against it, but on a closer examination it belongs to new form certificate No. 4,683 of date the 20th October 1847 in Sunjeevarayapetta, which is a known site, and the quit-rent of which is collected.

12. You will thus observe that the properties on the left side are different from those on right side, though the number for every two of them happen to agree from the circumstance of their belonging to different series. The properties on the right side for which we have the survey numbers are all known, while those on the left are unknown and could not be traced out.

13. Such are the difficulties encountered in the work of identification; and as this office has long been trying to identify the same without success, I request that some other means may be devised.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Statement.

Communicated to the Collector of Madras for any suggestions he may have to offer.

2. It would seem that nothing short of a resurvey of the whole town will secure the object aimed at. The annual loss of quit-rent on the unknown localities appears to be only Rupees 1,587 (vide Collector's letter of 30th April 1875).

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th July 1877, No. 3,339.

Read the following letter from E. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 8th July 1877, No. 192.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 2,335, dated 23rd May last, I have the honor to state that, in my opinion, the identification of the unknown localities can only be effected by a resurvey of the whole town, but considering the small amount of quit-rent actually lost to Government a resurvey is inadvisable.

2. In the majority of cases the amount of quit-rent outstanding against unknown localities forms double assessment, which has arisen from the following circumstances. When the survey was made many certificate-holders failed to appear before the surveying officers, and the numbers of these certificates were consequently not entered in the survey register. When the survey was closed bills for the survey numbers, opposite to which no certificate numbers were entered, were issued by the Quit-rent Department, in addition to the usual bills which the certificate-holders were paying. Thus two sets of bills were issued for the same land, and one of them being paid the land noted in the other set became what is termed an unknown locality. It will appear that in the

3. The amount of revenue estimated as lost annually was computed from the bills for which no corresponding holdings could be discovered, and as before stated in the majority of instances the quit-rent payable on these bills is collected on other certificates. From time to time some of these instances of double charge of assessment come to light, and I do not think it advisable to spend a large sum of money in finding out those that are still undiscovered.

Submitted for the information of Government with copy of the Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd May 1877, No. 2,335, with reference to G.O., dated 30th January 1877, No. 413.

2. The Board agree with the Collector.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. STURROCK,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 36.

ORDER THEREON, 4th September 1877, No. 2,636.

Land Revenue, No. 4

Under the circumstances stated no further attempt need be made to identify "unknown localities" in the Madras District.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.
the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

2636
2

2636
3

No. 3,339.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 18th July 1877.

Read the following letter from R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 6th July 1877
No. 192:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, No. 2,335, dated 23rd May last, I have the honor to state that, in my opinion, the identification of the unknown localities can only be effected by a resurvey of the whole town, but considering the small amount of quit-rent actually lost to Government a resurvey is unadvisable.

2. In the majority of cases the amount of quit-rent outstanding against unknown localities forms double assessment, which has arisen from the following circumstances. When the survey was made many certificate-holders failed to appear before the surveying officers and the numbers of these certificates were consequently not entered in the survey register. When the survey was closed bills for the survey numbers, opposite to which no certificate numbers were entered, were issued by the Quit-rent Department, in addition to the usual bills which the certificate-holders were paying. Thus two sets of bills were issued for the same land, and one of them being paid the land noted in the other set became what is termed an unknown locality. It will thus appear that in the greater number of cases unknown localities have probably no real existence, and it was to find out the certificates for which double assessment was charged that a temporary establishment was applied for.

3. The amount of revenue estimated as lost annually was computed from the bills for which no corresponding holdings could be discovered, and as before stated in the majority of instances the quit-rent payable on these bills is collected on other certificates. From time to time some of these instances of double charge of assessment come to light, and I do not think it advisable to spend a large sum of money in finding out those that are still undiscovered.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government with copy of the Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd May 1877, No. 2,335, with reference to G.O., dated 30th January 1877, No. 413.

2. The Board agree with the Collector.

(A true Copy and Extract..)

Shirrell
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd May 1877, No. 2,335.

Copy to the Acting Collector of Madras.
" " Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

11-6-6
11-6-7

2636

Received

JULY
No. 3339

PROCEEDINGS, 18th JULY 1877, No. 3339.

BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

1877.

1103501

Revenue Department

Copy of Town of Madras in identifying
unknown localities. Submitting to Govern-
ment, with Board's concurrence, letter from
Collector stating that is inadvisable.

2636
14

No. 2,335.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 23rd May 1877.

Read the following letter from Major A. deC. SCOTT, R.E., Acting Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chapauk, 7th May 1877, No. 1,464-47 :-

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,732, of the 19th April 1877, I have the honor to forward correspondence as per margin, from which it will be observed that the operations of this department in surveying unknown localities in the town of Madras are at a stand-still, owing to the fact that the means of identifying the localities are not forthcoming in the office of the Collector.

2. The case is fully explained in the letter of the Deputy Collector of the 19th April 1877, No. 634. The certificate numbers of the "unknown" holdings have not been connected with survey numbers. Inquiry into ownership does not appear to have been complete at the time of survey, and there was apparently no regular demarcation (vide Proceedings, Board of Revenue, No. 2,602, of 17th September 1875).

3. It seems to me that, unless further and better documentary evidence can be produced, identification is almost hopeless.

ENCLOSURE N°

Thomas' Mount, 30th April 1877, No. 353.
I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 1,288-111, of 21st April 1877, communicating copy of Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5,732, of 19th April, and requesting to be informed when the survey of the "unknown localities" in the town of Madras will commence and be completed.

2. On receipt of your letter, No. 789-63, of 7th March, forwarding the Government Order on the subject, and directing me to undertake the work, I put myself in communication with the Collector and requested him to depute a Revenue Inspector to accompany the Deputy Surveyors I had detailed for the work and assist them in identifying the localities.

3. Accordingly on the 6th April a Revenue Inspector attended at my office, and as I had only been supplied with the maps of Tondiarpet and Black Town, I directed the Surveyors to commence the work in Tondiarpet.

4. They, however, returned without being able to identify a single locality, in consequence of the survey numbers not being entered against the certificates given in the list of unknown localities.

5. I then directed them to take the registers, the list of certificates, and the survey map, and to go through each survey number and note down the certificated numbers which were contained in each.

6. Out of the sixty-one certificates in the 8th Division, Tondiarpet, only eighteen were found to be entered in the registers of the survey.

7. I directed the Surveyors to proceed to the ground and report if they could identify these eighteen numbers; but they were unsuccessful, and gave as the reason for their failure that the certificates entered in the registers did not correspond with the ground or with the certificates of the number entered in the list of unknown localities.

8. I enclose a letter* from the Deputy Collector which explains how the discrepancy arises.

9. As there appears to be no means of identifying the unknown localities, the work of surveying them, deputed to me, cannot be commenced, and I therefore await further instruction on the subject.

* No. 634, of 19th April 1877, in original, with one enclosure to be returned when done with.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From C. CUNDASAWMY MUDALI, Acting Deputy Collector of Madras, to the Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, No. 5, St. Thomas' Mount, dated 19th April 1877, No. 634.

I HAVE the honor to inform you that Revenue Inspector Masilamony Moodeliah of this office and N. Soobharamiah, deputed by you, have been trying together for the last few days to find out the unknown localities in the Madras District, for the identification of which Government, in their Order, No. 413, dated the 30th January last, sanctioned the entertainment of a small temporary establishment under your control.

2. The divisions selected by you for identification were Tondiarpet and Black Town, and of these the former is the only place where attempts have been made to trace out unknown holdings.

3. In the district of Madras from and after the year 1801 lands have been distinguished by (1) grant and (2) ungrant numbers, (3) old form certificate numbers, (4) new form certificate numbers, (5) old form bill of sale numbers, (6) new form bill of sale numbers, (7) choultry bill of sale numbers, (8) A form certificate numbers, and (9) uncertificate numbers, and the numbers have been continued commencing from No. 1 under each form during the period in which that particular form was in force; so that when a particular number is taken under any of the aforesaid forms, the same number will of course occur under each of the remaining forms, the property in each case being different from one another.

4. Previous to the survey of Madras the numbers of the aforementioned forms had not their corresponding survey numbers given to them.

5. During survey operations a few of the landholders appeared before the Survey Officers and registered against some of the survey numbers the particular forms of certificates held by them for the lands; and wherever this information is registered, this office has had no difficulty whatever in identifying the locality.

6. Many of the landholders, however, held back this information from the Survey Officers, and their properties being distinguished only by the numbers of the different forms of certificates, without any corresponding survey numbers, their identification by the help of the survey records, especially in the case of waste or unoccupied lands, has become one of the extreme difficulty, if not impossibility, and it is this work which has been by Government Order assigned to the Survey Department to accomplish.

7. The demand is collected according to the numbers of the different forms of certificates, and the lands are attached and sold in realization of arrears of revenue.

8. With the foregoing preface, I beg to point out how utterly helpless the combined efforts of the Revenue Inspector and Deputy Surveyor are in identifying the unknown localities in Tondiarpet Division.

9. Of the sixty-one unknown localities in Tondiarpet Division, No. 8, it was found from a careful examination of the survey records that eighteen of them have the survey numbers given them. On a closer examination, however, it is found that the certificate numbers given against the survey blocks are in forms different from those under which the unknown localities are, and the work of identification has therefore come to a stand-still.

10. The accompanying statement has on its left side unknown localities in Tondiarpet under different forms of certificates, and on its right side the survey numbers given apparently to the same certificate numbers; but comparing columns 2 and 4 on the left side with 10 and 12 on the right side, you will find that while the number we seek is in Attapallyam, the number given

* The first item.

by the Surveyor is in Royapooram, a totally different village. This latter property is known, and its quit-rent is being collected.

11. The above is the first number in the list, and I shall take one more instance to show you how the certificate form numbers given in the survey records against survey numbers belong to places other than those to be identified. Taking the fourth number, you will find that it relates to a piece of land covered by old form certificate No. 4,688 of 1st May 1804 in Tondiarpet. In the survey records survey No. 1,964 is marked against it, but on a closer examination it belongs to new form certificate No. 4,683 of date the 29th October 1847 in Sumpesaraipattah, which is a known site, and the quit-rent of which is collected.

12. You will thus observe that the properties on the left side are different from those on right side, though the number for every two of them happen to agree from the circumstance of their belonging to different series. The properties on the right side for which we have the survey numbers are all known, while those on the left are unknown and could not be traced out.

13. Such are the difficulties encountered in the work of identification; and as this office has long been trying to identify the same without success, I request that some other means may be devised.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Statement.

COMMUNICATED to the Collector of Madras for any suggestions he may have to offer.

2. It would seem that nothing short of a resurvey of the whole town will secure the object aimed at. The annual loss of quit-rent on the unknown localities appears to be only Rupees 1,587 (vide Collector's letter of 30th April 1875).

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Madras, with copy of statement.

Copy to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey,
with three original enclosures returned.

Exd. A. Grubert.

1877.
Board of Revenue.
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 38th MAY 1877, No. 2385.

Received.

MAY 4
No. 2385.

Unknown Localities—in the Town of M.
—(communicating to Collector for any s.
tions he may have to offer, letter from S.
tendant of Revenue Survey, stating that the
of surveying—is at a stand-still owing to
fact that the means of identifying the local
are not forthcoming in the Collector's office.

Q 4-9-77 No. 2636.

Dec. 3507