

(1) Number of pages 10

(2) Date of repair 11. 5. 1880

(3) Initials of the Referencer G

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	5 33	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	11. 5.	1880.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

11th May 1880, No. 533.

No. 66. READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th February 1880, No. 195.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting further information with reference to Collector's proposals for revision of settlement of Enadachalam and Rékapalle Taluks, Godávári District.

No. 67. ORDER THEREON, 11th May 1880, No. 533.

Land Revenue, No. 5.

THE Government await the Collector's further report which should be promptly submitted.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. W. H. French.

40 Copies.

4-279 ✓
1771-184 ✓
21-11-18

4/24/19

8.9.24 II

6/1/25 ✓
77/35-II
7-1-38 II
25-11-40 II

Settlement — of Bhadrachalam and Rajapalle Taluks, Godavari District. — Awaiting the Collector's further report in regard to the —, and direct- ing that the same be promptly submitted.

Recd. 15th.
Ptd. May 11th.
G.O., 11th May 1880, No. 503.
MAY.
No. 60-07.

REVENUE.
THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Bobt. of (1880) Settlement.

No. 5439.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 25th August 1879.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Collector of the Godavari District, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chodavaram, 12th July 1879, No. 178:—

I HAVE the honor to report on petition No. 642 of 1879 (herewith returned) presented to the Board of Revenue by Yelawarapu Subramhanya Sastrulu and Kachapswara Sastrulu of the Bhadrachalam Taluk, appealing against my order refusing to recognize their claims to an Agraharam in the Bhadrachalam Taluk.

2. Petitioners claim the village of Vinayakapuram as an Agraharam belonging to them, and I am directed by the Board's endorsement of the 20th May 1879 to inquire into and report on the case on its merits.

3. In paragraph 20 of my letter of the 26th April 1877, No. 13, I proposed that the jungle villages, paying less than Rs. 10 for a year which were resumed by Government should be given up to the proprietors or retained by Government according to what is decided as to the jungle. My proposal to give the jungles back to the proprietors was negatived by the Board of Revenue and the Government of India (vide G.O., 22nd April 1879, No. 875, Revenue Department).

4. Vinayakapuram is one of those villages paying less than Rs. 10 per year which was resumed by Government, and I request instructions as to whether the petitioners' claims are to be inquired into under the circumstances stated.

ENCLOSURE — Petition.

Mr. FOSTER recommended that the jungle villages, one of which is now claimed by the petitioners, should be governed by the decision with regard to the jungles and then recommended that the jungles should be given up. It thus follows that in recommending the adoption of all Mr. Foster's proposals, except the one relating to the jungles, the Board practically submitted an adverse recommendation with regard to the claims of the jungle villages also. Under these circumstances, however, they do not think that the instructions issued by the Government of India, that the settlement should be revised in general accordance with the Board's recommendations, should bar a reconsideration of claims to jungle villages, and this case may therefore receive attention during the revision of the settlement. Petitioners will be referred to the Collector.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godavari District.
Endorsement to Petitioners.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 6th February 1880.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Collector of the Godavari District, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 22nd September 1879, No. 251 :—

I HAVE the honor to submit the report called for in Board's endorsement of the 5th July last, No. 6,207, on G.O. of the 16th June 1879, No. 1,290, Revenue Department.

2. The question raised is whether the settlement of the Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle Taluks should be entrusted to a special officer or not.

3. As Government observe, there does not seem to be very much to be done if the land in those taluks is not to be assessed again with reference to the natural capabilities of the soil. In this case I would propose a rough settlement as detailed below.

4. It is not possible to get any reliable accounts of the actual collections of the estates from any of our own officers, and the figures given already by the proprietors may therefore be taken as representing the average collections.

5. The statement printed at page 6 of G.O. of the 13th January last, No. 61, Revenue Department, shows as follows :—

—	Actual Collections.	CHARGES.				
		Peishcush to Government.	Malikhana to Superior Proprietor.	Funds.	Village Servants.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Rekapalle Inferior Proprietary Estates ...	6,421	4,728	435	217	551	5,931
Bhadrachalam Inferior Proprietary Estates ...	7,551	4,862½	657	263½	1,862	7,645
Bhadrachalam Superior Proprietary ...	10,840	7,304	...	338	2,052	9,694
Total ...	24,812	16,894½	1,092	818½	4,465	23,270

6. Now, it will be seen that the present peishcush practically represents two-thirds of the actual collections and therefore if one-third alone is allowed to the proprietors no benefit will be conferred on them. I would therefore propose that, as is done in the Zemindaris of this district, two-thirds of the actual collections of Rs. 24,812, viz., Rs. 16,542, be fixed as future peishcush, and exempt them from paying the village servants and the Malikhana in the case of the inferior proprietors. The village establishments are a heavy charge on the proprietors, especially in the Superior Proprietary Estate.

7. The funds all amount to Rs. 818-80. I have hitherto proposed that they should be abolished and the amount payable by these funds calculated on the same principle as Local Fund demands are calculated elsewhere. This suggestion has been sanctioned by the Government of India, but, under the present circumstances of the country, I would not charge anything at all for these funds, as proposed. If we do, the proprietors in their turn have to collect the cesses from their tenants, many of whom are the Koyis, for whom concessions have to be made. But if Government wish it,

1879.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF THE
GODAVARI DISTRICT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated August 25th.

Printed September 2nd.

Received

PROCEEDINGS, 20TH AUGUST 1879, NO. 2.

AUGUST.
No. 2,439.

Petition—No. 642 of 1879 presented to the Board of Revenue by Yelawarapu Subrahanya Sastrulu and Kachapaveswara Sastrulu of Bhadrachalam Taluk, Godavari District, appealing against the Collector's order refusing to recognize their claims to an Agraharam in the Bhadrachalam Taluk.—Passing orders on Collector's report on —.

we can add the amount now collected under Funds to the peishcush payable by the proprietors themselves without authorizing them to collect it, or any portion of it, from their tenants in addition to what they have to pay under the settlement now in force. This course cannot entail any hardship on them as they will be exempted from the heavy charge on account of the village servants in accordance with the system adopted at the permanent settlement of the Zemindaris in this district. Then the peishcush would be as follows:—

	Future Peishcush of two-thirds of the Collections.	Funds.	Total.	Total future Peishcush in Round Figures.	Present Peishcush.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rékapalle Inferior Proprietary Estates ...	RS. 4,281	RS. 217	RS. 4,498	RS. 4,500	RS. 4,728
Bhadrachalam Inferior Proprietary Estates ...	5,034	263½	5,297½	5,300	4,862½
Bhadrachalam Superior Estate ...	7,227	338	7,565	7,565	7,304
Total ...	16,542	818½	17,360½	17,365	16,894½

8. The annexed abstract shows the present and future profit to the different proprietors:—

	Actual Collections.	CHARGES.		PROFIT.	
		Present.	Future.	Present.	Future.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rékapalle Inferior Proprietors ...	RS. 6,421	RS. 5,931	RS. 4,500	RS. 490	RS. 1,921
Bhadrachalam Inferior Proprietors ...	7,551	7,645	5,300	— 94	2,251
Bhadrachalam Superior Estate ...	10,840	9,694	7,565	1,146	3,275
Total ...	24,812	23,270	17,365	1,542	7,447
Deduct Funds ...	...	...	818½	...	818½
	...	...	16,546½	...	8,265½

9. Then my proposals are—

- (1), that the proprietors should pay a peishcush of Rs. 17,365, or Rs. 16,546½ excluding the charge under Funds, against Rs. 16,849½ paid at present;
- (2), that the charge under Funds if paid by the proprietors should not be collected from their tenants;
- (3), that the charge of Rs. 4,45-3-8 now paid on account of village servants by the proprietors be borne hereafter by Government;
- (4), that an annual remission of Rs. 1,092 be granted to the superior proprietor from the peishcush, as above stated, in recognition of his claims to the Inferior Proprietary Estates which now pay a Malikhana to him; and
- (5), that the proposal to charge the funds on the principle of the Local Fund demands be given up, at least for the present.

10. The jungles and the jungle villages, with the exception of the one referred to in Board's Proceedings of the 25th August 1879, No. 2,439, and the Abkari will be retained, as heretofore, by Government, and it will be clearly understood that all the rights and privileges heretofore enjoyed under the settlement of the Central Provinces will remain undisturbed for the thirty years to come, subject, of course, to the modifications which may be made now. The distinction of the superior and inferior proprietors will be abolished and all will be styled proprietors.

11. If Government approve of the summary settlement as above described, I think the appointment of a special officer is necessary. Otherwise, it is very desirable that some one should be deputed for the duty, unless it is meant that Lord Guilmore can take it up after the country is restored to peace.

The above paper contains Mr. Foster's proposals for the settlement of the Bhadrachalam and Rékapalle Taluks, recently transferred to this Presidency from the Central Provinces.

2. This Zemindari became British territory in 1860, and in 1861 a summary settlement was made with the proprietors, in which the Zemindari was charged with a peishcush of Rs. 9,500. In 1867 another settlement was effected for 20 years under which the peishcush of the Zemindari appears to have been fixed at Rs. 17,865 (*vide* Appendix XVII, Settlement Report). The peishcush now paid, however, is Rs. 16,641. The difference is not explained. This settlement was effected by the authorities of the Central Provinces, but as it was based not on actual realizations but on estimated collections, which have never been realized, the Government of India have on representation of the case permitted the settlement to be revised on the principles generally followed in the settlement of the Zemindaris in this Presidency, with the exception that the forests resumed in 1867 should not be restored to the Ranee and that the settlement should not be permanent but open to revision after 30 years.

3. Mr. Foster proposes to revise the peishcush with reference to the collections of the proprietors in one year, *i.e.*, 1872-73. He states that the figures were taken from the accounts of the Zemindars and those in the Tahsildar's office, but that he has not asked for returns for more years because one year is little different from another, and reliable accounts are not to be obtained. The Board do not think it right to settle the revenue payable for 30 years with reference to the collections of a single year. The Collector should obtain from the Zemindar's accounts the actual collections for 10 years, check them with such accounts as are available in the Tahsildar's office, and base his proposals thereon. He should also give the details of the revenue realized, the area on which it is realized, and the area still available for cultivation.

4. The actual collections of 1872-73 Paragraphs 9 to 12, Collector's letter in G.O., dated 28th August 1874. compare with the assets calculated at the settlement of 1867, as shown below:—

	Assets of 1867.	Actual Collections of 1872-73.	Difference.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
Rékapalle ...	8,106	6,421	1,685
Bhadrachalam under Inferior Proprietors ...	10,675	7,551	3,324
Do. do. Superior do. ...	12,679	10,839	1,840
Total ...	31,660	24,811	6,849

The Collector does not explain how much of the difference between the collections estimated in 1867 and those realized in 1872-73 is due to diminution of cultivation since 1867, how far to its having been found impossible to collect the revenue at the

rates fixed at the settlement, and to what extent to bad management. He thinks that all these causes have operated to cause the deficiency. It is also possible that full assessment is not collected on Inams resumed and incorporated with the Zemindari at the settlement. The Collector should ascertain whether this is so, and report the assessment so left uncollected. He should also state how the revenue is now realized, what proportion in money and how much in kind, and at what rates, the assessment received in kind, if any, has been commuted into money in calculating the assets. It should be explained to the Zemindars that if they now understate their rents it will be evidence against them should their right to claim larger rents be called in question at any future time.

5. Further explanation should be given in regard to the Road Fund, Dawk Fund, and School Funds referred to by the Collector. It should be stated whether they are now paid in addition to the peishcush, or whether they form the component parts of the peishcush (17,865) fixed at the settlement of 1867. Probably the latter is the case, as the funds (818½) plus the peishcush now actually paid (16,641) is nearly equal to the peishcush fixed in 1867. It should also be stated whether the proprietors now collect from their ryots any portion of the funds in addition to the land revenue payable according to usage or the settlement rates.

6. The Collector's proposal that Rs. 4,465, the wages of the village servants hitherto paid by the proprietors, should be hereafter borne entirely by Government, is not in accordance with the proposal contained in paragraph 27 of his letter embodied in G.O., dated 13th January 1879, No. 61, in which he merely proposed to deduct the amount from the assets before calculating the peishcush. The latter course is the correct one, and it is tantamount to a distribution of the charge between Government and the proprietors in the proportion of the revenue derived by the former and the profit enjoyed by the latter. This is what has generally been done in the case of other Zemindaris.

7. The Collector further proposes to exempt the inferior proprietors from the Malikhana (Rs. 1,092) which they now pay to the superior proprietor and to remit a corresponding sum from the peishcush payable by the latter in recognition of his claim. This proposal is novel and is not one of the original suggestions; at present Deputy Commissioner's letter embodied in the Malikhana is paid by the inferior proprietors to the superior proprietor in addition to the Government demand, and there is no reason whatever why the inferior proprietors should be exempted at the expense of Government. The Board are of opinion that this payment should continue to be made by the inferior proprietors to the superior proprietor as it is one of the conditions of their tenure. As regards the proposed abolition of the distinction between superior and inferior proprietors the superior proprietor protests against the arrangement as it will deprive him of his reversionary right. It appears that this reversionary right has been admitted on a former occasion (*vide* page 22 of the Settlement Report), and the objection appears valid. This point should be considered.

8. The Collector is requested to submit the further information called for without delay.

(A true Copy and Extract.)


Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Godáviri District.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 25th August 1879, No. 2,439.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

Revenue Dept
1880.

**Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.**

To THE COLLECTOR OF THE
GODAVARI DISTRICT.

Dated February 6th. *[Signature]*
Printed 17th. *[Signature]*
Received " 20th. *[Signature]*

PROCEEDINGS, 6TH FEBRUARY 1880, No. 195.

Copy 11/2/80

FEBRUARY.
No. 195.

Settlement—of Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle
Taluks, Godavari District.—Requesting further
information with reference to Collector's pro-
posals for revision of —.

with Mr. [Signature]

Land Revenue

*The pr. amt. the collector's
further report which value
promptly submitted.*

*See for
order
see order 293
in para 11/2/80*

11 May 1880

66-67