

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Spare copy

G.O. No. 460

Press
Mis.*5. copy*

Dated 17 - 6 - 1890.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

17TH JUNE 1890, No. 460, REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 19th March 1890, No. 160 :—

MR. H. W. BLISS.

MR. W. S. WHITESIDE.

MR. H. F. C. STOUN.

Read—the following letter from R. B. CLEGG, Esq., Acting Special Assistant Agent, Godavari District, to the Government Agent, Godavari District, dated Rajahmundry, 6th August 1889, No. 109 :—

I have the honor to submit the following revised accounts showing the resettlement of the Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle taluks in accordance with G.O., dated 21st October 1886, No. 914, Revenue :—

A. Statement showing the cultivation and rents of the ten years, fasli 1285—1294.

A-1. Statement showing the cultivation and rents of lands assessed for rent in kind for the ten years, 1285—1294.

A-2. Statement showing the cultivation and rents on river-bed lands for the ten years, 1285—1294.

B. Statement showing the average cultivation and rents of the ten years, 1285—1294.

C. Comparative statement of cultivation.

D. Statement showing the difference between the cultivable area recorded at the former settlement and the average cultivation of the ten years, 1285—1294.

E. Statement showing the emoluments of all the village servants.

F. Statement showing the emoluments of putwari, patel and taliari existing and proposed.

G. Statement showing the number of villages under each putwari.

H. Statement showing the assets of the village and the peshkash to be fixed.

J. Statement showing the amounts to be paid by the superior proprietor to Government and by the inferior proprietors to the superior proprietor.

K. Statement showing the adjustment of peshkash funds and malikhana under paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 914, Revenue, dated 21st October 1886.

L. A consolidated statement of the present demand against the estates.

M. A consolidated statement of the future demand against the estates.

2. It has been pointed out already (*vide* my letters, Nos. 205 and 6, dated respectively 26th November 1887 and 7th January 1888) that the accounts previously furnished were inaccurate. These, now obtained, are, I think, as reliable as any we can ever hope to obtain.

3. The basis of the new settlement is the receipts of the ten years ending with fasli 1294. Statement A shows this information for each village in the estate. One village, viz., Kottur, in the superior proprietor's estate, which was shown in Mr. Foster's accounts, has been excluded from these, having been taken up by Government for the purposes of forest reservation—*vide* G.O., No. 470, dated 4th July 1888 (Land Revenue).

The proprietors have kept two sets of accounts which do not tally with each other. The karnams or putwaris prepared yearly a jamabandi account for each village and furnished a copy to the Taluk office, Bhadrachalam. Besides this, they or the proprietors themselves generally kept a demand, collection and balance account, which

shows receipts but not cultivation. This account, as a rule, shows a higher figure than the corresponding jamabandi account. Hitherto the jamabandi accounts were the only ones furnished for the purposes of settlement, but now I have taken the assessments in all cases possible from the more accurate demand, collection and balance accounts. As for cultivation, the only figures forthcoming are those of the jamabandi accounts, and they are altogether unreliable, not being based on actual measurements. In statement A, I have left some of the details of mourass, gair mourasi and dupati cultivation blank. The reason is because the assessment in these cases does not agree with that given in the jamabandi account, and therefore they cannot be obtained.

The Rékapalle inferior proprietor and some other inferior proprietors have produced no trustworthy collection accounts. The Yetapaka inferior proprietor has no accounts at all from fasli 1291—1294. The superior proprietor's accounts are fairly accurate, but I can't say so much for those of any of the inferior proprietors.

4. Statement A-1 shows the collection of rents in kind. There are many blanks, but this can only be expected in the accounts when the system was expressly forbidden under the terms of the settlement of 1867. This account is not of much value. Its untrustworthiness is seen by the gross yield, in many cases being wholly out of proportion to the area cultivated. The system of collecting rent in kind was confined to the river-side villages and a few not many miles away from the river bank. In the villages of Suravaram, Kottagudem, Narsapuram and Turubaka it was the custom for the superior proprietor instead of taking his grain away after division to leave it in the possession of the ryots. When prices had risen and he wanted to realize, he demanded the whole amount of grain he had left, or its equivalent in money at the prices then current. It was rare that the ryots could produce the full quantity, and thus excess collections were made. Columns 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 show the results of this system. In other villages than those above mentioned, the proprietor would take the grain at division, store it himself and realise when he could get a good price for it. In the accounts, the price of the grain at division of the crop has been shown as the true assessment. Another grievance the ryots had with regard to collections in kind was that the crop was obliged to be left for a very long time, sometimes months, on the ground before the proprietor took his share. The measurement was usually carried out by the putwaris. These servants have very large ranges, and with the small establishment the superior proprietor keeps up there must necessarily be delay. In consequence of complaints against this system, it was ordered to be discontinued and rents collected in money as ordered at Captain Glasford's settlement. The ryots have since expressed to me their satisfaction. The only villagers that objected to its abolition were the Koyas of Nadikudi, who were probably instigated by the proprietor and were too ignorant to appreciate the benefits of a money assessment. Under the new settlement also, I think collection of rents in kind should continue to be strictly forbidden.

5. In Mr. Foster's report, embodied in G.O., No. 914, Revenue, dated 21st October 1886, he states that "Government have ordered that the extent of the land in the bed of the river and the average revenue realized on it should be excluded from the present settlement." I can find no such Government Order as supposed by Mr. Foster. The only occasion when the question of river-bed lands was raised was in 1877 when His Highness the Nizam's officials questioned the jurisdiction of our courts over the island of Motegedda above Bhadrachalam. Government in their order, dated 30th December 1878, No. 671, ruled that all that was ceded by the treaty of 1860 "was only certain taluks lying on the left bank of the river. This of course cannot be held to include any island in midstream. The Collector will therefore withdraw his claim to Motegadga." It was apparently in consequence of this ruling that Mr. Foster excluded the river-bed lands from his accounts. The river-bed lands under cultivation are mainly the slopes of the bank and any cultivable land at the foot of the bank between it and the water's edge. The treaty never intended that such lands should belong to His Highness the Nizam. Areas of river bed adjoining our bank were registered in the missels of certain river-side villages at the settlement of 1867 and the village Wazib-ul-urz has a clause which declares the right of the proprietors to everything which grows on the sandy land below the river bank. No question has ever yet arisen regarding these lands, and there is no reason why we should relinquish them.

Statement A-2 shows the average cultivation of river-bed lands. It is not large—acres 112-3-14 with an assessment of Rs. 294-7-1. Some of these also consist of Severy lunkas about which there can possibly be no question. I have therefore for these reasons included the river-bed lands in the account.

6. Statement B shows the average cultivation and rents of the ten faslis (1285—1294).

Statements C and D are comparative statements of cultivation. From these accounts, it will be seen that the average area cultivated during the ten years is acres 5,851 more than the land actually cultivated in 1867. The average area cultivated during the ten years, however, only exceeds the area recorded as cultivable in 1867 by 752 acres and the revenue realized is Rs. 2,874 more than the rental assumed for purposes of settlement in 1867. The extent of "dupati" allowed at last settlement was 47,383 acres. The cultivation accounts, as I have above pointed out, are far from reliable. In no village, however, do I consider that there is any necessity to increase the area of "dupati" land.

7. Statement E shows the emoluments, both settlement and zemindari attached to the offices of all village servants. This slightly differs from the accounts already furnished by Mr. Foster. Certain omissions have been supplied and errors corrected. I have retained all the servants and all the emoluments fixed at the previous settlement. Under the terms of the previous settlement, the proprietor had the power of dispensing with any servant other than putwari, and kotwal, when their services became unnecessary. This power should not be allowed hereafter. Government have ordered, with regard to putwaris, patels and taliaris, that the proprietor shall have the power of appointment and dismissal subject to the approval of the Agent. With regard to the minor servants, they may have the power of appointment and dismissal. The provisions of Regulation VI of 1831, however, apply to all village servants in the taluk, and they will therefore have the power of instituting suits under that regulation.

8. Statement F shows the emoluments of putwari, patel and taliari existing and proposed. Government have sanctioned in their order, No. 914, Revenue, of the 21st October 1886, an additional establishment of patels and taliaris at a cost of Rs. 227 annually. In revising Mr. Foster's account, I found that he had in some cases proposed additional emoluments where settlement emoluments already existed, but were not shown in his accounts. I have accordingly redistributed the excess emoluments chiefly in raising the pay of the proposed taliaris from 8 annas to one rupee. The villages on the west bank of the Severy were almost all allowed a patel. This, being unnecessary, I have transferred the sum thus allotted to other villages which more urgently require it.

9. Statement H shows the net assets after deducting payments to all village servants existing and proposed and the peshkash calculated at two-thirds of the net assets. The total amount of peshkash thus fixed is Rs. 19,182, being Rs. 1,743 more than that fixed at the former settlement. The exclusion of the village of Kottur causes the difference of Rs. 11 between the "amount fixed at the former settlement" in this account and that given by Mr. Foster. The payments to be made through Government to the putwaris, patels and taliaris is Rs. 4,306.

10. Statement J shows funds and malikhana. The rates of malikhana given in Mr. Foster's previous report are in a few cases incorrect. The following is a correct statement of the rates of malikhana taken from the settlement missels and according to which calculations have now been made—

Name of estate.	Rate on peshkash.
	RS.
Bhadrachalam and Marrigudem	10
Rékapalle	15
Tripurapentavidu	17
Venkatanarasinhapuram	15
Kotarugomma	2
Venkanagudem	15
Pragallapalli	3
Singavaram	

Name of estate.	Rate on peshkash.
Chintalagudem	20
Kolanugudem	12 1/2
Seetarampuram	20
Tekubaka	10
Lellavai	40
Rayanipeta	20
Venkatayapalem	14
Narasingapeta	15
Yedugurallapalli	15
Nandigama	10
Kunavaram	2 1/2
Regubilli	15
Madimeru	20
Seetampeta	5
Dantenaw	1
Nadikudi	2
Kesavapatnam	1
Yetapaka	12 1/2
Gundala	5
Pinapalli	5
Gangole	3 1/2
Gogubaka	3
Devarapalli	N/A
Chokkavapalli	15
Sriramagiri	5
Kumaraswamigudem	10
Burravemula	20

The Chedalavada and Tulugonda muttas and the aghaharam of Kondrajupeta now form a part of the superior proprietor's estate.

11. Statement K shows the adjustment of peshkash, funds and malikhana as ordered in paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 914, Revenue, of 21st October 1886. The deduction in the total amount payable under the 15 per cent. rule amounts to Rs. 1,426. According to the missels prepared at the last settlement, the tenure of the Gundala estate, consisting of the villages of Gundala and Pinapalli, prohibits the alteration of peshkash and malikhana at a resettlement. The peshkash is fixed at Rs. 150 and malikhana Rs. 7-8-0. Funds are calculated according to the miss adopted at last settlement on the peshkash arrived at by the general rule. The peshkash of the whole estate as thus adjusted is Rs. 17,901 as against Rs. 17,450 (including Kottur in the superior estate) at the last settlement and funds are Rs. 831 as against Rs. 818. The total amount of malikhana payable by the inferior proprietor to the superior proprietor is Rs. 1,044.

The villages of Pragallapalli and Singavaram composing the Pragallapalli estate are held on different tenures, as also are the villages of Chokkanapalli and Sriramagiri of the Chokkanapalli estate. They have therefore been treated separately.

12. Statements L and M show the present demand and future demand, respectively. The following statement compares the resettlement with the settlement of 1867 with respect to peshkash and funds:—

Name of estate.	Settlement of 1867.	Resettlement.	Increase.	Decrease.
Bhadrichalam cum Marrigudem, Tulugonda and Kondrajupeta and Chedalavada	Rs. 8,028	Rs. 8,394	Rs. 368	Rs. ..
Rékapalle	4,416	4,529	112	..
Tripurapentavidu	1,281	1,249	..	32
Nandigama	1,241	1,482	241	..
Kotarugoumu	63	29	..	34
Regubilli	37	25	..	12
Madimeru	21	23	2	..
Kolanugudem	13	18	5	..
Yetapaka	405	362	..	43
Pragallapalli	90	110	20	..
Sitampeta	37	68	31	..

Name of estate.	Settlement of 1867.	Resettlement.	Increase.	Decrease.
Dantenam	Rs. 94	Rs. 90	Rs. ..	Rs. 4
Nadikudi	124	137	13	..
Kesavapatnam	50	74	24	..
Yedugurallapalli	47	32	..	15
Gundala	177	182	5	..
Gangole	48	62	14	..
Devarapalli	219	138	..	81
Gogubaka	104	117	13	..
Chokkanapalli	214	240	26	..
Kumaraswamigudem	72	77	5	..
Chintalagudem	104	107	3	..
Sitarampuram	41	45	4	..
Tekubaka	96	122	26	..
Lellavai	83	91	8	..
Rayanipeta	522	319	..	203
Venkatayapalem	15	22	7	..
Narasingapeta	40	43	3	..
Burravemula	53	68	15	..
Kunavaram	528	477	..	51
	18,263	18,730	935	468

The payments are but Rs. 467 more than those under the previous settlement. To this has to be added Rs. 4,306, the cost of the village establishment. The total demand will therefore be Rs. 23,036. The malikhana payable by the Rékapalle inferior proprietor to the superior proprietor (Rs. 433) will be added to his peshkash and deducted from that of the superior proprietor. Certain deductions have still to be made in ten aghaharams for life. They are shown in statement M. With regard to the Tripurapentavidu inferior estate, according to information received from the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, the present proprietor is entitled to hold the estate as a "mukta" for his lifetime on a peshkash of Rs. 100. This entitles him under the resettlement to a deduction of Rs. 1,095 for life. This concession was not enjoyed under the previous settlement, and he apparently has not claimed it. Copies of the correspondence with the Chief Commissioner are enclosed. The orders of Government are requested as to whether the concession should now be allowed.

13. With regard to the preparation of a draft sanad as ordered by Government, I submit that it is not advisable to issue one general sanad to the superior proprietor for the whole of the estate. At the last settlement he was given a title-deed for each village separately, and for each village was drawn up a missel showing its circumstances in detail and forming a complete register of rights. Specimen copies of the title-deeds* and missels* then issued are

* Dantenam title-deed and Rékapalle missel. forwarded for the information of Government. Title-deeds of a similar form may be issued. The missels, with certain alterations and additions, may be retained. The alterations and additions will be as follows:—

- (1) The proprietors shall not have the right of transfer by sale, gift or otherwise of their estates or any portion of their estates without the consent of Government.
- (2) The malikhana payable by the inferior proprietor of Rékapalle shall be added to his peshkash and deducted from that of the superior proprietor. All other inferior proprietors shall continue to pay malikhana direct to the superior proprietor.
- (3) The proprietors shall not have the right to dispense with any of the village servants, but they may appoint or dismiss, and in the case of putwari, patel and taliar, they may appoint and dismiss subject to the approval of the Government Agent.
- (4) The proprietors shall pay the emoluments of putwari, patel and taliar of Government as an addition to their peshkash, and Government will directly pay these servants. The lands previously held by them free of assessment may be fully assessed.

- (5) The provision that when Government rent out palmyra trees on proprietary lands, two-thirds of the rent should be taken by the proprietors and the remaining one-third credited to Government should be abolished.
- (6) The provisions regarding land washed away by the river and accretions are unnecessary.
- (7) The provision regarding remission when more than one-fourth of a village is submerged is unnecessary.
- (8) The permission of the proprietor before ryots can fell trees on their own lands is unnecessary.
- (9) The provision regarding compensation for land taken up for public purposes should be abolished.
- (10) The provision regarding the vemberdar is unnecessary.
- (11) Sharti mourasi ryots become "pura mourasi."
- (12) The provision that requires a notice to be sent through the Tahsildar in case of raising rents on "gair mourasi" lands before the end of Chitram is unnecessary.
- (13) The full right of the State in mines and minerals as well as right of access and other reasonable conveniences for working them on behalf of Government or their assignees shall be reserved.
- (14) The settlement shall be in force for 30 years (from fasli 1299 to fasli 1329).

A full translation of the conditions of a settlement missel is given in G.O., dated 29th January 1885, No. 122, Revenue.

14. In G.O., dated 15th March 1883, No. 221, Revenue, the previous settlement was extended for one year. I request its extension for another year so that the new resettlement may run from 1889-90.

15. The Government Agent, Mr. Happell, has gone over the accounts with me and approved of them and this report before he proceeded on privilege leave.

Endorsement by G. F. T. POWER, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Godavari District, dated Cocanada, 16th August 1889, No. 46.

Submitted to the Commissioners of Land Revenue together with enclosures. It appears that Mr. Happell, who has a thorough knowledge of the subject, has gone over the accounts with Mr. Clegg and approved of them and the report.

2. I have no remarks to add.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. B. FULLER, Esq., Officiating Junior Secretary to Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, to the Government Agent, Godavari district, dated Nagpur, 4th November 1886, No. 1033 S.

With reference to your letter No. 340, dated 14th September 1886, regarding the claims of certain inferior proprietors in the Bhadrachalam taluk to a fixity of tenure, I am directed to forward copy of a letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Chanda, No. 4108, dated 13th November 1886, giving the information asked for by you. The enclosures of your letter are herewith returned.

From W. J. MacGEORGE, Esq., Deputy Commissioner, Chanda, to the Commissioner, Nagpur division, dated 13th November 1886, No. 4108.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your No. 6607, dated 13th ultimo, and beg to state that I have had each missel and paper sent by the Acting Government Agent, Godavari district, with his letter No. 340, dated 14th September 1886, carefully examined, as also other registers and records in our office concerning the rights of the inferior and superior proprietors over the villages referred to in the above letter, and find as follows:—

2. The village Wazib-ul-urz and entry No. 2* in the printed minufi register sanctioned by

* Copy attached.

the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, on the recommendation of the Settlement-officer and Settlement Commissioner, shows that the

villages of Pinapalli and Goondala have been given to the inferior proprietor Venkata Narsinga Rao Disbandia as a "mukta" on a quit-rent of Rs. 150 yearly in perpetuity, and therefore I do not see how the Government can now in any way interfere with the rights and privileges of the inferior proprietor in these said two villages unless they find fault with the conduct of the holder.

3. As regards the seven villages of Tripurapentavidu, Gudigudem, Nellipaka, Kottagudem, Kapavaram, Gommugudem and Kusmanapalli, the village Wazib-ul-urz of each of the above seven villages states that they were settled by the Settlement-officer (Colonel Glasford) with the superior proprietor for a period of 20 years up to 1887-88 and were subsettled with the inferior proprietor (Mr. A. Ramanujam Mudaliar) who holds these villages from the superior proprietor as a "mukta" on a quit-rent of Rs. 100. According to the sanad given by the superior to the inferior proprietor, the latter held these seven villages for about 6 years and then, at the time of the settlement, the Settlement-officer seeing that there was a break in the enjoyment of the rights of these villages by their being made "khalsa" for about a year in the six years' possession of the inferior proprietor, he made a summary inquiry and decided that these seven villages be held as a "mukta" by the inferior proprietor from the superior one on a quit-rent of Rs. 100 for his lifetime only. This inquiry further shows that this grant was given by the superior proprietor to the inferior one in consideration of a heavy loan given by the latter to the former to pay off arrears of revenue due; therefore it cannot be said that the Government has granted these villages as "muktas" to the inferior proprietor. As the Government has settled the villages with the superior proprietor for 20 years, it can, I suppose, on the expiration of this term, revise the assessments. The inferior proprietor is liable to pay to the superior one as "malikhana" at the rate of 15 per cent. (vide "malikhana" papers B).

* Vide inquiry paper A.

4. I enclose in original as many of the papers as could be found here and return those received with your endorsement under reply.

Endorsement by W. A. HAPPELL, Esq., Government Agent, dated Cocanada, 25th February 1887, No. 73.

Communicated to the Special Assistant Agent for information and guidance in reference to his letter, dated 14th January 1886, No. 7.

A copy of this office letter, dated 14th September 1886, No. 340, to the Commissioner, Central Provinces, and the missels† and other papers referred to in the above letters are also enclosed.

The Special Assistant Agent is requested to effect the settlement of these villages in conformity with the opinion given by the Deputy Commissioner, Chanda.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. THOMSON, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Godavari district, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Central Provinces, dated Cocanada, 14th September 1886, No. 340.

The inferior proprietors of Gundala and Pinapalli agharams in the Bhadrachalam taluk contend that the two villages were permanently settled by Captain Glasford on the strength of the old sanads produced by them (copies enclosed)‡ and that the peshkash being permanently fixed by Captain Glasford cannot be revised now. While Captain Glasford's report is silent on the subject, paragraph 15 of the memorandum prefixed to it says that the settlement was made for twenty years and it does not appear that these villages were made an exception to it.

2. Another inferior proprietor Arcot Ramanujam of Tripurapentavidu, Gudigudem, Kapavaram, Gollagudem, Nellipaka, &c., submits copies of correspondence (12 sheets) showing the services rendered by him to a former zemindar (enclosed to be returned) and objects to revision as well as to the payment of a malikhana. I find nothing in the papers favoring his objection, but before rejecting his claim, I request to know whether the records of your office show that he is entitled to any concession. The Mahratta missels with the papers concerned, which there is no one here to read, are forwarded (to be returned), and I have the honor to

Missel of Nellipaka	..	..	..	..	6 papers.
Do. of Gundala	..	..	..	..	11 "
Do. of Gummugudem	..	..	..	..	11 "
Do. of Kapavaram	..	..	..	..	15 "
Do. of Tripurapentavidu	..	..	..	..	12 "
Do. of Gudugudem	..	..	..	..	4 "
Do. of Kusumanapallimalipuvvaya	..	..	..	..	6 "
Do. of Kottagudem	..	..	..	..	22 "
Do. of Pinapalli	..	..	..	..	22 "
Total	..	..	..	..	76 "

request the favor of your furnishing me with all the information available on the subject and informing me how the claims of the applicants stand.

Read—telegram from RAJAH PARTHASARATHY APPA RAO, Bahadur, Ellore, Gadavari District, dated 21st September 1889.

ABSTRACT.—Stating that he hears that the report of the Government Agent of Gadavari concerning the resettlement of Bhadrachalam was sent to the Board without petitioner's opinion being taken on the matter; and requesting that the Board will pass no final orders on the report before they send petitioner a copy of the said report and obtain his opinion on the matter.

Resolution—dated 19th March 1890, No. 160.

The papers read above regarding the resettlement of the Bhadrachalam and Rēkapalle taluks are submitted to Government.

2. The taluks formed portions of the Palavancha estate in the Nizam's territory granted as a Military jaghire in 1324 (A.D.) by the Emperor of Delhi to one Anasa Ashwarao and held by his descendants until 1809 when, on the death of the last holder, the condition of service was abolished and the estate was granted on lease for Rs. 50,000 to his adopted son Venkatram.

Glasfurd's report, paragraph 56. Ashwarao. The estate was under management for some years during which, owing to the claims of the Setpully zemindar to the estate, there were constant disturbances. Eventually the estate was granted on a two years' lease to the elder son of Venkatram Ashwarao for two years, after he had by force turned out the Nizam's authorities from Bhadrachalam. He died soon after, when a cowle was granted to his younger brother, Sita Ramachandra Ashwarao, for nine years for Rs. 70,000 a year. This man died without issue in 1859 after having mortgaged his estate with the permission of the Hyderabad Government. The Nizam then acknowledged his mother as rightful heir. The taluks were transferred by the Nizam to the British Government in 1860, a sum of Rs. 8,000 having been remitted by the Nizam from the sum payable by the Rani for the Palavancha estate. On the cession of the taluks, they were added to the Central Provinces and were transferred in 1874 to the Madras Presidency. A summary of the settlement was made with the proprietors in 1861, by which the peshkash was fixed at Rs. 9,500. In 1867 another settlement was made for twenty years, by which the peshkash was fixed at Rs. 17,450, subject to a deduction of Rs. 4,428 on account of the diminution of her profits. On the transfer of the taluks to the Government of India, correspondence, the Government of India agreed to the revision of the settlement on the principles usually adopted in this Presidency in the case of permanent settlements. In 1875, the Rani died and the estate is now held by her daughter's son, Parthasarathy Appa Rao, to whom she had transferred it during her lifetime.

Rs. 9,310 according to Captain Glasfurd's letter.

which the forests in the zemindari and the abkari and miscellaneous revenue were brought under direct Government management, and the peshkash was fixed at Rs. 17,865 according to Captain Glasfurd's report.

to this Presidency, the proprietors applied for a reduction of the peshkash and the restoration of the forests. After some correspondence, the Government of India agreed to the revision of the settlement on the principles usually adopted in this Presidency in the case of permanent settlements. In 1875, the Rani died and the estate is now held by her daughter's son, Parthasarathy Appa Rao, to whom she had transferred it during her lifetime.

3. The zemindari contains several minor estates, the most important of which is Rēkapalle. This was originally leased out in 1571 by the then zemindar to Korkonda Venaya Raju for Rs. 600. It remained in the hands of inferior proprietors until 1814, when the holder having

been murdered by his Dewans, the estate passed to them and was held by them till 1862, when, on account of the misconduct of one of the members of the family, his moiety of the estate (Marrigudem taluk) was included in the Bhadrachalam taluk, and managed directly by the Rani under the orders of the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces. The other half continues to be held by the proprietor, though he has alienated several villages to strangers. The other minor estates are either small villages originally founded by the exertions of certain heads of villages or inam villages granted for the benefit of certain individuals either rent-free or subject to a quit-rent. All these estates were treated in the settlement of 1867 as inferior estates, the holders being made to pay to the superior proprietor the peshkash charged on the estates

plus a malikhana at fixed rates in recognition of his superior rights. As regards the proprietors' request for the reduction of the peshkash, the Government remarked that, as the settlement of 1867 would expire in 1886-87, no immediate measures of relief were called for—G.O., dated 29th January 1885, No. 122. The various questions in connection with the revision of the settlement were, however, then considered and decided by Government. The leading points were—

- (a) That the inferior tenures were not to be abolished;
- (b) That the muttas and the aghahams were to be treated alike as inferior estates;
- (c) That the settlement should be concluded with the superior proprietor for all minor estates except Rēkapalle;
- (d) That for Rēkapalle, the settlement should be made direct with the inferior proprietor, the malikhana payable by him to the superior proprietor being added to the peshkash payable by him (the inferior proprietor) and deducted from the peshkash payable by the superior proprietor;
- (e) That the peshkash of each estate should be fixed at two-thirds of the assets and the malikhana payable to the superior proprietor at 10 per cent. of the peshkash;
- (f) That the cost of the village establishment should be deducted from the gross assets and that of the potails, putwaris and village watchers should be added to the peshkash, the village officers being paid by Government;
- (g) That the percentage cesses should continue to be levied and formed into a fund called the Bhadrachalam Local Fund to be administered by the Collector.

4. The Collector accordingly submitted proposals for the revision of the settlement based on the average cultivation and revenue of the five years ending fasli 1294, but the Board recommended that the settlement should be based on the receipts of the 10 years ending fasli 1294, and that the Collector's proposals should be revised accordingly. The Government in its order, dated 21st October 1886, No. 914, accepted the Board's recommendation. Finding also that if the peshkash was fixed at two-thirds of the assets, the net income of many of the proprietors would be very materially curtailed, the Government directed that it should be so fixed that the net income might not be reduced by more than 15 per cent. It was also directed by Government that the malikhana payable to the superior proprietor should not be altered, but should be fixed at the existing rates, and that a reduction of Rs. 4,000 should be made from the peshkash payable by the superior proprietor as a compensation allowed as an act of grace for the resumption of the forests. The Collector was directed to revise the settlement according to these instructions and to introduce it on the expiry of the settlement of 1867. Accounts were accordingly prepared, and Mr. Happell, the Collector, proceeded to Bhadrachalam in October 1887 to introduce

the settlement. He found, however, that the accounts furnished by the inferior proprietors were untrustworthy and that it was necessary that they should be carefully scrutinized with the aid of local inquiry and all the available accounts, and he directed the Special Assistant Agent to make the scrutiny. As this scrutiny would take time and the new settlement could not be introduced, he requested that the settlement of 1867 might be allowed to be continued for another year. This suggestion was approved by Government—G.O., dated 15th March 1888, No. 221.

5. Mr. Clegg, the Acting Special Assistant Agent, accordingly scrutinized the accounts and has submitted a report on the subject. He states that the accounts previously furnished were inaccurate; that the proprietors kept two sets of accounts, viz., the jamabandi account and the demand, collection and balance account; that they do not tally with each other; that the latter account shows a higher figure than the former; that the former were the only accounts hitherto furnished, and that he has taken the assessment in all cases possible from the more accurate demand, collection and balance accounts. As regards cultivation, the jamabandi accounts are the only ones available and they are utterly unreliable. The accounts produced by the superior proprietor of Bhadrachalam were fairly accurate, but those furnished by the inferior proprietors were not. Mr. Clegg considers that the accounts now obtained by him are as reliable as any can be obtained. Mr. Clegg's proposals have been forwarded by the Acting Collector without any remarks as he was new to the district, but it is stated that they were seen and approved by Mr. Happell, the permanent Collector.

6. The following abstract shows the average area cultivated during the ten years ending fasli 1294 and that assumed to be cultivated and cultivable at the settlement in 1867 and the area cultivated in fasli 1294:—

Estates.	LANDS ACTUALLY CULTIVATED IN 1867.		LANDS CULTIVABLE BUT WASTE AT THE SETTLEMENT.		TOTAL.	
	Area.	Assessment.	Area.	Assessment.	Area.	Assessment.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bhadrachalam	ACS. 2,606	RS. 2,796	ACS. 1,154	RS. 1,081	ACS. 3,660	RS. 3,877
Marrigudem	6,704	7,492	1,094	1,246	7,798	8,738
Rokapalle	5,673	7,127	928	976	6,801	8,103
Tirupurapentavidu	992	1,497	505	543	1,497	2,040
Nandigama	1,253	1,817	228	302	1,481	2,119
Kotarugomma	40	54	69	61	109	116
Regubilli	45	60	..	..	45	60
Madimeru	21	28	4	7	25	35
Progallapalli	189	129	77	66	266	195
Sitampeta	23	50	1	1	24	51
Dantenam	83	104	9	12	92	116
Nadicudi	246	179	161	203	407	382
Kesavapatam	173	133	..	..	173	133
Yetapaka	372	547	11	22	383	569
Gundala	559	784	51	52	610	836
Gangolu	86	72	52	26	138	98
Devarapalli	201	382	6	12	207	394
Gogubaka	143	128	47	45	190	174
Kondraipeta	38	26	..	..	38	26
Chokkampalli	210	293	51	50	261	343
Kumarasamigudem	84	130	2	2	86	132
Chintalagudem	125	221	16	15	141	236
Kolanagudem	8	24	..	..	8	24
Sitarampuram	7	12	43	56	50	68
Tekubaka	84	117	37	35	121	152
Lellavayi	98	111	20	20	118	131
Rayanipeta	425	698	65	61	490	759
Venkatayapalem	37	21	..	..	37	21
Narasingsapeta	59	32	60	43	119	75
Burraemulu	33	63	..	..	33	63
Chedalavada	399	190	193	89	592	279
Talugonda	312	124	109	89	421	213
Yedagurallapalli	121	62	61	42	182	104
Total ..	21,549	25,503	5,054	5,158	26,603	30,661

Estates.	AVERAGE CULTIVATION OF FIVE YEARS ENDING FASLI 1294, EXCLUDING LANDS IN RIVER-BEDS (MR. FOSTER).		AVERAGE CULTIVATION OF TEN YEARS ENDING FASLI 1294, EXCLUDING RIVER-BED LANDS.		CULTIVATION OF FASLI 1294, EXCLUDING RIVER-BED LANDS.		Waste lands allowed at the settlement and in the re-settlement.
	Area.	Assessment.	Area.	Assessment.	Area.	Assessment.	
	8	9	10	11	12	13	
Bhadrachalam	ACS. 3,313	RS. 4,990	ACS. 3,306	RS. 5,051	ACS. 3,417	RS. 4,987	ACS. 8,294
Marrigudem	8,699	8,915	8,732	8,704	8,646	8,932	12,419
Rokapalle	7,001	8,323	6,809	7,911	7,029	8,344	11,589
Tirupurapentavidu	1,560	2,192	1,687	2,149	1,512	2,215	2,619
Nandigama	1,715	2,554	1,641	2,585	1,770	2,381	2,203
Kotarugomma	44	49	36	41	29	26	186
Regubilli	56	29	48	44	70	28	96
Madimeru	39	36	35	44	36	11	38
Progallapalli	303	405	300	374	263	342	1,333
Sitampeta	87	197	111	228	91	190	34
Dantenam	89	169	95	166	91	179	119
Nadicudi	250	224	251	256	245	182	804
Kesavapatam	177	241	161	228	219	186	296
Yetapaka	562	674	448	658	512	673	774
Gundala	613	969	610	1,252	564	857	1,091
Gangolu	196	131	174	150	211	113	319
Devarapalli	211	255	175	252	147	245	326
Gogubaka	270	276	246	249	279	290	350
Kondraipeta	38	26	38	26	39	26	77
Chokkampalli	338	504	352	496	342	484	370
Kumarasamigudem	86	133	89	138	73	111	62
Chintalagudem	198	193	163	197	192	192	162
Kolanagudem	23	41	24	55	14	8	25
Sitarampuram	69	93	62	116	60	98	47
Tekubaka	179	301	179	334	147	246	125
Lellavayi	175	247	159	238	174	207	82
Rayanipeta	378	577	425	684	306	512	708
Venkatayapalem	57	83	54	81	33	71	80
Narasingsapeta	48	77	50	74	48	100	265
Burraemulu	85	207	73	207	83	163	130
Chedalavada	274	126	258	121	287	144	1,289
Talugonda	277	107	284	118	252	99	649
Yedagurallapalli	162	57	164	60	166	58	422
Total ..	27,572	33,396	27,242	33,288	27,347	32,700	47,383

7. According to the orders of Government, the cost of the entire village establishment is to be deducted from the gross assets and the peshkash is to be fixed at two-thirds of the remainder, and the cost of potails, putwaris and village watchers to be added to the peshkash. Besides these, the proprietors of the several estates have also to pay a certain percentage of the peshkash to the superior proprietor as malikhana in recognition of his superior rights, and certain local cesses called the Road, School and Dak Funds at the existing rates. The annexed statement shows these several payments to be made by the several proprietors and their net income:—

Estates.	PAYABLE BY THE SUPERIOR PROPRIETOR TO GOVERNMENT.						PAYABLE BY INFERIOR PROPRIETOR TO THE SUPERIOR PROPRIETOR.				† Net income of proprietors.			
	• Gross assets, being the average assessment for 10 years.	Cost of the entire village establishment.	Net assets (Difference between columns 2 and 3).	Add cost of potalis, putvaris and talayaris.	Funds.			Total.	Total of column 11. allowance.	Total.				
					Peishchah, being two-thirds of column 4.	Road Fund.	School Fund.							
												Dak Fund.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Bhadrachalam	Rs. 5,051	Rs. 775	Rs. 4,276	Rs. 2,851	Rs. 674	Rs. 57	Rs. 57	Rs. 14	Rs. 128	Rs. 3,653	Rs. 3,653	Rs. ..	Rs. 3,653	Rs. 1,297
2. Marrigudem ..	8,704	1,211	7,493	4,905	1,094	100	100	25	225	6,314	6,314	..	6,314	2,273
3. Rikampalle ..	7,911	854	7,057	4,705	751	96	96	24	216	6,672	6,672	445	6,117	1,691
4. Tirupurapentavida ..	2,149	372	1,777	1,185	331	24	24	6	64	1,670	1,670	179	1,491	359
5. Nandigama ..	2,585	523	2,062	1,375	459	29	29	7	65	1,899	1,899	144	2,043	478
6. Koturugomma ..	41	3	38	25	3	..	1	..	21	29	29	3	33	9
7. Pegubilli ..	44	9	35	23	8	1	1	..	2	33	33	4	37	6
8. Madimeru ..	44	5	39	28	6	1	1	..	2	33	33	5	38	6
9. Progalapalli ..	374	39	335	223	39	4	4	1	9	271	271	23	294	80
10. Sitampeta ..	228	16	212	141	16	3	3	1	7	164	164	7	171	57
11. Dantenam ..	166	36	130	87	36	2	2	..	4	127	127	1	128	38
12. Nadioudi ..	256	26	230	153	26	3	3	1	7	186	186	3	189	67
13. Kesavapatam ..	228	21	207	138	21	3	3	1	7	166	166	1	167	61
14. Yetapaka ..	658	141	517	346	124	7	7	2	16	485	485	43	528	113
15. Gundala ..	1,252	178	1,074	718	149	14	14	4	32	897	897	36	933	290
16. Gangolu ..	150	9	141	94	9	2	2	..	7	107	107	3	110	40
17. Devarapalle ..	252	64	198	132	38	3	3	1	7	177	177	..	177	59
18. Gogubaka ..	249	28	221	147	28	3	3	1	7	182	182	..	182	63
19. Kondrajpetta ..	28	1	27	17	1	1	..	..	19	19	19	4	19	7
20. Chokkampalli ..	496	75	421	281	75	6	6	1	13	369	369	31	400	96
21. Kunarasesingudem ..	138	25	113	75	23	1	1	..	2	100	100	8	108	28
22. Chintalagudem ..	197	39	158	105	39	2	2	1	5	149	149	21	170	27
23. Kolanagudem ..	55	4	51	34	4	1	1	..	2	40	40	4	44	11
24. Sitarapuram ..	116	12	104	69	12	1	1	..	2	83	83	14	97	19
25. Tekubaka ..	334	37	297	198	37	4	4	1	9	244	244	26	264	70
26. Lellavayi ..	238	42	196	131	42	3	3	1	7	180	180	52	232	6
27. Rayanipeta ..	684	228	456	304	215	6	6	2	14	633	633	61	694	77
28. Venkatayyapalem ..	81	6	75	60	6	1	1	..	2	68	68	7	65	16
29. Narasingapeta ..	74	5	69	46	5	1	1	..	2	53	53	7	60	14
30. Burayamula ..	207	16	191	127	16	3	2	1	6	148	148	26	174	33
31. Chodalavida ..	121	8	113	76	8	1	1	..	2	86	86	..	86	35
32. Talugonda ..	118	8	110	73	8	1	1	..	2	83	83	..	83	35
33. Yedugurallipalli ..	60	4	56	37	4	1	1	..	2	43	43	6	49	11
Total ..	33,287	4,810	28,477	18,984	4,306	384	384	95	863	24,153	24,153	1,168	25,311	7,472

* This statement excludes river-bed lands, the extent of the average cultivation of which is 113 acres and assessment Rs. 294.
† Column 15 is arrived at by subtracting from column 2 the total of columns 4, 5, 10 and 13.

8. In paragraph 4 of G.O., dated 21st October 1886, No. 914, Government directed that as one of the objects of the new settlement was to improve the position of the proprietors and if the peshkash were fixed at two-thirds of the assets in all cases the net income of many of the proprietors would be materially reduced, the peshkash should be so fixed that the net income may not be reduced by more than 15 per cent. The annexed table shows the net income that would be left to the proprietors under the new settlement.

Estate.	PROPOSED NET INCOME.						Net income under the settlement of 1867.	Difference between columns 9 and 2.	15 per cent. of column 2 where column 10 shows a reduction.	Difference between columns 10 and 11.	Peshkash as finally adjusted, i.e., column 4 minus column 12.
	Assets.	Peshkash.	Funds.	Malikhana.	Cost of village establishments.	Total payments.					
1.	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Bhadrachalam	Rs. 13,755	7,846	353	..	1,986	10,185	3,570	..	..	..	8,012
2. Marriyadum	26	17	1	..	1	19	7	..	..	..	4,705
3. Kondraipeta	121	76	2	..	8	83	35	..	..	..	1,257
4. Chodalavada	118	73	2	..	8	83	35	..	..	..	23
5. Tatugonda	7,911	4,705	216	445	854	6,220	1,691	..	..	..	20
6. Rekupalle	2,149	1,185	64	179	372	1,790	359	..	..	..	118
7. Tirupurapentavidu	2,555	1,375	65	144	523	2,107	480	..	..	..	25
8. Nandigama	31	25	1	3	3	32	9	..	..	..	20
9. Kotarugomma	44	23	2	4	9	38	6	..	..	..	86
10. Regubilli	14	23	2	6	6	38	6	..	..	..	48
11. Medimeru	374	223	9	23	39	294	80	..	..	..	87
12. Progalapalli	177	141	7	7	16	171	67	..	..	..	30
13. Sitampeta	166	87	7	1	38	128	38	..	..	..	66
14. Dantesam	256	153	7	3	20	189	61	..	..	..	73
15. Nadicudi	228	138	7	1	21	167	113	..	..	..	345
16. Kesavapalem	658	345	16	43	141	545	290	..	..	..	249
17. Yedapaka	1,252	716	32	38	178	962	40	..	..	..	67
18. Gundala	150	94	4	3	9	110	59	..	..	..	132
19. Gangolu	252	132	7	..	54	193	63	..	..	..	110
20. Devapalle	21	137	7	4	28	186	63	..	..	..	74
21. Chokkampalli	118	147	7	31	75	400	28	..	..	..	14
22. Chokkampalli	34	75	2	8	25	110	11	..	..	..	39
23. Kumarasamigudem	496	281	13	6	4	97	19	..	..	..	105
24. Kolamgudem	338	75	2	4	4	44	39	..	..	..	87
25. Sitaru puram	116	69	2	14	12	264	70	..	..	..	304
26. Tekubaka	334	198	9	20	37	232	6	..	..	..	16
27. Lallavayi	238	131	7	62	42	607	77	..	..	..	40
28. Rayanipeta	684	304	14	61	22	637	14	..	..	..	48
29. Venkatasalem	81	60	3	7	6	174	33	..	..	..	37
30. Narasingapeta	24	46	2	20	16	49	27	..	..	..	101
31. Ruravennila	207	127	6	26	4	170	27	..	..	..	17,597
32. Yedugurallapalli	60	37	2	21	39	170	27	..	..	..	..
33. Chintalagudem	197	105	5	21	39	170	27	..	..	..	..
Total ..	33,287	18,986	803	1,158	4,810	25,815	7,472	..	..	..	..

* The estates of Chetalavada, Talugunda and Kondraipeta have reverted to the superior proprietor of Bhadrachalam and form part of his estate.
† The Peshkash of this estate is fixed at Rs. 100 in the settlement of 1867 and in the resettlement and malikhana, Rs. 7-8-0.

9. It will be seen that in the case of 18 estates, the net income will be reduced by more than 15 per cent. by the introduction of the new settlement, and that therefore the peshkash payable for them as shown in column 4 of the statement annexed to the preceding paragraph has to be reduced to the extent shown in column 13 of the above statement. The Board begs to recommend that this course may be sanctioned.

10. Some of the proprietors contend that the peshkash on their estates has been permanently fixed and that therefore it cannot now be revised. These claims have now to be considered—

(a) *The Gundala and Pinapalli aghaharams in the Bhadrachalam taluk.*—It appears from a letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Chanda, No. 4108, dated 13th November 1886, forwarded by the Collector, that these villages were given to the inferior proprietor, Venkata Narasinga Rao Despandia, as a "mukta" on an annual quit-rent of Rs. 150 in perpetuity. The claim of these aghaharamdars should therefore be admitted.

(b) One Mr. A. Ramanuja Mudaliar also objects to revision of peshkash on the seven marginally-noted villages and to the payment of any malikhana. The villages were settled by Captain Glasfurd with the superior proprietor in 1867 for 20 years. Before the expiry of this period the superior proprietor granted these villages as a "mukta" for six years on a quit-rent of Rs. 100 in consideration of a heavy loan to the proprietor. Captain Glasfurd is stated to have decided to grant the villages as a "mukta" to Mr. A. Ramanuja Mudaliar on a quit-rent of Rs. 100 for his lifetime only. It is difficult to understand this decision. If the villages were given to the superior proprietor himself only for 20 years, it is not clear how Captain Glasfurd could, on behalf of the superior proprietor, have granted the villages to the inferior proprietor for his lifetime. The Board considers that the claim should be rejected.

(c) Certain deductions have to be made in ten aghaharams during the lifetime of the present holders. On their death, full peshkash will be charged.

(d) Mr. Clegg has not taken into account the deduction of Rs. 4,000 authorised by Government to be made from the peshkash payable by the superior proprietor of Bhadrachalam, in consideration of the resumption of forests, &c.

11. There are a few more points on which the orders of Government are required—

(a) In paragraph 4 of his letter Mr. Clegg recommends that the collection of rent in kind should be prohibited. The Board supports the proposal.

(b) In the next paragraph Mr. Clegg urges that there is no reason for excluding from the assets the revenue derived from river-bed lands. They are mainly the slopes of the bank between it and the water's edge. Mr. Clegg says that areas of river bed adjoining our bank were registered in the missals of certain river-side villages at the settlement of 1867 and that the village Wazib-ul-urz has a clause declaring the right of the proprietors to everything growing on the sandy land below the river bank. There appears to be no reason why the river-bank cultivation should be excluded. The Nizam, it is true, only ceded villages in certain taluks lying on the left bank of the river, but that surely included not only the land on the bank, but all cultivation down to the water's edge. As, however, the Government has distinctly stated that these lands are to be excluded, the Board has excluded them. If the

Government reconsiders that order it will be easy to include them as has been done by Mr. Clegg. The matter appears to have been misunderstood by the Board in their Proceedings read in G.O., dated 25th January 1885, No. 122, Revenue.

The annexed statement shows the peshkash and other payments which the proprietors of the several estates will have to make under the new settlement:—

Estates.	Peshkash as shown in column 13 of the preceding statement.	Deductions on account of "muttas," &c.	Net peshkash.	Cost of patta, putwaris and taluqaris.	Funds.	Malikhana.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Bhadrachalam	Rs. 8,912	Rs. 4,437	Rs. 3,575	Rs. 1,755	Rs. 361	Rs. ..	Rs. 5,721
2. Marrigudem	4,705	228	4,477	751	212	437	5,877
3. Kondraipeta	1,185	..	1,185	301	63	176	1,745
4. Chedalavada	1,257	..	1,257	459	57	119	1,835
5. Talugonda	25	1	24	3	1	3	31
6. Rékapalle	23	..	23	8	1	3	35
7. Tirupurapentavidu	20	..	20	5	1	4	30
8. Nandigama	85	16	69	39	1	6	115
9. Kotaruzomma	48	..	48	16	4	2	68
10. Regubilli	87	62	25	36	2	1	66
11. Madimeru	130	48	82	26	6	3	117
12. Progalapalli	66	34	32	21	3	1	57
13. Sitampeta	345	..	345	124	15	43	523
14. Dantenam	150	..	150	149	32	8	339
15. Nadiudi	67	132	67	9	3	2	71
16. Kesavapatam	132	21	111	34	6	..	147
17. Yetapaka	110	62	48	28	5	3	125
18. Gundala	216	..	216	75	10	21	302
19. Gangola	74	..	74	23	8	7	107
20. Ievarapalle	101	..	101	39	6	20	166
21. Gogubaka	14	..	14	4	1	2	21
22. Chokkimpalli	39	..	39	12	2	8	61
23. Kumarasamigudem	105	..	105	37	5	11	158
24. Chintalagudem	67	..	67	42	3	27	139
25. Kolanagudem	304	..	304	215	14	61	594
26. Sitarampuram	16	..	16	6	1	2	25
27. Tekubaka	40	..	40	5	2	6	53
28. Lellavayi	48	..	48	16	2	6	76
29. Rayanipeta	37	..	37	4	2	6	49
30. Venkatayapalem	17,498	5,041	12,457	4,306	817	992	18,572
31. Narasingapeta							
32. Burravemulu							
33. Yedugurallapalli							

* This deduction is granted in consideration of the resumption of forests, Rs. 4,000—vide paragraph 8 of G.O., dated 21st October 1886, No. 914, Revenue, and Rs. 437, the malikhana payable to him by Rékapalle proprietor.
† The peshkash, Rs. 150, is fixed and malikhana, Rs. 7-8-0, both in the present settlement and in the proposed.

12. The Board agrees with Mr. Clegg in considering that separate title-deeds should be given for each village as on the last occasion and that it is not advisable to issue one general sanad. The terms of the title-deed proposed by Mr. Clegg should also, the Board thinks, be approved. The question of right to minerals may become important in the taluk and the Board, in connection with applications for the right to work for coal, called on the Collector to report on the subject which has been submitted to Government (Board's Proceedings, dated 25th February 1890, No. 112). In the meanwhile, in the new settlement, the rights of Government should be carefully guarded. The Board apprehends that it is at all events certain that the right to mineral produce vests neither in the superior nor in the inferior proprietors. It may, however, vest in the occupier, subject, as is the case in ryotwari lands, to a special cess. The point will be discussed at length hereafter.

13. The sanction of Government is requested for the continuance of the present settlement for another year, so that the new settlement may be introduced from the next fasli.

14. The Board thanks Mr. Clegg for the very careful manner in which he has dealt with this subject.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with
fourteen statements and sanads, in original, to be returned.
Copy to the Agent to the Governor, Godavari.

Read—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 19th March 1890, No. 161:—

MR. H. W. BLISS.
MR. W. S. WHITESIDE.
MR. H. F. CLOGSTOUN.

Read—the following letter from W. A. HAPPELL, Esq., Government Agent, Godavari District, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Cocanada, 20th July 1889, No. 42:—

In reference to your memorandum, dated 8th July 1889, No. 114, and in continuation of my letter, No. 41, dated 20th July 1889, I have the honor to state that one of the points on which report has been called for in Proceedings, dated 17th December 1888, No. 7380, Mis., is the alleged extortion of heavy assessments from the Koyas by the proprietors, &c. This subject is more or less connected with the resettlement of the Bhadrachalam and Rékapalle taluks and will be dealt with when my proposals for revision of settlement are submitted. The other point concerns forests. The following extract from my Agency Administration Report for 1888-89 expresses my views:—

"At present the forests in the Rampa country are vested in the muttadars, some of whom have leased out the right of cutting timber. The muttadars do not know the utility of conserving forests, and the renters naturally try to cut away as much timber as they can during their lease. The evil effects of this short-sighted policy are already visible, and if the work of devastation goes on at the present rate, Rampa will soon be stripped of all its best forests. Before reserving any of these forests, we must, however, first come to terms with the muttadars, and I do not think there will be any difficulty in securing the right of Government in the most important areas by granting a remission to them. A very small sum will satisfy them in most cases. The District Forest-officer has not yet had time to select any forest for reservation in Rampa. Connected with the question of the conservation of forests in Rampa is the question of the muttadars' right to levy fees for passes granted for the transport of forest produce.

"A reference was made to this subject by the Principal Assistant Agent in paragraph 5 of his letter, dated 11th June 1888, No. B, embodied in G.O., dated 21st September 1888; No. 2002, and the Board have, in their Proceedings, dated 17th December 1888, No. 7380, Mis., called for further information which I could not furnish without visiting these forests myself and ascertaining the true condition from local inquiry, which I did during my recent tour. The Principal Assistant Agent has with my approval issued orders that the levy of fees should be stopped pending final orders on the subject. The principal muttadars admit that no such fees have been levied from the time Sayer duties were abolished until recently. They have clearly no right to such fees. Even if Government should determine to reserve some forest areas in Rampa, I would recommend that the collection and distribution of forest produce be everywhere left free."

Resolution—dated 19th March 1890, No. 161.

Submitted to Government with reference to its order, dated 21st November 1888, No. 6966.

2. The subject of the exaction of heavy assessment from the Koyas is dealt with in paragraph 4 of Mr. Clegg's report submitted to Government with Board's Proceedings, dated 19th March 1890, No. 160. Mr. Clegg has proposed that the collection of rent in kind should be prohibited and the Board has supported the proposal.

3. The question of the reservation of the forests in Rampa and of acquiring the rights of muttadars by the immediate grant of remissions or small sums as compensation has been submitted to Government in Board's Proceedings, dated 6th September last, No. 449, Forest.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Agent to the Governor, Godavari.

ORDER—dated 17th June 1890, No. 460, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

In the first of the papers read above, the Board submits its final proposals for the resettlement of the Bhadrachalam in G.O., No. 914, dated 21st October 1886, and, with a few alterations, was practically accepted, the local officers being directed at once to "take the preliminary steps for the introduction of the settlement." Subsequently, however, to this order, it was discovered that the accounts were so untrustworthy that a careful scrutiny was considered necessary and the Special Assistant Agent was directed to carry this out. Mr. Clegg has accordingly collected the most accurate statistics procurable and the present proposals are based upon his report.

2. The subjoined statement shows the total amount payable to Government under the present scheme, as compared with that paid under Captain Glasford's settlement of 1867 and with that payable under the scheme of 1886.

	As per settle- ment of 1867.	As proposed by Board in 1886.	As now proposed.	Difference be- tween columns 3 and 1.
	1	2	3	4
Peshkash	Rs. 17,450	Rs. 18,898	Rs. 12,457	Rs. 4,993
Funds	819	850	817	2
Cost of potails, putwaris, &c.	4,353	4,580	4,306	47
Total	22,622	24,328	17,580	5,042

3. The greater part of the deduction of Rs. 4,993 in the peshkash is due to the concession of Rs. 4,000 per annum granted to the superior proprietor as compensation for the forests, abkari, and miscellaneous revenues which were resumed by Government at Captain Glasford's settlement of 1867. The remainder represents deductions allowed during the lifetime of the present holders of certain agharams and one while a certain temple is in existence.

4. In G.O., No. 914 of 1886, already quoted, it was ordered that in no case, under the new settlement, should the income of the proprietors be reduced by more than 15 per cent. and the statement given at paragraph 8 of the above Proceedings shows how the peshkash has been adjusted to meet this requirement. The following statement shows the percentages of increase and decrease in the income of the various estates. There is an increase in 17 cases, a decrease in 10, and in 2 there is no alteration.

No.	Name of estate.	Net income according to settle- ment of 1867.	Gross assets based on 10 years' assess- ment.	Total payments under the new settle- ment.	Proposed income.	Increase or decrease in income due to settle- ment.	Percentage of increase or decrease to income of 1867.	
							+	-
1-5	Bhadrachalam, &c.	Rs. 4,075	Rs. 14,058	Rs. 5,744	Rs. 8,312	+ 4,237	104	..
6	Rikapalle	1,711	8,038	5,961	2,077	+ 366	21	..
7	Tirupurapentavidu	818	2,165	1,755	410	+ 92	29	..
8	Nandigama	701	2,683	1,990	693	- 8	..	1
9	Kotaruagonima	31	46	35	11	+ 42	The former income was a minus one.	
10	Regubilli	6	45	36	9	+ 15		
11	Madiuera	14	44	30	14	..	..	..
12	Pragallapalli	256	374	118	256	..	..	..
13	Sitampeta	177	228	68	160	- 17	..	10
14	Dantenana	38	166	66	110	+ 62	163	..
15	Nadieuadi	106	256	117	139	+ 33	31	..
16	Kesavapatam	156	228	57	171	+ 15	10	..
17	Yetapaka	63	661	530	131	+ 68	108	..
18	Gundala	891	1,232	339	913	+ 22	2	..
19	Gangolu	91	130	71	79	- 12	..	13
20	Devurapalle	21	252	44	208	+ 229	Former income was minus.	
21	Gogubaka	118	250	126	124	+ 6	5	..
22	Chokkampalli	189	503	267	236	+ 47	25	..
23	Kumarasamigudem	34	138	107	31	- 3	..	9
24	Chintalagudem	37	197	165	32	- 5	..	14
25	Kolanagudem	37	55	21	34	- 3	..	8
26	Sitarampuram	68	116	61	55	- 3	..	5
27	Tokubaka	192	334	158	176	- 16	..	8
28	Lellavayi	82	238	139	99	+ 17	21	..
29	Rayanipeta	61	685	595	90	+ 251	Former income was minus.	
30	Venkatayapalem	59	81	25	56	- 3	..	5
31	Narasimhapeta	24	74	53	21	- 3	..	12.5
32	Burraomulu	129	207	76	131	+ 2	2	..
33	Yedugurallapalli	2	60	49	11	+ 9	450	..
Total		9,339	33,582	18,803	14,779	5,440	68	..

* Gundala pays a special quit-rent of Rs. 150.

N.B.—These figures take into account the deductions for "muttas" and the total increase is therefore in some cases (marked †) only temporary.

5. The following minor points, upon which the orders of Government are required, will be dealt with in detail:—

(i) *River-bed lands*.—In G.O., No. 122, dated 29th January 1885, it was stated that these lands should be excluded from the settlement, but this order was passed under a misapprehension of the facts. Mr. Clegg argues rightly that the treaty of 1860 with the Nizam, under which these taluks were ceded to the British Government, did not in any way exclude lands on the bank of the river from British territory, and the accounts now furnished show that assessment has in recent years been levied on such lands. The Government agrees in considering that there is no valid argument for the exclusion of these lands from the settlement, and, accordingly, directs that they be included. The necessary corrections have been made in the statements embodied in this order.

(ii) *The Gundala estate*.—The Government concurs with the Board in thinking that the claim to hold this estate on the special quit-rent of Rs. 150 per annum in perpetuity should be admitted.

(iii) *Tirupurapentavidu estate*.—The proprietor claims to enjoy this estate as "muckta" on an annual quit-rent of Rs. 100. The Board does not support this claim and His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that it should be rejected. The concession was not enjoyed under the previous settlement and the proprietor has no good grounds for urging his claims as against Government.

(iv) *Sanads*.—The revised terms of the sanads to be granted to the superior proprietor are detailed in paragraph 13 of Mr. Clegg's letter: these are in accordance with the previous orders of Government and are now approved. The Government also accepts Mr. Clegg's recommendation that a separate sanad should be issued to the superior proprietor for each village.

- (v) *Extension of the present settlement.*—The Board requests sanction for the continuance of the present settlement for another year, so that the new settlement may be introduced from the next fasli. It is observed that the settlement of 1867 expired in July 1887 and this was by G.O., No. 221, dated 15th March 1888, extended for one year: the old settlement, therefore, ceased to have effect from July 1888 and sanction is now accorded for its extension for two years, i.e., until July 1890, so that the new rates may commence from fasli 1300.
- (vi) *Collection of rents in kind.*—This question is dealt with in the second of the Board's Proceedings read above, and the case is clearly put by Mr. Clegg in paragraph 4 of his report on the settlement. The system, which is called the "buttaee" system and is described in paragraph 159 of Captain Glasfurd's report, appears to have been continued in several villages although expressly prohibited in the village "missels," and the Government now directs that in future the prohibition shall be strictly enforced.

6. The question of the Rampa forests was disposed of in G.O., dated 3rd February 1890, No. 103. The report promised in paragraph 12 of the first of the above Proceedings, on the subject of the right of the State to mineral produce, should be expedited.

7. With the above remarks, His Excellency the Governor, in Council approves of the proposals now submitted, and he desires to thank Mr. Clegg for the very able and careful manner in which he has carried out the resettlement.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue, with fourteen statements
and sanads, in original (returned).
,, the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture.
Copy to the Judicial Department.

Exd. A. D. Xavier.

60 Copies.

of site
in map
order
and
Please

at No
-
Madam
-

at

may

Gobt. of (1890) Madras.
REVENUE.

19.11.03

1.12.03

8.12.04

19.2.06

Revised
21.10.03

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 17th June 1890, No. 460.

JUNE.

Resettlement of the Bhadrachalam
and Rekapalle taluks.

Passing orders on papers relating to the —
in the Godavari district.