M.R.O. 1—77,000—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 80

(2) Date of repair 6 - 2 - 45

(3) Initials of the Referencer Ca

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 976-77 Press Mis.

Dated 13th November 1893.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 22nd July 1893, Mis. No. 2710, Revenue:—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 13th July 1893, Forest No. 829, Mis.:—

Read—the following letter from H. F. W. GILLMAN, Esq., Acting Special Assistant Agent, Gódávari district, to E. C. RAWSON, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Gódávari district, dated 14th April 1893, No. 143:—

In obedience to your endorsement, dated 15th February 1893, No. 40, on Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, I have the honour to enclose a statement showing the amount of the allowance to be granted to the muttadars and mokhasadars who have been deriving revenue from forests in Rampa.

2. I have just completed a tour through Rampa and have seen all the muttadars, except four, and all the mokhasadars, except one. Most of them I met at Chodavaram on the 26th ultimo and the rest at Ramavaram and Addatigela. I informed them of the purport of the Government Order and told them that the payment of the income was conditional on their rendering every assistance in the carrying out of any forest regulations that may be introduced hereafter. Government had further ordered, I said, that, so long as they were peaceful and quiet, they and their hill men were free to avail themselves of the forests for podu cultivation and to cut timber and gather forest produce for their wants.

3. All the muttadars expressed themselves satisfied with the order. Some asked if allowances would be perpetual or would end with their lives. I answered that Government would decide this question. I request that orders may be issued with regard to it. I presume that the allowances will be perpetual as they are in lieu of privileges permanently resumed.

4. In enclosure A will be found the statements made before me by the muttadars and mokhasadars and my reasons for selecting the figures in columns 3, 4 and 5 of enclosure B from which the allowances are calculated.

5. The total amount of the proposed allowances is Rs. 4,670.

Government in its final order will fix the date from which they are to be paid. I venture to suggest 1st April 1893 as a convenient date as it is the commencement of the official year and as I directed the Rampa mokhasadars on the 26th March to, at once, cease granting permits for cutting timber in their forests.

6. As regards Dutsarti, it has, I believe, been long since decided by Government that the forests were Government property. I do not therefore understand how the muttadar can have any claim to allowances, seeing that his cutting has been in direct contravention of this order. But as Mr. Happell took account of his receipts I have done so too.

7. There is one other mutta on which I ask for orders and that is the claim of Pallala Ramireddi of Valamur to the teak trees in his mutta. There really seems to be some ground for his assertion that they were planted by his ancestors, for teak is not indigenous to Rampa, and this mutta is the only place, so far as I know, in which it exists. I suggest that a competent Forest-officer be directed to make a local inquiry and give his opinion on the matter as a question of forestry.

Endorsement by E. C. RAWSON, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Gódávari, dated 5th May 1893, No. 35.

Submitted with enclosures to the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), in reference to paragraph 2 of its Proceedings, dated 27th February 1893, Forest No. 132.

2. The draft rules called for in paragraph 3 of the Proceedings quoted above have been sent to the Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, for his remarks and, when they are returned by him, they will be submitted to the Board of Revenue.

Resolution—dated 13th July 1893, Forest No. 829, Mis.

The Special Assistant Agent's letter forwarded by the Government Agent, Gódávari, with the endorsement dated 5th May 1893, No. 35, will be submitted to Government with reference to the concluding sentence of paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280.

2. The statement received with Mr. Gillman's letter shows the average annual income derived by the muttadars and mokhasadars from their forests and the amount of allowance recommended for each.

3. In cases Nos. 4, 6 and 7 entered in the statement, the Special Assistant Agent has largely reduced the gross income to arrive at the net, although nothing is entered in the column "cost of establishment." In the first two of these cases the gross income has been divided by three to arrive at the net income and in the third case it has been halved. The Government Agent is requested to explain on what principle the net income has been calculated.

4. In case No. 8 the Special Assistant Agent has entered the total of three years' receipts as the average annual income for one year. This appears to be a clerical error. The Board has made the necessary correction in the statement.

5. Mr. Gillman raises the following questions in his letter:—

(1) Whether the allowances proposed to be given to the muttadars are to be perpetual.

(2) Whether the Dutsarti muttadar, whose forests have long ago been decided to be Government property, should also have the allowance now proposed.

(3) Whether the claim of the Valamur muttadar to the teak trees in his mutta, on the ground that they were specially planted by his ancestors, is to be recognised.

With regard to question (1), the Board has no doubt that Government retains the power of stopping the allowances when it is satisfied that the conditions in paragraph 3 of the Government Order quoted in paragraph 1 *supra* are not being fulfilled, but that subject to this condition the allowances were meant to be permanent.

With regard to (2), it is observed that the Dutsarti mutta was included in Mr. Happell's proposals embodied in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, though Dutsarti mutta is not in the Rampa country. The Board has, therefore, allowed it to stand.

With regard to (3), the Board's suggestion in paragraph 10 of its Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, that a Forest-officer should be deputed to make a local inquiry on this point has been already approved by Government (paragraph 4 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280). It should now be set on foot at an early date either by the Conservator himself or by the District Forest-officer.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with a copy of the statement and enclosure A.

ENCLOSURES to Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 143, dated 14th April 1893.

ENCLOSURE A.

DETERMINATION OF THE INCOME OF (1) MUTTADARS.

(*a*) *who kept accounts.*

Bandapalli.—The Muttadar Karam Narasan Dora said his father produced all the accounts that he had before Mr. Happell and that he had no others. He kept a forest gumasta jointly with the Birampalli muttadar and a peon of his own.

Note.—The receipts on which this muttadar's income is calculated are—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1887	425	6	0
1889	462	0	0
Seven months in 1890	303	6	0

these being the figures given in Mr. Happell's letter No. 93, dated 11th December 1891. The annual cost of the establishment kept by the muttadar to collect this income was—

	Rs.
Gumasta (part pay)	72
Peon	60
Total ...	132

Birampalli.—Karam Jangan Dora, the muttadar, produced before me abstracts of accounts showing his receipts from timber during 1888-90 to be as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
1888	1,072	7	0	
1889	764	14	0	
First seven months in 1890	1,049	15	6	say 1,050

He said that the abstracts were prepared from the files of permits granted by him to persons who applied for timber. He stated that he kept up two establishments for the collection of his forest revenue—one at Ootta and the other at Kristudupalem. At each station there was a gumasta and peon, but the cost of the Ootta gumasta was partly borne by the Bandapalli muttadar.

Note.—The figures above given are nearly the same as those entered by Mr. Happell in his letter and may be accepted. Mr. Happell gives Rs. 1,080-11-0 as the muttadar's receipts for ten months of the year 1888. But as the receipts for the other months were *nil*, this figure should have been shown for the whole year. [Here I may state that, except for the year 1890, when cutting was stopped, I have taken the receipts given by muttadars who produced accounts for any portion of a year as the receipts for the whole year, assuming the receipts for the other portion to be *nil*, whether the muttadars admitted this or not. It is right, I think, to presume that the muttadars who regularly kept accounts entered therein all their receipts. As for 1890, I have calculated the average receipts per month and multiplied by 12.] The yearly cost of the Birampalli muttadar's forest establishment was—

		Rs.
Ootta station ...	1 gumasta on Rs. 7 part pay	144
	1 peon on ,, 5 ,, ...	
Kristudupalem ...	1 gumasta on ,, 7 ,, ...	144
	1 peon on ,, 5 ,, ...	
	Total ...	288

Musurumilli.—Mritivada Jogireddi, who is about to be recommended for the muttadar's post in succession to the late M. Raja Reddi, said that he had no accounts other than those that were given to Mr. Happell. He said that the late muttadar kept a forest peon who could write, on Rs. 6 a month, and that for some time, though not permanently, he entertained a gumasta on Rs. 10.

Note.—The years on which this muttadar's income is calculated are—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
1888	1,833	9	6	
1889	354	1	6	
Seven months in 1890	768	14	3	say 769

The muttadar stated to Mr. Happell that his forest establishment consisted of a gumasta on Rs. 8 and a peon on Rs. 5. This statement I adopt in preference to that made to me as being probably the more truthful one; the late muttadar who made it was directly acquainted with the working of the mutta forests. The annual cost of establishment I have taken therefore to be Rs. 156.

Marrivada.—Karam Dhulu Dora, who is also mokhasadar of Darimadugula, produced before me accounts showing his receipts from the forests in this village, when cutting in the mutta villages was forbidden, to be—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1892	381	2	0

His receipts during 1891 were, he said, Rs. 400, but he kept no accounts in that year. He produced accounts showing that during January and February of this year he received Rs. 99-2-0. He stated that he kept up no establishment, his son doing all his forest work for him.

Note.—Dhulu Dora informed me that the accounts for 1889-90 produced before Mr. Happell were for his mutta villages and his mokhasa Darimadugula. I have calculated his income from the following receipts:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1890	128	2	0
1891	400	0	0
1892	381	2	0

Dorachintalapalem.—Karam Butchen Dora, the muttadar, informed me that he used to receive an income of Rs. 100 a year from his forests. He has no accounts other than those produced before Mr. Happell.

Note.—In September 1890, Mr. Miller assembled the muttadars in order to acquaint them with the terms of G.O., No. 103, dated 3rd February 1890, and took statements from most of them as to their incomes from forests. Butchendora then said that he received Rs. 100 a year. I prefer to accept this statement, which was repeated to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram in 1890 and to myself lately, rather than depend on the scrappy accounts produced by the muttadar which are for only one month in 1888-89 and four months in 1890 and are not sufficient for the proper estimation *of his annual income.*

Bolugonda.—Marla Nukayya, the muttadar, said that he used to receive Rs. 1,000 from his forests. He produced an account for six months in 1889 showing his receipts during that time to be Rs. 454. This was, he stated, compiled from small scraps of paper. He said that some of his accounts were eaten by white-ants.

Note.—I do not trust this account; it appears to be posthumous. Paragraph 6 of Mr. Happell's letter leaves no doubt that every effort was made to obtain this muttadar's accounts and that all that he then had were produced by the renter of the forests. To Mr. Miller this muttadar stated that he received Rs. 10 to Rs. 20 a year. The accounts on which I calculate his income are—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1888	235	11	0
1889	163	11	0
Three months in 1890	73	4	0

Yerragonda.—The sub-muttadar said that he used to receive an income of from Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 a year and that he produced all his accounts before Mr. Happell.

Note.—These accounts were for two years as under—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1888	30	12	0
1889	205	8	6

From these the income has been calculated.

Dutsarti.—The Muttadar Chekka Abbayi Doragaru said that he produced all his accounts before Mr. Happell, he employed a gumasta on Rs. 12 a month to write up the accounts.

Note.—The receipts on which his income is calculated are—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1888	522	8	0
1889	1,731	3	0
Seven and a half months in 1890	959	10	0

Mr. Happell has shown Rs. 522-8-0 to be the receipts for eight months of 1888, but the muttadar informed me that no permits were given in the other months. I have taken his cost of establishment to be Rs. 150 a year.

(*b*) *Who kept no accounts.*

Velagapalli.—The Muttadar Mirtivada Ramireddi, a minor about 7 years old, was represented by his kinsman, the Musurumilli muttadar. He had nothing to add to the statements made to Mr. Happell.

Note.—The former muttadar informed the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram that he rented out the mutta forests to Sanapalli Swamigadu of Gokavaram for four years from 1st June 1887 at a rent of Rs. 400 a year. Mr. Happell has recorded that Rs. 350 only was paid the

muttadar, the balance was probably kept back on account of some doubt. I have taken muttadar's forest income to be Rs. 400 per annum.

Choppakonda.—The muttadar Chedala Yerramreddi said "for some years after the Fituri I realized a revenue of Rs. 200 a year by granting permits for timber. In fasli 1300, I leased out my forests for five years at Rs. 200 a year to Kasirazu Venkatarazu of Devipatnam who was my sowcar (banker). He paid me Rs. 150 for one year, setting off Rs. 50 against a debt of mine. The next year the forests were resumed by Government."

Note.—To the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram the muttadar made no mention of the Rs. 50 set off against a debt, but said that the annual amount of the lease were Rs. 145. I propose therefore to take his average annual income as Rs. 150 a year.

Palem.—Mirtivada Kominreddi, the muttadar said "I have now no accounts. My mutta has eight villages. I leased four for three years to Devisetti Narayanasami of Gokavaram at Rs. 150 a year and four to Bathela Swami of Gokavaram for the same amount. I did not mention Narayanaswamy's name to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram as he was dead. Prior to these leases, I had leased the villages to Narayanaswami and Yendapalli Subbayya of Veeravaram. Each paid me Rs. 150."

Note.—In 1890, the muttadar informed the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram that he leased out his mutta forests to Bathela Swami for Rs. 150 and made no mention of Narayanaswamy's name. I directed him to produce the cowle granted to the latter, but he has not done so, though more than a fortnight has elapsed. This muttadar informed Mr. Miller that he had been making Rs. 200 a year from his forests. This summary, I think, he accepted as his average annual income.

Rampa.—Sankuru Chinnayya, whose father was munsif of Chodavaram and was recognized by Mr. Sullivan as muttadar of certain villages in the Rampa casba, said "I keep no accounts. my income from forests used to vary, being 50 one year, 80 another, 150 another and so on. My average income was 100."

Note.—I do not believe this. To Mr. Miller, Chinnayya stated, that he received Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 a year; to Mr. Happell and the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar Rs. 50; and now to me Rs. 100. I think that Rs. 50 may be accepted as the *outside limit* of his receipts.

Geddada.—Murla Jogireddi said he used to receive Rs. 20, 30, or 40 per annum. He leased out his forests on three occasions, first to a comati for Rs. 20 per annum, then to Uppala Atchayya of Rajahmundry for Rs. 40 and then to Dasari Bapanna of Gokavaram for a like amount.

Note.—The income of this muttadar may be taken at Rs. 40.

Tadipalli.—Kattula Jogireddi, the muttadar, said "I received Rs. 50 per annum. I used at first to give passes, but subsequently I leased the mutta forests to Uppala Atchayya for Rs. 50.

Note.—This muttadar made a similar statement to Mr. Miller. I have therefore taken Rs. 50 to be his average annual income.

Vemulakonda.—The Muttadar Kulla Abbayi Dora did not appear before me.

Note.—His annual income from forests may be asserted at Rs. 150 which was, as he stated to Mr. Miller and Mr. Happell, the amount paid him by one Uppala Atchayya to whom he leased the forests.

Nedunur.—Chedala Latchireddi, the muttadar, said that about eight years ago he granted the right of cutting basi (*Schbrichera trijuda*) timber in his forests for three years to Uppala Atchayya for a sum of Rs. 300.

Note.—This is an exaggeration. Before both Mr. Miller and the Deputy Tahsildar, the muttadar said, that, under the lease, Atchayya paid him Rs. 30 per annum. From his replies to my questions I judge this to be an under-statement. I recommend that Rs. 50 be taken as his average annual income.

Chidugur.—Pallala Rajareddi, the muttadar, confirmed the statement made by him to the Deputy Tahsildar to the effect that he leased the right of cutting timber other than bamboos to Uppala Atchayya for an annual payment of Rs. 100; out of the bamboos for which he used to grant permits himself he made Rs. 100 more.

Note.—Annual income may be fixed at Rs. 200.

Tunnuru.—The Muttadar Pulla Kannamreddi said that he used to give passes for timber on payment of seigniorage and collected thereby Rs. 600 a year on an average, *i.e.*, Rs. 100 on timber sent down to the plains by the Gokavaram and Rs. 500 by the Godávari route.

Note.—This statement I disbelieve. Tunnuru is a mutta not easily accessible from the plains, and the muttadar could not have made Rs. 600 a year. This sum, moreover, is far in excess of the incomes of the neighbouring muttadars as stated by them. To Mr. Miller the muttadar stated that he received Rs. 100 a year. To the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar he said Rs. 200. This latter figure may be accepted as his annual income.

Kundada.—Kundla Tammireddi, the muttadar, said that he used to grant permits for busi timber and make Rs. 125 per annum thereby.

Note.—This sum may be accepted as his income.

Maredubilli.—Matta Swamireddi, the muttadar, said "seven years ago I leased out my forests excluding busi timber to Uppala Atchayya of Rajamundry for two years for Rs. 50 a year. From the busi timber for which I used to grant permits I got Rs. 100 a year. When Atchayya's lease expired, I used to get Rs. 50 per annum by granting permits for maddi and other kinds (marujati) timber."

Note.—To Mr. Miller the muttadar stated that Atchayya paid him Rs. 30 a year and made no mention of the busi profits. To the Deputy Tahsildar he said that these latter were only Rs. 60 per annum. I think that Rs. 100 is not an under-estimate of his *income*.

Valamur.—The Muttadar Pallala Ramireddi said that he leased his forests, reserving the right of cutting busi timber, to Uppala Atchayya for three years for Rs. 300 per annum. From the busi timber he made an annual profit of Rs. 100.

Note.—The following is Ramireddi's statement recorded by Mr. Miller: "He leased his forests to N. Atchayya for three years. This (1890) is the 3rd year and the lease will expire in a month. This was the first time he leased out the forests. Before that he used to collect fees on busi trees, but never made anything else out of the forests. Collected some 10 or Rs. 20 a year. The busi trees were all cut and so had to lease out the forest. The renter has cut teak and left some standing. The renter agreed to pay Rs. 300 a year." This shows that the busi was not cut during the currency of the lease and that the muttadar's annual income from forests may be taken to be Rs. 300, which was the sum he named to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram.

Pamuleru.—The Muttadar Pulikanty Jogayya said that his receipts varied from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 a year according as merchants came with transport bullocks from the plains in numbers or not.

Note.—To Mr. Miller, the muttadar stated, that merchants had ceased coming to him as the busi in his forests was exhausted; he did not say what he used to receive. He told Mr. Happell Rs. 40 per annum. Rs. 50 may, I think, be accepted as a very liberal guess.

Bodulur.—The muttadar did not appear before me.

Note.—To Mr. Miller he stated that he got nothing out of his forests, owing to their inaccessibility. This is probably true as the matter is a very remote one. I don't know why Mr. Happell estimated his income at Rs. 50 per annum.

Vetukur.—Kattula Bhupathireddi, muttadar, did not appear before me.

Note.—He informed Mr. Miller that he received nothing from his forests.

Kakur.—Pallala Karreddi, muttadar, informed Mr. Miller that he received Rs. 10 on busi timber, whereas before the Deputy Tahsildar he raised the figures to Rs. 60. This is a very remote mutta and it is not at all likely that the muttadar realized the latter income. Rs. 20 was probably as much as ever he received; at this sum I would fix his annual income.

Kota.—The Muttadar Madhuviti Jagannadhadevu made the same statement to me as he did to the Deputy Tahsildar in 1890, namely, that this income from forests was Rs. 140 per annum.

	Rs.
This was made up of forest rent of 4 villages	40
Amount from permits for cutting timber in other villages	100
Total ...	140

This figure may be accepted as the annual income.

Yarlagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).—The sub-muttadar Pallala Rajareddi said that he used to receive from Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 and 400 per annum by granting permits for timber and that his income was steadily increasing when the forests were resumed.

Note.—Rs. 400 was the figure stated to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokávaram in 1890. I think that this was the maximum amount obtained in one year and that Rs. 300 would more nearly represent the average income.

Nulakamaddi (sub-mutta of Kota).—Pallala Balareddi, the sub-muttadar, said that he never worked his forests systematically and that his receipts were nominal, about Rs. 25 a year.

Note.—This figure may be accepted.

Chamagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).—Pallala Tammireddi, the sub-muttadar, said that he made Rs. 100 a year, viz., Rs. 75 by leasing out two villages, and Rs. 25 by granting permits for cutting wood in others.

Note.—Rs. 100 may be taken to be his average annual income.

Pasaruginne (sub-mutta of Kota).—The sub-muttadar Pallala Bhupathireddi said he got Rs. 50 a year from his forests.

Note.—He told the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar Rs. 25, and this was probably his average income. I would fix at Rs. 30 to avoid a fractional allowance.

Mohanapuram.—Madhuviti Ramabhupatidevu, the muttadar, leased out all the forests in his mutta for five years from 1886 to Koka Sivayya Naidu for Rs. 60 a year.

Note.—This figure may be accepted.

Pandrapolu.—The muttadar said he obtained Rs. 180 a year by leasing out his forests to Januparedi Rajanna of Kottapalli.

Note.—Rs. 180 may be taken as his annual income.

(2) *Mokhasadars and persons who obtained villages on favorable tenure.*

Sankuru Chinnayya holds 10 villages in Rampa casba on an annual payment of a bow and three arrows. He has been treated as a muttadar and his income settled above.

Karam Dhulu Dora holds the villages of Marrivada, Bhimavaram and Peddakonda in the Rampa casba on a kattubadi of Rs. 15 a year and Darimadugula in the Bandapalli mutta as mokhasa. His forest income from these villages had already been taken account of along with his income from his mutta villages.

Pandu Swami holds the villages of Sirigindulapadu with its three hamlets, Pandirimamidi, Pandavarividhi, and Nadimvidhi on mokhasa tenure. He said that he kept no accounts. Last year he says he got Rs. 25, previous to that Rs. 30, Rs. 50 and for two years he received as much as Rs. 100 per annum.

Note.—He told Mr. Miller that there was not much timber in his mutta and that he received Rs. 10 or 5 a year. Rs. 30 will, I think, be a liberal estimate of his average income.

Sankuru Lakshmayya holds the village of Nimmalapalam as mokhasa. He produced accounts for 1891–92 and 1893 to 9th February showing his receipts to be as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1891	1,202	6	0
1892	212	11	0
1893	22	0	0

He said that for five years prior to 1891 he received Rs. 300 a year by leasing out his forests to Sankata Ramarazu of Cheruvupalem and Tumupathi Kamayya of Nellipudi and Chavalam Narasandora of Kottada.

Note.—This last statement is untrue, as he told Mr. Miller that he did not lease out his forests and got only Rs. 30 a year from them. The huge receipts of 1891 must not be taken into account in determining his income. They are due either to "cooked" accounts or to an endeavour on the mokhasadar's part to make as much as he could while Mr. Happell's order remained in force. It is difficult to estimate his annual income, but, judging by his receipts in 1892-93, I think that Rs. 200 may be taken as a fair average.

Kose Raman Dora holds the village of Vadapalli on a kattubadi of Rs. 15. He told me that he had never made any revenue from his forests.

Kurumagonda.—The mokhasadar did not appear before me and I heard nothing about him. I believe that his village is not distinguished from the other villages in Mohanapuram mutta.

(Signed) H. F. W. GILLMAN,
Acting Special Assistant Agent.

ENCLOSURE B.

Order—dated 22nd July 1893, Mis. No. 2710, Revenue.

Recorded pending receipt of the information called for in paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings.

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.

READ—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 2nd October 1893, Forest No. 1238, Mis.:—

Read—the following letter from the Government Agent, Gódávari, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 12th September 1893, No. 80:—

In reference to paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue), Forest No. 829, dated 13th July 1893, Mis., received as an enclosure to Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue), Forest No. 976, dated 12th August 1893, I have the honour to

inform you that in cases 4, 6 and 7 of the statement, the errors are clerical as in case No. 8 noticed by the Board in paragraph 4 of the Proceedings under reference. In the three cases in question the figures as per column 4 of the statement were erroneously treated as gross receipts instead of average annual receipts.

2. The office copy of the statement is duly corrected and an extract from it showing these three cases as also case No. 8 is herewith submitted.

3. The total amount of the proposed allowances now comes to Rs. 3,630 instead of Rs. 4,670 as mentioned in paragraph 5 of Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 643, dated 14th April 1893, submitted to the Board with this office endorsement No. 35, dated 4th May 1893.

Resolution—dated 2nd October 1893, Forest No. 1238, Mis.

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order, dated 22nd July 1893, No. 2710.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copy of the statement.

ORDER—dated 13th November 1893, No. 976, Revenue.

Forest No. 354.

The allowances proposed in the statement received with Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 143, dated 14th April 1893, subject to the modifications suggested in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Board's Proceedings thereon, and in the Agent's letter submitted with the second of the papers read above, are approved, and the Board will be informed that it has correctly interpreted the views of Government as to the nature of these allowances, viz., that they are to be perpetual subject to the power possessed by Government to stop them when it is satisfied that the conditions mentioned in paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280, are not being fulfilled. As, however, the sanction of the Government of India is required for the grant of the allowances in question, the following letter will be despatched to that Government.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
" Judicial Department.
" Accountant-General.

Erd. S. J. Pereira.

85 Copies.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 22nd July 1893, Mis. No. 2710, Revenue:—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 13th July 1893, Forest No. 829, Mis.:—

Read—the following letter from H. F. W. GILLMAN, Esq., Acting Special Assistant Agent, Gódávari district, to E. C. RAWSON, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Gódávari district, dated 14th April 1893, No. 143:—

In obedience to your endorsement, dated 15th February 1893, No. 40, on Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, I have the honour to enclose a statement showing the amount of the allowance to be granted to the muttadars and mokhasadars who have been deriving revenue from forests in Rampa.

2. I have just completed a tour through Rampa and have seen all the muttadars, except four, and all the mokhasadars, except one. Most of them I met at Chodavaram on the 26th ultimo and the rest at Ramavaram and Addatigala. I informed them of the purport of the Government Order and told them that the payment of the income was conditional on their rendering every assistance in the carrying out of any forest regulations that may be introduced hereafter. Government had further ordered, I said, that, so long as they were peaceful and quiet, they and their hill men were free to avail themselves of the forests for podu cultivation and to cut timber and gather forest produce for their wants.

3. All the muttadars expressed themselves satisfied with the order. Some asked if allowances would be perpetual or would end with their lives. I answered that Government would decide this question. I request that orders may be issued with regard to it. I presume that the allowances will be perpetual as they are in lieu of privileges permanently resumed.

4. In enclosure A will be found the statements made before me by the muttadars and mokhasadars and my reasons for selecting the figures in columns 3, 4 and 5 of enclosure B from which the allowances are calculated.

5. The total amount of the proposed allowances is Rs. 4,670.

Government in its final order will fix the date from which they are to be paid. I venture to suggest 1st April 1893 as a convenient date as it is the commencement of the official year and as I directed the Rampa mokhasadars on the 26th March to, at once, cease granting permits for cutting timber in their forests.

6. As regards Dutsarti, it has, I believe, been long since decided by Government that the forests were Government property. I do not therefore understand how the muttadar can have any claim to allowances, seeing that his cutting has been in direct contravention of this order. But as Mr. Happell took account of his receipts I have done so too.

7. There is one other mutta on which I ask for orders and that is the claim of Pallala Ramireddi of Valamur to the teak trees in his mutta. There really seems to be some ground for his assertion that they were planted by his ancestors, for teak is not indigenous to Rampa, and this mutta is the only place, so far as I know, in which it exists. I suggest that a competent Forest-officer be directed to make a local inquiry and give his opinion on the matter as a question of forestry.

Endorsement by E. C. RAWSON, Esq., Acting Government Agent, Gódávari, dated 5th May 1893, No. 35.

Submitted with enclosures to the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), in reference to paragraph 2 of its Proceedings, dated 27th February 1893, Forest No. 132.

2. The draft rules called for in paragraph 3 of the Proceedings quoted above have been sent to the Conservator of Forests, Northern Circle, for his remarks and, when they are returned by him, they will be submitted to the Board of Revenue.

Resolution—dated 13th July 1893, Forest No. 829, Mis.

The Special Assistant Agent's letter forwarded by the Government Agent, Gódávari, with the endorsement dated 5th May 1893, No. 35, will be submitted to Government with reference to the concluding sentence of paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280.

2. The statement received with Mr. Gillman's letter shows the average annual income derived by the muttadars and mokhasadars from their forests and the amount of allowance recommended for each.

3. In cases Nos. 4, 6 and 7 entered in the statement, the Special Assistant Agent has largely reduced the gross income to arrive at the net, although nothing is entered in the column "cost of establishment." In the first two of these cases the gross income has been divided by three to arrive at the net income and in the third case it has been halved. The Government Agent is requested to explain on what principle the net income has been calculated.

4. In case No. 8 the Special Assistant Agent has entered the total of three years' receipts as the average annual income for one year. This appears to be a clerical error. The Board has made the necessary correction in the statement.

5. Mr. Gillman raises the following questions in his letter:—

(1) Whether the allowances proposed to be given to the muttadars are to be perpetual.

(2) Whether the Dutsarti muttadar, whose forests have long ago been decided to be Government property, should also have the allowance now proposed.

(3) Whether the claim of the Valamur muttadar to the teak trees in his mutta, on the ground that they were specially planted by his ancestors, is to be recognised.

With regard to question (1), the Board has no doubt that Government retains the power of stopping the allowances when it is satisfied that the conditions in paragraph 3 of the Government Order quoted in paragraph 1 *supra* are not being fulfilled, but that subject to this condition the allowances were meant to be permanent.

With regard to (2), it is observed that the Dutsarti mutta was included in Mr. Happell's proposals embodied in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, though Dutsarti mutta is not in the Rampa country. The Board has, therefore, allowed it to stand.

With regard to (3), the Board's suggestion in paragraph 10 of its Proceedings, dated 23rd August 1892, Forest No. 458, that a Forest-officer should be deputed to make a local inquiry on this point has been already approved by Government (paragraph 4 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280). It should now be set on foot at an early date either by the Conservator himself or by the District Forest-officer.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with a copy of the statement and enclosure A.

ENCLOSURE to Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 143, dated 14th April 1893.

ENCLOSURE A.

DETERMINATION OF THE INCOME OF (1) MUTTADARS.

(*a*) *who kept accounts.*

Bandapalli.—The Muttadar (Karam) Narasandora said his father produced all the accounts that he had before Mr. Happell and that he had no others. He kept a forest gumasta jointly with the Birampalli muttadar and a peon of his own.

Note.—The receipts on which this muttadar's income is calculated are—

	Rs.	A.	P.
1887	425	6	0
1889	462	0	0
Seven months in 1890	303	6	0

these being the figures given in Mr. Happell's letter No. 93, dated 11th December 1891. The annual cost of the establishment kept by the muttadar to collect this income was—

	Rs.
Gumasta (part pay)	72
Peon	60
Total ...	132

Birampalli.—Karam Jangadora, the muttadar, produced before me abstracts of accounts showing his receipts from timber during 1888-90 to be as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
1888	1,072	7	0	
1889	764	14	0	
First seven months in 1890	1,049	15	6	say 1,050

He said that the abstracts were prepared from the files of permits granted by him to persons who applied for timber. He stated that he kept up two establishments for the collection of his forest revenue—one at Ootta and the other at Kristudupalem. At each station there was a gumasta and peon, but the cost of the Ootta gumasta was partly borne by the Bandapalli muttadar.

Note.—The figures above given are nearly the same as those entered by Mr. Happell in his letter and may be accepted. Mr. Happell gives Rs. 1,080-11-0 as the muttadar's receipts for ten months of the year 1888. But as the receipts for the other months were *nil*, this figure should have been shown for the whole year. [Here I may state that, except for the year 1890, when cutting was stopped, I have taken the receipts given by muttadars who produced accounts for any portion of a year as the receipts for the whole year, assuming the receipts for the other portion to be *nil*, whether the muttadars admitted this or not. It is right, I think, to presume that the muttadars who regularly kept accounts entered therein all their receipts. As for 1890, I have calculated the average receipts per month and multiplied by 12.] The yearly cost of the Birampalli muttadar's forest establishment was—

		Rs.
Ootta station ...	1 gumasta on Rs. 7 part pay	144
	1 peon on „ 5 „	
Kristudupalem ...	1 gumasta on „ 7 „	144
	1 peon on „ 5 „	
	Total ...	288

Musurumilli.—Mritiada Jogireddi, who is about to be recommended for the muttadar's post in succession to the late M. Raja Reddi, said that he had no accounts other than those that were given to Mr. Happell. He said that the late muttadar kept a forest peon who could write, on Rs. 6 a month, and that for some time, though not permanently, he entertained a gumasta on Rs. 10.

Note.—The years on which this muttadar's income is calculated are—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
1888	1,833	9	6	
1889	354	1	6	
Seven months in 1890	788	14	3	say 769

The muttadar stated to Mr. Happell that his forest establishment consisted of a gumasta on Rs. 8 and a peon on Rs. 5. This statement I adopt in preference to that made to me as being probably the more truthful one; the late muttadar who made it was directly acquainted with the working of the mutta forests. The annual cost of establishment I have taken therefore to be Rs. 156.

Marrivada.—Karaj Dalu Dora, who is also mokhasadar of Daramadugula, produced before me accounts showing his receipts from the forests in this village, when cutting in the mutta villages was forbidden, to be—

1892	Rs.	A.	P.
	381	2	0

His receipts during 1891 were, he said, Rs. 400, but he kept no accounts in that year. He produced accounts showing that during January and February of this year he received Rs. 99-2-0. He stated that he kept up no establishment, his son doing all his forest work for him.

Note.—Dhulu Dora informed me that the accounts for 1889-90 produced before Mr. Happell were for his mutta villages and his mokhasa Daramadugula. I have calculated his income from the following receipts:—

1890	Rs.	A.	P.
1891	128	2	0
1892	400	0	0
	381	2	0

Dorachintalapalem.—Karaj Butchendora, the muttadar, informed me that he used to receive an income of Rs. 100 a year from his forests. He has no accounts other than those produced before Mr. Happell.

Note.—In September 1890, Mr. Miller assembled the muttadars in order to acquaint them with the terms of G.O., No. 103, dated 3rd February 1890, and took statements from most of them as to their incomes from forests. Butchendora then said that he received Rs. 100 a year. I prefer to accept this statement, which was repeated to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram in 1890 and to myself lately, rather than depend on the scrappy accounts produced by the muttadar which are for only one month in 1888-89 and four months in 1890 and are not sufficient for the proper estimation *of his annual income.*

Boluqonda.—Murla Nakayya, the muttadar, said that he used to receive Rs. 1,000 from his forests. He produced an account for six months in 1889 showing his receipts during that time to be Rs. 454. This was, he stated, compiled from small scraps of paper. He said that some of his accounts were eaten by white-ants.

Note.—I do not trust this account; it appears to be posthumous. Paragraph 6 of Mr. Happell's letter leaves no doubt that every effort was made to obtain this muttadar's accounts and that all that he then had were produced by the renter of the forests. To Mr. Miller this muttadar stated that he received Rs. 10 to Rs. 20 a year. The accounts on which I calculate his income are—

1888	Rs.	A.	P.
1889	235	11	0
Three months in 1890	163	11	0
	73	4	0

Yerragonda.—The sub-muttadar said that he used to receive an income of from Rs. 150 to Rs 200 a year and that he produced all his accounts before Mr. Happell.

Note—These accounts were for two years as under—

1888	Rs.	A.	P.
1889	30	12	0
	205	8	6

From these the income has been calculated.

Dutsarti.—The Muttadar Chekka Abbayi Doragaru said that he produced all his accounts before Mr. Happell, he employed a gumasta on Rs. 12 a month to write up the accounts.

Note.—The receipts on which his income is calculated are—

1888	Rs.	A.	P.
1889	522	8	0
Seven and a half months in 1890	1,731	3	0
	959	10	0

Mr. Happell has shown Rs. 522-8-0 to be the receipts for eight months of 1888, but the muttadar informed me that no permits were given in the other months. I have taken his cost of establishment to be Rs. 150 a year.

(*b*) *Who kept no accounts.*

Velagapalli.—The Muttadar Maitwada Rami Reddi, a minor about 7 years old, was represented by his kinsman, the Musurumilli muttadar. He had nothing to add to the statements made to Mr. Happell.

Note.—The former muttadar informed the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram that he rented out the mutta forests to Sanapalli Swamigadu of Gokavaram for four years from 1st June 1887 at a rent of Rs. 400 a year. Mr. Happell has recorded that Rs. 350 only was paid the

muttadar, the balance was probably kept back on account of some doubt. I have taken muttadar's forest income to be Rs. 400 per annum.

Choppakonda.—The muttadar Chedala Yerramreddi said "for some years after the Fituri I realized a revenue of Rs. 200 a year by granting permits for timber. In fasli 1300, I leased out my forests for five years at Rs. 200 a year to Kasirazu Venkatarazu of Devipatnam who was my sowcar (banker). He paid me Rs. 150 for one year, setting off Rs. 50 against a debt of mine. The next year the forests were resumed by Government."

Note.—To the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram the muttadar made no mention of the Rs. 50 set off against a debt, but said that the annual amount of the lease were Rs. 145. I propose therefore to take his average annual income as Rs. 150 a year.

Palem.—Mutiyada Kommireddi, the muttadar said "I have now no accounts. My mutta has eight villages. I leased four for three years to Devisetti Narayanasami of Gokavaram at Rs. 150 a year and four to Bathela Swami of Gokavaram for the same amount. I did not mention Narayanaswamy's name to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram as he was dead. Prior to these leases, I had leased the villages to Narayanaswami and Yendapalli Subbayya of Veeravaram. Each paid me Rs. 150."

Note.—In 1890, the muttadar informed the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram that he leased out his mutta forests to Bathela Swami for Rs. 150 and made no mention of Narayanaswamy's name. I directed him to produce the cowle granted to the latter, but he has not done so, though more than a fortnight has elapsed. This muttadar informed Mr. Miller that he had been making Rs 200 a year from his forests. This summary, I think, he accepted as his average annual income.

Rampa.—Sankuru Chinnayya, whose father was munsif of Chodavaram and was recognized by Mr. Sullivan as muttadar of certain villages in the Rampa casba, said "I keep no accounts. My income from forests used to vary, being 50 one year, 80 another, 150 another and so on. My average income was 100."

Note.—I do not believe this. To Mr. Miller, Chinnayya stated, that he received Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 a year; to Mr. Happell and the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar Rs. 50; and now to me Rs. 100. I think that Rs. 50 may be accepted as the *outside limit* of his receipts.

Geddada.—Murla Jogireddi said he used to receive Rs. 20, 30, or 40 per annum. He leased out his forests on three occasions, first to a comati for Rs. 20 per annum, then to Uppala Atchayya of Rajahmundry for Rs. 40 and then to Dasari Bapanna of Gokavaram for a like amount.

Note.—The income of this muttadar may be taken at Rs. 40.

Tadipalli.—Kattula Jogireddi, the muttadar, said "I received Rs. 50 per annum. I used at first to give passes, but subsequently I leased the mutta forests to Uppala Atchayya for Rs. 50.

Note.—This muttadar made a similar statement to Mr. Miller. I have therefore taken Rs. 50 to be his average annual income.

Vemulakonda.—The Muttadar Kulla Abbayi Dora did not appear before me.

Note.—His annual income from forests may be asserted at Rs. 150 which was, as he stated to Mr. Miller and Mr. Happell, the amount paid him by one Uppala Atchayya to whom he leased the forests.

Nedunur.—Chedala Latchireddi, the muttadar, said that about eight years ago he granted the right of cutting basi (*Schbrichera trijuda*) timber in his forests for three years to Uppala Atchayya for a sum of Rs. 300.

Note.—This is an exaggeration. Before both Mr. Miller and the Deputy Tahsildar, the muttadar said, that, under the lease, Atchayya paid him Rs. 30 per annum. From his replies to my questions I judge this to be an under-statement. I recommend that Rs. 50 be taken as his average annual income.

Chidugur.—Pallala Rajareddi, the muttadar, confirmed the statement made by him to the Deputy Tahsildar to the effect that he leased the right of cutting timber other than bamboos to Uppala Atchayya for an annual payment of Rs. 100; out of the bamboos for which he used to grant permits himself he made Rs. 100 more.

Note.—Annual income may be fixed at Rs. 200.

Tunnuru.—The Muttadar Pilla Kannamreddi said that he used to give passes for timber on payment of seigniorage and collected thereby Rs. 600 a year on an average, *i.e.*, Rs. 100 on timber sent down to the plains by the Gokavaram and Rs. 500 by the Godávari route.

Note.—This statement I disbelieve. Tunnuru is a mutta not easily accessible from the plains, and the muttadar could not have made Rs. 600 a year. This sum, moreover, is far in excess of the incomes of the neighbouring muttadars as stated by them. To Mr. Miller the muttadar stated that he received Rs. 100 a year. To the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar he said Rs. 200. This latter figure may be accepted as his annual income.

Kandada.—Kandada Tammireddi, the muttadar, said that he used to grant permits for busi timber and make Rs. 125 per annum thereby.

Note.—This sum may be accepted as his income.

Maredubilli.—Matta Swamireddi, the muttadar, said "seven years ago I leased out my forests excluding busi timber to Uppala Atchayya of Rajamundry for two years for Rs. 50 a year. From the busi timber for which I used to grant permits I got Rs. 100 a year. When Atchayya's lease expired, I used to get Rs. 50 per annum by granting permits for maddi and other kinds (marujati) timber."

Note.—To Mr. Miller the muttadar stated that Atchayya paid him Rs. 30 a year and made no mention of the busi profits. To the Deputy Tahsildar he said that these latter were only Rs. 60 per annum. I think that Rs. 100 is not an under-estimate of his income.

Valamur.—The Muttadar Pallala Ramireddi said that he leased his forests, reserving the right of cutting busi timber, to Uppala Atchayya for three years for Rs. 300 per annum. From the busi timber he made an annual profit of Rs. 100.

Note.—The following is Ramireddi's statement recorded by Mr. Miller: "He leased his forests to N. Atchayya for three years. This (1890) is the 3rd year and the lease will expire in a month. This was the first time he leased out the forests. Before that he used to collect fees on busi trees, but never made anything else out of the forests. Collected some 10 or Rs. 20 a year. The busi trees were all cut and so had to lease out the forest. The renter has cut teak and left some standing. The renter agreed to pay Rs. 300 a year." This shows that the busi was not cut during the currency of the lease and that the muttadar's annual income from forests may be taken to be Rs. 300, which was the sum he named to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokavaram.

Pamuleru.—The Muttadar Pulikanti Jogayya said that his receipts varied from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100 a year according as merchants came with transport bullocks from the plains in numbers or not.

Note.—To Mr. Miller, the muttadar stated, that merchants had ceased coming to him as the busi in his forests was exhausted; he did not say what he used to receive. He told Mr. Happell Rs. 40 per annum. Rs. 50 may, I think, be accepted as a very liberal guess.

Bodulur.—The muttadar did not appear before me.

Note.—To Mr. Miller he stated that he got nothing out of his forests, owing to their inaccessibility. This is probably true as the matter is a very remote one. I don't know why Mr. Happell estimated his income at Rs. 50 per annum.

Vetukur.—Kattula Bhupatireddi, muttadar, did not appear before me.

Note.—He informed Mr. Miller that he received nothing from his forests.

Kakur.—Pallala Karreddi, muttadar, informed Mr. Miller that he received Rs. 10 on busi timber, whereas before the Deputy Tahsildar he raised the figures to Rs. 60. This is a very remote mutta and it is not at all likely that the muttadar realized the latter income. Rs. 20 was probably as much as ever he received; at this sum I would fix his annual income.

Kota.—The Muttadar Mathuviti Jagannadhadevu made the same statement to me as he did to the Deputy Tahsildar in 1890, namely, that this income from forests was Rs. 140 per annum.

	Rs.
This was made up of forest rent of 4 villages	40
Amount from permits for cutting timber in other villages	100
Total ...	140

This figure may be accepted as the annual income.

Yerlagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).—The sub-muttadar Pallala Rajareddi said that he used to receive from Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 and 400 per annum by granting permits for timber and that his income was steadily increasing when the forests were resumed.

Note.—Rs. 400 was the figure stated to the Deputy Tahsildar of Gokávaram in 1890. I think that this was the maximum amount obtained in one year and that Rs. 300 would more nearly represent the average income.

Nulakamaddi (sub-mutta of Kota).—Pallala Balareddi, the sub-muttadar, said that he never worked his forests systematically and that his receipts were nominal, about Rs. 25 a year.

Note.—This figure may be accepted.

Chamagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).—Pallala Tammireddi, the sub-muttadar, said that he made Rs. 100 a year, viz., Rs. 75 by leasing out two villages, and Rs. 25 by granting permits for cutting wood in others.

Note.—Rs. 100 may be taken to be his average annual income.

Pasalagimma (sub-mutta of Kota).—The sub-muttadar Pallala Bhupatireddi said he got Rs. 50 a year from his forests.

Note.—He told the Gokavaram Deputy Tahsildar Rs. 25, and this was probably his average income. I would fix at Rs. 30 to avoid a fractional allowance.

Mohanapuram.—Madhuviti Ramabhupatidevu, the muttadar, leased out all the forests in his mutta for five years from 1886 to Koka Sivayya Naidu for Rs. 60 a year.

Note.—This figure may be accepted.

Pandrapolu.—The muttadar said he obtained Rs. 180 a year by leasing out his forests to Janupareddi Rajanna of Kottapalli.

Note.—Rs. 180 may be taken as his annual income.

(2) *Mokhasadars and persons who obtained villages on favorable tenure.*

Sankuru Chinnayya holds 10 villages in Rampa casba on an annual payment of a bow and three arrows. He has been treated as a muttadar and his income settled above.

(Karaja) Dhulu Dora holds the villages of Marrivada, Bhimavaram and Peddakonda in the Rampa casba on a kattubadi of Rs. 15 a year and Darimadugula in the Bandapalli mutta as mokhasa. His forest income from these villages had already been taken account of along with his income from his mutta villages.

Pandu Swami holds the villages of Sirigindalapadu with its three hamlets, Pandirimamidi, Pandavidhi, and Nadmavidhi on mokhasa tenure. He said that he kept no accounts. Last year he says he got Rs. 25, previous to that Rs. 30, Rs. 50 and for two years he received as much as Rs. 100 per annum.

Note.—He told Mr. Miller that there was not much timber in his mutta and that he received Rs. 10 or 5 a year. Rs. 30 will, I think, be a liberal estimate of his average income.

Sankuru Lakshmayya holds the village of Nimmalapalam as mokhasa. He produced accounts for 1891–92 and 1893 to 9th February showing his receipts to be as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
... ...	1,202	6	0
1891	212	11	0
1892	22	0	0
1893			

He said that for five years prior to 1891 he received Rs. 300 a year by leasing out his forests to Sankata Ramarazu of Cheruvupalem and Tumupathi Kamayya of Nellipudi and Chavalam Narasimhadora of Kottada.

Note.—This last statement is untrue, as he told Mr. Miller that he did not lease out his forests and got only Rs. 30 a year from them. The huge receipts of 1891 must not be taken into account in determining his income. They are due either to "cooked" accounts or to an endeavour on the mokhasadar's part to make as much as he could while Mr. Happell's order remained in force. It is difficult to estimate his annual income, but, judging by his receipts in 1892-93, I think that Rs. 200 may be taken as a fair average.

Kase Ramadora holds the village of Vadapalli on a kattubadi of Rs. 15. He told me that he had never made any revenue from his forests.

Kuramagondi.—The mokhasadar did not appear before me and I heard nothing about him. I believe that his village is not distinguished from the other villages in Mohanapuram mutta.

(Signed) H. F. W. GILLMAN,
Acting Special Assistant Agent.

ENCLOSURE B.

Order—dated 22nd July 1893, Mis. No. 2710, Revenue.

Recorded pending receipt of the information called for in paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings.

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.

READ—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 2nd October 1893, Forest No. 1238, Mis.:—

Read—the following letter from the Government Agent, Gódávari, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 12th September 1893, No. 80:—

In reference to paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue), Forest No. 829, dated 13th July 1893, Mis., received as an enclosure to Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue), Forest No. 976, dated 12th August 1893, I have the honour to

inform you that in cases 4, 6 and 7 of the statement, the errors are clerical as in case No. 8 noticed by the Board in paragraph 4 of the Proceedings under reference. In the three cases in question the figures as per column 4 of the statement were erroneously treated as gross receipts instead of average annual receipts.

2. The office copy of the statement is duly corrected and an extract from it showing these three cases as also case No. 8 is herewith submitted.

3. The total amount of the proposed allowances now comes to Rs. 3,630 instead of Rs. 4,670 as mentioned in paragraph 5 of Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 643, dated 14th April 1893, submitted to the Board with this office endorsement No. 35, dated 4th May 1893.

Resolution—dated 2nd October 1893, Forest No. 1238, Mis.

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order, dated 22nd July 1893, No. 2710.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copy of the statement.

ORDER—dated 13th November 1893, No. 976, Revenue.

Forest No. 354.

The allowances proposed in the statement received with Mr. Gillman's letter, No. 143, dated 14th April 1893, subject to the modifications suggested in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Board's Proceedings thereon, and in the Agent's letter submitted with the second of the papers read above, are approved, and the Board will be informed that it has correctly interpreted the views of Government as to the nature of these allowances, viz., that they are to be perpetual subject to the power possessed by Government to stop them when it is satisfied that the conditions mentioned in paragraph 3 of G.O., dated 21st December 1892, No. 1280, are not being fulfilled. As, however, the sanction of the Government of India is required for the grant of the allowances in question, the following letter will be despatched to that Government.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
" Judicial Department.
" Accountant-General.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

85 Copies.

Govt. of {1893} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 13th November 1893, No. 976.

NOVEMBER.

Allowances.

Approving, with certain modifications, the — proposed by Mr. Gillman as compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts in Godávari in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forest situated in those tracts, and addressing the Government of India for sanctioning the grant of these allowances.

1893
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 2
To Current No. 976

19

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

E. GIBSON, Esq., C.S.,
Ag. Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT,

Dated Fort St. George, 13th November 1893.

SIR,

With reference to rule 1 of the rules approved by the Government of India in the Finance and Commerce Department letter No. 2800, dated 9th June 1890, I am directed to forward copies of the marginally noted Proceedings of this Government, regarding the grant of compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts in the Gódávari district, in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forests situated in those tracts.

Forest No. 355.

G.O., dated 21st Dec. 1892, No. 1280.
„ „ 13th Nov. 1893, „ 976.

2. The hill chiefs above referred to have been in the enjoyment of the proceeds derived from these forests for a very long time, but in February 1890 His Excellency the Governor in Council, after a careful consideration of their alleged claims to the exclusive ownership of these forests, came to the conclusion that they had no right thereto, and the forests in question, were accordingly declared to be State property. As, however, it was thought inadvisable, on grounds, both of equity and of policy, to deprive the chiefs absolutely of the considerable revenue that they had been realizing from these forests, His Excellency in Council decided that an equivalent should be granted to them in the shape of a permanent allowance amounting to half their net annual income therefrom, calculated on the average of the last three years, and called upon the Board to submit a statement showing the names of the chiefs, their net forest revenue during the last three years and the amount of the allowance to be assigned to each. This statement will be found printed as an appendix to this letter, and it will be seen that the total amount of the proposed allowances comes to Rs. 3,630. These allowances will come under assignments in lieu of resumed privileges, and I am therefore to request that, under the rule referred to in paragraph 1 above, His Excellency the Governor-General in Council will be pleased to accord his sanction to the grant of the same.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) E. GIBSON,

Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

60 Copies.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT showing allowances to be paid to Rampa Muttadars and Mokhasadars.

Name of mutta or mokhasa.	Muttadar or mokhasadar.	Receipts on which the allowance is calculated.		Average gross annual receipts.	Cost of establishment.	Average net annual receipts.	Half of the receipts in column 6.	Proposed annual allowance.
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8
	(a) Who kept accounts.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1. Bandapalli	Karam Narsandora	1887	425 6 0	469 2 0	132 0 0	337 2 0	168 9 0	170 0 0
		1888	462 0 0					
		1889	* 520 1 0					
		1890	1,072 7 0					
2. Brampalli	Karam Jangamdora	1888	764 14 0	1,212 7 0	288 0 0	924 7 0	462 3 0	460 0 0
		1889	† 1,800 0 0					
		1890	1,833 9 6					
3. Musurumilli	Mirtivada Jogireddi	1888	354 1 6	1,168 11 0	156 0 0	1,012 11 0	506 6 0	500 0 0
		1889	‡ 1,318 5 0					
		1890	128 2 0					
4. Marrivada Mutta Darimadugula Mokhasa.	Karam Dhulugora	1890	400 0 0	303 1 0	..	303 1 0	151 8 6	150 0 0
		1891	381 2 0					
		1892	..	100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
5. Dorachintapalem	Karam Butchengora	1888	235 11 0	230 12 8	..	230 12 8	115 6 4	120 0 0
		1889	163 11 0					
6. Bolugonda	Marla Nukayya	1890	§ 293 0 0					
		1888	30 12 0	118 2 3	..	118 2 3	59 1 2	60 0 0
7. Yerragonda	Vella Ramireddi	1889	205 8 6					
	(b) Who kept no accounts.							
8. Velagapalli	Mirtivada Ramireddi	..	..	400 0 0	..	400 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0
9. Choppakonda	Chedala Yerramreddi	..	..	150 0 0	..	150 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0
10. Palem	Mirtivada Kommireddi	..	..	200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
11. Rampa	Sankuru Chinnayya	..	..	50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
12. Geddada	Murla Jogireddi	..	..	40 0 0	..	40 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0
13. Tadipalli	Kattula Jogireddi	..	..	50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
14. Vemulakonda	Kulla Abbayigora	..	..	150 0 0	..	150 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0
15. Nelunur	Chedala Lachireddi	..	..	50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
16. Chidugur	Pallala Rajareddi	..	..	200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
17. Tanuru	Pilla Kannamreddi	..	..	200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
	Kundla Tammireddi	..	..	125 0 0	..	125 0 0	62 8 0	60 0 0
18. Kundada	Matta Swamireddi	..	..	100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
19. Maredubilli	Pallala Ramireddi	..	..	300 0 0	..	300 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
20. Valamur	Pulicanty Jogayya	..	..	50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
21. Pamuleru	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
22. Bodulur	Kattula Bhupathireddi	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
23. Votukur	Pillala Karreddi	..	..	20 0 0	..	20 0 0	10 0 0	10 0 0
24. Kakur	Madhuvit/ Jagannadevu	..	..	140 0 0	..	140 0 0	70 0 0	70 0 0
25. Kota	Pallala Rajareddi	..	..	300 0 0	..	300 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
26. Yerrakadda (sub-mutta of Kota)		..	..					

* $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 303-6-0. † $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 1,050-0-0. ‡ $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 769-0-0. § $\frac{12}{3}$ × Rs. 73-4-0.

Statement showing allowances to be paid to Rampa Muttadars and Mokhasadars—*cont.*

Name of mutta or mokhasa.	Muttadar or mokhassadar.	Receipts on which the allowance is calculated.		Average gross annual receipts.	Cost of Establishment.	Average net annual receipts.	Half of the receipts in column 6.	Proposed annual allowance.
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8
	(b) Who kept no accounts—cont.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
27. Nulakamaddi (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Balareddi	..	..	25 0 0	..	25 0 0	12 8 0	10 0 0
28. Chamagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Tammireddi	..	..	100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
29. Pasalaginni (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Bhupathireddi	..	..	30 0 0	..	30 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0
30. Mohanapuram	Madhuvit/ Ramabhupatidev/	..	..	60 0 0	..	60 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0
31. Pandrapolu	Madhuvit/ Ramabhupatidev/	..	..	180 0 0	..	180 0 0	90 0 0	90 0 0
	Mokhasadars and persons who obtained villages on favorable tenures.							
. . . . .	. . . . .							
32 Rampa	Sankuru Chinnayya	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
33. Marrivada Bhimaram and Peddakonda in Rampa and Darimudugula in Bendapalli mutta.	(Karam) Dhulu Dora	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
		..	..	30 0 0	..	30 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0
34. Sirigindalapadu	Pandu Swami	..	..	200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
35. Ninimalapalem	Sankara Lakshmayya	..	..	No receipts. Did not appear.				
36. Vadiralli Kurumagonda	Kose Ramandora Madhuvit/ Ramabhupatidev/ (Muttadar of Mohanapuram).	1888	522 8 0	1,263 0 6	150 0 0	1,113 0 6	556 8 3	550 0 0
		1889	1,731 3 0					
37. Dutsarti	Chekka Abbayigora	1890	* 1,535 6 5					
		..	..	..	..	..	3,644 10 3	3,630 0 0

* $\frac{24}{15}$ × Rs. 959-10-0.

1893.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, dated 13th November 1893, No. 977.

NOVEMBER.

REQUESTING to accord sanction to the grant of certain allowances to some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts as compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by them in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forests in those tracts.

13TH NOVEMBER 1893, No. 977, REVENUE.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

E. GIBSON, ESQ., C.S.,
Ag. Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT,

Dated Fort St. George, 13*th November* 1893.

SIR,

With reference to rule 1 of the rules approved by the Government of India in the Finance and Commerce Department letter No. 2800, dated 9th June 1890, I am directed to forward copies of the marginally noted Proceedings of this Government, regarding the grant of compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts in the Gódávari district, in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forests situated in those tracts.

Forest No. 355.

G.O., dated 21st Dec. 1892, No. 1280.
" " 13th Nov. 1893, " 976.

2. The hill chiefs above referred to have been in the enjoyment of the proceeds derived from these forests for a very long time, but in February 1890 His Excellency the Governor in Council, after a careful consideration of their alleged claims to the exclusive ownership of these forests, came to the conclusion that they had no right thereto, and the forests in question, were accordingly declared to be State property. As, however, it was thought inadvisable, on grounds, both of equity and of policy, to deprive the chiefs absolutely of the considerable revenue that they had been realizing from these forests, His Excellency in Council decided that an equivalent should be granted to them in the shape of a permanent allowance amounting to half their net annual income therefrom, calculated on the average of the last three years, and called upon the Board to submit a statement showing the names of the chiefs, their net forest revenue during the last three years and the amount of the allowance to be assigned to each. This statement will be found printed as an appendix to this letter, and it will be seen that the total amount of the proposed allowances comes to Rs. 3,630. These allowances will come under assignments in lieu of resumed privileges, and I am therefore to request that, under the rule referred to in paragraph 1 above, His Excellency the Governor-General in Council will be pleased to accord his sanction to the grant of the same.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

60 Copies.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT showing allowances to be paid to Rampa Muttadars and Mokhasadars.

Name of mutta or mokhasa.	Muttadar or mokhasadar.	Receipts on which the allowance is calculated.		Average gross annual receipts.	Cost of establishment.	Average net annual receipts.	Half of the receipts in column 6.	Proposed annual allowance.
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8
	(a) Who kept accounts.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1. Bandapalli	Karam Narasan Dora	1887 1889 1890	425 6 0 462 0 0 * 520 1 0	469 2 0	132 0 0	337 2 0	168 9 0	170 0 0
2. Birampalli	Karam Jangam Dora	1888 1889 1890	764 14 0 † 1,800 0 0 1,533 9 6	1,212 7 0	288 0 0	924 7 0	462 3 0	460 0 0
3. Musurumilli	Mirtivada Jogireddi	1888 1889 1890	354 1 6 ‡ 1,318 5 0 128 2 0	1,168 11 0	156 0 0	1,012 11 0	506 6 0	500 0 0
4. Marrivada Mutta Darimadugula Mokhasa.	Karam Dhulu Dora	1890 1891 1892	400 0 0 381 2 0	303 1 0	..	303 1 0	151 8 6	150 0 0
5. Dorachintalapalem	Karam Butchen Dora	1888	235 11 0	100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
6. Bolugonda	Marla Nukayya	1889 1890	163 11 0 § 233 0 0	230 12 8	..	230 12 8	115 6 4	120 0 0
7. Yerragonda	Vella Ramireddi	1888 1889	30 12 0 205 8 6	118 2 3	..	118 2 3	59 1 2	60 0 0
	(b) Who kept no accounts.							
8. Velagapalli	Mirtivada Ramireddi			400 0 0	..	400 0 0	200 0 0	200 0 0
9. Choprakonda	Chedala Yerramreddi			150 0 0	..	150 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0
10. Palem	Mirtivada Kominireddi			200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
11. Rampa	Sankuru Chinnayya			50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
12. Geddada	Murla Jogireddi			40 0 0	..	40 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0
13. Tadipalli	Kattula Jogireddi			50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
14. Vemulakonda	Kulla Abbayi Dora			150 0 0	..	150 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0
15. Nodunur	Chedala Latchireddi			50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
16. Chidugur	Pallala Rajareddi			200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
17. Tunnuru	Pulla Kannamreddi			200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
18. Kundada	Kundla Tammireddi			125 0 0	..	125 0 0	62 8 0	60 0 0
19. Marodubilli	Matta Swamireddi			100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
20. Valamur	Pallala Ramireddi			300 0 0	..	300 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
21. Pamuleru	Pulicanty Jogayya			50 0 0	..	50 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0
22. Bodulur				..	..	..	..	..
23. Vetukur	Kattula Bhupathireddi			20 0 0	..	20 0 0	10 0 0	10 0 0
24. Kakur	Pallala Karreddi			140 0 0	..	140 0 0	70 0 0	70 0 0
25. Kota	Madhuviti Jagannadhadevu			300 0 0	..	300 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0
26. Yarlagedda (sub-mutta of Kota)	Pallala Rajareddi							

* $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 303-6-0. † $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 1,050-0-0. ‡ $\frac{12}{7}$ × Rs. 769-0-0. § $\frac{12}{3}$ × Rs. 73-4-0.

Statement showing allowances to be paid to Rampa Muttadars and Mokhasadars—*cont.*

Name of mutta or mokhasa.	Muttadar or mokhassadar.	Receipts on which the allowance is calculated.		Average gross annual receipts.	Cost of Establishment.	Average net annual receipts.	Half of the receipts in column 6.	Proposed annual allowance.
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8
	(b) Who kept no accounts—cont.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
27. Nulakamaddi (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Balareddi	..	..	25 0 0	..	25 0 0	12 8 0	10 0 0
28. Chamagedda (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Tammireddi	..	..	100 0 0	..	100 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0
29. Pasaringinne (sub-mutta of Kota).	Pallala Bhupathireddi	..	..	30 0 0	..	30 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0
30. Mohanapuram	Madhuviti Ramabhupatidevu	..	..	60 0 0	..	60 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0
31. Pandrajadu	Madhuviti Ramabhupatidevu	..	..	180 0 0	..	180 0 0	90 0 0	90 0 0
	Mokhasadars and persons who obtained villages on favorable tenures.							
32 Rampa	Sankuru Chinnayya	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
33. Marrivada Bhimaram and Peddakonda in Rampa and Darimudugula in Bendapalli mutta.	Karam Dhulu Dora	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
34. Sirigindulapadu	Pandu Swami	..	..	30 0 0	..	30 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0
35. Nimmalapalem	Sankuru Lakshmayya	..	..	200 0 0	..	200 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0
36. Vadapalli Kurumagonda	Kose Raman Dora Madhuviti Ramabhupatidevu (Muttadar of Mohanapuram).	1888	522 8 0	No receipts. Did not appear.				
		1889	1,731 3 0	1,263 0 6	150 0 0	1,113 0 6	556 8 3	550 0 0
37. Dutsarti	Chekka Abbayi Dora	1890	* 1,535 6 5					
		..	..	..	..	..	3,644 10 3	3,630 0 0

* $\frac{24}{15}$ × Rs. 959-10-0.

1893.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, dated 13th November 1893, No. 976-977.

NOVEMBER.

REQUESTING to accord sanction to the grant of certain allowances to some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts as compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by them in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forests in those tracts.

Read - also Proceedings

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue) to Fort

Dated 2nd September 1893.

Forest No. 1238. Miscellaneous.

READ the following letter from the Government Agent, Godavari, dated 12th September 1893, no. 80.

In reference to para 3 of Board's Proceedings, (Land Revenue) Forest no. 829, dated 13th July 1893, miscellaneous, receives as an enclosure to Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue) Forest no. 976, dated 12th August 1893, I have the honor to inform you that in cases 4, 6 and 7 of the statement, the errors are clerical as in case no. 8 noticed by the Board in para 4 of the Proceedings under reference. In the three cases in question the figures as per column 4 of the statement were erroneously treated as gross receipts instead of average annual receipts.

2. The office copy of the statement is duly corrected and an extract from it

No. 2710 22-7-93

for 3 years

showing these 3 cases as also case no 8 is herewith submitted.

3. The total amount of the proposed allowances now comes to Rs 3630 instead of Rs 4,670 as mentioned in para 5 of Mr Gillman's letter no 643 dated 14 April 1893 submitted to the Board with this office endorsement no 35 dated 4 May 1893.

R 3420 in former statement
210 now added
R 3630

Resolution

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order dated 22nd July 1893, no 2710.

(True Copy and Extract)

[illegible]
Ag: Secretary

To

The Secretary to Govt, R.D.

with copy of the statement.

DS.

Revenue 189 3. Dept

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Current Number 7339.

To

The Secretary to Government,

R. D.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
15 OCT 93
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Read 5 Esq.

Proceedings, dated 2nd October 1893,
Forest No. 1238. Mis:-

Subject.

Submitting to Government letter from the Govt Agent Godavari District, informing that the figures in cases nos 4, 6 and 7 of the statement referred to in B. P. F. 978 Mis 12-8-93 are clerical errors and submitting a revised statement.

1893
DEPARTMENT.
No. 1
No. 7339

Extract from the statement showing allowances to be paid to Rampa Muttadars and Mokhasadars

	Name of Mutta or Mokhasa	Muttadar or Mokhasadar	Receipts on which the allowance is calculated		Average gross annual receipts	Cost of Establishment	Average net annual receipts	Half of the receipts in col: 6	Proposed annual allowance	Remarks
	1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9
4	Marrinada Mutta Darimadugula Mokhasa	Karam Dhula Dora	1890	128 2						previously proposed
			1891	400	303 1		303 1	151 8 6	150	50
			1892	381 2						
6	Bolugonda	Marla Mukayya	1888	235 11						
			1889	163 11						
			1890	293	230 12 8		230 12 8	115 6 4	120	40
7	Yerragonda	Netla Ramireddi	1888	30 12						
			1889	205 8 6	118 2 3		118 2 3	59 1 2	60	30
	37								330	120 [illegible] 210
8	Dutsarti	Chekka Abbaya Dora	1888	522 8						
			1889	1,731 3	1263 6	150	1113 6	556 8 3	550	[illegible] 550
			1890	1535 6						

(True Extract)

(Signed) S. H. Wynne
Govt. Agent
Godavari

(True Copy)

[illegible]
Ag. Secretary

D.L.

Read again G.O. $\frac{2710\ \text{Misc}}{22.\ \text{VII}\text{-}93}$
also C. No. 7339 of 93.

Forwarded no. 354

Print full statement as subsequently modified being printed as app^x to the G.O.

Order of 13th Nov: 1893, No. 976.

The allowances proposed in the statement received with Mr Gillman's letter No. 143 of 14th April 1893, ~~as modified with reference to~~ subject to the modifications suggested in paras 4 and 5 of the Boards' Procs thereon and in the Agent's letter submitted with the second of the papers, read above, are approved, and the Board will be informed that it has correctly interpreted the views of Govt as to the nature of these allowances, viz. that they are to be perpetual subject to the power possessed by Govt to stop them when it is satisfied that the conditions mentioned in para 3 of G.O. 1280 of 21st Dec: 1892 are not being fulfilled. As, however, the sanction of the Govt. of India is required for the grant of the allowances in question, the following letter will be despatched to that Govt.

To The Commrs of L.R.
" Judicial Dept
" Acct General

× Print statement as subsequently corrected as appendix to the G.O.

85/21/11/93

× R... 27/10/93

P.T.O.

To Forest No. 35
wed 21/XII/93
No. 977

The Secy. to the Govt. of India
Rev: and Agri Dept

Sir,

With reference to rule 1 of the rules approved by the Govt. of India, in the Finance and Commerce Dept letter No. 2800 dt 9th June 1890 I am directed to forward copies of the marginally noted Procs[×] of this Govt, regarding the grant of compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by some of the Muttahdars and Mokhasadars of the Rampa Hill tracts, in the Godavari district, in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forests situated in those tracts.

× G.O. No 1280 dt 21st Dec 1892
G.O. No 976 dt 13 Nov: 1893
([illegible] 1339 [illegible])

2. The Hill chiefs, above referred to, ~~were~~ have been in the enjoyment of the proceeds derived from these forests for a very long time, but in Feby 1890 H.E. the Governor in Council after a careful consideration of their alleged claims to the exclusive ownership ~~which they were alleged to posses~~ of these forests, came to the conclusion that they had no right ~~whatever to~~ thereto, and the forests in question, ~~which~~ were accordingly declared to be state property. As, however, it was thought inadvisable on grounds both of equity and of policy, to deprive the chiefs absolutely of the considerable revenue that they had been realizing from these forests, H.E. ~~the Governor~~ in Council decided that an equivalent should be granted to them in the shape of a permanent allowance amounting to half their net annual income therefrom ~~income from forests~~, calculated on the average of the last three years, and called upon the Board to submit a statement showing the names of the chiefs, their net forest revenue during the last three years and the amount of the allowance to be assigned to each. This statement will be found printed as an appendix to this letter ~~to the second of the papers, quoted on the margin of page 1 above,~~ and it will be seen that the total amount of the proposed allowances comes to Rs 3,630

These

The statement might be made complete in itself × and as an appendix to this letter - [illegible] 12/11

Some mistake in the reference here: the list is appended to the one × B.P. of 13/7/93 No [illegible]

× Partly in this & partly in B.P. 1238 Mis / 2.10.93.

These allowances will come under assignments in lieu of resumed privileges, and I am therefore to request that under the rule referred to in para 1 above, H.E. the Governor General in Council will be pleased to accord his sanction to the grant of the same.

Rm
27 Oct 93.

GG 1/11.

60/2

Draft G.O. & letter

Grant of allowances to the Rampa Hill chiefs for resumed forest privileges

I must see VS's orders 13/XI

G.Cedy 13 Nov. 1893, Nos: 976 & 977

Hms

Rm 16.X.93

C 2/11

Original

Govt. of {1893} Madras.

REVENUE.

8.2.04

25/9/13

8=3-21

11-9-22 MI

22/6/29 II

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 13th November 1893, No. 976.-77

NOVEMBER.

Allowances.

Approving, with certain modifications, the — proposed by Mr. Gillman as compensation for the loss of revenue sustained by some of the muttadars and mokhasadars of the Rampa hill tracts in Godávari in consequence of the assumption by the State of the management of the forest situated in those tracts, and addressing the Government of India for sanctioning the grant of these allowances.