

CONFIDENTIAL.

G.O., No. 1868

Confidential No. 587.

DATED 19 May 1893

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording Pro of the Judicial Dept passport
regarding the resumption of certain matters
in Vizagapatam.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CONFIDENTIAL

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

With reference to para. 2 of my letter, No. 1105, dated 8th October 1892, reporting on the late disturbance in the Golconda agency, I have now the honour of laying before Government my remarks on the conduct of the Gudem muttadars. So far as I can ascertain the following is a fairly accurate account of the movements of the gang and I propose to deal with the conduct of the various muttadars in turn as it passed through their muttas:—

2. After the loot of Krishnadevipeta, the party moved towards Koyyūr and halted at a village called Sidipalem, about two miles off, close by the road to Narsipatam. They demanded food and the head of the village appears to have

demurred to giving it without leave from Koyyūr. He sent a messenger who brought back the Koyyūr munsif and Juguva Sanyasi Padal, the man whom the widow of the late muttadar proposes to make her diwan and entrust with the management of the mutta. There is some difference in the various accounts as to the details of what took place, but they are of no importance as the main point, viz., that the proposed diwan met the fituridars there and then neglected to send any information to the police, was acknowledged again by him to me at Chintapally on the 26th January last. He acknowledges that the widow was made aware of the visit and excuses himself on the ground that he understood that the munsif would make a report. The latter made none to Narsipatam, but says that he wrote to his father who was near Addatigala and asked him to inform the police there. The father says he did so, but the police deny the receipt of the information; but this really does not affect the question at issue which is why the widow did not send news to Krishnadevipeta or Narsipatam. I consider that this should settle the question of the resumption of the Koyyūr mutta. There is no use in continuing it in the possession of a muttadar who has no more idea of his or her responsibilities with regard to these lawless gangs than the widow and her chief advisers evinced on this occasion.

3. The gang then circled round through the Sargudah valley, where they had originally mustered, and, passing close to Golgonda, entered the Chittampādghât. This was on the 2nd June. The muttadar had been warned of his duties and directed to get information if the men came within his limits in writing on the 29th and 31st May in addition to having been personally cautioned by the tahsildar on the 26th. Three of his villagers, including his own first cousin, were actually members of the gang when he was cautioned, yet he said not a word on the subject. They were, I may remark in passing, found on the 30th June at Narsipatam concealed in his gumastah's house. From the fituridars' statements, it appears that early on the morning of the 2nd June they interviewed the muttadar who sent them towards the big Dharaparvatam, promising to forward supplies to them which he did about an hour or so later. He did nothing towards giving information till the 3rd, when he told a taluk peon that he had heard that they had passed through his jungles and that he was going to Golgonda to tell the police. There had been no police party there and he must have been fully aware of this, in addition to which he should have given information early on the 2nd instead of on the 3rd. The muttadar was sent for by Mr. Laffan, and not till then did he communicate the information he had made up his mind to give such as it was. He arrived at Narsipatam at midnight on the 3rd-4th, and, asserting that the gang was at Robbasingi, took Mr. Laffan, Mr. Smith and thirty police there. Of course the gang was not there though they had passed close by twenty-four hours previously. It had passed through Davunur and had got to the other side of the Lammasinghi ghât the night before. It is impossible to prove that the muttadar deliberately led Mr. Laffan astray, but viewed in connection with his conduct in withholding information till the gang was well out of his part of the country and remembering that if he knew of the gangs going to Robbasingi at all he must have known that it was on the morning of the 3rd June that it went there, I think that there can be little doubt about the matter. In any case he deliberately withheld information which, if promptly rendered, might have been of the utmost value. Of the justice of resuming his mutta there can I think be no doubt.

4. The next mutta traversed was that of Kottavīdhi-Lammasinghi. The muttadar's head-quarters are Lammasinghi at the top of the chief ghât into Gudem. It appears, however, that he removed some four or five years back to Rajannapeta, a village some four miles from the foot of the ghâts in the ordinary tracts. He sometimes, however, lives at Davunur in his mutta, close by the foot of the Lammasinghi ghât. He was ordered by Mr. Laffan to reside within his limits personally and in writing when the outbreak began, but instead of doing so left Davunur for Rajannapeta! On the night of the 3rd June, the gang passed through Davunur, but the muttadar's people had followed his example and deserted it and this opportunity of getting information was lost. The result was the loot of Kintali

on the 7th June. Had the fact of the gang's passing Davunur been known mischief in that part of the country would have been suspected. This muttadar's conduct has already been reported to Government and in G.O., No. 2223, dated 28th October 1891, he was let off with a warning. In April last Mr. Shipley wrote as follows regarding him:—"He is a hopeless absentee. I have warned him personally and by taking of the danger he incurs in neither living at Lammasinghi nor making one of his three sons live there. Each time he has promised to obey and has not obeyed. When at Lammasinghi last month I spoke to his sons there and warned them that, unless one at least took up his permanent residence in that village, I should recommend that their mutta be attached. They promised compliance and as soon as I left for Chintapally they all went away and stayed away. I sent for the Padal (muttadar) himself to Kottakota. He had no excuse to offer. He talked about the health of himself and his eldest son not allowing them to live in Lammasinghi. He has two other sons. He spoke about cholera! There has been no cholera then. He is contumacious and I am certain he has no intention of living there." The man is still in Rajannapeta (said to be very ill) and none of his sons reside at Lammasinghi even now. One who accompanied me to Chintapally stated that he came to Lammasinghi about once a month. The family have had full warning and is evidently determined to evade residence at Lammasinghi to the utmost. I dare say I could compel one of the sons to reside there by keeping him constantly under observation, but the moment this was relaxed the place would be again deserted. A muttadar who fails to reside in the head-quarters of his mutta or some similar position has I think violated the understood condition on which he holds it and should be deprived of it.

5. The next mutta visited was Lotugedda, a small one in the north-eastern corner of the Golgonda agency. Here also the muttadar is an absentee. He is the mokhasadar of Nimmagedda, a village in the plains near Golgonda. He had been warned by Mr. Laffan regarding getting information and directed to reside in his charge, but disregarded the orders. At about dusk on the 10th June the gang passed by the Lotugedda market place about a furlong from the village of Lotugedda on market day though after the market was over. This must have been known though there is no absolute evidence on this point. Sagarapu Tatayya who turned Queen's evidence states that the men visited the Lotugedda temples close by the village, but this is not confirmed. Anyhow the passing of the gang through the Lotugedda mutta was not reported. Had it been it would have been clear that its destination was Kondakamberu, Dharakonda or Gudem and the gang would have been almost sure to have been intercepted. The Lotugedda muttadar's grandfather was made a State prisoner in connection with Sanyasi Bhupati's fituri in 1858. He was eventually released and the mutta restored to him, but the family had by this time got to prefer life in the plains. When questioned by me the muttadar said: "I have been ordered to live in my mutta but it is too unhealthy for my people, so I go to Lotugedda once a month." He has also utterly disregarded his duties and responsibilities as muttadar and will never reside at Lotugedda for a day except under compulsion. I think that he deserves to lose it also.

6. From Lotugedda the gang went to Dharakonda passing through a remote part of the Patavidhi Gudem mutta. With the conduct of the latter muttadar I will deal further on.

7. At Dharakonda I believe that the rebels were well received by Pandu Dora, the muttadar's half-brother, but Lingam Dora himself seems to have kept as clear of them as he could. I do not think it advisable to look too closely into what occurred there. Dharakonda is 30 miles from Chintapally across the roughest country in the district. It is but 16 miles from Kondakamberu, but the Kondakamberu police belong to Jeypore and the Dora may have had his doubts as to whether aid would have been forthcoming without delay. He always behaved well during the Rambha rebellion except when he dare not do so and was in my opinion the best intentioned and most loyal of the muttadars then with the exception of the Guditeru Dora.

8. From Dharakonda the gang crossed to Gudem passing through a considerable part of the Patavidhi muttadar's mutta, but this tract is totally uninhabited and he had no means of obtaining information until they arrived at Gudem itself. Here he owns a hamlet, the inhabitants of which must have known of the visit, but he himself was at Pedavalesa 12 miles off (where he resides) with a strong party of Gódayari police. I think his men in the village of Patavidhi Gudem should have sent him word of the arrival of the fituridars, but I do not consider that he failed in any way himself. The descent was also on the Kottavidhi muttadar's hospitality and not on the Patavidhi village.

9. The case against Sobilan Dora, the Kottavídhí muttadar of Gudem, is a very clear one. The fituri gang (from Dharakonda) entered his village on the night of the 14th June (Sunday). The Dora, according to his own account, ran away into the jungle and remained there till the following evening. He makes out that rebels looted some food and ill-used a couple of villagers to compel them to show pally 12 miles off on *Tuesday the 16th*, stating that the gang had been there and had gone towards Balreo. On that day a strong party of Gódávári police arrived at Gudem from Pedavalesa, but instead of putting them on the track he denied that the fituridars had been to Gudem at all although he had sent this report to Chintapally. Mr. Laffan took his statement and those of several other residents in Gudem on the 18th at Chintapally. His conduct, when questioned, was most unsatisfactory. He stated first that he had sent his peon Kareem Sahib to find out what direction the fituridars had gone in. Kareem Sahib denied that he was sent or had made any inquiries. He (Sobilan Dora) asserted that he had told the Gódávári police which was a deliberate falsehood. Several of the villagers said that they gave the Gódávári police no information about the visit of the fituridars because the muttadar always told such things himself. In other words they were doubtful whether the muttadar wanted to hush the thing up or not, to put the best interpretation on their conduct. A more correct one probably is that they had had strict orders to say nothing whatever. Sobilan Dora, when re-examined by Mr. Laffan, declared that he did not know whether the fituridars had come to Gudem at all or not and said that he wrote the letter through fear. His disloyal conduct was evinced by another fact which he let slip at the inquiry. He stated (as an excuse apparently) that the *ex*-convict Madakam Chinnigadu, the working leader of the gang, had threatened him about a year before—immediately after his release—with violence in return for his family having aided in his capture during the Rambha rebellion. In spite of his duty as muttadar he gave no information about this visit though inquiries were made all over Gudem about the time as to what Madakam Chinnayya had been doing in the agency—a rumour that he was concocting something having been communicated by the Makaram muttadar. The fituridars' account of the matter leads one to believe beyond doubt that they halted in Gudem for three days and that when they went away Sobilan Dora lent the raja his pony. Before me he acknowledged that they might have been there for three days and might have taken his pony. I do not think that there can be the slightest doubt about the advisability of making an example of him.

10. To sum up I am of the opinion—

10. To sum up I am of the opinion—

(1) That Sobilan Dora wilfully concealed the visit of the fituridars from the Gódávāri police without the slightest excuse, that he gave false information to Mr. Laffan and did all in his power to aid the gang and that he should be deprived of his mutta.

(2) That the Chittampád-Bandavalsa muttadar similarly kept back information which would have been of the utmost importance and that he probably deliberately drew Mr. Laffan and the police off in the wrong direction at day-light on the 4th June. He should be similarly treated.

(3) That the widow of the Koyyur muttadar and the man whom she proposed to make her diwan were fully cognizant of the visit of the gang to Sidipalem and took no steps to inform the police and that this mutta should not be entrusted into such hands.

(4) That the Kottavīdhi-Lammasinghi and Lotugedda muttadars deliberately disregarded the Agent's orders to reside in their muttas and in consequence utterly failed in obtaining information regarding the movements of the fituridars within their charges, that they are both confirmed absentees and should be held to have abdicated their position as muttadars.

(5) 'That the mutta system is now a hopelessly bad one for people, such as the inhabitants of Gudum, and that, instead of being a help to Government on such occasions as the recent rising, it has always proved to be a source of weakness, as any scoundrel who can get a few armed men together can count at least on benevolent neutrality on the part of the head men in the Golgonda agency.

(6) That advantage should be taken of the present occasion to terminate the system in Kottavídhí Gudem, Koyyúr, Kottavídhí-Lammasinghi and Lotugedda.

11. The above proposals would practically confine the mutta system to the wild area between Gudem itself and Malkanagiri, the area held by the Patavidhi muttadar near Pedavalesa and the Makaram and Antada muttas near Krishna-devipeta being unimportant.

12. The utter failure of a system which must have had its origin in its having worked fairly well in the past is doubtless largely due to the advance of intercourse with the plains and more effective control on the part of Government having deprived the muttadars of their authority over the inhabitants of their muttas—authority which probably was often grossly abused, but which enabled them to secure their orders being executed. At the same time the muttadars themselves seem to be degenerating owing to their surroundings and to the absence of the stimulus which their former arbitrary exercise of power supplied. They are now the most effete and cowardly class in the district. The more important ryots seem to be throwing off all control and making themselves more and more independent of them and in a few years their authority will completely die out except immediately round their own residence.

13. It is however one thing to make proposals and another to find a way of carrying them into effect, and here my hands are completely tied by the fact that the police arrangements of the Golconda agency could not, in my opinion, be worse suited than they are for dealing with any difficulties which might arise from putting them into execution. At the risk of repeating what is already known to Government I will state briefly what they are. In the huge area above the ghâts (about 500 square miles) we have only a single police station occupied by some forty odd Uriya constables, natives of a remote part of this district or of Ganjam, and many of them actually ignorant of Telugu. They are commanded by a pensioned native officer of the Madras Army who does not know their language, and, though well suited for the command of an armed body of men, is obviously not the man to hunt up conspiracies and find out what is brewing in the remoter parts of the area in his charge. Such a force is necessarily as completely out of touch with the hill people as if was a company from a Native Infantry Regiment. It is eventually to occupy a stockaded station about 250 yards square which commands none of the ghâts, is about as remote from all centres of population as it could be and does not afford the vestige of protection to a single resident in the Agency except the inhabitants of a few small huts close by. The muttadar of Lotugedda lives nine miles away when he resides in his mutta and all the rest much further. For a long way around, the country is practically destitute of all population and consequently of all means by which an alien (or indeed any) force could collect information. The first thing that will be done when a fituri does take place will be to break up the garrison and distribute it to the points which have some strategic value. The Lammasinghi ghât will have to be made secure and so will Pedavalesha in all probability. Gudem will require a strong party if information as to what is going on in the interior is to be obtained and the Chintapally fortress will be a white elephant, locking up a strong force in garrisoning it on account of its unwieldy size and of its water-supply being a quarter of a mile away. I speak with nine months' experience of how a fituri on a large scale really works out in this country and have no hesitation in saying that Chintapally is utterly useless as a centre owing to the impossibility of getting information and the uselessness of

working patrols in a country in which a fituridar can find nothing to eat and no safe shelter from which he can obstruct a party. I may add that this Chintapally fortress will in my opinion cost Government Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 40,000 to build and will take five or six years more to construct. The aid of the Public Works Department is I understand now being invoked and I know what that will mean in Gudem. Some temporary lines and a small pucca station-house are the sole results of four years' work and the future station is not even marked out yet. By the time the plan is finished there won't be an inhabitant within 5 miles in my opinion.

14. With such arrangements as these for keeping the peace in the Gudem hills I do not see how I can recommend that the resumption of any of the muttas above the main ghâts be carried into effect, desirable as I think the step to be. Were the police force however distributed in such a way as to allow of action being taken, I would oust Kottavîdhi Gudem, Kottavîdhi-Lammasinghi and Lotugedda and administer the country by means of a munsif on Rs. 30 at Gudem and another on Rs. 25 at Lammasingi with two peons each on Rs. 5. I think that the resumed area could be safely and efficiently managed in this way. The munsifs in addition to collecting the revenue might render valuable services in looking after forest work. I would grant the Lammasinghi and Lotugedda muttadars pensions dependent on the surplus income of their muttas and would continue half of the pensions to the next generation. Sobilan Dora of Gudem has behaved disgracefully and should not get anything like such a large allowance. I would probably remove him to Narsipatam. The exact details of the allowance I would grant to each would depend on the revenues of the muttas resumed. I do not think it expedient to inquire into this until I learn the views of Government about their resumption, but the additional revenue would more than cover the cost of management and allowances. Koyyûr I would resume without hesitation and keep a munsif on Rs. 15 and two peons on Rs. 5 each in charge. I have already made proposals regarding the widow's allowance. The Chittampâd-Bandavalsa mutta should also be resumed forthwith. The value of this mutta is Rs. 324 per annum.

15. I enclose a small map (will follow) showing roughly the line of the fituridars' march and also extracts from the depositions of (4) four important prisoners bearing on the conduct of the various muttadars.

From W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Agent to the Governor, Vizagapatam district, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 10th March 1893, No. 354.

I have the honour to reply to G.O., No. 929, dated 13th May 1891, regarding my proposal to resume the Koyyûr mutta. I have delayed doing so until now as I wished to visit the country first and inquire into the conduct of the muttadars generally during the late rising.

2. As regards the power to adopt given by the late muttadar to his wife I believe it was a general one. The first statement made by the widow was that the power, which was verbal, was to adopt a boy belonging to a respectable family. She now maintains that the power was to adopt the son of Sobilan Dora and produced several witnesses to testify to this before the late Mr. Laffan. I do not however believe their evidence, as I feel sure that had Sobilan Dora's son been mentioned the fact would have been stated at the commencement.

3. As to the second question asked by Government what effect the resumption of the Koyyûr mutta would have on the minds of the neighbouring muttadars, the late rising has considerably changed the aspect of affairs. Most of them are now on their trial for their own disloyalty in connection with it and are thinking more of their own affairs and future than of those of the widow. I see no reason whatever to hesitate about the resumption of Koyyûr on this account. They are a most despicable cowardly lot and no trouble need be apprehended from them in my opinion. The mutta has now been quietly managed by the tahsildar for two years and the change between this and resumption will be unnoticed.

4. In my general report on the conduct of the muttadars during the late rising, No. 355, dated 10th March 1893, I have shown that the widow and her proposed diwan were fully aware of the visit of the gang to Sidipalem—a village not two miles from Koyyûr—and took no steps whatever to communicate the fact to the police. They had less excuse than the other muttadars as they live in a much more civilized part of the Agency, but they only adhered to the tradition of the family, the late muttadar being, in my opinion, one of the most disloyally disposed of all during the Rambha rebellion. The existence of a strong force at Koyyûr throughout prevented his disloyalty from manifesting itself, but there was no muttadar whom I distrusted more.

From the Agent to the Governor, Vizagapatam district, dated 23rd March 1893, No. 447.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting in continuation of the Agent's letter No. 353, dated the 10th instant, a map showing roughly the fituridars' march.

ORDER—dated 2nd May 1893, No. 910, Judicial.

The Government fully concurs with the Agent that the treasonable conduct of the widow of the muttadar of Koyyûr and of the muttadar of Chittampâd-Bandavalsa have rendered their muttas liable to resumption and they will be resumed at once as proposed.

2. The conduct of the muttadar of Kottavîdhi-Gudem, Sobilan Dora, also was so bad as to justify the resumption of his estate, but Mr. Willock himself admits that it is impossible to take this course conveniently until the disposition of the police in the Agency tracts has been revised. The Government therefore thinks it best to depose Sobilan Dora, to deport him under an Agency warrant to Pârva-tîpûram and to appoint his son as muttadar. The Agent will act accordingly.

3. The Government doubts whether the case against the muttadars of Kottavîdhi-Lammasinghi and Lotugedda is sufficient to justify the sequestration of their estates, but it is sufficient to justify the deposition of the present muttadars and the appointment of their heirs in their places. This course will accordingly be taken.

4. Mr. Willock's proposals to allow the widow of the muttadar of Koyyûr half the revenue of the estate during her lifetime and to put in charge of the mutta a munsif on Rs. 15 and two peons on Rs. 5 are approved. The Agent should report whether he considers it advisable to give pensions to any of the other muttadars and, if so, the amount which he would recommend. Mr. Willock has not stated how he proposes to arrange for the future management of the Chittampâd-Bandavalsa estate.

5. The Agent's remarks concerning the police arrangements in the Agency will be referred, for early remarks, to the Inspector-General of Police. As the views of Colonel Porteous on the subject are understood to be widely divergent from those of Mr. Willock, the former officer should take an early opportunity of discussing the matter personally with the Agent in order that they may come, if possible, to some agreement.

(True Extract.)

Hedemishico

Chief Secretary.

To the Agent to the Governor of Vizagapatam.
" Inspector-General of Police.
Copy to the Revenue Department.

Exd. A D. Xavier.

Current Number 3697

Gobt. of {1893} Madras.
JUDICIAL.

CONFIDENTIAL No 23.

Issued

Recd. 17/5/93

Encl.

G.O., 2nd May 1893, No. 910.



Resumption of Muttas in
Vizagapatam.

Passing orders regarding the resumption of certain muttas in Vizagapatam and referring the Agent's remarks concerning the police arrangements in the Agency to the Inspector-General of Police for early remarks.

G.O. mis. No 1868 dt 19.5.93

Recorded.

Que
18.5.93
W
19/5/93

List
LP
17 May 93

Copy to the Comr of d.R. 20/5/93
with copy of J.O. order

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched.

READ AGAIN G.O., N.
189

DATED

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter

Spare Copies.

Struck

Issued

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES to C. No.

Total ..

In hand ..

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.

P.T.O.