M.R.O. 14—18,000—57-9-94

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 14 — Press ~~Mis.~~

24-26

Dated 5 — 1 — 1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 13.14

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 5th January 1867.

No. 24. Read the following Memorial of Rajah SUGATOOR IMMADEE SANKARA RAYAL ESOVUNTH Bahadur, Zemindar of Punganur, in the District of North Arcot, to His Excellency Lord FRANCIS NAPIER, K. T., Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated 20th June 1866.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

Your Memorialist begs to bring to your notice the following few facts:—

I. That the Inám Commissioner has unjustly assessed such lands, excluding those left for Brahmins, as were allowed by Colonel Thomas Munro and Mr. Travers, after the due consideration and examination during the time when the present Government attained its full extent. The holders of such lands are the following persons:—

1. The Gooroos or Priests and Aucharies who manage the religious matters of us properly.

2. Punchangy or Calendar Reader, whose duty is to attend the palace daily to read the calendars and to tell astrology.

3. Rajah Pourahetahs, whose duty is to have a list, (handed down from generation to generation of annual festivals,) such as Dwipavaly and Dasarah, of some particular worship of god, of the method of marriage after the Hindoo manner, and of other religious matters, and to attend the palace to give notice of the particular dates in which such festivals take place.

4. Puranicas are those persons whose duty is to read Puranas or ancient and religious histories.

5. On such festivals as above-mentioned, the service of the following are necessary:—

1. Pundits, to discourse on a certain point with the Pundits of other countries or among themselves.

2. Poets, to compose poems, some themes being given.

3. Buffoons, to entertain the State by their wit.

4. Butraj, to entertain the assembly by flattering.

5. Musicians, playing on some musical instruments.

6. Nuttavahs, to play dramas.

7. Surgeons, to apply medicine to any kind of sickness.

II. That these Inám Shrotriems, Bhutvurthy, and Khyrady (as they are called) are declared rent-free, and consequently our officers have informed the Inám Commissioner that these lands should not be assessed now, but should be allowed to continue in the same manner as before. I have spoken of this matter to Mr. Taylor, the Inám Commissioner, and have also informed him by some letters.

III. That these lands are in reality held by them as a remuneration for their services under the Memorialist and his ancestors. But now these persons are just declining to discharge their respective duties to me, being unjustly and in contradiction to the old custom, saddled with quit-rent, as aforesaid, in addition to the Jodi imposed upon them.

IV. That, in conformity to the practice observed in the Carnatic Samastanams, your Lordship's Memorialist should secure the services of the above-mentioned persons for his use and benefit, besides for keeping up his dignified position.

V. That your Lordship's Memorialist is fully persuaded (by the favorable treatment which he received from Colonel Thomas Munro, Governor Lushington, and Governor Trevelyan,) to believe that it can never be the wish of the British Government to do anything that can interfere with the comfort, ancient enjoyments, and privilege of the Zemindars and their families, and to dishonor and lower them in the estimation of the public.

VI. That under the above circumstances, your Memorialist begs that your Lordship will order that the aforesaid Service Ináms and Shrotriems may be left as usual free from any quit-rent, so that he may be able to continue and their services.

For this act of kindness, Your Lordship's Memorialist shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

No. 25. Read the following Memorial of Rajah SUNKARA RAYAL ESOVUNTH Bahadoor IMMADEE ganur, in the District of North Arcot, to His Excellency Lord FRANCIS NAPIER, K. T., Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, Poonganoor 29th June 1866.

Zemindar of Pun-

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That your Lordship's Memorialist begs to appeal, upon the following grounds, from the letter (Appendix I.) of the Officiating Inám Commissioner Mr. W. T. Blair, No. 116, dated 11th day of August 1865, which communicates to him the Order of the Government upon his petition addressed to that Officer, praying for the exemption of the several Kattoobadi and Amara Ináms and Shrotriems in his Zemindary from being saddled with quit-rent, in opposition to the immemorial local usage and fiscal system.

I. Because the Inám Commissioner is *not* correct in his representation (1) that the Kattoobadi and Amara Ináms are *excluded* from the assets of the Memorialist's Zemindary; (2) that the Memorialist has therefore *nothing* to do with them; (3) that they should be according to the rules, *enfranchised*, and (4) that *only* the Ináms enjoyed by such of the Kattoobadi and Amara servants in the actual household and personal service of the Memorialist should be rent free.

II. Because the Amaradars and Kattoobadies form an *essential* portion of the Village Revenue Establishments, and, as such, have been, from time immemorial, performing the *bona fide* duties of the collection of revenue, &c., &c.

III. Because the Memorialist has, as hitherto, every right to their services as the recognized village revenue servants.

IV. Because the measure recommended by the Commissioner is calculated to subvert the fiscal system of the Memorialist's Zemindary, and seriously to obstruct the collection of revenue.

V. Because it tends in a great degree to deprive the Memorialist of the long enjoyed benefit of employing them as his personal attendants suitable to his position and dignity as the Zemindar.

2. That, in regard to the *first* ground, the Inám Commissioner has based his proposal to enfranchise the Ináms enjoyed by "Village Officers," viz., Amaradars and Kattoobadies, "for Revenue services *still performed*," upon the alleged exclusion of the same from the assets, upon which the Peishcush was calculated in

1815. Upon the strength of the Khowlo granted to the Memorialist's grandfather in 1815, Mr. Blair declared that the aforesaid Ináms were excluded from the assets; but it must be observed that he is not fully aware of the cancelment or supercession of the said cowle by the Order of Government, issued in 1825 under the instructions of the Honorable the late Court of Directors. Besides this, a reference to the letter (Appendix III.) from Mr. Lacon, the then Collector of the Zillah of Cuddapah, No. 62, dated 23rd May 1833, to the address of the Memorialist's father, (being a reply to the communication (Appendix II.) No. 67, dated 24th November 1830, from the Memorialist's senior paternal uncle,) will convince your Lordship, beyond doubt, that the Government, in compliance with the Memorialist's senior paternal uncle's request, was not only pleased to *include* among the assets (save the Sayer, Abkarry, and Moturpha), all the villages described in the margin, as also the Jodi or quit-rent assessed upon the Ináms, and Baujebaub, *i. e.*, fruit trees subject to the annual Ijara; but also to grant his (Memorialist's senior uncle's) prayer that the Amaradars, Kattoobadies, &c., enjoying Amara Charana Amara Muktha and Shrotriems should be in his service doing the Revenue, Police, and other duties respectively. The privilege accorded to the Memorialist's father, through the letter of Mr. Lacon as aforesaid, has been graciously extended and confirmed to the Memorialist by the Sunnud-i-Milkeut Istimrar, with which he was favored by the Government in 1861 under which he holds his Zemindary at present.

1. Khalisa villages
2. Zufti, Muzras (hamlets).
3. Amara Muktha.
4. Amara Charana.
5. Shrotriem.
6. Nowkur Pesha.

Circar Zamin included in each of the above villages.

3. That, for the foregoing reasons, it must be declared that the Memorialist has as much right and claim to, and interest in, the Ináms enjoyed by the Amaradars and Kattoobadies employed for the collection of revenue and other revenue purposes, (to the services of whom he is fully entitled by the long and immemorial local usage,) as he has in the case of Ayen villages and Ináms for village services.

4. That the proposed enfranchisement of the said Ináms falling respectively under sub-divisions first and second of the fourth general class of Ináms in the Inám rules is diametrically opposed to the object of the very Inám Commission itself, inasmuch as the village officers, viz., Amaradars and Kattoobadies, *still perform their respective revenue services* in each Mouzah or cluster of ten to twenty hamlets within the Zemindary.

5. That while the Memorialist is very thankful for the exemption of a very few Ináms enjoyed by the Amaradars and Kattoobadies in his household and personal service, he is extremely sorry for being put to the risk (without any cause) of losing the long enjoyed privilege of having all the Amaradars and Kattoobadies as his private and public servants.

6. That adverting to the *second* and *third* grounds, your Lordship's Memorialist begs to say that in the time of yore, the Amaradars and Kattoobadies had been the Memorialist's ancestors' Military retainers; that after the cessation of the Poligar system (which required their Military services very much for the safety of the estates) and subsequent to the transfer of this Zemindary from Burmahal to Cuddapah, many of whom as were *actually* required for the performance of the Revenue, Police, and other duties, were retained in the permanent service, the residue being dismissed

Cases part of the old
Loge establishment

in conformity to the Maharrattah letter (Appendix IV.) despatched in 1800 by Major Munro, the then Collector of Cuddapah, and afterwards the Governor of this Presidency, to the Memorialist's grandfather.

7. That they have since continued generation after generation to discharge their respective functions enjoying their Ináms. There is really no distinction between the Kattoobadies and Amarams, excepting that the Service Ináms of the former are in scattered fields, whilst the Amarams are hamlets enjoyed by a community of Kattoobadies, and hence their holders are called Amardars. But both have been always attached to the service of the particular Mouzah or villageship in which they are situated.

8. That the Village Toties and Neerouttees have their own menial services to perform to the villagers, and it will be contrary to all custom to employ them in the collection of revenue and other Circar Revenue duties of the villages which require a higher and more responsible class of servants like the Kattoobadies and Amardars. In a few of the villages these village peons are known as Angajalas, whose Ináms have been left quite untouched by the Inám Commissioner, as those enjoyed *by a part* of the village revenue service. The other village peons employed for similar revenue purposes are called "Atwanies," "Thalsil Peons," and "Tirtevoocars."

9. That by the terms of the permanent Khowle, with which your Memorialist has been lately furnished, besides ordinary Ináms, all lands held for Police service have been reserved to Government, and your Memorialist recognizes the fairness of Government disposing at its pleasure the portion of the Kattoobadies and Amarams employed in Police duties. The number of these are expressly detailed in the account of Fusly 1220, which is adopted by the Inám Commissioner as the standard authority. But your Memorialist must beg to point out that interference with the rest of the Kattoobadies and Amarams would be an infringement of the terms of the permanent Khowle, for which there is neither authority nor sufficient ground.

10. That adverting to the *fourth* ground, your Lordship's Memorialist begs to observe that he will be deprived of the services of the Kattoobadies and Amardars, if the Commissioner's proposition of saddling their Ináms with quit-rent be carried out; for there can then be no consideration for their continuance of the service under the Memorialist, as public revenue village officers, without whose material aid it will be very impossible to collect revenue of each Mouzah to which they are respectively attached.

11. That while upon this subject, the Memorialist begs to say, that the Commissioner was not justified in assessing quit-rent upon the Ináms enjoyed by Bhutraj (who are included in the list of the Memorialist's courtiers) for services *still* rendered by them in his palace. The Commissioner seems to be of opinion that the Ináms of Bhutraj are "personal or subsistence grants," whereas they are enjoyed in consideration of their services under the Memorialist; at this rate he fears he may be deprived of all honors and privileges long accorded to him and his ancestors, by converting all the similar Service Ináms into personal and subsistence grants.

12. That with reference to the *fifth* ground, the Memorialist has nothing more to say than draw your Lordship's kind attention to the accompanying testi-

monials of character and loyalty of himself and his ancestors, so that your Lordship may be able to form an idea of the good esteem in which he and his forefathers have always been held by the Government and its Officers.

13. That the permanent Khowle, lately conferred on your Memorialist, simply confirmed the previously existing Peishcush, under the terms of which your Memorialist had for years past enjoyed the services of the Kattoobadies and Amaradars for the collection of his revenue and other duties. In the matter of this Peishcush, your Memorialist was unfavorably treated solely in consequence of the accidental circumstance of your Memorialist's Zamin happening to be transferred from Burmahal to Ceded Districts, where the rebellion of the Poligars led to a harsher line of policy. The Peishcush of the Kangoondy Polliem, which remained in Burmahal, and which Poligar, like your Memorialist's family, remained faithful to Government, was fixed at two-fifths of the assets, and all the Kattoobadies and Omiligars were allowed to the Poligars; whereas your Memorialist's Peishcush was fixed at four-fifths of the assets, and by subsequent calculations it was supposed to amount to two-thirds of the assets.

14. That your Memorialist under all these circumstances prays that he may not be reduced to still more unfavorable position by any interference with the Kattoobadies and Amarams, save and except those held for Police, which alone are reserved to Government, as such interference would be contrary to the stipulation of the permanent Khowle, and to the authorized enjoyment of years on the part of your Memorialist's family.

For which act of kindness your Lordship's Memorialist shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

No. 26. ORDER THEREON, 5th January 1867, No. 14.

Miscellaneous.

1. In these Memorials the Zemindar of Punganur appeals against the course taken by the Inám Commissioner in enfranchising certain Amaram, Kuttubadi, Bhutvurti, and Khyrati Ináms situated within the limits of his Zemindary.

2. The Governor in Council observes that the right of Government to these Ináms was distinctly reserved in paragraph 3 of the Sunnud granted in 1861, under which the Zemindar holds his estate; and that before the Sunnud was issued the Zemindar was informed that his claim to the Ináms was inadmissible, and that they would be dealt with by the Inám Commissioner.

G. O. 30th October 1860, No. 1,994.

3. The Memorialist's assertions that the maintenance of the Inámdars is essential to the Zemindar's dignity, and to the conduct of business in the Zemindary, were considered and finally disposed of in G. O. 28th March 1865, No. 674.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
Rd. S. T. Augustin.

Cases part of the old
Cope establishment

Petns. 1765 & 1766 of 1886

Memo.

The Memorialists urges that the Bhat Bandi & Khyat mamools are not mere grants for personal subsistence but grants for the services of priests, courtiers & other attendants, which are still rendered & which are requisite to keep up the dignity of the Zemindar; that the amaadars & kattu Padies are in most cases part of the old Loge establishment

zemindary "to exclusive"
of "Cutcherry lands (lands"
"exempt from the pay"
"ment of public revenue")
"of all other alienated"
lands paying a small"
"quit rent (which quit"
"rent unchangeable"
"by" the zemindar "is in"
cluded in the assets of"
his "zemindary" &c.

The last item includes
Choltrums (Choultries
& Kyrato mans &c) Choul
trams & Kattubadies.

Hence without going
farther back than
this Summd it is clear
that the memorialists
claims are not
valid.

When the Commrs
commenced the settle

This is the usual language
of a Zemindary Grant
vide Summd - Sec too
Reg: + + V. 1802 54

GO 28 Mar 65 N°674

ment of the zemindary
the zemindar complained
of same & the Commrs
made a full report
on the subject to Govt
took their orders upon
it. The zemindar was
treated with indulgence
& Govt gave him all
the inams enjoyed by
Kattubadies to this for
private & miscellaneous
service, when the ac
counts of F. 1220 were
made out. The Commrs
reported that Memo
dars were not required
for purposes connected
with the fiscal adminis
tration of the country
as all the villages were
provided with the full
complement of the
ordinary village establishment.

As the memorialist has tried to make out that these inams were part of the assets before the summud of 1801 was granted I have examined the former correspondence & find that the present settlement is based on calculations made in 1815 when a conditional summud (afterwards rescinded by the Court) was given to the zemindar.

In those calculations, chrotrums Purvemans, amaramuttu & amaracharane villages & the greater kattubadies were altogether excluded from the assets as belonging to Govt. The lesser kattubadies were considered as

Although the summud was rescinded the zemindary was given to the zemindar on lease.

Bd Board Rev 2d Apl 1815
in Mem Cons 23 June 1815
No 182 from 12, 19, 27 Feb.

belonging to the village establishment & were also excluded from the assets. The nowkar pash or servants' inams were included in the assets.

The settlement of the Inam Commr is in conformity with the arrangements & the present summud is based upon them.

Mr Lacon's letter is the hardest thing to construe I ever tried my hand at (i.e. that part of it that the zemindar refers to) but I have gone over it with several Telugu men & they all agree with the memorialists translator, who makes Mr Lacon say that the Circar lands only are alienated

Limits filing of the zemindar

5 January 1808

Note Memo

Mr. Petit memorials the zemindar of Purgah's appeals against the course taken by the Grain Commissioners in enfranchising certain Amaums, Kattubadi, Bhatvarti & Khyrate mams situated within the limits of his Zemindary

The Governor in Council observes that the right of Govt to these mams was

c 8 Dec 1813

distinctly reserved in para 3 of the Summd granted in 1858 under which the Jemeendar holds his estate. & that before the summd was issued the Jemeendar was informed that his claim to the lands was inadmissible & that they would be dealt with by the Inam Commr.

Co. Oct 30, 1860 N° 1994

The memorialists assertions that the maintenance of the mandars is essential to the Jemeendars dignity & to the conduct of Business in the zemindary were considered

I would stop here. Before the Summd was issued the Zemeendar raised the question of right to the Lands & to the Lands & put decided against him. Knowing this he accepted the Summd - which reserves the Lands to Govt. and I do not think it just that we consent to re-open the question.

L. D.S.

Yes Stokes Mr Lewin's case is clear. The case is a very clear one against Poongavanam of the 5 with Govt. with any argument existing in favour. Any stiff Letter we can bring forward the clearer part of this dispute.

WDL

No ambiguity in the

14 Feb 60 Govt to Govt
Govt to Govt 5 Dec 59

Govt of 28 Mar 1855 N° 574.

The language used in the letter from Mr Lacon which is appealed by the Zemindar is not precise; but it seems clear that he meant to say that the Circar lands only in alienated hamlets were included in ~~belonged to~~ the zemindars assets, & the writer of the English translation which accompanies the letter evidently understood it in this sense. Every of Mr Lacon had stated that these alienated hamlets were included in the zemindary, the

rights of the Govt would not be affected for Mr Lacon was never authorized by Govt or the Diwan of Travancore to make such a statement

The Govt see no reason to disturb the settlement of the Diwan Comm[r]

language of Mr Lacon letter can be explained Jemidar's claim. First because if his words do bear the interpretation put on them by Dewan & Govt, Mr Lacon is to blame by exceeding his authority and secondly because the Govt accepted, after discussion of the subject, a Summons in which his present claim was distinctly excluded and the Diwan of Travancore specially and expressly exempted from it

A JP

Before settling my Report the decision of my colleagues in this matter & which I am not competent to judge I wish to have some explanation on the subject in the Revenue Dept of the Revenue Secretary N.

Copied H.C.B.

Revenue 1867 Dep.t
Pro.s of Govt. for Jany

No. 11

Pro.s of the Madras
Government
dd 5.th January 67.

No. 24 @ 26.