

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2942

Press

~~Mis.~~

185. 187

Dated 10 — 12 — 1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handle d

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

Read the following :—

No. 185. Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 3rd May 1860, No. 2,157.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Rajahmundry, dated 3rd December 1859, No. 173, submitting the Report on the Settlement of the Estates under the management of the Court of Wards for Fusly 1268, A. D. 1858-59.

(In Con., 19th December 1859, No. 6,308.)

1. Besides the two estates of Pittapur and Kirlumpudi, which were under the management of the Court of Wards in Fusly 1267, there came under their charge in Fusly 1268 the estate of Lakavaram, under Orders of Government dated 8th June 1859. This last estate consists of four small properties, viz., Lakavaram, Jangareddigudem, Billimilli, and Byanagudem, the first three were taken in charge in consequence of the decease of their proprietor, who left a minor son, Durga Mullicarjana Prasadarao, and the last at the request of the late Zemindar's widow, to whom this property belongs.

2. The season of the Fusly under review was generally favorable. The prices of all sorts of grains ranged higher than in the preceding year.

3. PITTAPUR.—The whole current demand of the Pittapur Zemindary, including Dowlaishweram, amounted to Rupees 4,01,850, or Rupees 7,554 above the previous Fusly. Of this sum Rupees 3,89,767 were collected within the Fusly. The subsequent collections were Rupees 5,327; and there remained a balance of 6,756 Rupees at the date of the Collector's report.

4. Of the arrears, amounting to Rupees 2,35,016, Rupees 5,924 were collected up to the 31st October 1859, and Rupees 2,11,562 written off the accounts during the year with the Court's sanction; the balance still outstanding is Rupees 17,530. Of this a sum of Rupees 5,722 having been ascertained to be irrecoverable, the Collector is authorized to write it off the accounts of the estate.

5. The total income inclusive of the balance to the credit of the estate at the beginning of the Fusly amounted to Rupees 6,19,938, and the charges including Peishkush were Rupees 3,62,074. A balance of Rupees 2,57,864, therefore, remained to the credit of this estate, of which two lacs have been invested in Government Bonds.

6. KIRLUMPUDI.—The total current demand of the Kirlumpudi estate was Rupees 42,139, or Rupees 3,400 below that of Fusly 1267. Of this Rupees 41,926 were collected up to the end of October 1859; there remained, therefore, the small balance of 213 Rupees still to be collected at the date of the report.

7. The Collector gives the amount of arrears up to Fusly 1266, after correction as Rupees 32,889, of which Rupees 218 were collected within the Fusly. Of the balance of Rupees 32,671, which accrued when the estates were in possession of the late proprietor, a sum of Rupees 29,330-7-2 is stated to be wholly irrecoverable by reason of the death or desertion of the ryots; and the Court accordingly authorize

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

the Collector to write this sum off the accounts. Out of the arrears of Fusly 1267, amounting to Rupees 3,820, Rupees 3,704 were collected.

8. The aggregate receipts of the Fusly under review, including the balance in hand at its commencement, were 59,310 Rupees; and deducting the charges, Rupees 52,484, including Peishkush, which amounted to Rupees 26,749, the sum remaining to the credit of the estate was 6,826 Rupees.

9. The amount of debts due by the estate, inclusive of interest for Fusly 1267, stood at the beginning of Fusly 1268 at 35,286 Rupees. Adding the interest for Fusly 1268, they amounted to Rupees 38,983. Of this sum 17,623 Rupees were partly liquidated and partly given up by the creditor; thus reducing the balance of debt at the close of the Fusly to 21,360 Rupees. The Court are glad to learn from the Collector's report that there is a prospect of the estate being cleared from these embarrassments at an early date.

10. LAKAVARAM.—The four small estates of Lakavaram, &c., came under the management of the Court of Wards at the close of Fusly 1268. These estates comprise eight villages, all of which were settled under Ryotwary. The current demand including all sources of revenue amounted to Rupees 7,650-1-4; and the whole of this, as stated by the Collector in paragraph 55, was realized within the Fusly.

11. The arrears at the beginning of the Fusly amounted to 1,708 Rupees, of which none was collected. Of this amount Rupees 209 are found to be irrecoverable, and the Court authorize the Collector to write the sum off the accounts.

12. In paragraph 60 of the Collector's report an abstract is given of the Demand, Collection, and Balance of Peishkush both current and arrears. At the end of Fusly 1268, there was a balance of Rupees 4,386, most part of which appears to be outstanding against the estates of Byanagudem and Billimilli. This is stated to have been the consequence of a tank bund not having been repaired. The bund in question was breached in Fusly 1263, and on a former occasion a sum of

Rupees 1,318* appears to have been remitted. The Court wish to be informed whether the bund has since been repaired; and if so, when, and up to what Fusly the

remission of Peishkush was granted on this account, and whether any similar remission has been applied for by the Collector in his last General Report on the Settlement of Land Revenue. The particulars of arrears of Peishkush in each estate should be given. Even in the estate of Lakavaram and Jangareddigudem, which do not appear to have been affected by the bund, there remained a current balance of Rupees 408, which the Collector states will be adjusted shortly. The Government demand on the estates should not have been thus left uncollected beyond the Fusly, but should have been satisfied first out of the collections of the estates. The Court trust that care will be taken to avoid such arrears in future.

13. The Court regret that so little has hitherto been done to promote the education of their Wards of Pittapur. They trust that the appointment of a private Tutor, recently sanctioned, may have beneficial results during the short term of

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

the Zemindar's minority remaining unexpired. The Collector states that the Minor of Lakavaram is more than ten years' old, and that he is residing with his mother at Ellore, but he mentions nothing about his education. Mr. Purvis will be good enough to inform the Court what steps have been taken, or are contemplated for the child's benefit in this respect. Particular attention should be paid to this point.

14. In paragraph 14 of their Proceedings, dated 7th June 1859, the Court noticed the unnecessary inclusion in the Peishkush of the amount of Moturpha

which was remitted by Government on
In Con., 13th July 1859, No. 3,426. account of the resumption of that source

of revenue. In his reply, dated 7th July 1859, the Collector stated that he was aware of no objection to the amount in question being deducted at once from the Peishkush. He at the same time brought to notice that there are five other small estates in the district similarly circumstanced, in which the course above-mentioned might be followed. The Court are decidedly of opinion that nothing is gained by including in the Peishkush what has been remitted years ago, and afterwards debiting it in the accounts as Moturpha compensation. They accordingly direct that from Fusly 1269, the Peishkush of the several estates be brought to account after deducting the Moturpha compensation sanctioned by Government in each case. The amount of Moturpha tax that may be actually collected every year on account of Government should be carried to the credit of that head in the Collector's accounts, the particulars being given in the statement of Moturpha furnished to the Board with the Collector's Settlement Report.

15. With Statement No. 5 the Collector submits two detailed accounts A. and B. of charges incurred, the former including apparently all expenditure except that on account of Peishkush, the latter shewing those particular items for which the Collector seeks special sanction. This last does not, however, include all the items which are shewn in the former account to have been incurred without sanction, and the Court do not understand on what principle the Collector has drawn his distinction.

16. They see no reason, however, to object to any of the items, presuming that where the liability of the estate is not apparent from the nature of the charge, the Collector has satisfied himself that it is in accordance with previous practice and the wishes of the proprietor.

17. Ordinary annual charges do not, as a general rule, require the Court's sanction, but no unusual expenditure should be incurred without their previous permission except in cases of emergency, or when the amount is trifling, which should be noticed in the report.

18. In submitting the account particulars of charges, the dates of the Court's sanctions should be quoted.

19. The Progress Reports of Maramut works are submitted for the official year, while the charges given in Statement No. 5 are for the Fusly year. The several statements should be drawn up for one and the same period. The particulars of each estate should be given in one statement and not separately for each estate, as has been done in the present instance.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

No. 186. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th August 1867,
No. 5,169.

Read the following letter from the Collector of the Godavery District, to the
Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 8th July 1867,
No. 189.

1. Adverting to paragraph 4 of my letter, No. 93, dated the 4th May last,

1 Letter No. 126, dated 10th May 1867.
1 Enclosure in do.
1 Letter No. 183 of the 24th June ..

	RS.	A.	P.
1st Division of Nidadavole, &c..	1,451	2	0
2nd do. Tungellamudi ...	98	10	6
3rd do. Pentapadu, &c..	586	15	9
4th do. Chevendra ...	26	3	9

Total... 2,163 0 0

I have the honor to state that, from the enclosed correspondence, as per margin, received from the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, it would appear, that in the Order of Government, dated 22nd January 1851, No. 68, the Moturpha remission on the entire Nidadavole Zemindary was proportionately distributed on the four estates marginally indicated, and that there was no separate sanction of Government for the sum of Rupees 474-5-0 allowed on the Ambarapetta estate in question. From the first two paragraphs of the Acting Collector's letter, No. 183, alluded to above, it is clear that the first division of Nidadavole was composed of Nidadavole, Baharzalli, and Ambarapetta Purgannahs, and that in 1851, when the first two Purgannahs were

*Rupees 16,760-0-0
,, 474-5-0

bought by Government for arrears of revenue, proportionate Peishkush* and Moturpha remission were fixed on the

Ambarapetta Purgannah, which was left in the possession of the Zemindar.

2. The Moturpha remissions of Ambarapetta and Tungellamudi estates, amounting to Rupees 474-5-0 and Rupees 98-10-6, respectively, were, under the general authority granted in paragraph 14 of the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, No. 2,157, dated 3rd May 1860, reduced from the Peishkush of those estates in Fusly 1269, in which they were transferred to this from the late Masulipatam District, and the fact was noted in the remark column of the Jummahbundy Statement No. 12 of that Fusly.

3. It may not be out of place to mention here that the Peishkush of Ambarapetta, and that of Tungellamudi were stated to be Rupees 16,750 and Rupees 5,580, respectively, in the accounts received from the Collector of the Kistna District when the estates were transferred to this district. The same were accordingly entered in the statement submitted to the Board with my letter, No. 93, first quoted, but they differ from those given in the first paragraph of the Government Order No. 68, as shewn below :—

	1st Division, Nidadavole, &c.	Tungella- mudi.
As per Government Order	1,37,646	5,591
As per above quoted accounts.		
Ambarapetta	16,750	
Nidadavole and Baharzalli	1,20,886	5,580
Difference...	10	11

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

Regarding these differences, the Acting Collector informs me, in his letter No. 183, that these were the sums reduced from the Peishkush of Ambarapetta and Tungellamudi estates on account of cattle fines, the collection of which was reserved to Government under Act III of 1857, as per Government sanction dated 19th January 1859, No. 77, communicated with the Board's Proceedings of the 22nd idem, No. 239.

4. Referring to paragraph 5 of my letter under reference, I beg to enclose copy of a letter from the Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, No. 393, dated 13th June 1867, and a transcript of the Inam Commissioner's letter therein alluded to, from which it seems that of the quit-rent, of which an addition was made to the Peishkush of the Vizianagram Zemindary under the arrangement sanctioned by the Board and Government in their Orders dated 12th November 1861, No. 6,208, and 9th April 1862, No. 799, respectively, the sum of Rupees 2-4-0 under reference was redeemed by the Inamdar by paying a sum equal to twenty years' annual quit-rent, and that consequently the Inam Commissioner authorized a reduction of the corresponding sum of annual quit-rent from the Peishkush of that Zemindary. This reduction was never sanctioned by Government, but I have to point out that as ten per cent. was first allowed to the Zemindar when the above arrangement was made, for the trouble of collecting, &c., the proportion of that allowance should have been deducted from the above sum of Rupees 2-4-0, and the net amount only, viz., Rupees 2-0-5, reduced from the Peishkush. The Inam Commissioner's letter, paragraph 3, clearly mentions that a sum equal to the amount of Jody payable to the Zemindar in each case should be remitted from the Peishkush payable by the Zemindar. This seems to be contrary to the abovementioned arrangement.

From the Collector of the Kistna District, to the Collector of the Godavery District, dated Masulipatam, 10th May 1867, No. 126.

As requested in your letter of the 4th instant, No. 120, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of the Order of Government, dated 22nd January 1851, No. 68, sanctioning Moturpha remission to the entire Nidadavole estate.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 37.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Commissioner for the Northern Circars, dated Bezoarah, 25th January 1851.

Read the following :—

No. 68.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation, under date the 22nd January 1851.

Read the following letter from the Commissioner of the Northern Circars.

(Here enter 23rd December 1850, No. 144.)

1. The remission on account of Moturpha, allowed by the Order of the 29th November 1822, in the public demand, on the Nidadavole Zemindary, in the Masulipatam District, was Rupees 2,163

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

per annum, which on the sub-division of that estate has been apportioned rateably with the Peishkush on each division in the proportion shewn below :—

	Peishkush.	Moturpha.
	RS.	RS. A. P.
First Division, Nidadavole, &c.	1,37,646	1,451 2 0
Second do. Tungellamudi	5,591	98 10 6
Third do. Pentapadu, &c.	61,545	586 15 9
Fourth do. Chevendra... ..	5,218	26 3 9
	2,10,000	2,163 0 0

2. From delay in the preparation of the Sub-division accounts which were confirmed only on the 31st December 1849, the settlement of the Moturpha remissions has been in abeyance, and an adjustment of the accumulated amount requires to be made in the case of the two former Sub-divisions from Fusly 1254, and in the two latter from Fusly 1253.

3. The Right Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the Moturpha remission of the entire Nidadavole estate being apportioned on the four Sub-divisions, as shewn above, and grants authority for credit being given to the several proprietors in those proportions up to Fusly 1259 and hereafter.

4. Under the sanction now communicated, the arrears of Moturpha remission which have accumulated in favour of the several Sub-divisions to the close of Fusly 1259, amounting to Rupees (13,591-3-6) thirteen thousand five hundred and ninety-one, Annas three, and Pies six, will also be adjusted in the manner following :—

	RS. A. P.		RS. A. P.
On account of 1st Division, Nidadavole, &c.	1,451 2 0	for 6 years	8,706 12 0
Second Division, Tungellamudi	98 10 6	„	591 15 0
Third do. Pentapadu, &c.	586 15 9	for 7 years	4,108 14 3
Fourth do. Chevendra	26 3 9	„	183 10 3
	2,163 0 0		13,591 3 6

The Commissioner will instruct the Collector of Masulipatam to furnish the Civil Auditor with the names of the proprietors to whom credit should be given on account of the arrears, and who are entitled to enjoy the remission for the future.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Secretary to Government.

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing Extract Minutes of Consultation be communicated to the Collector of Masulipatam, with reference to his letter of the 31st October 1850.

Mr. Porter's attention is requested to the concluding part of the last paragraph.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) WALTER ELLIOT,
Commissioner.

From the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Collector of the Godavery District, dated Masulipatam, 24th June 1867, No. 183.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, No. 148, and in reply to inform you that there is no separate sanction of Government for the Moturpha

- * 1. Nidadavole.
- 2. Baharzalli.
- 3. Ambarapetta.

remission of Ambarapetta Muta, one of the three Purgannahs composing the 1st Division* of Nidadavole, for which a lump sum of Rupees

1,451 was sanctioned in the Order of Government, dated 22nd January 1851, No. 64.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

2. In the year 1851, the first two Purgannahs after attachment for arrears of Peishkush were bought by Government. Ambarapetta Muta was left in possession of the Zemindar. The proportion of Peishkush payable on it was calculated from the last Sub-division account sanctioned by the Commissioner; and in the same way, the Moturpha remission of Rupees 474-5-0 due to this portion of the original estate out of the lump remission sanctioned, appears to have been proportionately fixed. The accounts, I believe, will be found in the Circuit Committee accounts already sent to you. I have no records of the mode in which the proportion was fixed in this Office, all accounts that are extant having been already sent to you.

3. The difference pointed out in paragraph 2 of the letter under acknowledgment is owing to a deduction from the Peishkush of the following sums on account of cattle fines, the collection of which was reserved to Government under Act III of 1857 :—

	Peishkush.	Deduct cattle fines remitted.	Remaining Peishkush.
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
1. Nidadavole	82,662 0 0		82,662 0 0
2. Baharzalli	28,224 0 0		28,224 0 0
3. Ambarapetta... ..	16,760 0 0	10 0 0	16,750 0 0
	1,37,646 0 0		
4. Tungellamudi	5,591 0 0	11 0 0	16,580 0 0

E. M. C., 19th January 1859, No. 77.
Board, 22nd " " " 239.

4. The Order of Government sanctioning the same is forwarded herewith. As the first two estates were then Government property, no such deductions were made for them.

5. The original sum recommended as compensation by the Collector as per enclosure of his letter, No. 114, dated 10th June 1858, was Rupees 9-11-6, which appears to have been after Government sanction to save fractions of a rupee entering into the calculations, altered actually to Rupees 10.

From the Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Collector of the Godavery District, dated Cocanada, 13th June 1867, No. 393.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 149 of the 8th instant, and in reply to inform you that there is no special sanction of Government for the reduction of the sum of Rupees 2-4-0 referred to by you.

2. What is usually done in cases of this kind is this. An Inamdar, for instance, wishes to redeem the quit-rent and Jody on his land. He applies to the Collector paying the amount of twenty years' purchase into the treasury. The Collector forwards the application to the Inam Commissioner who directs what is to be done.

3. The present case was sent up to the Inam Commissioner in April 1865. His reply is dated July of the same year. According to paragraph 3 thereof the reduction was made. If the special sanction of Government is required in matters of this kind, it ought to be obtained by the Inam Commissioner I think. However, I now send you full copies of the letters referred to in my tabular statement, dated 22nd November 1865, together with extract from the Inam Commissioner's letter, dated 16th March 1865, giving cover to the same, by which I trust all doubts will be cleared off.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

From the Officiating Inam-Commissioner, to the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated Coimbatore, 21st July 1865, No. 560.

Mindi Rayappa.

* Your letter, 5th April 1865, No. 183.

† Nos. 506 and 591 of Bimlipatam Talook.

with your letter of the 13th September last, No. 513, and request that they may be delivered to the party on his paying twenty years' purchase of the old Jody into your treasury.

2. After the purchase money is paid and Title Deeds delivered, the amount should be entered in the appropriate column of the Vernacular Register.

3. A sum equal to the amounts of Jody payable to the Zemindar in each case should be remitted from the Peishkush payable by the Zemindar.

Extract of a letter from the Inam Commissioner, dated Coimbatore, 16th March 1865, No. 180.

1. I have the honor in acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 4th ultimo, No. 38,

Proceedings of Government, 9th April 1862, No. 799.
Board's Proceedings, 12th November 1861, „ 6,208.

to refer you to the Order noted in the margin, from which you will observe that the outright redemption of the quit-rent charged in the Title Deeds inclusive of the Jody payable to Zemindars has already received the sanction of Government and the Board of Revenue.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. H. MASTER,
Acting Collector.

1. Resolved that the foregoing letter and its enclosures be submitted to Government, in continuation of Board's Proceedings No. 4,171, dated 4th July 1867.

2. In Government Order, dated 22nd January 1851, No. 68, a reduction of Rupees 1,451-2-0 in the Peishkush of the First Division of the Nidadavole Zemindary which consisted of Nidadavole, Baharzalli, and Ambarapetta Purgannahs, was made. Subsequently, but in the same year, the two former Purgannahs were bought in by Government for arrears of Peishkush, when a proportion of the reduction was fixed on the Ambarapetta Purgannah which still remained in the Zemindar's hands. The proportion did not, it appears, receive any specific sanction from Government. It amounted to Rupees 474-5-0, and was fixed with reference to the accounts of the Circuit Committee.

3. The reduction of Rupees 98-10-6 from Tungellamudi, the Second Division of the Nidadavole Zemindary, was sanctioned by the same Government Order.

4. In the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, quoted by Mr. Fraser, the Court merely directed that the above reductions which continued yearly to be brought to account and then debited as Moturpha compensation, should be struck out of the accounts altogether, with a view to simplifying them.

5. The discrepancy adverted to in paragraph 3 of Mr. Fraser's letter between the Government Order, No. 68, quoted above, and the accounts received from the Collector of the Kistna District, is the result of reductions ordered in 1858 on account of cattle fines resumed with reference to Act III of 1857.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
10th December 1867.*

6. The Government Order is dated 19th January 1859, No. 77, and it reduces the Peishkush of the Ambarapetta estate from Rupees 16,760 to 16,750, and that of Tungellamudi from Rupees 5,591 to 5,580.

7. The reduction of Rupees 2-4-0 on the Kotapulli estate was made by order of the Inam Commissioner under the authority of the Government Order that Officer quotes in his letter to the Collector of Vizagapatam, copy of which is enclosed in Mr. Fraser's communication. The reduction should have been Rupees 2-0-5, as pointed out by Mr. Fraser; but as the difference between that sum and the reduction allowed is insignificant, the Board do not see any adequate reason for altering the existing arrangement.

No. 187. ORDER THEREON, 10th December 1867, No. 2,942.

Land Revenue.

1. No further orders seem necessary on the subject of the above Proceedings, the reductions of Peishkush in question having been in accordance with orders of Government.

2. The Government concur in the opinion of the Board that no adjustment need be made of the petty item relating to Kotapulli.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue:

Accountant General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

W. 2942. 6:

to find the most

was necessary on
the subject of the above
proofs - the reductions of
Ashhurst in question having
been in accordance with
orders of Govt. The Govt. came
in the opinion of the H. that
no adjustment need be
made of the petty items
relating to Kotalpalli.

List.

L. R.
10th Dec 1877

14 Copies to the H. of Rev. Secy to Govt.
6 - Chatterjee's

Recd. 17 July/67 No. 273-5
 " 9 April/62 No. 167-5
 " 22 June/51 No. 13-114
 " 25 June/54 No. 1-2
 " 25 Dec/51 No. 33-36.

Recd. 1867. Department.
 No. of Govt. for Decr
 No. 2220.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 12th August 1867.

Dear Sir,
 Recd 9th
 P. 1.

No. 5,169.

Submitting with remarks letter from Collector
 of Godavery District relative to reduction from
 Peishcush of Nihdavoile estate on account of abo-
 lition of Moturpha tax and stating that Board see
 no reason for altering arrangement with respect
 to the reduction of Rupees 2-4-0 on the Kotapaly
 estate instead of Rupees 2-0-5 as the reduction
 allowed is insignificant.

No. 294210 Dear

No. 1850 187