

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2824

DATED 4th June.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording with remarks Pres. of
the Court of Wards issuing instructions
in the matter of the survey of proprietary
estates under its management.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 1221



From *The Secretary, Court of Wards*

Order

No. *7 Press*

Dated *22 April 1897.*

Received *18.5.97*

Registered *18.5.97*

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Issuing instructions in the matter of the survey of proprietary estates under the management of the Court of Wards.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Printed May th.

Proceedings, No. 7, Press, 22nd April 1897.

APRIL.

Issuing instructions in the matter of the survey of proprietary estates under the management of the Court of Wards.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COURT OF WARDS.

RESOLUTION—No. 7, Press, dated 22nd April 1897.

The Court has considered the question of the survey of proprietary estates under its management, and has come to the conclusion that such a survey would, as a general rule, be distinctly advantageous to the minor proprietors. The following instructions are accordingly issued.

2. (i) The appended statement shows the proprietary estates under management, their current demand for 1895-96 and surplus balance on 30th June 1896.

(ii) The estates of Marungapuri, Sáptúr and Telaprole have recently been surveyed, and the question of demarcating the holdings in the last two estates is now under correspondence.

Peddákimedi, Sálúru, Peda Merangi, Palayavanam, Palayampatti, Shulagiri, Royakota and Ankusagiri.

(iv) In the case of Ettiyapuram, it appears that a survey was made while the estate was under management previously; but in view of the Acting Director's remarks at paragraph 2 of his letter of the 14th February 1876, No. 398-15, printed in * Government Order, No. 310, Revenue, dated 24th April 1889, the Court desires to have the opinion of the Collector as to whether any further action is necessary with reference to the present state of things.

(v) It is open to question whether the survey of Pithápuram should be taken in hand before the pending Privy Council appeal has been decided; the Collector of Gódvári is requested to report on this point.

(vi) The financial condition of Chispurupalle, which is a small estate, is far from satisfactory; Appikonda is more a mercantile than a landed estate; the position of Belgam and of Munagala is peculiar, and only a single village of Tangellamudi remains in the Ward's possession. These five estates may therefore be let alone.

(vii) As regards the remaining estates shown below, the Collectors concerned are requested to report on the advisability or otherwise of their survey:—

Estate.							District.
Bodogodo	...	...	...	...	...	...	Ganjám.
Chidikada	}	...	...	...	...	...	Vizagapatam.
Kurupám		...	...	...	...	...	
Kasinkóta		...	...	...	...	...	
Mamidivada		...	...	...	...	...	
Timmajammal's estate	}	...	...	...	...	...	North Arcot.
Thumba		...	...	...	...	...	Madura.
Mambarai		...	...	...	...	...	Tinnevely.
Tbalavankottai		...	...	...	...	...	Salem.
Kakangarai		...	...	...	...	...	

In the case of estates, the survey of which is recommended by Collectors, the approximate cost of a *fieldwar* survey and the dates when the Survey Department will be able to undertake the work should be ascertained from the Superintendent and reported. On receipt of the Collectors' reports, the Court will apply to Government for the necessary sanction.

(viii) The question of survey should invariably receive the attention of Collectors, when estates are newly taken under management.

(True Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Collector of Tinnevely (with copy of G.O., No. 310,
Revenue, of 24th April 1889).

To other Collectors in charge of Wards' estates (Managers).

Copy to the Collectors of other districts, except Madras.

" " Superintendent, Madras Survey.

„ „ Superintendent, Medical Survey.
„ „ Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT of proprietary estates under the Court's management.

Estates.	Current demand (faski 1305).	Surplus on 30th June 1896.	Date of restoration.	Remarks.
	Rs.	Rs.		
Bodogodo (1885)	39,209	52,201	15th March 1906.	
Peddakimedi (1892)	1,17,635	22,035	1st June 1898.	Debts due by the estate—Rupees 1,50,757.
Chidikada (1877)	22,137	50,299	Female ward.	
Chipurupalle (1892)	7,385	131	16th April 1908.	It is more a mercantile than a landed estate.
Appikonda (1886)	8,723	25,121	11th January 1898.	Legal position is peculiar.
Belgam (1889)	39,539	25,710	Female ward. 1898	
Kurupam (1891)	91,646	88,273	5th September 1899.	
Salora (1894)	1,20,296	12,353	22nd May 1906.	Debts due by the estate—Rupees 6,12,400
Pedda-Merangi (1894)	13,934	16,220	8th August 1903.	Do. Rs. 88,345
Kasimkōta (1896)	85,917	1,33,241	22nd October 1903.	
Mamdivada (1896)	4,964		Female aged 5 years.	
Lakkavaram (1879)	27,321	46,420	25th April 1897.	Will shortly leave the Court's charge.
Tangellamudi (1889)	29,687	72,021	16th October 1900.	Only a single village now belongs to the ward. Liabilities—Rupees 1,17,022.
Pithapuram (1890)	10,04,457	..	5th January 1908.	
Telaprole (1890)	1,07,908	3,75,061	31st August 1910.	Already surveyed.
Munagala (1893)	54,616	15,507	19th May 1900.	Survey considered undesirable in the present state of litigation.
Timmajammal's estate (1885)	5,981	15,980	11th March 1900.	
Thumba (1893)	5,487	1,335	26th July 1909.	
Palayavanam (1887)	2,000	3,430	27th March 1904.	Liabilities—Rs. 1,95,893.
Maranganuri (1888)	72,428	73,932	8th November 1905.	Surveyed in blocks.
Aptar (1886)	59,428	1,92,767	7th July 1902.	Do.
Maubarai (1889)	5,458	3,193	12th November 1900.	
Palayampatti (1894)	58,218	33,788	7th January 1909	Liabilities—Rs. 1,98,282.
Ettiypuram (1890)	3,78,083	2,12,014	30th December 1899.	Surveyed during previous management—paragraphs 75 and 76 of the letter in Court's Proceedings, No. 1248, dated 10th May 1878.
Thalavankottai (1891)	13,453	3,458	27th May 1898.	
Shulagiri (1883)	23,491	16,879	18th March 1903.	Liabilities—Rs. 10,138.
Rovakota (1890)	5,876	4,367	3rd December 1903.	Do Rs. 25,917.
Kankangarai (1892)	4,829	14,083	30th June 1902.	
Ankusagiri (1894)	29,605	6,318	25th July 1910.	Liabilities—Rs. 19,437.

Note.—The figures within parenthesis show the dates on which the estates were taken up by the Court of Wards.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

15/4-65

C no 4221/97

L.O. no. 2824 of 4th June 1897.

Recorded.

2. The amount ~~of~~ rent demand viz Rs 29,687 shown in column 2 of the Appendix against the Tangellamudi estate ~~includes~~ includes the remission of Rs 120. The correct figure should therefore be Rs 29,567.

3. The date of restoration entered in column 4 against the Pittapuram estate should be 5th October 1906 and not 5th January 1906 (vide Appendix A to the Court of Wards Administration Report for year 1305 (1895-96)).

4/4/97

Dist

To

The Court of Wards. Des. 10-6-97

18.

29 June 97

2-2

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

14/4/97

THE

STATE

40

5.7

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

B.B.—

A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only