

Revenue (1897) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3115

DATED 19th June.

[Despatch Abstract.]

payment sanctioning the proposal to make
by a per cent deduction of the assessment
on minor houses belonging to the Devarastanam
at Petur in the Coimbatore dt.

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 (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 4058



*From the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue)*

Order

No. 1722 bis :

Dated 12th May 1897.

Received 15.7.97

Registered 11.9.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Submitting to Government, with
remarks, Coimbatore Collector's
letter with the Income Commission
- er's endorsement thereon furnish-
- ing the information called for
in regard to the minor income
attached to the Perus Devacka
- name.*


BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2,000
28-1-07.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 12th May
No. 1722

1897.

Miscellaneous.

READ

G. O. Revenue Department, No. 5126,
dated 12th December 1896; and reference
thereon dated 19th December '96.

— also the following letter from Herbert Bradley,
Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary
to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras,
through the Inam Commissioners, Madras,
Ref^{ce} Let^r No. 808 (C) of 95, dated 15th April 1897.
Re: —

In reply to Board's Reference on
Government Register No. 2538 of 1896,
dated 19th December 1896, I have the honor
to report that the minor inam lands
themselves appear to have been originally
granted

granted for the benefit of the Perur-
devasthanam. The devasthanam has,
however, been receiving only the assessment
on these lands for a very long time and
the Secretary to the Devasthanam Committee
states that the present holders must
be considered owners of the lands
subject to the payment of the assess-
ment thereon to the devasthanam.
The assessment and not the land now
constitutes the Inam.

2. The lands are not subject to
the payment of any jodi to Government.

Read also the following endorsement of
the Inam Commissioner, Madras, R.
C. No 560 of 95, dated 4th May 1897.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, with the file of correspond-
ence returned as requested.

Resolution:- The Collector's letter with the
Inam

Inam Commissioner's endorsement
read above will be submitted to Govern-
ment with reference to its order ^{5726 m. R.}
12.12.96.

2. The Board agrees with the
Collector that the assessment on the
prints Inams attached to the Perur
devasthanam should be taken to con-
stitute the Inam.

/ True Copies & Extracts

Deccan
Secretary.

5
The Secretary to Government,
R-D, with 8 enclosures
returned.

4 Dec 1896

C no. 40834/97

The Hon. Mr. Gosse. C. I. &

* It appears that the Devasthanam has been receiving only the assessment ^{on these lands} for a long time, that the present holders are considered as the owners of the lands and that it is only the assessment that now constitutes the Inam.

For orders.

The Inam villages of Perur and Maruthampalli in the Coimbatore Taluk and ~~the Coimbatore~~ some minor inams scattered in several taluks of the Coimbatore district have been assigned for the maintenance and upkeep of the Perur Devasthanam. The Secretary to the Devasthanam Committee complains that considerable inconvenience and expense are caused to the Devasthanam authorities in the collection of the revenue on the minor inams scattered throughout the district and requests that these minor inams may be resumed by Government and an extent of land yielding a revenue equal to that derivable from the minor inams may be set apart in lieu thereof in one or two villages in the Coimbatore taluk or a lump sum equal to the revenue of these Inams may be ordered to be paid to the Devasthanam by way of being deductions from the annual collections of any village or villages. The paimash assessment on these minor inams is Rs. 268. 2. 4 and the settlement assessment

assessment is Rs 279.3. . . The
Devasthanam Committee have consented
to a lump payment of Rs 250 and
to the surrender of the kille-dee-dee.
Some of the occupants of the minor-
irani lands in Coimbatore taluk
are ~~stated~~^{reported} to be unwilling to pay
the settlement assessment since it
is higher than the paimash assessment
which they are now paying to the
temple authorities. This objection
does not, in the Board's opinion,
deserve any consideration because
the position of these ryots in no
respect differs from that of other
persons affected by Settlement. If,
therefore, the karam assessment is levied
on the lands, there would be a balance,
of Rs 29.3. . . (Rs 279.3. . . - Rs 250)
or about 12 per cent, to Government
for the cost of Collection and vicissitudes
of season.

2. The ancient lauded endowments,
on the resumption of which Jasdik
allowances were paid, were ordered
in L.O. 1166
2.7.63 to be restored wherever
they could be identified and in
other cases to be replaced by fresh
assignments of land. These assignments
Subsequently

Subsequently assumed the form of
assignments of land revenue, ~
equivalent to the annual money ~
payments with an addition of ten per
cent to cover vicissitudes of season
and cost of collection. vide L.O.
9237 25.5.71. In the next year,
this policy was reconsidered by the
Government of India and further ~
commutations were ^{ordered to be} discontinued.
And at length in 1876, the system of
payment by hiring deductions was ~
sanctioned by the Secretary of State
in accordance with which decision
the substitution of hiring deductions
in lieu of cash payments to religious
institutions was ordered; but no
mention was made of the land ~
revenue assignments previously ~
ordered in certain districts. In 1882,
however, the Board authorized ~
Collectors to sanction hiring deductions
in lieu of land revenue assigned in
substitution for Jasdik allowances.
(vide B.P. 40. 22.4.07 8. Sept. 1882)
3. In the case under reference, the
assignments not having been made
in lieu of Jasdik allowances, do not
fall within the scope of those orders,
but

but the Board considers that the indulgence above referred to viz - payment by bonus deductions may be extended to cases like those in question. The Board's proposal may, if it is submitted, be sanctioned.

The collector ~~observes~~ ^{observes} that the request of the Devastanani is reasonable and that its acceptance will remove from the drain list a number of small holdings in 18 villages in four taluks.

(P.
4 June 97

[Signature]

Yes

28

14/5/97

Dept 2.

[Signature]
15/5/97

Read again L.O. 5126 of 12.12.96.
" also. Chs 4083 of 97

L.O. (Min) Dec. 311 of 19th June 97.

The Board's proposal in para 3 of its Proceedings - No. 47 of 21.10.96 is approved and sanctioned.

[Signature]
14/6/97

From orders

So

The Board of Rev (L.A.)
with inclosure

(P.
17 June 97

25-6-97