

6202
5.3

18/10/11

21/10/11

Revenue (1897) Department.

PRESS SERIES

G.O., No. 805

Dated 23rd September
1897.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Revision of Village Establishments.

Approving and sang., with remark, the Board's
proposals for the — in the Bellary D.

BACK PAPERS.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1949



From The Board of New;
Land New;

Order

No. 259

Dated 26 July 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Suhung- further report
on the scheme for the
revision of Village Estates
in Bellary

8/7/97
12/10/97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	402	Original	21-5-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Case	10789	(9)	

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Printed August 6th.

Proceedings, No. 259, 26th July 1897.

JULY.

Revision of village establishments.—Submitting to Government further report on the scheme for the — in Bellary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE).

READ—the following letter from H. A. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Bellary, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 4th July 1897, Dis. No. 3495:—

I have the honour to submit the following replies to the Board's remarks in Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated the 26th October 1896.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings.—The modifications proposed by the Board in Appendix A to the Board's Proceedings are accepted with the exception of that relating to Yerigeri and Basarakodu villages. Both the Tahsildar and the Head Assistant Collector object to the clubbing of these villages on the ground that each is extensive and has a revenue exceeding Rs. 1,000 if village and land cesses be included. The villages may remain separate as proposed.

3. None of the Divisional officers raise any objection to the Board's proposals in Appendix B.

4. Paragraph 6 of the Board's Proceedings.—Of the six villages in Harpanahalli taluk named by the Board, only one (Anijigeri) has a hamlet (Jengam Thumbigeri) important enough to deserve a separate reddi. It is two miles from the parent village and had a population of 460 in 1881 (no separate census was taken in 1891), and a separate reddi may be allowed for it, if considered necessary by the Board. As regards the hamlets of the remaining villages, the fact that they are situated at a distance from the parent villages was duly considered when the scheme was drawn up, and it was decided that they were not worth being constituted into separate villages.

5. Of the seven villages in Rayadrug taluk, the hamlets of two villages are important enough to be sub-divided. Bhupasamudram has three hamlets, viz., Yerrainpalli, Devareddipalli and Marampalli, situated at a distance of 2, 3 and 4 miles, respectively, from the parent village. The first two hamlets cannot with advantage be attached to any other adjoining parent village, and the third one, Marampalli, is nearer to Avuladotla, being only two miles from it. It has a population of 300 and a beriz of Rs. 150 with twelve pattadars. It can be separated from Bhupasamudram and grouped with Avuladotla; in that case the figures regarding population and beriz will be as follows:—

	Population.	Beriz.	Number of pattadars.
Bhupasamudram	834	Rs. 1,565	99
Avuladotla	564	462	34

6. The other village in the Rayadrug taluk, which may be sub-divided with great administrative convenience, is Kanekal, a large village with three hamlets, a population of 5,600, and a revenue of Rs. 14,000. The Tahsildar and the Divisional officer propose to reduce this heavy charge by separating two hamlets from the main village and constituting them a separate reddi's charge—

Name of hamlet.	Population.	Beriz.	Number of pattadars.
Kottapalli	285	Rs. 1,116	41
Gangalaparam	396	1,861	56
	681	2,977	97

I support this proposal.

7. Paragraph 9 of the Board's Proceedings.—The information called for in this paragraph is given below:—

A.—Population of the three munsifs' groups referred to by the Board.

	Taluk.	Map No.	Name of village.	Population according to census of 1881.	Present.
	Hadagalli	76	Esapuram	313	396
	Hospet	45	Uppalagandi	402	500
		65	Dharmasagaram		400

B.—Number of additional talayaris allowable in Hospet taluk according to the South Arcot scale.

Map No.	Name of parent village.	Sub-village.		Population, approximate.	Number of additional talayaris.
		Name.	Distance from main village.		
19	Metri	Upparahalli	1½	600	1
22	Somalapuram	Devalapuram	1½	500	1
32	Antapuram	Chikkantapuram	2½	350	1
		Tumati	4	400	1
47	Avina Madugu	Vitlapuram	1½	500	1
44	Rajapuram	Uppalagandi	2½	500	1
51	Kodalu	Malapuram	4½	350	1
67	Bailuvaddigeri	Dharmasagaram	2½	400	1
		Gundlavaddigeri	1	400	1
65	Naganahalli	Anantasinagudi	1	600	1

C.—Statement showing additional talayaris required for villages other than those whose special requirements have been specially considered.

Taluk.	Name of village.	Number of additional talayaris.	Grounds of recommendation.
Hadagalli	Esapuram	1	Population is 396 and the village is 2 miles from the parent village
Harpanahalli	Jengam Thumbigeri.	1	vide paragraph 4 of this letter.

8. The special salary of Rs. 5 was recommended for the talayaris of Kudattani, Tambrahalli, Hadagalli, Kampli, Darogi, Tornagal, Gadiganur, Danaya Kanakeri and Chippagiri, because it has been practically found difficult to get men on a lower salary. These villages are either railway stations or large villages where there is considerable wet cultivation and the lower classes are able to earn wages at the rate of 4 annas a day. The work of talayaris is more difficult and exacting than that of vettis, and they are not to be secured for a salary of Rs. 4 a month.

RESOLUTION—No. 259, dated 26th July 1897.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, disposed of in Government Order, No. 402, Revenue, dated 28th May 1897.

2. The Collector accepts the modifications in the grouping for karnams' charges suggested by the Board in Appendix A to its Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, with the exception of the clubbing of Yerigeri and Basarakodu into one karnam's charge. The result is the substitution of four karnams on Rs. 6, two on Rs. 7 and three on Rs. 8 each for six karnams on Rs. 6 and five on Rs. 7 each included in the scheme already sanctioned. In other words, there will be a decrease of two in the number of karnams and of Rs. 9 in the cost per mensem.

3. Of the thirteen villages referred to in the concluding sentence of paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, the Collector considers it unnecessary to sub-divide the munsifs' charges except in the case of the three villages

- (1) Map No. 34, Anijigeri, Harpanahalli taluk.
 (2) Map No. 68, Bhupasamudram, Rayadrug taluk.
 (3) Map No. 28, Kanekal, Rayadrug taluk.

The Board considers that the requirements of this hamlet will be met by the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem. In the case of the second village, the Collector recommends that one of the distant hamlets may be placed in charge of the munsif of a neighbouring survey village. A grouping of this kind is open to objection, but as the entire revenue of the village is only Rs. 1,715 and the revenue of its distant hamlet only Rs. 150, the Board considers that in this case also the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem for the hamlet will meet all requirements. The third and last of the villages above referred to has three hamlets, a beriz of Rs. 13,963 and a population of 5,602. The Collector proposes to place two of the hamlets in charge of a separate munsif as shown below :—

Taluk.	Number of munsif's group as originally proposed.	Map number.	Names of villages and hamlets.	Distance.	Revenue.*	Population.*	Proposed munsif's charge.	
Rayadrug ..	53	28	{ Kanekal Marampalli Gangalapuram .. Hosahalli † ..	{ C. 2 3 4	{ RS. 13,963	{ 5,602	{ Revenue. RS. 10,986 2,977	{ Population. 4,795 807

* Taken from the taluk statement.

† Named "Kottapalli" in the Collector's letter.

The Board supports the Collector's proposal which involves the employment of two munsifs, one on Rs. 8 and another on Rs. 6, in place of a munsif on Rs. 10, and of two additional vettis and one additional talayari, each on Rs. 4 per mensem.

4. With reference to the information furnished by the Collector in reply to paragraph 9 of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, the Board recommends the following additional talayaris on Rs. 4 each per mensem :—

Taluk.	Map number.	Name of munsif's group.	Name of subordinate village.	Distance from munsif's centre.	Population.	Number of additional talayaris.
Hadagalli	76	Esapuram		..	396	1
	45	Uppalagandi		..	600	1
	66	Dharmasagar		..	400	1
Hospet	19 and 20	Metri	Upparahalli	1½	600	1
	47 and 35	Avina Madugu	Vitlapuram	1½	500	1
	67 and 68	Bainuvaddigeri	Gundlavaddigeri	1	400	1
	85 and 87	Naganahalli	Anantasainagudi	1	600	1

For the Somalapuram group (No. 14, Hospet taluk) the second talayari proposed by the Collector is unnecessary as the village has a total population of 699 only. The special requirements of the Chikkantapuram, Tumati and Malapuram villages in munsif-groups Nos. 19, 20 and 23, respectively, of the Hospet taluk, have been provided for in Appendix E to Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896.

5. In its Proceedings of 26th October 1896, the Board disallowed the Collector's provision of a special pay of Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 for the talayaris of certain villages on the ground that there was no reason to treat the talayaris differently from the vettis in the same villages, for whom the usual pay of Rs. 4 was proposed. The Collector explains

that the work of talayaris is more difficult and exacting than that of vettis and that it has been found difficult to get men to serve as talayaris for Rs. 4 per mensem. In other districts where the village establishments have recently undergone revision, it has not been found necessary to pay the talayari of a village more than the vetti. The Board is not satisfied that a departure from the general policy is necessary in the case of the villages under consideration.

6. The sanction of Government is requested to the proposals in the foregoing paragraphs, which involve a net additional expenditure of Rs. 43 per mensem or Rs. 516 per annum.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
 with ~~submissions~~ original, and the taluk statements
 (to be returned).
 „ Collector of Bellary.

Current Number 3949 of 1897

For Orders.

In its Proceedings d./
26th October 1896 No. 404, the Board of
Revenue called upon the Collector of
Bellary to report on the following
points in connection with the revision
of village establishments in his dis-
-trict:-

(i) Re: Karnams' Charges.

Whether the grouping
of certain Karnam's charges may not
be modified as proposed by the Board
in Appendix A to its Proceedings
No. 404 dated 26th October 1896;

(ii) Re: Reddis' charges.

Whether certain villages
of the Harpanahalli and Rayadrug
taluks shown in statement No. II
appended to the notes under G.O. 402
dated 28th May 1897, may not be sub-
divided by reason of their hamlets
lying at considerable distances from

the

213 in number.

the parent villages.

(iii) Re: Talayaris.

(a) What the population is of the marginally noted three villages for which information was not furnished and therefore no talayaris allowed;

(b) how many additional talayaris will have to be allowed to villages in the Hospet taluk with reference to the rule laid down for South Arcot, viz., of allowing an additional talayari for each survey village having (1) a population of 400 and upwards and distant half a mile or more from the central village or (2) a population of 300 and upwards and distant more than one and a half mile;

(c) whether any additional talayaris are specially needed for villages other than those whose special requirements have already been considered and if so to submit a statement showing them with full par-

For a & in the list.

Taluk	No.	Name of village
Madagalli.	76	Seapuram.
Hospet.	45.	Uppalagandi
	66.	Dharmasagarum.

Total number of karnams' charges 543.

Total cost ----- Rs. 3,790.

Vide statement in the notes under G.O.402,d/28th May 1897.

particulars of the grounds of recommendation in each case.

2. The current contains the Collector's replies to the above points and the Board's recommendation thereon. These are noticed below serially:-

(1). Karnams' charges. When passing orders on B.P.No. 404, dated 26th Octr. 1890, the karnams' charges as proposed by the Collector were allowed to stand pending his reply on this point. He now accepts the revision made by the Board with the exception that ~~the~~ Yenigi and Basarakodu should remain separate villages as both the Tahsildar and the Hd. Assistant Collector object to their clubbing on the ground that each is extensive and has a revenue exceeding Rs. 1000, if village and land cesses be included. The effect of this proposal, will be, as shown in the following statement, to reduce the total number of karnams by 2 and their cost by Rs. 9 per mensem.

Karnam's charges as proposed by the Collr. & revised by the Bd.

clubbing as ^{originally} proposed by Collr.					clubbing as ^{suggested} revised by the Bd. and ^{now} accepted by the Collr.				
	Villages	Distana	Beny	Popul ⁿ	Karnam charges	Villages	Beny	Pop ⁿ	Karnam charges
Adoni Taluk									
34	Chilukaladovu	C	2509	775	(1) on Rs 7	Chilukaladovu	434.6	1391	(1) on Rs 6
37	Bhatnihalli	2	937	730		Bodasaru			
	Bodasaru	-	1837	616	(2) on Rs 6	Bhatnihalli	3633	2583	(2) on Rs 7
38	Madhavaram	-	2696	1853	(3) on Rs 7	Madhavaram			
Madhavaram Taluk									
3	Marabhihal	-	758	374	(4) on Rs 6	Marabhihal	1742	899	(3) on Rs 6
4	Varadapur	-	984	525	(5) on Rs 6	Varadapur			
26	Ymigi	-	1554	794	(6) on Rs 6	Ymigi	1554	794	(4) on Rs 6
25	Basarakodu	-	958	468	(7) on Rs 6	Basarakodu	958	468	(5) on Rs 6
Kudligi Taluk									
9	Hausi	"	3194	1345	(8) on Rs 7	Hausi	4016	1885	(6) on Rs 8
12	Kollahalli	2	822	540	(9) on Rs 6	Kollahalli			
11	Boppalapuram	C	779	376	(10) on Rs 7	Boppalapuram	4117	1735	(7) on Rs 8
10	Hirihuggadahal	-	3338	1357		Hirihuggadahal			
49	Golla Surigammanahalli	C	531	601	(11) on Rs 6	Golla Surigammanahalli	973	1075	(8) on Rs 6
48	Tondigeri	2 1/4	442	474		Tondigeri			
52	Saliappaiahalli	5 1/4	421	620	(12) on Rs 7	Saliappaiahalli	703	901	(9) on Rs 6
51	Kanakaapuram	1 3/4	282	281		Kanakaapuram			
85	Hosahalli	C	1601	1215	(13) on Rs 6	Hosahalli	1601	1215	(10) on Rs 6
87	Balligattu	4 1/8	571	432		Balligattu			
88	Harakabavi	C	1078	1160	(13) on Rs 6	Harakabavi	2170	2202	(11) on Rs 7
89	Muddubasappaiahalli	2 1/2	521	710		Muddubasappaiahalli			

The clubbing originally proposed by the Collr. involves 8 Karnams on Rs 6 — 48
 4 5 Karnams on Rs 7 — 35
 13 — 83
 The clubbing as now accepted by the Collr. & agreed to by the Bd. involves
 6 Karnams on Rs 6 — 36
 2 Karnams on Rs 7 — 14
 3 80 — on Rs 8 — 24
 11 — 74

(2) Beddis' charges:- Of the 6 villages in Harpanahalli and 7 in Dayadurg taluk in regard to which the Collector was asked to report whether they might not be sub-divided for purposes of Beddis' charges, he stated that only Anijigeri in the former and Bhupasanudram and Kanekal in the latter need be so sub-divided.

(a) The Collector says that Anijigeri has a hamlet (Jengam Thumbigeri) of some importance two miles from the parent village and with a population of 460 according to the census of 1881 (no census was taken in 1891) and that a separate Beddi may be allowed for it, if considered necessary by the Board. The Board thinks that the requirements of this hamlet will be met by the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem.

(b) Bhupasanudram has three hamlets namely, Yerrainpalli, Dewarandipalli and Maremapalli, situated at a distance of 2, 3 and 4 miles respectively from the parent village. The Collector states that

that the first 2 hamlets cannot with advantage be attached to any other adjoining village and that the third

which has a population of 300 and a beriz of Rs. 150 with 12 pattadars, may be separated from Bhupasamudram and

grouped with the neighbouring village of Avuladotla ^{from it} which is only 2 miles.

~~avuladotla~~. But the Board observes that a grouping of this kind is open to objection and as the entire revenue of the village is only Rs. 1715 and that of the hamlet Rs. 150, it considers that in this case also the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem for the hamlet will meet all requirements. ~~In~~

In the above 2 cases the Board's proposals which involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 8 per mensem seem sufficient and may be sanctioned.

(c) Kanekal is a large village with 3 hamlets, a population of 5,600 and a revenue of Rs. 14,000. The Tahsildar and the Divisional officer proposed to reduce this heavy charge by separating 2 hamlets from the main village and constituting

The props given in the taluk state
 ...
 ...

constituting them a separate Paddi's charge as shown below :-

Village and hamlets.	Dis- tance.	Beriz.	Popu- lation.	Establish- ment al- ready sanc- tioned.	Grouping now proposed.		
					Beriz.	Popu- lation.	Establishment now proposed.
Kanekal	0			1 Reddi on Rs 10			1 Reddi on Rs 8
				4 Vattis on Rs 16			4 Vattis on Rs 16
				4 Talayaris on Rs 16			4 Talayaris on Rs 16
Marampalli	2	13963	5602	1 Talayari on Rs 16			
Gangalapuram	3	1861	396	1 Talayari on Rs 16			
Hosahalli	1	1116	285	1 Talayari on Rs 16			
				42	2977	807	1 Reddi on Rs 6
							2 Vattis on Rs 8
							1 Talayari on Rs 4
							Total cost 58

The Collector and the Board sup- port the proposal. If this is approv- ed the additional expenditure would be Rs. 16 per mensem.

3. Talayaris.

(a) The Board in para 9 of its Proceedings No. 404, d/20-10-06, in dealing with servants of this class, allowed none to one munsiff's group in Madagalli and 2 in Hospet Taluk, an in- formation as to their population was not furnished and called for the neces- sary particulars. The figures now fur- nished by the collector show that each

them is entitled to a talayari. The collector and the Board accordingly recommend that one talayari be allowed to each of them or three in all at a cost of Rs. 12 per mensem. This may be sanctioned. The villages and their population are shown below :-

Taluk	Village	Population
Hadapalli	76 Esapuram	396
	45 Tippalagudi	500
	66 Tharmasapuram	400

(b) In the statement for the Hoopet Taluk originally submitted by the Collector no information was furnished as to the population of the subordinate villages in the several munsiffs' groups and it could not therefore be seen how many additional talayaris should be employed in that taluk with reference to the South Arcot scale. The collector was accordingly requested to furnish the requisite information. In reply the collector reports that according to that scale 8 additional talayaris will

have to be allowed for the villages noted below :-

map No	Parent village	map No	Sub-village name	Distance from parent village	Population
19	Metsi	20	Upparahalli X	1 1/2	600
22	Somalapuram	21	Devalapuram	1 1/2	500
32	Antapuram	31	Chikkantapuram	2 1/2	350
47	Avina nadugu	34	Tumaki	4	400
		35	Vitlapuram X	1 1/2	500
57	Kodalu	48	malapuram	4 1/4	350
67	Bailuaddigeri	68	Gundlavaddigeri X	1	400
85	Naganahalli	87	Anantasinagudi X	1	600

But the Board recommends additional talayaris for only Upparahalli, Vitlapuram, Gundlavaddigeri and Anantasinagudi, at a cost of Rs. 16 per mensem. in all. As to the rest the Somalapuram group including the sub-village Devalapuram has a total population of only 609, and the Board considers that the one talayari already allowed for the group is sufficient and that no additional talayari is necessary specially for the sub-village. This may be approved. The Board also considers that no extra talayaris are needed for

10
Chikkantapuram, Tumati and Malapuram villages,

as the groups to which they belong have already been allowed one talayari in excess of the number admissible under the general scale. Antapuram has 2 sub villages

Chikkantapuram and Yerrabandhalu which

are $2\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles distant from it

respectively. As the former of these

has a population of 350 it is entitled

to a separate talayari for itself under

the South Arcot scale. If the popula-

tion of the other sub-village also is

not less three hundred it will be en-

titled to a separate talayari. It is

^{therefore} submitted that information on this point

may be called for. The total population

of the group is stated to be 1333 and

2 talayaris have already been allowed.

The Two sub-villages attached to the

Avanamadugu group are distant from it

by 4 and $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles respectively and have

a population of 400 and 500. Including

therefore the number admissible under

the South Arcot scale the total number

of talayaris to which the group is en-

titled

Appendix E
K.P. 404
26-10-57

Page 23 of 90-402
26-5-57

Appendix E
K.P. 404
26-10-57

(Page 23 of 90-402
26-5-57)

11
entitled is three. 2 have already been sanctioned and a separate one was proposed above for Vitlapuram. The requirements of this group have therefore been fully met.

The Kodalu group to which the sub-village of Malapuram is attached has got three other sub-villages attached to it, but the total population of the whole group is only 709 and two talayaris (i.e., one in excess of the proper number) have already been sanctioned. One of these may be set apart for Malapuram which is $4\frac{1}{4}$ miles from the central village with a population of 350. The other one will do for the remaining sub-villages as well as the parent village, as their total population will be only 359.

(c). The Collector also proposes special talayaris for Esapuram and Jengam Thumbigeri. Both these have been provided for. Vide paras 3(a) & 2 above.

4. It will be seen from para 9

of

12

of B. P. 404 d./26-10-96 that the Collector had originally proposed to provide a special pay of Rs.5 and of Rs.6 for the talayaris of the marginally noted villages but the Board disallowed the proposal for want of explanation as to why those talayaris should be treated differently from the vettis in the same village for whom the usual pay of Rs.4 was proposed. The collector now explains that the work of talayaris is more difficult and exacting than that of vettis, that it has been practically found difficult to get men to serve as talayaris on a lower salary and that the villages referred to are either railway stations or large villages where there is considerable wet cultivation and the lower classes are able to earn wages at the rate of four annas a day. But the Board observes that in other districts where the village establishments have recently

No.	Village	Periz	Pop.	No. of Talayaris allowed by Bd.	Rate proposed by Collector
77	Kudattali	9201	4856	4	Rs 5
17	Jambrahalli	1960	2492	2	5
56	Hadagalli	4464	4441	3	5
4	Kampli	14018	10529	4	5
16	Sarogi	6429	2620	2	5
18	Tornagalla	1158	1159	1	5
28	Gadiganur	1889	1662	2	5
55	Dauyakanur	3850	1095	1	5
69	Chippagiri	11068	1884	2	6

13

cently undergone revision, it has not been found necessary to pay the talayari of a village more than the vetti and that it is not satisfied that a departure from the general policy is necessary in the case of the villages under consideration. It is submitted that on general grounds the Board is right. If the Collector fails to secure the services of competent talayaris on the pay sanctioned, he will doubtless address the Board again.

5. The Board's proposals involve an additional expenditure of Rs.43 per mensem or Rs.516 per annum as below shown below

	Net result Rs. per mensem.
Para 2(1) of the note	9
" 2(2)(a) "	4
" " (b) "	4
" " (c) "	16
" 3(a) "	12
" 3(b) "	16
Total additional cost per mensem	Rs.43
---do--- per annum	Rs.516

6. The statement appended to para 5 of G. O. No. 402 dated 28th May 1897, will then stand as shown in the statement attached.

7. The following draft is submitted.

G. O. No: 402 of 23rd Sept 1897

The Board's proposals in its Proceedings read above which involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 43 per kensem are approved and sanctioned.

2. With reference, however, to the

remarks in the latter portion of

para 4 of the Proceedings it is ob-

served that the Antapuram group to

which the sub-village of Chikkantapu-

ram is attached, has another sub-

village named Yerrabanahalli at a

distance of 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ miles from it. If this

also has a population of not less

than 300, the number of talayaris

admissible for the group - including

those allowable under the South Arcot

scale - would be three instead of two.

22/9/97

Increase to the pay of certain karnams
One of Basaviah karnams at Rs 6 each
Increase to the pay of certain Reddis
Pay of the second number of Bellary town by the special regulation
Cost of 4 novigants at Rs 6 each
Cost of a special letter to the 16 38 of 40 mile the lake
Increase to the pay of certain parties
Cost of 4 additional talayaris at Rs 4 per head
Increase to the pay of certain talayaris
Cost of 86 talayaris at Rs 6 each
Cost of 4 talayaris

12
48
14
22
24
4
35
164
43
430
5312
1885312 per month

Grade	Number in each grade	Rate of pay	Total monthly amount payable	No. of changes in each grade	Rate of pay	Total monthly amount payable	No. of changes in each grade	Rate of pay	Total monthly amount payable	Population	No. of Reddis	No. of talayaris	Total number of talayaris	Total monthly amount payable
Grade Rs 2000	168	6	1008	384	5	1920	1	884	1536	Grade Rs 200	15	1	567	3268
Rs 2000 - 4000	266	7	1862	219	6	1314	2	438	1752	2000 1500	567	1	168	672
Rs 4000 - 8000	86	8	688	71	7	497	3	213	852	1500 8000	84	2	45	180
Rs 8000 - 12000	13	10	130	14	8	112	4	56	224	8000 4000	15	3	56	224
Rs 12000 - 16000	7	12	84	6	10	60	4	24	96	4000 16000	14	4	56	224
Rs 16000 - 20000	1	15	15	1	12	12	5	5	20					
Total	541		3787	695		3915		1120	4480		695		836	3344

150220

16

two as proposed by the Board. The
Collector should accordingly be re-
quested to report further on the
point.

11/15/97

To the Board of Revenue, Land Rev.
with statement
" " Accountant General.

6-8-10-97

11/11/97

Government { 1897 } of Madras.
REVENUE.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1897.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 805, 23rd September 1897.

SEPTEMBER.

Revision of Village Establishments.

Approving and sanctioning, with remark, the Board's proposals for the — in the Bellary district.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 259, dated 26th July 1897:—

Read—the following letter from H. A. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Bellary, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 4th June 1897, Dis. No. 3495:—

I have the honour to submit the following replies to the Board's remarks in Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated the 26th October 1896.

2. *Paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings.*—The modifications proposed by the Board in Appendix A to the Board's Proceedings are accepted with the exception of that relating to Yerigeri and Basarakodu villages. Both the Tahsildar and the Head Assistant Collector object to the clubbing of these villages on the ground that each is extensive and has a revenue exceeding Rs. 1,000 if village and land cesses be included. The villages may remain separate as proposed.

3. None of the Divisional officers raise any objection to the Board's proposals in Appendix B.

4. *Paragraph 6 of the Board's Proceedings.*—Of the six villages in Harpanahalli taluk named by the Board, only one (Anijigeri) has a hamlet (Jengam Thumbigeri) important enough to deserve a separate reddi. It is two miles from the parent village and had a population of 460 in 1881 (no separate census was taken in 1891), and a separate reddi may be allowed for it, if considered necessary by the Board. As regards the hamlets of the remaining villages, the fact that they are situated at a distance from the parent villages was duly considered when the scheme was drawn up, and it was decided that they were not worth being constituted into separate villages.

5. Of the seven villages in Rayadrug taluk, the hamlets of two villages are important enough to be sub-divided. Bhupasamudram has three hamlets, viz., Yerrainpalli, Devareddipalli and Marampalli, situated at a distance of 2, 3 and 4 miles, respectively, from the parent villages. The first two hamlets cannot with advantage be attached to any other adjoining parent village, and the third one, Marampalli, is nearer to Avuladotla, being only two miles from it. It has a population of 300 and a beriz of Rs. 150 with twelve pattadars. It can be separated from Bhupasamudram and grouped with Avuladotla; in that case the figures regarding population and beriz will be as follows:—

	Population.	Beriz.	Number of pattadars.
Bhupasamudram	834	RS 1,565	99
Avuladotla	564	462	34

6. The other village in the Rayadrug taluk, which may be sub-divided with great administrative convenience, is Kanekal, a large village with three hamlets, a population of 5,600, and a revenue of Rs. 14,000. The Tahsildar and the Divisional officer propose to reduce this heavy charge by separating two hamlets from the main village and constituting them a separate reddi's charge—

Name of hamlet.	Population.	Beriz.	Number of pattadars.
Kottapalli	285	RS. 1,116	41
Gangalapuram	396	1,861	56
	681	2,977	97

I support this proposal.

7. *Paragraph 9 of the Board's Proceedings.*—The information called for in this paragraph is given below:—

A.—Population of the three munsifs' groups referred to by the Board.

	Taluk.	Map No.	Name of village.	Population according to census of 1881.	Present.
	Hadagalli	76	Esapuram	313	396
	Hospet	45	Uppalagandi	402	500
		66	Dharmasagaram ..		400

B.—Number of additional talayaris allowable in Hospet taluk according to the South Arcot scale.

Map No.	Name of parent village.	Sub-village.		Population, approximate.	Number of additional talayaris.
		Name.	Distance from main village.		
19	Metri	Uppanahalli	1½	600	1
22	Somalapuram	Devalapuram	1½	500	1
32	Antapuram	Chikkantapuram	2½	350	1
		Tumati	4	400	1
47	Arina Madugu	Vithapuram	1½	500	1
44	Rajapuram	Uppalagandi	2½	500	1
51	Kodalu	Malapuram	4½	350	1
		Dharmasagaram	2½	400	1
67	Bailuvaddigeri	Gundlavaddigeri	1	400	1
85	Naganahalli	Anantasainagudi	1	600	1

C.—Statement showing additional talayaris required for villages other than those whose special requirements have been specially considered.

Taluk.	Name of village.	Number of additional talayaris.	Grounds of recommendation.
Hadagalli ..	Esapuram ..	1	Population is 396 and the village is 2 miles from the parent village.
Harpanahalli ..	Jengam Thumbigeri.	1	Vide paragraph 4 of this letter.

8. The special salary of Rs. 5 was recommended for the talayaris of Kudattani, Tambrahalli, Hadagalli, Kampli, Darogi, Tornagal, Gadiganur, Danaya Kanakeri and Chippagiri, because it has been practically found difficult to get men on a lower salary. These villages are either railway stations or large villages where there is considerable wet cultivation and the lower classes are able to earn wages at the rate of 4 annas a day. The work of talayaris is more difficult and exacting than that of vettis, and they are not to be secured for a salary of Rs. 4 a month.

Resolution—No. 259, dated 26th July 1897.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, disposed of in Government Order, No. 402, Revenue, dated 28th May 1897.

2. The Collector accepts the modifications in the grouping for karnams' charges suggested by the Board in Appendix A to its Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, with the exception of the clubbing of Yerigeri and Basarakodu into one karnam's charge. The result is the substitution of four karnams on Rs. 6, two on Rs. 7 and three on Rs. 8 each for six karnams on Rs. 6 and five on Rs. 7 each included in the scheme already sanctioned. In other words, there will be a decrease of two in the number of karnams and of Rs. 9 in the cost per mensem.

3. Of the thirteen villages referred to in the concluding sentence of paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, the Collector considers it unnecessary to sub-divide the munsifs' charges except in the case of the three villages noted in the margin. As regards the first of these villages, the Collector says that it has a hamlet of some importance at a distance of two miles and with a population of 460, and that a separate munsif may be allowed for it, if necessary.

(1) Map No. 34, Anijigeri, Harpanahalli taluk.

(2) Map No. 68, Bhupasamudram, Rayadrug taluk.

(3) Map No. 28, Kanekal, Rayadrug taluk.

The Board considers that the requirements of this hamlet will be met by the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem. In the case of the second village, the Collector recommends that one of the distant hamlets may be placed in charge of the munsif of a neighbouring survey village. A grouping of this kind is open to objection, but as the entire revenue of the village is only Rs. 1,715 and the revenue of its distant hamlet only Rs. 150, the Board considers that in this case also the provision of a special talayari on Rs. 4 per mensem for the hamlet will meet all requirements. The third and last of the villages above referred to has three hamlets, a beriz of Rs. 13,963 and a population of 5,602. The Collector proposes to place two of the hamlets in charge of a separate munsif as shown below:—

Taluk.	Number of munsif's group as originally proposed.	Map number.	Names of villages and hamlets.	Distance.	Revenue.*	Population.*	Proposed munsif's charge.
Rayadrug	53	28	Kanekal .. Marampalli .. Gangalapuram .. Hosahalli † ..	C. 2 3 4	Rs. 13,963	5,602	Revenue. Rs. 10,986 2,977 Population. 4,795 807

* Taken from the taluk statement.

† Named "Kottapalli" in the Collector's letter.

The Board supports the Collector's proposal which involves the employment of two munsifs, one on Rs. 8 and another on Rs. 6, in place of a munsif on Rs. 10, and of two additional vettis and one additional talayari, each on Rs. 4 per mensem.

4. With reference to the information furnished by the Collector in reply to paragraph 9 of Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896, the Board recommends the following additional talayaris on Rs. 4 each per mensem:—

Taluk.	Map number.	Name of munsif's group.	Name of subordinate village.	Distance from munsif's centre.	Population.	Number of additional talayaris.
Hadagalli	76	Esapuram	..	..	396	1
	45	Uppalagandi	..	..	500	1
	66	Dharmasagaram	..	..	400	1
Hospet	19 and 20	Metri	..	..	600	1
	47 and 35	Avina Madugu	..	1½	500	1
	67 and 68	Bailuvaddigeri	..	1½	400	1
	85 and 87	Nagunahalli	..	1	600	1
		Anantasainagudi	..	1	600	1

For the Somalapuram group (No. 14, Hospet taluk) the second talayari proposed by the Collector is unnecessary as the village has a total population of 699 only. The special requirements of the Chikkantapuram, Tumati and Malapuram villages in munsif-groups Nos. 19, 20 and 23, respectively, of the Hospet taluk, have been provided for in Appendix E to Board's Proceedings, No. 404, dated 26th October 1896.

5. In its Proceedings of 26th October 1896, the Board disallowed the Collector's provision of a special pay of Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 for the talayaris of certain villages on the ground that there was no reason to treat the talayaris differently from the vettis in the same villages, for whom the usual pay of Rs. 4 was proposed. The Collector explains

that the work of talayaris is more difficult and exacting than that of vettis and that it has been found difficult to get men to serve as talayaris for Rs. 4 per mensem. In other districts where the village establishments have recently undergone revision, it has not been found necessary to pay the talayari of a village more than the vetti. The Board is not satisfied that a departure from the general policy is necessary in the case of the villages under consideration.

6. The sanction of Government is requested to the proposals in the foregoing paragraphs, which involve a net additional expenditure of Rs. 43 per mensem or Rs. 516 per annum.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the taluk statements (to be returned).
Collector of Bellary.

ORDER—No. 805, Revenue, dated 23rd September 1897.

Miscellaneous.

The Board's proposals in its Proceedings read above, which involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 43 per mensem, are approved and sanctioned.

2. With reference, however, to the remarks in the latter portion of paragraph 4 of the Proceedings it is observed that the Antapuram group to which the sub-village of Chikkantapuram is attached, has another sub-village named Yerrabanahalli at a distance of 3½ miles from it. If this also has a population of not less than 300, the number of talayaris admissible for the group, including those allowable under the South Arcot scale, would be three instead of two as proposed by the Board. The Collector should accordingly be requested to report further on the point.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), with statements.
the Accountant-General.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

Copy sent to Press

Returned for signature

Despatched to print

Read 1000 000 No

Memorandum to G. H. R.

Letter of Appointment

Letter of Government

Statement with notes

APPROX NOT PRINTED YR. PRINTED ALMOST FOR DAMAGED
IN ORIGIN.

MS. -
A. or Print in full.
B. or Print in full.
C. or Print in full only.
D. or Print in full only.