0/ 5,000—6-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4968

DATED 16th December 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording B.P. submitting information as to how lands unfit for cultivation were disposed of included under holdings prior to resettlement of the Irrigation Policy &c—

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 (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8279

Dr 16-12-98

From The Board of Revenue, Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture, Madras.

Order this No. 4966 of 16th Dec 1898.

Recorded

No. 6995 Mis.

Dated 28th November 1898.

Received 3rd Dec 1898

Registered 5th

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

To the Board of Rev. Sett. Dtd. 17-12-98

9.12.98
13-12-98

Secy

This largely accounts for the apparent slight increase of holdings as determined at Settlement This however has been separately discussed

16/12

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government information regarding lands unfit for cultivation included under holdings prior to the resettlement of Trichinopoly District.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Mis	1596 4937	Rev.	6-11-75 Ord 25-7-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(Sett. 13—2,000—25 4 98.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 28th November 1898. 189 .

No. 6895 Mis.

READ.....again the following Board's Proceedings No.8952 Mis., dated 5th November 1897:—

Read the following letter from Bannatyne Macleod, Esq.,M.A. Bar-at-law,Ag. Collector of Trichinopoly,Dis No.1872/Rev. of 1897,dated 14th October 1897:—

I have the honour to reply to paragraph 4 of Board's Proceedings,Settlement,dated 1st December 96 No.378 calling for a report as to how lands unfit for cultivation or used for public purposes were included under hodings prior to Settlement.

2. Correct causes are not ascertainable;but the following indicate them. This was the first district in which the old survey operations were commenced. I think that the rules regarding the exclusion of lands unfit for cultivation and of path,channel &poramboke from pattas could not have been so clear and strict,and that the rules then in force were not also strictly followed. My view is supported by B.P.No.2419 dated 26-8-95. Since the last survey,river and channel embankments then in existence were raised and widened,and in some cases embankments were newly put up on patta lands. In

all

all these the lands occupied by the embankments were not acquired and deducted from pattas. Jungle streams alter their course frequently,and so what was patta land in the old survey became river-bed subsequently. In patta lands,houses were built subsequent to old survey. Portions of patta lands were being used as burning ground,thrashing floor and cart-tracts without being classed as poramboke. Further,in dry parts of the district,ryots are generally in favour of retaining Jungle streams &,unfit for cultivation in their pattas as the assessment is not high,because they may be used as pasture-ground and the trees in them may be utilised for agricultural purposes.

3. The lands which had been in patta before re-settlement and which were classed as poramboke in the Re-settlrment are being inspected in order that the lands that were incorrectly or unnecessarily classified as poramboke in the Re-settlement may be included in the pattas again,and the result of this inspection will be reported shortly.

Resolution:- N: 8952 Mis 95-11-97

Recorded pending receipt of the further report promised in para 3 of the Collector's letter.

(True Copy and Extract).

(Signed).R.V.Srinivasiar.

Secretary.

To

The Collector of Trichinopoly.

Read also the following letter from R.H.Shipley Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly,R.Dis No.1155/Rev of 96,dated 10th October 1896:-

With reference to B.P.(Sett)dated 21st

March 96 No.1963 Mis and B.P. Mis No. 8952/5-11-97,I have the honour to forward,herewith,a statement showing the extent of patta lands classed as poramboke in the re-survey, the extent re-classed as putta after inspection by the Revenue Inspectors and the extent retained as poramboke. It is reported that the extents retained as poramboke cannot be included in pattas as they are used for various public purposes,and as they were so used even before the re-survey when they were patta lands. The difference between the Talukwar extents as given in this statement and as reported in para 1 of this office letter to Board L.No. 1203/Rev of 96,dated 17-7-96,is not large excert in Trichinopoly. The Tahsildars report that the figures given in the enclosed statement are correct.

2. In some of the lands retained as poramboke there are fruit-bearing trees planted,reared and enjoyed by the pattadars free of tax. Some of these trees were assessed with tree tax by Divisional officers and tree-pattas issued on the ground that they were on lands registered as poramboke. The pattadars objected to the charge and the charge was remitted by my predecessor and by myself as the tree tax was much in excess of the land assessment and the pattadars were permitted to enjoy them free of tax. On some of the lands there were also jungle and wood trees, On the application of the pattadars,these trees were allowed to be cut down and removed. As the lands were classed as poramboke without paying any compensation,it is desirable,I think,that this concession be granted to the pattadars.

Resolution:-N: 6095 Mis 98-11-96

The papers read above,will be submitted for the information of Government with reference to para 7 of its order No. 437 R.D. dated the 28th August 1896.

2. The Board having stated in its Jamabandi Report for fasli 1304, that the decrease in holdings in Trichinopoly was stated by the Collector to be due partly to certain patta lands, which are either unfit for cultivation or are used for public purposes, having been classed as poramboke in the resurvey, Government enquired how such lands happened to be included under holdings prior to the re-settlement. The Collector states that corret causes are not ascertainable but that the following indicate them, viz, that as Trichinopoly was the first district in which the old survey operations were commenced, the rules regarding the exclusion of lands unfit for cultivation and of path, channel and other porambokes, from pattas could not have been so clear and strict, and the rules then in force were not also strictly followed; that, since the old survey, river and channel embankments then in existence were raised and widened and in some case, embankments were newly put up on patta lands, but that in these cases the lands occupied by the embankments were not deducted from pattas; that jungle streams alter their course frequently and so what was patta land in the old survey may have become river-bed subsequently; that on patta lands houses were built subsequent to old survey; that portions of patta lands were being used as burial grounds, thrashing floor and cart-tracks without being classed as poramboke, and that in the dry parts of the district, the ryots are generally (on) favour of retaining in? in their pattas, lands, through which jungle streams pass, though unfit for cultivation, as the assessment is not high and as they may be used as pasture-ground and as the trees in them may be utilised for agricultural purposes.

3. These lands which aggregated 7338 acres have since been inspected and an extent of 555 acres transferred to holdings leaving 6783 acres under poramboke. The Collector reports that this extent cannot be included in pattas as it consists of lands now used for various public purposes and as they were so used even before the resurvey when they were patta lands.

4. Paragraph 2 of the Collector's second letter read above, relating to certain concessions granted by him to owners of trees on poramboke lands, will be transferred to the Land Revenue Department for disposal.

(True Copies and Extract).

R. V. Srinivasan

Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government, Revenue Department. ✓

Copy to the Collector of Trichinopoly. with copy of statement

... Para 4 to the Secretary to the Govt: Land Revenue Department.

Encl
2/12

Statement showing the results of inspection of Bhustith Poramboke cases in the Trichinopoly district

Name of Taluk	Extent of Patta land classed as Poramboke (Bhustiti in re Survey		Extent of land shown in Col 2 re-classed as patta after inspection		Extent of patta land shown in Col 2 retained as poramboke after inspection		Remarks.
(1)	Acres	(2) Cents	Acres	(3) Cents	Acres	(4) Cents	5
Trichinopoly	656	19	125	5	531	14	
Musiri	915	97	10	31	905	66	
Kulitalai	1347	25	23	9	1324	16	
Perambalur	2715	93	316	45	2429	48	
Udayarpalayam	1672	76	79	86	1592	90	
Grand total	7338	10	554	76	6783	34	

Trichinopoly Collector's Office
10th October 1898

(Signed) T Sundara Row
for Collector.

(True copy)

R. V. Srinivasachar
Secretary

*When given for copying*_____
*When copied*_____
*When examined*_____ } 189 .
*When signed*_____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No. 7

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.								
ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.								

N.B.—

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

898
/
8279