

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ans	2726/99						

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1308

From The Board of Revenue,
Rev. Sett. L.R. & Agri.,
Madras.

No. 991 Mis.

Order this.

The retention of the
Rev. Inspector till 30 April 99
is sanctioned.

2. It is presumed that the charge
can be met from savings

Dated 16th February 1899.

Received 21st

Registered 22nd

Enclosures 3

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government
the further report, called for from
the Collector of Kurnool regarding
the necessity for the retention of
the Special Revenue Inspector for work
in connection with the grant
of compensation for lands taken up
for famine roads.

To the Bd of Rev (Rev Sett)
Financial Dept
A.G.

24-2-99
26
7-3-99


BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(Satt. 13--1,000--25 1 188.)



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 16th February 1899. 189 .

No. 991 Mis.

Read again Board's Proceedings No. 6892, dated 28th November 1898.

Copy attached

Read also the following letter from Mdamed Raza Khan Esq., Collector Kurnool, RCNo. 1173/E&G, dated 28th January 1899:-

With reference to Board's Proceedings No. 6892 Mis. dated 28th November 1898, I have the honor to submit herewith a copy of the Head Assistant Collector's letter RCNo. 1009 dated 28th January '99, and of its enclosure which gives full particulars of the work already done by the Special Revenue Inspector and which remains yet to be done. The Head Assistant Collector recommends the retention of the Revenue Inspector till the end of April next and I request that the Board may be pleased to obtain the sanction of Government thereto. I regret that the period for which the Special Revenue Inspector's services were likely to be required was much under-estimated in the first instance.

2. Referring to the last sentence of the Proceedings under reply, I beg to state that I wired to the Head Assistant Collector as early as the 14th October asking him whether the Revenue Inspector's retention was necessary beyond the six months for which his employment has been sanctioned and requesting that, if it was necessary, a

full

full report might be submitted as to the circumstances necessitating it. His reply was received only on the 7th November and I addressed the Board on the 16th idem. The Board's Proceedings under reply was received by me on the ^{1st} 16th December and I requested the ^{Head} Assistant Collector to furnish me immediately with a Talukwar statement of the work done and that remaining to be done but I received the necessary particulars from him only to-day. Hence the delay in the submission of this report which I deeply regret. I have not ordered the withdrawal of the Inspector lest by doing so, the work should come to a standstill. The ordinary establishment with their multifarious duties would be unable to cope with a work of such magnitude as the enquiry into the claims of hundreds of individuals in each taluk and the subdivisions of the numerous pieces of occupied land concerned and unless the Special Inspector be kept on, the work would probably be prolonged indefinitely entailing considerable inconvenience to the parties and confusion in the village accounts.

Resolution.

Submitted to Government.


2. The Collector of Kurnool requests sanction for the retention of the Special Revenue Inspector sanctioned in G.O. 1542/2-4-98 for a further period of 5 months and 20 days, i.e., till the end of April next. It is reported that the period for which his services were required was under-estimated at first and that the work remaining to be done will take him three months from the current month to complete. The Board requests that the sanction sought may be accorded.

3. The Collector will be informed that no further extension will be granted. He should arrange that some portion of the work at least is done by the ordinary Revenue Inspectors.

(True Copy and Extract)

R. V. Amudavani
Secretary.

To The Secretary to Govt. Revenue Department, with copy to
The Collector of Kurnool.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 28th November 1898. 189-

No. 6892 Mis.

READ the following letter from Mahomed Raja Khan Esq., Collector of Kurnool, C.No. 1173/B & G, dated 16th November 1898:-

I have the honor to request that the Board may be pleased to obtain the sanction of Government for the retention for a further period of six months, of the Special Revenue Inspector entertained in the Nandyal Division under Government Order No. 1542 Mis. dated 2-4-98, communicated with B. P. 122533 dated the 13th Idem. The subdivision &c. work for which the Revenue Inspector was appointed, has not yet been completed and judging from the amount of work done during the last six months, I think the extension applied for is necessary for the completion of the work.

Resolution.

In his letter disposed of in Board's Proceedings No. 1474 dated 1st March '98, the Collector estimated that the services of the Special Revenue Inspector would be required for six months. The reason for exceeding this estimate is not explained, nor is any idea given

in the letter read above of the amount of work already done by the the Revenue Inspector and what remains to be done. The Collector is requested to report on the above points, and also to explain, in case the Inspector has been retained beyond the sanctioned period, why previous sanction for his further retention was not obtained.

(True Extract)

(Signed) R.V. Srinivasar,
Secretary.

To
The Collector of Kurnool.

(True Copy)

R. V. Srinivasar
Secretary.

Statement showing information regarding extents of lands taken for several roads in the Nandyal Division with the list of claims involved in each road during the year 1897

Road works in Serial order for which lands were taken up	Total extent of lands taken up and No of claims involved.	Extent taken up	No of claims	Remarks.
Works already sub-divided.				
Nandyal Taluk				
Halas Bethamchola Road		13	22	26
		20	98	31
Rangapuram fuder Road		5	33	15
		3	87	4
		1	42	2
			88	4
			21	1
			23	1
		6	9	14
			15	1
		52	38	99

work already done by the
 he done. The Collector
 , and also to
 d beyond the sanc-
 ner retention

the Nandyal

21	78	112
35	38	62
17	8	38
13	90	31
2	34	2
2	8	1
8	68	10
99	24	256

6	88	28
5	45	19
9	23	43
11	90	36
24	64	65
6	46	41
5	20	17
11	66	28
10	5	28
4	98	17
12	66	49
2	45	16
3	14	11
4	92	11
6	30	20
1	59	17
3	77	6
14	25	24
6	97	11
14	25	24
13	95	32
3	56	5
19	42	81
6	1	9
3	79	11
10	27	24
2	95	13
3	70	12
220	412	674

13	32	48
1	35	4
23	68	54
8	92	9
3	70	5
7	91	9
5	77	13
14	58	16
79	23	158

Signed M. Ghose
 of the West C. M.
 (True Copy)
 Signed Rajakumth
 for Collector
 dated
 30 January 1993

(True Copy)

H. S. Amur
 Secretary

Head Assistant Collector's Office

25th January 1899.

From

M. Ghose Esquire, I.C.S.,
Head Asstt. Collector
Nandyal.

To

The Collector
Kurnool.

Sir,

With reference to your footnote RC 1173 dated 3rd ultimo to B.P.No.6892 dated 28th November last, I have the honor to submit a Talukwar statement showing the work done by the Special Compensation Revenue Inspector up to date and that remaining to be done, and to state as follows:-

2. As already reported in this office letter No. 1009 dated 4th November 1898, the Special Revenue Inspector commenced his special work in the Nandyal taluk from the 10th May 1898 and completed it by the 20th August 1898. The total extent measured and subdivided in this taluk amounted to 52.38 acres concerning the claims of no less than 99 persons. The Revenue Inspector then proceeded to Koilkuntla where he commenced work from the 22nd August 1898. There are 6 road works in this Taluk for which lands have been taken up to the extent of 329.65 acres belonging to 930 individuals. He has up to date completed the measurement subdivision of portions of 3 roads traversing the marginally noted villages to the extent of 99.24 acres concerning 256 claimants; he has yet to deal with 230.41 acres involving the claims of 674 persons. He explains that the short work is due to the difficulties attendant on field work and to considerable scripitory work in as much as he has to prepare 3 copies of sketches for each field subdivision A and B forms in triplicate, compensation statements and draft declarati-

and

* Mukkamakka
Akumakka
Lingampalle
Ouk
Gundlasingam
Mettupalle
Kakinigundla

and to take statements from the parties concerned and village officers. The work done by him in one village (Mukkamallah) was forwarded through you to the Special Survey Deputy Collector for his opinion. He considers that the Inspector has been doing much unnecessary work and has issued instructions which were received through you vide your NO No. 1173/11-1-99 and they have been communicated to the Revenue Inspector. According to these, the Deputy Collector estimates that the work in Koilkuntla can be finished in about 2 months.

3. In the Sirvel Taluk, which has to be taken up on completion of Koilkuntla Taluk, there are 3 roads for which lands taken up have to be measured to the extent of 79.23 acres involving the claims of 158 persons. The services of the Revenue Inspector will be required here for about a month. I would therefore recommend the retention of a Special Revenue Inspector for 3 months from February 99.

4. The period of 6 months originally sanctioned expired by the 10th November 98. With a view to apply for the Revenue Inspector's retention for a further period, my predecessor called on the Tahsildar of Koilkuntla so long ago as 26th September 98 (long before the receipt of your telegram dated 14th October 98) to submit definitely his proposal as to how long the Special Revenue Inspector's services would be required to bring the Special work to completion reporting what progress had been made and what still remained to be made. His reply was not received till the 28th October 98, while that of Sirvel was received on 17-10-98. Mr Turing addressed you on the subject on 4-11-98 applying for the Revenue Inspector's retention for 4 months. The delay in replying to your present reference is due to the Tahsildars of Koilkuntla and Nandyal. The former did not submit his reply till the 23rd and the latter has not sent in his reply yet in spite of urgent reminders.

I have &c.

(Signed) M. Ghose,

Ag Head Asstt. Collector.

(True Copy)

(Signed) Rafiulmuluk For Collector.

(True Copy)

D. 1000-7-0-98.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C No. 1308 of 1899

From the Board of Rev (Rev. sett)

No. 991 Dated 16-2-

1899.

FOR ORDERS.

To the Under Secretary

In G.O. 1542 2-4-98 sanction was accorded for the entertainment, for a period of 6 months, of a Rev. Inspector on Rs 35 for the Nandyal Division (Nandyal, Sirvel, & Koilkuntla Taluk), ^{Hand} for work in connection with the settlement of compensation to be awarded for the lands taken up for the famine roads in that Division during the distress of 1897. The work was commenced on the 10th May 1898, and up to the end of January 1899, ^(a period of 8 1/2 months) only

52.38 acres concerning 99 claimants in Nandyal & Sirvel Taluk

99.24 acres concerning 256 claimants in Koilkuntla

were measured and Sub. District

Total 151.62 acres & 355 claimants

leaving

230.41 acres concerning 674 claimants in

Koilkumbha &

79.23 acres concerning 168 claimants

in Simul

Total 309.64 acres & 832 claimants

yet to be done. The short work is stated to be due to the difficulties attendant on field work and to considerable scriptory work. The Special Survey of Collectors to whom a sample of the work done by the Rev. Inspector was sent, appears to have declared much of the work done by him as unnecessary, and to have given instructions as to what should be done. According to these the ~~work~~ ^{in Koilkumbha} remaining work is expected to be finished in about 2 months ~~more~~.

The period of 6 months sanctioned in the Gov. quoted above expired on the 10th November 98 and the Collector applies for the retention of the Rev. Inspector for a further period of 5 ^{months} & 20 days ~~months~~ i.e. till 30th April 99, & remarks that the period originally applied

applied for was under-estimated.

The Collector's application for the retention of the Rev. Inspector was made on the 16th Nov 98 - 7 days after the expiry of the sanctioned period. The delay is explained to be due to the late receipt of a report from the H^o Asst Collector to whom the Collector wired on the 14th Oct 98 asking him whether the Rev. Inspector's retention was necessary beyond the sanctioned period of six months. The Board had to make a further reference to the Collector on receipt of his application. Hence the delay in submitting the case for his orders of Govt.

The Board supports the Collector's proposal to retain the Rev. Inspector for a further period of 5 ^{months} ~~months~~ ^{pro tempore}. It has informed the Collector that no further extension beyond the 30th April 99 will be granted & has instructed

to arrange that some portion
of the work at least is
done by the ordinary Rev.
Inspectors.

For orders as to whether
the Board's recommendation
may be approved and sanc-
tioned.

The charge is to be
debited to Land Res & will
presumably be met from
savings in the budget grant.

A draft order sanction-
ing the retention of the Rev.
Inspector for a further period
of 5 months ^{to 20/8/99} is put up on the
docket of the current, for
approval.

Secy
C. 14-2-99
28
7-3-99
Final mag^h
asked to concur.
2. It is for
consideration whether
the delay in moving for
a renewal of the sanction
should not be noticed.

Mr
9/3/89
What is the Rev. I. being paid for?
is this concerned?

FOR ORDERS.

To the Under Secretary.

In G.O. 1542 of 2-4-98
it was decided that the charge
should be debited to 'Land Res'
and ~~provision~~ ^{an entry of Rs 2101} was accordingly
made in the ~~budget~~ ^{Revised Budget} for 6
months - vide item 45 on
page 47 of G.O. 1180 of 86-12-98.
This period having expired on the
10th Nov 98, there is no specific
provision ~~for the period~~ for the
period of extension now applied.

for.

RS
14-3-99

Secy
14-3-99



File Dtd 16/3/99
No. 707/16-11-1899

Finl Dept

Put in 2 case
Chul

Note

There is no objection to the ~~for~~ retention of the Revenue Inspector until the 30 April next being sanctioned; but ~~the~~ specific savings from which the charge can be met should be indicated. Para 2 of the draft on Rev. C. No 1308 ^{should} ~~may~~ (accordingly) be modified.

21/3/99
curd.
21/3/99.

R.D. a.o. No. 815 d/22-3-99.

W. J. J.

To a. S.

Please see revised draft order put up.

23/3/99
Rd
23-3-99

23/3/99
W. J. J.

Read Bgs Progs No $\frac{991 \text{ units}}{16-2-98}$
(Cus. 1308)

Sp.
24/2/99

S.p. units 121226724th March 1899

The retention of the
Rev Inspector till 30th April
'99 is sanctioned.

2. Provision having
been made only for six months
in the current year's budget,
The Board of Rev is requested
to indicate the source from
which the extra charge now
proposed can be met.

All
24/3/99

Sp. (5)

To the Board of Rev (Rev. Lett.)
• Financial Dept
• A.G.

23-29-99

Q
23-2-99
RS
23-3-99

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

HEAD AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

TREATMENT WITH DEPTO.

PAPER NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DEBATE
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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