

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 1455

DATED 22 April 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Coming to the Bd of Rev. Proesp.
of the P.W.D., considering that the
Guardian of the minor proprietor,
Kesana-Kurru estate may be given
the option of paying one-fifth of the
cost of all works reqd. in connection
with the whole North Bank
of the Polavaram Island, Godavari
Central D., or of paying three-fourths
of the cost of all works reqd. in connection
with the South bank alone.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	361		15-11-99				
	2545		100				
	1676		28-6-00				

10 4906 2/12-12-98
10 3869 2/28-9-98

Revenue (1898) Dep

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1899} of Madras. PUBLIC WORKS.

Current No 2397

Recd. } 8th April } 1899.
Regd. } 10th .. }

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 277 I., 18th March 1899.

MARCH.

G.O. No 1455 8 22 April 99
Communicated to the
Board of Revenue.

See

11th 20th 1899

16 To Mr. of Rev. (Rev. Secy) No. 24479

Polavaram Island Embankment 10-4-99

Considering that the guardian of the minor proprietor, Kesanakurru estate, may be given the option of paying one-fifth of the cost of all works required in connection with the whole north and south banks of the Polavaram island, Godavari Central division, or of paying three-fourths of the cost of all works required in connection with the south bank alone.

15-4-99

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 899 I., dated 18th November 1898.

Read—also the following paper:—

From W. C. DEMORGAN, Esq., M.I.C.E., Executive Engineer in charge, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Camp Vizianagram, 12th February 1899, No. 315 G.C.

With reference to G.O., No. 899 I., dated 18th November 1898, I have the honour to forward copy of letter, No. 3603 of 9th February 1899, from the Executive Engineer, Gódvári Central division, who was deputed to inspect and report on the case.

2. This report clearly shows that the estate is principally interested in the condition of the south embankment, while the north embankment benefits it only in a small degree.

3. The proprietrix therefore has reasonable grounds for objecting to contribute towards the upkeep of the north embankment; but on the other hand a contribution of one-fifth towards the upkeep of the south embankment is far below what is fair and reasonable considering the estate interests involved.

4. If therefore the proprietrix objects to contribute one-fifth towards the upkeep of the north embankment, the objection might be favourably considered. But at the same time her contribution towards the upkeep of the south embankment should be enhanced, and I agree with the Executive Engineer that a three-quarter share would not be unreasonable.

5. The tracing referred to in the report is enclosed for reference and return.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. C. LANGSTON, Esq., Executive Engineer, Gódvári Central Division, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated 9th February 1899, No. 3603.

With reference to G.O., No. 899 I., of 18th November 1898, communicated with your No. 1912 G.D. of 13th December 1898 and to Chief Engineer's memo., No. I/3 G.D. of 6th January 1899, communicated with your No. 52 G.D. of 13th January 1899, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. I inspected a portion of the low lands of the Kesanakurru in the village of Tillakuppa on the 1st instant and arranged a meeting in the afternoon with Kambhampati Subbaya and N. Bapirazu, the representatives of the proprietrix, who duly presented their vakalatnama. D. Venkata Reddi, tanadar of Kesanakurru, was also present.

3. Nothing new was elicited from them; they confined themselves very much to the repetition of what had already been said in the petition. They acknowledged that what is known as bankment did not affect any part of their estate. They acknowledged that it was reasonable willingness to contribute one-fifth.

4. It was then pointed out to them that if the northern bank was of little use in protecting their estate from floods damages, so, in like manner, the south embankment, which runs almost wholly in the estate limits, was not of much use in protecting Government villages and that they could not expect their share of the upkeep of this bank to remain at one-fifth. They then pleaded

inability of the estate to meet a higher charge than one-fifth that the peishcush was a fixed sum standing at two-thirds of the estimated profit and was not liable to any reduction, that in the case of Government villages remission was granted in cases of loss of crops which they did not have the advantage of, and other matters which are not connected immediately with the object of this enquiry.

5. In paragraph 4 of the petition, dated 14th October 1898, it is stated that the estate lands are high and that the Government lands are low. This is not altogether a fact. There is a very good survey of the island with levels taken right across it, and these show that there is as much Government high land as that owned by the estate, and that the estate owns lands which are on quite as low a level as the Government low lands and that the proportion in each case may be very nearly 5 to 1 as originally taken.

6. Enquiries were made as to the number of breaches which have occurred since the bank was constructed about twenty years ago. All admit of 3 breaches only—two in north embankment and one in south embankment—as follows:—

North embankment	... { Komaragiri, about 1886
	... { Patha Injeram, about 1888
South	... { Kesanakurru, about 1891

A number of village officers and ryots of Government villages were asked whether the two former breaches caused any appreciable damage to Kesanakurru lands and all who could be expected to remember it said that no damage of any consequence was done to the estate, and, similarly that the breach which occurred at Kesanakurru whilst doing slight damage to lands in Polavaram and Kottapalli, did not affect Government villages.

7. I can readily understand that this is exactly what would happen though I cannot confirm it from any records. At whatever point a breach occurred it would flood the high lands in the immediate vicinity and flow towards the low lands which are all to the east, and out into the river again through the gap between the ends of the bunds left on purpose. No doubt, low lands would be affected, but it would not involve much loss as it was intended that these low lands should be submerged during flood time. So whether they are submerged by water from a breach or whether from water backing up, it is only what must be expected. Therefore, clearly, if a breach occurs in Kesanakurru limits, it will be chiefly the high lands of the estate which will suffer, and they are far more interested in the maintenance of the south embankment than the Government villages.

8. The conclusions to be drawn, therefore, are that, as a matter of fact, the estate does not derive much benefit from the northern embankment, but that they are much more interested in the south embankment, and if their liability to contribute one-fifth share of the cost of all repairs to the whole embankment is negatived, they should contribute a much larger proportionate share towards the repairs of the south embankment, not less, I think, than three-fourths.

9. A copy of the tracing of the island showing the estate boundaries and the levels taken across it is enclosed for reference.

ORDER—No. 277 I., dated 18th March 1899.

The Government considers that the guardian of the minor proprietor, Kesanakurru estate, may be given the option of paying one-fifth of the cost of all works required in connection with the whole north and south banks, or of paying three-fourths of the cost of all works required in connection with the south bank alone, that is, the bank within the estate limits.

(True Extract.)

J. Hulom
Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Revenue Department.
" Guardian of the Minor Proprietor, Kesanakurru estate.

20 Apr 99
Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

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

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED 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