

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 358

DATED 25th January 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Referring to the Board of Rev., for report, petition from A. Rangayya and others, Sullampet, Gaddupalle, appealing against the orders of the Board of Rev. declining to interfere in the matter of the utilization of the water of a channel irrigating their village.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	5216/100						

$\frac{0}{18}$ 4,000-18-10-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8694

5/25/97

From

Akepatti Rangayya & others
Pulampet Taluk,
Cuddappa district
No.

Order Encl. No. 358 of 25th Jan 1899.

Referred to the Board
of Revenue for a full and
clear report.

Rs
23-1-99

11/5
25/1/98
Mue

Dated 10.12.98

Received 19.12.98

Registered 20.12.98

Enclosures 5

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

To the Board of Rev (Rev. Lett).
No. 26-1-99

Cl
23-1-98

Appealing against the
orders of the Board of Revenue
allowing one Chinnappa Reddi
to use the water of a certain
channel.

24
21/1/99

[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

SECRET
13 DEC 1948
DEPARTMENT OF MAJOR

0773

0773
శుభం శాంతిం దేవతా వందనం
విజయదశమి కైరవం

తదంతర్ముఖముననున్న పాదములను
 నానాదేశములతో నున్నవి / ఈ కేవలములను 2 వరులు
 ప్రతిపక్షము 3 వరులతో నున్నవి 4 వరులను 5 వరులను
 తదంతర్ముఖముననున్న పాదములను 6 వరులను 7 వరులను
 8 వరులను 9 వరులను 10 వరులను 11 వరులను 12 వరులను

[illegible][illegible]

G. 7
121-A.
300-20-4-98.



REVENUE DEPT.

Enc. No. 1 / No. 588 of 1909

Revol.

DEPARTMENT.

V. P. No. 552. D. 10th Dec 98. from Akota
Rampayya and others of Toguvar
-palli village. hamlet of Pullam
pet village, Pullampet, Dist
Cuddapah.

TRANSLATION.

The petri village is irrigated by the
Ekheleti channel. As the water
in this channel is insufficient for the
purpose the petris have also been
utilizing the water in the wells on
their dry lands for the purpose of
irrigating their wet fields. In the
year 1904 the ryots of Mittamida
palli attempted to take the water
from the above channel to their village
but on a protest having been made
by the Dy. Col. of the Division
prohibited them from doing so. And
they again attempted to do it, but the
Dy. Col. of Sirkon Division inspected
the spot and in his letter No. 406
of 22.7.00 to the Tahsildar of Pullam
pet ordered that the water of the
channel in question should not
be taken to any part of Mitta-
midapalli.

Mittamidapalli. In 1896 V. Chinna
Reddi a ryot of the peth village
presented a petition to the Collr.
praying for permission to take the
water of the channel to his lands
in Mittamidapalli. This was referred
to the Tahsildar for report. On receipt
of this the Dy. Collr. issued his order,
disposal no. 1896 of 96.8.28.8.96
stating that the ryot in question should
not utilize the water of the channel
but as he owned lands in Fagin
irrigated by the Fagivaripalli channel
he could make use of a portion
of the water he is entitled to have
for these lands. for the irrigation
of his lands in Mittamida-
palli, and that this concession
should not be supposed to have
conferred upon him any right
for irrigating his lands in
Mittamidapalli by the water of
the channel in question. Chinna
Reddi appeals against this
order to the Collr. The peth. also
presented an appeal to the Collr. against
^{that portion} of the Dy. Collr's order
which allows Chinna Reddi to
distribute the water he was entitled to
between

This B.P. is not
in the file.

between his lands under the
Fagivaripalli channel and those
in Mittamidapalli. The Collr.
issued an order to say that the
matter was under correspondence
with the Board. Some time after
this it was proclaimed in the
village that the Board had
permitted Chinna Reddi to
take the water of the channel
to Mittamidapalli. The peth
petitioned to the Board against
its unjust order but ~~that~~
it declined to interfere. The
peth therefore pray that the
records in the case may
be sent for and perused
and that the Dy. Collr's
order no 406 of 22.7.98
may be confirmed.

C.O.
17.12.98.

Taken no. 406, d. 22. 7. 88.
from the S.D. Dy. Coll. of
Cuddapah to the Tahsildar
of Pullampet. The

I have seen your order
no. 3356, d. 9. 7. 88 reporting
on the petition from the ryots of
Mittamisapalli complaining that
the Mallevani channel which ir-
rigates their lands receives no
water in consequence of an
anicut having been constructed
in the Yakkileti channel.

I have seen the ryots in question
and have also inspected the
Yakkileti channel and the
anicut. The ryots tell me that
the late Dy. Coll. also has
inspected the channels. The order
issued by him in this matter
appears to me to be just and
proper. No other orders can be
issued in the case. The ryots
of Mittamisapalli have
deposed before me that there
was an anicut ^{for the Yakkileti} near the
place

place marked F in the plan

submitted with your argu. But some of them said that the anicut was constructed at their own cost and others declared that it was constructed at the cost of the Pullampet ryots. I do not at all believe that it was constructed by the ryots of Mittamidaipalli for they would not have undertaken a work which would have affected the water supply of their own channel. ~~wherever~~ Apart from the question of the cost of the old anicut the ryots have no reason to object to the construction of the new anicut by Govt. I am not going to have the Nekkilleti channel water down the anicut supplied to the Mittamidaipalli channel, because this does not appear to have been done before at any time. The "manual" must be followed and the late Dy. Collr's order should be adhered to.

Encl. no. 2 to Cno. 8694. Rev.

Dy. Collr's encl. Dis. no. 1896 of 9/6 & 28.8.96. on petitions dat. 20.5.96 and 25.6.96. presented to the Collr. by Velagacherla Chennappa Reddi residing in Foguvaripalli, hamlet of Pullampet.

Read Tahsildar's report.

There are previous orders which distinctly prohibit the taking of the Foguvaripalli channel water to the fields in Mittamidaipalli. With reference to these orders the peti. has no right to take the channel water to his fields nos. 288, 289 and 290. But it appears that the peti owns certain lands in Pullampet which are irrigated by the Foguvaripalli channel. The peti may on the consent of the ryots utilize the quantity of water that he is entitled to for these lands, for the irrigation of the nos. above mentioned. But he should by no means suppose that this

Read Tabor's report.

There are previous orders which distinctly prohibited the taking of the topographical channel water to the fields in Matthews. With reference to these orders the fact has no right to take the channel water to his fields on 2-2-20 and 2-2-20. But it appears that the fact is some certain laws in Indiana that which are investigated by the topographical channel. The fact may be the content of the report while the quantity of water that he is entitled to for these laws, for the case of the 2-2-20 above mentioned but he is not to be mentioned.

From Certain ryots of Jaguvaripalle Village, Cuddapah
Dt.

Dated. 10 - 12 - 1898.

~~FOR ORDERS.~~

To U. S.

Please see the abstract translation of the petition in the Current which is an appeal against the Board's order declining to interfere in the matter of the utilization of the water of a Channel usually irrigating ^{Petitioners} ~~the~~ Village (Jagunvaripalle) for the irrigation of the lands in another village (Mittamidapalle).

2. In 1886 the Dy Collector of the division passed an order that the ryots of Elittamidapalle had no right to ~~complain~~ ^{complain} of the construction by Govt. of an Anicut across the Channel in question,

* a hamlet of Pullampet.

Vide translation of Bakid.
N^o ~~406~~ 4 22-7-88.

* Called Yekkilote channel

that he was not going to have the Yekkilete Channel water down the ancient supplied to the Mittamida palte Channel as this did not appear to have been done before at any time, that the 'Manual' must be followed, and that the late Dy Collector's order should be adhered to.

3. In 1896, Chinnappa Reddi a resident of Jaguwaripalle who owned lands in Pullampet (of which Jaguwaripalle is a hamlet) and Mittamidapalle appears to have applied to the Divisional Officer for permission to use the Channel water for irrigating his lands in the latter village, and the Divisional Officer allowed it in the following terms:—"it appears that the petitioner owns certain

Translation of Dy. Collector's
enclosurement No 1890 of 28-8-96

L

fields nos 248,
249 & 246.

Collector's Dis: No $\frac{6308}{12-11-97}$

U

"Certain lands in Pullampet
"which are irrigated by the
"Jaguwaripalle Channel. The
"petitioner may on the
"consent of the ryots utilize
"the quantity of water that
"he is entitled to for these
"lands, for the irrigation
"of the nos. above mentioned.
"But he should by no means
"suppose that this con-
"cession confers upon him
"a right to take the
"water in question for the
"irrigation of the nos.
"referred to."

4. The Jaguwaripalle
ryots appealed to the
Collector and got an endorse-
ment that the matter
was under ^{correspondence with} reference to
the Board. The petitioner
says "that some time
"after this it was given
"out in the village that
"the Board had permitted
"Chinnappa Reddi to take
"the water of the channel
to

to Muttamidapalle" and that the Board declined to interfere when the petitioners protested.

5. The Board's order declining to interfere is submitted with the petition but not the original order permitting the use of the Channel water to irrigate the lands in Muttamidapalle.

For orders as to whether a report may be called for from the Board.

RS
19-1-99 See A report may be called for. The matter is not clear from the pp. sent up by the petitioners.

Ull
20/1/89

[Signature]

Please see Draft Encl. in his docket of the current.

9
23-1-99
RS
23-1-99

[Signature]

FOR ORDERS.

BP. 954 m
10-2-98

[Signature]

G
121 given for copying
300 copied
examined
signed } 189

AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

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.