Revenue (1899) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 418

Dated 30th June 1899

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Resident at Hyderabad regarding the closing of a liquor shop in the Nizam's Territory situated at a distance of 4 miles from the British frontier and the distillation of liquor from jaggery.

## BACK PAPERS.

| No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 613-4 | Rev | 23.7.99 | | | |
| 4566 | Rev | 31.8.99 | | | |
| 5655-6 | Rev | 4.11.99. | | | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. No. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G.O. 120 | | 16.1.00. | | | |

0/18 4,000—18-10-98.

# Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 3978.

Read again G.O. No. 613 d/ 23.7.99.
" " letter No. 614 d/ 23.7.99
" " G.O. No 4566 d/ 31.8.99.
" " No. 5655 d/ 4.11.99
" " letter No. 5656 d/ 4.11.99.
" also letter from the Resident in Hyderabad No. 3341 d/ 17.6.99 (C. No. 3978)

From

Sub: Res: No. 73

Order Nos No. 418 d/ 30th June 1899

The Resident at Hyderabad.

Communicated to

the Board of Revenue.

No. 3341.

Dated 17th June 1899

Received 21st —do—

Registered —do—

Enclosures 1.

To

The Board of Revenue (S.R.) Dec. 25-7-99

Spare copies.

## SUBJECT.

Forwarding for information copy of a letter received from H.H. the Nizam's Minister on the subject of a liquor shop set up at Kodad in H.H. the Nizam's territory a distance of 4 miles from the Kistna District border.

As the Resident does not seem disposed to urge himself in the matter, perhaps the subject need not be pressed?

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ord | 5656 | Rev | 4.11.97 |
| Mis | 4860 | Rev | 15.9.97 |
| Mis | 4566 | Rev | 31.8.97. |
| Proc | 6134 | Rev | 23.7.97. |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Confdl | | | |

03, dated the 1st June 1899, from

From

l's Minister, Hyderabad, to the Firs

Sir Tre

bad.

To

---o---

The Secs pondence ending with your letter

ry 1899, regarding a Liquor shop

Dated Hyd Highness' Territory, a distance

Sir,

tna District border.

I have the hon mmamet who was directed to enquire

dated the 4th November 18

Reddigunta in His Highne the liquor shop in the village

District border.

Kistna I was tra

for the information of the Gov ard :

No.803, dated the 1st June 1899, the vil Political Office.

e Nizam's Minister, on the subject. No. 334 of 1899.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For R S I D E N T.

vor Chichele-Plowden, K. C. S. I.,

Resident at Hyderabad,

retary to the Government of Madras,

Revenue Department,

erabad Residency, the 17 June 1899.

ur to refer to your letter No.5655,

97, regarding a liquor shop set up at

s the Nizam's territory a distance of

With reference to the first of these points, His Highness' Government consider that they are not bound to close a liquor shop situated four miles from the frontier merely because it sells to British subjects.

With regard to the second point, I would explain that, although liquor is usually distilled in His Highness' Dominions from Gulmowha, there are parts of the country (of which the part now under reference is one) in which Gulmowha is not obtainable, and under these circumstances, distillation from Jaggery is permitted. It is not, therefore, possible to prohibit the use of Jaggery in the present instance. It being used when the shop was situated at its old site.

3. The Subedar of Warangal has been instructed not to permit the opening of any new liquor shops in the vicinity of the British frontier without special sanction, in each case, of the Board of Revenue, and so far as is compatible with local requirements, efforts will be directed to prevent competition with liquor shops on the British frontier.

( True copy )

Superintendent,

Issue Branch, Resident's Office.

# Government (1899) of Madras.
## REVENUE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Recd.* | 1899. | *Enclosures* |
| *Regd.* | | *Spare copies* |

**G.O., No. 418, 30th June 1899.**

**JUNE**

### Closing of a liquor shop in the Nizam's Territory.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Resident at Hyderabad regarding the —, situated at a distance of 4 miles from the British frontier and the distillation of liquor from jaggery.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again G.O., No. 613, Revenue, dated 23rd July 1897.

Abstract.—Approving the Board's proposals for guarding the Kistna-Hyderabad frontier and sanctioning the proposition statements for the frontier force required for preventing the smuggling of liquor from the Hyderabad State; and addressing the Resident at Hyderabad with regard to the neglect of the rule that mohwa arrack only should be distilled in the dominions of His Highness the Nizam and the removal of the still from Reddigunta to Nallamandagudem.

Read—again letter No. 614, dated 23rd July 1897.

Abstract.—Drawing the attention of the Resident at Hyderabad to the reported neglect of the rule that mohwa arrack only should be distilled in the dominions of His Highness the Nizam, and requesting him that the Government of His Highness may be moved to issue instructions, on opportunity offering, for removing the still now located at Reddigunta to Nallamandagudem.

Read—again the following G.O., Mis. No. 4566, Revenue, dated 31st August 1897:—

*Read*—the following letter from Sir T. CHICHELE-PLOWDEN, Esq., K.C.S.I., Resident at Hyderabad, to the Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated Hyderabad Residency, the 17th August 1897, No. 4615 of 1897:—

In reply to your letter, No. 614 of 23rd July last, I have the honour to state that I have no knowledge of the rule prohibiting the distillation in Hyderabad territory of any but mohwa arrack, and if such a rule exists, I should be glad to be supplied with a copy of it.

2. As regards the still located at Reddigunta, I beg to be informed on what grounds the proposal for the removal to the site specified is based. I am not aware of any agreement or understanding whereby the two Governments have mutually agreed not to establish shops within a prescribed distance of the frontier line and, unless there is to be reciprocity in the matter, I see no use in asking the Nizam's Government to comply with the present request.

*Order*—Mis. No. 4566, Revenue, dated 31st August 1897.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue. It is requested to state the authority on which its statement, in paragraph 10 of its Proceedings disposed of in G.O., No. 613, dated 23rd July 1897, that the regulations of the Nizam's Government prohibit the distillation of arrack from anything but the mohwa flower, except when it cannot be procured was based; and also to report with reference to paragraph 2 of the Resident's letter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).



Read—again the following G.O., Mis. No. 5655, Revenue, dated 4th November 1897:—

*Read*—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 4281, dated 28th September 1897:—

Read—G.Os., Mis. Nos. 4566 and 4860, Revenue, dated 31st August and 15th September 1897, respectively.

Resolution—Mis. No. 4281, dated 28th September 1897.

The Board begs to report that its authority for stating that the regulations of the Nizam's Government prohibit the distillation of arrack from anything but the mohwa flower, except when it cannot be procured, is contained in paragraphs 28 to 34 of a letter, No. 13-C., dated 6th March 1897, from the Assistant Commissioner, Masulipatam Sub-division, to the Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, extracts from which are given below. As the Board is not supplied with a copy of the Hyderabad Malguzari Code, it is unable to verify the references, but it has no doubt that the information furnished by the Assistant Commissioner is correct—

"28. It is now necessary for me to turn to the subject of the kind of arrack distilled in the Nizam's Dominions. The rules are strict enough as to what distillation is allowed; but apparently no one troubles himself about the matter. In July last, however, I learnt during the course of a conversation that distillation is restricted in the Nizam's Dominions by the rules to the mohwa flower only. I had great difficulty in getting any further information; but pushing my enquiries I got more and more together and finally I learnt that by section 394 of the Malguzari or Revenue Code, distillation in the Nizam's Dominions is restricted to the mohwa flower only except in certain tracts where it is not at all procurable. Now the taluks on our borders are Devarakonda and Devallapalle taluks of the Nalgonda district and Khammam, Madeira and Palvamba taluks of the Khammam district. Nalgonda district is one of those exempted from the operations of the section of the Revenue Code that I have quoted and may distil from jaggery in lieu of mohwa. Distillation from toddy is nowhere allowed in His Highness' Dominions according to rules. Although there is no mohwa locally (in Nalgonda district) it is sometimes imported and arrack distilled from it and hence it is that we find a little of it in the Devarakonda taluk as stated in paragraph 3 above. But in Devallapalle taluk there is nothing but jaggery arrack. I have, however, shown above that we have nothing to fear in the way of smuggling from these two taluks.

29. Turning now to Khammam district and its three taluks on our borders, this district is one in which the distillation from anything but mohwa is distinctly forbidden. The same has also been laid down in several abkári notifications that I have seen. I also learnt that last year the renter of the Khammam taluk was handed up for distilling jaggery arrack and a prohibitory order was issued. The original of that prohibitory order with a translation marked B is herewith submitted. The renters' jaggery was also attached and has only recently been released.

30. Enclosure marked C is a statement from the same renter in which he admits the above facts and also states that at the recent sales (September 1896) the Subadar of Warrangal distinctly and publicly ordered at the time of auction sales that only mohwa arrack should be distilled.

31. Again exhibit E is an order passed by the Subadar of the Warrangal district laying down that arrack should be distilled from the mohwa flower only and not from jaggery and that where the former is not available, the supply should be drawn from districts where it is available.

32. In the east end of the Tiriwar division, I have remarked that toddy arrack is distilled during the season; but this also is prohibited and liquor is not at all allowed to be extracted from "sendi," viz., toddy in His Highness' territory.

33. With a view to discuss the above matters generally, the second Talukdar of Khammam taluk (corresponding to our Head Assistant Collector) asked me to meet him at Redligunta on the 23rd February 1897, but at the last moment he wrote to say that he could not come there. Subsequently, I met him at Khammamett on 2nd March when the following transpired. I must premise that he had already expressed his surprise that jaggery was being distilled and that it was causing us any loss and he promised to do all he could legitimately do to help us.

34. I opened the conversation by remarking that jaggery arrack was being manufactured all along our boundary; that this led to smuggling and caused us loss; and that it appeared according to the rules of His Highness' Government that the only arrack allowed to be

distilled in the taluks on our borders was mohwa arrack. I remarked that I did not expect His Highness' Government to do anything to increase our revenue if the doing of it caused any decrease to him and referring to a previous remark of his, I said, "It was admitted by you just now that distillation from jaggery is a distinct loss to Government * as you lose the rentals on the mohwa flower. This being so, enforcement of distillation from mohwa can cause you no loss." He asked how that would help us and I replied that our people would not drink mohwa, even if sold cheaper than our liquor and that they could not afford to sell much cheaper if at all. He expressed a doubt whether he could enforce it throughout the taluk. I turned to section 394 of the Revenue Code which prohibits distillation from anything but mohwa. He replied that this contemplated permission being given to distil from jaggery when mohwa was not procurable. I, however, pointed out that this could not be said of the taluks on our border as the mohwa was available at Khammamett and at Kallur opposite Tiriwar in the Government forests and that these two places were central for the rest of the villages on the border. He admitted this and said that the Government had already suffered a heavy loss in the revenue from mohwa rentals in Kallur forest and that he had lately called on the arrack renter there to show cause why he should not be fined for distilling from jaggery. Proceeding, I laid before him copy of a letter from His Excellency the Minister to His Highness to the British Resident at Hyderabad which laid down what areas were declared to be purely mohwa-arrack areas and I pointed out that the Madeira, Kammamett and Palvambi taluks were all included under the mohwa areas. He perused this with interest and said it was an authority that could not be disputed. I then produced the statement given by the renter of the Khammamett taluk "exhibit C" stating that at the last auctions in September 1896, the bidders had asked to be allowed to distil from jaggery and the Subadar viz., the "Commissioner" of Warangal had refused, saying that only mohwa was to be distilled. I also produced a copy of a power of attorney granted by the Khammamett taluk arrack renter (exhibit D certified copy of original and translation put up) to Gurulingam to work the stills and shops along the border villages and this distinctly authorizes the man to buy mohwa, to pay for it and distil it; and no mention is made of jaggery. I argued that in the face of this the renters could not plead they did not know they were only to distil from mohwa. He admitted that. I then produced a certified copy of an order passed by the Subadar of Warrangal and dated 7th February 1897 (exhibit E).* This order is on a reference from the Khammam Tahsildar who distinctly asks the question as to whether jaggery arrack can be distilled; and the question is distinctly and emphatically answered in the negative. On perusing this he said he had never seen it or heard of it before; that it was all he wanted; and that he would at once issue orders stopping the distillation of jaggery and would fine the renters heavily. I reminded him that last year an order was issued by the Tahsildar to the renter prohibiting distillation from jaggery and I produced the prohibitory order in original, exhibit B; I also reminded him he had confiscated the man's jaggery. In conclusion he remarked he was sorry we have had all these difficulties and troubles; that had the matter been brought to his notice sooner he would have stopped it."

* The collection and sale of mohwa flowers is sold distinct and separate from the right to distil, but arrack renters are, by the terms of the sale notification, bound to buy the flowers from those contractors or from the Government in the Forest branch.

* Copy of original and translation put up. The certified copy of the order which I had, Head Assistant Collector asked me to give him to enable him to act on saying he had not received a copy and to obtain one would cause delay.

2. As regards paragraph 2 of the Resident's letter referred to in the Government Order under reply, the Board would draw attention to the following account of the circumstances under which the transfer was made:—

"I now will proceed along the frontier of the Nandigama taluk of the Bezwada Circle. Starting from where we left off near Buggamathavaram and on as far as Govindapuram (both Nizam's villages) we find that every village (16 in all) has an arrack shop. The taluk is called Khammam or Khammamett.

The still is situated at Redligunta at present but used to be formerly at Nallamandagudam. The arrack is distilled from jaggery. The present renter is one Ponna Gurulingam, an inhabitant of Jaggaipett, and a man who has hitherto regularly rented the Jaggaipett and Tiruvur arrack Khandams. This year, owing to a fierce quarrel that has been going on between the Brahmins and the Komattis of Jaggaipett, the latter determined that the former should not have the forms. At the first sales the Komattis were away at Bellary in connection with a dacoity case which forms part of the feud and the farms fell to Ponna Gurulingam and his friends. I obtained sanction for a resale, at which the Komatties were present and bid Rs. 10,000 more than we realized at the first sales and got the farms. This left Ponna Gurulingam & Co., without any interest in the Nandigama taluk and Tiruvur division. He thereupon went to Kammamett to the renter of that taluk and sub-rented from him the sixteen villages alluded to above along our borders. He moved the still from Nallamandagudam which is eight miles away from Jaggaipett and must be approached by one route only to



Reddigunta which is only four miles away and can be approached through the scrub jungle by many paths. Having done this, he gave notice by beat of tom-tom in Jaggaipett that liquor would be supplied free of cost at the Reddigunta still for two whole days; and he did actually give away liquor in this way to large crowds who flocked to the still. All this of course has been done with a view to ruin the Komattis and the shops have been opened in all the sixteen villages with this object only. The selling price of arrack in them is 9 pies per dram of 30° under-proof as against As. 1-9 to As. 2-3 per dram in our shops."

It is true that there is no agreement or understanding between the two Governments as to the distance at which shops shall be established on the frontier, but the Board thinks that the transfer of a still under such circumstances with the obvious intention of intercepting revenue which properly belongs to the British Government is a proceeding which could hardly have the approval of a friendly Government. It certainly would never allow such a thing to be done on this side of the frontier. There can be no question of reciprocity in the matter as the proximity of British shops to the frontier cannot affect the consumption of arrack in the Nizam's Dominions, where it is to be had at a much cheaper rate.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

---

*Order*—Mis. No. 5655, Revenue, dated 4th November 1897.

Ordered that the following letter be despatched to the Resident at Hyderabad.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Secretary to Government.

---

Read—also letter from the Hon'ble Mr. G. STOKES, I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, to the Resident at Hyderabad, dated 4th November 1897, No. 5656.

With reference to your letter, No. 4615, dated the 17th August 1897, requesting to be supplied with a copy of the rule prohibiting the distillation in Hyderabad territory of any but mohwa arrack, I am directed to state that from a report of the Assistant Commissioner, Masulipatam Sub-division, submitted in March last, it is understood that by section 394 of the Malguzari Code distillation in the Nizam's dominions is restricted to the mohwa flower only except in certain tracts where it is not procurable.

2. With reference to paragraph 2 of your letter, I am to forward the annexed extract from the report of the Assistant Commissioner above referred to which explains the circumstances under which the Khammamett still was removed to its present site. As arrack in the Nizam's dominions is to be had at a much cheaper rate than in British territory, the British revenue cannot but be prejudicially affected by the retention of the still in its present position. It is true that there is no agreement or understanding between the two Governments as to the distance at which shops shall be established on the frontier, but His Excellency in Council considers that the transfer of the still under the circumstances reported by the Assistant Commissioner with the obvious intention of intercepting revenue which properly belongs to the British Government is a proceeding which could hardly have the approval and support of a friendly state like the Hyderabad Durbar. There can be no question of reciprocity in the matter, as the proximity of British shops to the frontier cannot affect the consumption of arrack in the Nizam's dominions where, as already stated, it is to be had at a much cheaper rate.

Read—also the following letter from Sir T. CHICHELE-PLOWDEN, K.C.S.I., Resident at Hyderabad, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated Hyderabad Residency, the 17th June 1899, No. 3341 of 1899:—

I have the honour to refer to your letter, No. 5656, dated the 4th November 1897, regarding a liquor shop set up at Reddigunta in His Highness the Nizam's territory, a distance of 4 miles from the Kistna district border.

2. I now forward, for the information of the Government of Madras, copy of a letter, No. 803, dated the 1st June 1899, received from His Highness the Nizam's Minister, on the subject.

---

Enclosure.

From His Highness the Nizam's Minister, Hyderabad, to the First Assistant Resident, Hyderabad, dated the 1st June 1899, No. 803.

Kindly refer to correspondence ending with your letter, No. 144, dated the 13th January 1899, regarding a liquor shop set up at Reddigunta in His Highness' territory, a distance of 4 miles from the Kistna district border.

2. The second talukdar of Khammamett, who was directed to enquire into the matter, reports that the liqour shop in the village of Reddigunta or Redlagunta was transferred to its present site about a year ago from the village of Mullabunda, distant about 2 miles away.

The points for consideration are—

(*a*) Whether the shop in question being situated (as is admitted) at a distance of 4 miles from the British frontier, the Abkári Department of the Madras Government is entitled to ask that that it should be closed merely because some of its customers come from the Kistna district; and

(*b*) Whether there are any objections to the liquor being distilled from the jaggery.

With reference to the first of these points, His Highness' Government consider that they are not bound to close a liquor shop situated 4 miles from the frontier merely because it sells to British subjects.

With regard to the second point, I would explain that, although liquor is usually distilled in His Highness' dominions from gulmowha, there are parts of the country (of which the part now under reference is one) in which gulmowha is not obtainable; and, under these circumstances, distillation from jaggery is permitted. It is not, therefore, possible to prohibit the use of jaggery in the present instance. It was also being used when the shop was situated at its old site.

3. The Subadar of Warangal has been instructed not to permit the opening of any new liquor shops in the vicinity of the British frontier without special sanction, in each case, of the Board of Revenue; and, so far as is compatible with local requirements, efforts will be directed to prevent competition with liquor shops on the British frontier.

---

Order—No. 418, Revenue, dated 30th June 1899.

Separate Revenue No. 73.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. Shaik Karim.

35 Copies.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

Number of copies required. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with L

Read again G O. No. , dated 189 .

Current No.

Enclosures to O. No.

Order of Government.

Letter of Government.

Statement with ditto.

Papers not filed up being meant for despatch in original.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.