8,000—5-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4694

DATED 29th November 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders on a petition from the ryots of Kambarasampettai village, Trichinopoly district, praying for a reduction of the assessment imposed on their lands at the re-settlement of the district.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Con 762/13							

Revenue (189 8) Department.

CURRENT No. 6742.

From The Board of Revenue, Rev. Sett. & Regn., Madras.

Order

No. 5777 Misc.

Dated 26th September 98.

Received 30 "

Registered 2 Oct.

Enclosures 19

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government, with remarks, report from the Collector of Trichinopoly on the appeal petition from the ryots of Kambarasampettai village, Trichinopoly taluk and District, praying for reduction of assessment

VS
Pl
2/11/98
D 5/12/98

BACK P[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Depar[illegible]	
Mis	1012		23-7-97

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Ms	762	97	

No. 43. 1897. Court L. Buildings.

PETITION Madras, 7th day of July 1897.

To

The Hon'ble the Chief Secretary to Government of Madras.

Sir,

A Vakalat has been given to me by the Mirasdars of Lambaravanpallam in the Trichinopoly Taluq, Trichinopoly District to represent their grievances regarding enhancement of Land assessment to His Excellency, the Governor in Council. The Mirasdars I am informed, have already submitted a memorial to His Excellency, the Governor in Council. The Memorialists desire to represent their grievances to His Excellency, the Governor in person and have asked me to ascertain whether His Excellency will be pleased to accord to them an interview. It is the intention of the memorialists to nominate a few (not exceeding half a dozen in number) of the leading villagers to wait upon His Excellency. If it is found

P. T. Co.

SEC. GOVT. MADRAS
10 JUL 97
REV. DEPT.

CHIEF SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
9 JUL 1897

D.117

not practicable to accede to this request, I am desired to ask you whether it would be possible to hear me on behalf of the Village to regarding the matters contained in the Memorial.

I beg to send herewith the Calculations given to me. Any further information regarding the facts mentioned in the memorial are required, I will be prepared to furnish the same.

I remain, Sir,
Your most obedient servant
T. Lakshmipathi Raja
High Court Vakil,
Madras.

1898
REVENUE DEPT.
Encl. No. 17
Cur. No. 1692

PETITION
TO
REVENUE DEPT

CHIEF SECRETARY
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
-2 JUL 1897

2117
18-6-97

CURRENT No. 2543

2

3

1897

Encls (5)

COLLECTOR AND MAGISTRATE
12 MAR 98
TRICHINOPOLY.

accepted
R. V. Krishnaswamy Aiyar
High court Vakil
7th July 97

15/3/98

1898
REVENUE DEPT.
Encl. No. 18
Con. No. 6742

Rate of assessment	double or suigle crop	Extent Acs	Cents	
Rs 12	Double Crop	15	15	Second Crop assessment
	Suigle Crop	"	43	Rs 6 per acre
	Total	15	58	
Rs 10	Double Crop	157	99	do Rs 5 -
	Suigle Crop	99	52	
	Total	257	51	
Rs 9	Double Crop	112	13	do Rs 4½
	Suigle Crop	253	52	
Rs 8	Total	365	65	
Rs 8	Double Crop	11	76	do Rs 4
	Suigle Crop	328	74	
	Total	340	50	
	Grand Total	979	24	

R. V. Srinivasan
Secretary.

Cons 289

1898
REVENUE DEPT.
Encl. No. 19
C 5742

(Sett. 12—3,000—25 4 98.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 26th September 1898

No. 5777 Misc.

READ the following letter from J. A. Robertson Esquire, Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, D. Dis No. 1206 Rev. dated 20th July 1898:-

I have the honor to report on the allegations of the ryots of Kambarasampettai village in Trichinopoly taluk in their petition to Government referred to in B. P. dated 4th March 1898 No. 1583 Misc. Settlement.

2. The Head Quarters Dy. Collector and the Trichinopoly Tahsildar personally inspected the lands in the village of Kambarasampettai.

3. Allegation

× Forwdg: Dist Collector, Trichinopoly proceedings No. RO 1012 & 28/7/98

3. Allegation 1:-

Petitioners' allegations that 300 acres of their lands are repeatedly flooded from July to September is not borne out by the records. The Tahsildar of Trichinopoly, who has been in the taluk for over 20 years, can only remember 3 occasions on which petitioners' lands ~~were~~ were submerged by floods and the crops damaged viz Faslies 1294, 1306 and 1307. In Fasli 1306 remission was granted on 180.97 acres of 1st crop and on 9.3 acres in Fasli 1307. Details for fasli 1294 are not forthcoming. Petitioners themselves admit that remission has not been given to them on account of flood damages except in these three years. Since the receipt of the petition under report there has been an ordinary flood in the river but petitioners lands were not submerged and from personal inspection both the Deputy Collector and Tahsildar are of opinion that submergence would not take place except in years of extraordinary flood. This view is corroborated by the fact that no complaint of the kind was ever made till the resettlement in itself proof that the grievance is not a permanent one. Further the arches of the Cauvery bridge are never closed, but are open with no arrangement for closing them. Petitioners now explain that what they meant was that the level of the water had been raised by the action of the Local Fund Department in throwing boulders into the bed of the river near the arches. It is true that rough stones have been so placed from time to time by the Local Fund Department but this has been done merely to prevent scouring and has not in any way raised the water in the river or injuriously affected petitioners lands.

4. Allegation 2:-

The lands of this village are usually flooded by rain water draining into the Kodingal when

when the rainfall during the North East monsoon is abnormal and the large jungle streams such as the Koraiyar and Arisyar which empty themselves into the Wyyakondan come down in extraordinary floods and breach the Wyakondan. In ordinary years, the Kodungal floods would not affect the double crop lands of this village.

Allegation 3.

So far as can be ascertained, no promise was ever made by any officer to transfer the double crop land into single crop.

Allegation 4.

The village is irrigated by means of a channel from the river Kaveri, which, except when the river is low, receives a good supply. When there is little water in the river, it is necessary to divert the water into the channel by means of a Korambu or dam. For this reason and because the village is situated at a distance of six miles from the Channel head, it happens that the supply is insufficient to irrigate the 2nd crop. Such occasions, however, are rare.

5. The petition with its enclosure is returned.

Resolution.

The Collector's letter will be submitted to Government with reference to G. O. No: 1012 Misc. dated 23rd February '09. The report shows that the allegations of the petitioners referred to in the G. O. are not true.

2. In regard to the main allegation that 300 acres of lands are subject to submersion even in times of ordinary floods in the Cauvery, it is observed that the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar inspected the lands at a time when there were ordinary floods in the river and found that the petitioners' lands were not submerged. Those officers consider that submergence will

will not occur except in years of extraordinary floods; but even in respect of such exceptional years, it would appear from para 6. of the Assistant Commissioner's letter No: 431. B dated 26th December 1896 quoted in the G. O that he inspected the village after the extra-ordinary floods of 1896 and found that the areas affected or submerged were not large.

3. A statement showing the different rates of wet assessment in the village, prepared from the Settlement Register recently received from the Assistant Commissioner is submitted herewith for the information of Government. The whole block of lands adjoining the 'Kodrigal' Channel throughout its length has been assessed at the lowest rate Viz 8 Rs per acre for a single Crop.

(True Copy and Extract.)

R. V. Swaminadha Iyer
Secretary.

Ered 2879

To the Secretary to Government with
assistant's enclosures No ++

++ Sent by packet post.

An appeal from certain villagers in Trichinopoly Taluk re the assessment levied at the recent settlement

The Hon'ble Mr J. Grose C.I.E.
His Excellency the Governor

× flagged A

wet

Statements in Letter 39 dt 8th Sept flagged B.

C 4/1897
R 10/2/98
Mails 24/1/98.

4

Read again G.O. 1200 25.6.97
also C. Nos 5883, 5900 & 5?

For orders.

The above papers relate to an appeal preferred by the pattadars of Kambara Vaiyapatti village, in the Trichinopoly Taluk, in connection with the assessment imposed on their lands at the recent resettlement of the District.

From the sketch map submitted by the Assistant Commissioner it will be seen that the village lies close to the Cauvery river and has its source of irrigation therein. According to the old Revenue Accounts, the extent of the assessed lands in the village was 1008 acres and the assessment Rs 5,166. At the settlement, however, the lands were found to measure 984 acres ie 24 acres less, and the assessment was raised to Rs 8,876, the increase being Rs 3,710 or 72 percent as against the average

increase of 68 per cent in the Case of similar alluvial wet lands irrigated by the Cauvery.

The petrs thereupon Complained to the Board of Revenue, that the settlement assessment was very heavy and that the lands were liable to frequent inundation.

The Assistant of Commissioner of Revenue Settlement to whom a reference was made by the Board of Revenue, personally inspected the lands, and submitted a report recommending the reduction of the Classification of some fields which were either away from the Nattam (village-site) or liable to submersion owing to defective drainage, and stating that no further relief was necessary. The Board of Revenue accepted the Assistant Commissioner's recommendation and thus reduced the total assessment on the lands in the village by Rs 50-14-0.

The petrs, however, not satisfied with the relief granted by the Board of Revenue, now Come up to Govt.

Their first request is that the irrigation of the village should not be placed under the first class, because the lands are over flooded during the major portion of the Cultivation season, and they suffer from want of water from December to February.

The Assistant Comr who inspected the locality says that the source of irrigation belong directly Connected with the Cauvery has rightly been placed in the first class, and as regards the alleged over flooding of the lands observes as follows:— "On my inspection after the extraordinary floods of this year (1894), I noticed that block B and a few fields in blocks C, E & F had been slightly affected and that

that a portion of block D had been submerged. This years' flood being extra-ordinary, it should not be presumed that during ordinary floods the above blocks will be submerged."

The petrs' second prayer is that most of the lands Classed as 'double crop' at the settlement should be transferred to the head 'single Crop', and charged for 'second Crop only if & a second crop is raised.

It appears from the Asstt. Comr's report, that the lands which have been registered as 'double crop' at the settlement are those which were cultivated with two wet Crops for five Consecutive years prior to the settlement. This procedure on the part of the Settlement Authorities is in accordance with para 4 of Standing order No 1 (Revised-the total assessment on the lands in the village by Rs 50-14-a

Mr How about the very valuable manuring which the flooding implies?
Ag
2/5/97

which says that wet 'lands which in all ordinary 'seasons have an unfailing supply of water 'for two crops are to be 'registered as double crop 'the charge for the second 'Crop being half the first 'Crop Assessment.' It appears that some lands which had not been cultivated with two paddy Crops for five consecutive years were originally entered as 'double crop' by mistake but this has since been rectified by the Boards of Revenue on the Asstt. Comr's report.

The petrs' third request is that they should be allowed to Compound for the second Crop Charge, at the rate of one-third or one-fourth the first Crop assessment. It has however, already been decided by Govt in G.O. para 7 of G.O. No 200 dy 1.4.95 that no Composition for second Crops should be allowed in the Case

x flagged D

case of lands of the first class under the Cauvery.

The petrs' last request is that the rates of assessment should be reduced from Rs 12, 10 & 9 to Rs 9, 8 & 7. The Assistant Comr who inspected the lands has remarked that beyond the reduction in the classification of a few survey Numbers, which has been approved by the Board of Revenue, no further relief is called for, as the ryots have not adduced evidence to show that their "half net" is below the assessment assessment.

In C No 5883/97, one M. V. Seshagiri Aiyar, a High Court Vakil, states that the petrs desire to represent their grievances to His Excellency in person, and that they have asked him to ascertain whether H. E. will be pleased to grant them audience. The Vakil adds that it is the intention of the memorialists to nominate half a dozen of the leading villagers to wait upon H. E. & that if compliance with this request be impracticable he wishes to know whether it would be possible to hear them on behalf of the villagers.

The Govt it is submitted does not hear vakils and does not even consent to receive petitions through vakils.

It is submitted, with regards the merits of the case, that the lands have been assessed on the ordinary principles, that the Board has given relief where there was any reason whatsoever for doing so and that there is nothing whatever upon which Govt can go in order to grant further reduction. The increase (72 per cent) in the settlement rent shows how very light the former assessment was. No doubt the petitioners who all these years have been enjoying such inadequate assessment & by such means their poor kudies, have had the means of living in idleness, feel the deprivation and the consequent necessity to work, and hence these appeals.

Mr 30/7 2.8.97 7/8/97

Especially so, as at least it does not, save in exceptional cases. A deputation from this Division of the Province was received & heard before the settlement was sanctioned. No further persons are hearing will do any good

JG

I agree & think Govt. should see no reason to interfere.

JG 7/8/97

I have little doubt of the correctness of the view taken of the case by the Hon. Member. But, it would be a satisfaction to me if he would consent to call for certain papers related by petitioners, which do not seem to have been specially dealt with, should be enquired into. Petitioners say that the land is liable to flooding, and that a certain supply of water for a second crop is not assured to them. I suggest that the B^d be asked to ascertain from

7/8/97.

from the Collector, whether this statement is true or not.

8.9.98
16.2.98

The Hon. Mr. Fawcett

E.F.
24/8

No course is quite certain until both statements of facts are gotten, but as H.E. is not satisfied there can be no objection to getting further information from the Collr. The petitioner's main contention is repeated & flooded every year, or almost every year, that 300 acres of it are flooded again & again for July to Sept. when the anicut of the Cauvery bridge are closed, so that the river rises & flows into the Kodagal, that the whole village is flooded again & again during the season of Oct. to Dec. by rain water draining into the Kodagal, that the Local Authorities have been told of this several times & have come & inspected, & that the villages, being far from the Cauvery bow, & having 3 or 4 villages above it, get very little water for 2nd crop. These statements are not dealt with in detail by the Asstt Commr. He says he only sees marks of flooding on a few acres after the floods of Aug 6. When, according to the petitioner, the village was flooded twice or thrice, & he says nothing as to whether the supply of water for the 2nd crop is certain or not. The truth or falsehood of the statements

6

can be ascertained with certainty by a reference to the Revenue accounts & records, & the Bd should instruct the Collr to report.

JG
20/2/98

Draft to the Board asking for the further light required from the Collr
E.F.
24/8

X Please see draft overleaf.
ehr
28/8/98.

Draft attached

E

Revenue Department.

C. No. 6742 of 1898.

From the Board of Revenue (Rev. Sett.)

Mis. No. 5777 Dated 26th September 1898.

FOR ORDERS.

Attention is solicited to the notes under G.O. No. 1012 Mis. d. 28th February 1898, Rev., which have been separated from that order and attached to the present note for facility of reference. In the order referred to the Board of Revenue was asked to call for a report from the Collector of Trichinopoly on certain allegations made in an appeal preferred by the pattadars of the Kambarasampettai village, in the Trichinopoly taluk, in connection with the assessment imposed on their lands at the late resettlement of the district

district. With the current under disposal (C. No. 6742-B.P. Mis. No: 5777 Sett d. 26-9-98) the Board submits to Govt. with its remarks a report from the Collector of Trichinopoly on the allegations referred to.

2. The allegations in question and the answers furnished by the Collector with reference to them will be set forth below. ~~[illegible]~~ The Headquarters Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar of the Trichinopoly taluk ~~[illegible]~~ personally inspected the petitioners' lands.

3. Allegation 1.

"That 300 acres of the petitioners' village are repeatedly flooded from July to September, when the southernmost arches of the Cauvery bridge are closed, the river rises and flows into the Kodingal".

Ro. 1012 d 28-2-98 F

This

FOR ORDERS.

3

This allegation is not borne out by the records; and the Tahsildar of Trichinopoly who has been in the taluk for over twenty years, is able to recollect, from words appears, only three occasions on which the petitioners' lands were submerged by floods and their crops damaged (viz. faslis 1294, 1306 and 1307). The Collector states that the petitioners themselves admit that remission was not given to them on account of flood damages except in the above mentioned three years, and urges that the fact that no complaint of flood damages was ever made by the petitioners till the resettlement is in itself a proof that the grievance is not a permanent one. It is reported that although there was lately an ordinary flood

flood in the river Cauvery the petitioners' lands were not submerged, and that both the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar are satisfied from a personal examination that submergence would not occur except in years of extraordinary floods. In this connection the Board invites the attention of Government to paragraph 6 of the Assistant Commissioner's letter No. 431/B dt. 26-12-96, from which it will be seen that the inspected the petitioners' village after the extraordinary floods of 1896 but found that the areas affected or submerged were not large.

As regards the alleged closing of the arches of the Cauvery bridge, it is reported that the Local Fund Department has from time to time placed rough

B Please see extract copied at pp. 3-4 of the notes under G.O. 1012d 28-2-98, attached to the present note.

G.O. 1012 Mis dt 28-2-98

rough stones near the arches to prevent scouring, but that this has not in any way raised the water in the river or injuriously affected the petitioners' lands.

4. Allegations 2 and 3.

"That the whole village
" is frequently flooded
" during the season from
" October to December
" by the rain-water draining
" into the Kodingal" and
"that the local authorities
" to whom representations
" were several times made
" have visited the village
" and made verbal promises".

The Collector reports that the alleged flooding takes place only when the rainfall during the north-east monsoon is abnormal, but that in ordinary years the Kodingal floods would not affect the double crop land of the petitioners.

It

It is further stated that so far as could be ascertained no promise was ever made by any officer to transfer the petitioners' "double crop" land into "single crop" land.

5. allegation 4

"That the village being "far away from the "Korambu [or dam] and "situated at the tail end "of the irrigation channel, "with three or four villages "above, gets very little "water for the second crop "cultivation".

As regards this allegation, the Collector admits that it sometimes happens that the Cauvery river is low and the supply in the irrigation channel is insufficient to irrigate the second crop cultivation in the village. The Collector adds that such occasions are rare.

6.

As regards the above allegations of submergence, it may be remembered that submergence ~~with subsidence~~ is not injurious except to seedlings & is normally meant as just above meaning

G.O. 1012 Mis dt 26-2-981

This rare disability will not justify a reduction of the rates.

The remission rules remain for application in Exceptional cases.

KA.

Please see p. 6 of the notes attached to the present note.

6. It will be seen from the above that the petitioners' allegations are in the main untrue. One of the petitioners' requests is that the rates of assessment imposed on their lands may be reduced from Rs 12,10, and 9 to Rs 9,8 and 7. The Board points out that the block of lands adjoining the Kodingal — which appear to be the lands most liable to Submergence — is assessed at the lowest wet rate in the village, viz Rs. 8 per acre for a single crop. It will further be seen from the statement compiled by the Board from the Settlement Register that more than a third of the extent of wet lands in the petitioners' village is assessed at this rate. Orders are in the above circumstances

Sd

f stances requested as to whether the petitioners may be informed that the Government has received and considered a report on the ~~facts~~ allegations made in their petition and sees no reason to comply with their requests.

Pt.
31.10.98

Levy
7-XI-98

H.M.

The further report now submitted was procured at H.M.'s instance. It is plain that the allegations are untrue, & must have been known to the Petitioners when they made them.

The Hon. Mr. Groom suggested a reply on p.7 of the previous Note (attached & thus) that [illegible] "see no reason to interfere". This reply may now be accepted with the addition that it has made careful inquiries into the allegations

(1) H.M.

(2) H.M. the Premier

I quite agree with the reply proposed by the Hon. Mr. Groom.

The real grievance of the Petrs is not that the rates are wrong — though this is what they assert, — but that owing to the undue lowness of the rates before settlement, there has been so great an enhancement. This cannot be avoided, but the burden is lessened by the rules which spread the increment over a series of years.

I think the

H.M.
5.11.98.

8.11.98

c 3/11/98 Ltr.
Rec'd 11/11/98

the Hon. Member's opinion. First, there is no denying that the increase in assessment on these particular lands has been very great, ranging from 50 to 144 per cent. (see Statement attached to Asst. Settlement Commr's Report). This being the case, I would suggest that the Board should consider these cases, and if revision of assessment in any particular case should, in the future, seem called for, — that the Board should accord it.

A.9H 11.11.98.

Please dft and sf
8H 14/11/98

To the Under Secretary.

Please see draft order submitted.

Pt.
15.11.98.

Levy
16/11/98

Rev. Deptt.

Rev. C. No: 6742 of 1898.

—

"What is the Board's
"power to reduce an assess-
"ment".

(Sd/-) G. S. T.
(17.11.98).

—

To the Under Secy.

With reference to the above query made by the Secretary in connection with the draft order on Rev. C. No: 6742 of 1898, attention is solicited to E.M.C. No: 635 dated 2nd June 1854, in which the Board of Rev. was granted a "general "authority to reduce the "assessment on lands in "any individual instances, "where, ..., it is clearly "shown to be excessive."

P/L
18.11.98.

Secy
19.11.98

Read again G.O. No. 1012 Mis. d. 26-2-98
Read also B.P. (Sett.) No. 5744 Mis.
d. 26.9.98 (C. No. 6742 of 1898).

—

Order Misc. No. 4694 of 29th Nov. 1898.

The petitioners will be informed that the Govt. has made careful inquiries into the allegations made by them, but sees no reason to interfere in their behalf.

2. It is however observed from the report of the Asstt. Commissioner that the increase in the assessment on the petitioners' lands consequent on the resettlement of the district has been very considerable.

The Board of Revenue is requested to instruct the Collector to watch these lands and to sanction a reduction of the assessment in any particular instance in which the asst is clearly proved excessive. S.V. 25/11/98

in the future to found.

~~may~~ / necessary

~~the further consideration for~~

We
16 x of

(From order).

Do the Board of Rev., Rev. Sett., with encls (all except Nos 16 to 19).

Do the Pobs. (para 1 only).

Jus. 3-12-98

P.L.
15.11.98

When given for copying ——
When copied ——
When examined ——
When signed ——
} 189 .

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

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT ~~A~~ B 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.