

157-07
Revenue (1894) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 868

Dated 26th Dec. 95

[Despatch Abstract.]

Shamlat Dasabandam Chaves
Approving & sanctioning the proposal of the
Bd. of Res. for the treatment of the
Cuddahah St.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1899) Department

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1899.

Board of Revenue
(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),
MADRAS.

Current No. 7489.

Recd. *19/11*
Regd. *21/11*

} 1899.

Enclosures

Spare copies

Printed November th.

Proceedings, No. 351, 1st November 1899.



NOVEMBER.

Shamlal Dasabandam Inams.—Submitting, for the sanction of Government, proposals regarding the treatment of — in the Cuddapah district.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(REVENUE SETTLEMENT, LAND RECORDS AND AGRICULTURE).

Mr. A. W. B. HIGGINS.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 2339, dated 2nd April 1898:—

Read—Endorsement of the Inam Commissioner on the following letter from A. C. TATE, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, dated 7th June 1897, Ref. on Cur. No. 4657-Rev.:—

In reply to your Ref. on Cur. No. 182, dated 16th July 1896, I have the

Taluks.	Number of villages.	Number of cases.	Extent.
Madanapalle	80	1,282	Acres. 3,208-14
Kadiri	103	1,769	1,675-47
Vayalpad	108	3,009	6,100-92
Ráyachóti	85	3,380	5,933-97
Pulivendla	24	330	256-94
Sidhout	1	19	21-84
Grand Total	401	10,089	17,197-28

honour to report that shamlat dasabandam inams exist in all the taluks of the sub-division and to a small extent in the taluks of Pulivendla and Sidhout of the main division. The total number of villages, the number of cases and the extent of inam in each taluk is given in the margin.

2. From the correspondence ending with B.P., No. 111, dated 29th January 1873, it will be observed that the Inam Commissioner then stated "that the inams

held on shamlat dasabandam tenure were not brought under the settlement of the Inam Commission, as they had no locality and simply consisted of percentage remissions of the revenue or produce of the lands under certain works of irrigation granted in consideration of the construction by the inamdars of the works under which they are irrigated and for the purpose of maintaining them in repair."

3. With regard to the settlement of these inams, the Inam Commissioner stated as follows:—

"As regards the mode in which they should be confirmed, whether the existing system should be continued or fresh lands equivalent in value to the remissions now enjoyed should be granted, I am of opinion that the existing system under which the inamdar receives a certain percentage of the produce of the land cultivated each year under the work for which the inam was granted or of the Government assessment on it, is a good one, and that it should be continued. It is calculated to induce the inamdar to keep the work always in good condition and to promote cultivation; while, if a fixed piece of land be granted as inam, the inducement for keeping the work in thoroughly good condition cannot be so powerful. I do not see why the continuance of the system should be productive of any inconvenience owing to the operations of the Revenue Settlement Department. Where the inamdar receives his inam in grain, he will continue to do so; and in those cases in which the inam is a percentage on the assessment, it will be calculated on the new rates instead of on the old ones which will very rarely result in any reduction of the present payment."

4. The then Director of Revenue Settlement having concurred in the views of the Inam Commissioner, the Board also expressed its concurrence with their views and allowed matters to remain as they were.

5. In connection with the introduction of the new settlement into this district, the question of defining the limits of the Government and inam portions of these inams came up again for consideration, and in paragraph 27 of his letter, No. 176-71, dated 15th March 1879, printed in B.P., No. 2931, dated 15th October 1879, the Deputy Director stated as follows:—

"I need not, after all that Mr. Gribble has said in his Manual, enlarge on the subject of dasabandam tenures which is such an important feature in the revenue administration of these taluks. I give below the particulars of the area coming under the two kinds of khandam and shamlat in the Ráyachóti taluk, the former being, as explained by Mr. Gribble, a specific grant of so many acres, while the latter is the assignment of a certain proportion of the cultivated area each year free of assessment varying from half to one-fifth."

6. In paragraph 29 of the same letter, he continued—

"It was proposed at time of demarcation to define, if possible, the limits of the Government and inam portions of the shamlat dasabandam lands on the ground, but this was found such a formidable matter both on account of the number and smallness of the holdings, as well as the difficulty that was experienced in getting the parties concerned to come to any understanding as to the piece of land to be considered as inam, that it had eventually to be abandoned and the inam portion is shown in our accounts only as a sub-division or interstitial field."

7. Thus, while these inams were considered to be only allowances in grain or percentage deductions on the assessment of the cultivated area, the Revenue Settlement Department prepared their records as though these inams were land, the area of which they expressed in the accounts in terms of acres and cents, leaving, however, the position of the land undefined. This action by the Settlement Department has given rise to numerous complications in practice and seems to be intrinsically bad and misleading; for instance—

(1) Take the case of survey No. 299 in the settlement register of Pundikunta village, Ráyachóti taluk. At first sight of the permanent A register it would appear that there are seven sub-divisions of this field, the last of them bearing no sub-letter; but really there are only six sub-divisions (A to F). The extent of each sub-division is really double of what is entered in the register. Thus the extent of sub-division A is given as 17 cents. In fact its extent is 34 cents, half of which representing Government portion has been first entered and the remaining 17 cents representing inam portion is included in the 44 cents shown at the end as "sh I" without a sub-division letter. The inam and Government portions being inseparable on the ground, the inams being really of the nature described in paragraph 2 *supra*, the way in which the attempt has been made to exhibit them in the accounts is anomalous and is causing confusion.

(2) Again in the case of field No. 183 of the same village, the total area of the field is 16 cents; 8 cents is shown as Government land unoccupied and 8 cents is shown as shamlat dasabandam inam of Mandem Ramanna. There is no real sub-division or interstitial field and the division of the field into inam and Government is only imaginary. The Inamdar Mandem Ramanna enjoys the whole field and the inam portion is not separated from the Government portion by actual sub-division. When the whole field is cultivated, the karnam enters the cultivation of the imaginary Government portion as sivoijama cultivation and brings the revenue to account. When only a portion of the field is cultivated, half of such cultivation is shown under inam and the remaining half under Government. I say "half" because in this case the inam and Government shares are equal. The shares in inams of this nature vary from one-fifth to half and the cultivation is apportioned as "Government" or "Inam" in the proportion of the shares. The karnam does all this correctly if he is an intelligent and an honest man; but if he wishes to defraud Government or the inamdar, there is considerable scope for malpractice, because the detection of an error is difficult unless the inam and Government portions of the adangal and masavari which are maintained in two parts—one for "Government" and the other for "inam"—are closely examined along with the settlement diglott register.

(3) Darkhasts are some times presented for the occupation of the Government portion which is shown as "waste" in the accounts, while the inam portion is shown as in the occupation of the Dasabandamdar. In such cases the latter (*i.e.*) the dasabandam inamdar, is offered the first choice of taking up the Government portion on patta, but he does not generally take it up, as it is certainly to his advantage to keep it under the head "unoccupied" so that he may have the chance of defrauding Government of the revenue while enjoying the whole field. If a stranger takes up so-called Government portion of the land, he may be prevented by the inamdar from entering, because the land is already in his (the inamdar's) occupation. If the stranger is allowed to occupy, it is on the understanding that he pays the assessment or rental on the inam portion to the inamdar. If the occupant of the land relinquishes the land so taken up, such relinquishment does not affect the inam portion, which reverts to the inamdar again. This is repugnant to the nature of the tenure according to which every bit of land is both circar and inam and why the inamdar or other occupier can retain or relinquish only a portion without also retaining or relinquishing the other portion is incomprehensible, and yet such is the practice though the theory as already said is that every square inch of the land is part inam and part circar.

8. There are other difficulties arising in practice in connection with this class of tenure, and as its anomalies have been fully recognized in dealing with the question of the settlement of Gaddatiru shamlat inams, it is needless to dwell on them now more in detail. It will certainly be advantageous to define the position of these inams by converting them into khandas dasabandam inams. The old theory of the inamdar enjoying a portion of the produce of the cultivated area is no longer acted upon. The "extent" of inam has been defined by the Settlement Department and this has been in practice interpreted to exempt the inamdar from payment of assessment on that area whether cultivated or not. What I now recommend to be done is to sub-divide the inam portion from the Government portion wherever the pattadars of Government portions are different from the inamdars and, where the inamdars are in occupation of the entire holding, to fix the assessment of circar portion as jodi on the inam. No opposition from the inamdars need be anticipated as they are perfectly cognizant of the method of settlement adopted in the case of shamlat Gaddatiru inams, and it is a favourable settlement for them.

9. By this course an anomalous tenure will be abolished and much will be gained if the fields are identified on the ground. Under these circumstances, I strongly recommend that the demarcation and settlement of these inams may be ordered to be taken on hand by a special establishment as in the case of Gaddatiru inams as soon as possible.

Endorsement by the Inam Commissioner, dated Madras, 30th June 1897,
R.C. No. 182 of 1896.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture) for favour of remarks.

Resolution—Mis. No. 2339, dated 2nd April 1898.

From paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report for the Ráyachóti taluk and paragraph 30 (V) of the settlement notification of the Cuddapah district, it would appear that the entries in the settlement register merely followed those in the revenue accounts and it was not intended that any change should be made in the tenure of the inams. The inam consists of the deduction of a percentage of assessment on the lands forming the ayakat of the irrigation source. It appears to the Board that the proper course is to register all the lands as Government whether in the possession of the inamdar or others and to allow the fixed remission—half, one-third or one-fourth as the case may be to all—leaving it to the inamdar to collect his share from the holders of other lands. This will obviate the necessity for apportioning cultivation between Government and inam referred to in paragraph 7 (2) of the Collector's

letter. In cases in which a portion of a field is shown as Government waste, and the remainder as shamlat dasabandam inam and is in the occupation of the inamdar, patta may be issued to the inamdar for the portion occupied by him and assessment thereon levied subject to the usual dasabandam remission. The Collector is requested to report further on these points.

2. From paragraph 3 of the Inam Commissioner's letter, dated 9th December 1872, printed in B.P., No. 111, dated 29th January 1873, the Board observes that similar inams exist also in the Bellary district which then included Anantapur. The Deputy Commissioner, No. I Party, will be requested to report how these inams have been dealt with in those two districts. The settlement registers of Bellary do not throw light on the point.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.

" Deputy Commissioner, No. I Party.
" Collectors of Bellary and Anantapur.
" Inam Commissioner.

READ—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 3791, dated 21st June 1898:—

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. S. RUNGACHARIAR Avargal, B.A., Deputy Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Party No. I, Bellary and Anantapur Districts, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Camp, Hindupur, 5th June 1898, No. 96:—

With reference to paragraph 2 of B.P., Mis. No. 2339, dated the 2nd April, I have the honour to state that khandam and shamlat dasabandam inams are not as numerous in the Bellary and Anantapur districts as, from the letter of Mr. Tate read in the above, they appear to be in Cuddapah. In Bellary and Anantapur, the khandam dasabandam inams registered as such in the revenue accounts have been so surveyed and demarcated and are identifiable on the ground. They were therefore registered as such in the settlement accounts. In cases where the dasabandam inam consists of a remission of a certain proportion of the assessment, no account was taken of such cases and all the lands under such dasabandam sources have been registered as circar and charged with full assessment, the prescribed remissions being as usual granted to the inamdars by the Revenue Department at the annual jamabandi. The proportion of the remission is not shown in the settlement accounts.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3791, dated 21st June 1898.

Recorded, pending receipt of reply from the Collector of Cuddapah.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

READ—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 826, dated 7th February 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting the Collector of Cuddapah to explain certain point regarding the division of a shamlat dasabandam inam of Matli village, Ráyachóti taluk.

READ—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 1743, dated 31st March 1899:—

Read—the following letter from H. O. D. HARDING, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 4th October 1898, Ref. on Cur. No. 4657-Rev.:—

With reference to B.P., Mis. No. 2339, dated the 2nd April 1898, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The Board says that, from paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report for the Rayachoti taluk and paragraph 30 (v) of the Settlement Notification of the Cuddapah district, it would appear that the entries in the settlement register merely followed those in the old revenue accounts and it was not intended that any change should be made in the tenure of the inams; and that the inam consists of the deduction of a percentage of the assessment on the lands forming the ayakat of the irrigation source. If it is meant that the authority for the dictum in the latter portion of the above is to be sought in the records quoted in the first portion, I beg to submit that it does not appear to be so. The authority for such a statement is to be found in other records which I shall refer to below.

3. In reporting upon the subject of these inams in letter, No. 2364-81, dated 10th December 1872, Mr. Banbury wrote as follows:—

"When discussing this subject with the Cuddapah ryots and karnams upwards of a year ago, they were averse to the change as regards their district on the grounds that when the inamdar has a fixed and definite grant of land given him, he cared far less for the upkeep and repairs of the tank, well or channel, than when his emoluments depended upon a deduction from the assessment, as in the latter case, if the cultivation fails off his receipts fall off." The Inam Commissioner, who was consulted in the matter of dealing with these inams at the revenue settlement, reported as follows:—

"The person in whose favour the percentage remission is granted is not unfrequently a different individual from the holder of the lands on which the remission is granted. In Bellary, the inamdar obtains his percentage remission in money at a certain proportion of the assessment payable to Government, and in Cuddapah, he generally receives it in grain from the holder of the land who obtains a fixed remission on his assessment from Government. . . . I am of opinion that the existing system under which the inamdar receives a certain percentage of the produce of the land cultivated each year under the work for which the inam was granted or of the Government assessment on it, is a good one and that it should be continued.

"I do not see why the continuance of the system should be productive of any inconvenience owing to the operations of the Revenue Settlement Department; where the inamdar receives his inam in grain, he will continue to do so, and in those cases in which the inam is a percentage on the assessment, it will be calculated on the new rates instead of on the old ones which will very rarely result in any reduction of the present payment."

This proposal was approved in the Proceedings of the Board, No. 111, dated 29th January 1873. This order was in accord with that contained in paragraph 18 of B.P., No. 915, dated 6th June 1872, approved in G.O., No. 145, dated 5th February 1873, wherein it was ruled that "in cases in which the dasabandamdar is remunerated by a fixed proportion of the assessment of the land irrigated by the well, and there is no inam land forming the endowment of the work, the old system must be continued". The old authorities quoted in B.P., No. 437 (Land Revenue), dated 2nd December 1895, also show that the inam consisted of assignment of revenue or produce.

4. If these orders had been given effect to, what ought to have been done was to exhibit the entire land as Government in the settlement register and note the percentage of reduction in the column of remarks. Had this been done, the remuneration to the dasabandamdar would, after the passing of the orders contained in B.P., Mis. No. 2462, dated 27th June 1890, have assumed the form of payment by beriz deduction.

5. From paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report quoted by the Board, it would, however, appear that the Settlement Department adopted a different course. Paragraphs 28 and 30 of his report, disposed of in B.P., No. 2931, dated 15th October 1879, are quoted here for easy reference—

Paragraph 28.—"The above figures represent the area registered as shamlat inam in the accounts, for although the remission of assessment is only made upon the area cultivated, each field appearing in the accounts as shamlat dasabandam has the usual proportion of it registered as inam. There are also some lands irrigated under the dasabandam sources which not being registered in the accounts as shamlat dasabandam pay full wet assessment to Government and in this way afford some compensation for the waste shamlat dasabandam fields where a portion is registered as inam."

Paragraph 30.—"Besides the above allowances in land, there is an area of 108½ acres in six villages in the Rayachoti taluk on which dasabandam money remissions are granted for the upkeep of irrigation sources at the rate of one-fourth of the assessment amounting to, in all, Rs. 69-14-10. Similar remissions are met with to a large extent in the other sub-division taluks and will have to be continued in our settlement at the same rates as are now allowed."

6. It will thus appear that the Settlement Department did introduce a change which was approved by Government. It assigned definite areas of land as inam in proportion to the percentage deduction of assessment and registered such areas in the names of the inamdars though the portion so registered was not defined on the ground. A definite area on paper which at the same time is not defined on the ground is, of course, an absurdity and this seems to be the cause of all the trouble. This separate registration of inam areas is said to have been based on similar registration in the old accounts, and it is explained that the removal of the restriction of the inamdar's remuneration to a percentage reduction varying with cultivation was justified by the existence of lands paying full wet assessment to Government, which were considered as affording compensation for the waste fields of which a portion was registered as inam. It is also stated in cases where the inam actually consisted of payment by proportionate deduction of assessment, the same rate of deduction was allowed on the new assessments. The latter class of inams is now known as "Nagad Muzara lands or ready-money remission lands."

7. There is thus, no doubt, that a change was introduced by the Settlement Department with the sanction of Government, in spite of previous orders to the contrary. The Settlement Department evidently took their authority from the old accounts and apportioned the total area of the fields between circar and inam save in cases where remission of assessment was allowed which were left undisturbed. The latter class of cases are very few when compared with the former and are evidently the kind of inams which the Board seems to have in view in suggesting the course indicated in the Proceedings under reference. The kind of inams referred to in this office letter to the Board are, however, of the former description, which form the bulk of the dasabandam inams in the sub-division and which alone are known as "Shamlat dasabandam inams." There are doubtless still some cases here and there where the inamdar gets a share of produce from the holder of the Government land, but in many cases the inamdar is the enjoyer of the whole land and his inam takes the form of paying assessment only on a certain portion of it. I think that whether the inamdar enjoys the whole or a portion or even none of the land at all, the proper course is now to recognize these inams as what they originally were as a deduction of assessment under particular irrigation sources in consideration of keeping that source in repair. I would class the whole land as Government for the inam is not land. I would give Government pattas for the whole extent to the owners if they have not already got them and I would give a fixed remission of the percentage of the assessment which is the inam to the registered inamdar. A permanent inam remission register will have to be prepared which will require orders at jamabandi only in reference to any changes in the year and in reference to season remissions in this fashion; that is, the

inamdar being entitled to a fixed money payment which is a proportion of the assessment under the tank, he will, of course, get nothing if the tank has failed and the lands pay no assessment for the year; or if the failure is partial, his receipts will bear the prescribed proportion to the amount of revenue realised. This will, no doubt, entail some extra labour at jamabandi but the only alterations are to class the whole of each field as inam, or to demarcate the inam portion on the ground. The latter proposal is impossible because the inam portion is often non-existent. The former is open to the objections that it will make Government ryots inamdars unnecessarily and that it will include as joint inamdars one person who is a real inamdar having certain duties as such and other persons who are not inamdars at all. I propose that Government instead of leaving him to collect his share from the joint owners because the latter course seems impracticable. The State granted the inam and requires duties as a consideration therefor. If we leave the inamdar to collect, he will find difficulties in doing so. The Civil Court proceedings will take long and meantime he may allow the tank to fall into disrepair and plead non-realization of his inam. To class all these lands now as Government in the way proposed will involve much correction of settlement registers; but since the settlement registers have treated this matter wrongly, I do not see how this trouble is to be avoided.

Trouble is inevitable but I think it must be faced in order to clear away entirely the present confusion as regards the cultivation of these lands and whether Government or inam portions are cultivated.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1743, dated 31st March 1899.

Recorded, pending receipt of Collector's reply to B.P., No. 826, dated 7th February 1899.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed)

R. V. SRINIVASIAH,

Secretary.

Copy to the Collector.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 4076, dated 17th August 1899.

ABSTRACT—Approving, with remarks, the Collector's proposal regarding the sub-division of a shamlat dasabandam inam in the Ráyachóti taluk, Cuddapah district.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899:—

Resolution—Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899.

The Board generally approves of the proposals contained in paragraph 7 of the Collector's letter, No. 4657, dated 4th October 1898. The proposals can be readily carried out if the inamdars agree in respect of cases in which the inamdar holds the whole or no portion of the ayakat of a dasabandam source, or definite portions of the ayakat. In cases, however, in which the inamdar holds only a proportion (shamlat) of the ayakat, the remaining portion being (a) held by other persons or (b) unoccupied according to the revenue accounts, it will have to be settled first for what particular land patta is to be issued to the inamdar. For this, survey and sub-division of the inamdar's portion will be necessary, unless in case (a) he and the other holders consent to accept a joint patta for the whole ayakat, or in case (b) the inamdar consents to the inclusion, in his patta, of the unoccupied portion of the

ayakat or will specify which portion he desires to be registered as his own holding. The Collector is requested to report fully how he proposes to deal with such cases. His report shows that the number would be comparatively small, but it is in them that real difficulty will be felt.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

C. BENSON

Deputy Director

for Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.

Read—also the following letter from H. O. D. HARDING, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 20th September 1899, Ref on Cur. No. 478 B and G:—

With reference to B.P., Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899, I have the honour to state that my proposal was to pay to the dasabandamdar an amount of ready-money remission in the ratio of the total assessment on the inam to the realisable revenue on the ayakat of the irrigation source for the upkeep of which the dasabandam inam is granted. As, according to my proposal, the dasabandamdar will have nothing to do with the land (he being entitled only to the assessment thereon) unless he was already the holder, I do not see the necessity of sub-dividing the land in any case.

2. The three classes of cases in which the shamlat dasabandam inams are now held are—

- (i) Where the inamdar and the pattadar are the same individual.
- (ii) Where the inamdar is different from the circar pattadar.
- (iii) Where the circar portion is Government waste.

3. In case No. (i) the whole land being in the ownership of the inamdar, patta may be granted in the name of the inamdar for the whole land where he now holds patta for only a portion.

4. In case No. (ii) the pattadar is in the enjoyment and ownership of the whole land. He only pays a portion of the assessment to the Government and the rest to the inamdar. If the inamdar be compensated by ready-money remission, he will have nothing to do with the inam and Government pattadar will be the actual owner and enjoyer of the full field. As the inamdar has nothing to do with the land, no sub-division is necessary.

5. In the case of No. (iii) the whole field is actually waste though in the accounts a portion is shown as waste and the rest as inam. As the inamdar is entitled to a share of the assessment only when the land is taken up on darkhast and cultivated and as he will be granted remission separately, the inam portion of the land when converted into circar would become Government waste to be disposed of under Darkhast rules. The inamdar can have no claim to any portion of the waste land and hence no sub-division seems necessary even in this case.

Resolution—No. 351, dated 1st November 1899.

The papers read above relate to the treatment of "Shamlat" dasabandam inams in the Cuddapah district.

2. Dasabandam inams, i.e., inams granted for the upkeep of irrigation works, fall under two classes—"Khandam" and "Shamlat." In the former, a specific area was granted as an inam, and the inam was accordingly dealt with by the Inam Commissioner. In the latter, a certain proportion, e.g., half, one-third or one-fourth

of the revenue or produce of the land cultivated under the irrigation work was granted as an inam, which thus consisted of no specific land. This class of inam was not therefore brought under the inam settlement.

3. The question how these shamlat dasabandam inams should be dealt with at the settlement was raised on a reference from the Collector of Cuddapah in 1872 (vide B.P., No. 2030, dated 18th October 1872). The Collector of Bellary proposed to replace these inams by definite grants of land, but the Board, on the recommendation of the Inam Commissioner and the Director of Revenue Settlement, decided not to alter the nature of the inam, as it was considered that this system was a more powerful inducement to the inamdar to keep the irrigation work in repair than the grant of a specific area as an inam.

4. In the old revenue accounts, it would appear that each field, upon which shamlat remission was grantable, was shown in the accounts as "Shamlat dasabandam" and the usual proportion of it was registered as inam. The same course was apparently intended to be followed in preparing the settlement register also, but the actual results have been misleading. The following is an example:—

Number.	Extent.	Assessment.	In whose name registered.
299-A ..	ACS. 0-17	RS. A. P. 1 0 0	Vankalopalle Chinnakka.
B ..	0-10	0 10 0	Peddareddigari Peddanna.
C ..	0-05	0 5 0	Vankalopalle do.
D ..	0-05	0 5 0	Do. Iragam Reddi.
E ..	0-05	0 5 0	Peddareddigari Peddanna.
F ..	0-02	0 2 0	Vankalopalle Chinna Reddi.
..	0-14	2 10 0	Do. Peddanna, &c.
..	0-88	5 5 0	

It will be seen that the total extent entered against sub-divisions A to F is 44 cents and is equal to the area shown as shamlat dasabandam inam which is entered without any definition on the ground, or sub-division letter. As a matter of fact, the extent of each sub-division is double the recorded area and the object of the entries was apparently to show that the proportion of shamlat inam was 50 per cent. of the whole revenue. A specific area of land, however, having been shown in the settlement register as inam, the Collector reports that half of each sub-division is supposed to be inam, and as the land is not defined on the ground, confusion and difficulty have arisen in the matter of recording cultivation and in the disposal of waste land. These difficulties are detailed in paragraph 7 of his first letter read above and to remedy them, the Collector at first proposed to employ a special establishment to convert the inams into "khandam dasabandam" and to re-settle them on the lines followed in the settlement of Gaddatiru inams. The Board, however, considered that there was no necessity for this extra expenditure, and that all that was required was to treat the whole field or sub-division as ryotwari instead of a portion as ryotwari and the rest as inam as hitherto, and to issue pattas for the full extent, the share of the assessment due to the inamdar being deducted as a fixed remission or beriz deduction. The Collector has accepted the proposal and the Board requests the sanction of Government for the change. The same course has been followed in respect of similar inams in the districts of Bellary and Anantapur where all the lands under the irrigation sources concerned have been registered as "Government" and fully assessed, the prescribed remissions being granted annually at jamabandi.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Deputy Director
for Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" Collector of Cuddapah.
" Inam Commissioner.
E.d. Md. Pahlwan.

Revenue Department

Read Pro. of the Board of Revenue
(R.S. L.R. & A.) No 351 of 1st Nov. 1899
(C. No 7489 of 1899)

G.O. Press No 868 of 26th Dec. '98

The proposal contained in para 4
of the B.P. is approved & sanctioned.

16/12/98

18/12/98

See

The B.P. (p 9 at foot of p. 10)

States the matter clearly &
briefly.

To the Board of Revenue (R.S. L.R. & A.)
Dis. 12-1-1900

W.N.

15/12/99

16/12/98

Government (1899) of Madras.
REVENUE.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1900.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 868, 26th December 1899.

DECEMBER.

Shamlat Dasabandam Inams.

Approving and sanctioning the proposal of the Board of Revenue regarding the treatment of
— in the Cuddapah district.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), No. 351, dated 1st November 1899:—

Mr. A. W. B. HIGGENS.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 2339, dated 2nd April 1898:—

Read—Endorsement of the Inam Commissioner on the following letter from A. C. TATE, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, dated 7th June 1897, Ref. on Cur. No. 4657-Rev.:—

In reply to your Ref. on Cur. No. 182, dated 16th July 1896, I have the

Taluks.	Number of villages.	Number of cases.	Extent.
			ACS.
Madanapalle ..	80	1,282	3,208-14
Kadiri ..	103	1,769	1,675-47
Vayalpad ..	108	3,009	6,100-92
Ráyachóti ..	85	3,680	5,933-97
Pulivendla ..	24	330	256-94
Sidhout ..	1	19	21-84
Grand Total ..	401	10,089	17,197-28

honour to report that shamlat dasabandam inams exist in all the taluks of the sub-division and to a small extent in the taluks of Pulivendla and Sidhout of the main division. The total number of villages, the number of cases and the extent of inam in each taluk is given in the margin.

2. From the correspondence ending with B.P., No. 111, dated 29th January 1873, it will be observed that the Inam Commissioner then stated "that the inams held on shamlat dasabandam tenure were not brought under the settlement of the Inam Commission, as they had no locality and simply consisted of percentage remissions of the revenue or produce of the lands under certain works of irrigation granted in consideration of the construction by the inamdars of the works under which they are irrigated and for the purpose of maintaining them in repair."

3. With regard to the settlement of these inams, the Inam Commissioner stated as follows:—

"As regards the mode in which they should be confirmed, whether the existing system should be continued or fresh lands equivalent in value to the remissions now enjoyed should be granted, I am of opinion that the existing system under which the inamdar receives a certain percentage of the produce of the land cultivated each year under the work for which the inam was granted or of the Government assessment on it, is a good one, and that it should be continued. It is calculated to induce the inamdar to keep the work always in good condition and to promote cultivation; while, if a fixed piece of land be granted as inam, the inducement for keeping the work in thoroughly good condition cannot be so powerful. I do not see why the continuance of the system should be productive of any inconvenience owing to the operations of the Revenue Settlement Department. Where the inamdar receives his inam in grain, he will continue to do so; and in those cases in which the inam is a percentage on the assessment, it will be calculated on the new rates instead of on the old ones which will very rarely result in any reduction of the present payment."

4. The then Director of Revenue Settlement having concurred in the views of the Inam Commissioner, the Board also expressed its concurrence with their views and allowed matters to remain as they were.

5. In connection with the introduction of the new settlement into this district, the question of defining the limits of the Government and inam portions of these inams came up again for consideration, and in paragraph 27 of his letter, No. 176-71, dated 15th March 1879, printed in B.P., No. 2931, dated 15th October 1879, the Deputy Director stated as follows:—

"I need not, after all that Mr. Gribble has said in his Manual, enlarge on the subject of dasabandam tenures which is such an important feature in the revenue administration of these taluks. I give below the particulars of the area coming under the two kinds of khandam and shamlat in the Ráyachóti taluk, the former being, as explained by Mr. Gribble, a specific grant of so many acres, while the latter is the assignment of a certain proportion of the cultivated area each year free of assessment varying from half to one-fifth."

6. In paragraph 29 of the same letter, he continued—

"It was proposed at time of demarcation to define, if possible, the limits of the Government and inam portions of the shamlat dasabandam lands on the ground, but this was found such a formidable matter both on account of the number and smallness of the holdings, as well as the difficulty that was experienced in getting the parties concerned to come to any understanding as to the piece of land to be considered as inam, that it had eventually to be abandoned and the inam portion is shown in our accounts only as a sub-division or interstitial field."

7. Thus, while these inams were considered to be only allowances in grain or percentage deductions on the assessment of the cultivated area, the Revenue Settlement Department prepared their records as though these inams were land, the area of which they expressed in the accounts in terms of acres and cents, leaving, however, the position of the land undefined. This action by the Settlement Department has given rise to numerous complications in practice and seems to be intrinsically bad and misleading; for instance—

(1) Take the case of survey No. 299 in the settlement register of Pundikunta village, Ráyachóti taluk. At first sight of the permanent A register it would appear that there are seven sub-divisions of this field, the last of them bearing no sub-letter; but really there are only six sub-divisions (A to F). The extent of each sub-division is really double of what is entered in the register. Thus the extent of sub-division A is given as 17 cents. In fact its extent is 34 cents, half of which representing Government portion has been first entered and the remaining 17 cents representing inam portion is included in the 44 cents shown at the end as "sh I" without a sub-division letter. The inam and Government portions being inseparable on the ground, the inams being really of the nature described in paragraph 2 *supra*, the way in which the attempt has been made to exhibit them in the accounts is anomalous and is causing confusion.

(2) Again in the case of field No. 183 of the same village, the total area of the field is 16 cents; 8 cents is shown as Government land unoccupied and 8 cents is shown as shamlat dasabandam inam of Mandem Ramanna. There is no real sub-division or interstitial field and the division of the field into inam and Government is only imaginary. The inamdar Mandem Ramanna enjoys the whole field and the inam portion is not separated from the Government portion by actual sub-division. When the whole field is cultivated, the karnam enters the cultivation of the imaginary Government portion as sivoijama cultivation and brings the revenue to account. When only a portion of the field is cultivated, half of such cultivation is shown under inam and the remaining half under Government. I say "half" because in this case the inam and Government shares are equal. The shares in inams of this nature vary from one-fifth to half and the cultivation is apportioned as "Government" or "Inam" in the proportion of the shares. The karnam does all this correctly if he is an intelligent and an honest man; but if he wishes to defraud Government or the inamdar, there is considerable scope for malpractice, because the detection of an error is difficult unless the inam and Government portions of the adangal and masavari which are maintained in two parts—one for "Government" and the other for "inam"—are closely examined along with the settlement diglott register.

(3) Darkhasts are some times presented for the occupation of the Government portion which is shown as "waste" in the accounts, while the inam portion is shown as in the occupation of the Dasabandamdar. In such cases the latter (*i.e.*), the dasabandam inamdar, is offered the first choice of taking up the Government portion on patta, but he does not generally take it up, as it is certainly to his advantage to keep it under the head "unoccupied" so that he may have the chance of defrauding Government of the revenue while enjoying the whole field. If a stranger takes up so-called Government portion of the land, he may be prevented by the inamdar from entering, because the land is already in his (the inamdar's) occupation. If the stranger is allowed to occupy, it is on the understanding that he pays the assessment or rental on the inam portion to the inamdar. If the occupant of the land relinquishes the land so taken up, such relinquishment does not affect the inam portion, which reverts to the inamdar again. This is repugnant to the nature of the tenure according to which every bit of land is both circar and inam and why the inamdar or other occupier can retain or relinquish only a portion without also retaining or relinquishing the other portion is incomprehensible, and yet such is the practice though the theory as already said is that every square inch of the land is part inam and part circar.

8. There are other difficulties arising in practice in connection with this class of tenure, and as its anomalies have been fully recognized in dealing with the question of the settlement of Gaddatiru shamlat inams, it is needless to dwell on them now more in detail. It will certainly be advantageous to define the position of these inams by converting them into khandasabandam inams. The old theory of the inamdar enjoying a portion of the produce of the cultivated area is no longer acted upon. The "extent" of inam has been defined by the Settlement Department and this has been in practice interpreted to exempt the inamdar from payment of assessment on that area whether cultivated or not. What I now recommend to be done is to sub-divide the inam portion from the Government portion wherever the pattadars of Government portions are different from the inamdars and, where the inamdars are in occupation of the entire holding, to fix the assessment of circar portion as jodi on the inam. No opposition from the inamdars need be anticipated as they are perfectly cognizant of the method of settlement adopted in the case of shamlat Gaddatiru inams, and it is a favourable settlement for them.

9. By this course an anomalous tenure will be abolished and much will be gained if the fields are identified on the ground. Under these circumstances, I strongly recommend that the demarcation and settlement of these inams may be ordered to be taken on hand by a special establishment as in the case of Gaddatiru inams as soon as possible.

Endorsement by the Inam Commissioner, dated Madras, 30th June 1897,
R.C. No. 182 of 1896.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture) for favour of remarks.

Resolution—Mis. No. 2339, dated 2nd April 1898.

From paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report for the Ráyachóti taluk and paragraph 30 (V) of the settlement notification of the Cuddapah district, it would appear that the entries in the settlement register merely followed those in the old revenue accounts and it was not intended that any change should be made in the tenure of the inams. The inam consists of the deduction of a percentage of assessment on the lands forming the ayakat of the irrigation source. It appears to the Board that the proper course is to register all the lands as Government whether in the possession of the inamdar or others and to allow the fixed remission—half, one-third or one-fourth as the case may be to all—leaving it to the inamdar to collect his share from the holders of other lands. This will obviate the necessity for apportioning cultivation between Government and inam referred to in paragraph 7 (2) of the Collector's

letter. In cases in which a portion of a field is shown as Government waste, and the remainder as shamlat dasabandam inam and is in the occupation of the inamdar, patta may be issued to the inamdar for the portion occupied by him and assessment thereon levied subject to the usual dasabandam remission. The Collector is requested to report further on these points.

2. From paragraph 3 of the Inam Commissioner's letter, dated 9th December 1872, printed in B.P., No. 111, dated 29th January 1873, the Board observes that similar inams exist also in the Bellary district which then included Anantapur. The Deputy Commissioner, No. I Party, will be requested to report how these inams have been dealt with in those two districts. The settlement registers of Bellary do not throw light on the point.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAH,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.
" Deputy Commissioner, No. I Party.
" Collectors of Bellary and Anantapur.
" Inam Commissioner.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 3791, dated 21st June 1898:—

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. S. RUNGACHARIAR Avargal, B.A., Deputy Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Party No. I, Bellary and Anantapur Districts, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Camp, Hindúpur, 5th June 1898, No. 96:—

With reference to paragraph 2 of B.P., Mis. No. 2339, dated the 2nd April, I have the honour to state that khandam and shamlat dasabandam inams are not as numerous in the Bellary and Anantapur districts as, from the letter of Mr. Tate read in the above, they appear to be in Cuddapah. In Bellary and Anantapur, the khandam dasabandam inams registered as such in the revenue accounts have been so surveyed and demarcated and are identifiable on the ground. They were therefore registered as such in the settlement accounts. In cases where the dasabandam inam consists of a remission of a certain proportion of the assessment, no account was taken of such cases and all the lands under such dasabandam sources have been registered as circar and charged with full assessment, the prescribed remissions being as usual granted to the inamdars by the Revenue Department at the annual jamabandi. The proportion of the remission is not shown in the settlement accounts.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3791, dated 21st June 1898.

Recorded, pending receipt of reply from the Collector of Cuddapah.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAH,
Secretary.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 826, dated 7th February 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting the Collector of Cuddapah to explain certain point regarding the division of a shamlat dasabandam inam of Matli village, Ráyachóti taluk.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 1743, dated 31st March 1899:—

Read—the following letter from H. O. D. HARDING, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 4th October 1898, Ref. on Cur. No. 4657-Rev.:—

With reference to B.P., Mis. No. 2339, dated the 2nd April 1898, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The Board says that, from paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report for the Ráyachóti taluk and paragraph 30 (v) of the Settlement Notification of the Cuddapah district, it would appear that the entries in the settlement register merely followed those in the old revenue accounts and it was not intended that any change should be made in the tenure of the inams; and that the inam consists of the deduction of a percentage of the assessment on the lands forming the ayakat of the irrigation source. If it is meant that the authority for the dictum in the latter portion of the above is to be sought in the records quoted in the first portion, I beg to submit that it does not appear to be so. The authority for such a statement is to be found in other records which I shall refer to below.

3. In reporting upon the subject of these inams in letter, No. 2364-81, dated 10th December 1872, Mr. Banbury wrote as follows:—

"When discussing this subject with the Cuddapah ryots and karnams upwards of a year ago, they were averse to the change as regards their district on the grounds that when the inamdar has a fixed and definite grant of land given him, he cared far less for the upkeep and repairs of the tank, well or channel, than when his emoluments depended upon a deduction from the assessment, as in the latter case, if the cultivation falls off his receipts fall off." The Inam Commissioner, who was consulted in the matter of dealing with these inams at the revenue settlement, reported as follows:—

"The person in whose favour the percentage remission is granted is not unfrequently a different individual from the holder of the lands on which the remission is granted. In Bellary, the inamdar obtains his percentage remission in money at a certain proportion of the assessment payable to Government, and in Cuddapah, he generally receives it in grain from the holder of the land who obtains a fixed remission on his assessment from Government. . . . I am of opinion that the existing system under which the inamdar receives a certain percentage of the produce of the land cultivated each year under the work for which the inam was granted or of the Government assessment on it, is a good one and that it should be continued.

"I do not see why the continuance of the system should be productive of any inconvenience owing to the operations of the Revenue Settlement Department; where the inamdar receives his inam in grain, he will continue to do so, and in those cases in which the inam is a percentage on the assessment, it will be calculated on the new rates instead of on the old ones which will very rarely result in any reduction of the present payment."

This proposal was approved in the Proceedings of the Board, No. 111, dated 29th January 1873. This order was in accord with that contained in paragraph 18 of B.P., No. 915, dated 6th June 1872, approved in G.O., No. 145, dated 5th February 1873, wherein it was ruled that "in cases in which the dasabandamdar is remunerated by a fixed proportion of the assessment of the land irrigated by the well, and there is no inam land forming the endowment of the work, the old system must be continued". The old authorities quoted in B.P., No. 437 (Land Revenue), dated 2nd December 1895, also show that the inam consisted of assignment of revenue or produce.

4. If these orders had been given effect to, what ought to have been done was to exhibit the entire land as Government in the settlement register and note the percentage of reduction in the column of remarks. Had this been done, the remuneration to the dasabandamdar would, after the passing of the orders contained in B.P., Mis. No. 2642, dated 27th June 1890, have assumed the form of payment by beriz deduction.

5. From paragraph 28 of Mr. Cox's scheme report quoted by the Board, it would, however, appear that the Settlement Department adopted a different course. Paragraphs 28 and 30 of his report, disposed of in B.P., No. 2931, dated 15th October 1879, are quoted here for easy reference—

Paragraph 28.—"The above figures represent the area registered as shamlat inam in the accounts, for although the remission of assessment is only made upon the area cultivated, each field appearing in the accounts as shamlat dasabandam has the usual proportion of it registered as inam. There are also some lands irrigated under the dasabandam sources which not being registered in the accounts as shamlat dasabandam pay full wet assessment to Government and in this way afford some compensation for the waste shamlat dasabandam fields where a portion is registered as inam."

Paragraph 30.—"Besides the above allowances in land, there is an area of 108½ acres in six villages in the Ráyachóti taluk on which dasabandam money remissions are granted for the upkeep of irrigation sources at the rate of one-fourth of the assessment amounting to, in all, Rs. 69-14-10. Similar remissions are met with to a large extent in the other sub-division taluks and will have to be continued in our settlement at the same rates as are now allowed."

6. It will thus appear that the Settlement Department did introduce a change which was approved by Government. It assigned definite areas of land as inam in proportion to the percentage deduction of assessment and registered such areas in the names of the inamdars though the portion so registered was not defined on the ground. A definite area on paper which at the same time is not defined on the ground is, of course, an absurdity and this seems to be the cause of all the trouble. This separate registration of inam areas is said to have been based on similar registration in the old accounts, and it is explained that the removal of the restriction of the inamdar's remuneration to a percentage reduction varying with cultivation was justified by the existence of lands paying full wet assessment to Government, which were considered as affording compensation for the waste fields of which a portion was registered as inam. It is also stated in cases where the inam actually consisted of payment by proportionate deduction of assessment, the same rate of deduction was allowed on the new assessments. The latter class of inams is now known as "Nagad Muzara lands or ready-money remission lands."

7. There is thus, no doubt, that a change was introduced by the Settlement Department with the sanction of Government, in spite of previous orders to the contrary. The Settlement Department evidently took their authority from the old accounts and apportioned the total area of the fields between circar and inam save in cases where remission of assessment was allowed which were left undisturbed. The latter class of cases are very few when compared with the former and are evidently the kind of inams which the Board seems to have in view in suggesting the course indicated in the Proceedings under reference. The kind of inams referred to in this office letter to the Board are, however, of the former description, which form the bulk of the dasabandam inams in the sub-division and which alone are known as "Shamlat dasabandam inams." There are doubtless still some cases here and there where the inamdar gets a share of produce from the holder of the Government land, but in many cases the inamdar is the enjoyer of the whole land and his inam takes the form of paying assessment only on a certain portion of it. I think that whether the inamdar enjoys the whole or a portion or even none of the land at all, the proper course is now to recognize these inams as what they originally were as a deduction of assessment under particular irrigation sources in consideration of keeping that source in repair. I would class the whole land as Government for the inam is not land. I would give Government pattas for the whole extent to the owners if they have not already got them and I would give a fixed remission of the percentage of the assessment which is the inam to the registered inamdar. A permanent inam remission register will have to be prepared which will require orders at jamabandi only in reference to any changes in the year and in reference to season remissions in this fashion; that is, the

inamdar being entitled to a fixed money payment which is a proportion of the assessment under the tank, he will, of course, get nothing if the tank has failed and the lands pay no assessment for the year; or if the failure is partial, his receipts will bear the prescribed proportion to the amount of revenue realised. This will, no doubt, entail some extra labour at jamabandi but the only alternatives are to class the whole of each field as inam, or to demarcate the inam portion on the ground. The latter proposal is impossible because the inam portion is often non-existent. The former is open to the objections that it will make Government ryots inamdars unnecessarily and that it will include as joint inamdars one person who is a real inamdar having certain duties as such and other persons who are not inamdars at all. I propose that Government should collect the whole assessment and pay a money inam to the inamdar instead of leaving him to collect his share from the joint owners because the latter course seems impracticable. The State granted the inam and requires duties as a consideration therefor. If we leave the inamdar to collect, he will find difficulties in doing so. The Civil Court proceedings will take long and meantime he may allow the tank to fall into disrepair and plead non-realization of his inam. To class all these lands now as Government in the way proposed will involve much correction of settlement registers; but since the settlement registers have treated this matter wrongly, I do not see how this trouble is to be avoided.

Trouble is inevitable but I think it must be faced in order to clear away entirely the present confusion as regards the cultivation of these lands and whether Government or inam portions are cultivated.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1743, dated 31st March 1899.

Recorded, pending receipt of Collector's reply to B.P., No. 826, dated 7th February 1899.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAH,
Secretary.

Copy to the Collector.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 4076, dated 17th August 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Approving, with remarks, the Collector's proposal regarding the sub-division of a shamlat dasabandam inam in the Rayachoti taluk, Cuddapah district.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899:—

Resolution—Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899.

The Board generally approves of the proposals contained in paragraph 7 of the Collector's letter, No. 4657, dated 4th October 1898. The proposals can be readily carried out if the inamdars agree in respect of cases in which the inamdar holds the whole or no portion of the ayakat of a dasabandam source, or definite portions of the ayakat. In cases, however, in which the inamdar holds only a proportion (*shamlat*) of the ayakat, the remaining portion being (*a*) held by other persons or (*b*) unoccupied according to the revenue accounts, it will have to be settled first for what particular land patta is to be issued to the inamdar. For this, survey and sub-division of the inamdar's portion will be necessary, unless in case (*a*) he and the other holders consent to accept a joint patta for the whole ayakat, or in case (*b*) the inamdar consents to the inclusion, in his patta, of the unoccupied portion of the

ayakat or will specify which portion he desires to be registered as his own holding. The Collector is requested to report fully how he proposes to deal with such cases. His report shows that the number would be comparatively small, but it is in them that real difficulty will be felt.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. BENSON
Deputy Director
for Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.

Read—also the following letter from H. O. D. HARDING, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 20th September 1899, Ref on Cur. No. 478 B and G:—

With reference to B.P., Mis. No. 4077, dated 17th August 1899, I have the honour to state that my proposal was to pay to the dasabandamdar an amount of ready-money remission in the ratio of the total assessment on the inam to the realisable revenue on the ayakat of the irrigation source for the upkeep of which the dasabandam inam is granted. As, according to my proposal, the dasabandamdar will have nothing to do with the land (he being entitled only to the assessment thereon) unless he was already the holder, I do not see the necessity of sub-dividing the land in any case.

2. The three classes of cases in which the shamlat dasabandam inams are now held are—

- (i) Where the inamdar and the pattadar are the same individual.
- (ii) Where the inamdar is different from the circar pattadar.
- (iii) Where the circar portion is Government waste.

3. In case No. (i) the whole land being in the ownership of the inamdar, patta may be granted in the name of the inamdar for the whole land where he now holds patta for only a portion.

4. In case No. (ii) the pattadar is in the enjoyment and ownership of the whole land. He only pays a portion of the assessment to the Government and the rest to the inamdar. If the inamdar be compensated by ready-money remission, he will have nothing to do with the inam and Government pattadar will be the actual owner and enjoyer of the full field. As the inamdar has nothing to do with the land, no sub-division is necessary.

5. In the case of No. (iii) the whole field is actually waste though in the accounts a portion is shown as waste and the rest as inam. As the inamdar is entitled to a share of the assessment only when the land is taken up on darkhast and cultivated and as he will be granted remission separately, the inam portion of the land when converted into circar would become Government waste to be disposed of under Darkhast rules. The inamdar can have no claim to any portion of the waste land and hence no sub-division seems necessary even in this case.

Resolution—No. 351, dated 1st November 1899.

The papers read above relate to the treatment of "Shamlat" dasabandam inams in the Cuddapah district.

2. Dasabandam inams, i.e., inams granted for the upkeep of irrigation works, fall under two classes—"Khandam" and "Shamlat." In the former, a specific area was granted as an inam, and the inam was accordingly dealt with by the Inam Commissioner. In the latter, a certain proportion, e.g., half, one-third or one-fourth

of the revenue or produce of the land cultivated under the irrigation work was granted as an inam, which thus consisted of no specific land. This class of inam was not therefore brought under the inam settlement.

3. The question how these shamlat dasabandam inams should be dealt with at the settlement was raised on a reference from the Collector of Cuddapah in 1872 (*vide* B.P., No. 2030, dated 18th October 1872). The Collector of Bellary proposed to replace these inams by definite grants of land, but the Board, on the recommendation of the Inam Commissioner and the Director of Revenue Settlement, decided not to alter the nature of the inam, as it was considered that this system was a more powerful inducement to the inamdar to keep the irrigation work in repair than the grant of a specific area as an inam.

4. In the old revenue accounts, it would appear that each field, upon which shamlat remission was grantable, was shown in the accounts as "Shamlat dasabandam" and the usual proportion of it was registered as inam. The same course was apparently intended to be followed in preparing the settlement register also, but the actual results have been misleading. The following is an example:—

Number.	Extent.	Assessment.	In whose name registered.
299-A ..	ACS. 0.17	RS. A. P. 1 0 0	Vankalopalle Chinnakka.
B ..	0.10	0 10 0	Peddareddigari Peddanna.
C ..	0.05	0 5 0	Vankalopalle do.
D ..	0.05	0 5 0	Do. Iragam Reddi.
E ..	0.05	0 5 0	Peddareddigari Peddanna.
F ..	0.02	0 2 0	Vankalopalle Chinn Reddi.
..	0.44	2 10 0	Do. Peddanna, &c.
..	0.88	5 5 0	

It will be seen that the total extent entered against sub-divisions A to F is 44 cents and is equal to the area shown as shamlat dasabandam inam which is entered without any definition on the ground, or sub-division letter. As a matter of fact, the extent of each sub-division is double the recorded area and the object of the entries was apparently to show that the proportion of shamlat inam was 50 per cent. of the whole revenue. A specific area of land, however, having been shown in the settlement register as inam, the Collector reports that half of each sub-division is supposed to be inam, and as the land is not defined on the ground, confusion and difficulty have arisen in the matter of recording cultivation and in the disposal of waste land. These difficulties are detailed in paragraph 7 of his first letter read above and to remedy them, the Collector at first proposed to employ a special establishment to convert the inams into "khandam dasabandam" and to re-settle them on the lines followed in the settlement of Gaddatiru inams. The Board, however, considered that there was no necessity for this extra expenditure, and that all that was required was to treat the whole field or sub-division as ryotwari instead of a portion as ryotwari and the rest as inam as hitherto, and to issue pattas for the full extent, the share of the assessment due to the inamdar being deducted as a fixed remission or beriz deduction. The Collector has accepted the proposal and the Board requests the sanction of Government for the change. The same course has been followed in respect of similar inams in the districts of Bellary and Anantapur where all the lands under the irrigation sources concerned have been registered as "Government" and fully assessed, the prescribed remissions being granted annually at jamabandi.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. BENSON
Deputy Director
for Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" Collector of Cuddapah.
" Inam Commissioner.

ORDER—No. 868, Revenue, dated 26th December 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The proposal contained in paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings is approved and sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement,
Land Records and Agriculture).

Exd. Shaik Karim.

45 Copies.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G.O. No.
189 .

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. -

- A = Print in full.
- H = Not to be printed.
- P = Print abstract only.
- V = Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.