

1826.8. Fort St. George — December 1840

Diary

Sent the following letter.-

21st

To.

The Collector of

Bellary.

(1)

To the Collector of Bellary.

Sir. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of the Statement of smuggled goods submitted by you for the month of September last, and to convey Sanction for the confiscation and sale of the Articles therein enumerated with the exception of 312 lbs of cu- Chillies. This Article not being includ- ed in the list of taxable commodities you will be pleased to state on what authority it was seized.-

10th inst: 19th October.-

† Vide list of 36 Articles in Fort St. George Gazette 1837. Page 512.-

Revenue Fort St. George 21st December 1840.

Board Office,

[Signed] D. B. Smollett Secretary.

Sent the following letter.-

21st

To.

To

The Acting Collector of

Cuddapah.

(2)

To the Actg Collr of Cuddapah

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of the Statements of smuggled goods seized in the month of September, bearing date 13th October last.

Inclos: 19th Octr.

2. In the Statement of articles released on payment of Extra duty, the Board observe that treble duty was levied on a Carpet valued at 7 Rupees. This article not being included in the list of payable + commodities, you will be pleased to state under what authority it was seized and assessed with treble duty. The penalty levied on the other articles enumerated in the Statement is approved.

+ Vide list of 36 Articles in Fort St. George Gazette 1837 Page 512.

3. With regard to the seizure of Joggery 69 Viss valued at 20 Rs at Rs 71 Joggery reported in the Statement of goods recommended for confiscation, the

the Board are of opinion that of the 69 Maunds seized, it being proved that 54 Maunds had paid duty, the excess only (Mds 15) is liable to confiscation, which the Board accordingly authorize. You will be pleased to release the remaining 54 Maunds.

Revenue Board Office, Fort St. George, 21st December 1840.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett.
Secretary.

25th Sent the following letter.

To

The Collector of

Trichinopoly.

(3)

To the Collector of Trichinopoly

Sir,

With reference to my letter of the 3d Instant, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to draw your attention to a further seizure of course cloths, the Value of which is entered at Rs 4 3 in the Statement of smuggled goods for the month of September last, and to desire that the article may be released on payment of duty. The confiscation and sale of the remaining articles are authorized.

30th Sept. inclos: 29th October 1840.

Revenue Board Office, Fort St. George, 21st December, 1840.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett.
Secretary.

Al.

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

At a Meeting Present.

Thursday 24th December 1840 —

John Dent Esqre. Senior Member.

Walter Elliot Esqre. Third Member.

and

Alexander Maclean Esqre. Temporary Member.

John Sullivan Esqre. Acting Second Member

absent on duty.

Minutes of the last meeting read and approved.—

Read again Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 4th. and entered in Consultation 17th. Instant.—

Ordered that the following address be submitted in reply.—

To. The Chief Secretary to Government.

4

To the Chief Secy. to Government &c.

Sir.

Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of an Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

In Cons. 17th Dec. 1840.

date 4th. Instant.—

2. The Board are of opinion that 4 Annas per diem for the entire period that bearers may be absent from their residence will be ample remuneration whether they return along the road they are posted with an empty Palanteen or without one.—

Revenue Board Office, Fort St. George.— 24th. December, 1840.

/ Signed / P. B. Smollett. Secretary.—

From the Chief Secy. to Government &c.

5.

Read the following Extract.—

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 31st. August, 1840.—

Read the following Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Sudder Adalut reporting on the administration of Criminal Justice in the Provinces under this Presidency for the 2d half of the year 1838 and the 1st half of the year 1839.—

/ Here enter 5th February No. 31 B. 20th April No. 79 A & 25th May No. 105 of 1840 /

Pro. dated 25th May 1840.

Paras 5 & 7. Para 10. A copy of these paras will be transmitted to the Board of Revenue with a request that they will lay before Government

at

at their earliest convenience, after its receipt, with their own sentiments thereon, the Statement mentioned therein as about being submitted to them by the Magistrate of North Arcot for remunerating the Village Sibbendy in the Poloor Talook of his district.-

Extract from the Proceedings of the Foujdaree Adalut under date the 25th. May 1840.

Para 5. The next point on which the Magistrate was required to report, was as regards the Statement of the Head of Police of Poloor, that "in some Villages in his Talook there are no Police Meerasses or maniums, and no Taliaries."-

6. The Magistrate states that this is "quite true." He explains that there are 58 Villages in Poloor where there is neither Taliar Meras, nor Taliar Manium, consequently no Taliars.- That there are 80 Villages where the Meras is so small, Taliars will not accept of it,- consequently in these Villages also, there is no

are

are no Taliars. That the remaining Villages of the Talook are 44 in number, but in these there are Taliars, the Meras and Manium being sufficient for them: that "since the assumption, these Village have been thus situated, but that a Statement is now in progress for submission to the Board of Revenue of the land to be granted in each Village for remuneration to the Village Sibbundy."-

The Court of Foujdaree Adalut

7.

would strongly recommend to Government the adoption of the plan proposed by the Magistrate, Mr. Ogilvie, for remunerating the Village Sibbundy of this portion of his District, and it is hoped that the Board of Revenue will be enabled to lay the "Statement" referred to, before Government, at an early period.-

(True Extracts.)

(Signed) W. Chamier.

Chief Secretary.

5 - 6

Order thereon.- Ordered to be brought forward at a future Meeting.-

Read

18275 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

From the Chief Secretary to Government.

(7) Read letter transmitting copy and translation of certain Acts of the Supreme Government.

Order thereon.

(7-8) Ordered to be lodged in the Office.

Read the following resolutions.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 15th December 1840.

(From Bd 30th November)

From the Chief Secy to Government.

(8) The Right Honorable the Governor in Council authorizes the Principal Collector of Salem to employ 18 Extra Goomastahs on a Salary of Rupees (12) twelve each per mensem, for a period not exceeding 4 Months for the purpose specified in the above letter.

(Signed) Hy Chamier.
Chief Secretary

(9-10) Resolution thereon. Ordered that transcript of the foregoing Extract from the Minutes of Consultation and of the letter in which it is proposed be furnished to the Principal Collector of Salem, for his information and guidance.

Extract

18276 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 19th December 1840.

(From Board 30th Novr 1840)

From the Chief Secy to Government.

(11) The Right Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the charges reported in the above letter amounting to Rupees (36,461—11—6) thirty six thousand four hundred and sixty one, Annas eleven and Pice six.

As these charges appear very high, His Lordship in Council desires to be furnished with information as to the disposal of the large quantity of Cardamums for which the Hill Proprietors received payment, and the Net results of the Farm for the year during which those charges were incurred.

(Signed) Hy Chamier.
Chief Secretary.

(11-12) Order thereon. Ordered to be brought forward at a future day.

(Read again in Cons 11th January)

Extract

1827.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

From the Chief Secy. to Government.

13

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 21st. December 1840.

(From Board 3d. December.)

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council grants special sanction for the charges incurred by the Agent to the Governor of Fort St. George in Vizagapatam in July 1249. on account of Establishments &c. amounting in the aggregate to Rupees 2,283 12 2) Two thousand two hundred and Eighty three, Annas twelve and Pice two.

(Signed) Wy. Chamier
Chief Secretary.

13 14

Order thereon.- ordered to be brought forward at a future meeting.-

Read again 1st Jan. 22d March

Read

Read the following letter

To,
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.
Fort St. George.

Sir,

15

From the Collector of Ganjam - - - - - } Para.

Submitting revised Statement of the proposed sub-division of the Cowmary Estate in pursuance of a Decree of Court.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 22d Ultimo, on the subject of the sub division of the Cowmary Estate in pursuance of the Decree of the Court of Sudr Dda. Sub in Appeal Suits Nos 8 and 8 of 1838 of the file of that Court.

2. In conformity with the instructions contained in the 3d Para of your letter under reply I have the honor to submit two Subdivision Statements, prepared in the form transmitted with your Predecessor's letter under date the 3d September 1806, in which the valuation of the several Villages according to the accounts upon which the Permanent Settlement was calculated, is exhibited in the 3d Column of the Statement has been taken from the detailed Statement

Statement of the resources of the Estate submitted to the Special Commissioners by Mr. Collector Cherry under date the 25th February 1803. The present actual value of the Village, has been assumed, agreeably to the Board's directions with reference to the annual rental for five years, according to which data the Village of Coomary most nearly corresponds in value with the amount of the annual rental of the lands to be transferred to Trustees Venkata Condul Row, as has been noticed in your letter.

3. Adopting the annual rental of the last five years, as the present valuation, and assessing the Permanent Peishcush as the respective subdivisions according to the rule laid down in Section VI Regulation XXVI of 1803,

1803 the Jummah to be fixed upon the Village of Coomary would be Rupees 907-11-4 and the annual Peishcush to be borne by the remaining portion of the Estate would be Rupees 5092-4-8 yielding on the former a profit of Rupees 311-4-11 and on the latter of Rupees 1702-3-11. But as according to the interpretations put by the Provincial Court of the Northern Division on the Decree of the Sudder Adalut, the beneficial value of the subdivisions to the owners is not to be taken into consideration, the surplus remaining to them respectively after payment of the Government Peishcush need not be adverted to.

4. I beg to observe that the separation of the Village of Coomary from the remaining portion of the Estate is not desirable, owing to its lands in common with

with those of all of the other five Villages composing it, excepting Hurredapadrah, which possesses other Sources of irrigation, receiving their supply of water from the Saint river Channel, which circumstance, owing to the feelings of enmity which have long existed between the two Brothers, would most likely create further quarrels, besides being on other grounds objectionable. Moreover, Coomary being the Curtah V.[illage] contains the dwelling house and Premises of the Proprietor, whose son has presented an Arzee to me expressing his father's wish that for the above reasons notwithstanding the valuation of the V.[illage] of Hurredapadrah is higher than the Amount which has been decreed by the Court

Court of Sudr Adalut that Village may be separated from the Estate in preference to Coomary. Should the Board think proper to concur in this arrangement, the Statement No 2. shews that the annual Peishcush to be assessed upon the Village of Hurredapadrah would be Rupees 12-10-14 — yielding a Surplus of Rupees 416-15-4 to the new Proprietor —

5. In taking the actual Rental of the Estate during a lengthened period of years as the data for assuming the present value of the several Villages, I had a due regard to the fact of the Market prices of Grain during the last three or four years having been higher than they were ever known to be in any former consecutive years and I am still of opinion that this cause has tended to raise the rents of the whole

J

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

of the Villages beyond what they would have attained under the ordinary prices which have been considered the usual Standard rates in this District, but it is probable that this Cause has operated pretty uniformly in respect to the different Villages. I think however that the Government Peishcush to be assessed on the respective Sub Divisions, according to either of the two Schemes now submitted as exhibited in the Statements Nos 1 & 2 under either of which the Amount to be assessed upon the Villages of Cormary and Surredapadrah respectively does not differ very materially from the distribution of the Summ

	Cormary			Surredapadrah		
Present valuation assumed on the average of 5 years	1218	12	3	1025	13	4
Peishcush calculated with reference to Section VII Regn XXVII 1803 Rent hitherto proposed by Mr Cherry	907	11	4	1210	14	4
	825	0	4	1170	0	0
Difference	82	11	4	40	14	4

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Summah which was made in the first instance by Mr. Collector Cherry, may safely be confirmed by the Board should either of these schemes appear to fulfil the object and intention of the Decree of the Court of Sudr Adalut—

6. I beg leave to request the early decision of the Board in respect to the Sub division, as it will be necessary immediately to advertise the remaining portion of the Estate on account of the Arrears of Revenue due on account of fusly 1249 which still remains unliquidated—

Ganjam District, — —
Collectors Cutcherry, — —
Ganjam, 23d November 1840—

Signed R. A. Bannerman
Collector—

Statement

18285 — Fort St George

2d December 1840.

Statement Shewing the Sub Division proposed to be made in pursuance of a Decree passed by the Court of Sadr Adalut in Original Suits Nos 648 of 1838 and the Amount of the Pesheush proposed to be fixed on the respective Sub divisions of the Gowary Estate situated in the District of Ganjam in pursuance of the Decree passed by the Court of Sadr Adalut in Original Suits Nos 648 of 1838 and the Amount of the Pesheush proposed to be fixed on the respective Sub divisions—

Name of the entire Estate by its Proprietor with the Permanent Jummah assessed thereon—	Names of the Villages composing the entire Estate—	Average produce of the several Villages according to the accounts upon which the permanent assessment was calculated—	Present actual value of the several Villages deduced from the results on an average of the five last Fusles or from Fusly 1244 to 1248—	Amount of Arrears due by the Proprietor on account of Fusly 1249 including interest up to the 15th November 1840—	Sub Divisions proposed to be made shewing their value respectively according to the results noted in Column 3—	Sub Divisions proposed to be made shewing their value respectively according to the Account noted in Column 4—	Permanent Rents to be fixed on the proposed Sub Divisions as recommended by the Collector with reference to Section II Regulation I of 1819	Difference per Cent between the total actual present value of the entire Estate & the total Permanent Jummah	Difference per Cent between the actual present value of the proposed Sub Divisions & the Permanent Jummah recommended to be fixed on each Sub Division
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Cds A P	Cds A P	Cds A P	Cds A P	Cds A P	Cds A P		
Pedapoor Jaggannaikum Annual Peishcush Cds 6,000	Seven yellow Villages Paduakah	709 14 3	741 2 2						
	Jayapoor	972 11 5	1103 11 6						
	Trausing Iyen	765 5	773 13 6						
	Montcushadah	1129 12 4	1539 12 11						
	Hursdapanah	1203 5 1	1025 13 4						
	Mangonah	456 8 6	725 3 2						
		6189 8 11	6659 8 7						
	Shrotriums & Agraharums								
	Cistu adah	125 . .	125 . .						
	Total	6314 6 11	6794 8 7						
	Jeroyallew Village Gowary	963 4 5	1218 12 3						
	Grand Total	6157 11 4	8013 4 10	4013 5 1	6157 11 4	8013 4 10	6000 . .	25-8-½ Per Cent	25-8-½ Per Cent / 5-8-½ Per Cent / 33-½ Per Cent

Ganjam District, Collr's Cutcherry, Ganjam 7th November 1840

E E Fs (Signed) C. A. Kennedy
Collector—

Statement—

1828

Fort St. George

No 2.

Statement shewing the Sub Division proposed to be made of the Company passed by the Court of Sudr Dewanny Adawlut in Original Suits Nos 7 and 8 of 1838, and Sub Divisions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Name of the entire Estate and of its Proprietor with the Permanent Jummah affixed thereto	Names of the Villages comprising the entire Estate	Average produce of the current Fuslee Villages according to the Accounts upon which the Permanent Assessment for Fuslee, a former was calculated	Present actual value of the several Villages deduced from the Sub Collector's average of last Fuslee, or from	Amount of Peishcush payable by the Proprietor on account of Fuslee 1249 including interest thereon up to the 15th November 1840	Sub Divisions proposed to be made shewing their actual respective Assessment according to the Accounts noted in Column 3	Sub Divisions proposed to be made shewing their value at the respective rates noted in Column 4	Permanent Rents to be fixed on the proposed Sub Divisions as recommended by the Collector with reference to Section II Regulation I of 1819	Difference per Cent between the total actual present value of the entire Estate & the total permanent Jummah affixed	Difference per Cent between the actual or gross rent value of the proposed Sub Divisions & the permanent Jummah recommended to be fixed on the Sub Divisions	Remarks
		Cdl Rs As P	Cdl Rs As P	Cdl Rs As P	Cdl Rs As P	Cdl Rs As P	Cdl Rs As P			
Fort St. George Jaggeer adawar Annual Peishcush Sr. 6,000-	Seventeen Villages Company ———									
	Padaulah ———	709 11 3	741 2 2							
	Jayapoor ———	974 2 5	1183 11 6							
	Soraungheer ———	703 5 4	773 13 6							
	Montapadah ———	1179 12 4	1839 12 11							
	Mongonah ———	1564 1	725 3 2							
		4,829 0 3	6262 7 6							
	Shotheem y Agraharums									
	Cotawadah ———	125 . .	125 . .							
	Total	4954 0 3	6387 7 6							
	Seventeen Villages									
	Burradahadah ———	1203 5 1	1825 13 4							
	Grand Total	6,157 11 4	8,013 4 10			4043 5 1	4137 11 4	3613 4 11	1000 . .	Pr Cent 25-8-4 1/2

21st December 1840

Estate situated in the District of Ganjam in pursuance of a Decree

the amount of the Assessment proposed to be fixed on the respective

Pr Cent 25-8-4 1/2

Ganjam District Collr's Cutcherry Ganjam 23d November 1840

E E Fs Signed H Sandeman Collector

Orders

15. 16

Order thereon. Ordered to be brought forward at a future Day.

(Read again in Cons. 11th Jany.)

Read the following Letter.

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.
Fort St. George.

Sir,

From the Collector of Vizagapatam, — — — } Dated the

With reference to your Letters of the 10th September 1838 and 12th Instant, regarding an explanation on the subject of a petition from certain Weavers of this District, I have the honor to submit the following report.

17

From the Collector of Vizagapatam, — — — } Dated the

With reference to Letters dated 10th September 1838 & 12th November 1840 the Collector submits a Report in explanation on the subject of 2 Petitions from certain Weavers in the Vizagapatam District.

2. These Weavers complain that while they formerly received a written promise from the late Commercial Resident that they were to be for ever exempted from taxation of any kind on account of their profession and were accordingly so exempted till Fasly 1245 my predecessor then imposed a Mr. Turka tax upon them which has since been realized.

The

3. This promise appears to have been contained in certain instructions framed for the management of the factory of Vizagapatam dated 25th September 1800. If they are genuine I cannot but think that they must have been forfeited without sanction of the Government.

4. The 19th para of these instructions is as follows.

"It is hereby promised to the Weavers who engage to weave cloth for the Company that those Weavers from whom the cloth so stiled shall still be considered as engaged in the service of the Government and relieved from all troubles of every description in the part of the Cloth."

5. But such a Regulation how framed with the sanction of the Government I feel confident that some instructions would have been sent for the guidance of the Revenue Authorities which was not the case.

Now

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

6-

Nor can I believe that the Government would have sanctioned the following which forms the 3d Rule-

"Those who demand wages for the manufacture of Cloth for the Resident, will be reported to the Talookdars and they shall be compelled to pay any taxes that they may choose to impose upon them-

7-

My Predecessor was of opinion that the Weavers had no just ground for exemption and therefore imposed a Moturfa taxation as reported in his letter dated 1st March 1837-

8-

The Petitions are here with returned-

Vizagapatam District-
Vizianagaram Collectors
Circuit Cutcherry-
1st December 1840-

Signed W. H. Shuttleworth
Collector

Order thereon-

Ordered to be brought for
Read again on the 8th Feby 1841
Comd. C.J.R.

"ward to a future day-

17. 18

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Read the following letter-

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George.

(19)

Sir,

From the Coll. of Rajahmundry - Para 1.

I have the honor to forward copy of a letter addressed by Mr. Crawley, late Collector, to the Honorable Geo. E. Russell Esqr. late Commissioner, under date 29th January 1834, together with Copy of the Statement, which accompanied it, of Charges incurred in this District under the authority of the latter Officer, on account of the family of the late Zemindar of Palcondah in the District of Vizagapatam, amounting to Rupees 7764 2 3, which sum is still remaining in the accounts of this Collectorate, awaiting adjustment, in consequence of no Orders having been received for the same

No 2.

The Accountant General having now required an early adjustment of the above charge and the Original Vouchers have in support of

of it having been forwarded with the above Statement to the Commissioner I have the honor to request the Board of Revenue will be pleased to obtain the sanction of Government for the charge in question of Company's Rupees seven thousand, one hundred and sixty four, annas two and Pice three, for the purpose of its being charged under its proper head.

Zillah Rajahmundry
Coll.r's Circuit Cutcherry,
Rajahnagarum, 8th December 1840.

Signed G. Smith
Collector

No. 1.

To

G. E. Russell Esqr.
Commissioner 4th Div. 4th Sub
Remedy

Sir,

Para 1. In compliance with the direction contained in your letter of the 2d September last, I have now the honor to transmit an account Particular supported by Vouchers, of all charges incurred on account of the Family of the late Ummidar of Palcondah, amounting to Rupees 7167 3 9.

As it would have been inconvenient
2
for the Jamadar to have been encumbered with a large sum of money for the Prisoners expenses on the road. I requested the several Collectors to make such advances as appeared requisite, for which as well as the Balance paid by the Paymaster of Stipends at Vellore, they have received Credit in my accounts.

Nine Doolies were required for
3
the use of the Family and I endeavoured to purchase them but succeeded in obtaining three only at a moderate rate, when I was informed that there was a Depot of Company's Doolies at Bunder, six more there for were indented for. The Paymaster of Stipends at Vellore had been requested to sell those which were purchased here and to carry the amount to the Credit of Government.

Zillah Rajahmundry
Coll.r's Circuit Cutcherry
Rajahnagarum, 29th January

(Signed) A Crawley
Collector

Dr. The Collector in the zillah of Rajahmundry in account Current with G. E. Russell Esquire Commissioner.

			Rs	a	p
1833 August 31st	To amount of advances made from the Public Deposit by the Collector of Rajahmundry to the Officer Commanding Samulcottah Viz^t on account of the expences of the Polavendal zemindar and his family together with three other Prisoners during the months of August 1833		1627	8	-
September 30th	To Dr of Dr Dr during Dr of September 1833		1257	-	-
October 31st	To Dr of Dr Dr during Dr of October 1833		679	4	8
November 30th	To Dr of Dr Dr during Dr of November 1833		2037	8	-
December 4th	To Dr of Dr Dr during Dr of December 1833		14	12	-
1834 January 29th	To Dr of Dr Dr during Dr of January 1834		47	5	10
1833			5663	6	6
December 17th	To Dr of Dr made by the Collector of Guntoor to the Zemindar of the Guard escorting the said zemindar's family to Vellore as per his letter of 17th December 1833 for which Credit is given to him		782	-	-
28th	To Dr of Dr made by the Principal Collector of Nellore to Dr Dr as per Dr of 28th December 1833 for which Credit is given to him		260	-	-
1834 January 21st	To Dr of Dr made by the Pay master of Stipends at Vellore as per his letter of 21st January 1834 for which amount Bill on the Principal Collector of North arcot is forwarded to him as requested		176	-	10
			7241	74	
	Deduct returned into the Treasury on the 23d December 1833 by the Officer Commanding Samulcottah being balance of advances remaining after the expences for Adda jiggah Conveyance to Bellary have been made		77	51	
			7164	23	
	Rupees		7164	23	

Zillah Rajahmundry, Collectors Office, Cutcherry, Pattee 29th January

			Rs	a	p
1833 September 5th	By amount of Disbursements made in advance on account of Daily Batta and other charges of the Polavendal zemindar and other State Prisoners when sent to Ghooty and Chingle put as per State ment received with Letter of 5th September 1833 from the Officer Commanding Samulcottah Viz^t		707	-	-
	Total amount of the Statements		70	2	
	Deduct amount of two different items of Rs 62 2 and Rs 8 Carried into his subsequent account Current of 28th November 1833 being balances of advances remaining after the expences for the Conveyances of the above Polavendal zemindar and other three Prisoners to Ghoo.				
	By Viz have been made ... Vide his above Statement No 1 with A & B his Statements of the above balances of advances		6364	-	
October 14th	By amount of Disbursements made on account of daily Batta to the Polavendal family as per account Current Dated 1st October 1833 from the Officer Commanding Samulcottah Viz^t		1718	-	
	Deduct amount returned to Treasury by the 23d December 1833 being balance of advances of Rupees 336 remaining after the expences of Adda jiggah Conveyance to Bellary have been made		77	3	
	Vide his above account Current No 2 with its vouchers and with C his Statement of above balances of advances		6412	11	
30th	By Dr of Rs on account of Dr as per Dr Dated 30th October 1833 from the Officer Commanding Samulcottah Vide No 3 with its Vouchers		3768	8	
November 30th	By Dr of Dr on account of Dr as per Dr Dated 30th November 1833 from the Officer Commanding Dr Vide No 4 with its Vouchers		1291	8	
1834 January 31st	By Dr of Disbursement of Daily batta to the family and three to bear ers and Vice in their way from Samulcottah to Vellore as per Statement Dated 31st January 1834 from the Paymaster of Stipends at Vellore Viz^t				
	Total Disbursements		17614	-	
	Deduct amount of this paid to bearers Vide by the Paymaster of Stipends on 14th January 1834 making the balance of advances made on the 1st remaining in the hands of the Collector of the 2nd		6412	10	
	Vide above Statement No 5		11202	10	10
	Vide above Statement No 6		476	66	
	Rupees		7104	23	
By Dr of Dr on account of Dr as per account Particulars Vide No					

Ordered

1834 E. E. Dr Signed W. Crawfo Coll^r

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Ordered that the following address be submitted together with the foregoing letter.

To

The Chief Secretary to
Government.

(19 - 20)

To the Chief Secy to Government.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request you will submit for the orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, the accompanying letter from Mr. Smith, with its enclosures, having reference to a charge of Rupees 7164-2-3, incurred under the orders of Mr. Ruthell while officiating commissioner in the Northern Circars, on account of the family of the late Zemindar of Palconda, and for which the special sanction of Government is required.

8th Inl. 24th Dec. 1840

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
24th December 1840.

(Signed) P. B. Lowell
Secretary.

Proceedings

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Proceedings Relative to the management of the Extra Sources of Revenue of the Nellore District for Fusly 1269--

Read again the accompanying letter from the Principal Collector of Nellore reporting the outturn of the Extra Sources of Revenue in the Nellore District in Fusly 1269

(Here entee No. 58)

Salt Demand

1248--435481-6-11.
1269--453437-12-2

Increase 19956-5-3

(21)

1. The Increase of Rupees 19956-5-3 observable in the Current sales of Salt is the result of an Increase of 12606-15-8 in the sales for home Consumption and of 7667-8-- in the Ship sales and of a Decrease of Rupees 318-2-5 in the Inland Sales--

2. At the Cotars in the Centre and Southern part of the District there was a large Increase in the Inland sales but this was more than balanced by the falling off in the sales at the Northern Cotaurs Pudaly and Pakalah which is accounted for by certain Merchants who usually take large supplies from these Cotaurs having in the Fusly under review deserted them for the Depot at Chenna Ganjam in the Goontoor District, whether Mr. Montrose seems to think they were invited by the hope of obtaining some advantage afforded by the practice of

selling

B

selling Salt in whole heaps which at present prevails in that District This point will be noticed by the Board in their Proceedings on the Extra Revenue report for the Guntoor District.—

3 Including Extra Collections the total receipts of Salt Revenue within the year amounted to 4,56,948-12- exceeding the gross Collections in the year preceding by 20,540—11—11- as however, the Amount of Charges owing Chiefly to a larger quantity of Salt so being received into store exceeded the charges of Fusly 1248 by Rupees 27,603-8-8 there was a falling off in the net Revenue to the extent of 7,062-7-9 the net Revenue of Fusly 1248 being 3,83,958-3-1 and that of Fusly 1249-3,76,894-11-4.—

Para 8- 4 In this Para the Principal Collector reports that under the sanction of Government dated 4th June 1840 a quantity of spontaneous Salt to the extent of 40-200 was Collected in the year under review in the Tudda Division The Board would have been glad to know the cost of gathering &c.

In Cons. 25th June 1840

which they do not find Exhibited in any of the statements Enclosed in the report.

Sayer- 5 Under the Head of Sayer there was an Increase of 14,143-12-4 in the Current and of 13,881-9-8. in the Gross Collections, arising from a large Increase in the amount of Duty paid on Indigo, together with an Increase in the Collection from — Chayroot, lamp and gingily oil seed — Tobacco and Betel- The net Revenue amounted to 87,579-14-11 and Exceeded the net Revenue from Sayer in Fusly 1248 by — 13,960-6-7

Demand & Current Collection.
Fusly 1248-90,903-3-7
1249-1,05,046-5-11
14,143-12-4

6 of the Balance outstanding at the End of Fusly 1248, amounting to 667-9-8- the sum of Rupees 230—4 were realized in the Fusly under review, and proper measures have been taken by the Principal Collector for the recovery of the remainder.—

Sea Customs.
Current Collns.
1248- 6,202-3-10.
1249- 10,859-5-8.
Increase 4,657-1-10.

7. The Increase of Rupees 4,657-1-10 which appears under the Head of Sea Customs occurred in the Collections of Export Duty— The net

Net Revenue amounted to Rupees 8,902-9-0. Exceeding the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 by Rupees 4,636-13-11.

Abkarry. 8. The Abkarry Farm was rented in the year under review for 19,665-6- being Rupees 319-6- in excess of the Rent of Fusly 1248. The Balance of 477-5-11 outstanding at the close of the Fusly had been recovered in full before the date of the Report. The gross receipts amounted to 19,467-15-10 and the Net Revenue to 19,131-15-10. falling short of the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 by Rupees 359-14-1.

9. In the Net Revenue from small farms and Licenses, which amounted to 289-9-4- there was a Decrease of 73-8-11 and in the Net Revenue from Stamps amounting to 13,903-4-2 an Increase of 1121-14-8. Neither of which require remark.

10. The Settlement of the Moturpha Revenue amounted to 20495-8-3- exceeding the Demand for Fusly 1248 by

by

Rupees 1912---7 arising from the Collections under this head in the Choondy Zemindary having been carried to the account of Government for the first time in the present year, as well as from the resumption of the Jaghire of Woodiagherry and an increase in the number of Loans and houses which paid the tax, the Collections within the Fusly amounted to 18,204-1-2 besides arrears to the Extent of 453---, making the total receipts 18,657-1-8- The same view, there being no charges, formed the amount of Net Revenue, which exceeded the Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 by Rupees 645-7-2.

11. Of the Balances for the Fusly under review outstanding at its close Rupees 703-15-9 had been collected upto the date of the report, and of the Remainder, 700 Rupees is considered recoverable. The rest, is stated to be Chiefly due by parties who dispute their liability to the Sarcar.

12. The total Demand under

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

under all the Heads of Extra Revenue amounted to 6,25,833-12-4 exceeding the Demand of the year preceding by Rupees 42,129-14-- The gross receipts in the year, including Extra Collections and Arrears, amounted to Rupees 62,6636-1-5 or ---- 40437-12-9 in Excess of the receipts of Fusly 1248 - Owing to an Increase of charge to the Extent of 27,670 ---- which occurred almost intirely from the larger Manufacture of Salt, the Excess in the Net Revenue was not more than 12,767-12-1 the aggregate Net Revenue of Fusly 1248 being 5,12,591-7---- and of Fusly 1249 - 5,25,359-3-1.

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing Extract from the Board's Proceedings with the annexed Comparative Statement of the Collections, Charges and Net Revenue, be submitted to

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

to Government, and a transcript of the same be forwarded to the Principal Collector of Nellore for his information and guidance.

Nellore

18302

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Vellore - Fusly 1249 -

		Fusly 1248			Fusly 1249			Increase			Decrease		
		Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Salt	Demand	4,35,481	6	11.	4,55,437	12	2.	19,956	5	3.	-	-	-
	Balance on the 1st July	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Current Collection	4,35,481	6	11.	4,55,437	12	2	19,956	5	3.	-	-	-
	Extra Dr.	926	12	4.	1,510	8	-	583	11	8.	-	-	-
	Arrears	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	4,36,408	3	3.	4,56,948	4	2	20,540	-	11.	-	-	-
	Charges	52,450	-	2.	80,053	8	10.	27,603	8	8.	-	-	-
	Net Revenue	3,83,958	3	1.	3,76,894	11	4.	-	-	-	7,063	7	9
Sayer	Demand	90,903	3	7	1,05,046	15	11	14,143	12	4.	-	-	-
	Balance on the 1st July	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Current Collection	90,903	3	7	1,05,046	15	11.	14,143	12	4.	-	-	-
	Extra Dr.	232	11	8	195	-	3.	-	-	-	37	11	5.
	Arrears	454	7	7	230	-	4	-	-	-	224	7	3
	Total	91,590	6	10.	1,05,472	-	6	13,881	9	8.	-	-	-
	Charges	17,170	4	6	17,892	1	7.	21	3	1	-	-	-
	Net Revenue	1,07,760	2	4	1,23,364	14	13	15,903	6	7	-	-	-
Sea Customs	Demand	62,023	10.	10	1,07,359	5	2.	45,371	10	-	-	-	-
	Balance on the 1st July	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Current Collection	62,023	10.	10	1,07,359	5	2.	45,371	10	-	-	-	-
	Extra Dr.	364	5	7	355	1	3.	-	-	-	9	4	4
	Arrears	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	63,869	5.	11	1,07,146	11	11	43,277	13	6	-	-	-
	Charges	2,300	13	6.	2,311	12	1.	10	15	7	-	-	-
	Net Revenue	47,651	11	11.	1,04,834	14	10.	43,266	13	11.	-	-	-
Abkary	Demand	19,346	-	-	19,665	6	-	319	6	-	-	-	-
	Balance on the 1st July	2004	8	-	477	5	11	277	13	-	-	-	-
	Current Collection	19,145	11	4.	19,188	-	1.	42	4	9	-	-	-
	Extra Dr.	120	7	2	79	11	1	-	-	-	40	11	1
	Arrears	361	11	10	200	4	2	-	-	-	361	7	2
	Total	19,827	14	4	19,467	15	10.	-	-	-	359	14	6
	Charges	336	-	-	336	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Revenue	19,491	14	4	19,131	15	10.	-	-	-	359	14	6
Sundry small sums & Licenses	Demand	291	12	4	291	12	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Balance on the 1st July	5	-	-	5	3	-	2	3	-	-	-	-
	Current Collection	288	12	4	286	9	4	-	-	-	2	3	-
	Extra Dr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Arrears	74	5	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	71	5	-
	Total	363	14	4	289	9	4	-	-	-	73	8	-
	Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Revenue	362	14	4	289	9	4	-	-	-	73	8	-

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

| | | |

practised deception on me in respect to his cultivation. The evidence, indeed his own admissions, sufficiently testify to the great impropriety of his conduct, in other respects as Head Sheristadar of the Cutcherry.—

3 Ramanjarow appears to have first established cultivation in several Villages when he was Sheristadar of the Zillah Court in consequence as he alleges of the insufficiency of his pay. This was both when he was Sheristadar of the Cud Division and subsequently when Deputy Sheristadar in the Principal Collector's Cutcherry. It was not held in his own name In the Village of Reddypollem in the Talamanchee Taluk it was in the name of Nackalapully Venkatanarsoo the Criminal Record Keeper in the Zillah Court of Nellore, a son of Ramanjarow's sister, and living in the same house with him as an undivided family. In the

the Village of Codoor it was in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasa-chariar, a person in his house I believe his Cook Brahmin and in Nellore also it was in the name of the same person. In Sungiapollem it was first in the name of Talatoor Santacharloo and subsequently of Toomoolcor Caunachetty, and it appears from the accounts that Ramanjarow had also cultivation in the Village of Yedliapollem in the Nellore Taluk. A few months after I joined the District I found that Ramanjarow was annually receiving Puttawaree remission on Reddypollem as a Punyacary Cultivator. I joined the District on the 1st April 1835 or about 3 months before the close of Fusly 1244 Ramanjarow was appointed Head Sheristadar on the 15th June of that Fusly. On his appointment I intimated to him that I conceived it to have been improper his having been as Deputy Sheristadar receiving Puttawaree remission

on

on his cultivation in Reddypollam and that I considered it still more unprofitable as Head Shereshdar his keeping cultivation in the Government Village like other Cowar Ryots and that it must as a sine qua non be thrown up I was then informed of his Reddypollam cultivation only he appeared reluctant to throw it up & represented that it was inconvenient doing so immediately, and as I did not wish to inconvenience him I consented to his keeping it for Fasly 1244, but informed him that he could not be allowed Puttee remission, -sion, and none was allowed for Fasly 1245 From Fasly 1246 the cultivation was to be given up.

4 Ramiengaroo at the same time stated that he had no cultivation in any other Government Villages He had a Candrega in the Village of Jockapully Cordoor in the Cawalty

Cawalty Talook but Candregas are a species of private property, and I told him therefore that I saw no objection to his retaining it, He also had also he said a Cocoanut Garden in the Village of Cordoor and that his Cattle grazed in the same Village of Cordoor, upon which he paid the Poollary tax and in connection which there appeared to me at the time nothing objectionable. I was then aware of what has since come to light, the nature of the Veesahuddy tenure of the lands in this Village which shews that the grazing of cattle in the Veesahuddy cattle lands is incompatible with having no cultivation in it, at least approved to the universally received and established usage of all Veesahuddy Villages in this District.

5 Subsequently on more occasions than one it had been represented

represented to me by persons in the Village of Codoor that the Sheristadar had secretly cultivation on that Village, and that it was entered fictitiously in another persons name on those occasions I asked Ramanjarow, and he always in the most solemn and unqualified terms denied having any cultivation whatever either in Codoor or any other Village, and that the statement was made through enmity. From the high opinion I entertained of him and knowing also that he had enemies in persons connected with the Moorgamoor family I accepted with confidence his assurances and made no further enquiry.

In march 1839 the circumstance was brought to my notice by and strongly affirmed by the Assistant Sahsildar of the Nellore Talook in which the Village of Codoor is situated and also from his Cousin

returned

situation was likely to be correctly informed on the subject and upon further enquiry of the Reddy who was stated to be managing the cultivation for Ramanjarow, also of those who had been Tahsildars of the Talook during the period referred to and of other persons who appeared to me most likely to be informed on the subject there was such a concentrated body of evidence speaking to the contrary which Ramanjarow had denied that I found it necessary to take the matter up seriously, for if true, I felt that he was utterly undeserving of my further confidence.

The first case which has been entered into therefore is the circumstance as to whether or not Ramanjarow while denying it to me has in fact and in truth kept exclusively cultivation in the Village of Codoor, also in the Village of Reddypollem in the Village of Talamunchee

Fort St. George 24th. December 1841.

Salandachee Salook. It has been affirmed and I think with reason that Ramanjarow has also kept cultivation secretly in the Nellore Cudah, but the extent is not large and it seems unnecessary to enter particularly into it.

No. 1 & Baur Baukroorow the assistant Sahsildar of the Nellore Salook deposes that Ramanjarow has long had a Cumnatum in the Village of Codoor, that up to the close of Fusly 1247 it was managed for him by Cundoola Soobbareddy who threw it up as he told witness because it was a loss upon himself, that Ramanjarow took away the produce and grazed his cattle, while the Shist payable to the Circar was a charge upon himself. Soobbareddy's relinquishment of the management seems also to have arisen from some disagreements between him and Ramanjarow. On Soobbareddy giving up the management, it was made over by

Fort St. George 24th. December 1841.

by Ramanjarow to another Reddy named Tammunkauk Venkatramreddy.

No. 2 I next examined Puttry Prestnarow who had been Sahsidar of the Nellore Salook. He stated that it was known that Ramanjarow had Cultivation in Codoor, and that it was managed by Cundala Soobbareddy up to Fusly 1247 that a relation of Soobbareddy's had told him that it was not their intention to keep it any longer, but to make it over to Tammunkauk Venkatramreddy.

No. 3 The next person examined was Yaragoodee panty Nurraiah one of the Sheristah Coomastahs and who was likely to be acquainted with the circumstance having been a few months previously deputed by me to Codoor to make an enquiry into the individual balances outstanding

outstanding on that Village for Fasly
1247 He deposes that Vannumbank Ven-
catramreddy Cundoola Soobbareddy's
brother in law whose name he did
not know, Curnum Ramanpah and
another brahmin whose name he
did not know all severally told him
that Ramanjarow had 3 Seevahuddy
Ploughs cultivation at Codoor &
managed till then by Cundoola
Soobbareddy, and from Fasly 1248 &
by Vannumbank Venkatramreddy.
He deposed moreover that there was
a balance of 30 Rupees for Fasly 1247
in the Codoor Village in the name
of Moodoomkee Kristnamachabo
Ramanjarow's man in whose
name the Commutations was en-
tered during the period that Ra-
manjarow admits that he had the
cultivation of that from the enquiries
he made he understood that this
balance was due on account
of

of Ramanjarow's Puttah that 30 Rupees
had been deducted from the payments
made on account of the Circar Shist
by the Ryots and carried to the credit
of a sum of 30 Rupees due on the
said Kristnamachabo's cultivation
on account of River channel fines
and that from this cause a revenue
balance of 30 Rupees was outstanding
ing on the Village.

No 4 Cundala Soobareddy was
then examined and he deposed to the
fact of his having managed Raman-
jarows cultivation for Fasly 1246
and 1247, and in Fasly 1248 Maurum-
reddy Soobbareddy and others were
managing it through Vannumbank
Venkatramreddy. Soobareddy states
that Ramanjarow's cultivation in
Codoor consisted of 3 Seevahuddy
Ploughs out of 40, the total number
in the Village that he Soobareddy
gave it up because he was a loser
by it, he having to cultivate the
land

land and pay the circar Shist, while Ramanjarow enjoyed the pastures attached to that land. It may be as well here to explain that the pasture lands of the Codoor Village are not perhaps equalled by any in the District both as to extent and quality, and this is the great inducement to Ryots to hold cultivation there Viz.t for the sake of the pasture land. By Coobareddy managing Ramanjarow's cultivation the only consideration which rendered it an object of desire to have cultivations in the Village was removed. There is nine years out of ten more loss than profit on the mere cultivation on account of the inferior quality of the lands, the Village being near the Sea Coast, and were it not for the pastures the cultivation would hardly be worth keeping.

N.o 23 12 On his subsequent re-examination by Ramanjarow, it was evident

he had come with the intention of retracting his former testimony though it was difficult to bring him to it in plain and decided terms. His declaration plainly shews that he was endeavouring to steer a middle course which was still more clearly demonstrated by the manner in which he gave his evidence. In his answer to the first question, he says the Sheristadar "through me" in carried on Fuslies 1245, 1246, and 1247, and subsequently I understand through Vannambank Venkatramreddy, but it was not his (Sheristadars) own cultivation. During the three years I had it, the grass produce was taken by me, and I paid the Shist. When there was loss I always paid it. I never had any profit

profit on it. Soobbareddy states on further that when the cummatum was given over "into his charge" in Fusly 1245 he was told that he was to enjoy the profit but it was not entered in the Dittum or Puttah in his name, that having held the cummutum for three years he had given it up for two reasons, the death of his tala maneeahee (overseer) and because he had always sustained loss on the cultivation, that during the three years he had the Cummutum he neither sent nor does he know of any portion of the produce of the Cummutum having been sent to Ramanjarow, that none was given by his order and that it is nothing to him (Soobareddy) if any other person gave any.-

He

He then proceeds to state in direct terms that Ramanjarow has a garden and cattle in Codoor but no cultivation since the Cummutum was given up by Moodoomeewar in whose name it was held when Ramanjarow had the cultivation but upon being asked what he means by having no cultivation, he states that the Poollary and Garden Shist being entered in the Puttah and jointly entered in the Puttah and Dittum. He stated there was no cultivation. This assertion of Ramanjarow having no cultivation is in subsequent answer more fully explained, when Soobbareddy being asked whether the Moodoomeewar or Ramanjarow have had any connection with the cultivation during the three years he (Soobareddy) held the cummutum, he replies that "their bullocks and people did not come and plough the lands. That there was no cause" by which he on subsequently

subsequiently explained himself to mean that the non existence of a cause was because he (Soobbareddy) took the gross produce and paid the Circar Shist, but all this was perfectly compatible with what has been alleged, viz namely, that the Cummatum was still Ramanjarows, but the cultivation of it carried on by Soobbareddy for him while Ramanjarow Kept possession of the pasture lands belonging to the Cummatum for his Cattle.

13 Soobbareddy then proceeds to say that he allowed the Sheristadar Cattle to graze on the Vessaluddy Cattle land of the Moodaum-=keewar Cummatum after it had been given up by them because he was a great man and a public Servant, and his Cattle had always grazed there before, that he (Soobbareddy) had cattle land sufficient for himself and also because he

he said he would pay the Polary.-

14 About a month after this examination of Soobareddy, I received an arzee from him dated the 21st December 1839 which at once explained the inconsistency in the two Statements he had made, in the first affirming that the Sheristadar had cultivation in Codoor, and in the second denying it. I beg to transmit a translate of that Arzee G, also a translate of another Arzee H. received about the same time from some of the Codoor Ryots.-

No. 6. 15.- The next witness I examined was a Hoozoor Dalayet named Cremedi Pedda Soobbiah, who has for some time had the superintendence of the irrigation of the Jaffier Sahib's Channel, and its tributary Channels, one of which is that leading to the Village of Codoor - all Villages supplied by river channels are bound to send

send a certain proportion (generally regulated by the number of Roughs) of laborers to clear out those channels, and the duty of the Dalayet superintending the irrigation is to see that the proportions allotted to the several Ryots having Roughs are duly sent, and to forward to the Talook Cutcherry of the absentees, who are chargeable for their non attendance with the usual river channel fine. The Dalayet states that Ramanjarow has been carrying on cultivation through Cundoola Soobareddy of 1½ Share in Codoor up to last fuoly (1247), that from the Current year (Fuoly 1248) Soobareddy had given it up, and Vanumbauk Venkatramreddy was having the Cultivation carried on. That for the 1½ Share which Ramanjarow had in that Village one and half pardons should work at the Jaffer Sahib's

channel

P.S. a large share which consists of two small shares.

channel, that since the death of a certain Talsildar which occurred in August 1836, or beginning of fuoly 1246 Ramanjarow's laborers had not come to work.

No 7 16. One Nalatoor Turdacharlo, an Inhabitant of Codoor and holding one of Mr.e Fraser Canjem Puttahs in that Village speaks also to Ramanjarow having a cultivation of three Shares in 40 which was managed by Cundoola Soobbareddy up to last year (Fuoly 1247) and by Vanumbauk Venkatramreddy in Fuoly 1248.

No 8 17. The Deputy Sheristadar of the Cutcherry who was evidently a reluctant witness, states that in Codoor a Cummatum was kept for some years prior to Fuoly 1245 for the sake of the Cattle, Moodoombee Streenevasacharlo's name was entered in the Circar accounts, and the cattle

grazed

grazed in the pasture lands, according to the Veesabuddy proportions subsequently in Fusly 1245. the Dittum &c. was formed in the names of Candoola Soobbareddy, and Moodoombee Streenevasacharlos, in Fusly 1246 in the names of Candoola Soobbareddy and Moodoombee Vencata-krista-nacharlos, and for the current year, Fusly 1248, in Vanumbauk Vencata ramreddy's name, and cattle are grazed in common with other Ryots on the pasture lands according to the Veesabuddy proportions.

No. 9. 18

The next witness examined was Subuck Arundarow who had held the office of Settore Tahsildar subsequently to Fusly 1244 at the close of which year Ramanjarow affirms that he relinquished his cultivation in Codoor. He speaks to the same effect as the others; about Ramanjarows having

having cultivation. That on his asking Soobbareddy to keep the land as usual for Fusly 1248, he said that he had sustained much loss on it, that the Sheristadar's cattle grazed in the proportion of pasture land allotted to the Dittum held in the name of the said Vencatakristanacharlos, that he (Soobbareddy) had sustained much loss on that account, that a large balance was due to him, that he could stand it no longer, and that he did not want the Dittum. He (the witness) states further what is no less important than true, and which will be again noticed in a subsequent part of this report, that the fact of the Sheristadar's cattle grazing on the proportion of pasture land allotted to this Dittum is

is sufficient of itself to prove that the Dittum land is the Sheristadar's.

In his answer to the 4th question he states that the Villagers will not give Beedoo land for the pasturage of Cattle to any one who has not cultivation in the Village in which his cattle graze, that he can state decidedly that the circumstance of the Sheristadar's cattle grazing in the proportion of pasture land allotted to the Cummatum could not take place without the Cummatum being inwardly his.-

No. 11. 19.- The Head Assistant Sheristadar who has been employed in this Cutcherry since the assumption of the Country states that although the Sheristadar for a long time past has had cultivation in Cudoor, he has kept

kept it in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo his servant and not in his own name, and had the Dittum and Puttahs prepared in his (the servants) name, up to Fusly 1244 but having at the close of that Fusly been appointed Sheristadar he considered that if entered only in Streenevasacharloo's name it would be known that it belonged to himself, and he therefore had it entered jointly in the names of Streenevasacharee and Cundoola Soobbareddy, took more than he had up to Fusly 1244, and had a remark written in the Dittum that the land having been given up by Streenevasacharee, had been taken by Cundala Soobbareddy. He states further that as the Sheristadar's cattle are now grazing

in

in the pasture lands allotted according to the Veesabuddy shares in the Village, there is not the least ground to doubt his (the Sheristadar's) still having cultivation there, notwithstanding the fictitious entry in the Dittum - That Ryots in any Village will agree to receive grazing tax for one or two cattle of individuals who have no cultivation, and allow them to graze in Minha lands, but they will not allow many Cattle belonging to any one to graze from year to year without his having cultivation according to the Veesabuddy - that he made enquiry when he went to the Village in Fusly 1246, and it was then known that although the names of Kistnamacharlu and Wobul=reddy were entered, the Cummatum belonged to the Sheristadar.

No. 13. 20. The evidence of Aummanchala Ramana the

the Peishcar of the Village of Codoor and under whose immediate eye the cultivation and management of the Village is conducted, is to the same effect, and I would call the Board's especial attention to this man's statement. -

No. 17. 21. The next witness whose evidence it is of importance to notice is that of Vanumbaukt Vencataramreddy who is one of the leading Reddies in the District, and who it will have been seen is stated to have taken up the management of the Sheristadar's cultivation when relinquished by Cundoola Soobbareddy at the close of Fusly 1247 - Vencatramreddy deposes that Ramayarow had up to that day cultivation in Codoor - For some time the Puttahs and Dittums were in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasachurlu and Ramayarow used himself to manage the cultivation, pay the Circar Money and enjoy the profit and loss of the Cummatum. - For the last three years

Cundoola

Cundoola Soobareddy used to manage the Cummatum and procured laborers for its cultivation. The public revenue on it was paid through Cundoola Soobba=reddy and the profit and loss on it was Ramanjarow's. He deposed further that Ramanjarow used to graze about 60 head of cattle separately in the pasture land allotted in proportion to his Ploughs - that he used to graze his cattle according to the Vecabuddy in the same way as all the other Ryots used to carray on their cultivation and graze their cattle - that at the beginning of the current year (Fuoly 1248) Ramanjarow sent for him (Vencatramreddy) to Nellore and told him that from this year he must carray on the cultivation of his (Ramanjarow's) Cumtum land, that the land would not be kept

with

with Cundoola Soobareddy as he had declined to carry it on - Subsequently Ramanjarow told him that he (Vencatramreddy) must have the land entered in his (Vencatramreddy's) name, and that the loss and profit on it would be his (Ramanjarow's) that he should let his cattle graze at Codoor as hitherto, that accordingly he (Vencatramreddy) did have the Cummatum land put in his own name for Fuoly 1248, and got the land cultivated and that Ramanjarow's cattle were up to that time grazing in the cattle land allotted to that Cummatum. -

22. Before pro-ceeding to notice the bearing of the official records on the question, I think it right to men= tion that Seetaramoodoo, one of the Curnums of Codoor was not examined by me in consequence of Ramanjarow strongly

strongly objecting to his examination on account of an ill-feeling which he declared the Curnum to entertain towards him - He was an important witness as will be apparent when the Dittums are considered, and well acquainted with all that had taken place, but there is no doubt that he is not actuated by the best feelings towards Ramanjarow and I therefore did not examine him. The other two Curnums were called by Ramanjarow for his defence, and their examination was open to a simi= =lar objection to that urged against Seetaraimoodoo, they being as notoriously partial to Ramanjarow, as Seetaramoo= =doo is inimical to him. -

23 I now proceed to the consideration of the official records: These comprize chiefly the Dittums: Shist forms, and Poollary accounts. -

First.

First as regards the Dittums:

24. These are Statements for each Village - formed usually early in the year shewing the lands occupied for the year, the name of the occupants, the number of Ploughs belonging to the cultivation of each Ryot whose name is entered in the Dittum, with other particulars - each Puttadar should sign the Dittum himself or by proxy. -

In the Dittum of Fusly 1244 this Cummatum is entered in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo but not signed for him by any one. That Ramanjarow had this cultiva= =tion up to the close of Fusly 1244 is not attempted to be denied. -

25.

In the Dittum of Fusly 1245 it is entered in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo and Cundoola Soobbareddy, and is signed by Soobbareddy with the following remark. "Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo

26.

Streenevasacharloo having given up this land it has been given to Cundoola Soobbareddy."-

27.- The fictitious character of this remark is self apparent- If Streenevasacharloo had in reality given up the Cummatum, not only would he have given a formal resignation of it in writing denominated as Estifa, as is the universal practice in the District in all cases of an entire relinquishment of land by a Ryot, but even without it there was no necessity for his name being entered jointly with Soobbareddy in the Column appropriated for the names of the occupant Ryots for the year.- If the cultivation had been in reality relinquished, there was no necessity whatever, so far from it, it was absolutely irregular and improper for

Streenevasacharloo

Streenevasacharloo's name to appear as he does in the Dittum as a joint occupant with Cundoola Soobbareddy.-

28. The Board may naturally ask why Ramanjarow should have Streenevasacharloo's name continue to appear in the Dittum when by a private arrangement with Soobbareddy he might have still kept the cummatum, and done it more secretly.- The public accounts are those which are decisive of the title to occupancy, and had the Moodoombeewars name disappeared altogether from the public accounts, the Cummatum would probably have been lost to Ramanjarow, and with it the right to the Cattle land, if Cundoola Soobbareddy had at any time been disposed to convert it in truth and in fact to his own use, an event not by any means improbable considering that cultivation in this Village is much sought

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

sought after on account of the valuable and large extent of pasture which belongs to it. The object and intent of keeping the Moodoombeewar's name in the Dittum was simply to keep his hold on the Cummatum, and at the same time by having the name of a joint occupant entered in the Dittum to leave a door to creep out of, in the event of the matter being ever brought forward. The Moodoombeewar have never up to the present day given a relinquishment in writing of their Cummatum in this Village, a practice which has been universally followed for years in all similar cases. -

29. - The Dittum of Fooly 1246 is still on a singular. -

Fort St. George 24 December 1840.

singulars. In this year there were two Dittums. The first was forwarded by the Tahsildars to the Honble. on in September 1836. The reason of there being a second Dittum was this. In most Veesabuddy Villages there is a periodical division of all the wet lands of the Village. This was to take place in Cadoor in fusly 1246 and it was the wish of the Ryots, that the Dittum and Puttahs for that year should be issued according to the new division of the lands. The first Dittum for the year was therefore merely nominal. The cummatum was however entered in it thus "Cundoola Soobbareddy instead of Moodoombee Streenevasachar loo-5. Ploughs the same as in fusly 1246" and signed by Curnum Seetaramoodoo for Soobba reddy. To this Dittum is appended a remark signed by the Tahsildar, Head Gomastah and the two principal Reddies of the Village Vanambaukk Venkatramreddy and Maurumreddy Soobareddy saying that the Ryots were desirous that year of marking a

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

a new division of the lands, and that the Puttahs should be issued at the settlement according to the new distribution that as it had not yet been finished the dittum had been sent us in last year

30. The second dittum containing the new division of the lands was subsequently sent according to which the settlement Puttahs for the year were issued and in this dittum the names of Moodoombee Vencata Kristnama charloo and Cundoola Soobareddy are both entered - It is not signed by any one for the Cummeturdars

Entry in the Dittum "Moodoombee Vencata Kristna charloo and Cundoola Soobareddy"

31. This second dittum establishes one point of great importance namely that the Moodoombees name continued to be entered as connected with the Cummatum after a new division of the lands had taken place I mention it as matter of importance because the explanation given by the witnesses on the part of the defence for the Moodoombees name continuing to appear in

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

in the Public accounts after the asserted resignation of the Cummatum at the close of fusly 1244 is this, that it was the practice to enter the name of the old Cummaturndar as well as the new one till such time as a new division of the lands of the Village took place - In fusly 1246 a new division took place the Moodoombeewars name appeares in it as it had done previously and I will now proceed to shew that it appeared also singly in the fusly following the new division -

32. The entry in the dittum of fusly 1247 is thus -

Moodoombee Vencata Kristnama

charloo 5 1/2 Ploughs -

(signed) Vanumbauk Vencatramreddy

for Vencata Kristnamacharloo

33. It is clearly proved by the evidence and admitted on all sides that Cundoola Soobareddy had the cultivation of the Cummatum for fuslies 1245, 46 and 47 and yet his name does not appear in the

the dittums of that year. Would it have been so had the cultivation been really soobareddy's. The Cummatum is entered in the name of Moodoombee Venkata = Krishnamachurlo, and Cundoola Soobareddy does not even sign for him but Vanumbauk Venkatramireddy -

34. Again in the Dittum of fusly 1243 it is thus entered -

"Moodoombee Venkata Kristnma = "=charee. Cummatum For the current "year Vanumbauk Venkatramireddy 5 p/s "Plough"

35. Even taking the dittums so alone and viewing the entries in the several years shewing as they do that in every year subsequent to fusly 1244 the year in which the Moodoom- =beers are affirmed to have given up their cultivation their names ap- =pear as connected with the dittum and even in that of fusly 1247 without any joint occupant - I think there is sufficient to say without hesitation that the Cummatum was still the Moodoombeers' up to the close of fusly 1248 But other papers will make

make this more evident -

36. Next as regards the Shist Forms, these are tabular Statements corresponding with the Puttahs issued to the individual Puttadars, and exhibiting all particulars relating to each mans extent of cultivation, number of ploughs and the amount of his assessment, to which the signature of each Puttadar is affixed -

37. In the Shist Form of fusly 1244 Vanumbauk Venkatramireddy signed for Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo -

38. In that of fusly 1245 the following is the entry Cundoola Soobba = =reddy Cummatum Moodoombee Streene = =vasacharloo 5 ploughs" -

(Signed) Soobareddy -

39- In the Shist Form of fusly 1246 The entry is "Moodoombee Venkata = "=kristnamacharloo and Goorreem = Vobulreddy 5 ploughs -

(Signed) Cundoola Soobareddy for Venkata Kristnamacharloo and Vobulreddy

40- In the Shist Form of fusly 1247. The entry is as follows -

Moodoombee

"Moodoombee Vencata Kristnamachar=
=loo 5/12 Ploughs"

(Signed) Vanumbauk Vencatramreddy
for Vencata Kristamachurloo

To this is appended a Kyfeat taken up=
=parently by the Sheristadar from two
cumnums of the Villuge Tulpoor Rawo=
=napah and Annutapully Kristnamee=
41. The following is a trans=
=late of the Kyfeat -

"In the Sittum and Puttah
"for fusly 1246 the names of Moodoombee &
Vencata Kristnamachurloo and Cundoola Soobu=
=reddy are entered, whereas in the
current year fusly 1247 Moodoombee &
Vencata Kristnamachurloo's name only
having been entered in the Sittum
we had the Shist form and Puttah
written in his name but Moodoombee
Vencata Kristamachurloo is nominal
Cundoola Soobareddy is entitled to
the land that is to say he cultivates
the land and enjoys the profit and
loss in consequence of which the
right to this land appertains to Cun=
=doola Soobareddy" This is our voluntary
declaration

declaration -

I submit to the Board
42 -
whether such a Statement as this was ne=
=cessary whether if the Moodoombeevar
that is to say himself had in reality
given up the Cummatum in fusly 1244 &
if Moodoombee Vencata Kristamachurloo
were as mentioned in the Statement
merely nominal and the bona fide
occupant and cultivator Cundoola Sooba=
=reddy. If these things were true would
any Sheristadar have hesitated to correct
the entry in the Sittum the Shist form
and the Puttahs to transfer it at once
from the name of the person who was
his own nominee for the Cummatum &
previous to its relinquishment in fusly
1244 to the name of the person to whom
it truly belonged. would not Ramanja
Row as Sheristadar if all were open
and straight forward and if as he asserts
the Moodoombeevar had no concern in
the Cummatum since fusly 1244 have at once
struck his name out of the Sittum

and

and have had the Cummatum and the Puttah for it issued in the name not of the nominal but the real occupant- all that took place regarding the ~~a~~ ditterms and shist forms and Poolliay accounts as I shall now proceed to notice are reconcileable with the Cummatum being still the Moodoombeewar but utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that they had relinquished it -

43.

There is another paper on the records which appears most inconsistent with Ramanjarow's assertion of his Cummatum having been given up in Jusly 1244. It is the draft of an order passed by him to the Pellace Tahsildar on the report of G. Nursiah whom I have already mentioned as having been deputed to enquire into the Cadoon balances of Jusly 1247 in the beginning of 1839 or middle of Jusly 1248- The following is a translate of a passage in it -

"The Curnums of that Village have caused a remark to be entered "in the account of the Moodjoor a Goomastah

"Goomastah shewing the balance payable by W. Subbreddy to be in the name "of Moodoombee Kristnamacharloo who "is not present and it does not appear "that the circumstance has been properly enquired into - you must enquire "properly into the circumstance and inform about the difference - If the balance "according to your account is found "to be payable by Gorrum Subbreddy's "Cummatum, the correct amount of the "river channel fines ought to be collected "because you have stated that it was "due in consequence of the Ayen Collections having been credited on account "of river channel fines - As this balance "should be paid by the said Cummatdar "- dar some how or other, you will ca u o "collect the said sum of 46-14-1 with- "out delay from this Cummatumdar "or from any other person by whom "it may be found to be due" -

I submit that if the

44.

Moodoombeewar

Moodoombeecuar had given up the Cummutum in fusly 1244 would not the Sheristadar have stated in plain terms that such was the case and have directed an explanation to be taken from the cumums how there could be a balance due for fusly 1247 by a cummatumdar who had given up his Cummatum in fusly 1244. No doubt he would have done so if the Cummatum had in truth been relinquished, but the circumstance is still more remarkable when as was the case, the remarks in the balance statement distinctly affirmed that the Moodoombeecuar had only given up their cultivation in fusly 1247 I shall have to recur to this point again —

45. I shall now notice the Poollary Accounts —

46. In fusly 1243 the Poollary account shews the total number of Ramanjarows' cattle to have been 84 of which 14 were declared as ploughing cattle, leaving 70 - The amount

amount of Poollary payable on the actual number of cattle was Rupees 26-13-0 whereas that charged was the Veesabuddy proportion which amounted only to 19- 3-10. This was correct because he was in that year a Veesabuddy Cummatumdar but In reality the circumstance because in every subsequent year although he says he had given up his Veesabuddy Cummatum in 1244 his Poollary is charged according to the Veesabuddy proportion the same as when he had the cummatum - If he had no longer a cummatum, there was no reason why he should pay Poollary as if he had a cummatum unless he really had it. He ought and would have paid upon the actual number of his cattle and the only inference to be drawn from his paying according to Veesabuddy is that he still had a Cummatum in the Village —

In fusly 1244 the last

47- year

year in which Ramanjarow says he had cultivation ix Cobon the total number of his cattle were 41 of which 20 were deducted for 5 ploughs- leaving a remain- =der of 21- The account shews that he had actually but 14 whereas 20 were deducted as the proportionate number for five ploughs, the established rate of deduction for this Village being four bullocks per plough- The amount ac- =tually charged to Ramanjarow in the Village was 10/2 Rupees being the Peesa- =buddy proportion of the Cammatum @ which he had in the Village - 48.

In the Poollary account of Fusly 1245 there is not a single head of the cattle entered in the name of Moodoo- =beenar or Ramanjarow - In Cundoo- =da Soobareddy's name 5 Ploughs are entered, and 17 ploughing cattle- but these are not deducted from other cattle for none are shewn. 103 R cattle are entered separately in the account in the name of Soo- =bareddy and Gooroom Noobulreddy

and

and no ploughing bullocks deducted there- =from- The Poollary payable upon the number of cattle was 35-4-0 but in the Shist Fasly 27-15-0 only is actually charged for the said cattle -

The Poollary account of 49- fusly 1245 therefore shews that the Heris- =tudar had no the cattle in that years- By a comparative statement have- =ever of the Poollary of fusties 1245 and 1246 prepared in the latter year, and signed by the Mazoomdar of the Nellore @ Talook and by the Cobon Curnums Rowa- =napah and Seetaramoodoo the Heristar- =dar the cattle are shewn to have been incorporated in fusly 1245 with those of Soobareddy's and to have formed part of the 103 cattle entered in Soobareddys name as above men- =tioned. This comparative Account shews the proportion of the 27-15-0 chargeable to each, that is to the Heristudar and Soobareddy, Ramanjarows share was 16-8-0,

and

and the remainder was charged to Soobareddy - It is clear therefore that in this year also when he says he had not the Cummatum in Cadoor he paid Poollary as Veesabuddy Cummatumdar the same as he had done in the previous fusly when he avowedly had a Cummatum in this Village - Why Ramanjaraw's the cattle should have been all incorporated with Soobareddy's does not appear and it is at least suspicious as to the existence of some private arrangement between them -

5-0.

The Poollary accounts of fusly 1246 are more conclusive - In them Moodoombee Venkata Krishnamachariar's name only is entered - The account in his name stands thus -

Total cattle chargeable 61-3/8

Deduct -

Ploughing cattle for 5 Ploughs 20.

Sundry Accounts ..... 4 24.

Remainder - 37/8

On which the Poollary chargeable upon the number of Cattle is Rupees 18-9-"

Why I may ask should 20 Cattle for five

five ploughs be deducted in this year from Ramanjaraw's cattle if he had relinquished his cultivation in fusly 1244 but in this year also he paid Poollary as if he had a Veesabuddy Cummatum in the Village - The Poollary payable on the number of cattle was Rupees 18-9-" while his Poollary according to the Veesabuddy proportion amounted to 20-7-" which was that entered in the shist form and paid

In the Poollary account

5/-

of fusly 1247 the name of Moodoombee Venkata Krishnamachariar was first entered and above it in the hand writing of the Head Goomastah of the Taluk Cutcherry is written "Belonging to Soondaraghery Venkatarungum" -

5-2.

The entry in the account stands thus Ploughs 5- Cattle 82-

Head of Cattle chargeable 66 3/8

Deduct -

Ploughing cattle 20-

Sundry Accounts ..... 4 24.

Remainder 42-3/8

The Poollary according to the number of

* A Boy of 12 years of age the son of Ramanjaraws elder brother and an undivided family -

Fort St George 24th December 1840

of Cattle is Rupees 21-3-a.p.- Here as in fusly 1246 we have ploughing bullocks for the ploughs of this Cummatum deducted from Ramanjarows own Cattle - Is it to be believed, is it not indeed absurd to suppose that such a deduction would have been made if he had no concern with the cultivation - In this year also he paid according to the Vasa-=buddy proportion of the Poollary and not upon the number of Cattle -

53.

Shaik Pursick the Sheristah Goomas-=tah was deputed in January 1839 before I was under any suspicion of the Sheristadar having secret culti-=vation in Codoor to make an en-=quiry into the balances outstanding on the Village of Codoor - He made his report on the 21st January sending a Statement of the balances due by each individual for fusly 1247 in which is entered as follows -

No 5. Goorrum Nallareddy's Cumma-=tum Moodoombee Vencata Krishna-=macharloo -

Balance

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Balance due up to 19th January 1839.

On account of Fusly 1247 - - - 46-14-1

Balance recoverable in the

current year - - - - - - - - 16-14-1

Balance outstanding on ac-=count of Jukrar or objections - - } 30 - - -

Remark - "This 30 Rupees is the por-="tion of Moodoombee Vencatakistnamacharloo "This man has not from the first done the "river channel work and the Ayn Collections "were deducted on account of Nagas / river channel "fines / which is the cause of this balance being "due. He gave up the cultivation for the cur-="rent year / Fusly 1248 /. The Caupoos and "Curnums have informed that the individual "also is not present. - This balance account "is signed by Goorrum Narrainreddy the per-="son who managed the Cummatum and the "Curnums"

Among the Cadjan Accounts

54

of Cundoola Soobareddy there is one headed thus.

An Account of the Codoor

55

Cummatum of Fusly 1246 corresponding with the

the year Doormooky.

Entry.

Joint Cummatum of Moodoombee Vencata-
-Kristnamacharloo and ours (Soobareddy and
Goorrumwar) being one Puttah.-

	Rs. a. p
Shist is	361-8-2
Deduct on account of Garden	21-6-3
Fusul Tastee	3-7-4
Poollary	20-7-0
	45-4-7
	316-3-7

56. There is also another cadjan ac-
-count purporting to be the private account of
this Cummatum kept by Goorrum Nobulreddy
for Fusly 1247 and is headed thus.-

"Particulars of the fields ac-
"cording to the dittum occupied by Moodoombee
"Vencatakistnamacharloo and Goorrum Nobulreddy

57. The details given in this account
shew clearly that the Moodoombeewar had
joint cultivation in the dittum. at the end of the
Account are distinctly exhibited the differ-
-ums of the land and their assessment held
by the Moodoombeewar including a garden.-

I

58 I beg to forward also a trans-
-late of an Arzee from the Tahsildar of
Nellore to Mr Whish in 1833 relative to
the Sheristadars cultivation in Codoor which
shews the objectionableness of the system of
Public servants holding cultivation like
other Ryots.-

59 Having thus noticed the
evidence as regards Ramanjarow having con-
-tinued to keep cultivation in Codoor I pro-
-ceed to notice it as regards Reddy pollium.-

60 I have already stated that
the additional remission which he had been
receiving on his cultivation in Reddy-pol-
-lium was disallowed by me in Fusly 1245,
in which year he was permitted to retain
the cultivation in this village on account
of the alleged inconvenience of suddenly
throwing it up but with fusly 1245 it was
to terminate. I think it was early in
Fusly 1246 that Ramanjarow informed me
that

that he had sold his ploughing bullocks to Mooloomoody Veerareddy who had taken the Reddypolliem cultivation from Fusly 1246. This Veerareddy is the elder brother of Mooloomoody Narrainreddy who has been for years the private agent and friend of Ramanjarow and between whom there have existed money dealings.— Veera-reddy and Narrainreddy are an undivided family. It is unnecessary to notice in detail the statements of the several witnesses regarding the Reddypolliem cultivation but for the sake of easy reference, I beg to note in the Margin the Witnesses and the parts of their depositions which refer to the subject. I beg also to forward translate 3 of an Arzee and its enclosure being a deposition of the Village Curnam from the Assistant Sheristadar of my Cutcherry who on a complaint of Cawoor [illegible] Paramrauze

No. 1. Bar Baaboorow. answers 1-4-5 and 6.
No. 11. Rapaty Luchemenarsoo.
No. 10. Pallay Kistnarow Tahsildar of Talamurchy in which Talook Reddy-polliem is situated. Answers 1 to 4.
No. 9. Subb Anundarow answers 5 to 7.
No. 8. M. Poorooshottum Deputy Sheristadar.
No. 3. C. Nursiah Head Sheristadar Gomastah Answers 2.

Paramrauze of there being concealed cultivation was deputed to measure the lands of that Village. It will be observed that the Curnum states distinctly that in Fusly 1246 the whole cultivation was carried on by Soondaragherry war's Cummatam although the Kittum and Puttah were in the name of Mooloomoody Veerareddy. This evidence he afterwards retracted before me.

*See Encl. 39 & 40.

61. Certain Cudjan accounts were obtained from the Reddy polliem Curnum which throw considerable light on the matter of the Reddy polliem cultivation subsequent to Fusly 1245 in which year it is stated to have been thrown up. These accounts of which translates accompany are marked from A to E. They seem to be private accounts kept by the Curnum between Mooloomoody Narrainreddy and Ramanjarow. I shall have to notice these accounts in detail in a subsequent part of

of this report, and will only remark for the present that to the best of my judgment they furnish con=clusive evidence of the cultivation having been Ramanjarow's in Fusly 1246, and the Circar cultivation even in fusly 1247 which Ramanjarow affirms was also thrown up with the rest.-

62 Ramanjarow was allowed to take copies of all depositions and directed to name the witnesses he wished to cross examine alss those he would examine for his defence..

Pro. 18- 63. The first witness called by him was Tulpoor Rowanapah one of the Codoor Curnams Rowanapah deposed that during the Fusslies 1245, 1246 and 1247 when the Cammatam was Cundoola Sorbareddy's, Ramanjarow had no concern in it that Sorbareddy took the grss produce, paid the Circar Revenue and bore the profit and loss of the cammatam that Sorba=reddy's own Cattle were used in the cultivation that Ramanjarow has had no cultivation in Codoor since Fusly 1245, that the reason of the

the name of the Sheristadars man appearing in the subsequent Fusslies was this. That the Maganee lands were divided every four or five years and as this division had not taken place, the Dittums were not altered, and the original Cummatumdar's name continued to appear in the accounts- that Cundoola Soobareddy has a separate Cummatum in Codoor in the name of his Father in law Goorrum=Nobulreddy and has Cattle their joint pro=perty. that in Veelsabady Villages persons graze their Cattle in lands which do not belong to their Cummatum, in other words that having cultivation in the Village they graze their Cattle in lands of a different Cummatum to which their cultivation be=longs and that in Codoor the undermentioned persons so graze their cattle Vizt.

1. Vanumbauk Vencataramreddy-
2. Valapollem Vencoreddy-

Ticcavarapo

3. Tiecavarapoo Sectaramreddy Inhabitant of Mypaud.-

4. Nookalapatywar. Inhabitant of yellamallicum.-

That the two last graze cattle in the Cummatum of Doossa Vengareddy. He deposed further that in Fuslies 1248. and 1249 the Sheristadar's Cummatum lands were cultivated the gross produce taken and the shist paid by Vanumbauk Vencataramreddy. That the Sheristadar's Pooliary, the Sheristadar's garden shist and pay of his labourers was paid in Fusly 1248 by Cundoola Soobareddy / which is contradicted by the other Curnum Kristrama and virtually contradicted by Soobareddy himself as he declares that he received no young bulls after the Settlement of the Account and the same was done in Fusly 1249 for which two or three Months ago he drove off some young bulls, but how many the witness did not know- that

Ramanjarow

Augt. Septr. 1839.

Ramanjarow told him in Fusly 1247 that if there were any balances due on the Moodoombeewar Cummatum up to Fusly 1244 he would pay them but that witness did not tell him because the Accounts were in the Hoozoor.

That there is a balance due on the Moodoombewar Cummatum up to Fusly 1234 as follows.-

Fusly	1234	33-15-.
"	1239	15-8-.
"	1240	65-15-10
"	1242	16-13-3
"	1243	-13-3
"	1244	9-14-.
	Total	142-15-4

The witness then explains the causes of these outstanding balances. That on account of Fusly 1234 was owing to the excessive Estimates of the produce and the high prices fixed by Appajee Row the Head Sheristadar under Mr. Smalley and partly due on account of Roysoms. The balance of

of 1239 Fusly is stated to have been due on crops perished which is said to have been at first remitted and afterwards ordered to be collected. A part was collected, and the balance consists of the uncollected portion and of Roofsooms..

64 If the explanation of the balance outstanding for Fusly 1240 be true it ought not to appear as it does as a balance upon the Cummatum..

65 The Balance of Fusly 1242 is occasioned by short produce which Ramanjarow did not seem to think himself called upon to make good from his private resources.-

66 The balances of Fuslies 1243 and 1244 are due partly for Roofsooms and partly (6 Rupees) on account of Mooloom Banjer which was included in the settlement.

67 Rowanapah states further that Ramanujarow has had no ploughing cattle in Codoor since Fusly 1245. He proceeds then to detail the reasons why the name of the Moodoombeewar were included in

in the subsequent years dittums although they had relinquished the Cummatum in Fusly 1244. The name of Moodoombee Streenevasa-charloo being entered in the dittum of Fusly 1245 he says was because it was entered up to Fusly 1244, and because the dittum of Fusly 1244 is entered in the Dittum of Fusly 1245, that Moodoombee Vencatakristnamacharloo's name being entered in the dittum of Fusly 1246 was, he understood, because Moodoombee Streenevasa-charloo had died, that the omission to enter the name of Cundoola Soobareddy in the dittum of Fusly 1247 was an inadvertence. Lastly in explanation of the Moodoombeewar name appearing in the Dittum of Fusly 1248 he states that their names could not be left out of the accounts till the periodical division of the Maganee lands took place. It has already been shewn that this periodical division did take place in Fusly 1246 the second year after the Moodoombewar are affirmed to have given up their cultivation

Vizt.

Vuzt. in Fusly 1244 and that in this new division the Moodoombeewar appear as also in each succeeding year up to the period of the investigation into Ramanjarow's conduct. This witness though Curnam of the Village pretends that the last periodical division of the lands took place in Fusly 1243 or 1244 when the public records shew it indisputably to have taken place in the course of Fusly 1246.

68. Next as regards the Pollam Accounts. He deposes that the 20 ploughing cattle deducted from Ramanjarow's Cattle in Fusly 1247 were Cundoola Soobareddy's and that the Account was written as it was from his want of recollection

No. 19 69. The next witness called on the part of Ramanjarow was Maurumreddy Soobareddy the Village Moonsiff, whose evidence is to the same effect as that of the Curnam Ravanapah, but he mentions one fact which is of importance namely that when the cultivation of the Moodoombeewar Cummatam was thrown up in fusly 1247 by Cundoola Soobareddy, it was not taken up by Vanambaukum Venkataramreddy till the season of the principal (the Moodoorus) cultivation was over, Why should this have been? Why should Vanambaukum Venkataramreddy have taken up land for which he knew he would have to pay the full assessment, when the season for the

Comp. S.R.

the principal crop was over? except it had been, as he states, that he was asked by the Sheristadar to undertake it for him. It is difficult to believe that a Reddy who had already a large cultivation in Codoor and other Villages would have taken up lands on his own account when the season for the principal cultivation had passed. This witness also gives a similar account to that of the Curnum Ravanapah of the reason of the Moodoombeewar's name appearing in the Pottum &c. accounts subsequently to Fusly 1244, namely, that it should appear in the accounts till a new division of the Maganie lands took place.

His witness deposes to his allowing the Cattle of one Goonoopaty Venkatareddy to graze in his (witness') Cummatum lands though he has cultivation for which he assigns two reasons. One, because he has not the full number of cattle for his Vasahaddy share, and secondly,

because

because he/witness/ is under pecuniary obligations to him. about 13 of Venkata-reddy's cattle graze in witness cumma-tum, Another Reddy named Diswaar Ch. Vengareddy also allows Goonoapanty Ch. Venkatareddy's cattle to graze in his Ch. Vengareddy's/ cummatum, for the Ch. same reasons that witness allows it.. There is nothing further in this witness evidence requiring notice, but I may mention that he is notoriously a man in Ramanjarow's interest, and either himself or his brother or near relative has had the Management of Raman-jarow's cummatum previous to fusly 1244.-

20 71 Ramanjarow next proceeds to cross examine the witness Macha-reddy Pararedy. -This man was for four years a Labourer in Raman-jarow's cummatum. In his first examination, he stated the cultivation in Codoor to be still Ramanjarow's, but as his reasons for saying so were not very strong

Vizt.

Vizt. because he had formerly been his Ch. Labourer and because the Villagers said so I did not notice his evidence in my report.- In his cross examination he retracts his former evidence and affirms that the Sheristadar has had no cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245.-

The next witness called was

No. 21 72 Sirvapully Veerapparauze, a Bramin Cultivator in Codoor.- He like the last witness affirms generally that Ramanjarow has had no cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245.- This man has no independent cultivation, no Puttah in his own Name but is a common cultivator having a share of only ½ small plough in the cummatum of Cotta Ramreddy which consists of 6½ large or Seesa huddy ploughs or 13 small ones, and the witness declares that he does not even know what he pays, and that the curnum should be asked if that information is wanted.-

The next witness examined

No. 22 73 by Ramanjarow was Valapollem Venkatareddy, a Cultivating Ryot of

Codoor

Codoor. He states that he can swear that Ramanjarow has had no cultivation in Codoor since fasly 1245. This man has no separate Putta, but his brother has 4 out of 13 small shares in the Cummum of Cota Ramreddy. This is the witness's statement, but the public accounts shew that Cotah Ramreddy's Cummatum consists of only 11½ ploughs, of which the witness's brother's share is the trifling one of 1¾ plough. This witness was mentioned by the Curnum Rawanapah as grazing his cattle in a Cummatum different to that in which he held cultivation. It appears from his own evidence that this is not the case with his own cattle, but with that of his nephew who grazes about 20 cattle in the pasture land of Collareddy Seetaramreddy's Cummatum because Seetaramreddy's cattle are insufficient for the whole extent of his pasture land, and he therefore allowed them to graze

and

and received poollary from the owner for their so grazing. This witness further deposes that Ryots in Veesahuddy Villages will allow the cattle of others to graze in their Veesahuddy cattle land on the payment of Poollary. I may remark here that this is a mere private arrangement of which the Circar has no knowledge, and neither such cattle nor the name of the owner ever appear in the public accounts. A Cummatundar has not perhaps a sufficient number of cattle for the whole extent of his Veesahuddy cattle land, and as he must pay the Veesahuddy proportion of the Poollary of the Village, whether cattle graze or not, he allows the cattle of others to graze on payment to himself of Poollary, but this is a mere private arrangement between the parties, and neither the owners name or the cattle so permitted to graze appear in the public accounts. The Poollary is paid to the Cummatundar, not to the Circar

so

so far from such having been the case on
with respect to Ramanjarow's cattle, on
they have been distinctly entered on
every year in the public Accounts under
the Moodoombeewar cummatum, & the
Poollary paid to the circar, not to the Cum-
-matundar, & even that not on the Cu
number of cattle but according to the
Veesabuddy proportion in the same Cu
way as other Veesabuddy cummatums
-dars paid upon their cattle, and in
the same manner as he paid himself
when he had the cummatum. -

No 23 & 26 74. Cundoola Soobbareddy was
next re-examined, but this has been
already noticed and requires no further
comment here except on one point.
He states that the reason of the Moo-
-doombeewar's name being entered
in the Dittum after they had relin-
-quished the cummatum was be-
-cause in the same Puttah was
included the Sheristadar's Poollary
and Garden which he still retains.
No other witness not even the Cu

Village

Village Monsiff or the Curnums, the
latter, the persons employed in preparing
the dittums, has assigned them as a rea-
-son which it is obvious could have
been done had it been true. But why
may ask was the Sheristadar's Garden
and Poollary included in a Puttah for
land which he declared he had throwd-
-up? Why was the Puttah for the Garden
and Poollary not made out at once in the
name of the Sheristadar or of the Cu
Moodoombeewar or any other of his peo-
-ple, and why should the Sheristadar's
Poollary and Garden have followed the
Moodoombeewar's cummatum in the
charge which took place at the close
of July 1247, when the cummatum
paper over from Cundoola Soobareddy
to Vaumbauck Vencatramreddy. But
so it did. In the first place from
the time the cummatum is said to
have been relinquished by Moodoom-
-beewars, there has been a separate Cu
Puttah for this cummatum although
it

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

it is said to have been incorporated with Cundoola Soobbareddy's other cultivation in Codoor, and the Cummatum and Garden and Poollary were all in one Puttah in the name of Vaanumbauth Vencatrainreddy till the commencement of the present enquiry.-

Nº 24-25-34. Goorrum Narrainreddy was 1/5 then examined. He is the son of Goorrum Vobulreddy, a man of very advanced age, in consequence of which Narrainreddy has had for some time the immediate management of the cummatum in Codoor, the subsequent evidence had led me to believe that it was necessary to examine this person, and though after Ramanjarow had entered upon the examination of his witnesses, the admissibility in a formal trial on a Criminal charge of the examination of a witness who was not called on the part of the defence may be questionable, still the object was to ascertain the truth of the matter at issue, and all I can say is that if the Board are of opinion

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

opinion that he ought not to have been examined, let his evidence at once be rejected.- It would give the Sheristadar the benefit of an informality in my proceedings though morally the evidence is good.- He states that Ramanjarow has cultivation in Codoor, that before he was Head Sheristadar he cultivated it himself, but that after he became Head Sheristadar he said that if he kept it separate, somebody might tell the Collector, and told my father Goorrum Vobulreddy to join it with his, that he would pay for the seed, laborers, and loss on the cultivation.- That the ploughing bullocks were Ramanjarow's for the first two years, and that the cattle land called the Ammagharry Mauniam which is the proportion belonging to the 3 shares was given up for the grazing of the cattle, that the loss on Ramanjarow's three shares was entered in the account as a balance against Ramanjarow, that is to say, after selling the corn shares of the grain and applying it to the payment of the Government demand

demand if there was any loss it was entered as a balance against Ramanjarow, that Cundoola Soobbareddy had told him, witness, when the Cutcherry was at Indoocoarpett (early in 1839) that Ramanjarow owed him 500 or 600 Rupees, and that this and the proposal of Ramanjarow was given up by Cundoola Soobbareddy to the Sheristadar's Charity at the Sreerungum Pagoda, that he (witness) himself saw the account, that the amount given up was between 400 and 500 Rupees. This witness also states that the Rookalapantywar who were mentioned by the Curnum Rowanjap-ah as grazing their cattle in the Village without having cultivation have in reality no cultivation in the Gundavarapoowar Cummatum that they graze also cattle in Doo-woor Vengareddy's cummatum cattle land, the reason of which is that the Cummatundars have few cattle, while the Rookalapantywar are very rich

rich and advance them money and they return the obligation by permitting their cattle to graze on their cummatum lands.

No 27. 76

The next witness called on the part of Ramanjarow was the curnum Anuntapully Kristama. He states that the Sheristadar's cummatum was given up to Cundoola Soobbareddy at the close of July 1244 and that Ramanjarow has had no ploughing cattle or cultivators in Codoor since July 1245. This witness deposes that when the cummatum was given up at the end of July 1244, it was on the following conditions. That Ramanjarow's female cattle were to graze on the cattle lands of the cummatum and to pay the Poollary on them, but that the cultivation was to be Soobbareddy's and his the profit and loss. The witness says he knows all these private arrangements because "he does curmums duty" though he confesses he does not write the accounts and does not even know the amount of the Sheristadar's Poollary, nor does he know why the cattle land should have

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

have been given up to Ramanjarow's cattle and the cultivation merely expanded over to Soobbareddy. To give the Board an insight into the intelligence of this witness, I beg to refer them to the 20th Question and answer. The fact is he is but nominally a curnum of the Village. He transacts none of the business at the Tahsildar's Cutcherry, nor does he attend the annual settlement and by his own statement he knows nothing of the Village accounts.

No 28 yy The Sheristadar's next witness was Ullareddy Seetaramreddy, an inhabitant of Codoor and an independent Puttadar. He speaks to the point of Ramanjarow having had no cultivation in Codoor since

+ Answer 18 fusly 1243, which he says he knows, because he is a cultivator. This witness states moreover that about 1/4 of the cattle of one Augusty reddy Kristnareddy graze in Veesabuddy cattle lands of witness's curnum which

Comp.e J.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

which is permitted by reason of his Kristnareddy making cash advances to the Ryots of the curnum. The Augustyreddy Kristnareddy has cultivation of one plough in Codoor but not in witness curnum. This Witness is the elder Brother of Ullareddy Kristnareddy who is stated to have had the Management of the Moodoo curnum up to fusly 1244 the period of its after relinquishment.

78. This witness deposes further answer 40 that the only persons not having cultivation in Codoor, and who graze their cattle in the cattle lands of the Village are Augustyreddy Kristnareddy and Ramanjarow. These two, he says, have no cultivation and graze their cattle, though in the preceding answers he had spoken to the said Kristnareddy having one plough cultivation in the Village and therefore by this Witness's evidence Ramanjarow stood alone as the person grazing his cattle

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

cattle in the cattle lands and having no cultivation. This witness states further answer 43 that unless the Veesa-buddy Ryot has cattle of his own sufficient for the extent of cattle land which falls to his share, he would not think of allowing another person's cattle to graze on his lands. The arrangements Ryots in Veesabuddy Villages make when such occurs has been already alluded to and explained to be a private arrangement between the Cummatundar to get Revenue from land which he has not cattle of his own to graze, and is only to a small extent seldom exceeding 20 Cattle but in Ramanjeeram's case there were about 60 head of the cattle grazing exclusively in a separation of the cattle lands appertaining to his absolute cummatum in the Village Cundoola Seshareddy has single and joint cultivation in three or four Villages and his aggregate Puttah which exceeded for

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

for fusly 1249 5,000 Rupees. He has some hundred heads of cattle, and it is idle to suppose that he could have been in want of cattle to graze upon any cattle land which belonged to him.

No. 29 79 Ramreddy Seshareddy was the next witness, and he speaks to the same effect as the other, namely that the Sheristadar was had no cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245. This witness has a share of one fo-lawgh in Cota Ramreddy's cummatum, but has no Puttah in his own name, the cultivation being in the name of his elder brother Narrainreddy. This witness retracts the deposition he first gave before me on the 27th March 1839, which was as follows. The dittum at Codoor is held in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasa charlu, and Ramanja-ram enjoys the cultivation. Ramanja-ram's cattle are to this very day grazing at Codoor. The whole num-ber of shares at Codoor is 40, of which Ramanjeeram's has cultivation of 3 shares.

To

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

"As it is a Veesabuddy Village I know of
"the circumstance of Ramanjarow
"holding cultivation of 3 shares"- I beg
to refer to the entire deposition of this
man which details particulars which
could have been known only to him-
self and which he has been now persuad-
ed in its most material part to
retract.-

No 30- 80.- The next witness was
Gundavarapoo Pauparedidy who deposed
to Ramanjarow having no
cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245
This witness has a share of 2 Veesabuddy
ploughs in Maurumreddy Soobbareddy
Cumtum but not in his own name-
Maurumreddy Soobbareddy it will
be recollected was the 2d witness called
on the part of the defence- This witness
further states/ answer 24/ that persons
belonging to other Villages graze their
cattle in the Veesabuddy cattle lands
of Codoor, although they have neither
cultivation in the Village or in the
cummatum to which the cattle land
in

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

in which their cattle graze is allotted
in consideration of their making advances
of cash to the Ryots- He speaks also to another
rather important circumstance, namely,
/answer 26/ that Gundoola Soobbareddy
and his family have had cultivation in
Codoor since about 50 years, that they
have always held two Veesabuddy
shares and never more, and it certainly
does strike me that under such circum-
stances there must have been something
unusual his taking just at the time
they are said to have been withdrawing up
the three shares of Ramanjarow and
foregoing the early consideration which
makes cultivation in Codoor valuable
the use of the pastures for his the
cattle which he was entitled to
by virtue of the new shares he had
taken- The witness further declares
in answer to a question of Ramanjarow
that he knows of no other Village in
which persons having no cultivation
graze their the cattle in the Veesabuddy
cattle lands-

No 31 81.- The next witness was
Camereddy.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

Cannereddy Rannereddy— He also deposes to Ramanjarow having no cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245— He was he says a Laborer in the Mordoonkeerai's cummatum when it was in their possession, has no cultivation now in Codoor but subsists himself by daily labour with any one willing to employ him.—

No 32

82

Cavelly Vencareddy was the next witness, and he deposes to Ramanjarow having had no concern in the cultivation of Codoor since fusly 1245 This witness has a share of one Visa-buddy plough in the cummatum of Ullareddy Seetaramreddy but it is in the name of his Uncle.—

No. 33 & 35.

83.—

The next witness is Muddalay Ramanah the Coorna-tah of Cundoola Soobbareddy and he deposes to Ramanjarow having had no cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245 This witness seems to have been called chiefly to dis-prove a circumstance alleged to have

Fort St. George 24th Decembers 1840—

have taken place regarding the delivery of 8 Poatties of grain to Ramanjarow from the produce of the Codoor cummat-tum on the Punkha of Cundoola Soobba-reddy but as far as the enquiry had touched upon the point it had been fully sufficient to convince me that the grain which I have no doubt was delivered and the receipts referred to in this witness's evidence genuine / was not delivered on account of the produce of the cultivation in Codoor, but as a douceur on the occasion of the marriage of the Sheristadar's daughter in August 1838 for among Cundoola Soobbareddys' cadjan Accounts is one purporting to be a receipts and disburse-ment accounts of Goorum Abulreddy's grain at Codoor dated 30th decreas-ing moon of Aushadum of the year Villumbee / corresponding / with 21st July 1838 / in which is the following entry.—

"Eight Poatties Peshamum
"Paddy delivered according to the Reddy's
"Punkha

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

"Tunkha into the charge of Chensoo
"Delayet who — came on behalf
"of Maharayaatry Soondaraghetty
"Ramanyum Puntoolou".-

† The Peon in attendance on the Shanstaar.-

N°35.- 84 The next witness called was Sannumpoody Soobhanatu. an Inhabitant of Vellacaneepully. an attached Shrotriem. He was called for the same purpose as the last Witness in respect to the receipt for the 8 Poottie of Grain alleged to have been delivered to Ramanjarow by Cundoola Soobareddy. and as I am satisfied that Ramanjarow did not receive that grain as produce from his cultivation at Codoor, the matter is not material to the question at issue, namely, whether Ramanjarow kept or did not keep secretly his cultivation at Codoor while he was unequivocally denying that he had any in that Village.-

N°37 85 The last witness called by Ramanjarow was Codoor Venkatarow reddy.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

reddy, an Inhabitant of Cotta Codoor who declares that since fusly 1245 Ramanja-row has had no cultivation in Codoor This witness has a share of 1½ plough in the cummatum of Cota Ramreddy.-

86.- Ramanjarow after the examination of this witness expressed a wish to cross examine Vencatarammreddy, but not any of the other witness's who had been previously examined by me.- He was accordingly called.- In his cross examination there is nothing requiring special notice.-

N°38. 87.- Their evidance regarding the Codoor cultivation having been brought to a close. Ramanjarow called three witness's in respect to the cultivation at Reddypollems. Vagoor Audeena-ramaspah, the Curnum whose deposition before the Assistant Sheristadar is enclosed in the paper Marked I. Moothroody Narrainreddy and Coomaspah Rameereddy, a Rayt

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

Proof of Reddy pollem:-

No. 39840.

88.- Vargoor Audeenarain-
a/pah teztares in this examination
that Ramanyaran's cultivation ceased
with fusly 1245, that the cultivation
since fusly 1246 was Moalmoody +
Veerareddy's that when the cummatam
was given up, the ploughing bullocks
labarers, plowghs and other implements
of husbandry were made over to +
Moalmoody Veerareddy and that this
was in the beginning of fusly 1246-
but it appears notwithstanding ans. to
10/ that the cattle were not priced
till the end of that year that the price
at which they were to be taken by
Veerareddy was then fixed, the accounts
looked over and settled, fully corraborating
the accounts already noticed as found
with this witness which shewed the +
cultivation of fusly 1246 to have been
carried on account of Ramanyaran
and a transfer of the cultivation to
have

In No. 39.-

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

have only taken place at the close of
that year, and it was only at the end
of fusly 1246 (answer 20) that Maunsing
formerly a Jail Peon and who had been
placed by Ramanyaran in Reddy pollem
to look after his concerns there left the
Village and went away.- It will be
seen also, answer 22, that Maunsing
in that year as he had done in the
previous years took charge of the produce
of the Reddy Mannium.-

The 2d Witness examin.

In No. 39.-

No. 41842.

89
-ed by Ramanyaran was Moal-
-moody Narrainreddy the younger
brother of Moalmoody Veerareddy. to
whose name Ramanyaran's cumma-
-tum in Reddy pollem was transferred
in fusly 1246.- The Brothers
are an undivided family.- He states
that his Brother Veerareddy has
been cultivating the Reddy pollem
lands since fusly 1246.- and that +
neither Ramanyaran or his Nephew
Ruckabauly

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo have had any concern with it. I may as well mention here that Reddypallem scarcely deserves the name of a Village there not being more than eleven houses and that the whole of the Lands are held under one Puttah. This witness on being asked by Ramanjarow whether he owed him any balance / 2: 11 - 2d Deposition / states that about 10 & 11 Months ago he went to Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo at Nellore, looked over the Accounts, when there appeared a balance due to him / Narrainreddy / of 500 Rupees which he received and gave up the Cadjan Accounts to Venkatanursoo. The Witness's Deposition bears date the 24th December last, and this Settlement of Accounts therefore must have taken place only a month or two before the Sheristadar's suspension, when there was a sum of 500 Rupees due to Narrainreddy. It leaves one point unquestionable that although Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo had nominally transferred the Cummatam to the Mahmoodenwar

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Mootoovodeewar there was a running account kept up between them as before till the beginning of 1839.

No. 43. The 3d witness called on by Ramanjarow relative to the Reddypallem cultivation was Goorroopaty Ramreddy a Ryot of that Village who speaks as the preceding witnesses had done to Ramanjarow having had no connection with the Reddypallem cultivation since fusly 1245. Witness has a cultivation of one Putlongha in the cummatam.

Nos 44 to 53 inclusive. The remaining depositions 9 in this case refer to the cultivation of Ramanjarow is believed to have had in Nellore and other Villages regarding which it would be tedious to enter into detailed remarks, but I think it is difficult on a perusal of those declarations to divest oneself of the belief that ---- Ramanjarow through his nephew Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo had, even if at present he have not, same concern in Guddum with Narrainreddy's cultivation, the Ryot who

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Depositions of Nellore Curnum Venkayalu Pantly Kurnam 20: 4-12-13

who cultivated a moiety of his lands for him when they were avowedly his. The lands consisted of wet and Garden lands and the whole were transferred from Moodoombee Streenevasa Pachaniés name to that of Suddum Narraineddy in Fusly 1245, but it appears that two Wells having been dug at some expense for the cultivation of the Garden lands were taken from Suddum Narraineddy again in Fusly 1247- and put in the name of Cullavacour Venkatadoabhiah the family priest of Nuckalapully Venkatanarsoo the Sheristadar's Nephew- The reason of this is stated to have been that if the Garden lands with the Wells had remained in the name of a cultivating Ryot, he might perhaps have been induced to wish for the possession of them for himself, that as the Putta for them was in his (Narraineddy's) name he might perhaps have claimed a right to the Wells and taken possession of them for himself- These Garden lands now stand in the name of Cullavacoloo Venkatasoobhiah the family

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

family Priest.-

92 The case appears to me clear and of the same character as the fictitious transfers of the cultivation in Coolaar and Reddy-pallem- Here were certain Garden lands cultivated under two Wells the private property of Ramanjarow These lands and Wells were transfered in Fusly 1245 together with the wet lands held by Ramanjarow to the name of Suddum Narraineddy, the Ryot who had been cultivating a considerable portion of them when in Ramanja-row's possession- How had it been a bonâ fide transfer to Narraineddy, some arrangement must have been made about these Wells which had been built at Ramanjarow's expense and were his private property, more especially as there being such a demand for Garden products in a large town like Nellore, that description of cultivation is profitable and valuable- But there is not a tittle of evidence

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

evidence to shew that the value of these Wells was made good by Narrainreddy, or any arrangement made regarding them. He was not questioned upon the point and the

Question 14 Kellore Curnum Nursunnah who was questioned about it says there was no arrangement made with the circar about it, nor did he (the Curnum) make out any agreement regarding them. If it had been a bonâ fide transfer in July 1245 to Gurdeum Narrainreddy these Wells could not have been given over for nothing, and yet there is no evidence that they were paid for or any consideration made for the transfer of them to him. It is to be believed that Ramanjarow would have given over his Wells, his own private property for nothing, and yet it would seem he did, from unwillingness to the

Comp. F.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

the only conclusion to be drawn is that it was a mere nominal transfer, and that the cultivation remained essentially as it had been previous to the transfer, and this is strongly supported by what occurred subsequently Viz. the retransfer in July 1247 of these Garden Lands and their Wells to Ramanja Row in the name of Cullavacollee Vencata Lobbiah the priest of the family.

93. The Original Records in this Case with translations with Ramanja Rows Original Defence and a translation are herewith transmitted but I have sent only Copies of Extracts of the Accounts referred to as they are Cadjan Accounts and cannot be conveniently sent, independently of which they are private Accounts. If there be any in particular of which the Board would wish to see the Originals, they shall be forwarded.

94. I would be glad to abstain from any remarks on Ramanja Rows Defence in this Case, as I do not wish to detract from the force of his Statement, but some observations are essentially called for to a right understanding of some of his

Statements

Statements and of the whole Case- The evidence inculpatory of Ramanja Row may be defined under three heads-

First- The evidence of those who were Sahaidders of the Talook during the period in question of other public Servants who were either immediately connected with the Talook or the Village of Odoor, of the Reddies to whom ostensibly the Cultivation belonged, of the Chief Servants of the Sherista Cutchery and of the Sherista Goomastah Y. Narsiah who was specially deputed to Codoor some time before this Complaint was made of the Ramanja Row being cultivation there, to enquire and report into the outstanding balances of that Village-

Secondly- The entry of the Mordoome beewars name in the Dittums Shist Forms, and Pollary Accounts in each year successively after the Cummatieum is said to have been relinquished by them-

Thirdly- The circumstance of the Village being a Veesabaddy on the nature of which tenure renders it highly improbable if not impossible that Ramanja Row would have been permitted to appropriate for the grazing of his the Cattle, the Cattle Land which appertained to a certain Cummatieum

Cummatieum in the Village, unless the Cummatieum was virtually his, though the actual cultivation was managed by another- The Cummatieum moreover in the Cattle Lands appertaining to which his Cattle grazed was the identical Cummatieum which he had avowedly held previous to fasly 1245-

95- In regard to the first point Ramanja Row objects that several of the public Servants who have spoken to his having Cultivation in Codoor are nearly related to each other. It is true that some are so related and one is I believe distantly related to Ramanja Row himself- But I submit that the examination of these persons was purely accidental. Their examination suggested itself to myself alone as being the persons whom I thought were best able from the situations they held and had held to give me correct information- There is not one I believe who will not readily swear to his Statement, but I was not legally empowered to administer an oath to a Witness in an enquiry of this sort- They are I hope too respectable to have falsified themselves by stating any thing they

they did not know or believe. The Deputy Sheristadar M. Ponnoshettum belongs to a family of great respectability. He is a near relative of the Sheristadar of his Highness the Nabob and a relative also I believe of the Board's Sheristadar and has been nearly 30 Years in the Service. I do not think he would wilfully tell an untruth. Bar Baboo Row the Assistant Fakeildar who informed me in the first instance of the Sheristadar having cultivation in Codoor is neither of the same religion as the others, or related, except very distantly to the Assistant Sheristadar G. Vencataramaniah. I do not however attach so much importance to the Statements of the persons who were examined as I do to the public Accounts and as Stolz Ramanja Row if he could satisfactorily explain himself regarding the Entries in the accounts, the Statements of the Witnesses would be much weakned, whereas at present they strongly supported each other. But as regards the Witnesses called on the part of Ramanjarow I would point out that out of 38 Veesabuddy Puttadars in Codoor two Puttadars only were called as Witnesses besides the

Moonsiff

Moonsiff and two Curnums Ponnapah and Kristnama the rest being persons who had small shares in the Cummatum of another Ryot mostly of one Cummatumdar Cota Ramareddy but no cultivation or Puttah of their own, and it is further remarkable that not one of the three persons who carried on a portion of the Cultivation of the Cummatum for Vanumbauk Vencatramreddy in fasly 1248 were called or examined by Ramanja Row.

90. The second point Viz. the continued entry of his mans name in each year successively after he is said to have given up the Cummatum does not from the manner in which it has been treated appear to have been viewed by Ramanjarow with so much importance as I think attaches to it. His main object seems to have been to obtain from the Witnesses examined on the part of the defence a general assertion that he had no cultivation in Codoor that the Cultivation was Cundoola Soobbareddy's, that the Cattle used in the ploughing of the

land

land were Soobbareddy and in fine that he Ramanjarow had no concern whatever with it and they had of course grounds for making a general assertion of this kind because it has never been denied that Cundoola Soobbareddy had the management of the Cultivation upto fusly 1247 and Venkatamreddy for fusly 1248. The essential question is for whom were they managing the Cultivation, for themselves or for Ramanja Row?

97

The witnesses for the Defence speak of what took place outwardly upon which there is no question, excepting in regard to whose Cattle were used in the ploughing of the land, Ramanjarow's or Soobbareddy. It will occur to the Board that the Ryots of the Village are not likely to have been cognizant of any private arrangement which may have been made between Ramanja Row and the party who took the management of the Cultivation of the Cummatums.

98.

In para 23 of his Defence Ramanja Row commences his explanation of the entries

entries in the Accounts and observes that on reference to the first Dittum of fusly 1246 it appears that the words "the Cultivation has been relinquished" is erased out. I do not know how Ramanja Row could have been led into such a mistake, It is not true as he states. The words struck out are given in the Margin. They stand after the name of Moodoombeewar and are intended to signify a want of ability and means on their part to cultivate, and that for that reason Cundoola Soobbareddy stood in the Dittum "instead of" the Moodoombeewar. This assertion of a want of ability on the part of the Moodoombeewar to carry on the Cultivation is that which is erased out.

99. Ramanja Row objects also to the second Dittum of fusly 1246 not being signed by the Ryots but this was owing to the late period at which the Division of the Lands was completed and I understand the Dittum corresponding therewith was not given in till the Settlement. But whether signed or not by the Ryots it was signed by the Tahsildar, Curnums and all

necessary

necessary public officers was accepted by Ramayya Row at the Settlement, who had the Thist form and Puttahs made out agreeably thereto, and if the Dittum was not signed by the Ryots its counterpart as relates to the occupancy of the lands Vizt. the Thist form was so signed. It does not appear to me therefore that Ramayya Row can now make any reasonable objection to a Dittum which he then accepted and adopted for the Settlement of the Village for fusly 1246-

100- Ramayyarow next urges in Para 26 that if he had intended to make it appear that he had no cultivation why should he have allowed the name of the Moodoombeeveer to appear in the Accounts I have already noted this point in Para 96- He had for fifteen or sixteen years been grazing his the Cattle on that Cattle land by virtue and only by virtue of his having a Cummatum in the Village: It has been already spoken to in evidence/ the Deputy Sheristadar/ that the Cummatum was kept for the sake of the Cattle and if his connection with the Cummatum were shewn by the Public

Public accounts to be dissevered, his Cattle were liable to be immediately turned out of the Cattle land- His object was to secure the uninterrupted possession of these Cattle lands for his Cattle and having put the management of the Cultivation into the hands of another, and kept his Cocoanut Garden in the Puttah for the Cummatum lands instead of separating it, and taking a Puttah for it in his own name or of some one on his behalf, he trusted I suppose to being able to explain matters sufficiently should enquiry be made which he certainly at that time had not any reason to expect- Such in fact is the explanation he has now given. He observes in the same Para that there was a reason for the name of Venkatakrishnamachariar also being entered in the Dittum &c. Account because his Cattle grazed on the Beedoo Lands of that Cummatum and the garden is also included with the land of that Cummatum and he /Ramanjarow/ paid the assessment

of

of the Garden and the Poollary tax on account of the Cummatum and therefore it must be considered that the Curnums entered his name in that account. First I ask why was the Puttah for the Cocanut Garden included in the Puttah for the Cummatum. It was altogether a different spot it had no connection with the Cummatum, neither had Ramanja Row as he avers, any connection with the Cummatum beyond grazing his Cattle in the Cattle Lands appertaining to it. Why was not a separate Puttah made out in Ramanjarow's name for the Cocanut Garden and his Poollary's. Why I may ask in the second place was a separate Puttah given each year for the three ploughs which formed the Cummatum of the Moodoombeewar after they had relinquished it to Soobareddy, instead of those 3 ploughs being included in the Puttah for the two Ploughs of Cundoola Soobareddy's own cultivation. But so it was, Cundoola Soobareddy when he took up the Moodoombeewar Cummatum in fuely 12 he had already a Cummatum of two Ploughs, one Puttah only was necessary for both, but instead of this a

a separate Puttah is continued to be issued for the Moodoombeewar Cummatum of three ploughs and in it Ramanja Row's Garden and Poollary are also included. There is no assignable reason why if the Moodoombeewar lands had in truth and in fact become Cundoola Soobareddy's, they should not have been included in the Puttah for the Cultivation he already held, there is no reason why a distinct Puttah should have been given to him for the Moodoombeewar Lands, or why the Sheristadar's Garden & Poollary should have been included in the Puttah for the Cummatum instead of a separate Puttah issued in his name except that in reality the Cummatum was not Soobareddy's, but Ramanja Row's. But if as Ramanja Row states this were the true reason of the Moodoombeewar's name continuing to appear in the public accounts, why did not the Curnum Ramanapah and the Moonsiff Soobareddy two of Ramanja Row's witnesses assign that as the reason. So far from it they assigned a totally different reason, namely that it was necessary for

the

the Moodoombeewar's name to appear till a new division of the lands took place, and it will have been seen from my previous remarks that a new division of the lands did take place in fusly 1246 the second year after the Cummatum is said to have been relinquished that the Moodoombeewar's name appeared in the accounts of the new division and in the ensuing fusties 1247 and 1248. Again I may ask if what Ramanja Row asserts was the reason of the Moodoombeewar's name continuing to appear in the accounts be true, why was nothing said about this in the explanatory Kyfat given by the Curnums at the Settlement of fusly 1247 noticed in the 40th Para of this report. Moreover if this were the true reason why should the entries in the Dittums be such as they were. In fusly 1245 stating in an appended remark that the Moodoombeewar had given up this land and in fusly 1246 Cundoola Sooberd by instead of Moodoombee Sheen was chosen too. If by virtue of the Garden being included in the

Comp. S.R.

the Cummatum Puttah the Moodoombeewar's name ought to have appeared in the Dittum as where was the necessity of such entries as the above in the Dittum Statement.

101. As regard the deduction from his Cattle of the ploughing Cattle in fusly 1247 as already noticed, Ramanjarow observes (Para 27) that the She Cattle and the ploughing Cattle used in tilling the Cummatum are in Veesabaddy Village counted as appertaining to that Cummatum and the he Cattle deducted according to the number of the ploughs, and for the Remaining Cattle the Poollery is charged, and that Cumum Rowanapah has explained how it was that the ploughing Cattle were deducted from his Ramanjarow's Cattle in fusly 1247. Rowanapah it will be seen says it was from want of recollection, but the same mistake occurred in fusly 1246, although in fusly 1245, Ramanjarow's Cattle, both male and female had disappeared from the Poollary Accounts. As referring to the accounts of fusly 1243, when Ramanjarow had ploughing Cattle,

it

it will be seen that the number corresponds nearly with the total number in Fuslies 1246 and 1247. In Fusly 1243 the number was 84. In Fusly 1246-77, and in Fusly 1247-82. There is no satisfactory oral evidence speaking to Ramanjarow's own Bullocks being used in the Cultivation of the Cummatum lands since Fusly 1246 and the witnesses for the defence say that they were not his, but Cavadoola Soobareddy's for the three Fuslies that he had the Cultivation, and Vannumbaukt Vencatrameireddy's and others afterwards. Goonnum Narrainreddy declares that for the first two years Ramanjarow's own bullocks were used, but not in Fusly 1247 - as he had driven them away to some other Village and though prepared to return them for the cultivation of the Codoor Cummatum, they were not sent back, and the land was cultivated that year with their bullocks, But the same thing took place in Fusly 1246. In that year the ploughing bullocks were deducted from Ramanjarow's Cattle. I submit however that in a question of this kind the public records and accounts should be received as the testimony least open to suspicion, and they

they distinctly shew that the deduction for ploughing Cattle both in Fusly 1246 and 1247 was made from Ramanjarow's Cattle, and whether the ploughing bullocks were in reality his or not, he had the advantage of the deduction in a proportionate reduction of his head of Cattle upon which Poollary was chargeable.

102. I come now to the 3d division of the subject, the extreme improbability if not impossibility of Ramanjarow being allowed to graze his Cattle in the Cattle lands of a Cummatum, in a Veesabuddy Village like Codoor without a concern in the Cultivation of that Cummatum. This Ramanjarow says is done both in Codoor and other Villages but he has not instanced any parallel case. This point has been already fully touched upon by me, and it will have been seen that the instances which have been enumerated in the evidence are wholly dissimilar to that of Ramanjarow's. The Statements of the witnesses on this point are not consistent with each other, but even admitting them to be not open to such a remark, it will be found that those whose

cattle

Cattle graze have in fact a Share in the Cultiva-
-tion of the Village though not in the particular
Cummatum in which a few of the Cattle were
allowed to graze. But these as I have already ex-
-plained were private arrangements between the
Puttadar and the owners of the Cattle, neither
the Cattle or their owners names appear in the
public Accounts, and it will be seen that it
has been permitted partly as a return for
obligations confered, such as advances of money
to the Puttadar to enable him to pay his rent,
and other afsistance. I cannot trace any similar
case to Ramanjarow's in Codoor or any other
Veesabaddy Village in this District. Ramanjarow's
exclusively grazing his she Cattle on the lands
appertaining to a Veesabuddy Cummatum held
in another's name, could only occur in one of
two ways, either by the Cummatum though in
nominally another's being virtually his, or as a
personal favor confered by the Cummatumdar,
and accorded to his Official station and used no
doubt as a means through Ramanjarow's afsistance
of advantaging himself in other ways. In either Case

Ramanjarow's

Ramanjarow's conduct would be highly reprehensi-
-ble. There is no doubt I believe that the Cultivation
in Codoor is not in itself profitable, in itself not an
object of desire. It is the pasture lands which are
so valuable, and which is the strong incentive to the
Ryot to hold Cultivation in that Village. I may here
mention a circumstance which appears to me to bear
strongly upon the case. Cundoola Soobbareddy it will
have been seen took the Cultivation of the Moodoom-
-beevar in Fusly 1245. In the Village of Tatapully
in which he holds his Chief Cultivation. for 12 Years,
that is since Fusly 1234 no Paulevasee had been
allowed. In Fusly 1246 at the time of giving Puttahs
Soobbareddy put in a claim to it, and was told that
no regular account, as was necessary, had been
received but that when it had been, Paulvasee
would be given, an order which would never have
been given had I been informed by the
Sheristadar that it was altogether a new
claim, and had not been given for the
12 preceding years. an account was im-
-mediately after given in by the Talook

people

on on people which appeared to have been made out by the Cunnum, but it was not the regular account always received in such cases. On the 24th July of Fusly 1247 an order was issued to the Tahsildar to send a regular account of Paulecvansee for that Village for Fusly 1246, which was not answered and no regular Account of the Paulecvansee was received. nor any subsequent order issued from the Hoozoor. The object was however gained as Soobbareddy kept the amount of Paulecvansee claimed Viz. 279-13-5. as a balance. This is shewn by a balance Statement of Fusly 1248 subsequently sent in, in which it is so entered with a remark that it was a tukrar balance to be settled by an order from the Hoozoor, but no order was issued on this balance Statement. In giving Puttahs for Fusly 1247 in April 1838 a claim to Paulecvansee for that year to the amount of Rupees 309—14—9 was again preferred by Cundoola Soobareddy, upon which the Tahasildar represented that the Villagers had given an account of Paulecvansee but that it required to be examined. Subsequently the Tahsildar sent in an account upon which no orders were issued

and

and from a balance Statement sent in on the 15th December 1838, the Amount claimed as a Paulecvansee was still unpaid and formed part of the outstanding balance on the Village. Nothing seems to have been done till the month of February 1839 when the Sheristadar brought me the Draft of an Order disallowing the Paulecvansee, and ordering it to be collected for Fusly 1247. but dropping altogether the mention of the Paulecvansee claimed for Fusly 1246 which was still uncollected. It should be observed that this order was brought forward in Fusly 1248, Cundoola Soobbareddy having thrown up the Cultivation of the Codoor Cummatum on the expiration of Fusly 1247. For two years had Ramanjarow allowed him to prefer a claim which he knew was untenable and which he ultimately rejected. For two years had he left the matter without a final order allowing or disallowing the claim, but giving Soobareddy all the benefit of his application in withholding payment of the amount. During this period Soobareddy had the Codoor Cultivation, but no sooner does he throw it up than Ramanjarow brings forward an order disallowing

the

the claim to Paulecaussee, and deciding that he should pay. However up to this time, the Paulecaussee since it was first claimed has not been collected and I have been obliged recently to adopt more effectual measures for its recovery. I have not a doubt in my own mind that the claim to Paulecaussee was first preferred on a secret understanding with the Sheristadar who withheld information from me which would have probably led to its immediate rejection, and though afraid in a case of such obvious impropriety to attempt to have a distinct and final order issued allowing it, he adopted a course which answered the purpose, namely of allowing Soobareddy to withhold payment, and this was done till Soobareddy threw up the Cadoon Cultivation, which forthwith produced an order disallowing the claim and ordering the recovery of the amount.

103. As regards the Reddy pollam Cultivation, the first circumstance which appears singular and calculated to engender suspicion as to the bonâ fide relinquishment of the Cultivation by Ramanjarow is its transfer to

to the brother of his friend and Agent Mooloomoody Narrainreddy who had been closely mixed up with the cultivation when it avowedly belonged to Ramanjarow. The Mooloomoodywar's lands in Nagoor are stated to be contiguous to the Reddypollam lands. This may have been a reason for the Mooloomoodewar taking them, but that they should also purchase Ramanjarow's ploughing Cattle is highly suspicious viewing the previous intimate connection between the parties.

104. The main evidence in regard to the Reddypollam Cultivation consists of the private accounts which were kept by the Curnum and on which appear to me conclusive.

105. On the matter of these accounts Ramanja Row says little. He observes in Para 51 that "in the Accounts brought by Venkataramaniah "it is not only stated that in Fusly 1246, the "ploughing Cattle of Veneatnarsoo, the seed paddy "which was stored in that Village, and the grain "kept for the wages of the Servants were purchased "by Narrainreddy and the account settled, but "that Narrainreddy paid the thist Rs "for that Fusly".

Having

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

106. Having stated that I look upon these accounts as conclusive of Ramanjarow having still held the cultivation of Reddypollem in fusly 1246. I shall proceed briefly to point out why I have formed this opinion of them. They refer to three fusties Viz.t 1244, 1245 and 1246. but they have not been marked consecutively as they should have been, and I have therefore numbered them in Red Ink as they should stand.-

107. Account No.1 purports to be the account Current between Mooloomoody Narrainreddy and Ramanjarow for fusly 1244. This account does not bear upon the present question, but it is deserving of notice that Narainreddy's advances for Ramanjarow amounted to upwards of Pa. 1000 and that from a note at the foot of this account a balance of 1,000 Rupees is stated to be due on account of a former Settlement of Accounts.

108. Account No.2 is an account of the advances made by Mooloomoody Narainreddy for the cur-

Cummatum

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Cummatum of Muckalapully Vencatnarsoo at Reddypollem for fusly 1245. The only point deserving of notice in this account is that 10 Poollies of grain were supplied by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy for a Yeggnum or Sacrificial Ceremony performed, to my knowledge for I was at Alloor at the time, by Ramanjarow and that Sums paid by two Reddies Baparedy and Caunumpoody Vencatapaty reddy amounting together to 68 Rupees was credited to Ramanjarow's account in part liquidation of the grain so furnished. I mention this merely as a circumstance suspicious in itself, and evidencing the existence of pecuniary concerns with more than one Reddy under his authority. In fact these accounts alone shew that his pecuniary concerns with the Reddies in the District were rather extensive.

109. No.3. Is the account of the actual measurement by Mooloomoody Narainreddy of the produce of the Reddypollem Cultivation in fusly 1246 on the

7th

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

7th Veysakhum year Bavalumbee, corresponding with 11th May 1837. It will be seen from this that the produce of June Paddy was 28 Candies and 17½ tooms. that 20 Candies and 14¾ tooms were taken away by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy to his Village Cherlopollem, and the remaining quantity of 5 Candies 2¾ tooms delivered to Maunsing. 110. It will be seen also that of the coarse paddy produce of 17 5 10¼ fifteen Candies and 13 tooms was used for sundry charges and taken away by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy, and the remaining quantity of 1 12 made over to Maunsing, and the produce is entered in the Account as that "of Ruckalapully Venkatanursoo's Cummatum belonging to Mooloomoody Veerareddy's Putta" which appears to me sufficient of itself to warrant the belief that the Cultivation was still Ruckalapully Venkatanursoo's, but this is conclusively shewn by the Account No. 4 which is headed Soondaraj Ramanjarow's Account for the year Doomaothy.

The

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

The Board will there find that the Circar demand on the Reddypollem Cultivation for fusly 1246 stands charged to Ramanjarow and that the very same produce of fusly 1246 as shewn in account No. 3. part of which was measured out to the Ulloor people and the chief portion taken by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy to Cherlopolem Viz. 23 Candies 14¾ Tooms of fine, and 15 Candies and odd of coarse Paddy is credited to Ramanjarow's Account in discharge of the payments made on account of the Circar Shist. These two Accounts No. 3 and 4 appear to me conclusive. The produce of fusly 1246 is measured a larger portion of it is taken away by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy (no doubt for the payments which had to be made) the remainder is made over to Maunsing Ramanjarow's Servant, the payments on account of the Circar Shist for the year are charged to Ramanjarow's account and on the same account he receives credit for the value of the produce of the year which was taken away by Narrainreddy, that which

was

was not so credited having been already delivered to Maunsing his Servant. To the account N.4 is appended a remark to the effect that "the Shist "payable to the Circar, the Seed supplied to the "the Cummatum and the wages of the laborers "furnished by Khasa (Owner) for the Current "year is not added to the Amount advanced "for the year because the Cummatum came "into his charge"—

111 "When this remark was written it is impossible to say but it will be sufficient to observe that it is believed by the Accounts Nos. 4 and 5. Khasa in the remark evidently means the Irooloonoodyvar and the remark is intended to shew that Ramanjarow was not charged with the advances for laborers seed &c. because the Cummatum had become theirs whereas the account No. 5 entirely belies this and shews that the Seed and pay of the laborers up to March of fusly 1246 were furnished by Ramanjarow and not advanced by the Irooloonoodyvar while Account No. 4 distinctly shews

1841

shews that the assessment on the Reddypollem cultivation in fusly 1246 was charged to Ramanjarow and made good by the produce of that Year, the value of which was credited to Ramanjarow's account—

112 It appears to me clear beyond a doubt that Ramanjarow still had the Cultivation in Reddypollem in fusly 1246, that after the harvest of that year the accounts were looked over and settled and this ploughing Cattle taken at a valuation by Irooloonoody Narrainreddy, but whether this was a true and bonâ fide sale or not is I think open to question. The account No. 6 appears to be a continuation of No. 5 and brings up the account to the 10th Increasing Moon of Answeejuno Year Yelumbee or 29th September 1838 of fusly 1248 or upwards of two years after he had as he asserts given up his Cultivation in Reddypollem—

113 Regarding the balances due on his former Cultivation in the Village of Sangiapollem, Ramanjarow observes that the

the balance account appears to have been newly written by Venkatakristniah an unnominated Curnum of the Village on the 4th November two days previous to the charge being given him; This account was merely one written on paper and extracted from the Curnum's Cadjan Accounts, but Ramanjarow has omitted to state that the original Accounts of the Curnums as also those in the Hoozoor which exhibit the two principal items of balance Viz. Rupees 109-6-3 for fusly 1237 and Rupees 104-7-9 for fusly 1240 were given to him at the same time. The Accounts of balances up to fusly 1239 inclusive and closed up to the end of fusly 1245 were forwarded to the Board on the 26th November 1836 and consequently after Ramanjarow became Head Sheristadar, in which the balance on his Cultivation in Sungiapollem for fusly 1237 was included and subsequently written off. The balance on account of fusly 1240 was entered in a remark on the back of the Doubs of fusly 1241 as recoverable, but no portion of it has up to this time been paid on the contrary in the Annual

Statement

Statement of balances since fusly 1240 forwarded with the Jummabundy Accounts, this balance is entered as irrecoverable. Ramanjarow does not appear to have had any Cultivation in this Village since fusly 1242.

114. As respects the Cultivation of Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo in Goondlapollem Ramanjarow has stated what is not true when he says (Para 59) that he had already "informed me that Venkatanursoo had the Cultivation in Goondlapollem and was also concerned "in some Nutta and Bogayet Cultivation in "Nellore". I do not think Ramanjarow has made this misstatement wilfully, but that it is a misstatement will be evident from the following Extract of an Arzee he addressed to me on the 24th March 1839. "N. Venkata "nursoo the son of my deceased Sister had "some Cultivation in Nellore and Goondalapollem "and he now holds Cultivation and Cattle in "the latter having, he said to me since some "Years gave that in Nellore to a Capa man

and

"and he has a small betel Garden and a piece of
"betta land in Nellore. This is known to many
"people and is not a secret Vencatamurroo
"only lives in my house and takes his
"meals with my family but I have not
"any concern or interference with his income,
"his profits in short I have nothing to do with
"his pecuniary concerns nor am I master of his
"transactions nor those of H. Ramarow who
"lives separately from me, and this circum-
-stance I can prove by many respectable per-
-sons of this place and therefore there can be
"no reason to consider his Cultivation is
"mine, but I now regret that I did not
"before bring this to your honor's notice, My
"only motive for not having done so, was
"that being conscious that I was no way
"concerned with his Cultivation, it did not
"occur to me that it could possibly be said
"to belong to me."

115. It is unnecessary for me to
dilate upon the obvious impropriettes of
Ramanjarows

Ramanjarows conduct as Head Sheristadar indepen-
-dently of the abstract question of the Cultivation
as they will force themselves upon the Boards
attention, but no person holding such an
Office can be as he should be, thoroughly
disinterested and independent in the discharge of
the high and responsible duties which devolve
upon him, while he is carrying on pecuniary
dealings with the Reddies under him and keep-
-ing running Accounts with them, settled, if
settled at all, at long intervals and laying
himself under personal and pecuniary
obligations to those whom he has to control
in matters where the public interest, and
more especially the public revenues are
concerned. The Reddies who have been
named in the present Case are not the only
ones with whom such Accounts have been
kept, as will be seen when the other Cases
are brought before the Board. The arrange-
-ments he made with Cundoola Soobareddy
whereby the latter had to pay the Poollary
on his Cattle and the assessment on his
garden

garden, and reimbursed himself by taking the Sheristadar's young bulls appears to me to have been most reprehensible, considering the relative Situations of the parties and equally so the appointment of Maunsing a Jail Peon to the Village Moonsiffship of Reddy-pollem, Ramanjarow is strictly and justly blameable for Maunsing's Appointment. He was a Jail Peon when Ramanjarow was Sheristadar of the Zillah Court and by no means a person of a Class and Character to be invested with the functions of Village Moonsiff he had no Cultivation in Reddy-pollem but by Ramanjarow's Account was kept "on Venkatamursoo's part to conduct "the duties of Head of the Village and the "produce of the Village Inaunium was ap-"propriated for the use of such person." The Maunsing enjoyed the produce of the Reddy Inaunium is utterly untrue and Ramanjarow does not and cannot in direct and positive terms affirm that he

he did. The Reddy Inaunium was cultivated by Ramanjarows Cummatum, and the Coroo produce enjoyed by him. Maunsing in the first instance took Charge of this as he did of the other Grain and received a subsistence from his employers, but the Reddy Inaunium being in his enjoy-ment is notoriously untrue.

The Tahsildar of the 116.

I took on the 20th March 1835 wrote an Arzee recommending Maunsing's Appointment, (the death of the former Moonsiff Palem mootealoo had been reported on the 13th December preceding) and mentioned him as "managing Nuckalapully Venkatamursoo's "Cultivation and other affairs in Reddy-pollem." The order appointing him as Moonsiff was sent on the 26th March four days previous to Mr. Ogilvie's leaving the District and my taking Charge. It is true that Ramanjarow was not at that time Head Sheristadar but he was Deputy Sheristadar and the Head Sheristadarship being

being vacant, he was to all intents and purposes Head Sheristadar.

117. It has been attempted to be shewn that Cundoola Soobareddy was induced to manage the payment of the Poollary on Ramanjarow's Cattle, the Shist on his Cocoanut Garden, and the Wages of his Servants on account of the profit he derived on the young Bulls he took from Ramanjarow, but this is absurd, and even were it true does not take from the impropriety of the whole proceeding. Cundoola Soobareddy states that in the three years he received 15 bulls and that the average profit on each was 1 Rupee, making the Annual profit 5 Rupees and it surely is absurd to suppose that this could have been an object to a substantial Reddy paying upwards of 5000 Rupees revenue to the Government, Soobareddy's undertaking the Management of these Matters for the Sheristadar was nothing more or less than a personal favor for which he no doubt expected to be amply recompensed.

Ramanjarow's

118 Ramanjarow's conduct in regard to the Pauleevansee on his Cultivation at Reddypolliem was most unbecoming a person holding the high Revenue Offices he was then and had been for some years previous holding. The Pauleevansee Remission had been enjoyed for some years and had been given at the rate of 10 Rupees for every 110 Rupees. It was given to Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo as a Puyacarry Cultivator. He being at the time a Servant of the Zillah Court and the ground on which it was given was that the Cultivation was more than 10 Miles from Nellore. It was disallowed by me in fusly 1245 and has been since withheld. A Pauleevansee account was however given in by the Talook Servants at the Settlement of fusly 1245 Amounting to

Rs	a	P
95	4	1

Upon which a remark is made is as follows. "This should not be deducted

at

"at present" from which I am led to infer that he still indulged a hope that I would be eventually allow it.—

119 I know not what apology to offer for the length to which my remarks in this case have extended, but it was one of a rather complicated character, and my only motive has been to lay it before the Board in as clear and intelligible a shape as its nature admits of—As however I found the report would extend so much beyond what I had a conception of, I thought it better to submit it as a separate report, and make the other three Cases the subject of another, and which I hope to submit very shortly. This will be a saving of time, on which account I am sure the arrangement will be as acceptable to the Board as it is convenient to myself, and to public business.

Nellore
Print. Collr's Office
12th June 1840.

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Comp. J.R.

No 1.

Deposition of Bar Baboo row Assistant Tahsildar of Nellore dated 10th March 1839.

1 2. Do you know the circumstance of Sonnaraj Kerry Ramanoojarow having cultivation in the Carvo lands in the Villages of the Nellore and Talumunchy Talooks?

A. In the Village of Codoor in the Nellore Talook he has had since a long time a Cummatum up to last year Cundoola Soobareddy was getting the cultivation carried on. This year he (Heristadar) is getting the cultivation carried on through Vuravoonka Venkatasamareddy besides this he has cultivation and a Cocoanut garden in the Village of Reddypollem in the Talumunchy Talook which is going on through Mootoomoody Narrasimreddy since fusly 1246 he has made some Ryots in the Cuslabat Nellore Establish a Cummatum and carry on cultivation. The names of those Ryots I do not at present recollect. Nuckalapully Venkatamurroo has his own cultivation black cattle and sheep in the Zuptee Shrotrium of Gonalla pollem.

Although

Fort St George 24th December 1830

although the produce is measured and the resources shewn in the Doule, yet the balance is not paid - In July 1248 the Heristadar Ramanoojiroo had about 18 acres of land in Nawlakka near Ranzepollem entered in the name of Pajadaranze Venkatappa a Curnum of Allepooram with the intention of getting a garden of Cocoanut trees planted there. This year that land not having been cultivated, I asked Venkatappa the reason, he said that the last was entered in his names in the Dittum, because the Heristadar had told him to do so for the purpose of planting a garden that he would pay the Shist of the land, and that he Venkatappa had nothing to do with it -

2 Q. Do you know why the aforesaid cultivation was given up by Cundoola Soobareddy ?

A. When he came for the settlement of last year he told me that the Heristadar took away the produce of the said Codoor cultivation, Granges & his cattle, but that the Shist only was

Fort St George 24th December 1830

a tax upon himself - How much longer could he be paying so unfairly and that he would for the future give up the cultivation - This is what Cundoola Soobareddy told me - As the Heristadar caused same Bunjer Shist to be put on Cundoola Soobareddy for July 1247 as a dispute had arisen between them in consequence of its having been known that the Codoor Curnums' Complaint had been made on the hint of Soobareddy, he gave up the cultivation -

3 Q. What was the cause of the Heristadar having put the Shist of Bunjer land upon Soobareddy, when he was carrying on his (Heristadar's) Cultivation ?

A. Soobareddy told me that the Heristadar conceived hatred against him previously to the settlement of last year because he considered that the Codoor Curnum's complaint had been made on his hint, and for this reason Soobareddy told me the Heristadar had put the Bunjer Shist upon him -

With

Fort St George 24th December 1840

4 2. With whose cattle and ploughs is Ramanoojarow's cultivation at Red= =dy pollem carried on?

A. With his own cattle and plough. The produce of that cultivation is sent to him by Mootoomudy Narrainred= =dy at the rate of 5 Potties a Month for his own use and the use of his Chauttry—

5. 2. Ramanoojarow said sometime ago that he had disposed of all his cattle yea belonging to his cultivation at Reddy pollem. but from this it do appears he did not do so.—How is this?—

A. He did not so dispose of them that cultivation is carried on up to this time with his ~~own~~ cattle yea

6 2. Who pays the shist of that land?

A. Narrainreddy pays the shist on his (Sheristadars) behalf and again gets credit for the same from him—

(Signed) Bar Baboorow.

Deposed before me this 10th March 1839

(Signed) T. K Stonhouse

Pr. Cler

Deposition

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

№ 2.

Deposition of Puttry Krishnarow Acting Cash Keeper—dated 10th March 1839—

1 2. It is understood that the Head Sheristadar Sundaraghurry Ramanoojarow has cultivation of Coroo lands in some Villages of Nellore Talook and that it has been entered in the Circar accounts in the names of others, as this circumstance may have been known to you when Tahsildar of the Nellore Talook state what is the truth?

A. It is known that in the Village of Codoor he has some cultivation, and that it was managed through Cundoola Soobareddy up to fusly 1247 on the occasion of my going once to Istapully Godoor a relation of Cundoola Soobareddy told me it had been so up to that year, that they would not keep the cultivation under them any longer, but would make it over to Vanombaaka Venkata= =ramareddy. It is likewise known that he

Fort St George 24th December 1840

he has cultivation at Nellore - and that the Dittum and Puttahs are made out in the name of another individual whose name I dont know, that in the Shrotriem Village of Gundlapollem there is some cultivation in the name of Nuckalapully Venkatanarsoo -

2 Q. When you are Nellore Tahsildar was there any balance due on account of the shist of the said Codove cultivation for fasly 1247?

A. Cundoola Loobareddy and Vanombauka Venkatanareddy used to engage for the payment of the Codove money and were paying it, Cundoola Loobareddy engaged one to pay 240 Rupees on account of Codove and paid some money and said that 40 Rupees had been paid to Vanombauka Venkatanareddy & which he should pay. On Venkatanareddy being asked as to what was the circumstances of the 40 Rupees, he said it was a balance due on account of

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

of the Sheristadars cultivation, that he Venkatanareddy had nothing to do with it and that it should be paid by Cundoola Loobareddy - That money was still due up to the time that I was changed from the Tahsildarship of that Talook, but I dont know whether it was subsequently paid -

3 Q. Ten Rupees monthly are now being deducted from your pay on account of the balance of Tuccavy due by Venkatroyadoo the son of Tippuranze Pumpanah a Ryot of Canoopurty paud in the Nellore Talook what was the cause of your not having acted up to the course laid down for the recovery of Tuccavy balances -

A. I know that the Tuccavy balances should be deducted from the first payments but in July 1838 the Head Sheristadar sent for a daily account of the payments of each individual in every Village in the Nellore Talook when the money was received from Tippuranze Venkatroyadoo, I mentioned that the Tuccavy money

money should be first deducted, and the remainder credited for the thist, but the Sheristadar (told me and Nagoo Narsinga-row the Mazoom Goomastah of the Nellore Talook not to do so and that the whole money should be credited to the thist as the Head Sheristadar directed but I did not do so from ignorance of the rule This circumstance is known to Nyapa-ty Rama row Cotha Venkatachellum Vunum seetiah and many others, but I do not know whether they would at present state the truth -

4 2. Was any security taken for the Tuccavy paid to Venkatroyadoo the son of Sipparauze Pampanah, and if so who stood security and was a demand served upon him for the Tuccavy money?

A. Security was taken for the Tuccavy paid to Sippa-rauze Venkatarayadoo but I do not remember the name

name of the security. The security bonds and their bits were forwarded to the Roazoor When I was Talooldar of that Talook, some property belong-ing to Venkatrayadoo was attached on account of the said Tuccavy balance. That property was subsequently sold in auction and the proceeds thereof it is understood carried to the circar account for the Tuccavy balance, but I dont know whether any demand was served upon the security for the remaining ba-lance -

5 2. Do you know the reason of Cundoola Soobareddy having given up the Head Sheristadar's cultivation in Cudoor since fusly 1247?

A. I understood that in conse-quence of a dispute between the Head Sheristadar and Cundoola Soobareddy the latter said he would give up the cultivation -

(Signed) Puttry Krishnarow.

Taken before me this 19th March 1839 -

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

Deposition

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

No 3.

Deposition of Yaragoodapanty Nursiah Head Sheristah Goomastah Dated 12th March 1839.-

1 2. Do you know of the Woozoor Head Sheristadar having Cultivation in any Villages of the Nellore Talook-

A. Vanoombaka Venkataramareddy Cundoola Soobareddy's brother in law whose name I dont know, Carnum Ravanapah and another Brahmin whose name I dont know, all severally told me that he (Sheristadar) kept 3 Veesa budy ploughs cultivation at Codoor, and kept it up to this time under Cundoola Soobareddy and entering it in the name of Modoor-bee Kistnamacharloo who having been shown this year as having absconded, the cultivation has been kept under the superintendence of Vanoombaka Venkataramareddy- Besides this Venkataramareddy told me that the Sheristadar Ramanjarow told him that upon his representing to the Principal Collector that he had cultivation at Codoor, he

Fort St George

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

he (the Principal Collector) had said there was no hurry, and that he might keep the cultivation, and that he therefore kept the cultivation. There was a balance of 30 Rupees for fusly 1247 in the Codoor Village in the name of the said Kristnamacharloo and after my report on the balances of the Village was sent to you, I made other enquiries and understood from some persons that balance was due on account of the Puttah of the Sheristadar Ramanjarow that 30 Rupees was deducted from the payments made on account of the Circar shist (by other Ryots) and carried to the credit of a sum of 30 Rupees due on the said Kristnamacharloo's cultivation on account of the River channel fines due on that cultivation in consequence of his not having sent persons to clear the channel and that from this cause there is a Revenue balance of 30 Rupees due on the Village and that the Villagers had stated both before Subut Ramunda row the Tahsildar and myself during the enquiry that individual (Kristnamacharloo) had absconded.-

2 2. Relate in what other Villages did you hear that he has cultivation?-

In

1839 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. In last year when I went with the Deputy Sheristadar to measure lands in Canoopurty paud, I heard upon making enquiry of some Ryots who were near the field situated on the east of the Road, that the Sheristadar has cultivation of 2 Ploughs jointly with another Ryot at Cavoobak Nellore - I did not ascertain the names of these persons who mentioned it because I did not then consider it necessary. I heard from many persons that his cultivation in Redolypollem in the Talamunchy Talook is going on as before, that it is merely entered in the name of another -

3 2. Do you know who pays the shist on those cultivations?

A Upon enquiring seperately of some persons at Codoor, I understood that for the cultivation in that Village Ramanjeerow was himself paying the shist in former years and that from fusly 1245 to fusly 1247 the Villagers paid it I dont know the names of those persons - I heard that he (Sheristadar) got the profit derived from the cultivation of that Puttah and from 50 the Cattle belonging to him which are grazing (in the Village) according to the proportion of his ploughs -

(Signed) Yarayen deponent Nursiah
Deposed before me this 12th March 1839 -
(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse pr. Coll.

Compd. J.R.

1840 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

N. 4.

Deposition of Cundoola Soobareddy of Mawchoola vaurepolem, a hamlet of Totapully - 13th March 1839.

2. 1. Do you know of the circumstance of S. Ramanjarow, Head Seristadar, having cultivation in the Villaage of Codoor, in the Nellore
A Talook?

Formerly he had cultivation in that Village, and up to last year it was in the name of Moondoombee Venkata Kristnamacharloo. It was Managed by the Seristadar himself before he became Seristadar - After that, Considering it improper, he gave it over to the Village people and they were managing it - Afterwards I managed it for two years. Viz Fusles 1246 and 1247. This year Maurumreddy Soobareddy and others are managing it, through Vaunumback Venkatram reddy. This is no secret, the whole Country know it -

2 2 Of how many ploughs does that Cultivation consist?

Of

A Of 40 Veesabudy ploughs, it forms three ploughs.—

24 Why did you give up the management of that Cultivation?

A As it was Cultivation attended with loss I gave it up, by which, I mean that he (the seristadar) grazed his Cattle, while I cultivated the land and paid the Puttah sist, which was a loss to me, and therefore I gave it up.—

24 Who took away the Government share of the produce of that cultivation?—

A I took the gross produce and discharged the shist.—

25 Did you or did you not at any time give grain to the Head Sheris-tadar Ramanjarow?—

A I never gave any grain.—

26 Are there any dealings between you and Ramanjarow?

A I pay the shist of his garden at Codaur, also the poollary upon the cattle which he has there, and the wages of his labourers

labourers and receive in discharge of these payments, the young bulls which are borne of his cattle there.—

27 When were the accounts of your dealings settled? When you came on circuit to Indoocoorpett and those parts and returned lately to Nellore, I settled the account at my house signed it and sent it through my Jemmastah. This year I paid also 20 Rupees on account of poollary for which there are young bulls, which I shall take in discharge. That account struck a balance of 7 as 4 as 0 subsequently I paid 20 Rupees on account of poollary and since have been paying the wages of the labourers. The sheristadar Ramanjarow without settling in any way the balance shewn by the above account was personally asking me to settle the account and give him a receipt.—

28. You have stated that Ramanjarow asked to settle the account and gave a receipt, what is your meaning? Is it that he asked you to give a receipt for the amount without paying the balance?—

A yes

A Yes, that was his meaning.—

2 9. Without taking Credit for the young bulls what balance of account would have been due?—

A About 300 Rupees.—

2 10. From the time you began to manage Ramanjarow's Cultivation at Cadoor, was the account of dealings between you at any time settled before?—

A No, the Settlement which took place lately was the first.—

2 11 Did you give a receipt as he requested you?—

A I did not give him a receipt as he desired, but gave him one, taking Credit for the young bulls in Consequence of which he got from the Tahsildar an account of the lands Cultivated under Beetahs in last year in Totapully Cadoor, but afterwards with held the Palewashes allowed in Fusly 1246 and got an order issued at canaepanty: paid for the Collection of the Money.—

D. 12 Who is Mordumbee Venkata Krishnamacharlo?—

A I have never seen him, I do not

know who he is, or where he is.—

D 13 Did not Battey Kristna Row when he was Tahsildar ask you for a balance of 170 Rupees due on account of shist payable on that Cultivation for Fusly 1247?—

A Yes He asked me, I told him I would not pay it but at last I paid it.—

D 14. Why did you say you would not pay the balance?—

A It was cultivation attended with loss. I had to cultivate the land and pay the shist, while he grazed his cattle, I told Battey Kristnarow what sort of thing was this, and I would not pay the balance.—

D 15 Where is the said account of dealings?—

A In my house.—

D. 16. Why was there a balance of 170 Rupees outstanding on that Cultivation for Fusly 1247?—

There was a loss upon the gross produce, inconsequence of which the balance was outstanding.—

Does

× ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥ ಕೊಡು— Meaning enjoyed the only benefit attached to having Cultivation in the Village where pasture land is so valuable that the ryots would not listen for an instant to a single head of cattle grazing unless the persons had an equal and undoubted right by having Cultivation in the Village—

D 17 Does the account which you have stated to have settled as above include the balance of 170 Rupees?

A It does not.

D 18 How many bulls were given when you settled the account of dealings with him?

A 15 Bulls.

(Signed) Cundoola Seshareddy

Deposed before me the 13th March 1839.

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

No. 5

Deposition of Byna Boyana Naraspah Managing the Codaur River Channel. Dated 13th March 1839.

This day Hanneedas Dewkhan the 1st Assistant Tahsildar of the Vellore Talook sent for and asked me to state who of the people who should come for the Codaur River Channel are not Coming regularly? regarding this I have to state that 18 persons should according to account

Come

Come from my Village to the River Channel - Hitherto 16 persons have always come, one and a half person for the Soondaraghavevar's Cummatum and half person belonging to the Village Cummatum - altogether 2 persons have discontinued coming - the other Cummatars now and then seeing that these 2 persons did not come, used also to keep back one or two persons upto last year - Cundoola Soobareddy used to manage Soondaraghavenars

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Soondaragherear's Cunnumatum For the Current year Vanoombanka Venkata-ramareddy caused the Cultivation to be carried on by Rayacaries - namely Aumoolaor Narrainreddy and others.

Forty or fifty Cows are grazing in the Pasture land allotted proportionally to this Cunnumatum - This is what I know -

Mark of Byana Byana naraparu

(Signed) Coraun Pedda Soobiah

(True Translation.)

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector -

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

No. 6

Deposition of Coraun Pedda Soobiah 2nd Class Daloyet at Hoozoor. -

dated 19th March 1839. -

1 2. Does my Hoozoor Head Seristadar Soondara gherry Ramanjarow hold Cultivation in any Village in this Zillah. 2 If so. state all you know regarding it. -

A. Ramanjarow has been carrying on Cultivation through Cundoola Soobareddy of 1½ Share in the Village of Codoor in the Nellore Talook up to last year - From the Current year Cundoola Soobareddy gave it up, and Vanoombanka Venkataramereddy is causing the Cultivation to be carried on, on account of the 1½ Share which Ramanjarow has got in that Village. 1½ persons should work on the Jaffur Shaeb's Channel - In the time of Sar Shahagherry Row late Tahsildar of the Nellore Talook, persons used to come regularly to work in the Channel - After his death Ramanjarow's proportion of people, did

did not come to clear the Channel. On my asking Byana Boyana Naraspah of the Head River Channel man of the Cudoor Village, as to why those persons did not come, he said that Cundoola Soobareddy did not send the persons belonging to Soondaraghery var's Cummutum. I immediately came and mentioned this to Puttry Kristnarow the then Tahsildar of Nellore. He said they are persons belonging to the Serestadar's Cultivation. What can we do. after which I wrote them down as Nagas / or absent and liable to fine / I made out every month an account of the Nagas and delivered it into the Talook Cutchery in common with that of all other Villages. What amount of the River Channel fine has been collected, I dont Know. This year only Vanoombauka Vencataramereddy is sending regularly persons according to the proportion, to work in the Channel.

The Serristadar's Son-in-law

Nuckalapully

Nuckalapully Venceatanursoo manages the cultivation of these lands. Viz.:

1. The field Dodlagoonta chanoo situated to the South of Nellore and Cultivated by means of Guddum Naraimreddy an inhabitant of Nellore.

2. One share of a Tobacco garden situated to the east of Nellore.

3. One Betel garden situated to the west of Nellore and cultivated by 3 persons, Viz. Cuntabuttoony Paupareddy, Poonoogoty Rungapah and Bundar Venca-taramoodoo.

Naraimreddy Cultivates the Nellore land and the Tobacco garden. The Puttah merely for the Nellore cultivation is in the name of Naraimreddy and the superintendence is made by Nuckalapully Venca-tanursoo the son-in-law of Sheristadar Ramanoojarow. The Betel garden was given on Mustah to Rungapah and some others, 3 persons.

Besides this, I heard that the Sheristadar has shares of the Cultivation in the

the fields called Vyala and Wooddemetta situated to the east of Nellore, but I am not well acquainted with the circumstances.

2 2. You have stated that the Sheristadar has one and a half share in the cultivation of Codoor. Of how many ploughs does 1½ share consist?

A. I know that the Sheristadar has 1½ plough at Codoor, I do not know with how many more ploughs he carries on cultivation. I thought that one plough was a share.

3 2. Do you know the circumstance of the Sheristadar Soondarayherry Ramanjarow having cultivation in any Village of the Talamunchy Talook?

A. I am hearing that Ramanjarow holds cultivation in the Village of Reddypollam, but I never went to that Village or saw it.

(Signed) Coreem Pedda Soobiah.

Deposed before me this 19th March 1839.

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse.

Princ. Collector.

Deposition

No. 7

Deposition of Nalatoor Vurdacharloo Kayem Puttadar in the Village of Codoor - dated 19th March 1839.

1 2. State the whole of what you know regarding the Sheristadar Soondarayherry Ramanjarow holding cultivation in the Village of Codoor.

A. The Cultivation of Codoor is carried on in 40 shares, of which the Sheristadar has three shares, and land sowable with 3 Candies of seed is cultivated for his three shares. The number of ploughs is not fixed. Cundoola Soobareddy used to manage the cultivation of the three shares for the Sheristadar up to the last year, the Sheristadar received the profit derived from the Cultivation and put on Soobareddy any loss when it occurred. In last year Soobareddy refused and gave up the Sheristadar's Cultivation, in consequence of which measures have been taken so that Vanumbaut Vencatramreddy may manage the cultivation of the said

said three shares for the Serishtadar, and accordingly in the current year Venkat-ramareddy is managing the Cultivation of the 3 Shares which the Sheristadar holds in the Village of Codoor. about 80 female Cattle and calves and about 40 ploughing Cattle making altogether 120 Cattle belonging to the Seristadar are grazing in the Village Codoor, Cundala Soobareddy manages about the Poollary payable on the female Cattle Vca and the hire paid for tending them when graz-ing, and such other things. The Sheristadar has a Cocoanut garden in three gartoos of wet land in the Village of Codoor. The shist of the that land amounts to 30 Rupees. I heard that the wet land was this year included under dry and the produce of the garden enjoyed by the Seristadar. In that Cocoanut garden there are plantain, guava and other fruit trees. The Village of Reddypollem in the Talamanchy Talook was enjoyed by the Sheristadar up to the

Fusly

Fusly 1246 as one Puttah. From Fusly 1247 Mooloomoody Narrainreddy is managing that Cultivation and the produce is enjoyed by the Sheristadar. It is going on in this way.

2 2. Are the 40 ploughing Cattle in the Village of Codoor the Sheristadar's own.

A. They are his own. As he is the Sheristadar, Ryots send their Cattle during the Cultivating Season and afterwards again take them away.

3 2. Is Cundoola Soobareddy, still managing about the Poollary payable on the Sheristadar's female Cattle Vca and other things.

A. Soobareddy is managing to this day about the pasturing Vca of the female Cattle Vca at Codoor belonging to the Seristadar.

4 2. When Cundoola Soobareddy was managing the Sheristadar's Cultivation at Codoor, who used to pay the shist for his Cocoanut Garden, poollary for his Cattle, hire for tending them shist

for

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

for his land in cultivation in that Village, and the wages of his labourers and gardeners - and who used to look after his Cattle Vizt.-

A. Up to last year Cundoola Soobareddy used to pay the wages of the labourers and of those who grazed his Cattle the tax on the Cattle and the Shist of the land, so far as the resources derived from Seristadar's Cultivation admitted, and if there remained any balance, he used to deduct from the payments made on account of the Shist of other Ryots and Credit it to the balance due by the Seristadar, and the rest was made to appear as a balance due by other Ryots. There are no Servants in the Cocoanut Garden. The produce derived from that garden is enjoyed by those who Cultivate it. For the current year Soobareddy manages the Cattle in that Village and the Cocoanut garden only, and Manombauk Meucataramreddy the net

Cultivation

Fort St George 24th December 1840.

Cultivation, as the Circar Shist is not yet paid for the current year, it is not known whether the Seristadar would hereafter pay it from the resources, or no Meucataramreddy.-

Do you know the circumstance

3 2. of the Seristadar and Cundoola Soobareddy having come to a settlement of their dealings a few days ago.-

A. I am acquainted with the circumstance of the Seristadar having sent Surraze Narrainapah, Dumpoor Soobiah and Meucatroydoo and others who live in the Seristadar's house, to Soobareddy suspecting that he /Soobareddy/ might mention in the Hoozoor the circumstance of the Seristadar being indebted to him, and sent for him, but I dont know whether the matter of their dealings was settled - He was saying that the Seristadar was indebted to Soobareddy in a sum of about 700 or 800 Rupees.-

/Signed/ Nerdacharloo

Deposed before me this 19th March 1839.-

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse.

Asst. Collector.

Statement.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 8.

Statement of M. Ponnoosbottum. Deputy Sristadar dated 21st March 1839.

1 2. State if you know the circumstance of the Head Sristadar Ramanjarow holding cultivation in the Villages of the Nellore or Talook or in the Villages of any other Talook, and state what you know regarding other irregularities committed by him.

A. In Cushah Nellore of the Nellore Talook there then was from Fusly 1234 to Fusly 1246 cultivation in the name of Moodoombee Sheene-vasacharlar, man of the Sristadar Ramanjarow. This cultivation was carried on by a Ryot called Guddeem Naraidoo and in Fusly 1246 Sheenevasacharloo's name was taken out and the said Guddeem Narainreddy's name entered in dittum. The dittum up to Fusly 1246, was as

Dms Cents
3. 32 of Metta. ac. 27. Cents. 29/16 of Maugauny 2. 38/4 of Bagayet. total 34. 20/16. In Fusly 1247 1. 19/2 of dry land of the Cushah, situated near the road leading to Goondlapollem was taken, and this as well as 3. 32. held

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

in the name of Narainreddy. total 5. 11/2 of Metta and 2. 38/4 of Bagayet making altogether 8. 10/0 is entered in the dittum as with some of Cullavacolloo Venentsoobiah a man of Ruckalapully Venentumsoo, a stone well in the Metta and one also in the Bagayet were constructed by them, and the Bagayet land is cultivated with Betel &c. and a portion of the Metta land with Modoom.

+ Sristadar's Nephew.

In this Nellore Village a portion of the Metta land held in the name of Goloo-pully Sashagherry Row, a man of Nyapaty Hanoomantarow up to Fusly 1246 was taken from Hanoomantarow and put in the dittum of Fusly 1247 in the name of Soomooloorce Ramasawmy a man of Ramanjarow, but as Hanoomanta-row disliked Ramanjarow he again took his land and got it put in the name of the said Sashagerryrow for Fusly 1248.

In the Guefted Shotrium of Goondlapollem situated in this Talook Anoomade Raghavareddy and

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

and Nuckalapully Vencatnursoo kept a joint cummatum and are carrying on cultivation, this is shewn in the Circar books of this Village; their Cattle remain in the Village for some time. In Codoor a Cummatum was kept for some years prior to Fusly 1245 for the sake of the Cattle, Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo's name entered in the Circar accounts, Cattle grazed in the pasture lands according to the Meerabuddy proportions and the Cummatum carried on subsequently in Fusly 1245. the dittum &c. was settled in the names of Cundoola Soobareddy and Moodoombee Streenevasacharlos and in Fusly 1246 in the names of Moodoom-bee Venkatakristnamacharlos and Cun-doola Soobareddy, and for the current year (Fusly 1248) in Vanumbaka Venkata-pamareddy's name and Cattle are grazed in common with other Ryots on the pasture lands according to the Veesabuddy pro-portion. In this Village there is a Cocoanut tope planted by him (Seristadar). In the

Peishcar's.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Peishcar's account of Cattle received by the Circar for this Village in Fusly 1247. 82 Cattle are entered for the five ploughs of Moodoom-bee Venkatakristnamacharlos as belonging to Soondaragherry & Vencatrungum of — which 20 are deducted as ploughing Cattle and four on other accounts making 24— His (Sheristadar's) Cattle are in this Village.—

In the Village of Reddy-pollem in the Talamunchy Talook a Com-matum was held in the name of — Nuckalapully Vencatnursoo up to Fusly 1245 and in Fusly 1246 the name of one Mooloo-moody Veerareddy an inhabitant of Vagoor was entered in the dittum. In this Village he has plantain and Cocoanut Gardens &c. For some years past he employed a Peon — Mootialoo on this Cummatum and his death having taken place he employed one Maun-sing. He got the Head Caupoo's Maunium of this Village continued to Mootealoo — while he lived and after his death in the name of Maun Singand used to enjoy the produce

* A Boy of about 12 years of age & the eldest son of Ramanjarow's elder Brother.

+ Formerly a Peon when the Seristadar was employed at the Zillah Court.

produce of it. The Inaumium is still continued in the name of Maun Sing.

/ Signed / M. Pooroshottum
Deputy Seristadar

Delivered in this 22d March 1839.

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

No 9.

Deposition of Chaluck Arundarow Acting Tahsildar of Sunguru and formerly of Nellore dated 21st March 1839.

1 2 State particularly what you know regarding the circumstances of the Head Seristadar Soondaragherry Ramanjeru holding Cultivation at Codoor?

A The dittum was in Fusly 1247 in the name of Moodoombee Venkatakistnamacharloo and all along before that Soobareddy Cultivated the land which on his own account was entered in the name of Goviram Wobalreddy and also the whole of that entered in the name of the said Venkatakistnamacharloo. For Fusly 1248 Gundoola Soobareddy being asked to take the

the said dittum land as usual stated that he had sustained much loss, that the Seristadar's Cattle were grazing in the proportion of pasture land allotted to the dittum held in the name of the said Venkatakistnamacharloo that he had sustained much loss on that account that a large balance was due to him on that account, that he could stand it no longer, and that he did not want the dittum afterwards Varambanka Venkatareddy had the land entered in his dittum for the Current year. The Seristadar's Cattle graze in the proportion of pasture land allotted to this dittum. The Seristadar's Cattle grazing on the proportion of pasture allotted to this dittum is sufficient of itself to declare that the dittum land is the Seristadar's besides this the proportion of river Channel work appertaining to Moodoombee Venkatkristnamacharloo's dittum was not done in Fusly 1247. The fines (thereon) were deducted from the Total Village Collections

Collections and there is a balance of 30 Rupees outstanding on Goorrum Woobulreddy's Cummatum on that account. At the time of enquiry into the balances I asked the Capoors and Currums and Soobareddy on what account the balance was due, when Cundoola Soobareddy stated that it was the amount of river Channel fines payable on Ramanjarow's Dittum held in Venkatakristnamacharloo's name, and was to pay this for in addition to the loss upon the Cultivation, that the whole Village should pay it that he had nothing to do with it, and that it had been deducted from his payments. On the Villagers being directed to pay it, these Capoors said that he (Soobareddy) managed the Cummatum for his (Sheristadar's) favor, were they to suffer this loss in addition to getting water to his Cummatum lands. In this way both parties objected, so this balance of 30 Rupees is entered under the Head of Tukrar, and exhibited

+ Meaning that the whole labour of clearing the Channels was theirs in which the Sheristadar did not assist.

exhibited as a Tukrar balance on Goorrum Woobulreddy's Cummatum on account of river Channel fines deducted (from his payments) shortly after I came to this Talook (Nellore) Cundoola Soobareddy told me, that the Seristadar Ramanjarow owed him a balance of about 1000 Rupees on account of sums advanced for this Cummatum &c, afterwards when you came to Indoocoorpett he told me he had settled the account of the dealings between him and the Seristadar, but the particulars of the settlement he did not mention.

2 Who is the Venkatakristnamacharloo you have mentioned above?

A He is commonly mentioned by both the names of Venkatakristnamacharloo and Kistnamacharloo, and so it is in the Dittum. At the formation of the dittum for fusly 1247 I enquired as to who he was, and understood that he was the Seristadar's servant

servant and lived in his house. I did not see him in that Fusly or in the Current one.

32 Do you know of his holding Cultivation in any other Village of the Nellore Talook?

A In Cusbah Nellore a Bagayet betel Garden is held in the name of Cullavacoor Vencatasoobiah and Cultivated by Bunder Vencatramareddy and Poonoogoty Vencatramireddy. The extent is 2 Acres and 38 3/4 Coontahs and the Shist thereof is Rs 11 a 2 o. Curnum Moorterauze told me once that the Cunnatum held for 5 or 6 years in the name of Guddeem Narrainreddy was nominally his but in reality the Seristadar's this and a Inooloom Garden called Seyladinna Doroovo toda Cultivated in Puttu land under the irrigation of a Kunney bhawee or large Well held in the name of Calavalo or Vencata Soobiah belonged to the Seristadar Ramanjarow and

and at another time he said they belonged to his (Seristadar's) Son in law Nakalapully Vencatnursoo. Curnum Moorterauze also mentioned that the ploughing Cattle in the Shrotriem of Goondlapollem belonging to Nakalapully Vencutnursoo tilled the Cunnatum lands held in Guddum Narrainreddy's name. These inwardly are their Cultivation. In the Syfted Shotriem of Goondlapollem there is still a Cunnatum in the name of Nakalapully Vencatnursoo and Anoomareddy Rayavareddy. In the account of the measurement of the grain sent to the Hoozoor for fusly 1247 the names of these two persons are distinctly entered. Moorterauze mentioned that there was a durkast in the name of Cullavacoor Vencata Soobiah proposing to plant a tope in 1 Acre and 19 1/2 Coontahs of dry land at Nellore situated contiguous to the boundary of Goondlapollem. Ramanjarow has a Cocoanut Garden at Codoor and Cundoola Soobareddy manages

* This Shrotriem does not belong to N. Vencutnursoo but he has the principal cultivation in it.

managers at It is understood that the last years shist was paid through Soobareddy I recollect that the name of the said Moodoo-bee Vencatacharloo was entered also as Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo in the ad-dittum of some years Cundoola Soobareddy has paid for the Current year Fusly 1248 on account of Poollary payable for Ramanjarows Cattle a sume of upwards of 20 Rupees—

4 2 You have stated above that Ramanjarows mere grazing of his Cattle at Codoor is a proof of his holding Cultivation there what is your meaning?

A. The Villagers will not give beedoo land for the pasturage of Cattle to any one who has not Cultivation in the Village in which his Cattle graze I can state positively that the circumstances of his Cattle grazing in the proportion of pasture land allotted to the Cummatam could not take place without the Cummaturs being

being so—

5 2 Do you know of Ramanja-rows holding Cultivation in the Village of Reddypollum?

A. Formerly the whole Village of Reddypolliem was held under one Pottа either in the name of Vakana-pully Venkutsurroo, or of Soondarayherry Venkutrungum— I heard that after Ramanjarow became Head Seristadar he put it in charge of Mooloomoody Narrainreddy but I do not know what is inwardly the condition made between Ramanjarow and Narrainreddy—

6 2 Who is this Mooloomoody Narrainreddy, is there friendship between him and the Seristadar and are there any dealings between them?

A He is an inhabitant of Cherlopolliem a hamlet of Vagoor in the Talamunchy Taloob— From the time Reddypollem came into Ramanja-rows possesion, there have excisted dealings and friendship between Narrain-reddy

reddy and Ramanjarow.

Q. 2. Do you know if the Seristadar is indebted to Mooloomoody Narrainreddy?

A. It is commonly said that Ramanjarow owes Narrainreddy about two or three thousand Rupees.

/ Signed / Chaluck Anundarow

Tahsildar

Deposed before me this 21st March 1839.

/ Signed / T. V. Stanhouse

Principal Collector

Deposition

Compd. L.R.

No. 10.

Deposition of Pullay Kistnarow, Tahasildar of Tala-
-munchy. Dated 21st March 1839.

2. State all you know regarding the cir-
-cumstance of the Hoozoor Head Seristadar, Soondaragherry Raman-jarow, holding cultivation in the Village of Reddy polliyem in the Tala-
-munchy Talook.

A. Ramanjarow's Cultivation has been carried on for a long period in the said Village of Reddy pollem. About 2 or 3 years ago, the cultivation was entered in the name of Veera-
-reddy, elder brother of Mooloomoody Narrain-
-reddy, an inhabitant of Cheroolapollem and friend of Ramanjarow, and a Puttah issued in his name, but as the Office of Head Capoo of Reddy polliem was continued in the name of Maunsingh the Head person of Ramanjarow's cultivation, he was at Reddy pollem up to the time I enquired into all the Circumstances of that place when Tahasildar of Talamunchy Talook in last year. It is understood that this said Maunsingh has gone away to some place or other, by which I think that Ra-
-manjarow got the cultivation for his Puttah issued in the name of Veerareddy, Considering

it

it improper to Keep it in his own name.- Besides this Mooloomoody Narrainreddy used to tell me occasionally when I was formerly Tahasildar of the Talamunchy Taluk that Ramanjarow has a Cocoanut Garden and Plantain Garden in this Village and enjoyed the produce thereof.-

2.Q. Did you ask the said Maunsingh at any time as to on whose account he was managing the Cultivation at Reddy pollem?-

A. It was not necessary to ask him about it, every one Knows that the Cultivation managed by Maunsingh at Reddy pollem belongs to the Seristadar Ramanjarow, and as I am also perfectly acquainted with the circumstance of Maunsingh's managing Ramanjarow's Cultivation, I did not ask him about it.-

3.Q. The Seristadar Ramanjarow represented to me that he sold to Narrainreddy the ploughing Cattle he had at Reddy pollem. State what you Know of that Circumstance?-

A. There have existed dealings between Ramanjarow

Ramanjarow and Narrainreddy to a large extent. that is to say upwards of 5000 or 6000 Rupees, therefore it is not known whether Ramanjarow sold his ploughing cattle to Narrainreddy, and although Narrainreddy is put upon oath and questioned about the sale of the ploughing Cattle, he would not say so because there are large money dealings between them.-

4.Q. Is there much friendship between Narrain reddy and Ramanjarow, and if so for how long?-

A. There exist much friendship between them and it has existed for about 15 years.-

5.Q. Do you Know the circumstance of the Seristadar Ramanjarow holding Cultivation in Codoor or any other Village.- State the whole circumstance about it.?-

A. I Know the circumstance of his holding cultivation in Codoor, there was a large balance outstanding on account of Ramanjarow's Cultivation in Codoor, in the name of a man of Ramanjarow with whose name I am not acquainted. In fusly 1235

or

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

or 36 or shortly afterwards (I dont exactly recollect the fusly) The said cultivation was managed by a man of Ramanjarow upto the time Mr. Stonhouse came to this co. Zillah as Principal Collector.-

After Ramanjarow became seristadar, I heard he got the cultivation entered in the name of some other person thinking it not proper to keep it in his name. I heard that Ramanjarow holds cultivation at co. Nellore also but I do not know in whose name it is held. I heard that Ramanjarow has a Cundrega at Jucpully Goodoor in Cavely Talook, and that he incorporated a certain extent of Government land with the Cundrega, I heard also that co. Bhaskara Sashachellem preferred a co. Complaint in Mr. Whishstime stating that he had incorporated a certain extent of caroo (Government) land with his Cundrega That complaint has not been enquired into and disposed of.

(Signed) Pulley Heistnarow.

Deposed before me this 21st March 1839.-

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse.
Principal Collector

No. 11

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

No. 11.

N. Lutchmenursoo's Declaration, dated 23d co. March 1838.-

1. 2. State if you know the circumstance of the Head Seristadar Ramanjarow holding cultivation in the Villages of the Nellore co. Talook or in the Villages of any other Talook, and state what you know regarding other irregularities committed by him.?

A. Seristadar has cultivation in the Village of Codoor and in the Zufted Shotrium of Goondlapollem in the Nellore Talook and in the Village of Reddepollem in the Talamun=chee Talook, although he has for a long time since had cultivation in Codoor he has kept it in the name of Moodoomby Streenevasa=charloo his servant and not in his own co. name, and got Puttahs and Dittums prepared in that man's name up to Fusly 1244.- at the end of that Fusly having been appointed Seristadar, he considered that if it was entered only in the name of Streenevasa=charloo, it would be known that it belonged to himself, and therefore had it entered in

the

the name of Streenevasacharloo and Cundoola Soobareddy jointly, occupied more land than he had up to Fusly 1244 and had the same entered in the Dittum and caused a remark to be written in the Dittum that the land having been given up by Streenevasacharloo was taken by Cundoola Soobareddy- at the time of giving Puttahs for Fusly 1245 he had a Puttah made out in the name of Cundoola Soobareddy and Streenevasacharloo- while it ought to have been in the name of the former only if it had been actually given up by the latter-

For Fusly 1246 the Sahsildar sent in a Dittum in the first instance in which the land was entered in the name of Cundoola Soobareddy in the room of Moodoomby Streenevasacharloo, and a fresh Dittum was given at the time of settlement of the lands which had been divided according to the Veesa-bady Shares in this Dittum, the Seristadar caused the names of Moodoomby Kistnama-charloo and Cundoola Soobareddy to be both entered. In the Shist form prepared before this (the giving in the 2nd Dittum) the Seristadar caused the names of Moodoomby

Venkata

Venkata Kistamacharloo and Goorrum Wobul-reddy to be entered and Puttahs given according to the Veesabaddy Shares, he reduced the land below what it was in the previous Fusly 1245. In forming the Dittum for Fusly 1247, the name of Moodoomby Venkata Kistnama-charloo was entered under the apprehension that if the name of Wobulreddy or Cundoola Soobareddy was entered, it would give them a right to the land- more land was taken than was occupied in Fusly 1246- upon the Dittum the Seristadar made Veneataramareddy sign for Venkata Kistnamacharloo and the same was done in the Shist form. Thinking that any one might complain that he had cultivation in this Village he caused a Fly Jeut to be executed by the curnum of that Village mentioning that the land belonged to Cundoola Soobareddy who was to enjoy the profit or loss on it, and kept it on the record although a Fly-Jeut was executed in this manner and there are ambeguelties in the accounts, he Supposing that Soobareddy Vca would hereafter perhaps claim the land, under these circumstances caused to be entered in the Pollary accounts

of

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

of Fusly 1247. five Ploughs of Moodoomby Venecata Kistnamacharloo a dependant of Soom= =dragherry Vencatrungum deducted 20 ploughing cattle at the rate of 4 per plough, and also 4 Cattle for the family, making a totab of 24. These 24 were deducted from the 82 cattle counted in that Village as belonging to that man and grazing tax was charged for the remaining cattle. In Fusly 1248. Dittum. Venecata Kistna= =macharloo's Cammatum was entered in for the present belonging to Vencatramreddy. This Villy being a Veesabaddy Village, and as the pasture lands must be divided according to the Veesabaddy cu= cummatums and grazed by cattle according by the entry of Vencatramreddy's name was merely nominal, as 84 Cattle belonging to the Seris= =tadar are remaining in this Village and in the Poolary account sent to circar after the counting of Fusly 1248 took place, the name of Soondragherry Vencatrungum was entered, as these cattle are now grazing in the pasture lands allotted according to the Veesabady shares in the Village, there is not the least ground to doubt his still having Cultivation there, notwithstanding the entry

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

entry of a fictitious name in the Dittum. Ryots in any Village will agree to receive grazing tax for one or two cattle of individuals who have no cultivation, and to allow them to graze in menka lands, but they will not allow many cattle belonging to any one to graze from year to year without his having Cultivation according to the Veesabuddy (or shares). I enquired into this when I went to the Village in Fusly 1246 and it was then understood that although the names of Kistnamacharloo and Wobulreddy were entered, the Cummatum be= =longed to the Seristadar. that there were many cattle belonging to him grazing in that Village and that he has a garden and cattle sheds there. By this, and for the foregoing reason, there is no ground whatever to doubt his having cul= =tivation.-

In the Village of Goondla= =pollem there is a joint Cummatum in the names of Nuckellapully Vencatnursoo the Seristadar's nephew and who lives with him an undivided family, and Anamareddy Paupa= reddy. In the accounts received by the Circar these names are regularly en= entered.-

In

In the Village of Reddy pollem he has had cultivation from Fusly 1231 in the name of Nuckalapully Vencatnursoo (his nephew) and the Head Caupoo's Maunium is enjoyed by him. at the Settlement of Fusly 1242 the same was entered in the name of Mootaeah who was the cultivator of his cummatum lands, since Fusly 1245 the Head Caupooship was in the name of one Maunsing who managed this Cultivation but the land was entered in the Dittum of Fusly 1245 in the name of Ven-
-catnursoo his (Seristadar's) Nephew. although for Fusly 1246 the land was entered in the name of Veerareddy the nephew of Mooloomoody Cw Narrainreddy, yet the Head Caupooship was in the name of Maunsing who is the Seristo-
-dar's dependant, from which it is understood that the produce of the Caupoo Maunium and the loss and profit of the cultivation is his. The Head Caupoo Maunium being still in Maunsing's posession, there is no room to say that he has not cultivation in that Village. Mooloomoody Narrainreddy is a person deeply concerned in the Seristadar's Cw private

private concern. They are both one.-

Besides this the Woortoowar's Cw (Poligars) maunium in the Village of yaroor and the maunium in the Village of Codoor are enjoyed by the Seristadar. It is understood that they were assigned over as a donation to his (Seristadar's) Choultry. I don't think Cw this was brought to your notice when the Poligar's report was prepared and dispatched.-

He (Seristadar) had Culti-
-vation in the Nellore Town up to Fusly 1244 in the name of Mooloomby Streenewasacharloo and had it carried on by Guddum Nar-
-raidoo. Now it is the name of Guddum Narraidoo and a well was dug in the Name of his Calender Brahmin and Bagayet Cw crops are cultivated.-

In Fusly 1247 the Cw Seristadar took forcibly the garden of Nyapaty Hanoomuntrow at Nellore and had it entered in the dittum in the name

of

18482 Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

of Soommaloor Ramasawmy, his de-
-pendant. as Hanoomunstarow de-
-manded it back, and was prepared
to give an arzee to your honor to
had it entered in fusly 1248 inco
the account of relinquished lands
and gave it to him back again.

(Signd.) A. Lutchmenarsoo
1st assistant Sristadar.

Delivered in this 23d March 1839.

(Signd) T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector.

Deposition.

18483. Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No 12.

Deposition of Aregala Narsimhallo Cultivator
dated 23d March 1839.

1 2 Do you know of the Honor Head
Sristadar Sundaraghavy Ramanjarow holding
Cultivation? state all the particulars about it.

a Hithato we used to cultivate the
fields called Doddukutta and Conadatoo
situated to the south of Kellore, about 10 or
12 years ago S. Ramanjarow took them
took, had them cultivated by his servants
and enjoyed the produce therefore. I hear
that for the last 4 years Ramanjarow as-
sociated himself with a Ryot called
Guddum Narraidoo, had them cultivated
and is enjoying the produce thereof
equally with Narraidoo. The said two fields
are assessed at about 80 Rupees. I am
acquainted with this circumstance be-
cause it was from us that Ramanjarow
took the fields having taken them without
my leave relinquished them & gave Petitions to
the

Fort St. George 26th December 1840

the late Principal Collectors Messrs Smalley, Thompson and Thick, requesting to have them restored to me, as they gave no answers to my Queries, I write this — for your information

2 2 Are these fields still under Ramanjaroo?

a They were on Ramanjaroo's name till he became Sirristadar, after that he put Sircaimeddy between — and though I am told them cultivated and he and Ramanjaroo enjoyed the produce myself

3 2 For how many years had those fields been in the possession of yourself and your members when they were taken from you and you continued to pay the assd on them without keeping balance?

a Those fields were in possession from the time of father and grand father Viz — about 60 or 70 years — During the Tenure I had pd Peishcar for all my fields whether the Crops raised up or gratuitously thereafter I the ryot to pay Sunnadu fee for which also

Fort St. George 26th December 1840

upon these two fields. After the survey when the pahi was fixed that the assessment was to be collected only on lands which were productive and not on those in which the Crops perished. Ramanjaroo took those fields from us for his own profit we paid the assd on these lands according to Mr Travers's Patteh, whether they yielded produce or not up to the time of the survey — without keeping any balance.

How do you know those fields are still under the Sirristadar and on what grounds do you make that statement?

a I know it because some of the Cattle which cultivate that land are — Ramanjaroo's and his labourers are cultivating in those fields and because I paid assd to the Sirristadar house and as the accounts of the Cultivation written there and taken the produce of those fields to the Sirristadar house and has to put into his grain pits

3 All these circumstances are known to me

Thom

Fort St. George 22nd December 1840.

I know that those fields are still under the Sevitadar, at the time of Ramanjarow's first taking those fields from me he sent for me, and made Cullavacow Vencatasuddy ask me, if I was willing to have them cultivated by laborers on his behalf and to share the produce equally (with me) but as I did not consent, he afterwards got it Cultivated first as his own Cultivation.

5 2 Do you know the names of the laborers who are at present those fields on behalf of Ramanjarow?

a As they are Parriahs, I don't know properly their names.

6 2 What is the persons are acquainted with the circumstance of those fields being still under Ramanjarow and what are their names?

a Cullavacow Vencatasuddy Ramagooty Venkatanarrah Pundaram Timmaraniady and all other Ryots of Kellore know of the same

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

will tell it to the Gentleman.—

Signd Narrapilla Narsimhulu

Disposed before me this 23d March 1839.—

Signd C. P. Stonhouse

Pt Collector

No 13

Deposition of Aumunchurlah Rammunnah.—

Pottah of Cudoor in Nellore Talook dated 27 March 1839.—

1 2 State all the particulars you know regarding the Circumstances of the Sevitadar Ramanjarow holding Cultivation at Cudoor.—

a Cudoor is a Vencatagiry Village of 50 Coughs of which Ramanjarow has Cultivation of 3 Shares.— He has pasture lands and fields pertaining to the 3 Shares. These years before the Dittum was held in the name of Muddoosamy Streenivasachariar for some time and in that of Muddoosamy Venkata Kotnamachariar for some time Sondaragiry Ramanjarow used to enjoy the produce thereof upto last year Cundula Jorbareddy joined Ramanjarow's 3 Shares with him for about 3 Years and jointly cultivated

Ramanjarow's

Ramanjarow's and his own lands.— In last year for having been sustained on Ramanjarow's shares Soobareddy did not pay although the[y] was over a balance of about 120 Rupees due on account of Ramanjarow's share of his Coconut garden. Seeing on his Cattle &c. for Conveyance of being prepared to pay Soobareddy told me to inform the Tahsildar that he had nothing to do with it, and would not pay it because it was a balance due on the Sunkadavu shares I enquired then the then Tasildar of this who sent for Soobareddy and asked him for the balance. He (Soobareddy) spoke to the Sirestadar at this place (Kellore) and paid 100 Rupees odd. There is still a balance of 16 Rupees and odd outstandings for last year. The Rice channel not having been cleared for Ramanjarow's shares a sum of 30 Rupees was deducted from the village Collections and carried to the credit of the Rice Channel Fund from Ramanjarow's 3 shares and cleared off the balance under —

Ramanjarow

Ramanjarow's Cummatum for the current year Soobareddy has given up the Cultivation of the 3 shares considering that Ramanjarow would not pay the balance and why should he (Soobareddy) be bothered to pay. as there was no one to carry on Ramanjarow's Cultivation as other Ryots. The Canoe and Peddavary Cultivation was not made. When the Tahsildar came for the Sangabady Pittum of that Village, he enquired into the circumstances, but as Vencombanka Venkatarameddy had already gone to Kellore spoken with the Sirestadar and returned. He got the 3 shares of Ramanjarow's Cultivation put down in his name and as the season was late, Cultivated Cowrie Cora and Cassary Crops.— It must be known hereafter who will enjoy the produce of those shares, Ramanjarow's Cattle are still grazing in those lands, People for clearing the Rice channel for those 3 shares were not sent the men People of 37 shares only came, from Codoor to clear the Rice channel. The sum of 30 Rupees deducted

on

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

on account of the River channel Sunes due on those
3 Shares for Fusly 1247. as above mentioned
and the balance of more or less 15 Rupees which
is outstanding have to be collected on account
of the Cultivation of those 3 Shares.—

Signed Rammunnah.
Peishkar

Deposed before me this 27th March 1839.

Signed F. O. Stonhouse
Asst Coll.

Ft. St.

Deposition of Manchireddy Parareddy an inhabitant
of Codoor in Nellore Talook dated 27 March 1839.

2 Hale all you know regarding the circumstance
of the Head Shristadar Soondaraghery Ramanjarow
holding Cultivation at Codoor.—

A Cultivation is held in Codoor
in the name of Moodoomby Shreenevachalu and
the whole enjoyment of the Cultivation on the Shristadar Rammanjarow's— As Ra-
=manjarow used to pay me wages at 2 Toms of Paddy
per mensem for 4 years, I was carrying on the
Cultivation in Codoor as his labourer— Afterwards

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

as I fell sick, and gave up the service,
then one Allareddy Kistnareddy an inhabitant
of Codoor used to receive wages at 2 Toms of
grain per mensem and carry on the busines
of Ramanjarow's Cultivation. Kistnareddy
afterwards gave up the service and Cundoola
Soobareddy used to have Ramanjarow's Cultivation
carried on.— For the Current year Vanambaka
Venkataramareddy is having the Cultivation
Carried on.— The Cultivation at Codoor is carried
on in 40 Shares of which Ramanjarow
has three Shares. His Cattle are still, that
is to say, to this very day grazing at
Codoor.—

2 Q For how many years, that is to
say, in which particular Fusles, were you
a labourer of Ramanjarow?

A I was Ramanjarow's Cultivator for 4
years.— I dont know the Fusles. From 4 years ago
I was for 4 years his labourer: during the first two years
in which I was a labourer: Ramanjarow
had 2 Shares in the Cultivation at Codoor, from the

the 3d year he had three shares.-

3 2 How do you know that that Cultivation still belongs to Ramanjarow?

A As I was formerly his labourer and as he had held the Cultivation for a long time, and as the Villagers are stating that cultivation is his, I say that it still belongs to Ramanjarow.

4 2 Who is Moodoomby Streenevasachariar?

A He is a servant in Ramanjarow's house.-

Mark of Mauchareddy Parareddy.

Deposed before me this 27th March 1839.

(Signed) J. C. Stonhouse

Pmt. Collector.

No 15

Deposition of Ramireddy Lachareddy inhabitant of Codoor in Nellore District dated 27th March 1839.-

1 2 State what you know of the Head Sirstadar Ramanjarow holding Cultivation at Codoor?

A The Dittum at Codoor is held in the name

name of Moodoombee Streenevasachariar.- and Ramanjarow enjoys the Cultivation.- Ramanjarow's Cattle are to this very day grazing at Codoor. The whole number of shares at Codoor is 10, of which Ramanjarow has Cultivation of 3 shares, as it is a Nevasabady Village.-

I know the circumstance of Ramanjarow's holding cultivation of 3 shares. Of the 3 shares, he had 2 shares up to the year Faurnah but in that year having sustained loss, Ramanjarow took land belonging to the share of one small plough which I and another Cultivator or Weaver named Markapoo Chennoogandoo, each held, and since the year Faurnah he has been carrying out the Cultivation of three shares.-

2 2 Is that Cultivation still under Ramanjarow?

Vanoombaukia

Vanoombauka Veneataramreddy

having the Cultivation carried on only in this year, and it must be known hereafter who will enjoy the produce of the current year.

32 Who is Moodoomba Thimmaya. = chartoo.

= used to hear it said that he was a person living in Ramanjarow's house.

Mark of Ramareddy Soobareddy

Deposed before me this 27th March 1839.

(signed) H. Stonhouse

Print. Colle

Compd. S.R.

No. 16.

Deposition of Goondlapully Chetumbarum late Pishcar of Codoor dated 3d April 1839.

In an Arzee which you = 2. have presented to me this day you have = stated that Vanumbauk Veneatramreddy levelled about one Gentoo of Circar waste situated close to the field called Ra= savangoo in the Village of Codoor and planted Chillies and plantains for the household use of Soondaraghery Ramanja= = row. How do you know that the garden was not planted for Veneataram reddy's use and for Ramanjarow's.

Hitherto Cundoola Sooba = a. = reddy use to manage the Cummatums held by Ramanjarow at Codoor. This year it was put in charge of Venumbauk Veneataram = = reddy. Hitherto Chillies and plantain = trees were planted for Ramanjarow's house = hold use in the Cocoanut Garden which

Ramanjarow

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Ramanjarow has at Codoor but this year they were not planted in the said Cocoa = = nut Garden but in separate spot by Ven = = cataramreddy as above stated - From this I know that it is for Ramanjarow's household -

2 2. How do you know this cir = = cumstance? 2

a. I know it because the Codoor Ryots told me of it yesterday and the day before yesterday -

3. 2. Who are the Ryots who told you the circumstance 2

a Nalatoor Vardacharlu and Vuntimetta Chumpereer -

4. 2. What else do you know? 2

a A Ryot of Codoor named Machereddy Vencareddy paid to the Cutcherry a sum of 30 Rupees in Fusly 1215 on account of the Shist on his own cultivation and - tundoola Soobareddy, the Curnums and others placed it to the credit of the balance due

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

due on account of the Shist of the Cocoanut Garden which Ramanjarow has in that Village and exhibited it as a balance under Ven = = kooreddy - Venkooreddy having died, his Sisters son is in possession of a receipt given him by the Curnum for that sum -

/ Signed / Goondlapully Chetumbarum -

Deposed before me this 3d April 1839 -

Translation of an Arzee of Goondlapully = Chetumbarum late Peishcar of Codoor to the Principal Collector of Nellore dated 3d April 1839 -

In the Village of Codoor in the Nellore Salook Soondaraghery Ramanja = row Head Sheristadar of this District has a 13th Veesabuddy share of the Cultivation of that Village and his Cattle &ca graze in common with those of other Ryots and he has a concern in the Cultivation in conse = = quence of which there are several irregulari = = ties in this Village - as the Head Seristadar holds

holds cultivation there whatever Servants
come to the Village did not hitherto
bring those irregularities to the Circar's
notice for fear of the Serishtadar and
did not enquire into the bottom- As the
Capoos and Curnums of this Village from
the circumstance of the Serishtadar having
Cultivation in the Village and having his
protection used to embezzle the Circar
Money as they pleased- For the current
year fusly 1248 the management of Ramanja=
=raw's kummatum having been made over to
Vanumbank Venkataramreddy- he (Venkataram=
=reddy) levelled about one Gurtoo of Circar waste
land situated close to the field called
Rasavangoo in that Village and planted
Chillies and plantain trees for the house=
=hold use of Ramanjarow- The land is not
at all entered either in the dittum or the
measurement Accounts and because it belongs
to the Serishtadar it is concealed without

being

being brought into the Circar Accounts- If
an order is now given to measure that land
and produce an account- and if the late Cur=
=nom Seetaramaodoo is sent with me, I will
measure the land and furnish an account
For Fuslies 1242 and 1243 there is a large
balance out-standing on this Village Amount=
=ing to about 1000 Rupees of which about 300
Rupees is due on account of Ramanjarow's Rum=
=matam in consequence of whose protection
the rich Ryots in that Village got their ba=
=lances written down in the names of their la=
=bourers and their herdsmen and evaded the pay=
=ment of the balance- If the balance Accounts
of Fusly 1242 and 43 which they caused to
be written in the Talook Cutcherry and the
Cadjan accounts of the Curnums which are
in the Huzoor are brought and an enquiry made I will prove
this circumstance- Besides this Ramanjarow has
planted a Cocoanut tope in 1½ Gurtoo of 3rd Class Maganie

land

land forming part of his Puttah land held in the Cadoor Village and in that topee, has cultivated Mooloom Ragee and Indigo which are enjoyed by the Pully people who took care of the trees (Cocoanut) Brinjals and other vegetables only are brought and given to Ramanjarow. the Shist of something less than 30 Rupees fixed for that 1½ Gorbas of land is entered as balance due by any Ryot and as a Collection from him (Ramanjarow) without any balance. If the individual balance account which the Cummums of this Village have caused to be written in the Tahsildar's Cutcherry for fusties 1244, 1245 and 1246 are brought I will prove this point also. Besides this he is not paying to the Circar, the tase on his cattle which are grazing in this Village for his Cummatum the way in which it is not paid is this. all the

cattle

cattle of the Village are counted and when the account for the Circar is made out, his cattle are deducted and the cattle of the other five Cummatums are reduced and the number so reduced as his (Ramanjarow's) cattle. It was thus he evaded the payment of the poolary and that due by other Ryots cattle only was deducted. Besides this the people belonging to his Cummatum used to work for the river Channel as long as Bar Sarhaggherry Row was Tahsildar of this Talook and afterwards no Channel work was done by this Cummatum, Circar Soobiah the Delayet who superintends the clearing of the Channel now and then produced in the Tahsildars Cutcherry accounts of River Channel fines due from the people of his (Ramanjarow's) Cummatum amounting to about 20 Rupees. As his people do not work for the river Channel

in

in this Village, the other people also are not clearing it properly. This circumstance I will prove from the accounts of the Codoor River Channel finer which are in the Talook Cutcherry and by Cerem Soobiah the Deloyet who superintends the river Channel work. I served for 12 years without any fault and maintaining myself. As the Seristadar has a Cummatum at Codoor and as the Taksildars and other Head Servants were neglectful, I lost my situation through my bad luck. I am poor and have a large family and am about to die from Starvation. I request you to have favor and restore me to my situation.

/Signed/ Chetumbaram.

No 17

Deposition of Vanoombaka Venkatarama reddy an inhabitant of Ryapaud in Nellore Talook. Dated 8th Sept. 1839.

1. Q. Does the Hoojoor Head Sheristadar Soondaraghenny

Soondaraghenny Ramanjarow hold Cultivation at Codoor?

A. From the time he was in the Zillah Court upto this day, he has had Cultivation at Codoor. Till 4 years ago there were 3 Ploughs belonging to Ramanjarow, Codoor is a Village consisting of 40 Veesabady ploughs. after a new Channel was got. Dug 4 or 5 years ago, the number increased to ploughs of 4 Cattle to a plough and more land was taken by us. For the 4 or 5 years since the River Channel was dug, Ramanjarow has 4½ ploughs and carried on Cultivation in that proportion. For some time the Puttahs and Dittums were in the name of Moodaumby Streenevasacharlu and Ramanjarow used himself to manage the Cultivation and pay the Circar money and used to enjoy the profit and loss of that Cummatum. For the last 3 years

Gundoola

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Cundoola Soobareddy used to manage the Cummatum, procure Ryots for its cultivation and make them Cultivate, and after giving them share of the produce, Ramanjarow used to enjoy the Government share of the produce He arranged that the Cummatum money should be paid to the Circar through Cundoola Soobareddy, and Ramanjarow used to have the profit and loss on it. Ramanjarow used to graze about 60 Cattle separately in the pasture land allotted in proportion to his ploughs. He used also to graze the above Cattle according to Versabady in the same way as all of us used to carry on our Cultivations and graze our Cattle at the beginning of the current year Ramanjarow sent for me to Nellore and told me that from this year, I should carry on the Cultivation of his Cummatum land that the land would not be kept with Cundoola

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Cundoola Soobareddy, as he said he would not carry on the Cultivation and that I must keep the land under my management and carry on its Cultivation. Afterwards Ramanjarow told me I must have the land entered in the Dittum in my name. that the loss and profit on it would be his (Ramanjarows) that I must let his Cattle graze at Cadoor as hitherto, that I must put his Cummatum land in my name in the Dittum, that after the land is cultivated and the produce come to hand, and the Circar Shist paid from the produce which remains after paying the Ryot share, I should pay him the profit and if there was loss, he would make it good. in consequence of this I put his Cummatum land in my name in the Dittum for the current year (Fusly 1248) and got the land cultivated. His cattle are grazing in the waste land allotted

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

allotted to that Cummatum according to
Inamool. It is going on upto this day in
the manner I have told.

2 Q. Relate particularly as
far as you know the circumstance of a por-
tion of the Collections made from another
Ryot having been deducted and credited to
the balance due on account of River Channel
fines payable by the above said Cummatum
in Codoor in last year and the circum-
stance as to how the balance of about 170
Rupees due from that Cummatum in last
year from loss (sustained) was collected?
A. The Tahsildar deducted
30 Rupees on account of River channel
fines from the Village Collections of
Codoor in last year - For a full Juster, one and
a half persons should work for the River Chan-
nel per diem for Ramanjarow's share - but since
the Cummatum has been under the management

of

ORIENTAL DESTROYED

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

of Soobareddy the persons for the River chan-
nel were not at all sent - In the same
way persons from the Seristadar's Cummatum
were not sent to the River channel in last
year also, in consequence of which the River
channel fines for their proportion amounted
to 30 Rupees which is the sum above stated
but when the Collection of that Village
were received at the Talook Cutcherry the
Tahsildar deducted 30 Rupees from the
total, and carried it to River Channels
fines, crediting the remainder to the Village
Collections - The Tahsildar having deducted
30 Rupees for River channel fines from the
payments made by the Ryots in the
Village on account of their Shist and this
30 Rupees being the amount due for River chan-
nels fines from Ramanjarow's Cummatum
in this Village - We had it entered in the ac-
counts as a balance upon Soobareddy who
had the management of Cummatums, but

the

the Tahsildar having after the Collections
were received into the Talooks Cutcherry, de-
ducted the sum of 30 Rupees on account of River
Channel fines, it cannot be ascertained that the
deduction was made from the payment of any parti-
cular Ryot. Besides this, I recollect that there was
a balance of which 170 Rupees due upon Ramanja-
raws Cummatum in last year, Cundoola Seobareddy
who managed the Cummatum not having paid
that sum. The Tahsildar pressed him much
for it and told him plainly that he would
serve a demand upon him for the balance.
I heard that Seobareddy came to Nellore and spoke to
Ramanjarow and that the balance 10 Rupees more or
less was paid afterwards. I am not sending persons to
work at the River Channel for Ramanjarow's Cummatum
which I am managing this year, because it was not
done hitherto.

/ Signed / Vanoombuka Venkataramreddy

Deposed before me this 8th April 1840.

/ Signed / T. V. Stonhouse

Pr. Coll.

No. 18.

By Ramanjarow.

1. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

2. In Teloogoo.

a. Deposition of Tulpoor Rownapah Son of Kristna-
maraujee of the Bramin Caste, Smartha Sect about
44 years old, inhabitant of Codoor and by profes-
sion a Cummum, dated 12th November 1839.

Before the Prin.l Collector of Nellore.

1. Do you know up to what fusly
2. Do. the Cultivation of the Cummatum in Codoor held
in the name of my man Moodoombee Venkatakist-
namacharloo was kept, and when it ceased?

a. The Cummatum was held from
fusly 1233 and was relinquished at the close of fusly 1244.

2. Who took the Cummatum
Do. cultivation land from fusly 1245 and who culti-
vated it?

a. Cundoola Seobareddy took it and cultivated
it for 3 years Viz.t fuslies 1245. 1246 and 1247.

3. Who enjoyed the Gross
produce

produce of that Cultivation, paid the Circar Shist and enjoyed the profit and loss.

a Cundoola Soobareddy paid the Shist upon the extent Cultivated and took the produce, Soobareddy enjoyed the profit and loss.

4 Q. Whose are the ploughing Cattle which cultivate that Cummatum?

A These are Cundoola Soobareddy's

5 Q. Do you know whether my Cattle graze upon the pasture Land belonging to that Cummatum - Do you know of Poollary being paid to the Circar for those Cattle and the cause of their so grazing?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy's Cattle=ting Cattle and Ramanjarow's Cattle graze in the pasture Land allotted to the Veesabady share of the Village - the Poollary and the Shist of a Garden which Ramanjarow had in the Village and the wages of the person who tend the Cattle, Cundoola Soobareddy used to pay for 3 fusslies, 1214, 1215, 1216 and 1217 and do

Comp. GR

received in repayment the young Bulls bred from Ramanjarow's Cattle at the time of giving up the Cultivation to him, Soobareddy had agreed to take one third of the Pasture land and to allow Ramanjarow's Cattle to graze on two thirds and to pay himself their grazing tax Shist of the Garden and the Cattle tender's wages -

6 Q. Did he take the young Bulls bred from the Cattle first and in return pay the Poollary, the Shist of the Garden and the Cattle tender's wages, or did he pay the same at first and afterwards take the Bulls or did he take the Bulls after three years -

A He used to pay the Circar Shist 8 per. the Shist of the Garden and the Poollary in the same manner as his own Shist In every month he used to give gram and money to the Cattle tenders - He first paid the Circar Shist and took away

away the young Bulls after they were grown the Cattle were always in his charge -

7 2 Have I any Cultivation in that Village from fusly 1245 upto this time?

A Ramanjarow has had no Cultivation --

8 2 What was the cause of the entry of Moodoomby Vencatakistanama Chetties name also in the Cuttabadi Accounts such as Pittum Vce while Cundoola Soobareddy had taken the Cummatum land and was Cultivating it?

A Since fusly 1245 the Pittums were not altered, by which the different names or those of Moodoomby Vencatakistnama-charloo Cundoola Soobareddy and Goorrum Vobooloareddy were likewise entered in the Pittums --

9 2 What do you mean by saying that the Pittums were not altered?

A Wet lands of the rich medium and low soils are divided once in

4 or 5 years. as such a division of them was not made, that name was Continued to be entered --

10 2 Did I ever tell you that the name of Moodoomby Vencatakistnama-charloo should be inserted in the Pittum?

A You did not -

11 2 Has Cundoola Soobareddy any other Cummatum in Codoor and are his Cattle in that Village?

A There is a Cummatum in the name of Goorrum Vobooloareddy the fatherinlaw of Cundoola Soobareddy - The Cattle of Soobareddy and Vobooloareddy remain together -

12 2 Is the land of the Cummatum and that of Moodoomby Vencatakistnama-charloo nigh to each other? --

A They are so near as to appear to be joined together -

13 2 You have stated as that

that Soobareddy was taking the young bulls bred from my Cattle Did he derive profit by selling them or not?--

a There may be a profit at the rate of 1 or 1½ Rupee per Bull.

14 2 You have stated that Soobareddy has female Cattle at Codoor Does he sustain any loss by paying the Servants who tended my Cattle in the same manner as he paid those who tended his own Cattle?--

a. There is no loss The price of produce is fixed at 1 or 2 Rupees more than the Selling rate This is the price of grain borrowed and according to it the wages of the Servants are paid--

15 2 Do the Cattle of other Ryots who have no Cultivation graze in the pasture land of any Ryot in Veesabady Villages with his consent?--

a They do. Canoombanka Venkataramreddy Callapollem Venkoreddy's Tickaranapoo

Tickavarapoo Seetaramareddy of my paud and Nookalapautewar of Yelliapollem are grazing their Cattle in the Village of Codoor-- Have Nookalapatewar any

16 2 Cultivation at Codoor?

a They have no Cultivation at Codoor. They graze their Cattle in Devoor Vengareddy's Cummatum-

17 2 In whose Cummatum land does Tickavarapoo Seetaramreddy graze his Cattle and has he any Cultivation on it?-

a He has no Cultivation in that Cummatum nor in the Village-

18 2 As far as you know in what other Veesabady Villages do individuals who hold no Cultivation in them graze their Cattle?--

a I do not know but have heard that Canoombanka Narsareddy's Cattle graze in the Veesabady land at Coratoor belonging to Cauhootoor Chenchooreddy an inhabitant

inhabitant of Myspaud and that the Cattle of Yerrajerla Condareddy an inhabitant of Wootcoor graze in the land of Putrum Lingareddy at Coratoor- Cundareddy and Narsareddy have no Cultivation at Coratoor-

19 2 You have stated that I have a garden at Codoor- Am I deriving any profit from it after deducting the Shist.[2]

A- None up to this time The Cocoanut trees began to bear since fusly 1248

20 2 What may be derived from the produce of the Cocoanuts[2]

A I do not know the circumstance as none have been sold yet-

21 2 What is the amount of its Shist.[2]

A About 30 Rupees-

22 2 You have stated that I relinquished my Cummatum since the close of fusly 1246 Does Cundoola Soobareddy pay the Garden Shist, Labourer's Wages and Poollay merely

merely to enjoy the profit from the young Bulls or is it compulsory on him to make the payments[2]-

A It is merely to enjoy the profit on the Bulls-

23 2 Who has cultivated the land of that Cummatum for fuslies 1248 and 49. who enjoys the gross produce from it and who pays its Shist to Circar.[2]

A Canoombaka Vencatarama: reddy carried on the Cultivation for fuslies 1248 and 49- He took the produce and paid the Circar Shist-

24 2 Who paid my Garden Shist grazing tax of the Cattle and Labourers wages for fuslies 1248 and 49.[2]

A Cundoola Soobareddy paid them for fusly 1248 and fusly 1249 is the Current year In this year the same thing will occur as in fusly 1248-

25 2 Did Soobareddy already receive

receive young Bulls on that account?—

A Two or three months ago he took away some young Bulls, but I do not know how many—

26 2 Did I not send you messages many times that I would pay any balance which may be outstanding against Vencatakistnama charlu's Cummatum upto fusly 1246 if you inform me of the same?—

A Ramanyar now himself told us once or twice as the accounts were not with us and as they were at Hoozoor, we did not inform him He told us in fusly 1247-

27 2 Have you now seen the accounts as to whether there is any balance against Vencatakistnamacharlu's Cummatum upto fusly 1246 and is there any balance?—

A Ten days ago, the Circar sent for me and upon examination of all the accounts there has been found a balance—

What

What was the amount of

28 2 the balance and what was the Cause of its outstanding?—

A The Balance of fusly 1234 was Rupees 33-15-0 In a+ payeerow's time the Settlement was made upon estimates of Produce The Estimates were excessive and the prices were fixed at 7 or 8 Pagodas per Pootty but the produce was sold at 5 or 6 Pagodas per Pootty— Some balance on account of Iyen Shist and some on account of Rufsooms remained unpaid owing to the deficiency in the estimated produce and the depression of prices- The balance of fusly 1239 is Rupees 15-8-0 and was the amount of Sookkee Shist at first so deducted and afterwards again charged in that fusly as it was collected in every part of the District— At that time it was partly paid the remainder of the Sookkee balance and the balance of Rufsooms so remained

+ Then Read Sheristadar of the Cutcherry

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

remained outstanding. For fusly 1240 the balance was Rupees 65-15-10, in this year 1,200 Rupees of Sooktee were charged and 1170 Rupees remained unpaid on the Village on this account I have stated this on a guess-Mr. Whish sent for the Tahsildar and the Village People and enquired and finding that this was true he ordered the balance to be stopt-There was no balance for fusly 1241-In fusly 1242 the balance was Rupees 16-13-3 this year a Commissioner was sent and money Collected by disposing of his (Ramanjeanow's) Grain according to selling prices-This was the Case with this Cummatum only-The said sum is still outstanding as a balance Some Natcheny were stored there on account of this balance but how much I don't recollect-The then Tahsildar had stopt the sale of the Natcheny the money being credited in account-The balance

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

of fusly 1243 was Rupees -13-3-This being very small was not recovered-The balance of fusly 1244 was Rupees 9-14-- which was on account of the Moolom Garden-The Pattum of the Garden was 1/4 Garto which was not Cultivated in that year for want of water-The Shist of the uncultivated Garden which was Charged is Rupees 6-9--this and the residue which is on account of Rufsooms have been outstanding.--

29 2

Were the payments of other Ryots in this Village ever credited under the Cummatum of Moodoomby Vencatakistama-chariar either up to fusly 1241 or at any time?--

Ramanjeanow's People used a to make their payments direct to the Circar-Ramanjeanow never paid in the Village We Compared the account of Collections and Balance with the payments made to the Circar The payments of other Ryots were never credited under this Cummatum-

By

By the Principal Collector--

30 2 Were the payments of other Ryots credited under this Cummatum either in fusly 1245 or in any subsequent fusly ?--

a It was not done so--

31 2 Was the Cultivation of this Cummatum ever carried on with the ploughing Cattle of other Ryots of that Village ?--

a It was never done so--

32 2 With whose ploughing Cattle was the Cultivation of this Cummatum carried on ?--

a Ramanjarow's ploughing Cattle were used for the Cummatum of Vencatakistna-ma Charloo upto fusly 1244 subsequently for three years in which Cundoola Soobareddy had it his Cattle were used for the Cultivation afterwards Vencataramareddy's ploughing Cattle were used in the Cultivation I do not know with whom Vencataramareddy joined and carried on the Cultivation--

33 2 Are there any of my ploughing Cattle in this Village since 1245 fusly ?--

a No-

34 2 Who ought to have done the River Channel work of this Cummatum since fusly 1245 ?--

a Cundoola Soobareddy did the River Channel work in the first year or fusly 1245 He did not do so for fusles 1246 and 47 I don't know why he did not--

35 2 If it was not done so, as who should pay the fines ?--

a Much rain not having fallen in fusly 1246 no fines were due in that year Cundoola Soobareddy having Carried on the Cultivation for fusles 1246 and 47 he is answerable for the fines--

36 2 Who carried on the Cultivation for fusly 1245 ?--

a Cundoola Soobareddy.

37 2 Who pays Calavasem or Village Servants fees on account of this Cummatum

since fusly 1245.

a Cundoola Soobareddy is paying as also Manoombaka Vencataramareddy.

38 2 See the Dittums &c. accounts from fusly 1245 to 1248 and relate the particulars regarding the names therein entered Concerning this Cummatum.

a. Upto fusly 1246 the names of Moodoomby Streenevasooloo and Vencata Kistnamacharloo were entered The name of Cundoola Soobareddy also was entered for fusly 1245— His name also was inserted because the Cummatum was made over to him - The Dittum of fusly 1246 also being entered in this Dittum the name of Moodoomby Streenevasooloo was likewise inserted in it—In the Dittum of fusly 1246 the name of Moodoomby Streenevasooloo was at first entered It being understood afterwards that he was dead his name was struck out and that of Vencatakistnamacharloo substituted.

This

This man is the younger Brother of the said Streenevasooloo In fusly 1247 a mistake was made in not entering the name of Cundoola Soobareddy in the Dittum The individual who was the manager of his Cummatum at Codoor upto Fusly 1247 having died, he made it over to Vencataramareddy because he could not manage it having had no people to do so for which reason the name of Manoombaka Vencataramareddy was entered in the Dittum of fusly 1248—As a periodical division of the fields had not taken place I have above stated that the name of Moodoomby Vencatakistnamacharloo was entered in the Dittum—In this same manner his name was entered for all the other years.

39 2 Can you shew that the names of individuals who gave up as Cummatums before the periodical division

of

of the lands took place were entered in Dittams Vee in the same manner as that of Moodoomby Vencatakistnamacharloo was entered-

a.— It did not occur in that manner-

40 2 Did any one else give up his Cummatum in this Village between fuslies 1244 and 1248 besides Moodoombewar?.

a No one gave up his Cummatum in this Village in that manner

41 2 When was the last periodical division of the lands in this Village made?.

a Either in fusly 1243 or 1244.—

By Ramanjarow.—

42 2 In what Cutcherry were all these Dittams prepared and who caused them to be written?..

a Sand Cunnum Sectaramoodoo had them written in the Talook Tahsildar's Cutcherry-

will

Will you state upon solemn oath that I have no Cultivation in Codoor since fusly 1245?..

43 2 I will.—

a Who caused the Chittas and Listforms of the Codoor Village to be prepared in Hoozoor and who prepared them during the Settlement?..

44 2 Sand Sectaramoodoo caused

a them to be written I dont know who wrote them I do not recollect which particular Goomastahs prepared them..

45 2 In the Poollary account of fusly 1247 twenty ploughing Cattle of Soondraghery Vencata Rungum were deducted on account of the 5 Roughs of the Cummatum of Moodoomby Vencatakistnamacharloo what is the cause of this deduction being made if he has no Roughs of his Cummatum- To whom do those Cattle belong- These 20 Cattle were excluded from the

number

number of Cattle counted and entered in the account— What do you say to this?—

A These 20 ploughing Cattle belong to Cundoola Soobareddy the female Cattle are Ramanjarow's whatever may be their number it appears that it was so written so from forgetfulness—

46 2 What is the cause of the 20 Ploughing Cattle said to belong to Soobareddy being entered in the account of my Cattle?—

A As ploughing Cattle ought to be deducted according to the number of ploughs. I think that mistake was made in entering them—

47 2 In which land do these ploughing Cattle and female Cattle graze?—

A Ramanjarows female Cattle are grazing in two of the three Shares of Pasture land attached to the Cummatum occupied by Soobareddy In the land of the other one share Soobareddy's ploughing Cattle

are grazing The limits of that one share land are defined?—

48 2 Are the Cattle of any other petty individuals mixed in those which you say to be mine?—

A There are 10 Cattle of petty individuals but among the 82 Cattle Counted under this Cummatum there are none belonging to petty individuals—

49 2 Was the Poollary due to Circar on account of the Cattle for fusly 1249 collected and what is it's amount?—

A I dont recollect its amount This Mulary was Collected together with the money paid by Cundoola Soobareddy—

By the Principal Collector—

50 2 How many young bulls did Cundoola Soobareddy take in every year on an average from the Cattle of Ramanjarow?—

A I do not sufficiently recollect it. He might have taken about 4. 5. or 6—

51 2 In whose pasture did Vallapollem Vencooreddy and Vanoombauka Venkatarama reddy graze their Cattle?—

A They both grazed their Cattle in the Pasture land of Ullareddy Seetaramareddy's Cummatum they were female Cattle each might have grazed ten?—

Has

52 2 Has Ullareddy Seetaramareddy any Connection with the Cultivation of the Cummatum of Vallapolliem Venkooreddy and Vanoombauka Vencataramareddy?—

A There is not any agricultural Concern.—

53 2 How many Cattle does Tickavarapoo Seetaramareddy graze in the Cummatum land of Doovoor Vengareddy and what kind of Cattle are they?—

A I do not recollect how many Cattle they are they are female Cattle He grazes them for 7 or 8 months.—

54 2 What had become of the ploughing Cattle with which the Cultivation of Moodoombewar's Cummatum was carried on up to Fusly 1244?—

A Ramanjarow's People took them away they were not sold in that Village.—

55 2 Do you positively say that those Cattle were not sold in that Village?—

A I do I did not hear that those ploughing Cattle were sold in that Village.—

What

56 2 What is the number of those ploughing Cattle?—

A As the rains were deficient there were 10 or 12 ploughing Cattle for the Cultivation he Carried on.—

By Ramanjarow.

57 2 How many Cattle were there when they were taken from that place?—

A I do not recollect how many Cattle were taken away.—

By the Principal Collector.

58 2 You have stated that Moodoombewar gave up the Cummatum at the end of Fusly 1246 and that Cundoola Soobareddy occupied it Do you know the Cause of Moodoombewar giving it up?—

A As the Cummatum was entered in the Dittum in the names of Kreeneva poolo and Vencata Kistnamacharloo and the produce enjoyed by Ramanjarow, People were saying that he relinquished it because he should not hold Cultivation having been appointed

Seristadar

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Serishtadar--

By Ramanjarow--

59 2. In which month does Cultivation come to a close in Podoor?-

A If rains fall fully and the Tanks are filled, it will end by the 15th of the decreasing moon of makum month--

/Signed/ Tulpoor Ravanapah

Taken before me this 12th day of November 1839.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

(True translation)

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector

Cnfd. J.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

No. 19.

2 Q. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?-

A In Telgoo.

Deposition of Maurumreddy Soobareddy son of Singareddy of the Pinta Caupu Caste, cross mark religion 45 years old, inhabitant of Chennapully-paud, a Hamlet of Podoor and by profession a Cultivator Dated 14th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore

By Ramanjarow. 1 Q. Have you any Cultivation in Podoor since 1245 fusly?-

A. No.

2 Q. Do you know that the Cummatums which was before that in Moodoomby Venkatasubbiah's name upto fusly 1244 was given up to Cundoola Soobareddy?-

A I know it.

3 Q. Is Cundoola Soobareddy since fusly 1245- Cultivating it with his ploughs?-

Soobareddy

A Soobareddy Cultivated with his own ploughs in fusslies 1245, 46 & 47- the land which formed the Cummatum in the name of Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamacharlo, that is to say, the land which was held in the name of Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamacharlo upto fusly 1244, joining it with his Cummatum of 2 Ploughs in that Village which was in Veboolooreddy's name-

By the Principal Collector.

4 D. You have Stated that Cundoola Soobareddy joined the Cummatums land which was in Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamacharloo's name and Cultivated it- Relate the circumstance particularly.

A Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamacharloo had 3 Shares and Cundoola Soobareddy two Shares in the name of Veboolooreddy- all this is the land of one Chit drawn at the time of our dividing the Soils- and as the fields adjoin each other, he Soobareddy joined one field with another and Cultivated it.

it was thus done in fusslies 1245, 46 & 47- after Venkata Kistnamacharloo relinquish. 2d it; Venkata Kistnamacharloo Cultivated the land in fusly 1244 & relinquished it-

5 D. You have Stated that the land of Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamacharloo and of Cundoola Soobareddy Came in one Chit- When did the division of the land take place in which the land of both of them Came in one Chit?

A. In fusly 1242 or 43 I do not recollect.

6 D. Once in how many years does the Pumpa Runs or division of land take place?

A. Once in 5-6-4- or 3 years- It is not on a fixed footing- The division takes place when all parties Consent- After 5 Crops are produced and Cut, they are divided- By this I mean that after the 5 Crop is Cut, it is the rule in my Village that lands are to be divided

7 D. You have Stated that lands were divided in fusly 1242 or 43- When were the lands again divided-?

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A Said to for want of recollection. The last division was made in that Village in fusly 1244.

By Rama: Enoja Row. 3 2c. Had this Edana or portion come in one chit in former divisions too. 3

A The land of these two persons, that is of Cundoola Soobareddy and Moodoombicoar used to come in one chit in former divisions also.

J 2c. Did Moodoomby Venkata Kistnama-chariar cultivate separately with his Ploughs upto fusly 1244 his Cummatam lands of three Ploughs. 7

A Upto fusly 1244 - Moodoomby Venkata Kistnamachariar cultivated his 3 Shares of land with separate Ploughs. & Suckalapilly Venkatanarsoo managed that Cultivation on account of Soondaraghurry rao, and paid the Circar Shist. In some former division or Cumpatum I recollect that the lands of a certain individual either Pemmareddy Venkatareddy or Gungareddy or some other and of Moodoombicoar came

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

came in one chit.

10 2c. Are there any tilling cattle belonging to my man, Moodoomby Venkatakistnamachariar or Cultivator there since 1245 fusly.

A Soon after the expiration of fusly 1244 some of the Ploughing cattle belonging to Soondaraghierrevar were missed with young bulls and Sold. Four Bullocks were taken to Nellore to be used for Bandies. Since Fusly 1245, there were no Ploughing Cattle or Cultivators. & Female cattle only are Grazing there.

11 2c. Now have Stated that Cundoola Soobareddy Cultivated this Cummatam land with his own Ploughs since fusly 1245. Who took the whole produce thereof, who paid the Circar Shist, and who enjoyed it's profit and Loss.

A. Cundoola Soobareddy himself carried on Cultivation, paid the Shist and was answerable for the profit and loss.

12 2c. Since Fusly 1248 - who Cultivated the

the lands of this Cummatum and who enjoyed the produce?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy had it upto July 1247- and in Consequence of the death of the manager of his Cummatum, he gave up the land of three Ploughs, as he had no person to manage it, and as he was unable of himself to Cultivate it, he divided the Land from each field and caused the Curnum to measure the same and retained only his own Land. Afterwards as the land was lying Waste, Vanumbaw: Sha Venkataramareddy Cultivated it- The Mondooroo Crops were not Cultivated. He had them entered late in his name in the Dittum-

13 D. You have stated that Soobareddy divided and gave up the land of three Shares: Has not the division made before that?

A. After the Chit Came out, the land having Come into Soobareddys' possession, the lands were not divided, i.e.- the lands of

of this Edava or portion were not divided Separately into Three and two Shares respectively-

14 D. After it was made over to Venkataramareddy with whose Ploughs is he Cultivating the land and who is enjoying the profit and loss?

A. Venkataramareddy Cultivated the land with Some of his own Ploughs and with those of Some Payacarries and whom he procured and enjoyed the profit and loss- The Garden of Soondaraghery var was included in the Pattu of the land of three Ploughs under Venkataramareddy- The Thist of this Garden and the Grazing tax of the female Cattle of Soondaraghere var, have been paid by Cundoola Soobareddy to Circar

15 D. Do the Cattle of the Ryots who have no Cultivation graze in the Pasture land of any Veesabady Ryot in Veesabady Villages with his Consent?

A. They do-

16 D. Do they graze so in your Village?

They

Fort St. George 24th December 1846.

A They do- The cattle of Vallapalleruvu Vencooreddy and of Vanoombaukam Venkata-ramareddy graze in the pasture land of Ullareddy Seetaramireddy's Cummatum- Those of Goomoopauty Venkatareddy are likewise grazing in the Pastures of my Cummatum and in that of Devuor Vengareddy. He has no Cultivation in my Village, viz. Codoor-

17 Q. You have stated the Cundula Soobareddy is paying the Rollary of my Cattle and the Garden Shist, do you Know of his purchasing my young Bulls and paying in lieu of the price thereof my Garden Shist and Rollary?

A. I Know it. He Pays the wages of the Cattle tenders- the Rollary of the Cattle and the Garden Shist- and disposes of, if any purchasers Come there, the young Bulls bred in his (Ramanujarow's) Cattle. In some years, he used to take the Young Bulls beforehand and to sell them when he liked- The money from those

Fort St. George 24th December 1846.

those sales, he used to receive on account of the payments he made for the Garden Shist- Rollary and Cattle Servants-

18 Q. Were the young bulls under his charge so that he Could take them whenever he wanted them?

A They were-

19 Q. Has he any profit by the sales of the Young bulls?

A He has at the rate of 1 Rupee- half a Rupee- 2 Rupees or 3 Rupees per head.

20 Q. Since fasly 1246, whose business was it to do the River Channel work or Repairs?

A Soobareddy's for fasslies 1245-46-&47.

& Venkataramareddy's for fasslies 1248 & 49-

Did they do accordingly?

21 Q. A Soobareddy did the work in fasly 1245 and for a short time in fasly 1246, and not for the remainder of the latter year- but he did not pay the fines- For the whole of fasly 1247 he did not do the work nor did he pay the fines-

Who is answerable for the payment

22 Q. of the fines?

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. Soobareddy should pay it for the 3 years.

23 Q. Was the payment of other Ryots in this Village ever Credited under this Cummatam?

A. The payment of one individual was never Credited under another, nor was the balance of one person entered under another.

24 Q. Was the Cummatam land of Venkatasubbiah Kistnamachariar Cultivated at any time with the Ploughing Cattle of other Ryots?

A. It was not.

25 Q. Since fusly 1245 who pays the Calavaram or fees of the Village Servants arising from this Cummatam?

A. Soobareddy paid for these 3 years. and Venkataramareddy for fusly 1248.

26 Q. Was the money paid by any ryot, Credited at any time on account of any Peishcush Garden?

A. The money of any one, Gundoola Soobareddy excepted, was never Credited on that account.

27 Q. Was the money so paid by Gundoola Soobareddy made up by him from the Sale proceeds of any Young bulls?

A. He used to settle the Price of young bulls

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

bulls one Rupee more or less, I dont know whether it would be a little more or less.

28 Q. What will be the profit of one Veesabady Share in this Village after paying the Cowle Shist and Charges of husbandry?

A. In a year in which rain falls properly and there is a good produce, I think there may be a profit of 10 Poonas per Pootty - in other years a less will be the result.

By the Principal Collector.

29 Q. You have Stated that there will be a profit of 10 Poonas per Pootty: Is it on the Gross produce or how?

A. It is on the whole produce - that will be the case in years in which three Crops are produced.

By Ramanooja Row.

30 Q. How many Potties of Grain will be produced for each Veesabady Share?

A. In a good year the produce will be

10

10 or 10½ Bullocks, and in some years 11 Bullocks.

31 Q. Are the Cattle belonging to each individual in Cudoor Counted and entered accordingly in Circar account, and is Pollary received for them or not?

A. The Cattle of different individuals are correctly entered and Pollary is accordingly received. The Cattle are entered as so many for each Cummamtum. There is no account for each individual. Viz., there is no account of Bullocks. Cows. female Buffaloes, or Rams belonging to each individual.

32 Q. Is Pollary received or not Correctly for Cattle Correctly Counted under each Cummamtum?

A. It is received.

33 Q. Was any fraud Committed in regard to Pollary so received justly?

A. Nothing of the Sort was done.

34 Q. Do you know the Cause of Venkata Ristnamachariar's name also being entered in the Pattum Vo. accounts Since fusly 1245?

A. Things will Stand as they were

were at the time of dividing fields, till they are again divided.

35 Q. What is the Sist of the Garden said to be in my possession, and is there any profit derived from it?

A. The Sist of this year is 35 or 36 Rupees. If there be any produce in it, the Gardener will enjoy it. but you have not any profit whatever. you have not any other Garden of Cholliers or Vegetables.

By the Principal Collector.

36 Q. Since how many years has Cundoola Seebareddy Land of 7 Ploughs in this Village?

A. Since Fusly 1226.

By Ramanoojarow.

37 Q. Will you State positively upon oath that I have no Connection whatever with the Cultivation in that Village excepting the said Garden & Cattle?

A. I will.

By the Principal Collector.

38 Q. You have above Stated that Moodeendayars Ploughing Cattle were sold at the end of Fusly 1244. How many

Fort St. George 24th December 1845.

many battle were sold and to whom?

A. Two or Three Ploughing battle were sold to people from the Southward. The others were disposed of together with the young bulls. I dont know to whom they were sold. Four bullocks were brought for Bandies and 2 bullocks died. At the time Moodoombevar gave up the Cummatam; that is, the end of Fusly 1254. there were 16 Ploughing battle.

39 Q. You have stated above that Vanoomb=baulka Venkataramareddy cultivated the land of this Cummatam by procuring some Payacauries also. who are those Payacauries.

A. Sunnoolar Narrain reddy an inhabitant of my village. Narvatareddy Kistnareddy an inhabitant of that village. Commara Bogana of Codoor. These 3 are Ryots who were not included in the Veesubady. They cultivated together with Venkataramareddy.

40 Q. If at the end of Fusly 1254. the 3 Shares of Moodoombevar were given up, and

Fort St. George 24th December 1845.

and if the same was occupied by Candoo Soobareddy what is the Cause of there being a Separate Puttah for it instead of only one Puttah for it and the land of 2 Shares of Soobareddy.

A. Since former times a Puttah used to be issued in the name of Veboolareddy as Moodoomby Streenevasacharlu's name used to be entered in Puttahs for the three Shares, separate Puttahs were issued.

41 Q. How many battle belonging to Vellapollum Vencooreddy and Vanoombauka Venkataramareddy are there in Ullureddy Seetaramareddy's Cummatam?

A. Ten or Twelve of each were there in last year. The exact Number I do not recollect. They are grazing in that Cummatam land since 5 or 6 years.

42 Q. Have Vanoombauka Venkataramareddy and Vellapollum Vencooreddy any cultivation in Codoor?

A. There is in the names of Vanoomb=baulka Narsareddy the elder brother

of

of Venkataramareddy and of Vellapollem Soobareddy the elder brother of Vencooreddy.

432. Do the battle of Vellareddy Seeta:-ramareddy graze in the Cummatums land of Vanoombadi Na Venkataramareddy or in that of Vellapollem Vencooreddy's Elder brother.?

A. No.

442. When Gonoopauty Venkatareddy &c. has no Cultivation in your village, what is the cause of your allowing his Cattle to graze in your Cummatum land.?

A. As I have not Cattle Sufficient for a Veesabady Share and as he is in the habit of lending money to us, his Cattle are grazing in my Cummatum land.-

452. How many battle of Gonoopauty Venkatareddy graze in your Cummatum land.?

A. Thirteen.

462. Why does Doovoor Vengareddy allow the Cattle of Venkatareddy to graze in his Cummatum land.?

A. For the same Reasons as I Stated above.

above in regard to my own Cummatum, he is also allowing them to graze.-

472 How many young Bulls of Soondaraghereyvars, did Cundoola Soobbareddy receive in every year.?

A. Eight, nine or Ten, or Five or as many as have become useful.-

482 Why did not Cundoola Soobbareddy do the work of River channel in Fuslies 1246 and 47.?

A He employed two Coolies, inhabitants of either Padoor or Narookoor, for the River channel work. One of whom was doing the work. the other either died or I do not know what had become of him. Two or three of his labourers in Codoor came to do the work. Those Coolies were employed in Fusly 1246. In my village some others employ Coolies in the same manner.

492 What is the name of the head man of Cundoola Soobbareddy's Cummatum in Codoor.?

A Maucheredy Vencooreddy he has died in Fusly 1246. after his death the

the Cummatum became disordered, Viz. it could not be continued.

50 Q After the death of Mauchereddy Vencooreddy, whom did Soobbareddy appoint as head man to manage the 2 Shares of his land?

A Caumereddy Ravanareddy the son of the Maternal Uncle of Mauche-reddy Vencooreddy having come from Southward, he (Soobbareddy) appointed him as head man. He managed the cultiva-tion of this land as head man in Fusly 1247 & 48. The same individual managed the 2 Shares of Soobbareddy's land for Fusly 1249 also. He is quite disqualified for the business.

By Ramanoojarow.

51 Q Is it for only Butter milk for the use of my family that I keep my Cattle in Codoor or to derive any other profit?

A Merely for Butter Milk for the family. If young Bulls be bred and sold that will be of use to make up the Poollary expenses to tend the Cattle and the Garden

Garden shist and a little more will be gained if one more is sold; in a year in which one will be deficient in the number bred the gain will be less.

52 Q What is the service you hold in this Village?

A Village Moonseffship.

(Signed) Mauremreddy Soobbareddy

Taken before me this 14th day of November 1839.

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse
Pr. Coll.

No. 20.

Q In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A In Telgoo.

Deposition of Mauchereddy Para-reddy son of Vencatareddy of Dasoor Cas-pa Caste round mark religion. About 30 years old and by profession a Cultivator dated 16th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Ramanoojarow

1 Q Had any cultivation in Codoor since Fusly 1245 a period of 5 years?

A No.

2 Q Do you know that previously upto Fusly

Fusly 1244 there was a Cummatum in the name of Moodoomby Vencatakistnamacharlo who is attached to me.²

A Ids.

3 2 Do you know the circumstance of the Cammatum having been given up in favor of Cundoolah Soobbareddy at the end of Fusly 1244.²

A After it was given up by him Cundoola Soobbareddy cultivated it for 3 years.

4 2 During the 3 years that Cundoola Soobbareddy had the cultivation with whose Cattle were the lands of that Cummatum cultivated, who enjoyed the profs produce and paid the Circar shist and who enjoyed the profit and losses.²

A The Cattle with which the lands of that Cummatum were tilled during the 3 years belonged to Cundoola Soobbareddy who enjoyed the profs produce of that Cummatum and paid the Circar shist and enjoyed the profit and losses.

5 2 Have there been any Ploughing Cattle

Cattle belonging to me at Codoor since Fusly 1245.²

A There were none since Fusly 1245.

6 2 Since how many years have my Cattle been grazing in the pasture lands alloted to Vencatakistnamacharloo's Cummatum

A The the Cattle have been grazing since 16 years.

7 2 Was there any arrangement entered into when the Cummatum was given up that my Cattle should graze in the pasture lands of the Cummatum.²

A Cundoola Soobbareddy took one Pagoda share of the Beedoo for ploughing Bullocks and the Puttadar Kistnamacharloo took 2 Pagodas share for grazing the Cattle and the Poollary thereon was paid according to Capitation.

By the Pte Collector

8 2 In what Fusly was this arrangement entered into.

A Ido not know the particular fusly but it was 5 years ago.

By Ramanoojarow

9 2 Did Cundoola Soobbareddy give up this Cummatum after holding it for three

three years.² why did he give it up and — who cultivated it afterwards.²

A I do not know why he gave it up but after he held it for 3 years, Vanoombauka Vencataramareddy was — carrying on the cultivation.

10 Q To whom did the ploughs used in Vencataramareddy's Cultivation belong and who enjoyed the grofs produce.²

A They were Vencataramareddy's own. 1/3d of the Ploughs employed were his own and the other two thirds belonged to — others whom he procured from the Villages. Vencataramareddy's were the profit — and loss. The two shares in the Village, — belonged to Amsoloor Narrainareddy. I do not know if he had any in shares with him. This Narrainareddy is not a Veesa — badydar but a resident of the Village.

11 Q How many Ploughs did Aumaloor Narrainareddy employed in this Cummatum are any of his insharers — Veesabody dars, state if you know their names.²

Hee

A Hee had two Ploughs. the insharers in which were Purvatareddy — Kistnareddy and Coommara Boyana who — are not Veesabady Ryots but are inhabitants of that Village and Paupacarries. Vencata- -ramareddy paid the shist of the Cummatum and used to enjoy the profit and loss after giving them their share.

12 Q Can you positively swear that I have no connection whatever with the cultivation at Codoor since these 5 years.²

A I can.—

13 Q Have I at present as many cattle as had been formerly grazing in — this Village.²

A You have half as many now.

14 Q Formerly that is when the — Cummatum was previous to Fasly 1245 under me, who was the manager of it.²

A I was.—

15 Q Had I any labourers or — Ploughs since Fasly 1245.—

A The labourers went over to Cun- -doola Soobbareddy and you have no Ploughs at all.

16 Q Were you ever before summoned to the Cutcherry.² A I was once summoned. Did

Fort St. George 24th December 1846

17 2 Did you give any deposition at that time?

A I did.—

18 2 Did you state in that Deposition that I had any cultivation in Codoor during the last 5 years?

A No.

By the Pl. Collector

19 2 Do you recollect what you had stated in that Deposition?

A I recollect having been asked and deposed to 2 or 3 points.

20 2 Have you heard any of the Village people say that Ramanoojarow holds cultivation in Codoor since Fasly 1245 or the last 5 years?

A He neither has cultivation nor did I hear any body say so.—

21 2 What is your Putta shist in Codoor Village for Fasly 1248?

A Ten Rupees which is the shist of a garden which I hold. I have a 25th share in Allareddy Streeramareddy's Pattah

22 2 What other cultivation does Aumaloor Narrainareddy hold in this Village besides the 2 Ploughs in Vanoomba Venkataramareddy's

Fort St. George 24th December 1846

Venkataramareddy's Cultivation?

A Narrainareddy has no other cultivation in this Village independent of the aforesaid two Ploughs. He must have a small Jareeb Garden.

23 2 You have stated above that after the Cummatum in Moodoomby Venkatakistnamahcharloo's name was made over to Cundoola Soobbareddy, he enjoyed the gross produce, and the profit and loss for 3 years. How do you know it?

A I know it because in one year I and Cundoola Soobbareddy cultivated together and he gave me one Veesabady share and the Village people told me it was so during the 3 years.

24 2 Cundoola Soobbareddy's Cummatum at Codoor is held in the name of Goorrum Vobooloreddy. Were the Ploughing cattle of Soobbareddy used in the cultivation of the land attached to that Cummatum or those of Vobooloreddy?

A The cattle of both were used. They live together in Goorrum Vobooloreddy's house

Fort St. George 24th December 18

houde at Mauchcherlavaary polliem. Fo
cattle of both Soobbareddy and Voboolareddy
ploughed the Cummatum.

25 2 Who had the whole Manage
of this Cummatum?

A Voboolareddy's son Narrainareddy

By Ramanarojarow

26 2 Who was the Manager of my
Cummatum when it was ultimately given up
5 years ago?

A I was.—

27 2 When was Allareddy Kistnareddy
Manager of this Cummatum?

A As I was sick for 2 years
after I gave up the Management, my son in la
and Allareddy Seetaramareddy managed the
Cummatum and I returned to the Management
in the year prior to that in which it was
given up.

28 2 What became of the plough
=ing cattle which remained when I gave up
the Cummatum?

A Two ballocks were sold to
some people from the Southward. Three died
in consequence of some dicease and the were
taken to Nellore to be driven in Bandies. These
were all.

Marked by Mauchereddy Parar[illegible]
Taken before me this 16th day of November 1839.
(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse
Pl. Collector

Comp. E.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

No. 21.

2 In what language will you cause
your deposition to be given?

A In Teloogoo.

Deposition of Survapally Veeraparauze son of
Paroomaliah of the Brahmin Caste, Soomarta
Religion about 80 years old, inhabitant of
Codoor and by profession a Cultivator dated
16th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector.

By Ramanjarow.

1 2 Had I any cultivation at Codoor
since fusly 1245?

A. Ramanjarow has had no cultivation.—

2 2 Had there been any Cummatum previous
to fusly 1245 in the name of Moodoombe Venatakistnama=
=chary. Do you know the circumstance of the
Cummatum having been given up and who
occupied and cultivated it?

A. I know that the Puttadar and
Ramanjarow were jointly cultivating it. From
fusly 1245 Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated it for 3
years. In last year and this year Vanoombauka
Venataramareddy

Venkataramareddy got a Puttah granted in his name and is cultivating it.-

3 2. Had I any ploughing cattle or plough in that Village for the last five years.?

A. As I live in that Village I heard the Cattle tenders and others say that at the time the Cummatum was given up to Cundoola Soobareddy some died, some were sold and some were taken to Nellore to be used in bandies. You have no ploughing cattle in that Village.-

4 2. During the 3 & 2 years in which Cundoola Soobareddy and Venkataramareddy respectively had cultivation, who took away the gross produce and who paid the Shist thereof.?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy took away the produce thereof during the three years he had the Cultivation and paid the Shist. For the two years during which Vanoombauka Venkataramareddy had it, he took away the produce and paid the Shist.

By the Principal Collector.

5 2. How do you know this circumstance.?

A. As I am a Veesabady cultivator in that Village, I know that they used to

to pay like myself.-

By Ramanjarow

6 2. Have I any she Cattle in this Village who used to take the young Bulls produced from them and who used to pay the grazing tax of the she Cattle and the Shist of the garden of the last five years.?

A. You have female cattle. The young Bulls when of a proper age were valued and taken by Cundoola Soobareddy and the Money was taken for the payment of the garden shist and the Poollary of the she Cattle.-

1 2. What garden is it which you have stated, and do I derive any profit from the garden.?

A. There are Cocoanut and Mango Trees in the garden which are young. Since two years, ten trees have begun to bear and give a small produce who has enjoyed the produce — I dont know. The produce of the 10 trees is not sufficient to pay the Shist and I do not know what would be the result when the whole garden begins to bear.

By

By the Principal Collector

8 Q. Do you know what is the Shist of that garden.?

A. I have been told that the shist of the garden this year is 35 Rupees. I dont know properly. That must be known to the Curnums.

9 Q. What is the extent of your cultivation in this Village.?

A. I have 1½ plough in the Cummatum of Cota Ramareddy which consists of 6½ Veesabady Shares of which I have ¾ of a share, but no separate Puttah in my name. The shares of different people are inserted under each in the Dittum.

10 Q. What is the amount of your shist.?

A. I do not recollect. The Curnums must be asked for my shist.

By Ramanjarow.

11 Q. Can you positively swear that I have had no cultivation in Codoor since the last 5 years.?

A. I can.

/Signed/ Veeraparauze.

Taken before me this 16th November 1839.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse.

Pl. Collector.

In

No. 22.

Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written.?

A. In Telougoo.

Deposition of Vellapollum Vencoreddy son of Paupereddy of Dasoor Caste, long mark religion, 30 years old. Inhabitant of Codoor and profession a cultivator. Dated 16th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Ramanoojarow.

1 Q. Have I any cultivation since 5 years that is from fusly 1245 in Codoor.?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy has carried on the cultivation for 3 years with his own ploughs and labourers. You have no cultivation. Soobareddy used to take away the produce. Your female Cattle used to graze. Grazing tax was paid according to Circar's Puttah and the number counted. Soobareddy was himself paying the Circar's shist for the 3 years, Vanoombauka Vencata-ramareddy has carried on the cultivation both last year and this year. Puttah was granted in his/ Ramanoojarows/ name for the garden and Cattle grazing tax which was different from

from the Cummatum Putta. As an Alga Puttah was granted for the Poollary, I do not know whether the garden also was entered in it or in the Putta of the land cultivated by Soobareddy.

2 2. Have I since fasly 1245 or since the 5 years that I gave up the Cultivation, ploughing Cattle, ploughs or labourers in this Village?

A. He had no Bullocks, ploughs or labourers after Soobareddy relinquished, Venkatarama Reddy has been carrying on the cultivation and paying the Circar Shist. This was the cultivation which was in Moodoombee Venkatakistnamacharloo's name five years ago.

3 2. Will you state positively upon oath that I have no cultivation in that Village since these 5 years?

A. I can swear that you have no cultivation your female Cattle only are in that Village.

4 2 Have you any Cummatum in that Village?

A. I have a Cummatum of 1/16 share at

at Codoor that is to say my elder brother has in his name the cultivation of 4 ploughs out of the Cummatum of 6½ shares entered in Cota Ramareddy's name. there are 13 ploughs in this Cummatum. None in my name.

5 2. Are you and your elder brother living together and who manages the Cummatum?

A. I and my elder brother are living together. he superintends the tilling of the Cummatum lands and I pay shist to Circar. There is no separate Putta in my name. my elder brother's name is Vellapollum Soobareddy. His name is entered in accounts.

By the Principal Collector.

6 2. In the Chitta of fasly 1245 of the Codoor Village it is entered that 1¾ of the 11¼ Ploughs of Cota Ramareddy belong to Vellapollum Soobareddy but you have above stated that 4 of the 13 Ploughs of Cotta Ramareddy's Cummatum were entered in the name of your elder brat[illegible]

What is this circumstance?

A We have now only 1¾ ploughs — but since last year we have cultivated the land belonging to one plough of Survapully Veeraparauze and of ¾ plough of Agustereddy Kistnareddy and we are paying the Shist I therefore stated 4 Ploughs.—

By Ramanoojarow.

7 Q. Since how long have I female Cattle in this Village?

A. Since 10 or 11 years.—

8. Q. Was not the grazing tax of my Cattle correctly paid to Circar and was not the Shist of my garden likewise paid to Circar.?

A. He was paying through Cundoola Soobareddy to Circar the Shist of the garden and the Poollary he was paying by the sale of the young bulls.

9. Q. Do you know why Cundoola Soobareddy relinquished the Cummatum?

A. He transferred it to Venkata-=ramareddy for want of a person as his manager had

had died.

10. Q. You have stated that there is a Cocoanut Garden. Am I getting any vegetable from it?

A. I do not know what it is.

By the Principal Collector.

11 Q. How many Cattle have you in this Village?

A 40 or 50 Cattle.

12 Q. Where do you graze those Cattle?

A. In the Cummatum land of Cota Ramareddy. All the Cattle graze in this Cummatum land.

13 Q. To whom do the said 40 or 50 Cattle belong to you or to your elder brother?

A. As I and my elder brother live together they belong to both of us. Viz. They are mine and my elder brother's.—

14 Q. Do the Cattle belonging to yourself and to your elder brother graze in the pasture land of any Cummatum besides that of Cota RameReddy's?

My.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. My Nephews Cattle graze in the pasture land of Allareddy Seetaramareddys Cummatum. His name is Augustreddy Kistnareddy.

15 Q. What is the number of the Cattle so grazing and what is the reason of it?

A. 20 Cattle. They having few Cattle they allow our Cattle to graze, and receive a grazing tax from us.

By Ramanoojarow.

16 Q. Do the Cattle of such Ryots as hold no cultivation in a Veesabady Village graze in the pasture land of any Veesabady Ryot of that Village with his consent?

A. They do so after the Puttadar is spoken to and the Poollary tax paid to him.

17 Q. Are the Cattle of other Villages grazing so in your Village?

A. They do.

18 Q. Why did I keep my Cattle at Codoor whether for milk required for my private use or for enjoying any riches?

There

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

A. There is no wealth to be acquired from them. They are grazed only for buttermilk. There is not much to be got from them.

19 Q. Was any loss sustained through me by the Circar or the Ryots either during the time that I had a Cummatum in this Village up to 5 years ago or since, by my having Cattle and a garden after I relinquished the Cummatum?

A. It does not appear that by this there has been any loss to the Circar or to the Ryots.

/Signed/ Vencooreddy.

Taken before me this 16th day of November 1839.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collr.

No. 23.

Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

A. In Telooguo.

Deposition given by Cundoola Soobareddy son of Narrainareddy of the Punta Caupa Caste cross mark religion 40 years old and by profession a cultivater and trader dated 19th November 1839.

Before

18569 Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore -

By Ramanoojarow.

1 2. Had I any cultivation in Codoor in the last 5 years. Vizt. since fusly 1245.?

A. Cultivation was carried on three in Fusties 1245, 1246 and 1247 and subsequently I understand through Vanoombaka Venkataramareddy, you have no cultivation of your own.

2 2. During the 3 years you had the cultivation who enjoyed the gross produce and the profit and loss and who paid the Circar Shist.?

A. The gross produce was taken by me and I paid the Circar Shist. In the year in which there was a loss, I paid it. I never had any profit on it.

3 2. Was the Cummatum which was held up to Fusly 1244 in the name of my man Moodoomby Venkatakistnamacharlo given up to you.?

A. It is true that it was made over to my charge.

Comp.t S.R.

You

18570. Fort St. George 24th December 1840. 2

4 2. You have stated that you cultivated it for 3 years from fusly 1245. Did you cultivate it with your own ploughs.?

A. When my cultivation was carried on, it was with my own ploughs, but not with those of others. I caused it to be tilled with my own ploughs.

5 2. When I gave up the Cummatum at the close of fusly 1244, were you told that from fusly 1245, you should carry on the cultivation and enjoy the profit and loss.?

A. I was told so. but it was not entered in the Dittum or in the Suttahs in my name.

6 2. You have stated that you have cultivated the Cummatum for 3 years from fusly 1245. Is your name entered in the Dittum and Suttahs in those fusties or not.?

A. I do not recollect it and cannot say unless I see the Dittum. I recollect that in the 1st year, it was entered in the name of Moodoomby Venkatakistnama-charlo and in that of mine, the 2d year in the name of Goorrum-charlo and in the 3d year in the name of Voboolo reddy & either Venkatakistnamacharlo or Streene-vausacharlo, but I cannot tell without seeing the Dittum.

In

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

7 Q. In which Cutcherry are the Dittums made and who causes them to be written?—

A. Tahsildar get it written, and the Dittum is framed by the Curnums before the Tahsildar. It is the busings of Curnums to have it written down before the Tahsildar.—

8 Q. Is the Poollary on the female Cattle which had been graging in the heedoo land of that Cummatum up to the time it was given up to you, regularly paid to the Circar since fusly 1245?

A. It has been paid, it is paid to the Village Curnums and Shroffs and receipts taken. Are there not receipts.—

9 Q. When the Cummatum was given up, did you consent to allow the female Cattle to graze in this heedooland?—

A. It was because I had consented that they grazed for 3 years.—

10 Q. Is any garden belonging to me included in this Cummatum?—

A. In Venkatakristnamacharlo's Putta a garden is included. It is entered in the

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

the Dittum, Puttahs, and Village Accounts.—

11 Q. Was the circumstance of the Curnums having caused both your name and that of Moodoomby Venkatakristnamacharlo to be written in the Dittum and other accounts in any way opposed to your being answerable for the profit and loss, which you have stated to have enjoyed during those 3 years?

A. There was none.— I have already represented about this.—

12 Q. Why then was Venkatakristnamacharlo's name entered in the Dittum &c. Accounts. Was it because he had a concern with the garden or with the Cattle?

A. The Poollary for your Cattle and the Rent of the garden are included in the Puttah in each year.—

By the Principal Collector.

13 Q. State clearly why was Moodoombevaru's name entered in the Dittum &c. Accounts after they gave up the Cummatum at the close of the fusly 1244?

It

A. It is so entered in the Puttah because the Poollary and Garden shist are included in it.—

12 Q. What is the reason of the said garden being included in the Puttah for the Cummatum without a Separate Puttah being issued for it?—

A. The garden is Mauganie land — and the Mauganie is included in the Dittum for which reason it is included in this Puttah. In the Dittum also the garden is entered under Maugany.—

By Ramanoojarow

15 Q. Is it customary in your Village that the names entered at the time of one Pumpa-kum or division of the Mauganie land should be retained in the Dittum accounts till a new division takes place?—

A. I do not know that circumstance.

16 Q. Who used to take the young Bulls bred from my Cattle which are graged in that Village?

A. I used to take the young Bulls — I pay the Poollary, the wages of the people who tend

tend the Cattle and the shist on the garden. He [the Sheristadar] used not to pay for these three items, which I used to do after receiving the young Bulls.—

17 Q. Have you paid the Poollary and the garden shist to the Cuicar for fusleis 1245/46. 47?

A. I paid them.

18 Q. Did you take the young Bulls in each fusly and pay for the three items?

A. The young Bulls, at the time of paying the Cuicar were not of an age to be saleable, but in each year, I took such young bulls as were available amongst the Cows.—

19 Q. Was the taking of the young bulls and making the payments, done with your Consent?

A. This was done with my consent — If I did not consent, how could they be taken and how could the payments be made.—

20 Q. Did you receive in each year the Poollary, the shist of the garden, and the wages of the labourers paid by you from the young bulls taken by you that year, or was

there

there any hinderance to your doing so.?

A. Every year I took young bulls. sometimes what I paid was in excess & sometimes the value of the bulls was in excess. On the final settlement of the account there was some dispute about the price of the bulls upon which arbitrators were nominated and the account settled.—

21 Q. Was it on account of the difference in the price that the arbitrators were nominated?

A. It was on that account.—

22 Q. What was the cause of this Cummatum having been given up after 3 years in fasly 1248.?

A. It was because the manager of my Cummatum died, and because I had always a loss.—

23 Q. By whom was the Cummatum cultivated afterwards?

A. They said that Vanoombanka Venkatasamareddy &c. cultivated it.—

24 Q. Excepting as above stated, about taking the bulls and paying the Pollary &c. are there any other dealings between you and myself.—

There

A. There are no other dealings excepting this.—

25. Q. Was any grain or money given me.?

A. I did not give any.

By the Principal Collector.

26 Q. Did you send to Ramanoojaraw any portion of the produce of the Cummatum during the 3 years you had it, or do you know the circumstance of it's having been so sent.?

A. I never sent nor do I know that circumstance. How can I understand if any body had sent. No grain of my Cummatum was measured out by me or with any order. It is nothing to me if another person gave any.—

27. Q. Besides the Moodoombevaru Cummatum lands which you stated you have taken, have you any other cultivation in Codoor Village?.

A. I have a separate Dittum of 2 Ploughs in that Village in the name of Govarum Voodoo reddy Two out of 40 Veesabady ploughs.—

28 Q. Who managed the cultivation of the 2 Ploughs which you assert you have in

in that Village in the name of Goorum Vobooloo-reddy and the Cummatum of 0 ploughs which is stated to have been given up by Moodoomberver.

A Manchereddy Venoo-reddy managed it formerly and after his death his Soninlaw Rawanapah had the management of the cultivation of the five ploughs—

29. Q. What sort of connection has Goorum Vobooloo-reddy with this Cummatum—

A. There was one named Pedhereddy formerly after whose death the Cummatum was entered in the name of this Vobooloo-reddy because he is the head of the family but I retained the management under myself—

30 Q. Who has charge of the produce of the Cummatum?

A. A portion of the grain is kept in store at Codoor and a portion is brought to our Village. In any one year my young man Goorum Narainreddy used to go and get the produce thrashed and brought home, keeping a portion at that place for the labourers—

Can

31 Q. Can you positively state that in the accounts which you stated above to have been settled between yourself and Ramanoja row, that is to say the accounts between you and Ramanojarow during the 3 years while you had the Cummatum there are no entries of grain having been delivered—

A. I cannot positively recollect—but used to look into the account of each period at the sametime and I used to receive credit—

By Ramanojarow

32 Q. Have I any cultivation in Codoor either inwardly with others or privately or in any other way?

A. He has Cattle and garden but no cultivation—

33 Q. Did the Circar or the Ryots suffer any loss by my man Moodoomby Venkatakristnamacharlu having a Cummatum in his name up to Fasly 1246 or having my female Cattle and garden subsequently in this Village—

A. As I am not an Inhabitant of that Village I do not know that circumstance I do not know whether there is any loss or not—I manage the cultivation by keeping

keeping a Tala manishee or manager in that Villag and only go to that Village once in a year or once in six months - I never heard that the Ciccar or Ryots had sustained any loss -

34 Q. During Fuslies 1245. 46 & 47 when you had the Cunnatum, was any work done to the River Channel?

A. One year I did not send people to clear the River Channel because they did not give me water. The other 2 years I sent people -

35 Q. You have stated that you did not send people to work on the River Channel because water was not given - Was an account of the river channel fines made out - what was the cause of it's not having been so done?

A. That year a portion of the fine was collected from me but I do not recollect the year - I recollect that I once paid 4 Rupees and odd. I do not recollect that I ever paid more than that for River channel fines in Cobor -

By the Principal Collector.

36 Q. You have stated above that they did not give you water - what was the reason

reason for water not having been given?

A. My Talamanish for manager of my Cunnatum I died and there being no other all my people were in confusion which prevented my sending them to clear the River channel as I did not send people to clear the River channel till I procured another man, they did not give water -

By Ramanjoorow

37 Q. You have stated above that I have no cultivation in Cobor either secretly or openly - After I gave up the Cunnatum at the close of fusly 1244, had I any cultivation either secretly or in any other way since fusly 1245?

A. He has no Cultivation exceepting the garden and Cattle -

By the Principal Collector -

38 Q. What do you mean by saying that he has no cultivation?

A. The Garden and the Poollary being entered in the Puttah and jointly entered in the Puttah and Dittum therefore I say there is no cultivation - As the garden and Poollary or Cattle are included in the Dittum and Puttahs and as he has no cultivation,

I

I say he has no cultivation nor does he derive any thing from it - I have therefore represented that he has no cultivation -

39 Q. Can you positively state that either Moodoombevar or Ramanoojarow have had no connection with the cultivation of that Cummatum excepting graging their Cattle and having a garden at Codoor since fusly 1245?

A During the years I held the Cummatum, their Bullocks or people did not come and plough the lands - They had nothing to do with it. For the subsequent years Vanombaka Venkatramareddy must know -

40 Q. You have stated that they had nothing to do with it - What do you mean by stating in that manner?

A I have stated so, because I took the grose produce and paid the Sheist thereof --

By Ramanoojarow

41. Q. How many days ago, have you and Goorreum Vobooloreddy disputed and seperated?

A It

A It was on the 2d Increasing moon of Caurteekum of this year, now 12 days ago. We have devided all the Cattle together with the Cummatums property, debts &c.

42 Q. Is there any dispute between you and him at present?

A There is no dispute in the family - There is no family dispute between the people of my family and myself, but there is a dispute between me and Narrain reddy.

43 Q. Was I ever acquainted with Voboolooreddy or Narrainreddy?

A I do not know

44 Q. What was the balance of the account settled upto Fusly 1247 as stated by you after giving credits for the young bulls?

A I recollect that there was a balance of 7 Rupees and odd -

45 Q. Have you subsequently taken the young bulls bred from my Cattle

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Cattle and received credit for the same. 3

A. I took no young bulls subsequently, but your man came and sold young bulls to one Indoopoor Kistnamah an inhabitant of Pollapooy. There were not sold through me nor was the money carried to the Credit of my balance. your man named Sanapaha. it is said came, valued the young bulls, took the money and paid the Pollary and garden shist and took a receipt and delivered it to you.

By the Principal Collector.

46 Q. Why did you allow Ramanoojarow's Cattle to graze in the Veesahady Cattle lands of the Moodoombevaro's Cummatum after it had been given up by them in Fusly 1244 and you had occupied it?

A. I allowed him to graze his Cattle because he was a great man and a public Servant, and I had no particular occasion for the heedoo lands. he said he would graze his Cattle in

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

in his former heedoo land and pay the Pollary and I had Cattle land sufficient for my Cattle.

47. Q. Was the Pollary on Ramanoja=rows Cattle taken during the 3 years you had the Cummatum according to the actual number or according to the proportion of the Cummatum?

A. It was taken according to the proportion of Cummatum and not upon the actual number of the Cattle.

48 Q. How many young bulls bred from Ramanojarows Cattle used you generally to take in a year?

A. I received altogether 15 young bulls in the 3 years, but I do not recollect how many I got yearly.

49 Q. Had you any profit from those bulls. What would be your profit for every bull on an average? After paying Pollary, interest and other=

A. escences, the profit on each bull is one Rupee.

50 Q. Do you know when the last division of lands took place in Coloor?

A. I do not recollect whether it was in Fusly 1245 or 1246.

51 Q. Was it before or after you took the Moodoombevaro Cummatum that the division took place?

A. It was after I took it.

By.

By Ramanoojarow

52 Q. From How long are my female Cattle grazing in the Beedoo lands of this Cummatum-

A. Your Cattle have been graging from the time you had cultivation in that Village-

53 Q. Have my Cattle been graging in that Village or not before I gave up the Cummatum in Fusly 1245-

A. You had cultivation and your Cattle were therefore that time-

54 Q. Was the same rule which was observed in years prior to fusly 1244 in the payment of Poollary for my female Cattle and those of the Ryots of the Village generally followed since fusly 1245 or any other rule?

A. One rule has been observed all along of collecting Poollary according to Necessary shares-

55 Q. Is my keeping my female Cattle only in the beedoo land of this Cummatum with your consent since fusly 1245 after I gave up the Cummatum only on account of buttermilk for the use of my house or to enjoy any wealth?

A. If any bulls were bred, they were sold and a profit derived - and buttermilk was got from the milk-

(Signed) Cundoola Soobareddy.

Taken before me this 19th day of November 1839.

(Signed) T. F. Stonhouse

Principal Collector-

No. 24.

Q. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A. In Telloogoo.

Deposition of Gurrum Narraimreddy Son of Woobbooloreddy of the Puntacaupoo Caste, long Mark religion, about 26 years old, inhabitant of Mancherlaw a Pallam and by profession a Cultivator, dated the 20th November 1839.

Before the Pl. Collector of Nellore.

By the Pl. Collector.

Q. Has Soondaragherry Ramanoja-row any cultivation in Codoor, If so, state the circumstances which you know regarding it?

A. He has- Before he was Sheristadar he cultivated it himself, after he became Sheristadar, he said that if he kept it separate somebody might tell the Gentleman, and told my father Gurroom Woobulreddy to join it with his- that we were to pay for loss on the cultivation, labourers and seed- The Bullocks were to be his (Ramanjarows) For the grazing of

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

of the Bullocks of these three Shares, the Bu=
=doo called immagarennaeriam which formed
part of the cattle land which came to Ra=
=manjarow's share, was given.

2. 2 To what Cummatum was the cattle
land called Ummagarennaerien allotted?
A That formed part of the Beedo
land which came to his 3 Shares during
the late Division.

3 2. In what fusly did the junctio
of Soondragherry Ramanja-rows cultivation
with that of Gurreum Wobulreddy take plac
A It was in fusly 1245 Cundoola
Soobbareddy told Gurreum Wobulreddy and
myself that after deducting the pay of the
persons employed in the cultivation, the
seed for the three shares and Gurreum=
Wobulreddy's Madepaulow for the three
Shares, the account for the year would
be looked over and whatever was the
loss he would pay. His bullocks were the
accordingly for two years. The third year
when the time for ploughing had arrived, the

Mr

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

cattle were driven away and upon our then
asking for the bullocks, he used to say that
he would send them. He was asked in this
way 2 or 3 times, and he kept saying that he
would send them - but no cattle were sent at
all that year. That year there was a still greater
loss than usual in consequence of his not has=
=ing sent cattle as he promised at the pro=
=per time. Upon which we said we would
not keep it and threw it up. Then the culti=
=vation of our Shares as well as Ramanoja
rows was impeded on account of his shares
We then asked Ramanapah and Maurum=
=reddy Soobbareddy Moonsiff and an inhabi=
=tant of Coodoor Village to separate our culti=
=vation as we had joined the Cultivation of
five shares and cultivated it as a Cum=
=matum, we accordingly caused the land
of our two shares to be measured out in
presence of Moorumreddy Soobbareddy and
Ramanapah and tickets were put both for
the three and two Shares. I drew for Goorrum
Wobalareddy

Woobulreddy and the Moonsiff of Codoor & maurumreddy Soobbareddy for Ramanuja Row.

b 2. What is the reason of drawing tickets?

A. Considering that if we were to & take the field on & mere judgment there might be some doubt that the respective fields are either of a rich or poor soil, we put tickets distenguishing the North and South Divisions, of which we got the & ticket for our two shares.

5 2. Do you recollect the particular Fusly in which this drawing of tickets took place?

A. It was in last year or fusly 1246. Our Shares we cultivated with Paddavary and the other shares remained uncultivated for some time, when Ramanja Row sent Sarraf Narrainapah for Vanumbauka Venaturaw-mareddy and put the three Shares in his charge and he carried on the cultivation afterwards what took place between them We dont no.

b 2. When the Cumnattum of three Shares was under you, did you conti- taking the gross produce thereof or what had

had become of it?

A. We joined the three and our two shares together. The loss on our two shares we bore and that on his three shares was enter-ed in the account as a balance against him. The Coroo share of the produce derived from the Cummatum of three shares we sold and carried to the payment of the Shist, and if there was still any loss it was entered as a balance against him.

y 2. used you to take and sell the whole of the Coorograin or as was any portion thereof sent to Soondragherry Ramany arow?

A. Some of the grain we used to send to him and the rest we sold to pay the Circar Shist.

8. 2. State the particulars of the circum-stance as to when the grain was so sent to the Sherestadar Soondaragherry Ramany arow, was it every year during the time you had the Commar-tum of three shares under you or once, at any time?

A. This was only done once, but not again at any other time.

9 2. What is the quantity of the grain so sent in

in one instance?

A. I dont recollect I must see the Account. It was about 7 Candies and odd, I dont recollect properly.

10 Q. You have stated that you must see the accounts. What account is that?

A. The grain of our five shares was hoarded up at Codoor. We measured out to him the grain from one of the pits in which it was stored. Cundoola Soobbareddy wrote me a Chit saying that as there was a Marriage in Soondaraghiry Ramanyarow's house, I was to open one of the pits and send to him 7 Candies and odd or 8 Candies of fine Peeshanum grain.

11 Q. Was it the grain of Cundoola Soobbareddy that was sent to Ramanyarow at that time?

A. It was the produce of the five shares of Condoola Soobbareddy and Korbulreddy who do not live separate but together. It was measured out as per Soobbareddy's Sunkha by Muddaly Ramanah a Goomastah at Codoor and a receipt taken. The Muddaly Ramanah is our Goomastah because we and Soobbareddy are re-

12 Q. Was the said seven or eight Candies of

grain entered in any account according to which Soondragherry Ramanya Row was to pay?

A. It was not entered, on my asking Cundoola Soobbareddy, who is my fatherinlaw, he told me that it was a donation on account of the Marriage in his house.

13 Q. Between whom did the cultivation account of the Cummatum of the three shares exist, was it between Cundoola Soobbareddy and Ramanoya row or who?

A. It was between Ramanya Row and Condoola Soobbareddy.

14 Q. Do you know when the said account was settled?

A. When the Gentleman came to Indoor Koorpett. Cundoola Soobbareddy came there also. Soobbareddy was saying before that time, that Ramanya row owed him about 5 or 600 Rs. Soobbareddy told me that Ramanjarow laid he had established a lamp at Sreerungum and asked him Soobbareddy what he would give towards the expense attending it. My father-in-law said what can he give, that he could give nothing, upon which he (Ramanjarow) asked him to

give

give up the account of the loss on the Codoor affair and he accordingly gave it up. These circumstances my father-in-law Soobbareddy told me, but I did not hear them myself.

15 Q. Did Cundoola Soobbareddy mention this circumstance to any other person. Were any others present when he told this circumstance to you?

A. Putchepala Abbereddy, Moogard Soobbareddy and Colemreddy Soobareddy who came to Indoorooperett at that time are acquainted with this circumstance.

16 Q. Is not Cundoola Soobareddy in the habit of taking Ramanoy a row's young Bulls in discharge of the Money advanced by him on account of Ramargarow?

A. He used to take them formerly when Streenevassarow was Amildar he asked for ten Candies of grain of the Codoor Cultivation. We gave it then as a loan. The grain was then given, but the price not fixed, it is usual when the price was high to charge it at that rate, on that account he used to give the young Bulls four or five as they were available and we used to give credit for them in the account

17 Q. How long ago was the grain given to

to Streenevassarow?

A. It was given in the year in which he came to this Mootah, that is to say about 7 or 8 years ago.

18 Q. Since how long are the young Bulls taken in payment of the balance?

A. Since five years.

19 Q. What is the cause of receiving the young Bulls given 3 or 4 years subsequent to the period at which grain was given to Streenevassarow in payment of the Money due for the grain?

A. That was an old balance, and as it had never been cleared off we asked him for it, and he used to say that he would pay, and therefore the young Bulls were taken for it, and the Balance due on the subsequent account for cultivation was given up.

20 Q. What was the amount of Balance for which the account was given up?

A. I have already stated it to have been about 4 or 500 Rupees.

21 Q. Have you ever before seen the account?

J.

A. I had seen it. The account used to be at Goodoor and the grain was also measured at Goodoor. that is to say Totafully Goodoor.

22 Q. Cundoola Soobbareddy deposed before me that on settleing accounts a balance of 7 Rupees and odd was struck - you have stated it to be four or five hundred Rupees. How is this circumstance?

A. He stated so as he is combined with Ramanjarow.

23 Q. Do the Nookalapatewar graze their cattle in the Veesabady pasture lands of any Cummatum in Coodoor?

A. They graze their cattle in Gundavarapoo Veerareddy's Cummatum, they have two Shares.

24 Q. Have the Nookalapatewar any cultivation in Coodoor?

A. Their name is not entered in the Dittam, but they have inner Cultivation in the Gundeevarapoowar's Cummatum.

25 Q. Are you perfectly aware of Nookalapatewar having inner cultivation in the Gundavarapoowar's Cummatum?

J.

A. I dont recollect.

26 Q. Do the Nookalapatewar's Cattle graze in Doovoor Vengareddy's Cummatum?

A. They do.

27 Q. Do you know how many of Nookalapatewar's Cattle graze in Gandewarapoowar's Cummatum, and how many in that of Doovoor Vengareddy?

A. I dont know the particular Number.

28 Q. Do you know the cause of the Nookalapatewar's Cattle being allowed to graze in the pasture lands of those two Cummatums?

A. The Nookalapatewar are very rich people and the Cattle of the Gundavarapoowar and Doovoor Vengareddy are few. The former make advances of hundreds and two hundreds for the Shist &c. of the Cummatum, and as a return for the favor they allow their cattle to graze on their lands.

29 Q. Do you know the circumstance of Tickavarapoo Seetaramareddy grazing his Cattle in the Veesabady pasture land of Doovoor Vengareddy?

A. I dont Know.

30 Q. Do you know the circumstance of Goonapaty

Goonoopauty Vencoreddy, an Inhabitant of Coodetepolliem, grazing his cattle in the Vesaba-dy pasture lands allotted to the Cunnratums of Maurumreddy Soobareddy or Doovvvr Vengareddy.²

A. I do not Know.

31 Q. Where is the account of Condoola Soobbareddy alluded to by you.²

A. He made away with it.

32 Q. Since how many days are you and Cundoola Soobareddy at enmity.²

A. We have no enmity but are on good terms.

33. Q. Are you and he now living to-gether or how many days ago is it since you separated.²

A. We disputed about looking over the accounts, bonds and cattle, and we take rice together.

34 Q. With whom did the dispute take place.²

A. He / Soobareddy / is persuaded to say there is a dispute, but there is none between Soobareddy and myself and we are in good terms.

35 Q. Did not you already divide your property

property and debts thro' Mediators.²

A. What connection is there between my property and debts and the Circar affairs. but we have divided the Cows and Bullocks notwithstanding which they are all kept together.

36 Q. How many days ago did the division take place.²

A I dont recollect, it may be about 20 days ago.

37 Q. Was the Cultivation also divided.²

A. It has not been divided.

38 Q How many days is it since you came to Nellore.²

A It is four days.

39 Q. With whom did you Come?

A I came alone, bringing my aunts son Pullumputty. Soobareddy with me.

40 Q. Do you Know Malatoor Nurdacharlu, Cunnum Seetiah and Goodalapully Chedumbarum.

A I Know them, but I did not come with him

41 Q. Do you mean to say that you did not stay with them at any place.²

Sp.

A If we meet together when going along the Bazar, we ask each other, "when did you come," because we know one another. This is all.

42 2 Did not they take you to the house of any of the public Servants.?

A No.

43 2 From the time you came to this Village where do you sleep and stay, and in whose house do you take your rice.?

A I don't know the particular houses, we are Strangers, and if we happen to come at any time we pass along the Bazar. I pay four dubs to any Banian and get rice. There is no fixed house either at a Caupoos or a Comaty's house as it happens.

64 2 What other Caupoos also take rice at the place in which you take rice during the last four days.?

A No other Caupoos.

65 2 Where did you take your rice this morning?

A The Peons who were with me, made

me take my meal in the house of some Pakanaty man.

By the Principal Collector.

462 you were not to be seen yesterday, Where had you been.?

A I went to see Canoopoowar who are my relations at Pottapalem because Candoola Soobareddy's people told me the night before last that I was about to give evidence, and that if I gave evidence the Gentleman would give me annoyance. I yesterday took my midday rice in their house and on coming to Nellore at two Ghadies in the night, two Dalayets caught me saying. How do you come at a late hour in the night?

472 you have stated that Soobareddy's people came and told you, who are those people.

A Conjaty Narsoo a Comaty of Mancherlavarepaulem.

482 Were there any persons with you at the time when Conjaty Narsoo came to you?

A A Curnum of Tolapulleygoodoor named Tolapulley

Totapulley Pauparah was with me -

By Ramanujarow.

49.2. At what time did he tell you and at what place?

A He told me near the huts of the black Smiths near Caularedy's Choultry at about one Ghuddy after sun set.

50.2 Used you to see and speak with Columreddy Soobareddy and Putchepaula Abbereddy, for the last four days?

A When I meet them in the Bazar if I am asked when I came, I used to say that I came just then and to go away -

51.2 Did no Peon come to call you to Nellore.

A No.

52.2 Are you at this place during these four days or did you go to your village & return?

A Pullumpaty Soobadoo came to sell his grain which was in the Godown of Duggoomaty Soobadoo, and as I wanted 10 Rupees, I waited for it but did not return to my village -

Did

53.2 Did you ever come to Nellore at any time before these 4 days, or is this the first time?

A I always used to come when I had business -

By the Principal Collector.

54.2. You have stated above that Cundala Soobareddy told you that Ramanjarow asked him to give up the account of loss on the Codoor affair and that he accordingly gave it up, Did Soobareddy bring the account with him to Indoocoor-pett and give it up or where did he do so?

A He came from Indooscoorpett to our Village and said that ramanjarow had asked him to give up that account and that he agreed to give it and came. Being asked as to why he had agreed to give up an account with such a large balance, he said that as he was Seristadar dowe not get a profit in the Palwasee of Meacherlavaure-pollam and the balances of poor Ryots to the sum of one thousand Rupees yearly that by giving up this account there

there would be no harm, and so not minding us and without our consent, our Goomastah Pellaut Vencataroyadoo carried the account to Nellore and delivered it at his house. This Vencataroyadoo is one who writes accounts with the Indigo Gentleman and with us -

55 Q Do you mean to say that that account was never again brought back?

A It was never again brought back to our house. -

By Ramanjarooz.

56 Q You have stated that Soobareddy told you that there was a profit of 1,000 Rupees by my assistance; state the particulars of these items as to whether they are false or true ones?

A I dont Know them am I an accurate Cumum to know the account in the Village. In the Course of time I will prove it.

57 Q You have stated that you went to Pottapaulem because Soobareddy sent a man to you considering that you came to give evidence. Did you tell any one that you came to give evidence?

A I never told any one, Soobareddy only suspected because I went to Nellore. - and had not returned for two days to the Village - but I did not tell any one.

58 Q Did not you tell any one previous to your giving evidence before the Gentleman, that you would deliver the deposition as if you are aware of these circumstances?

A No.

59 Q Do you know the circumstance of there having been a Cummatum in the name of my man Moodoomby Venoata Kistanamacharlo in this Village up to Fusly 1244?

A I know it.

60 Q Do you know how many ploughing Cattle were there when the Cummatum was given up to Cundala Soobareddy at the close of Fusly 1244?

A There were 10 or 12 plowing Cattle -

61 Q Do you know where they were taken to?

A Those Bullocks were kept there for two years and employed in tilling with

with our Cattle, after which they were
taken away. We carried on the Cultivation
for one year; afterwards What do I know
whether they were taken to Reddepaulem
or Goondalapaulem. I dont know where
they were taken to, but supposed that they
might have been taken to one of those
villages, Vizt. Reddy polem or Goondala-
polem as it was said that there was
Cultivation there.

62 Q. Do you mean by loss, the loss
arising after the sale of the whole of
the Coroo Grain on account of the
Circar Shist?

A. I mean the deficiency to be the
loss. The advances made by us on account
of the Cultivators' Wages and Seed will
be about ten Candies a year, of which
three Shares are yours and two ours;
altogether five. The seed and the pay of the
labourers for the three Shares of the
Soondaragherry war is calculated. The
Coroo Share of the grain and Madepaulo
is ascertained to be so much, and after
deducting the Circar Shist from the Coroo grain,
the

the remainder was carried to the
credit of the Seed and the wages
of the labourers.

By the Principal Collector.

63 Q. Was it out of the Madepaulo
or Coroo Share of grain that credit
was taken for the wages of the
labourers and the price of the
Seed?

A. It was out of the Madepaulo.

64 Q. If the wages of the labourers
and the seed are paid out of the Made-
paulo and if Wooboloo reddy received
Madepaulo how could these two
items form an item of loss chargeable
to Soodaragherry Ramanjarow. State the
circumstances particularly?

A. We receive Madepaulo and
as the Coroo grain is insufficient for the
Circar Shist, all the other advances
were entered in the account as a
balance. The loss on the Cultivation
was Ramanjarow's, and he was answerable

for

for all, after deducting the Madoopauloo due to us-

65 Q What is the rate of Madepauloo paid to you for the Cultivation of the three shares-?

A At the rate of nine in Twenty-?

66 Q You have stated that you get Madepauloo at nine in Twenty. ought not you to defray the Charges for the pay of the labourers and seed, out of the Madepauloo-?

A We aught.

67 Q How in such case can those items form a charge of loss against Soondara = = gherry Romanjarow-?

A After taking Madepauloo, the Coroo Share will not pay half the Circar Shist- The difference of the Circar Shist which may remain after paying from the sale of the Coroo Share, we pay and write it in the account as a loan made

68 Q Whose Cultivators are they who carry on the Cultivation of these three Shares-?

A When the Cultivation was made

over

over to us, their labourers were also made over to us-

By Ramanjarow

69 Q You have stated that ten Candies of Grain were given when Sreenevasarow was Tahsildar of this Talook; at what rate was it given, and what was the amount and by whom was it given-?

A Soobareddy gave it, about the price I cannot speak without seeing the account.

70 Q. Used you to see Soobareddy's account-?

A Our Goomastah used to see the accounts and tell us.-

71 Q You have stated that the grain was charged with a high price, of what year was it-?

A I donot recollect,

72 Q Doyou know what was the loss in each year during the three years since fusly 1245-?

A I donot recollect.

Do

3 Q. Do you know what was the lot upon the three years?

A. I dont recollect.

/Signed/ Narrainreddy.

Taken before me this 20th day of November 1839.

/Signed/ J.V. Stonhouse.

2d. Collector.

/True Translation/

/signed/ J.V. Stonhouse.

No. 25. Principal Collector.

Deposition of Goorrum Narrainreddy a second time, before the Principal Collector 21st. November 1839.

By Ramanjarow.

1 Q. In your first deposition you have stated that after I became Seristadar it was not proper that I should keep cultivation separate, and that you should join it with yours and such other words. Who told you this?

A. My fatherinlaw Cundalo formerly told me. He said that it must be joined with ours.

2 Q. You have stated that the bullocks attached to the Cummatum were kept there for two years: By whom were they driven away from thence afterwards?

A. I dont recollect who they were.

3 Q. Who used to tell you that he would sent back the Bullocks when you asked two or three times for them?

A. They were not sent back that year, in consequence of which the Cultivation was indifferently carried on and the next year given upon.

By the Principal Collector.

4 Q. You have stated that the Ploughing Cattle wer kept there for two years. If it was the case, what was the reason of their being afterwards driven away from thence?

A. They were driven away for the lot season and because it was not the time for tilling, on a promise of bringing them back, but they were not brought back afterwards.

5 Q. Do you know what is the cause of the Cattle not having been brought again to the Village?

A. I do not know.

By Ramanjarow.

6 Q. You have stated that after you gave up the land you have divided your share of the land and drew tickets. If the shares were not equal how could it be possible to put tickets distinguishing

only

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

only the North side as belong to one and the South side to the other.-

A. There were five tickets 3 for their three shares and two for our two shares.-

7 Q. You have stated that for 8 Candies of Grain were measured out on a Chit written to you by Soobareddy and that a receipt was given for it. Who was the man that measured and took the grain and gave a receipt?

A. He was their Ron and I dont properly recollect whether his name was Chenchoo or something else.-

8 Q. Was it at the time of sending the account of loss on Codoor affair that Lundoola Soobareddy told you that he would give it up, or when was it?

A I dont know whether he had already sent it or not. but he told me that he gave it up and he also said so to some other respectable people.-

9 Q. You have stated that grain was measured out to Seenaparow when he was Tahsildar.

Who measured and took the grain and do you know what is the estimated value of it?

A. I cannot recollect without seeing the Account. The name of the person in whose charge it was measured out is entered in the account.-

By the Principal Collector.

10 Q. Where is the account at present?

A. That account has hitherto been at Goodoor. all the accounts that were at Goodoor were taken away to Mancherlaveepaulem by Lutchepalda Abbereddy about 15 days ago.-

11 Q. Are those accounts now at Mancherlaveepaulem?

A. They are in Lundoola Soobareddys' possession.-

12 Q. What is the Cause of keeping those accounts at Lotapullegoodoor and in whose house were they kept there?

A. Our family is at Goodoor because our Cummatum is there. Soobareddys' Cummatum is in that Village.-

By Ramanjarow.

13 Q. Did you ever see the account containing this entry?

A I did.

14 Q. Where did you see it?

A. I used to see it every year.-

Wher

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

15. Q. When did you see it last?

A. I dont recollect when it was.

16 Q. When Seeneva Jarow was Tahsildar did he cause all the lands belonging to Soobareddy to be measured and bring to account the excess found at that time, and was there in consequence enmity between Soobareddy and Seeneva Jarow?

A. For some time there was enmity between them after which they again became friends.

17 Q. Was it in the first or second year after Seeneva Jarow became Tahsildar that the grain was delivered to him?

A. I dont recollect.

18 Q. Do you know how much of the grain debt has been paid off and what is the balance inserted in the Account?

A. I do not recollect.

19 Q. You have stated that Nookalapatewar gave loans to Gundavaraposwar, What is the amount of loans so given and do you know it of yourself?

A. I dont know how much it is. It might be one or two hundred. I heard them say that they got

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

got loans of hundreds and two hundreds from the Nookalapatewar and graze their Cattle.

20. Q. you have stated that your Goomastah Vencatroyadoo delivered the account in my house on what was it written and have you seen or do you know what were the items inserted in it?

A It was a Cadjan account. I did not see the items in it but Soobareddy told me.

By the Principal Collector,

21 Q Do you mean to say that you did not see the items in the account when your Goomastah Vencatroydoo took the account to Soondara-gherry Ramanjarow's house, or that you never saw the items in it?

A Cundoola Soobareddy and our Goomastah used always to tell. They used to mention in their house that there was so much loss.

22 Q Who used to manage the Cultivation of your Cummatum of 5 shares at Codoor?

A Manchereddy Venkooreddy used to manage it. He died three years ago. He had the Manage-ment of the Cummatum and I superintended his management. We always used to

to be with the Ploughs.

/Signed/ Narrainreddy.

Taken before me this 21st day of November 1839.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse
Princl. Collector

No. 20.

Deposition given by Cundoola Soobareddy a second time dated 21st November 1839 Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.-

1 Q. Where is at present the account which existed between you and Ramanoojarow during the three years in which you had the Cummatum of 5 shares at Codoor?

A. I gave it up to him.-

2 Q. Do you mean to say that you gave up the original account which either yourself or your Goomastah used to keep during the three years?

A. I did not give up the original account of dealings. I mean the one relating to the monthly payments to Cattle tenders and the Poollary on Cattle as well as garden Shist Fees. These are the only accounts.-

3 Q. Was the original account on Cadjans or on Paper?

A. It was on Cadjans-

4 Q. Where is that Cadjan account at present.?

A. It is in my house amongst the other Cadjan accounts at Mancherlanarepollem.-

5 Q. Which was the account you gave up to the Sheristadar Ramanjarow?

A. It was one which related to the dealings between us, that is to say Poollary on Cattle. wages and Garden Shist.-

6 Q. You have deposed that the original account between you and Ramanjarow is in your house and that you gave up one account to Ramanoojarow- Was the account which you gave up, a Copy or an Abstract of the original one or what was it?

A. I gave up an Abstract and the accounts of monthly payments are with me.-

By Ramanoojarow.

7 Q. You have now stated about an account which was given me- Was it the account referred to in your former Examination where a balance of Company's Rupees-7-4-0 was struck?

A. It was the very same account.-

By

By the Principal Collector.

8 Q. Did you ever give Soondaraghery Chee=
=neravaarow, when he was formerly Tahsildar
of this Taluck, 10 Candies or any quantity
of grain for loans or Sale ?

A. He never took grain from me nor did
I give him grain or any thing else - There
was a great Animosity between us and he
was doing much against me.-

9 Q. Did you ever give a Tuntcha for 7 or 8
Candies of grain to be sent to Soondaraghery
Ramanoojarow on any occasion ?

A. I did not.-

10 Q. Did you ever send some grain to Soondara=
=ghery Ramanoojarow from the grain stores
of your Cummatum at Codoor ?

A. I did not send. My Gooroo Narrainreddy
was saying - Beyond that I dont know -

/Signed/ Soobareddy.

Taken before me - this 21st day of November
1839.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse

Princl. Collector

In

No. 27.

2 In what language will you cause your De=
=position to be written. ?

A In Telogoo.-

Deposition of Anuntapulla Kistnama son of
Poloorauze of the Braming Caste, Smarta Religion
about 32 years old, inhabitant of Codoor and by
profession a Carnum, dated 22nd November 1839.-

Before the Principal Collector.-

By Ramanoojarow.

1. Q. Was there a Cummatum in Codoor in the
name of Moodoomby Venkatakistamacharloo up to
fusly 1244 ?

A. There was a Cummatum in the name of
Venkatakistnamacharloo up to the end of
fusly 1244.-

2 Q. Was the Cummatum given up to Cundoola
Soobareddy at the end of fusly 1244 ?

A. It was.

3 Q. Who Cultivated the lands of the Cummatum
since fusly 1245 ?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy Carried on
the Cultivation in fuslies 1245-46 and 47.
and paid the Circar Shist.-

Who

4 Q. Who enjoyed the gross produce of the Cummatum?

A. Soobareddy enjoyed it.- In fusslies 1248 and 49. it was cultivated by Vanoombaka Vencataramareddy who paid the Circar Shist.-

5 Q. Who enjoyed it's gross produce in fusslies 1248. and 49.?

A Vencataramareddy has been enjoying it.-

6 Q. Since fusly 1245 had I any ploughing Cattle or Labourers in Codoor?

A. There are neither Bullocks, nor Labourers nor any one.-

7 Q. You have stated that Candoola Soobareddy Carried on the Cultivation in fusslies 1245-46 and 47. To whom did the ploughing Cattle and ploughs with which the Cultivation was Carried on belong.?

A. To Soobareddy.-

8 Q. Since how long are my female Cattle grazing in the pasture land of the said Cummatum?

A Since 15 years.-

9 Q. At the time of giveing up the Cummatum at the end of fusly 1244 was it relinquished upon the

the condition that my female Cattle were to graze in the pasture land thereto belonging, that Candoola Soobareddy was to Carry on the Cultivation and enjoy the profit and loss, and that I was to pay to Circar the grazing tax of the Cattle.?

A It was.

By the Principal Collector.

10 Q. How do you know the said circumstance?

A. I know it because I do Curnums duty.-

11 Q. Were you a Curnum when the said Cummatum was given up by Moodoomleewar?

A I was.-

12 Q. How long have you been as a Curnum.?

A Since 12 years.-

13 Q. What was the reason of a stipulation having been made that Candoola Soobareddy was to cultivate the lands of the Cummatum and that Soondarapperry Ramanjarow's Cattle were to graze in the Veesabady Pasture of the Cummatum.- Is such a thing usual in this Veesabady Village of Codoor or in any other Veesabady Village?

A He grazes in the pasture for Bullocks to the Value of 1 or 2 Pagodas.- I do not know the Cause.

Wit

His (Ramanjarow's) Cattle were grazing in my Village and he pays the grazing tax.-

By Ramanjarow-

4. 2. Why did Cundoola Soobareddy give up the Cummatum?

A. We relinquished it because he had a loss, afterwards Vencataramareddy held it.-

15 2. What is the name of Cundoola Soobareddy's Head man or manager and where did he die?

A. Mancheredy Venkoo- He died two years ago- I think in Fusly 1250 but cannot recollect properly.-

16. 2. Is my Garden included in the Dittum of this Cummatum?

A. It is included-

17 2. Do you know who used to purchase the young Bulls produced from my she Cattle?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy used to take them-

18 2. Who used to pay to Circar since Fusly 1245 the grazing tax of these female Cattle and the Garden Shist?

Soobareddy

A. Soobareddy paid for three years and Vencataramareddy for 2 years.-

19 2. Have the Garden Shist and Collary been paid for this year, Fusly 1249?

A. They have been paid

By the Principal Collector-

20 2. Where were the Garden Shist and Collary paid?

A. About 2 Months ago Varnasy Sanapah paid-

21 2. To whom did he pay it?

A. We paid it to the Shroff in the Village and took a receipt.-

22 2. Who is Varnasy Sanapah?

A. There is a house in his (Ramanjarow's) Garden in my Village- He is a Bramin who lives in it.-

23 2. What is the amount of the Collary or grazing tax he paid?

A. I do not write accounts- my younger brother writes them- I do not know it.-

24 2. What is the name of your younger brother?

A. Venkiah-

25 2. Have the Cattle of Codoor Village been counted for Fusly 1249?

They

A They have been counted but no accounts have yet been forwarded.

20 Q Whether have they not been despatched.?

A To the Tahsildar's Cutcherry

27 Q When were they counted.?

A About one Month ago.

28 Q How did Sanapah pay the Dollary money before the Counting of the Cattle took place.?

A He paid the Garden Shist which was due for last year. I do not write the accounts my boy writes them.

By Ramanjarow.

29 Q Were the lands of this Cummatum Cultivated in full for last year or fusly 1248 in common with other Cummatums or not.?

A They were.

By the Principal Collector.

30 Q Was the Moodoorroo Cultivation carried on in the lands of this Cummatum for fusly 1248.?

A My boy writes the accounts I dont write accounts. I was nominated as Curnum and he

he write accounts.

31 Q Tell plainly whether Moodoorroo Cultivation was carried on or not under that Cummatum.?

A My boy must know it. I do not know.

32 Q Did Cundoola Soobareddy give up the two shares of Cultivation which was in the name of Goorum Veboolooreddy, at the time of relinquishing the Cummatum of the said three shares.?

A Soobareddy is holding the Cummatum of two shares.

33 Q You have stated that Cundoola Soobareddy gave up the said Cummatum of three shares because he had loss. Did he (Cundoola Soobareddy) sustain any loss in the other Cummatum of two shares.?

A After the death of the Manager of that Cummatum he relinquished the Cummatum

of

of three shares as there was no person to manage it- and he Carried on Cultivation of the Cummatum of two shares.-

34 Q You have stated that Moodoobemar gave up the Cummatum at the end of fusly 1244- If it was so relinquished what is the cause of Moodoobemars name being inserted in the Dittums Vca accounts of the Subsequent fusles. Q

A I do not recollect.-

35 Q Relate when the last Pampa Kunn or division of the lands in Codoor Village took place- Q

A About 5 years ago- I dont remember whether it was in fusly 1246 or 47.-

[Signed] Kistnama.

Taken before me this 29th day of November 1839.

[Signed] J. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

No. 28.

In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

Do. In Telugoo.

I. Deposition of Allumreddy Seetaramareddy son of Naurnapah of the Punta Caupa caste- Cross mark religion 60 years old, inhabitant of Codoor and by profession a Cultivator dated 22nd November 1839.-

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.-

By Ramanoojarow. Q. Had any Cultivation at Codoor for five years, from fusly 1245?

A. No.-

Q. Do you know that the Cummatum held in the name of Moodoomby Venecatakista- = machaloo prior to 5 years, was given up at the close of fusly 1244 to Cundoola Soobareddy?

A. I know it.-

Q. Who is carrying on the Cultivation of this Cummatum since fusly 1245?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated it for three years and he having subsequent- = ly relinquished it, Vancombanka Venecata- = ramareddy is carrying it on.-

What.

By the Prin.
Collector

What relation is allareddy
Kristnareddy to you.?

A. He is my younger brother.

5 Qr. Was Allereddy Kistnareddy ever Sa-
=lamanashee or Manager of the Moodoombevar's
Cummatum where it was in their possession.?

A. He was formerly.

By Ramanoo-
jarow. 6 Qr. The 3 years that Cundoola Soobared-
=dy had the Cummatum, whose ploughing Cattle
were used in the Cultivation, who enjoyed the
gross produce and who paid the Circar Shist.?

A. It was Soobareddy. The Plough-
=ing Cattle belonged to Soobareddy and the
female Cattle to Ramanoojarow.

7 Qr. Is a portion of this Cum-
=matum beedoo set apart for the plough-
=ing Cattle.?

A. It is set apart.

8 Qr. Have Suther ploughing Cat-
=tle or servants (i.e. Cultivators) in this
Village since Fusly 1245.?

A. No.

9 Qr. You have stated that the
female

female Cattle are grazing in this Village. Since
how many years have they been grazing.?

A. They have been grazing since Moodoom-
=by Seeneevasooloo and Kistnamah have
had Cultivation.

10 Qr. Since how many years before
the Cultivation was given up to Soobareddy,
was there a Cummatum in the name of
Moodoombee Streenevasooloo.?

A. It was 4 or 5 years, I don't
recollect before it was relinquished to
Soobareddy.

11 Qr. What is the name of the Sala-
=manshee or Manager of Cundoola Soo-
=bareddy's Cummatum.?

A. Muncheareddy Veneeoreddy and
after his death, his son in law Caumereddy
Ramareddy.

By the Prin.
Coll.r 12 Qr. Does Caumereddy Ramared-
=dy live in Codoor.?

A. He lives in Codoor.

13 Qr. Is Caumereddy Ramareddy Sal-
=manishee or Manager of the Cultivation which
this Soobareddy has in any other Village.?

No

A. No. In Codoor only.

42. Has the said Rowmareddy had Cultivation of his own at Codoor.

A. He has one plough cultivation in Soobareddy's Cummatum.

By Ramanoo. 15 Do. Why did Soobareddy give up this
Jarow. Cultivation of 3 ploughs and who carried it on afterwards.

A. He gave it up because there was loss on it and Vanoombaka Venkatara-
=mareddy carried it on.

16 Do. Whom do the ploughs and plough-
=ing Cattle which are used in Vanoombaka
Venkataramareddy's Cultivation, belong to.

A. The ploughing Cattle belong-
=ed to Venkataramareddy.

17 Do. Who enjoyed the gross produce and
who paid the Circar shist.

A. Venkataramareddy.

By the Prinl Coll.r 18 Do. How do you know all these circum-
=stances.

A. Because we are Cultivators.

By Ramanoo. Jarow 19 Do. Have you any Veesabady Cummatum
in that Village.

A. I have a Cummatum of 6 shares
in the Village.

You

By the Prinl Collector 20 Do. You have stated that you
have a Cummatum of one Sixth share in the Vil-
=lage of how many ploughs does the Cummatum
consist and how many of them belong to
you.

A. There are 12 ploughs in that
Cummatum, of which I have one plough.

By Ramanoo. Jarow 21 Do. Who used to take the young
bulls bred from my female Cattle, and pay
the Poollary for those Cattle, the shist of the
garden in that Village, and the wages of
the servants who tend the Cattle since fusly 1245.

A. Cundoola Soobareddy used to
take the young bulls and also to pay the
wages of the persons who take care of the
cattle but whether he (Ramanoo Jarow) paid
the shist of the garden or Soobareddy I
don't know.

22 Do. Can you Swear that I have
had no Cultivation in this Village since fusly 1245.

A. I can.

By the Prinl Coll.r 23 Do. How many she Cattle have you.

A. All I have are four in number.

You

24 Qu. You have stated that your Cummatum in this Village consists of 12 Ploughs what is the total number of the Cattle belonging to all the individuals who hold the 12 Ploughs.-

A. I dont recollect and cannot state

25 Qu. Besides the female Cattle belonging to the persons who carry on the Cultivation of the said 12 ploughs, do the sheep Cattle of any other individuals graze in the Veesabady Cattle land of your Cummatum?

A. Yes.

26 Qu. To whom do they belong?

A. They belong to Agustareddy Kistnareddy a resident in our Village.

27 Qu. How many are his Cattle?

A. He grazes six Cattle in my share.

28 Qu. Do the Cattle of any others besides those of Agustareddy Kistnareddy graze in this Cummatum.-

A. Agustareddy Kistnareddy's Cattle also graze in the beedoo lands of some of the other shares of the Cummatum.

What-

29 Qu. What is the total Number of Cattle belonging to Agustareddy Kistnareddy which graze in your share of the beedoo land and that of the other Ryots in your Cummatum consisting of 12 Ploughs?

A. The total Number is 14.-

30 Qu. Besides the 14 Cattle of Agustareddy Kistnareddy, do the Cattle belonging to any others graze either in your share of the Beedoo land or in that of any other of the Ryots attached to your Cummatum of 12 Ploughs?

A. There are no other Cattle in your Cummatum besides the above.-

31 Qu. What is the reason of your allowing the Cattle belonging to the said Agustareddy Kistnareddy to graze in the Beedoo land allotted in proportion to your Cummatum?

A. Agustareddy Kistnareddy makes Cash advances for seed &c.

32 Qu. Who was Talamanshew or Manager of the Moodoombevar's Cummatum in this Village when it was given up to Cundoola Seobaraddy?

A. I dont recollect who he was. He was either Mauchareddy Pararaddy or Allareddy Kistnareddy.-

33 Qu. When did the last division of the Veesabady lands in this Village take place?

A. We divided four years ago - we are now about to make another

Division

Division.-

By Ramanoo-ja Row- 34 Qe. Do you know what had become of the ploughing Cattle which Veneatakistna-macharioo had when Noodeombeevar gave up their Cummatum to Cundoola Seobareddy at the close of Fusly 1244.?

A. One or two pairs of bullocks were driven away to be used for bandies.

By the Printed Coll^rs. 35 Qe. How many were all the Cattle.?

A. I know that they drove away two pairs of Cattle- What became of the rest whether they died or are alive or were sold, I don't know-

36 Qe. Is Allaneddy Kistnareddy living with you or separately-

A. He is living separate. We have been a divided family from 30 years-

By Ramanoo-janow- 37 Qe. Do the Ryots of other Villages who have no Cultivation in your Villages speak with the Ryots and graze their Cattle in the Cattle lands of those Ryots or not-?

A. They do-

Has

By the Printed Coll^rs. 38 Qe. Has Augustareddy Kistnareddy any Cultivation in Beedoor Village-

A. He has a share of 2 bullocks or land of one plough-

39 Qe. In whose Cummatum-?

A. In the Cummatum of Villa-pollem Veneooreddy-

40 Qe. State the names of the persons who have no Cultivation in Beedoor but graze their Cattle in the Veesabady Beedoo lands of the Village-?

A. They are Augusteereddy- Kistnareddy and Ramanoojarow Puntooloo. These have no Cultivation and graze their Cattle-

By Rama-noojo Row- 41. Qe. You have stated above that the people of other Villages graze their Cattle without having any Cultivation- Do you know their names-?

A. I do not know-

42 Qe. You have stated that the Cattle of Augustareddy Kistnareddy are graging in your Beedoo- In which year was it-

A. It is now 14 years with the present

present year.

13 Q. Does Vancombaka Viceataramareddy graze his female Cattle in the Bedoo-lands of the Cummatum belonging to any other person besides in that attached to his own Cummatum.?

A. Any person who has a small number of Cattle sometimes take charge of the Cattle of others. but those who have a sufficient number will not do so.

14 Q. Do you mean to say that Agustareddy Kistnareddy's Cattle grazed in your Cummatum 4 years ago or that they are grazing for the last 4 years.?

A. They are grazing for the last 4 years.

15 Q. Did the Cattle of any other Ryot who has no Cultivation in your Cummatum, besides those of Agustareddy Kistnareddy, graze with your Cattle within the last 4 years?

A. No.

16 Q. You have stated that Agustareddy Kistnareddy has a share or two bullocks in your Village and have again stated that I and Agustareddy Kistnareddy

Kistnareddy have no Cultivation what is this difference. Have I any sort of Cultivation in this Village.?

A. You have no sort of Cultivation but you have Cattle and garden only in that Village. I did not state that Agustareddy Kistnareddy has no Cultivation.

Marked by Allareddy Sastaramreddy

Taken before me this 27th day of November 1839.

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Prin.l Coll.r

No. 29.

Q. In what language will you cause your Depositions to be written.

A. In Telugu.

Deposition of Ramareddy Subareddy son of Peloreddy of the Dasary Caupoo Caste Vaishnaby Mark religion about 50 years old inhabitant of Cadoor and by profession a Cultivator dated 25th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector.

By Ramanoojaroo 1 Q. Had I any Cultivation at Cadoor during the last five years since July 1246.

A. No.

2 Q. Do you know to whom the Cummatum

Cummatoore held before that in the name of Moodoomby Venkatakistnama = =chariar, was relinquished.2

A. He gave it up to Cundoola Sooba= =reddy who took it.

3 Q. How many years did he hold it.2

A. Three years.

4 Q. To whom belonged the ploughing = Cattle with which Soobareddy Cultivated during those years.2 and who enjoyed the = gross produce and who paid Circar Shist.2

A. Soobareddy himself paid and with his ploughing Cattle the Cultivation was carried on. He enjoyed the gross produce.

5 Q. Are my ploughing Cattle or labour= =ers in this Village since these five years.?

A. No Sir, If you had cultivation, there would be ploughing Cattle and = labourers.

6 Q. Why did Cundoola Soobareddy give it up afterwards, and whether he kept it.2

A. The Manager of Cundoola Soobareddy's Cummatum died and as.

as he then stated that he had no person = to manage it, Venkata Ramareddy is Carry= =ing on the same.

7 Q. To whom belonged the = ploughing Cattle with which Venkata Rama= reddy Carried on Cultivation both in the last and present year. who enjoyed the gross produce and who paid the Circar Shist.2

A. The Cattle with which the Cultivation is Carried on belong to Venka= =taramareddy. who enjoys the gross pro= =duce and pays the Shist.

8 Q. What is the number of = ploughs with which Venkata Ramareddy= cultivates. are they all his own or did he join those of others with his.2

A. I do not know of his having = joined those of others. He is a Single person= saw not aware whether he joined any other person or not, with himself.=

9 Q. Do you know from how many years any female Cattle are graz= =ing

grazing in this Village?

A. Since 10 or 12 years.

10 Q. Will you Solemnly declare that I have no Cultivation in the Village since five years?

A. I will declare Solemnly.

By the Principal Collector. 11 Q. Have you any Cultivation in this Village?

A. I have Cultivation of one Plough in the Cunnamatum of Cota Ramareddy.

12 Q. Have you any Separate Putta in this Village?

A. No.

13 Q. Your name is not entered among the individuals Concerned with that Cunnamatum. What do you say to this?

A. It is entered in the name of my elder Brother Narrainreddy.

14 Q. Did you give any deposition before the Principal Collector Five Months ago?

A. I did.

15 Q. Relate what you Stated in that deposition?

A.

A. I was asked if Ramanooja how had any Cultivation in that Village (Godoor) and I replied that he had none, Having been asked who had, I said that Moodoombe Streenevasaloo had Cultivation for Some time - that Condoola Soobareddy had it afterwards, that he subsequently gave it up - that Vencataramareddy is carrying it on. Having been asked as to how Moodoombee Streenevasaloo got the ploughs I said the Village People had given him the Share of two ploughs and that I gave him one Single plough and a weaver another, because we were not able to manage them - To this effect I gave deposition - On Stating that I had then given up the plough being unable to carry it on, and having asked that it might be given back to me, I was asked to whom I had given it up, and I Stated that I had given it up to Bayareddy who was managing the Moodoombe ward's.

Cunnamatum

Cummatum.

By Ramanja pan — 16. Q. You have Stated that the Villagers gave the Share of two Ploughs - Were they Veesabaddy Shares?

A. They were Veesabaddy Shares.

17 Q. Was the one plough that you and the Weaver gave, likewise a Veesabaddy Share?

A. It was a Veesabaddy Share.

18. Q. How many years ago was it Seginent

A. 10 or 12 years ago.

19 Q. Will you Solemnly State that I had no Cultivation of any Kind in Codoor Since these five years?

A. I will declare solemnly.-

The Mark of Ramareddy Soobareddy.

Taken before me this 25th day of November 1839.

[Signed] J. C. Stonehouse

No. 30. Principal Collector

Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

A. In Telugoo.

Deposition of Gundavarapoo Paupareddy Son of Poleareddy of the Punta Caufna Caste, long Mark religion - about 30 years old - inhabitant of Chinnaputlypaud a hamlet of Codoor and

and by profession a Cultivator - dated 28th November 1839 - Before the Principal Collector of Nellore -

By Ramanoja Row — 1 Q. Have I Cultivation of any Sort in Codoor Since five years or from July 1245?

A. None in that Village.

2 Q. Do you Know my having given up before that the Cummatum in the name of Moodcomby Vencata Kistnama = charloo at the end of July 1244?

A. I Know it -

3 Q. Since July 1245 or these 5 years who held the Cummatum and who enjoyed its profit and loss?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy had it - He was enjoying the profit and loss -

4. Q. How many years did Cundoola Soobareddy held it and who occupies it Since?

A. Cundoola Soobareddy had it for 3 years and Vamombaka Vencata Ramareddy is holding it Since -

5 Q. During the 3 years that Soobareddy had it, whose were the ploughing Cattle which were used in Cultivating?

Cundoola

A Cundoola Soobareddy's-

6 Q Were there any ploughing Cattle or Cultivators in Coodoor since 5 years?

A There were neither yoke ploughing Cattle nor Cultivators-

7 Q. Since how many years are any female Cattle grazing in this Village?

A Since Moodoombeevan Established Cultivation- they are grazing-

8 Q. Do you know about how many years that is?

A About 10 or 16 Years-

9 Q Do you know why Cundoola Soobareddy relinquished the Cultivation after holding it for 3 years?

A I don't know it-

10 Q Do you know the name of the Manager of Cundoola Soobareddy's Cummatum?

A I do- He was Manchereddy Vencooreddy-

11 Q. When did he die?

A About 3 years ago-

12 Q. You have Stated that Cundoola Soobareddy enjoyed the profit and loss during the 3 years he had it Who

Who enjoyed it's profit and loss since Vanoobank Venkata Ramareddy held the Cultivation?

Vanoombank Venkataramareddy-

A Will you positively swear that

13 Q since Fasly 1245- or from 5 years that I have had no Cultivation either as Ryoyacarri or in any other way in this Village?

I will.

A In whose Cummatum have

14 Q you Cultivation in Coodoor?

In Maurumreddy Soobareddy's Cummatum-

A How many ploughs?

15 Q Two Meesabady Shares-

A In whose name?

16 Q In the Name of my elder brother Soobareddy-

A Are you and Soobareddy living

17 Q together?

We live together-

A What is the amount of the

18 Q Shist of your 2 Shares, and is there profit or loss after paying Shist?

The Shist is about 200 Rupees and the produce is equal thereto-

A Do you know whether before

19 Q Cundoola

Cundoola Soobareddy took the Cummatum, Shad any ploughing Cattle and what had become of them?

A Moodoombevar had ploughing Cattle when it was given over to Soo=
=bareddy, but he (Ramanoojarow) had none. Moodoombevar's people came and took some of the Bullocks to Nellore. Two old Bullocks died at the place.

20 Q. Were any of Moodoombevar's Bullocks in the Village afterwards?

A There were none in that Village.

21 Q. Have Moodoombevar any Cultivation Since 5 years?

A None in that Village.

22 Q. Have Manchereddy Bararedy and Manchereddy Vencooreddy, any Shares in the Cummatum of Cundoola Soobareddy?

A Each of them has Culti=
=vation of half a Share.

23 Q. Has Manchereddy Ba=
=rareddy had it in all Years, or on=
=ly at one time?

Only

A Only in one year Since Sooba=
=reddy took the Cummatum.

24 Q. Do the female Cattle of Ryots who holds no Cultivation either in that Cum=
=matum or Village, graze for Kollary in the Veesabady pasture lands?

A People of other Villages graze their Cattle by making Cash payments.

By the Principal Collector. 25 Q. How much Cultivation did Soobareddy hold in this Village by the time he took Moodoombevar's Cummatum?

A He had two Veesabady Shares.

26 Q. Since how many years has he Cultivation in Codoor?

A. Since about 50 Years. he, his father, Maternal Uncle, and others held Cultivation.

27 Q. Has he only the said 2 Veesabaddy Ploughs Cultivation from the first or more or less?

A From the first he has or had only 2 Veesabady ploughs.

By Ramanoja Row 28 Q. Did Goorrum Paupereddy formerly rent the Village of Codoor? Iwas then young. they

A. Said he has rented it. Goorrum

Paupereddy

Pauperedy is the elder brother of Veloodooreddy

29 Q. Do you mean to say that since you came to years of discretion that Condoola Soobareddy had cultivation of 2 shares in ploughs in this Village?

A. Yes.

30 Q. Were Goorrum Veloodooreddy and Leundoola Soobareddy living together or separately, and how are they now?

A. They have been living together since I have known them. This year I hear they have separated.

31 Do you know Goorrum Narainreddy?

A. I do.

32 Q. Do you know under the influence of whose persuasion he now is?

A. I dont Know.

33 Q. You have stated that Cundoola Soobareddy had Moodoomhe=nars Cummatum for 3 Years after he occupied it. Did you ask the said Soobareddy at that time or Venkata=ramareddy afterwards about the Circumstance of this Cummatum?

A. At any time I may [illegible] have

have asked them in that Village.

34 Q. What did they tell you when you asked them?

A. They told me that they were themselves carrying on the Cultivation and enjoying the Profit and loss.

35 Q. You have stated that my female Cattle are grazing in this Village. Do you know the Circumstance of Pollary being paid to the Circar?

A. I know it.

By the Prince's Collecta. 36 Q. Do any people who hold no Cultivation in the Codoor Village nor in your Cummatum graze their Cattle in the Pasture lands of your Cummatum?

A. Pootchalapully Narainareddy inhabitant of Mootoor graze Cattle for 4 Pagodas at the rate of 8 per Pagoda in the pasture Lands of Maurumreddy Soobareddy's Cummatum.

37 Q. Has the said Narainareddy any Cultivation at Codoor or not?

A. Narainareddy has one Bullock Share in my Cummatum.

38 Q. You were above questioned as to whether the female Cattle of any

any individual who has no Cultivation either in the Codoor Village or in your Cummatum graze in the pasture lands of your Cummatum you will comprehend the same, and state whether the female Cattle of any person who has no Concern with Cultivation in Codoor, graze in the pasture Lands attached to your Cummatum or not.2

A. The Cattle of Pootchalapulle Iyyar who belong to another Village graze there. Besides this, the Cattle of Coodetopollum people are grazing in the lands of my Cummatum. They have no Cultivation in my Village. The name of the individual is Goonoopaty Venkatareddy. This the Cattle are grazing there

By Ramanoja Row 39 2. Is it usual in any other Village to allow the female Cattle of persons who holds no Cultivation, to graze in Veesalady pasture.2

A. I dont Know.

[Signed] Gundamarajoo Pauperedy.

Taken before me this 25th Day of Novr. 1839.

[Signed] F. W. Stonhouse

Prin.l Collector

No. 31.

2. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written.2

a In Telooguo.

Deposition of Caumereddy Raumereddy son of Condareddy of the Reddy Caste, spot mark Religion, about 30 years old, inhabitant of Cottacodoor and by profession a Coolly, dated 28th November 1839.

Before the Principal Collector.

By Ramanarayal Row 2 Have any kind of Cultivation in Codoor since fusly. 1245.2

A. No.

2 2 Do you know that there was a Cummatum in the name of moodoomby Venkatakistnamakharloo before that and that it was given up at the end of fusly 1244.

A I Know it.

3 2. Who had the Cummatum since these five years.2

A. Cundoola Soobareddy had it three years.

4 2 Who had it afterwards.2

A. Vanoombaka Vencataramareddy.

5 2. are my ploughing Cattle or Cultivators since these 5 years in this Village?

A. No. I have

6 Q. When there was a Cummatum in moodoombewars name, in what Capacity were you employed in that Cummatum?

A I was a labourer—

7 Q you have stated that moodoombewar had given up the Cummatum five years ago, were you employed as a labourer at that time too?

A. I was—

8 Q. Who was then manager of Moodoombewar's Cummatum?

A After Parareddy, Kistnareddy managed it for three years, and after it was made over to Soobareddy. he resigned. Kistnareddy was the manager, when the Cummatum was relinquished.

9 Q What is the house name of that Kistnareddy?

A. I do not know his house name.

By the Principal Collector—

10 Q What has become of the individual who was Head man or manager at the time the Cummatum was given up by moodoombewar?

A I do not know where he had gone

gone to. In consequence of some one dying in my family I was not for two years employed in that Cummatum.

11 Q Who was the manager of Moodoombewars Cummatum from the beginning?

A. Mauchereddy Parareddy.

12 Q Why did not Mauchereddy Parareddy attend when ullareddy Kistnareddy was the manager?

A. He was sick—

13 Q after he recovered his health did Mauchereddy come back or not?

A. He came—

14 Q How long after that was this Cummatum given up?

A One or two years afterwards. I do not recollect or know—

15 Q How long afterwards had Soobareddy this Cummatum?

A Three years—

16 Q During the time Soobareddy held this Cummatum had Mauchereddy Parareddy any share in it?

A. Soobareddy having given him a share of two bullocks for one year, he had it and enjoyed its profit and loss—

Was

17 Q Was it in the first year of Soobareddy's occupying the cummatum that he gave a share of two bullocks to Mauchereddy Parareddy or when?

A In the first year.

By Ramanujah Row 18 Q Do you know what was done with the ploughing cattle of Moodoombewar's cummatum when it was given up?

A I know. Three old bullocks had died. Two were sold to some People from the southward. four were taken for the use of a cart.

19 Q after Soobareddy took the cummatum were there in that Village any ploughing cattle of Moodoombewar's?

A No.

20 Q Whose were the ploughing cattle with which the cummatum lands were cultivated afterwards, and who enjoyed the produce thereof during three years?

A The Bullocks were Soobareddy's. He enjoyed the profit and loss.

21 Q Who was the Manager of Soobareddy's Cummatum?

A Mauchereddy Venkooreddy. He died about 2 or 2½ years ago.

Why

22 Q Why did Soobareddy give up the cummatum afterwards?

A I dont know.

23 Q Who had it afterwards?

A Vanoombaka Vencataramareddy.

24 Q Will you solemnly state that I have no Cultivation of any kind in this Village since five years?

A I will.

25 Q Will you positively state that I have no ploughing cattle in that Village since five years?

A I will.

By the Board 26 Q Have you any cultivation in the Coodoor Village?

No.

27 Q are you a labourer in any one's Cummatum in this Village?

A I am not under any one since 4 years. I work daily for my subsistence and stay at Home.

28 Q You have stated that you were a labourer when Moodoombewar's Cummatum was given up. were you a labourer in that Cummatum after Soobareddy took it?

I

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

A I was for one year.

29 Q Why did you leave your service is a labourer in that Cummatum?

A. as there was not any other person to manage the family and as there was not a second person in the house. I left the service thinking it not proper to remain under the control of another person—

30 Q Why did Mauchereddy Parareddy give up the share of two bullocks he had in that Cummatum?

A He gave it up owing to ill health—

31 Q How long were you a labourer in moodoombewar's cummatum?

A Four or five years—

32 Q During the time moodoombewar had the cummatum in this Village, with how many ploughing cattle did they carry on the Cultivation of it's lands?

A. For some time, nine, for some time ten, and for some time twelve, there was no fixed number—

33 Q How many labourers were there in moodoombewar's Cummatum when they had it?

There

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

A. There were four when there was no press of work and five or six when there was much work. There was no fixed number—

34 Q. State the names of the four persons employed when there was no press of work who were engaged in the Cummatum when it was given up by moodoombewar—?

A Cavelacy Cotadoo—Cavaly—

Chennadoo—Edoor Boyegaudoo, and—

Nucka Narsadoo—

35 Q Where are those four persons at present—?

A. Cavelasy Cotadoo is dead, Cavaly Chennadoo is an old man and employs himself as a cooly in the Village—Edoor Boyegaudoo is employed as a Cultivator in Goorrum Vaboolooa—reddy's Cummatum, and Nucka Narsadoo is dead—

Why and when did Cavaly Chennoodoo leave his service as a labourer in that Cummatum—?

When

A When cundoola Soobareddy had the cummatum he cultivated under him for one or two years - afterwards saying that he was not sufficiently able to work. he resigned and remained in his own house, being an old man and employs himself as a day Cooly -

The mark of Caumereddy Rammereddy -

Taken before me this 28th. day of November 1839 -

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse.
Principal Collector -

No. 32 -

D. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written? -

A. In Teloogoo -

Deposition of Cavelly Vencoreddy son of Condareddy of the Dasoor caupoo Caste, straight mark Religion - about 30 years old, inhabitant of Codoor and by profession a cultivator. dated 29th. November 1839 -

Before the Principal Collector -

By Ramanyum 1 D. Have I any connection with agriculture at Codoor since five years; viz. from Fusly 1245 -

No

A. No.

2 D. Do you know of there having previously there to been a Cummatum in the name of Moodooby Vencatakistnacharlo and that it was relinquished at the end of fusly 1244? -

A. I know that there was a Puttah in the name of Kistnamacharloo -

3 D. Do you know that the Cummatum for which there was a Putta in the name of Kistnamacharloo was given up five years ago - and by whom has the land been since cultivated? -

A. after it was relinquished by Moodoo-beware, Cundoola Soobareddy Carried on the cultivation -

4 D. How long did Cundoola Soobareddy professs it? -

A. Three years -

5 D. During the three years Soobareddy had it. with whose ploughing cattle did he Cultivate the land and who enjoyed the whole produce and also the profit and loss? -

Soobareddy

A Soobareddy, and the ploughing-
cattle were his own.

6 Q After those three years by whom
was the cummatum land cultivated and
who has been enjoying the profit and loss
arising therefrom?

A Vanoombauka Vencataraumareddy.

7 Q Since these five years did my
ploughing cattle or labourers remain in
your Village?

A No.

8 Q What is the name of the Head
man of Cundoola Soobareddy's Cummatum?

A. Mauchereddy Vencoareddy.

9 Q What has became of him?

A. He is dead.

10 Q How long ago?

A About two years ago.

11 Q Do you know why Cundoola Soob-
reddy gave up the Cummatum after he
had it for three years?

A I do not know.

12 Q Will you positively declare upon
oath that I have no cultivation in this
Village

Village since 5 years, or from fusly 1245- either
under another individual or in any other way?

Swith.

A. Have you any cultivation on this Village
By the Pt. Coll. 13 Q and if so how much and in whose Cumma-
-tum?

A I have a share of one Veesabady
Plough in the Cummatum of Villareddy-
Seetarawmareddy. It is in the name of my
paternal Uncle Pararedddy.

are you and your paternal Uncle
By Raumanjaw's Pcow 14 Q. Parareddy living together or separately?

Separately.

A.

15 Q If you both are living separately
why was your cultivation entered in his
name?

A. It is continued in his name
he being older.

[Signed] Cauvellyreddy Vencoareddy.

Taken before me this 29th day of
November 1839.

[Signed] F. V. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector
&c

No. 33.

2 In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A. In Teloogoo

Deposition of Muddaly Ramana, son of Conapa, of the Brahminy caste- Smartha religion- about 32 years old- inhabitant of Codoor and by profession an accountant- under Cundoola Soobareddy- dated 29th November 1839-

Before the Principal Collector-

By Ramanoojar rogu. 1. 2. Have I any cultivation in this Village since 5 years or from Fusly 1245?

A. No.

2. 2. Do you know that previously thereto or 5 years ago, there was a cummatum in the name of Moodoomby Vencatakistnama-charloo- and that I relinquished it?

A- It is true that it was the case formerly, and that it was relinquished-

3. 2. Who had the cummatum afterwards?

Cundoola Soobareddy- had it for

for 3 years- after him Vanoombauka Venca-taramareddy had it for 2 years-

4 2 Have I any ploughing cattle or labourers in this Village since 5 years?

A. No.

5 2 During the last 5 years, did you measure out grain in any one year to any person of mine and obtain a receipt?

A Idid not take- i.e. I did not take a receipt, nor did I measure out grain-

6 2 About 20 days ago, did any person bring a receipt to you, and what did he desire you to do?

A. Goorrum Narrainreddy,- curnum Sutarapoodoo and Vencata-Govindarow's Peon, whose name I do not know, brought a receipt to me and prefsed me to attest it as a Witness and saying that my fatherinlaw wanted me- they took me to Veeloocanypully to my fathersinlaw- Sanumpaody Soobaroyadoo who asked me "Did you see the grain measured-

or

or did you draw out the receipt? I stated that I had not measured out the grain, that the receipt was not written by me, that I did not see the grain measured, that I did not get it measured, and that there was no occasion for me to attest the receipt. I told this to my fatherinlaw when all these persons were present. My fatherinlaw told me not to attest the receipt - after which those persons went away - This is all I know.

7 D. Did you see what were the contents of the receipt?

A. Narrainreddy and Seetiah said that it was a receipt for the delivery of 8 Poottics of Paddy - It was not given into my hand -

By the Prin.l & Coll.r 8 D. Did you not see the receipt in their hands?

A. I saw it in their hands, it was given from Narrainreddy's hand to Seetadoo who gave it to Vencatagovindaraws Peon -

Who

By Ramanjaraw 9 D. Who enjoyed the produce and who paid the Circar Kist during the 3 years Soobareddy had the cultivation?

A. Soobareddy enjoyed the produce and he paid the Kist -

By the Prin.l & Co.ll.rs 10 D. Can you positively state that you were not present when grain was measured out to be sent to Soondaragherry Ramanoojaraws from the Boards of Cundoola Soobareddy or Goorramwar, according to a Tanakha or Chit written to Goorrum Waboloreddy or Narrainreddy by Cundoola Soobareddy?

A. I was not present nor was any grain measured out in that Village - I do not know if grain was measured out in any other Village -

By Ramanjaraw 11 D. Can you state the above mentioned circumstances upon oath?

A. I can state upon oath -

Signed Muday Ramanah -

Taken before me this 29th day of

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

of November 1839-

/signed/ T. V. Stonhouse-

Principal Collector-

N. 34-

Deposition given by Goorrum Narrainreddy a third time before the Principal Collector on the 29th November 1839-

1 Q. The Questions and answers from 6 to 10 of Muddally Ramanah's Deposition will be read to you, listen to them- you have stated in your deposition that this Ramanah formerly measured out 8 or 7 candies of grain to Ramanjarow and obtained a receipt- What do you say about this?

A. If Muddaly Ramanah is called by the Gentleman and directed to write a similar receipt and it is compared with the original one it will then be known whether the latter

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

is his own hand writing or not-

2 Q. Was it muddaly Ramanah that wrote out the receipt for the said 7 candies and odd or 8 candies of grain?

A. It was muddaly Ramanah himself-

3 Q. Have you in your professional either the Tanakha or chit written by Cundoola Soobareddy for the grain?

A. They are kept with the Goomastah muddaly Ramanah who is a confidential person to keep the account at present he is combined with Cundoola Soobareddy and has concealed all the accounts and now deposes as he has done

4 Q. What do you say about what muddaly Ramanah has stated that you conducted him to his fatherinlaws House and asked

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

asked him to attest the receipt &c

A. He being muddaly Ramanas fatherinlaw speaks in Ramanah's favor I did not ask Ramanah to attest the receipt-

/Signed/ Goorrum Narrainedy

By Ramanjarow &c 2. Did you, Curnum Seetaramood and another Peon go within the last 20 days, to muddaly Ramanah and ask him to attest the receipt &c

A. No- neither within the last 20 days nor before that time.

/Signed/ Goorrum Narrainedy

Taken before me this 29th day of November 1839-

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse

Principal Collector-

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 35

2 In what Language will you cause your Deposition to be written-?

A In Telgoo-

Deposition of Sanampoody Sooband son of Bootcherauze, of the Bramin Caste, Smartha sect. 60 years old inhabitant of Veeloocaunepully and by profession a Curnam, dated 29th November 1839-

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore-

By Ramanoja: 1 2. Do you know Goorrum Narain Row- reddy?.

A I do-

2 2. Do you know Mudalaly Ramana.?

A I do.

3 2 Did these two persons come to you about 20 days ago and what took place at that time.?

A They came to my house- They said that there was a receipt which my son in law Lakaraze Ramanah refused to attest as a Witness- and they desired me to tell to him to attest

attest it. I asked Ramanah whether he knew any thing about the receipt. He said that he did not know. I told him not to sign upon a receipt which he know nothing of. I mentioned this to Ramana, in their presence. Ramana did not attest it. Narrain=reddy and Ramana both came into my house, a Peon with a Cadjan account in his hand was standing at the outer gate, Narraine=reddy told me that Cumma Seetadoo and Moolloomadoo Lutchamenumdoo were sitting in the street near the Pagoda of Maha Lutchmana, Ramana also told me the same.-

By the Pnt. Coll.
4 Q. At what time did this take place?

A About three Guddies after sun rise

/Signed/ Sammypoody Soobannah

Taken before me this 29th day of November 1839.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse
Pnt. Collector

Fort St. George, 24th December 1840.

No. 30.

A Second Deposition of Maddaly Ramanah, given before the Principal Collector on the 29th November 1839.

By the Pnt. Coll.
1. Q. At what time did you go to the house of your father-in-law Sammypoody Soobanah together with Goorrum Narrainreddy?

A It was two Gnddies after sunrise.-

2 Q. Who went into the house of your fatherinlaw accompanied by you?

A Narrainreddy I and my father inlaw sat in the Cattle shed and spoke together.-

3 Q. Where was the peon at that time?

A He was standing at the gate of the backyard.-

4 Q. Where was Seetaramoodoo?

A. He was in the middle of the Street.-

/Signed/ Muddaly Ramanah.

Taken before me this 29th day of November 1839.

/Signed/ J. V. Stonhouse.
Pnt. Collector.

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

No. 37.

2 Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

A In Telugoo.

Deposition of Goodoor Vencataramareddy. Son of Rangareddy of the Punta Canpoo caste, straight mark religion, about 60 years old inhabitant of Catta Codoor and by profession a Cultivator, dated 2d. December 1839.-

Before the Principal Collector.-

By Ramanjarow 1 Q. Do you know that up to the close of fusly 1244 there was a Cummatum in Codoor in the name of my man named Goodoomby Vencata Krishnama Charlo.?

A The Dittam and Cutta were in the name of Goodoomby Streenevasoolo.

2 Q. Afterwards during the last five years who has been holding the Cummatum and enjoying its profit and loss.?

Cundoola

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

A Cundoola Soobareddy enjoyed it for three years and it was afterwards under Varoombaupa Vencataramareddy for two years. He carried on cultivation last year and is carrying it on this year also.-

3 Q. During the 3 years Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated, with whose ploughing Cattle was the agriculture carried on and who enjoyed the profit and loss.?

A Soobareddy enjoyed it and the ploughing Cattle belonged to him.-

4 Q. You have stated that Varoombaka Vencataramareddy carried on the Cultivation since two years. Who is paying the Circar Sheist and who enjoys the produce as also the profit and loss.-

A Vencataramareddy.

5 Q Since [5] five years or from fusly 1245. Have I any kind of Cultivation in this Village.?

No

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

a No.

6 Q Were there at Codoor during the five years either my. plough ing Cattle or Labourers.?

a No.

7 Q Do you know why Candoo= =la Soobareddy gave up the Cum= =matum after he had it for 5 years ?

a How could I know it. For two years the produce was deficient for want of rain. I do not know whether he relinquished it for that reason or from his inability to hold it.

8 Q What is the name of the Head Man of the Cummatum of Candoola Soobareddy ?

a The present man is Cumme= =reddy Ramanareddy and the former one is dead.

9 Q Have you Cultivation at Codoor ?

a I have.

How

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

10. Q. How much Cultivation do you posses ?

a I have a share of three Bullocks or 1/2 plough in the Cummatum of Cota Ramereddy.

11. Q. Are the female Cattle of such individuals as have no Cultivation in your Village or in that Cummatum, allowed to graze on payment of tax in the pasture lands of that Village with the assent of the Cum= =matumdar ?

a They are if there be room for= them to graze.

12 Q Are any people grazing their Cattle ?

a Some few are so grazing.

13 Q Do you know how many Cattle of Nookalapatwar of Elliapollum are grazing ?

a I do not know.

[Signed] Goodoor Vencataramareddy.

Taken before me this 2nd day of December 1839.

[Signed] J.V. Stonhouse.
Asst. Coll.r

An

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

No. 38

Q 2 In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A In Teloogoo.

Deposition of Vanoombanka Vencata Rama=reddy Son of Ramareddy of the Punta Campoo Caste. Straight mark Religion. about 33 years. inhabitant of Myspanda=narasapoorum and by profession a Cultivator. dated the 2d. December 1839.

Before the Principal Collector.

By Ramanoojarow.

1. 2. Do you know that there was a Cummatum in Cadoor up to fusly 1244 in the name of my man Moodoomby Vencatakisthnamacharlos.?

A I know it.

2 2 Do you know that the Cum=matum was given up at the end of fusly 1244 and that Cundoola Soobareddy took it.?

A I do not properly recollect whether the Cummatum was in the name of

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

of Moodoomby Vencatakisthnamacharlos or Streenevasacharlos or Cundoola Sooba=reddy, since fusly 1245.

3 2 Who has been cultivating the lands of this Cummatum since fusly 1245. Is it Cundoola Soobareddy?

A The Cultivation was carried on through Cundoola Soobareddy for three years. He took the produce and the Shist was paid through him. How it was going on between Cundoola Sooba=reddy and Moodoombe was People I do not know. In fusly 1248 at the time of Cultivation Chabook annundarow the Tah=sildar said that Soobareddy declined to carry on the Cultivation. After this Ramanoojarow told me to Cultivate it and that he would be answerable for the profit and loss. I carried on the Cultivation. The Cattle of Soondara=gherry was grazed in the pasture land of that Cummatum.

who

4 Q. Who enjoyed the produce of fusly 1248 ?

A. I enjoyed it. The produce is under my charge. I kyled the produce and intended to ask him (Ramanoojarow) to adjust the account, but as it was not lately practicable to go to his house or to ask him, I did not go under the idea that it was not proper to go without the order of Circar.

By the Dist. Coll.

5 Q. You have stated that you should not go to his house and ask him (Ramanoojarow) without the order of Circar. What is your meaning in so stating ?

A. As people were talking as that Peons were placed over him, that he was likewise suspended and that I should not go to his house without the order of Gentleman. I did not go and settle the account and ask him about the profit and loss.

I have

6 Q. Have you an account of the profit and loss.

A. I have an account of the Grain kyled. My share or Madepaloo is to be deducted according to that account and dealing the Ceroo or the remainder according to the Current prices and making an account of the Money I paid I must adjust about any excess or deficiency that may be then found.

By Ramanoojarow

7. Q. Who was present when the kyle was made ?

A. For two or three months the Grain was left in heaps, when I had it kyled and paid the Circar that as it was under any circumstances to be paid.

By the Dist. Coll.

8 Q. Maureemreddy Soobareddy the Village Moonsiff and Tulpoor Ramanapa Curnum of Codoor have stated in their deposition that Soondrayherry Ramanjarow has had no Cultivation in the Codoor Village since fusly 1245

By

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

By the Deposition you formerly gave and by what you have now deposed it appears that he has concern in the Cultivation - What do you say to this - ?

A Soobareddy had the Cultivation for three years and I held it subsequently - They know that we held it but can they know the private terms which existed between us and him - (Ramanjarow)

By Ramanoojarow

Q 2 You have stated that I told you that I would be answerable for the profit and loss, were there any other persons when I told you so besides you and I.

A He told me so because he was holding a high situation and I carried on Cultivation placing confidence in his word. There was none one else present at the time - He told me at his House

Q 2 How many days is it since

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

since you came to this Village and who brought you down?

A Ganapenaney Naidoo a Hoozoor Dilogit brought me - I came about 15 days ago -

(Signed) Vanambauka Venkata Ramareddy

Taken before me this 2d day of December 1839.

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse
Pr. Coltr.

No. 39.

In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

Q In Telugoo.

Deposition of Vagoor Adenarrainappah of the Bramin Caste, son of Ramachundroo of the Smarthe religion, 50 years old, inhabitant of Vagoor subsisting by service as Curnum dated 21st December 1839, before the Principal Collector -

By Ramanoojarow

Up to what year was the Cultivation held in the name of my Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo?

Q 1 2 Reddy pollem

A Up to Fusly 1246

Q 2 2 Since Fusly 1246. have I had any Cultivation in Reddy pollem?

A Since Fusly 1246. there has been no Cultivation in Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo's name.

Q 3 2 Since Fusly 1246 have I had any Cultivation in Reddy pollem?

A No

A. No

42. Since Fusly 1246 who have carried on the Cultivation of Reddy pollam?

A It has been Cultivated by the Cummatum of Mooloomoody Veerareddy:-

52. Who paid the Circar sist and enjoyed the profit and loss?

A. Veerareddy paid the sist, enjoyed the profit and loss and carried away the produce

62. Since Fusly 1246 in whose name has the Village been and to whom has the Puttah been given?

A The Dittum was in Mooloomoody Veerareddys name and Puttah was given to him.

72. What relation is Veerareddy to Mooloomoody Narraineddy?

A He is Elder brother

82 To what arrount of the sist is there Jareeb land in that Village since Fusly 1246. who has enjoyed the Jareeb land and who paid the sistom it to the Circar?

A Since Fusly 1246 the dittum has been in the name of Veerareddy and he has paid the sist and has enjoyed the produce.

Do.

92. Do you know what was done with the ploughing cattle belonging to the Cummatum which Nuckalapully Vencutnursoo had up to Fusly 1245?

A I know the Cummatum ploughing Bullocks labourers and ploughs and other implements of husbandry were given up to Mooloomoody Veerareddy in the beginning of Fusly 1246.

102 Do you know whether the ploughing bullocks were sold to Veerareddy?

A As they did not agree about the valuation of the Cattle at the end of the year they put a value of 10 Rupees per head and at the rate they were given up the accounts looked over and settled.-

112 You have stated that they could not arrange about the valuation of the Cattle whose property were those ploughing Cattle considered to be from Fusly 1216?

A They were considered to be Mooloomoody Veerareddys property

122 Is there any Head Capoos maunurrns in that Village?

A There is.— Do

13 Q. Do you know a person named Palem Mootialoo?

A I know him.

14 Q. Was that Maunium continued in his name?

A It was.

15 Q. During Palem Mootialoos life time who enjoyed the produce of that Maunium?

A The Maunium was Cultivated by the Cummatum and the Ryots share taken by the Cummatum people and the Coroo share was given to Palem Mootialoo.—

16 Q. What became of Palem Mootialoo?

A He died.—

17 Q. After that in whose name was the Pedda Canjoo Maunium continued?

A In the name of Maunsing up to the time

18 Q. Up to the time Maunsing was in the Village, who enjoyed the produce of that Maunium?

A Maunsing as long as he remained

remained in the Village enjoyed the Coroo share of the produce and cultivated the Maunium by means of the cummatum—

By the Principal Collector.

19 Q. Explain particularly your meaning in answer you have given to the 18th Question which will be read to you?

A. It was Cultivated by Nucka Capully Venkatnarsoo's Cummatum— The Madepaulloo was taken by the Cummatum people and the Coroo given to Maunsing.

20 Q. Where did Maunsing leave the Village?

A After the produce of Fasly 1246 he went away. The Maunium was Cultivated that year by Moolowmoody Veera reddy's Cummatum—

By Ramanujum Row

21 Q. After Maunsing left what was done with the Coroo Grain of this Maunium?

A In Fasles 1247 and 1248, as Moolowmoody Veerareddy Cultivated it with his Cummatum, the produce of the Maunium was

was made over to him on security.

By the Pt. Collector

22 Q. What was done with the produce of the reddy Maurnum in Reddy pollem in Fasly 1246?

A It was taken by Maunsing.

By Ramanoojem Row

23 Q. Can you solemnly swear that neither I or Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo or have had concern in the Cultivation of Reddy pollem or any concern with the profit or Loss of it during the last 4 years since Fasly 1246?

A I can solemnly swear that there has not.

24 Q. Was there an examination every year of the Cultivated lands of Reddy pollem by the Tahseldar?

A There was

25 Q. If any increase or decrease appeared on that examination was it not brought to account?

A It was

26 Q. At the time of Gotaw Venkatramiah coming from the Hooyoor to make enquiry at Reddy pollem it appears that some private accounts were produced before

before him in a Cadjan marked A amongst those accounts there is entered on account of the Jarub shist of Reddy pollem for

Fasly 1246	27	2	5
" 1247	27	2	5
Total	54	4	10

which is added in the accounts of sum stated to be payable by me. What is that circumstance?

A In Fasly 1246 some accounts produced in the Cocoanut garden were sold. They were sold for 9 Rupees on the supposition that those Rupees had been sent to Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo and supposing that the Jarub shist of Fasslies 1246 and 1247 must be charged to him / Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo / I wrote it down so. The 9 Rupees were not sent to Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo and that / Jarub / shist was not paid by him.

27 Q. Who enjoyed those Cocoanuts and who paid the rent to Cheat on them?

A Mooloomoody Narrainreddy brother of Mooloomoody -dy the younger Vurareddy told me that he had taken the Cocoanuts and paid the rent.

28 Q. Are Narrainreddy and Vurareddy divided or undivided?

They

A They are undivided family.

29 Q. Have any concern with the enjoyment of the parcel lands or the Shist thereof in Reddy pollem since Fusly 1246?

A No you did not pay the Shist nor had the enjoyment.

30 Q At the time of giving up the Cummatum at the end of Fusly 1246, was there any grain in store appertaining to Vencatanurroo's Cummatum.?

A There was

31 Q. In the Cadjan Account Book B purporting to be an account of the grain measurement of Reddy pollem for the year Fusly 1245 Doonnookkee it is stated as follows?

Sixteen Candies of Puchanum grain of Nuckalapully Venkatanurroo's Cummatum belonging to Mootoomoody Vurareddy's puttah What are the particulars of this?

A. Be it had all along been usual up to [Mummudha Fusly 1245] to enter it as Nuckalapully Venkatanurroo's Cummatam. his name was written inadvertently but the Cultivation was not

not that of Vencatanurroo's Cummatum.

32 Q. Has Mootoomoody Narrainreddy been in the habit of receiving grain on Contract to sell at a profit?

A He purchases grain at the time of the harvest when it is cheap and sells it when it is dear, when he sells it at the selling price taking a profit of one or two Rupees.

33 Q. Did either this Narrainreddy or his elder brother Pauperreddy during his life time receive the Reddypollem grain on Contract for their profit when they require it and were they at any time in the habit of paying either the Shist due to the Circar or the expenses of Cultivation?

A. They were.

[Signed] Vagoor Audemarraina pah

Taken before me this 21st day of December 1839.

[Signed] F. W. Stonhouse
Pr. Coll.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 40

Second Deposition of Vagoor Auder-
-narrainpah 24th December 1839.

By Ramanoojarow

1 Q. In the account of fusly 1244 marked C there are two items one relating to Sutty Chenchooreddy and the other to Caurumpoody Venkatapatty Reddy do you know the circumstances?

A. Mooloomoody Paupereddy asked Sutty Chensooreddy and brought from him 230 Rupees and paid it on account of Circar. Shist he (Paupereddy) delivered Peshanum grain to him.

The 100 Rupees paid by Carumpoody Venkatapatty reddy was on account of Cawaracara seed received by him at Reddypollem.

2 Q. To what Village did the Peshanum grain delivered belong?

A. It was delivered at Reddypollem.

3 Q. In the account is entered

1000

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

1000 Rupees the total of a former balance of account. Do you know what that is?

A. I know Mooloomoody Paupereddy told me that he had paid it for the Circar shist of former years of Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo's Cummatum upon their trade in grain. Narrainreddy told me subsequently that he had received back the grain consequently that balance has not been conscientiously carried forward.

Q. Is any balance now due to the Mooloomoodywar according to the accounts now shewn to you marked A. B. C. D. E. F?

A. In the Month of Aswuyeejum of the year Vulumbee (October 1838) Mooloomoody Narrainreddy and Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo looked over the accounts, and Narrainreddy told me they had been settled, including former balances, I was not present when the accounts were finally settled.

By

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

By the Principal Collr.

52 In the Account D relating to Fusly 1245 there is an entry of 180 Rupees the value of 10 Pottees of Peshasum paddy caused to be furnished on account of the yeggum or sacrificial ceremony at Ullore of which 36 Rupees was paid by Vubbareddy Baupareddy and 32 Rupees by Cannapoo dy Venkatapatyreddy total 68 Rupees and leaving a Net Balance of 112 Rupees on this account charged to Soondargherry Ramanoojumnow's Account. What is the circumstance?

A. A Brahmin who performed the yeggum at Ullore asked Mooloo moody Narraimreddy and got from him 10 poottees of grain at a cost of 180 Rupees which he said he would pay on this account he said Bau pireddy would pay 9 Pagodas and Venkatapatyreddy 8 Pagodas and saying that he would pay the remain der went away. How the balance was repaid to Narraimreddy I dont

Know

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

know. Narraimreddy must be asked. I entered it in Soondergherry ward's Account and after wards asked Nuckalapally Venkatnarsoo about it, who said he had nothing to do with it, and that it should be entered in his Accounts. In the counterpart account which he kept he did not include it.

By Ramanoojarow.

62 What reason was there for the Mooloomoody war taking the reddy pollam lands from Fusly 1246 after Nuckalapally Venkatnarsoo had given up the Cummatum?

A. As Mooloomoody Narraim reddy's land in Vagoor and the Reddy pollam lands adjoin each other and it was therefore near for men and Cattle to go there and as Nuckala pally Venkatnarsoo was saying that he must give up the Cummatum Narraim reddy took those lands and put them in the Kittum and Puttahs in his elder brothers name.

Did

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

7 Q. Did Mooloomoody Narrain-reddy take these lands and put them in his elder brother's name in the dit-tum of his own account or was he told to do so by the Tahsildar?

A. He was directed to do so by the Tahsildar.

8 Q. Why should the Tahsildar order Narrainreddy to take these lands?

A. As they were near his own portion of land in Vagoor, he told him to take them, which he did.

9 Q. Since Fusly 1246, has the Circar Grain of the Mooloomoody warfullah in Reddypollem been more than sufficient to pay the Circar shist or an sufficient?

A. Since they established the Cummatum in Fusly 1246 they have not kept me present at the kyle of the grain nor have I gone there. The

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

produce as far as it was estemated shewed a loss in Fusles 1246 and 1247 but in Fusly 1247 they got their Madepaudoo.

10 Q. In the time of Mr. Whish did not the then Tahsildar Cuddapah Sashagherry row measure the Reddy-pollem lands and furnish an account?

A. He measured the lands and furnished an account.

11 Q. Do you recollect what Fusly that was?

A. I dont recollect the Fusly. I dont know unless I see the Accounts.

By the Principal Collector.

12 Q. Why were the Reddy pollem lands measured by Cuddapah Sa-shagherry Row?

A. They were measured by the Circar orders.

13 Q. Were the Maanium lands also measured at that time?

The

A The Reddy Maunium only was measured and an excess found of $\frac{39}{64}$ of a Goortee which was accordingly assessed. The other Mauniums were not measured.

14 Q. When did Palem Mootaloo dee, how many years ago?

A I recollect that he died in Fusly 1242.

15 Q. Who was Palem Mootaloo?

A He was an Inhabitant of Nellore A Bulja

16 Q. What was he doing in Reddypollem?

A He resided there, enjoyed the Coroo produce of the Reddy Maunium, had a share of one plough in the Coroo Cummatum and subsisted himself.

17 Q. Was he managing or

Nuckalapally Vencatnursoo's Cummatum or was he in any way connected with him?

A As he had been made Village Moonsiff he used to conduct those duties and support himself.

18 Q. How came he to be made Village Moonsiff?

A I dont know.

19 Q. When did Palem Mootia.

too first come to Reddypollem?

A I dont recollect when he first came, but he resided there four or five years.

20 Q. When did Maunsing first come to Reddypollem?

A He came shortly after the death of Palem Mootaloo

21 Q. Was Maunsing Village Moonsiff of Reddypollem?

A He was.

By Ramanoojarow.

22 Q. Do you know why Maunsing left and where did he go to after the harvest of Fasly 1246?

A He

18737 Fort St. George 21th December 1840

A He said his relations were at Madras and he went to them.

By the Principal Collector.—

23 Q. Who was the Bramen who performed the Yeggyum at Ullor and who took the 10 Pottles of Grain from Moolloomoody Narrainreddy?

A I dont know his name or his house name, I heard that his Village was Ullor.

24 Q. Who was Village Moonsiff before Palem Mootialoo?

A. Nuckalapally Venkatnursoo.

25 Q. How long was he Village Moonsiff?

A. From the time of his first establishing a Cummatum there, till Palem Mootialoo came.

26 Q. When was Nuckalapally Venkatnursoos Cummatum first established in Reddypollem?

A In Fusly 1231 and continued till Fusly 1245.

/Signed/ Adenarrainapah.

Taken before me this 21st day of December 1839.

/Signed/ T. V. Monkhouse

Principal Collector

Comp. HR

18738 Fort St. George 21th December 1840.

Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

A In Telugoo.

Deposition given by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy, son of Nursareddy of the Puntacaulpa Caste, round mark religion 50 years old, inhabitant of Chittapollem and by profession a Cultivator. Dated 20th December 1839 Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Ramanja. Row 1. Q. Who has been cultivating the Reddypollem fields for the last 6 years since Fusly 1246?

A My Elder brother Veerareddy put them in, his Dittums and we are cultivating them.

2. Q. Since Fusly 1246 up to this time who has taken the produce of the lands which have been cultivated, paid the Circar Shist for them and enjoyed the profit and loss on them?

A We pay the Circar Shist, we cultivate and enjoy.

3 Q. Were either Sir Nuckalapally Venkata Nursoo had any cultivation in Reddypollem since

since these 4 Years?

A No-

4 Q Previous to these 4 years was there a Cummatum in this Village in the name of Ruckalapully Vencatanursoo, and do you know the circumstance of the Cummatum having been given up at the end of Fusly 1245?

A Before that it had been in the name of Rackalapally Vencatanursoo, Rabaula Lutchemenursoo sent for me and told me that having no occasion for it they (Ramanogaraw and Vencatanursoo) had given it up, that it was close to my cultivation in Vagoor and told me 2 or 3 times to take it and consequently took it in Veeareddy's name- since that time we have cultivated the lands paid their Shist and enjoyed the produce-

5 Q Since these 4 years after the Cummatum in Ruckalapully Vencatanursoo's name was given up, have myself or Ruckalapully Vencatanursoo had any cultivation in your Cummatum, or has the profit and loss on your

your puttah been charged to me or have I Charged it to you-?

A No-

6 Q Was there any written or Oral engagement between me and you that such profit and loss should be charged by you to me or by me to you-?

A No.

7 Q Who has been since these 4 years enjoying the Sareeb lands which are in that Village, and who has been paying the Shist on them to the Circar?

A We have been enjoying them and paying the Circar Shist on them-

8 Q Have I had any enjoyment in or concern with those Sareeb lands since this 4 years-?

A No you have had no concern.

9 Q After the close of Fusly 1245 upon Rackalapully Vencatanursoo giving up the Cummatum, who took the ploughing Cattle belonging to that Cummatum-?

A We bought them-

10 Q Who enjoyed the Coroo Share of the

the produce of the Reddy Maunieem the first
year that you kept a Cummatum in Reddy pollem?

A Maunsingh enjoyed it.

11. Q. In whose name was the Reddy
Caupoo Maunieem when Maunsing enjoyed it that year?

A It was in Maunsingh's name.

12 Q. Afterwards did Maunsing remain
there or where did he go to?

A Maunsingh remained till the
close of the harvest of that year, and as the
Maunieem had been cultivated by the Cum-
matum, he measured out the Koroo
grain of the Maunieem, gave the Madeshaha
to us, and having up to that time resided
in Reddy pollem, he left and went to Madras-

13 Q. In the subsequent years after
Maunsingh left, who enjoyed the produce
of the Reddy Maunieem?

A Since 2 years the Peishkar has
delivered it over to me on security.

By the Principal Collector Hr. Q. Was any person appointed Village
Moonsiff after Maunsingh left?

A No one

Ded

By Ramanjas Sam— 15. Q. Did you inform the Tahsildar of
Maunsingh having left?

A Informed him.

By the Pr. Coll.r 16 Q. What is the name of the Peishkar
who you stated to have given over Reddy Maunieem
produce in Reddy pollem to you on security
in Fusslies 1247 & 48?

A His name is Imparyany Lutchem
-nursoo and he obtained the writing.

17. Q. Did that Lutchemenursoo give
over the produce to you by the Tahsildar's
order or did he do so of himself?

A He did so on the permission of the
Tahsildar.

By Ramanjas Sam 18 Q. What situation did Raubala
Lutchemenursoo, whom you have mentioned
above, then hold?

A He was Tahsildar.

19 Q. When Ruckalapally Vencatanarsim
had his Cummatum, who was the Tala-
manshee or Head man of the Cummatum.

A Gonoopauty Soobareddy.

20. Q. In some accounts produced
by

by Cumum Audenarainapah, in that marked D relating to Fusly 1245, there is entered 180 Rupees for ten Poollies of grain given to the Yeggum at Nellore, and after giving a credit of 68 Rupees, a balance remaining of 112 Rupees, do you know what this Circumstance was -?

A. The Brahmin who performed the Yeggum said he was going to perform an Yeggum, and having asked me I gave him these 10 Poollies of grain at a price of 4½ Pags per Poollie. On this account he got in cloth Som Rupees from Vubbareddy Bauperedy and some from Cairipoody Venkatapaty reddy and paid them to me - Besides these he made another payment of 4 Pagodas, these he brought himself and paid -

By Coll. 21. D. What was the name of the Bramin?

A I donot recollect the name of the Bramin.

22 D Where does he live?

A Perhaps in Allore. It was in Allore that he asked me for it.

23 A Had you ever seen that Bramin before -

before that -?

A I saw him when he was performing the Yeggum -

24 2 Did you see him before performing the yeggum or not -?

A I saw him - Elamvokaola Parareddy and Vencareddy came with him to me and left him saying he was going to perform - yeggum, and if I could any where get 10 Poollies of Paddy he would by begging get Money and pay for it - I afterwards asked the Bramin for the remaining sum unpaid he said that he would procure it any where and pay it, subsequently he told me that he could not pay it, and that he had not procured any where - and I therefore gave it up as Charity -

By Ramanja raw 25. D. Why is that item entered in my account -?

A How the Cumum wrote it through inadvertence (I donot know) I told him to write in this way (as explained above) How he wrote I donot know -

Mark

Mark of Mooloomoody Narrain
= reddy. taken before me this 26th December 1839.

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Princl. Collector

№ 42.

Second Deposition of Mooloomoody Narrain
reddy. Dated 27th December 1839.

By Ramanja
ram 1. Q. In the account of Fusly 1245
marked D there is an entry of 200 Rupees as
a Laheda Vuntumpoo (or received from another
source.) Do you know what it was?

A The Bullocks of that Cummatum
were sold and the proceeds credited to the
Shist of that Village.

2 Q What sort of Bullocks were those?

A Old ploughing bullocks belonging
to Nuckalapally Vencatamursoo's Cummatum
were sold and the proceeds credited to
the Shist.

By the Pl.
Collector. 3. Q. If they were the proceeds of
the sale of the old ploughing bullocks of the
Cummatum why was it not so entered in
the account?

A As those Rupees were paid
on account of the Circar Shist, it was
merely

merely entered as a Memorandum.

Who paid the money?

4 Q

A The person who purchased
the bullocks.

Who were they. they

5 Q Some person from Southward
purchased them. How should I know who
they were. His name was Caumesetty
a Beyree man.

How many Bullocks did he buy?

6 Q Ten Bullocks.

A Did he pay 200 Rupees
7. Q. for these 10 Bullocks?

A He did.

Besides these were there any other
8. Q. Bullocks belonging to Nuckalapully
Vencatamursoo's Cummatum?

There were other ploughing
A Cattle which I purchased afterwards.

How many did you purchase?

9 Q There were 26 including bul-
A locks and he buffaloes.

Can you positively swear that
By Ramanja
ram 10. Q. I have had no concern in the cultivation
of Reddy Pollam since Fusly 1246?

J.

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

A Ican.

11. Q. Do I owe you any balance-?

A. About 10 or 11 Months ago I came to Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo, at Nellore, looked over the accounts and there appearing a balance due of 500 Rupees. I took those Rupees and gave him up the Cadjan account and went away.-

By Sr. Coll.r 12. Q. Do you recollect in what Month that took place-?

A It was about 10. or 11 Monthes ago as I am an illeterate person I cannot recollect the precise Month.

Mark of Imerlaconreddy Narrain reddy.

Taken before me this 27th. December 1839.

Signed J. V. Stonhouse.
Principal Collector.

No. 43.

Q In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A In Teloogoo.

Deposition given by Gonoopaty Ramareddy- son of Soobareddy of the Ruota Caupa Caste, round Mark religion, about 40 years old. inhabitant

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

inhabitant of Reddy Pollem and by profession a Cultivator- Dated 27th. December 1839. before the Principal Collector of Nellore-

By Ramanja Row. 1 Q Was there formerly in this Village a Commutation in the name of Nuckalapally Vencatanursoo-?

There was previously to 4 years ago-

A Afterwards since these 4 years

2 Q who has had a Cummutation and Carried on the Cultivation-?

The dittum is on Imerlaconreddy

A Veenareddy's name- & Narrainreddy Carries on the Cultivation.

Who has taken the produce of

3 Q it, who pays the Circar Shist on it, and who enjoys the profit and loss since these 4 years-?

Narrainreddy.-

A Have I since these 4 years had

4 Q any sort of concern in the Cultivation in this Village-?

A No.

Have you any Cultivation in

5 Q the Commutation-?

I

A I have no plough.

By the Pl. Coll.r 6. D. How long have you had cultivation in the Cummatum -?

A Since four years, but before that my father had it.

7. D. How long had your father the cultivation?

A. Ten or twelve years.

Marked by Goonoohanty Ramareddy.

Taken before me this 29th day of December 1839.

(Signed) F. W. Stonhouse.

Principal Collector.

No 44.

D In what language will you have your Deposition to be written -?

A In Telugoo.

Deposition given by Guddum Narrainreddy son of Poollareddy of the Pancanaty Caste, round mark religion 40 years old - inhabitant of Nellore and by profession a Cultivator Dated 30th December 1839 - Before the Principal Collector of Nellore

By Ramarjas Raw- 1. D Have I any Cultivation in the Nellore Cudiah lands -?

A- No -

2. D. Was there formerly in this Village any

any puttah in the name of Vredoombee Streenevasacharlee?

There was -

A Who has been cultivating the -

3 D land of that puttah since these 5 years -?

Have been cultivating it -

A Who has enjoyed the profit & loss -

4 D Myself.

A Whose were the ploughing Cattle - employed in the cultivation of that land -?

5 D They were mine -

A Has any one since these 5 years -

6 D shares in the cultivation of this Puttah land?

No.

A Since these 5 years in whose name

7 D have the Dittum and Puttahs for this land been (entered)?

In my name -

A Have I or Nuckalapully Vencatanurdoo

8 D any concern in the cultivation or the profit or loss of the Dittum - Puttah lands entered in your name -?

No -

A Will you positively swear that the

9 D cultivation and the profit and loss upon the Dittum and Puttah land in your name or yours -?

S

A I can positively swear that the profit and loss on the lands now in my puttah is enjoyed by myself.

10 Q In fasly 1246. that is to say 6 years ago did I keep a Cummatam in your name or the name of any other Ryot in Nellore?

A No, I donot knows.

11. Q. Had you any other Puttah in this Village before you took up the land including in the Puttah which was held in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo?

A No.

12. Q. Had you any Cultivation in the Puttah land of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo while it was in his name?

A I then cultivated it for some time I cultivated half and he the other half.

13 Q Since how many years have you had cultivation in that Puttah land?

A Up to this time I have had the cultivation ten years. I cultivated it for 5 years previously to the Puttah being given in my name. And my people having quarrelled we divided our fields, and two fields came to

to my share. Before that I was cultivating under Guddum Vengareddy and the above side fields which came to me on the division with him were included in the Puttah of Moodoombe Streenevasacharloo and we cultivated half & half.

Since these 5 years that the Puttah has been issued in your name, who has been cultivating Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo's half share?

By Ramanja Naw. 14. Q. I have been cultivating.

15 Q You have stated that 6 years ago you were cultivating half and Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo the other half. afterwards since this 5 years who has been cultivating and enjoying the whole of that Puttah land together with your own land?

A I have been cultivating and enjoying it.

By the Pr. Collr. 16. Q. When you and Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo were cultivating the Puttah land half and half, was it after you had joined the two fields you got on the division with Guddum Vengareddy, with Streenevasacharloo's Puttah

Puttah Land or before?

A It was after I did not cultivate before it was joined.—

17 D When you and Woodarmbee Streenevasacharee were Cultivating half and half, what was the extent of the Puttah land?

A I pay 40 Pagodas for my Puttah at present and dont recollect what it was before that time. It is sawable with one Candy of seed, but I donat Know the nuber of Goortoo.—

18 D How many ploughs have you for the whole of your Cultivation?

A Three ploughs which are my own.—

19 D What is the extent of your joint Village Cultivation?

A One plough.—

Marked by Caddem Narrainreddy.

Taken before me this 30th day of December 1839.—

(Signed) T. W. Monkhouse

Principal Collector

In—

No. 45.

D In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?—

A In Teloogoo.—

Deposition given by Cantabuttoony Paupered-dy, son of Timmareddy, of the Paucanty caste, Crossmark religion about 30 years old, inhabitant of Nellore and by profession a Cultivator.—

Dated 30th December 1839.—Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.—

By Ramanjarow

D Have I any Cultivation in the lands of Nellore Custom?—

A No.

2D Was there formerly any Puttah Land in the name of Woodoombee Streenevasacharloo?—

A There was 5 or 6 years ago.—

3D Afterwards since these 5 years who was Cultivating that land, and enjoy the profit and loss?—

A Gunddum Narrainreddy a Ryot Cultivated it, paid the Shist to the Circar and enjoyed the produce.—

4D Whose are the ploughs and ploughing Cattle with which Narrainreddy Cultivates the

the land?—

A Narrainreddy's.

5 D In whose name has the Dittum and Puttah for this land been, since these 5 years?—

A In Narrainreddy's.—

6 D Have I or Nuckalapully Vineeta nursoo had any concern since these 5 years in the Cultivation or the profit and loss of this Puttah land?—

A Not the least.—

7 D Will you positively state upon oath that we have had no Concern and that Guddum Narrainreddy has Cultivated and enjoyed the profit & loss on it?—

A I will.—

By the Collr D How do you know this Circumstance?

A Narrainreddy sells the grain, and if a quantity, say half a Poolly remains, he takes it for himself, and therefore I dont think any one else has any Concern in it.—

By Ramanoojah Row. 9 D Has Narrainreddy any share in the joint Cultivation of the Village?

A He has.

10 D Which are the lands which he Cultivates?

Cultivates, and why are they Cultivated jointly by the whole Village?—

A Since 10 or 16 years, the lands, Viz. Coddee Pootta, Sowable with 8 Pooties of Seed, Some Magany land Called the Vyala bhoome near the Village and Sowable with one candy of seed, having become impoverished, Ramanoojarow made whole Village join and Cultivate the land Sowable with six Pooties.

11 D For whom did he get the land so Cultivated?—

A The Circar.

12 D To whom was the Thist on that land paid and who enjoyed the produce?—

A The Thist was paid to the Circar and the Ryots enjoyed the produce.—

13 D Had a person of the name of Arogala Nursimloo formerly any Puttah in this Village, and what has now become of it?—

A He had. He relinquished it from inability to cultivate, when a field per head was distributed (to the other Ryots)

11 D How many years ago did Arogala Nursimloo relinquish it?—

A Most

A About 10 or 16 years.—

15 D You have Stated that a field was given to each Ryots who did this?—

A The Circar.—

By the Pl. Collr. 16 D. What was your age when Aregaty Nursimloo gave up his Cultivation, and had you at that time any Puttah in your name?

A I was then about Ten or Sixteen years of age. There was no Puttah in my name. I heard the elder Members of my family at that time saying that as he (Nursimloo) has sustained loss; he had given it up and gone away. At that time the Puttah was in my father's name.—

By Ramanja Row 17 D. Do you know for what reason the Puttah land which used to be in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo was taken by Guddum Narrainreddy?—

A It is said that Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo told Narrainreddy that he cannot every year employ Labourers, get it Cultivated and pay their wages. that they make away with the produce at the time of harvest, that they were every year sustaining loss and that

that they could not cultivate it, in Consequence of which Narrainreddy is Cultivating since that time.—

Marked by Cuntabattoony Paupereddy.—

Taken before me this 30th December 1839.—

(Signed) J. H. Stonhouse
Principal Collector.

No 46.—

D In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?—

A In Teloogoo.—

Depositions given by Bundar Vencataramareddy Son of Chenchooreddy, of the Paucanaty Caupa Caste long mark religion, 50 years old Inhabitant of Nellore and by profession a Cultivator. Dated 3d January 1840. Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.—

By Ramanja Row 1 D Have I any inside Cultivation or any other Cultivation in Nellore?—

A No.—

2 D Do you know Guddum Narrainreddy?

A I know.—

3 D Has he any Puttah in this Village?—

A He has been Cultivating for some time

time with Guddum Venganah, and then they having divided the lands, he Cultivated for some time with Mosdoombewar, and afterwards he told me that he would Cultivate the whole land and took away his two ploughs which were with me, saying that the whole land had Come into his possession, he took away the ploughs which were with me.

4 D Since 3 years in whose name have the Puttah and dittum for these lands been issued—

A In Guddum Sparrainreddy's name.

5 D To whom do the ploughing Cattle & and ploughs belong which have been used since these 5 years in cultivating the Puttah Lands in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy who has paid the Circar Shist on them, and whose has been the profit and loss?

A The ploughs were Narrainreddy's— He Cultivated the lands with those which he had before and those which he took away from me; Narrainreddy paid the shist on them to the Circar, and his was the profit and loss.—

Have

6 D Have I any inconcern or Connection of any kind with the Cultivation of the Puttah land in the name of Narrainreddy?—

A No—

7 D Have you any Puttah in this Village, and what is the amount of Shist of the Puttah?—

A I have Cultivation in this Village to the extent of about 400 Rupees.—

By the Pl. Clk 8. D Are you one of the Pedda Capoos of this Village?—

A They say that I am one of the 4 Pedda Capoos.—

By Ramanoojy Row D Has Cuntabutloony Paupereddy any Puttah in this Village and what is the amount of his Shist?—

A There is a Puttah in the name of his uncle Gneevereddy. The Shist exceeds 300 Rupees.—

10 D Had Aregala Nursimloo former-ly any Puttah in this Village, and what became of his Puttah lands subsequently?—

A There was subsequently in the year

year in which the produce used to be estimated, and as he had sustained loss, and his father having died, he gave it up. The lands were parcelled out one to each person.

11 D. You have stated that Guddum Narrainreddy took the whole of the Moodoombwar's land and was Cultivating it. what was the Cause of Narrainreddy's taking the Moodoombwar's land?—

A. They were Cultivating together, as the Moodoombwar Cultivated it by employing labourers, they got no profit and gave it up.

12 D. Do you know of Narrainreddy having given up the Bajayet and Netta which was in his Dittum, and why did he give it up?—

A. At the time of taking away from me his two ploughs, his younger brother was Cultivating. He took away the two Ploughs from me and sent his brother to the beetle garden (Bajayet) In 2 years

years his brother died; and I Considered therefore that he had given it up from not having any person to manage it).—

By the Pl Coll 13 D. Are you related to Guddum Narrainreddy or have you friendship with him?—

A. There is no relationship between us There was between our ancestors. What friendship is there; I am on the same terms with him as the rest of the Village.—

14 D. Altogether how many ploughs has Guddum Narrainreddy in this Village?—

A. Four.—

15 D. State the extent of Guddum Narrainreddy's Cultivation in this Village?—

A. His Puttah land is Sowable more or less with one Candy of Seed.—

16 D. Were only these 4 ploughs employed in the Cultivation of Guddum Narrainreddy's Puttah land?—

A. yes.—

17 D. In Narrainreddy's Puttah and Dittum three ploughs only are entered, you State that there are four. how is this?—

He

He has Cattle for 4 ploughs. He may perhaps join his Cattle with one Madar Saheb, but he cultivates the land with 4 ploughs. 2 are used for half a day and the other 2 for the other half.—

18 D In what year did Guddum Narrainreddy take his two ploughs which were with you?—

A Five or Six years ago, I dont properly recollect.—

19 D Why had Narrainreddy, Kept those two ploughs with you?—

A Narrainreddy's younger brother was for five or six years Cultivating for Share under me with 2 ploughs.—

20 D Has Narrainreddy any other Cultivation or Concern in the Cultivation of this Village except the Puttah land?—

A He has got nothing more than this Puttah and his share of the joint Village Cultivation. He and one Madar Saheb are Cultivating the Kumsala Maniem, and he has also a plough Cultivating the—

Curnums

Curnum's Maunium under Coppa loo Venkiah.

21 D Who is Coppa loo Venkiah?—

A He has Cultivation in this Village but no Puttah.—

22 D You have Stated in the answer to the 6th question that Ramanoojarow has no Concern or Connection of any Kind with the Cultivation of the Puttah land in the name of Narrainreddy. How do you know this?—

A Moodoombevar had it always and I heard so. Narrainreddy having then Separated his Share from Vengareddy, they for 5 or 6 years Cultivated together and after they had given it up, Narrainreddy Cultivated it.—

By Ramanoojarow 23 D You have Stated that Narrainreddy had some of the joint Village Cultivation. Is that Carried on with the 4 Ploughs you have abovementioned, or with other Ploughs?—

A With those 4 Ploughs.

24 D What reason is there for you to know about Narrainreddy's Cultivation.—

affairs?— Because

A Because I live in the Villag and we talk with one another.—

25. D Do you Know Cullavacoor Soobiah?

A I have heard him spoken of, but have not much personal acquaint- ance with him.—

26 D Will you state positively on oath that I have no in cultivation, or Cultiva- tion of any sort in this Village of Nellore?—

A I will.—

Marked by Bunder Vencata ramareddy.

Taken before me this 3d January 1840

(Signed) T. V. Stonhouse,

Principal Collector.

No 17.

2. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A. In Telgoo.

Deposition given by Cheemacoorty Rungareddy Son of Venceata Reddy of the Paukanaty Caste, long Mark & Ligion - 60 years old - Inhabitant of Nellore and by profession a Cultivator - Dated 3d January 1840 - Before the Principal Collector of Nellore -

By Ramanja Pmr 2. Have I any in cultivation or any other Cultivation in the Village of Nellore?

A. None now -

2 2. Do you Know Guddum Narrainreddy -

A. I know Guddum Narrainreddy -

3 2. Has he any Puttah in this Village?

A. Guddum Narrainreddy has a Puttah -

4 2. Who cultivates the Puttah Lands which are in the name of Narrainreddy - to whom do the plough- ing Bullocks which cultivate them belong - who pays the Circar Shist on them - & who takes the produce -

A. Narrainreddy cultivates the Lands - The ploughing cattle are his - He purchased them this year from some Tank diggers in the North - His own Cattle had died - He pays the Shist

to

to the Circar & takes receipts - He carries home the produce to his own house from the heaps, but what is done with it afterwards I do not know -

By the Principal Collector -

5 Q. How many months ago did Narsaimreddy purchase those ploughing Cattle from the Lank diggers and how many did he purchase? -

A. How many Cattle I do not know - 5 or 6 months ago he told me he had no ploughing Cattle, & that Lank diggers Cattle had come and that he would purchase them -

By Ramaja Row.

6 Q. Since how many years is it that the Puttah was issued in Narsaimreddy's name? -

A. I dont recollect 4 or 5 years -

7 Q. Since these 4 or 5 years has the Puttah land in the name of Narsaimreddy been his own Cultivation, and were the ploughing Bullocks which Cultivated it his own?

A. It was his Cultivation - If any Cattle died, he purchased others, Narsaimreddy used to tell me that it was his own Cultivation -

8 Q. Have you any Puttah in this Village and

and what is the Shist?

A. I have - The Shist besides on the Caur is 84 Rupees -

9 Q. Which are the lands which are cultivated jointly by the Ryots and how many are the Shares?

A. Doddee Metta - Naugoda Metta, Vyalee and a Tobacco Garden - they are cultivated in 31 Shares -

10 Q. You say they are cultivated in 31 Shares who enjoy the produce thereof and who pay the Shist? -

A. Upto July 1247 the produce was divided according to the 31 Shares, and finding that the Crops produce was only sufficient for the Circar Shist, in the subsequent years there was a disagreement and in July 1248 the land was divided in proportion to the respective Shists - The Ryots enjoy the produce of the lands which they respectively Cultivate & pay in proportion to their Shist -

11 Q. Has Guddum Narsaimreddy

a

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

a share in this joint Cultivation?

A. He has a share. Land was apportioned to him in proportion to his Shist.

12 Q. When he cultivated jointly with the Village Ryots upto fusly 1247 did he enjoy his proportion of the produce and did he pay the Shist upon it?

A. Yes.

13 Q. Since how many years has the Tobacco Garden and the rest been cultivated jointly?

A. The Tobacco Garden has been cultivated jointly since the Nabobs time. The other Magany Lands have been cultivated jointly since Fusly 1215.

/Signed/ Rungareddy.

Taken before me this 3d day of January 1840.

/Signed/ F. W. Stonhouse
Principal Collector.

No 48.

Q. In what language will you cause your deposition to be written?

A. In Telgoo.

Deposition

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Deposition given by Vuncayalapauty Nursunnah Son of Ramennah of the Brasmin Caste, Smarthasect 56 years old. inhabitant of Nellore & by profession a Curnum Dated 4th January 1840. Before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Ramanjo Row.

1 Q. Have I any Cultivation in Nellore?

A. There has been cultivation since fusly 1235.

2 Q. From fusly 1235 upto what Fusly?

A. Up to Fusly 1246 it was in the name of Noodeembee Streenevasachariar. that Land in fusslies 1246 & 1247 was in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy. The Mooloom and Jareeb of that Land from fusly 1247 to Fusly 1249 has been in the name of Cullavacala Venkat Soobiah and the Maganee Land in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy.

3 Q. Who cultivated the Lands held in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy and who pays the Circar Shist?

A. The person in whose name the Puttah is given cultivates the Land and pays the Shist.

4 Q. Who takes away the produce?

A. Guddum Narrainreddy.

Can

5 Q. Can you say that I have ever recieved even a Moontah of Grain out of the produce obtained by Narrainreddy?

A. From the commencement Venkatanurs-soo and Narrainreddy have managed the affairs in the Village, you have never managed them. Venkatanursoo and Narrainreddy must know the profit and loss on them. I dont know.

6 Q. What do you mean when you say that Narrainreddy & Venkatnursoo must know the profit and loss on it?

A. As I was asked whether you had ever received a Moontah of Grain, I said that you had not the management, that Venkatanursoo and Narrainreddy had the Management & therefore they must know.

7 Q. Do you know who enjoys the Profit and Loss?

A. I have stated above I dont know

By the Principal Collector.

8 Q. Who is Venkatanursoo the abovementioned person?

A. Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo Pamanja Row's Sister's Son.

Whose

9 Q. Whose ploughing Cattle have been used in the Cultivation of that Land since Moodoombee Streenevasacharee's Land was put in Narrainreddy's name?

A Gaddum Narrainreddy was cultivating the Land when it was in the name of Moodoombee Streenevasacharloo and since I dont know whose ploughing Cattle were there.

10 Q. When you are Curnum of the Village can you say that you dont know whose ploughing Cattle?

A. I wrote the accounts of the Number of the ploughing Cattle, but I cannot recognize them as belonging to particular persons.

11 Q. Has Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo had any concern these Last five years since Fusly 1245, with the Land held in Moodoombee Streenevasacharee's name up to Fusly 1244?

A. In the Maganee Land I dont Know in the Moolom & Jareet he has Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo gives the Lands on a fixed money payment & manages it.

12 Q. Who is Cullavacottoo Venkata Soobiah Nuckalapully

A. Nackalapally Venkatanarsoo's family Priest.

13 Q. Do you know why the Mooloom & Jareeb Land was transferred in Fusly 1247 from Guddum Narrainreddy to Cullavacalla Venkatasoobiah?

A. Venkatanarsoo dug two Wells at an expense of 50 Rupees each in the Mooloom Garden and Jareeb Land. If they remained in the name of a Cultivator, he might have perhaps wished to get possession of them for himself, and for this reason I think it was done as the Puttah was in his name he might perhaps have claimed a right to the Wells & taken possession of them for himself, so I think.

14 Q. What arrangement was made about the said Wells when the Puttah Land of the Moodoombeewar was transferred to Guddum Narrainreddy at the end of Fusly 1248?

A. There was no arrangement made with the Circar about it nor did I write any Carrenamah.

15 Q. Do you know any thing of Narrainreddy having this year purchased any ploughing Cattle?

A. I dont know.

How

16 Q. How many of his own Ploughs had Guddum Narrainreddy when he was cultivating with Moodoombeewar?

A. Nackalapally Venkatanarsoo had two ploughs and Guddum Narrainreddy two.

17 Q. Since Fusly 1245 how has it been going on?

A. Those four Ploughs of which one is employed in the joint Tobacco Garden of the Village and the other three are employed in that Cultivation.

18 Q. Do you know what became of the two Ploughs belonging to Nackalapally Venkatanarsoo which had been employed in that Cultivation up to Fusly 1244?

A. What became of those two Ploughs I dont know Guddum Narrainreddy has since as before been cultivating that Land with four ploughs.

19 Q. Has Guddum Narrainreddy any other Cultivation in Nellore besides?

A. He has Cultivation in Manniems but not in Coss.

20 Q. What is his Cultivation in Manniems?

The

A. The Maunium belonging to three of the Curnums was formerly mortgaged to Venkatnursoo in consequence of which it was given for Cultivation to Guddum Narrainreddy two years he did not cultivate it but Cultivated it subsequently. Besides this he is also carrying on some other Cultivation in the Carpenters Maunium.

21 Q. On whose account is Guddum Narrainreddy carrying on Cultivation in the Carpenters Maunium?

A. He is Cultivating it for a share of the produce through the Maunumdar. Narrainreddy takes the Ryots share but whether he delivers the Corn Grain to the Maunumdar or places it to his credit for the liquidation of any balance which may be due to him, I dont know.

22 Q. When was the Curnums Maunium mortgaged to Nuckalapelly Venkatnursoo and why?

A. I dont recollect the day or the month but it was 10 years ago they borrowed money which they required & executed a Mortgage bond. The Deponents share in the Maunium was mortgaged for money borrowed on account of a marriage in their house or for some other reason.

23 Q. Is there one Maunium for all the Curnums?

A. There is but one Maunium which is Cultivated and enjoyed by all six persons.

24 Q. Was the Land of the Maunium mortgaged or only his share of the produce?

A. It would have been stated that you Venkatnursoo should cultivate the Land appertaining to our share and place the Corn to the Credit your balance.

25 Q. Is the share which those Curnums have in the produce of the Maunium still under mortgage to Nuckalapelly Venkatnursoo?

A. Last year the Curnums took away their respective shares of the produce. They said among themselves that there was still a balance due of 20 or 30 Pagodas. The Curnums told me that they had not yet looked over the accounts.

26 Q. If there was still a Balance due, why did the Curnums take away the produce?

A. Because Guddum Narrainreddy did not cultivate the Land last year, the Curnums took away their respective shares of the produce no one objected to their doing so for the same reason Guddum Narrainreddy again

again kept this Cultivation this year.

27 Q. Since how many years has Guddum Narrainreddy cultivated that Mauniium?

A. He cultivated it subsequent to the last ten years. Goondlapolem people cultivated it for two years and Narrainreddy for 4 or five years, it may have been about 2 years that he Narrainreddy did not cultivate it, and this year he again cultivated it.

28 Q. Who had the Puttah land before it came into the possession of the Moodoombeewar?

A. Arogala Venealapatty.

29 Q. Do you know why Arogala Venealapatty gave it up?

A. A very heavy Assist was put upon these Lands in estimating the produce in fusly 1234 and the Circar took away the whole gross produce for the remaining balance, he mortgaged his house, Cattle, &c. to some persons, and although he paid the proceeds, there was a still a balance left and he therefore gave it up and at the time

time of the Settlum absconded. He gave up the whole of his Cultivation. His Lands were given to each Ryot who wanted them.

30 Q. Do you know why the Land which was held in the name of Moodoombee Streenee-vasachary up to the end of Fasly 1244 was entered in the name of Narrainreddy in fasly 1245?

A. As Soondaragherry Ramanja Row had become Sheristadar & the Cummeatum in the names of his people in the several Villages were taken out because they ought not to be Kept, I think this was also taken out in the same manner.

(Signed) Venegalapaty Narsunnah.

Taken before me this 4th Day of January 1840.

(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Princ. Collector.

No. 49.

Deposition of Millady Streenevasaloo son of Remana of the Braming Caste Vyetna Sect. Inhabitant of Chinna Cherchoor about 30 years old and by profession a Cumum dated 8th January 1840.

Before the Principal Collector.

Witness on the part of Ramanja Row.

Since

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840-

By Ramayo
Row- 1 2. Since what Fusly have you had Circar Cultivation upon Darkhast in the Village of Singiapollem?-

A- From Fusly 1242 to Fusly 1245-

2 2. In those Fusties had I any concern with the Cultivation in that Singiapollem?-

A No-

3 2 Subsequently to Fusly 1245 who has been Cultivating Singiapollem?-

A- Magonta Adapareddy Inhabitant of Gundavaram and others have been cultivating-

4 2- Had I any concern in their Cultivation?

A- I did not hear that you had-

(Signed) Streeneevasaloo-

Taken before me this 6th day of January 1840

(Signed) J. V. Stothouse
Princl. Collr-

No. 50-

2. In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?-

A- In Telugoo-

Deposition given by Munnapully Venkatachellum, Son of Alchanah, of the Brahmin Caste

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840-

Caste, Vistnoo religion, inhabitant of Gelliapollem 40 years old- & by profession a Curnum dated 6th January 1840-

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore-

By Ramayo
Row- 1 2- Have I had any concern in the Cultivation in Singiapollem since Fusly 1242?

A- No-

2 2- In whose name was Singiapollem Cultivation for some years up to Fusly 1241- and is there any balance due on it for any & what fusslies, & do you know from what cause that balance is outstanding?-

A- For sometime it was in the name of Moodoombee Streeneevasachaloo- It might have been a year- I dont properly recollect that it was in Nalatoor Letachaloo's name, subsequently it was in the name of Loonmoloor Camakhutloo- The circumstance of the old balances I dont perfectly know, previous to that time I was not in Service-

3 2- Do you know if there was any balance outstanding on account of dried up crops for any fusly?

A- I have stated that I was not then in employ Unless I see the accounts I cannot

cannot tell.

4 2. Since Fusly 1242 who have Cultivated this Sungiapollem Venjoyed the produce?

A. The Puttah has been in the name of Mittadody Streeneevasoolo and the Cultivation has been carried on by Wubbareddy Kistnareddy inhabitant of Covoor & Codoor Reddy an Inhabitant of Pennareddypollem Jetty Chinsoo Reddy Goonoopaty Roonapeah and Neeleemoosalee Polareddy who enjoyed the produce; after this Mazoomdar Adee-pareddy an Inhabitant of Gundavarem Cultivated it at present Doovvoor Nursareddy and Codoor Reddy are both Cultivating it.

By the Principal Collector.

5 2. Who was Loonoolour Canabhuttoor.

A. An Inhabitant of Ulloor.

6 2. Do you know for whom he was carrying on the Cultivation?

A. He was not Cultivating. the Puttah was in his name but Nuckalapally Venkatanarsoo was managing

7 2. For whom was Nalatoor Sataeharlo cultivating?

A. That was also going on in the same way.

[Signed] Munnapully Venkatachellum.

This Witness further states that it was said that when the Puttah was in the name of Mittadoo see Streeneevasoloo, there was some written agreement that Vubbareddy Kistnareddy & others who cultivated the Land should furnish a quantity from one to one & half Candy of grain we are not in possession of the written agreement but there is the enjoyment.

[Signed] Munnapully Venkatachellum.

Taken before me this 6th day of January 1840.

[Signed] F. W. Stanhouse

Principal Collr

Compd F.R

No. 51

2 In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?

A In Telgoo.

Deposition given by Labboo Bootcherauze son of Saumbunnah of the Bramin Caste, smartha sect 60 years old inhabitant of Vauvelatepaud and by profession a Curnum Dated 9th January 1840 Called by Ramanoojarow before the Principal Collector of Nellore.

By Ramanoja Row.

1 2 Have I any Cultivation in the Shroterium Village of Goondlapollem?

A No.

2 2 Do you know Nuckalapally Venkatanarsoo?

A I know him.

3 2 Has he any Cultivation in Goondlapolliem and since how many years?

A He has had since Fusly 1242 or the 1832/33 year Nundana.

4 2 Whose is the profit and loss on that Cultivation?

A

a Vencatanursoo--

5 2 Has he any female Cattle in that Village?-

a He has about 40 or 50 including Calves 50--

6 2 Whose is the profit and loss upon those Cattle?-

a Vencatanursoo-

7 2 Have I any Concern with the profit and loss upon Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo Cultivation Vca?-

a You have no concern with the profit and loss upon that Cultivation Vca--

8 2 How do you know that?-

a I have been for 8 years since he had Cultivation in that Village in the habit of going to him. have been made to write his Cultivation Vca accounts and his private accounts. He used to make advances Vca required for that Cultivation. and to pay the wages of his Servants and himself spends his pay and purchases his own Cloths &c contracted

contracted loans for the Cultivation Vca Having no means of paying the Shrotriem dar 100 Rupees. when he rented the Village in Fasly 1242 He mortgaged his own gold girdle to Loopelly Ramasamy, received 300 Rupees. paid it to him (the Shrotriemdar) and used to repay Loopely Ramasawmy by the sale, in the Bazar of the Goondlapollem grain when he received, and by the sale of the young bulls the produce of his cattle- At the time when the Village was under rent- He had bonds executed on his behalf to Goorroovapa Naidoo Vca by Anumreddy Raghavareddy to be paid to on the Circar in those years in which there was loss. used to receive the money and pay it. and repay it by the sale of the grain in that Village. He used himself to enjoy his profit and loss- For these reasons. I know very well that there is no Concern between him and you--

9 2 In what year was the Goondlapolem Shrotriem Fasted?-

Fort St. George 24th December 1841

A In July 1246.

10 2 In whose house does Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo live?

A In Ramanoojarow's house.

11 2 Has this Venkatanursoo any Cultivation at this time in Nellore?

A Up to July 1246 Guddum Narrainreddy had Cultivation of 2 ploughs and Venkatanursoo 2 ploughs. In July 1245 Venkatanursoo gave it up and telling Guddum Narrainreddy to Cultivate it sent off the ploughing Cattle to Goondlapollem since that time Guddum Narrainreddy has Cultivated it and borne the profit and loss.

/Signed/ Boucherauze

Taken before me this 9th day of January 1840

/Signed/ F.V. Stonhouse

Prin.l Coll.r

No. 52

Deposition of Anamareddy Raughava reddy son of Venkatareddy of the Punta Caapoo Caste Short Mark Sect. about 30 years

Fort St. George 24th December 1841

years old inhabitant of Goondlapaulem co and by profession a Cultivator dated 9th January 1840.

Before the Principal Collector.

By Ramanoojarow Witness on the part of Ramanoojarow.

1 2 Have I any Cultivation in Goondlapollem?

a No.

2 2 Do you know Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo and has he any Cultivation in Goondlapollem and since how many years?

a I know him. He has had Cultivation in Goondlapollem since 8 years.

3 2 Has he any female Cattle in that Village?

a He has.

4 2 Have I any Concern with the profit and loss of Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo's Cultivation Vca in Goondlapollem.

a No.

The mark of Anamareddy Raghavareddy

Taken before me this 9th day of January 1840

/Signed/ F.V. Stonhouse

Principal Collr

Jar

No. 53

2 In what language will you cause your Deposition to be written?—

A In Teloogoo—

Deposition given by Vencayalapauty s/o Moorteraauze son of Nursunnah, Brahmin Caste, Smartha sect 26 years old inhabitant of Nellore and by profession a Curnum Dated 9th January 1840—

Before the Principal Collector of Nellore—

1 2 Has Guddum Narraineddy a Puttah in Nellore?—

a There is a Puttah in Guddum Narraineddy's name since Fusly 1245.

2 2 Is that the Puttah land held previously to fusly 1245 in the name of Moodoomby Streenevasacharee?—

A Yes—

3 2 Is that Guddum Naraaineddy's own cultivation or has any one else a share in it?—

A Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo employed labourers and himself had the Cultivation carried on of the land for which there had been

been a Puttah in the name of Moodoomby Streenevasacharee from fusly 1235 to fusly 1239. In fusly 1240 Guddum Narraineddy had 2 or 3 fields separated from those of Guddum Venganah included them in this Puttah and both Vencatanursoo and Narraineddy Cultivated them jointly In fusly 1245 the Puttah in the name of Moodoomby Streenevasacharloo was (put) in the name of Guddum Narraineddy and consequentty it has been held in his name since that time. They are carrying on the Cultivation together—

4 2 Whose ploughs and ploughing Cattle have been used in the cultivation of that land since fusly 1245?—

a The Cattle of both have been cultivating it—

5 2 Which ploughing Cattle of Nuckalapully Vencatanursoowere cultivating that land?—

a The particulars of the ploughing Cattle are not known to me—

6 2 Did you mention to Chabookoo Anundrow former

former Tahsildar of Nellore which & ploughing Cattle of Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo cultivated this land?-

A I did not tell him that such & Cattle tilled the land. He asked whose land it was, and I said it was Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo's. Guddum & Narrainreddy was then present as the land was being measured.--

7 2 When did these words take place?-

A I dont recollect the particular Fusly but it was when he was Tahsildar and came to make an Examination of the land.-

By Ramanoojarow

8 2 You have stated that since Fusly 1245 the Puttah was in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy in whose name were those lands entered in the Circar Pittum?-

A In the name of Guddum Narrainreddy

9 2 Do you know the circumstance of & Guddum Narrainreddy having in Fusly 1245 given a durkhast, requesting that the

the land might be given up to him after they had been relinquished by the Moodoombevar because they did not want them?-

A The change from one name to the other in the Pittum was made after the 2 Papers giving up and taking the land had been produced in the Talook Cutcherry.--

By the Rt. Honble.

10 2 Explain clearly what you mean by the 2 Papers giving up and taking the land?-

A As regards giving up the land the person who relinquishes gives & writing relinquishing it signs & gives it in. The person who takes the land in the same way gives in a writing that he will take the land.-

11 2 Was this writing relinquishing the land given by Moodoomby Sheenevasa Chartoo in Fusly 1245?-

A I recollect he wrote & gave such a paper.

12 2 If he wrote and gave this paper, upon what grounds do you say that up to this time Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo has joint Cultivation with Guddum Narrainreddy?-

A As they were Cultivating together from fusly 1240 as there are 2 Wells in the Mootoom and betel gaodens built by Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo at an expense of 50 Rupees each, and as those gardens are included in this Puttah there is a talk amongst us (Curnums) and the Ryots in the Village that Vencatanursoo has also Cultivation in it.-

By Ramanoojarow

13 2 Who paid the Circar shist upon the Puttah lands held in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy?-

A Narrainreddy paid it & took receipts.-

14 2 Who used to take away the produce of those lands?-

It

A It used to be taken to Narrainreddy's house.-

By the Prin.l Coll.r 15 2 If Vencatanursoo had joint Cultivation what was done with his share of the produce?-

A How should I know what orders for grain were going on in their joint accounts.-

By Ramanjarow

16 2 You have stated that because N Vencatanursoo and Guddum Narrainreddy were Cultivating together since fusly 1240 during the time the Puttah was held in the name of the Moodoomhewar and because Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo had dug 2 Wells in the Pagayet lands that there was a talk that Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo had also Cultivation.- Have you at any time seen with your own eyes the labourers of Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo who are carrying on the Cultivation in this Cummatum?-

A I did not with my own eyes see them tilling.-

2

17 2 Do you know whose is the profit and loss upon the lands held in Narrainreddy name?—

A Narrainreddy now and then used to tell me that the profit and loss was borne jointly.—

18 2 Was the Curnum's maunium ever Cultivated with your Cummatum?—

a We gave last year one field in our Cummatum to Cossoloo Venkiah on a share of the produce—He last year cultivated the Curnum's Maunium By last year I mean Fusly 1248.—

19 2 Who Cultivated the Curnums Maunium in fusly 1247?—

a Cossoloo Venkiah, Bootskayala Rowndreddy and 2 or 3 more jointly Cultivated it.—

20 2 Who gave it to them to Cultivate?—

A We, that is the Curnums.—

21 2 Did Guddum Narrainreddy at any time cultivate this maunium, or did he alone cultivate it, or did any

Comp. S.R.

any other Ryot take a share with them?

A Previous to Fusly 1247 Guddum Narrainreddy, Bundar Venkatramreddy and Talla Sawmy cultivated it. This year Fusly 1249 I understood that Guddum Narrainreddy carried on the cultivation of 5 Shares and Bundar Venkatramreddy and Coppelou Venkiah the other five shares.—

22 2 Do you Know which field out of those formerly given up by the Aregalavar is included in the Outlah lands of Guddum Narrainreddy?

A Doddu Kutta Chanoo and Data Kya or portion of the field called Sultadaree Chanoo These two Sircullet came to Thumvasachartoo.—

23 2 Do you know Cuntabuttoni Pathareddy and Advireddy and are they living together or separate?

A I know them. they are living together.

Signed Vunnyatahanty Moorteauze

Taken before me this 9th day of January 1841.

Signed J. Stokoe
Asst. Collector
Poondaneghurry

1875

A

Specification accompanying Patent dated 25th December 1875.

To all to whom these presents shall come I Thomas Cooke of Bishopsgate Street Without in the City of London Engineer and Optician send greeting Whereas Her most Excellent Majesty Queen Victoria by her Letters Patent under the Great Seal of Great Britain bearing date the Twenty fifth day of December in the Year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and seventy five in the Thirty ninth Year of Her Reign did give and grant unto me the said Thomas Cooke my Executors Administrators and Assigns Her especial Licence full power sole authority and Privilege that I the said Thomas Cooke my Executors Administrators and Assigns or such others as I the said Thomas Cooke my Executors Administrators and Assigns should at any time or times during the Term of Years therein mentioned by writing under my or their hand or hands or the hand or hands of any one or more of us signify unto Her Majesty Her Heirs and Successors my or our desire that Letters Patent should pass the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granting unto me the said Thomas Cooke my Executors Administrators and Assigns the sole use benefit profit and advantage of any Invention which I the said Thomas Cooke should by my Petition in that behalf humbly represent unto Her Majesty Her Heirs and Successors to be new and useful and which should not at the time of making such Application be in use by any other person or persons whomsoever in Great Britain and Ireland the Channel Islands and Isle of Man and Her Majesty Her Heirs and Successors thereby intended and declared that it was Her Royal Will and Pleasure that the said Letters Patent should contain such Proviso Restriction Condition and Limitation as the Law should require and as I the said Thomas Cooke my Executors Administrators and Assigns should in my or their Petition desire and that I the said Thomas Cooke should in pursuance of the said Licence and within the Time therein limited for that purpose by writing under my hand describe and ascertain the Nature of my said Invention and in what manner the same is to be performed and by such writing should declare whether I desired Letters Patent for the sole use benefit profit and advantage of my said Invention for the Term of Fourteen Years or for the Term of Seven Years only as I should think fit and that I the said Thomas Cooke should leave with the Clerk of the Patents at the Great Seal Office in Chancery a Specification in duplicate of my said Invention and that I should also deposit in the Office of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs in London

1876

Yale made by electromedically determined on the 7th measuring Clean & Clear-
ness when examined in the Vicinity of Hackettstown for the year beginning-

Claim Stamp

Hackettstown Valley & Pleasantcreek Claim Surveyed Sandstone Limestone
Quantity Collected in this Valley
Coarse Valley & the finite Double Staminate & Pistillate Flowers Collected
Total of one Acre
Quantity Planted and for which Compensation Applied
" " "
Quantity under an Account of Pleasure-
Coarse Valley of the Valley called Processed Radiomicrometers or Type Measurement in
Total
Claim to Advancement Certificate
" " 6/8
Claim Valley & Small Stream called Stream
" " 3/8
Quantity Collected Together in a Vase
" " 1-12-
Contents of a Valley
" " 6-14 2/4
Total
8 6 2/4

Quantity taken by Prescription of Three Villages. a-Town-Ac
" " 6-14-
Total Coarse Valley-
7 3 10/8

Coarse Valley remaining in Column 2 Quantity
" " 5-12-2/4
Total
16 3 2/4

Coarse Valley Quantity of Pleasant Valley Creek
" " 2-12-
Total
3 9 8

Quantity measured and Valley Measurement of Valley
" " 2
Total
9 2/4

Coarse Valley Creek Valley Creek
" " 7-
Total
7 —

Quantity Collected in Valley Creek
" " 2/4
Total
" 7 2/4

Coarse Valley Valley Creek Valley Creek Valley
" " 2
Total
2 10 "

Total
7 19 10/4

Coarse Valley Valley Creek Valley Creek Valley
" " 4 3

Quantity Collected in this Valley
Coarse Valley & the Valley Double Staminate & Pistillate Flowers
Total of one Acre
" " 4

Quantity Planted and for which Compensation Applied
" " "

Quantity under an Account of Pleasure-
Coarse Valley of the Valley called Processed Radiomicrometers or Type Measurement
" " 4

Total

Claim to Advancement Certificate
" " 6/8

Claim Valley & Small Stream called Stream
" " 3/8

Quantity Collected Together in a Vase
" " 1-12-

Contents of a Valley
" " 6-14 2/4

Total
8 6 2/4

Quantity taken by Prescription of Three Villages. a-Town-Ac
" " 6-14-

Total Coarse Valley-
7 3 10/8

Coarse Valley remaining in Column 2 Quantity
" " 5-12-2/4

Total
16 3 2/4

Coarse Valley Valley Creek Valley Creek Valley
" " 7-

Total
7 —

Quantity Collected in Valley Creek
" " 2/4

Total
" 7 2/4

Coarse Valley Valley Creek Valley Creek Valley
" " 2

Fort St. George 24th December 1841.

Account Shewing the advances made by Rosloomoody Narrainreddy & the amount paid in liquidation thereof as also the balance on the Village of Reddipollem for Fasly 244 - the year Jayo

	Rs	as
Total amount advanced as per particulars Viz:		
Paid on account of the Tax upon the Cummatum		
on the 19th February through Narrainreddy — 200		
8 " March through yedla Narsareddy — 100		
9 " May — Do. — Do. — 180		
19 " June paid at Cherlopollem — 175		
23 of this Month Do. — Do. — 65		
For 3 Ploughing Bullocks	720	
" 6 Do. Do. Calves	44	
	60	8
	824	8
One Candy Cushanum on account of the House hold use 28		
One Candy Cushanum on account of unnecessary of Shodumma 24		
Value of 5 Candies of Cushanum procured formerly from Calastriwar — 36	88	
	912	8
Deduct		
Price of 8 Candies of Cushanum produce given to yedla Nursareddy at Reddy Pollem	100	
Do. of 13 Do. of Do. 15 Do. at 21 Rupees	270	
Do. of 5 Do. of Coarse Paddy	80	
Amount which was caused to be paid by pattykarrs	453	
	200	
Balance	253	8
Deduct price of 9½ Loomes of Coarse Paddy	229	
	7	9
Remainder	221	11
Do. — Do. to Kistnavazoola Ramaswamy	30	
Do. — Do. to Pandaroo	21	
	32	
Deduct Amount agreed to be paid by Cauvenpaddy Venkatakistareddy	273	11
Balance due on account of a former settlement & accounts as written on paper	100	

True Translation

Signed T. Stanhope

Asst to Collr

Compd JR.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

No. 2 D

Account of Advances Made by Rosloomoody Narrainreddy for the Cummatum of Nuckalapully Venkatnursoo at Reddipollem for the year Munmadah or Fasly 1245. — 1835/36

	Rupees	as
Amount given to Pavuttareddy Nursareddy on account at Alloor Caur Reddy on the 7th November	96	"
Ditto which was caused to be given by Yedla Nursareddy at Nellore on account of grain contracted on the 14th February 1836	300	"
Ditto paid for his own use on the 10th June at Cherlopollam	200	"
Ditto . . . do. . . . do on the 15th July	200	"
Ditto paid to himself in Cherlopollem on account of Coroo of Gungapatam Nursoo on Do.	9	"
Ditto . . . do. . . . do at the house at Cherlopollem on the 11th July	100	"
Ditto paid into the Talook Treasury on account of the Repairs of Vagoor Tank	60	"
Ditto . . . do. . . . do being the amount given to Audenarrainah pah on account of the Vuppoodalla of Allour by Vubbareddy Bauperreddy	36	"
	Amount	

Amount paid to the Circar on account of his Tuckalapully Venkatasur = =ooa's Cumanatum out of the amount of Tank Repairs of Vagoor	23	" "
Price of 1 Bandy Bullock given on ac = =count of the household use	20	" "
Ditto - - of Ploughshares and Spades	5	1 "
Total	1,046	1 "

Deduct Payments

Price of 6 Candies of Caur Grain of Reddy = =pollam given to Caurempoody Ve = =nkatapedereddy in November	96	" "
Ditto of 1834 do of Peerkanum Grain given to Nellore Yedla Nursareddy at 4 Pagodas per Candy	300	" "
Amount paid by Jutty Chenroreddy of Yelliapollum out of the amount of Maudeepanboo receivable on for his (Venkatanuroo's) cultivation	100	" "
Ditto - - received from a separate means - another account shews this payment to have been made through Caurreddy	200	" "
Price of 2 Soams of Caurerboo given by Gongapatam Nurvareddy out of his own Cultivation	8	11 3

Price of 4 Pottiers Peerkanaloo given to the Tank diggers repairing the Vagoor Tank	80	" "
	784	11 3
Remainder	261	5 9.

Add

Price of 10 Pottiers of Grain agreed to be given on account of the Yeggium or Sacrificial Ceremony at Alloor at 18 Rupees per Candy is Rupees	180	- " -

Deduct - Rs.

Amount paid by Bapereddy	36	- " - "
Do. - - Do. by Caurempoody Venkatareddy	32	- " - "
	68	- " - "
Remainder	112	" "
Total -	373	5 9.

Paid on the Poorheum

Price of 9 Candies 13 Soams of Peerkanaloo given to Yedlanoora reddy of Nellore at 5 Pagodas a Candy		Pagodas 48 1/4
Do. of 6 Candies 7 Soams of do according to an Assignment brought at one time		31 3/4
Amount paid by Vanteemitta Ramavaoony on ac. account of Alloor Vuppoodalla		18 Rupees

(True translate)
(Signed) J. W. Stonhouse
Trans. Collr.

Account

No. 5 **E**

Account shewing the amount paid by Mooloomoody Narrainreddy to Puntoolou in the Village of Cawreddypollem for the year Doormookhy 1836/37 or Fusly 1246.—

Page 109

13th Chaitrum of the year Hwalambee.

Peeshanum Grain given to Doonum: Candy			
=rangewar at Vellore	1	—	"
Quantity of fine Paddy for the rice given at the time of Puntooloowar entering in the (new) houses	"	—	1/2
1 1/2 or	10	8	"
Paid to Khasa Ramanjeerow pun de= =count of Chunam for the houses	20	"	"
	30	8	"
Rupees	122	"	"
Price of 9 Candies of Turgoollou Peeshanum Grain at 20 Rupees	180	"	"
	302	"	"
Balance due on account of what was advanced in the year Jaya or Fasly 1244	373	14	6
Do. Do. Do. in Bundaneh or fusly 1244	53	5	4
For three years	729	4	3
Carried forward	729	4	3

Brought forward	729	4	3
Deduct Payments.—			
Price of 2 Candies and 18 1/2 Tooms of Peeshanum seed supplied by Puntoolou to be sown in the Cumtum lands of Reddypollem in the year Doormookhy at 6 Pagodas is — 17 Pagodas 35 1/64			
Deduct price of 1 Candy and six Tooms of Peeshanum seed supplied by Mooloo=moodyan — 7 51/64			
Remainder	9	12	"
Seed of Canweriou — 2 — 6 1/2			
Cavary seed — " — 7 1/2			
2 — 14 at 5 Pagodas	13	8	"
Wages of Labourers.			
From 1st to 30th of Aushadam of Doormookhy Coarse Paddy — Pootlies Tooms 1 — 2 1/2			
Straanum — 1 — 4			
Carried forward 2 — 6 1/2	23	4	"

	P.	F.	Page	A/c
Brought forward	2	6½	23	4
Bhadrapadam	1	4		
Aswejum	1	2½		
Caurteekum	1	4		
Margaseeram	1	4		
Pooshyum	1	4		
Maghum	"	"		
Phalgoonum	"	13 5/8		
	8	18 5/8		
Coarse Paddy given to Weavers	1	18 14/16		
Cooly given to the Man temporarily employed	"	2 7/16		
Chillies and Salt	"	1½		
	11	13½/16		
5 Pagodas			35	4 13
			78	8 13
				a/c
Rupees			314	3 3
Value of 10 Ploughing Bullocks			120	" "
Do. of 16 He Buffaloes			140	" "
			574	3 3
Paid on account of Purgallo Veeharum Paddy			180	" "
			754	3 3
Carried forward Surplus payment			24	15 "

Brought forward		24	15 "
Fasly 1244	Candies		
Veeharum Paddy given for house hold Expence	1		
Do. Do. which was caused to be given by Pellacoomar	1½		
Ditto Do. given for the Anniversary of Choodamah	1 / 3½		
On which the amount credited on account of high price charged in that fasly	Page 4½ or	18	" 7
Fasly 1245			
Difference of price on 18¾ Candies of Veeharum Grain to Yedla Narsoo on account of Contract at 4 Rupees per Candy		75	" "
Ditto. - do on 12 Toomes of Coarse Paddy of Gun-gapatam Narsoo by measurement received by Narrainreddy at Do. Do.		"	14 3
Amount which was due after what has been paid on account of Grain supplied to the Yeggnum or Sacrificial Ceremony at Ellore		112	" "
Price of 15 Toomes of Cavary seed sown at Vedavaloor		15	" "
Total Amount due by Narrainreddy up to 15th Vysakum of the year Havalamba		245	13 3

(True Translate) Signed P. Stonhouse
Princ. Collector.

Account

1805 Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

No. 4 F

Account of Soondragherry Ramanoojapuntoolu for the year 1836/37 Doormookhy

Pags. Rs. P

Price of 1 Candy and 6 Toomms of Seeshamum seed at 5 Pagodas per Candy — 6 5 "

Do. of 16 Toomms of Jonnoolu which were caused to be given by Gedda Narra=reddy at Nellore in the Month of Jannary Poorhenun at 6 Pagodas per Candy inclusive of the hire of Conveyance — 4 12 13

Ditto of 2½ Toomms of Eswerlu of Cherla=pollem given on account of 5 Cs Cultivators — " 10 "

11 14 13

January

8th Poorhenun

Paid to Ramasing on account of Ploughshare — " 8 "

Do ... Do. — Do. of Syekler — " 8 "

Do ... on account of Neeroogoodala — " " 8

12 15 3

Rupees — 51 13 3

Carried forward 51 13 3

1806 Fort St. George 24th. December 1840

Rs. A. P.

Brought forward 51 13 3

Paid to Audeenarraina Appah on account of Cs Shist on the 10th. December of Fusly 1246 — 60 " "

Ditto to Tondayee Veneataramoodoo on the 14th. January — 80 " "

Ditto to do. ... do. ... on the 11th. Feberuary — 100 " "

Do. to do. ... do. ... on the 15th. March — 176 — " — "

Deduct on Old Quarter Rupee on account of bad Coin — 3 — 12 — "

Remainder 172 — 4 — "

Deduct

Nawoor Reddy — 40 — " — "

Vata Narrainreddy — 12 — " — "

Caureinpoody Venkatapa=tee reddy — 20 — " — " — 72 — " — "

Remainder on account of their Cumtum — 100 4 "

Paid to Tondayee Veneataramoodoo on the 15th day — 400 " "

720 1 3

Do. to Curnum on account of Batta at the Settlement — 2 " "

Carried forward 794 1 3

	Rupees a/	
Brought forward	794	13
Peerkannum Paddy which was caused to be given to Doonumrauzewar at Nellore on the 13th Chaitrum ——— Candies 1		
Do. on account of 5 Loams of Rice of fine Paddy given at the time of Puntoolawar entering into the houses ——— 1/2		
1½ value Pagodas at ——— 10½		
Paid to (Khasa) himself on account of Chunam for the Houses ——— 20		
30½ or	122	" "
Deduct.		
Price of 23 Candies and 14¾ Loams of Peerkannum Grain given at Reddypollem up to 15th May Vyshakhum ——— Pags. 1/62 37/64	916	13
Do. of 14 Candies and 6½ Loams of Coarse Paddy and 14½ Loams of Casarlos Paddy making together 15 Candies 1 Loam ——— 75¼		
217 43¾/64 or	870	7 1
Remainder due	45	7 1

The Shist payable to the Circar the seed supplied to the Cummatum and the wages of the labourers furnished by Khasa (cowle) for the Current year is not added to the Amount as they for the year because the Cummatum came into his charge

(True Translate)
(Signed) J. J. Monkhouse
Princ. Collector

Agree

G

Argee of Cundala Toobareddy to the Principal Collector dated 20th December 1839 received 21st idem.

After Soondragherry Ramanjarow became Head Sheristadar he in July 1245 said that it would not be proper for himself to carry on the Cultivation of the 3 Veesaluddy Shares which up to that time he had in Codoor, that I might take charge of it, have the Cultivation carried on, pay the Circar Shist and take the produce derived therefrom. That he would in the end look over the accounts and make good to me the profit and loss, that he would give me pasture land valued at 1 Pagoda for grazing the Bullocks and carry on the Cultivation, and that he would graze his Cows and the remainder of his portion of the pasture land and thus put the cultivation in my charge. For three years I had it carried on, as he did not look over the accounts of those three years and make good to me the profit and loss

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

loss. but grazed his own Cows and subjected me to great difficulties, I was not able to represent this circumstance to your honor because he was Sheristadar afterwards I declined to carry on the Cultivation and gave it up upon which he was very angry with me, and took all the accounts relating to his Cultivation. During the three years Fusslies 1245, 1246 and 1247 I sustained a loss about 400 or 500 Rupees, and considering that if the particulars of the accounts were looked into he would have to pay this sum, he without looking over the accounts had them all brought to his house & Sellars, and took them from me. For the value of the Young Bulls he gave me he obtained receipts from me making out an account as if it was for the Poollary of his Cattle and the thrist of his Garden I do not know in what way he has

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

the balance due by him in the Village written down.

As regards the Nagas all the people of the Village agreed to do jointly the River Channel work for his proportion of 3 shares of the Cultivation of the Village and they did the work some years according to that agreement, As they omitted to work at the River Channel for only one year I understood subsequently that a sum of 30 Rupees was deducted from the joint Village Collections on account of those Nagas (River Channel fines) paid the same was entered as a balance due on the Village collectively.

As Ramanjarow when the periodical division of the lands took place in Fusly 1245 did not get good pasture lands for his share, he in the beginning of Fusly 1246 sent Surrauze Narrainapah a man of his to Codoor and having sent for me to that place as well as Vanumbank Venkatramreddy and all others in the Village, caused the tracts

tracts of pasture lands to be divided again.
By the time this division was over, many
disputes arose in the Village, and the Ditt.
=tum not having been settled it was given
at last at the time of Gummahbundy.
This circumstance is known to your
honor. From that time, I made Curnum
Vellore Seetiah, and Nullatoor Vurda.
=charloo inhabitants of Codoor to pre.
=sent a Petition to your honor to acquaint
your honor with all that had taken
place in the Village, in consequence
of which he got Curnum Seetiah's Cr
Uncle Chemperee to be dismissed from
the Curnumship, and issued orders
unjustly to levy a sum of 150 Rupees
from Curnum Seetaramoodoo to at.
=tach the Canyem Puttah of Vurdacharloo,
and to collect the Pauleewassee of Tolapaty
Village which had been granted to me.
In regard to this I represented something
to your honor at Pedda Coodoor, subs.
=quently and previous to your sending
for me, he sent Lurranze Narrain
=a speak two or three times to me

to tell me that I must state that he (Raman=
=jarow) had no concern in the Cultiva=
=tion that the Gentleman would again
favor him with the Sheristadar's si=
=tuation. That as I had not had the
Cultivation under my charge for the
last two years and as he had put it
in charge of Vummumbaut Vencataraw
reddy since fusly 1248 I should have
no trouble about it, that if on the
contrary I were to state what was
the fact the Gentleman will some
how or other confirm him in the
situation because he had had not
yet been dismissed and that I would
then come to know the trouble which
would happen to me. In consequence
of this I became alarmed and have
become far from your honor's mind.
I did not in the first instance
represent to your honor all the circumstances
which I have now stated, owing to
the deceitful way on which he ca
sent word to me, and owing to my
bad luck. I beg your honor to ca
pardon

pardon my fault and to keep favor on me.

In this Zillah any Ryot or other person who has no concern with the Veesahuddy has no right to divide and take a proportion of the lands in Veesahuddy Villages and graze their Cattle within those limits. At Codoor this Ramanjarow has three shares of Veesahuddy Cultivation up to this very day, and he is enjoying the profits and loss there of. If it were not so, he could have no right whatever to graze his Cattle in the Veesahuddy lands of that Village. And others being afraid under an impression that if he become Shereistadar again, he would act unjustly and irregularly towards us, did not state the circumstance. He has Cultivation of 3 out of 40 Veesahuddy shares of Codoor and in whosesoever's name the Puttahs and Dittams are and whether he makes good the profit and loss thereon or evades paying persons of our description the Cultivation is his own, and no one has any right to the Cultivation of those three Veesahuddy shares at the present time your honor has a different opinion of me owing to my bad luck. From the first I informed you every thing about this Ramanjarow and Codoor. Used to have Petitions presented for some circumstances. I am not one who am desirous of his friendship and protection I am a dependent at your honor's feet. I do not know what my Enemies, although they may have done many wicked deeds have represented to your honor to create your honor's displeasure against me, and your honor will know when represented the truth in your honor's presence. Request your honor to peruse this and pardon my fault.

(Signed) Coondoola Coobareddy

(True Translate)

(Signed) P. D. Sinclair
Asst. Collr.

Compd. J. R.

H

Translate of Arzee of the undersigned Ryots of Codoor to the Principal Collector dated 27th December 1839.—

From fasly 1233 to fasly 1249 Cw

Soondaragherry Ramanjarow has had in our Village Cultivation of three out of 40 Veesahuddy shares of which the Village consists for some years in the name of Moodoomhee Streenevasacharloo and for some years in the name of Moodoomhee Cw Venatakrisnamacharlos. For three years in the name of Coondoola Coobareddy and two years in the name of Veenumbaik Venataramareddy. In this way he has actually had Veesahuddy Cultivation up to this very time. The profit and loss thereon is Ramanjarows but not the aforesaid persons in consequence of which the petty business of working for the river Channel, subscriptions for the Village festival, tank work and such other things are not done for the proportion of 3 shares in our Village which is great loss to us. When a Cw division takes place of the pasture lands

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

lands and fields, he raiser disputes & wanting to get those fields and pastures lands which he wishes for in consequence of which as much obstruction as can be desired is thrown in the way of cultivation &c. of our Village, whereby we are suffers. — We are thus in consequence of his having cultivation subjected to as much trouble as can be desired. — We therefore request that if from From July 1250 as that Cultivation is made over to us, we shall do the River Channel work properly and pay the Circar Shist &c. — We therefore strongly request your honor to put us in possession of the said 3 Fees baby shares.

(Signed) Surrapully Venkatrow. —
Mark of Annoodoor Narrainreddy. —
Ditto of Seeroomoor Narsareddy. —
Signed Mark Apooram Ramnadoo.
Signed Mark Apooram Chinniah
Mark of Valapollem Nyaareddy
Ditto of Ramareddy Chinniah Seshareddy
Ditto of Ullareddy Krishnareddy
Ditto of Doowoor Seshareddy
Ditto of Yemmareddy Venkatrow

(True Translation)
(Signed) J. W. Stonhouse
Principal Collr
Translr

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

1

Translation of Extract of an Arzee from Vamoogunty Venkatrow Tahsildar of Nellore Dated 5th June 1833 No. 14 to the Principal Collector of Nellore. —

In the Village of Codoor there is a Cummatum in the name of Moodoomkee Streenevaspacharloo, a man of Goondraghery Ramanjarow, and also one of Suroapully Panpanah a man of Moon=gamoor Putchmanurasoo. These people cultivate that land every year and take away the produce thereof like Mannium=dars, and the Parkuttees and Curnums as well as other Circar servants whose business it is to collect money, considering that they would run a risk of loosing their situations if they were to ask for the money, only receive so much as they choose to pay, and leave off asking for more. — This has been going on for the last ten years, in proof of which I herewith forward an annual balance statement of a few years for your information. —

The last year's Beriz payable by Moodoomkee Streenevaspacharloo Rds. 10-1 as.
from which the Amount Collected Vizt. — 69-7-4
being deducted the Remainder is — 71-2-9

For

For this balance they have made out a statement to shew that there were only Cattle but no resources afterwards in the month of September I went to that Village and during my enquiries understood that there ought to have been 15 Toomes of fine & Paddy and 10 of Ratcheny that the 10 Toomes of Ratcheny were taken away by Streenevasakaree who also secured the remaining 15 Toomes of fine Paddy in parcels for seed and & went to the Northward to Ongole and & thereabouts in Consequence of which it was not at that time practicable to ask him for the money. I had ordered the Capoo and Curnum to take care of the Paddy in store There never has existed a practice of writing orders to give up the produce of this individual or of any other unless the money is collected nor did I write any order to give up his produce A few days afterwards the Villagers informed me that the said Streenevasakaree had come and sown the seed for the Current years cultivation. Afterwards on enquiring as to where Streenevasakaloo was it was understood that he

had gone to Ongole and returned a few days before and on my demanding him for the money he paid into the Talook Treasury on the 4th June the balance of 71 Rs 2 ℳ due for last year referred to in the above order.- He says that he will sell the produce which is in the Village and pay within 15 days the balance of the Current year. I gave strict orders to the Villagers not to give up any of this & mans produce.-

(A true Extract & translation)
(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

J

Arzee of Gootoor Venkataraniah 2nd Apistr Sheristadar dated 17th April 1839 To the Principal Collector.-

In regard to an arzee & presented by Cavaloor Peyrumraugee & nominated Curnum of Codavaloor in the Talamcindy Talook stating that Vildundy Venkatah Tahsildar had not brought to account his Usmaish & Gootoor of land applied at about 150 Rupees

Rupees which was cultivated under Cau
and yielded a Crop this year in the Vil=
-lage of Reddypollem in which the Head
Cheristadar Soondragherry Ramanjarow
holds cultivation and that he will
point out the 8 Goorlaes of land assessed
at 150 Rupees which the Cheristadar Ra=
-manjarow through Veldandy Venkatrow
decreased and concealed, and went to
Reddypollem on the 31st March in pur=
-suance of your verbal orders directing
me to proceed to that Village have the
lands measured and report to you
and although the limits of the Circar
Maganie fields and the Mauniums
are not clearly defined, I made all pos=
sible enquiry and measured all the
Mauganie and Jareeb lands cultivated
for fasly 1248 in that Village. The tot=
Mauganie dittum of this Village for
the Current year exclusive of Cau
52 3/64 Goorlaes. The extent cultivated ac
according to the Talook Aymaish
recei

account is 37 58/64 and my measurement ac
amounted to 44 23/64 Goorlaes inclusive of 6 6/64
which fell short of the Talook account
in one field thereby exhibiting an excess
of Maganie Cultivation of 6 29/64 Goorlaes assessed
at 129 r a p and also 7/64 ths in Jareeb land as
assessed at 4 r a p making a total of 134 r a p 5
I therefore herein enclosed a fieldwar state=
-ment for this excess. Besides this the total
extent of Mauganie Mauniums in this vi=
-llage according to the Jaree is 4 3/64 Goor=
-laes and the Talook accounts shew the a=
whole land to have been cultivated, a=
whereas according to my measurement
it amounted to 6 29/64 goorlaes shewing an
excess of 2 25/64 goorlaes which will appear
in the said accounts.

It has been entered in
the talook accounts that 24/64 of a goorlaes
of land assessed at 12 r a p cultivated
with Peshanum crop in this Village
had rotted which according to my mea=
=surement came to 23/64 assessed at 8 r a p
a decrease of 11/64 assessed at 3 r a p.

On

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

On enquiry about the cultivation &c.a of this Village I came to understand that up to Fusly 1245 the Circar Puttah was issued in the name of Racalapally Vencatanarasoo, that Bootoomoody Narrainreddy made advances for seed, for the wages of labourers and for the Circar Shist. &c.a and managed the cultivation that Soondragerrywar used to enjoy the whole produce derived from this Village and to make good in grain and other ways to Narrainreddy &c.a the amount advanced by him, that although the Circar dittum and Puttah were in the name of Bootoomoody &c.a Veerareddy for Fusly 1246, yet the whole cultivation of that Fusly was carried on with Ruckalapillay Vencatanarasoo Cummatum, that Narrainreddy himself made advances for the Circar Shist. and the wages of servants &c.a in that Fusly as it had been done in former Fusly and after the produce was obtained, they came &c.a to

Shrustadars son in law

Bootoomoody Narrainreddy's brother.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

to an adjustment of accounts. That from Fusly 1247 they Soondragerrywar have had no concern with the Mangany Cultivation but enjoyed the produce of the Jareeb &c.a lands making good to Narrainreddy the amount of Jareeb Shist which he had previously paid to the Circar in proof of which there are some accounts amongst those which I sent for from the house of Vagoor Adeenarrainappah Curnum of Vagoor and from that of his brotherinlaw. I write this for your information and enclose herein the Petition presented by the Curnum Peyrumrange Resident on my enquiring about the reddy's Maunium in this Village I have understood that from Fusly 1230 in which Puttah was issued in the name of Ruckalapully Vencatanarsoo up to Maunsingh being appointed Monsiff in &c.a Which time the Monsiff's Puttah was in the name of Ruckalapully Vencatanarsoo and the produce of the Maunium enjoyed by them at that time Maunsingh who was

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

was formerly a servant in the Nellore & Tellah Jail was appointed Moondiff as he was nothing but a servant on behalf of Soondaragherry war, the Reddy Mauneium was cultivated in common with their Cummatum and they used to enjoy the produce derived from it in common with the other Coroo fieldes. Maunsingh used to manage all the busines of their cultivation and whenever he represented that he wanted something for his food, they used to give him one, two or three booms of grain by which means he maintained himself. Up to the time the crops came to maturity in Fusly 1247 Maunsing was in the Village, and then went to Chadra or thereabout, This Maunieum having been cultivated by Narrainreddy's Cummatum for that Fusly (1247) the produce was reaped and stacked the estimate on the standing crop was 3 Potties which was made over to Narrainreddy on security, and for the current year also the reddy Mauniem which

†By the Tahsildar

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

which was cultivated by Narrainreddy's Cummatum yielded produce which was heaped separately and not estimated up to this time. I herein enclose the Statement of the Cummum of the Village.

(Signed) G. Venataramiah
2nd Asst. Sub.

(True translation)
(Signed) J. V. Stonhouse
Asst. Collector

Enclosure 1 in 3.

Statement of Vaygoor Adeenarrainpah Cummum of Reddypollem dated 11th April 1839.

21. State particularly by whom & the Reddy Mauneium of this Village has been enjoyed.—

A. From Fusly 1230 when the Cuttah was issued in the name of Buckalapully Venatanarsoo and the Soondaragherry war established a Cummatum and began to carry on the cultivation up to Maunsingh's appointment in Or. Nu. this time the Soondaragerry war used themselves to enjoy it. This Maunsingh was employed in the Jail, and the Soondaragerry war appointed him Moondiff had a Moondiff's Cuttah

Pattah given to him and sent him to the Village from that time he used to manage the business of Soondaragerry Ramanjarow's cultivation and engaged himself in agreements for the payg revenue &c. Whenever he represented while so employed that he had nothing to eat, they used to have one, two or three toomes of grain given him from Soon-
-dragerryvar's grain which was in store at Reddy pollem and when there was none Though Rooloomoody Narrainreddy at Cheroo-
-woopollem by which he was maintained and managed on their behalf all the business of the Village. The Soondragerry-
-war used to cultivate the reddy Maunium with the Cattle of their cummatum and enjoy the produce thereof in comonon with the other produce, up to the time, the crops came to maturity in Fusly 1247 Maunsingh was in this Village he used to cultivate the Maunium belonging to any person in the Village seperately by which he maintained himself and remained there till just before the reaping of the crops and then proceeded to Pedda and those parts. From Fusly 1247 Rooloomoody Narrainreddy who used to carry on the cultivation as his cummatum did not give him &c

Maunsingh

Maunsingh any Maunium for his cultivation and as Narrainreddy used to manage his own cultivation, Maunsingh had no means of livelihood and went away. In fusly 1247 the produce of this reddy maniumm was estimated at about 3 or 3½ Candies by myself and the Peshcar afterwards Narrainreddy &c went to the Tahsildar and brought an order to put it in his possession upon security who measured the grain in common with the other produce and took it away. The produce was estimated in the first instance but there was no check Estimate or any account of the actual measurement. I do not know what the measured quantity was. For Fusly 1248 it was cultivated with Easwara corra yielded produce which has been reap-
-ed, but not yet estimated. This Mau-
-nium has been cultivated by the Roo-
-loomoodyvar's cummatum both in the current (Fusly 1248) and last year.

State after all this by whom

2.2 the produce of the Reddy Maunium was enjoyed from the time the Moonsiffs &c Putta was given in the name of &c

Maunsingh

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

Maunsingh up to the time the Soondaragerry
waris cultivation ceased[2].

A. Soondaragerry war used to
cultivate it by means of their Cummatum
and enjoy the produce.

2.3 Up to what time was the Puttah
issued in the name of Ruckalapully Venkatanar-
soo and by whom was the produce of the Village enjoyed

A. Up to Fasly 1245 The Puttah was issued in the name of
Ruckalapully Venkatanarsoo as he used to live in Soonda-
ragherry Ramanjarow's house, and as he is his son in
law Soondaragerry Ramanjarow used to manage the
whole cultivation himself from the beginning and enjoy
the produce. In fasly 1246, the whole cultivation was
carried on by Soondragerry wars Cummatum although
the dittuno and Puttah were in the name of Rooloomoody
Veerareddy after the cultivation was carried on and the
produce obtained Rooloomoody Parrainreddy himself caused
the whole grain to be measured and removed to Rooloomoodys
house. He kept some grain in the Village for the wages
of the labourers. Rooloomoody Parrainreddy myself
and Soondaragerry Ramanjarow fixed the price of the
bullocks which were used in the cultivation of the
Cummatum, settled an account at Escapully of
the quantity of grain and the amount advan-
-ced for fasly 1246 by which there was a balance
due to Ruckalapally Venkatanarsoo's Cum-
-matum by Rooloomoody Parrainreddy. From the
Sand Parrainreddy came to Nellore, furnished Ruck-
-lapully Venkatanarsoo with a copy of the settled
account and went to Reddy pollem.

This is a true Statement
Taken before me
(Signed) G. Venkatarungaiah
2nd Pt. Sheristadar

(Signed) Hyder Hussein

(True translation)
(Signed) J. F. Monbonte
Pt. Asst.

Compd. L.R.

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

K

Case No. 1.

To the Principal Collector
of the Zillah of
Nellore.

The Defence of Soondara-
jerry Ramanujarow suspended Head
Sheristadar.

The depositions you given
by some servants and others as if I
had cultivation and the charge brought
against me in consequence having been
delivered to me with directions to give
in my explanation regarding the cir-
-cumstances therein stated, and that if
I thought it necessary I could call witnesses
and also question the Witnesses who had been
examined by you. I have seen those papers-

Humbly beg to represent

2. in regard to this that I did not tell
you any untruth and deceive you
to destroy the faith and confidence
you had in my good conduct as stated
in the charge. there is no benefit to me in

in doing so, nor is it in my nature to deceive in that manner—

3. I and my ancestors con= ducted ourselves in this Zillah with honor and celebrity - I entered the Honor= able Company's service in the Month of April 1807 - I was at first for some years in the Court, and afterwards under the revenue authorities - I performed the duties connected with my Employ strictly and faithfully with great zeal so as to induce the Gentle= men under whom I served to praise me for my good conduct, without being suspended or dismissed even for one day from the time I was first employed, and thus served for a continuous period of 32 years The originals of the public characters given me by the different Gentle= men under whom I served and the copies of the letters they had written to the higher authorities in my favor were delivered to the Commissioner in the enquiry made into a certain

case

case against me and you also have seen them. these he has forwarded to Government -

4. While I was Sheristadar in the Sub Collectors' Cutcherry of this Zillah Mr Whish who was then Collector wrote to the Board recommending me for the situation of Head Sheristadar which became vacant in the Principal Division, and changed me to the situa= tion of Deputy Sheristadar of this Division shortly afterwards you were appointed Principal Collector and notwithstanding my experience in the business and the characters you had formerly given me when you were Head Assistant Collector of this Zillah after enquiring into both my public and private conduct you again examined properly into my conduct and were pleased to recommend me to the Board to be appointed to the situation of Head Sheristadar, and the Board accordingly approved it -

From

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

From that time to this, a period of 4 years, I conducted myself faithfully with a great care in the circar duties, to the best of my knowledge without occasioning any loss either to the Government or to the Ryots and without the deceits of any one taking effect, so as to please you, and I took much trouble and de conducted myself according to your pleasure- you also wrote in the Summa=bundy Reports in each year about my good conduct upon which reports the Board and Government were pleased to notice your good opi=nion of me in their Proceedings- During the time I was Sheristadar of the Sub Division I conducted myself in such a manner as to induce the Sub Collectors to notice me favorably in their annual Summa bundy reports with regard to my trustworthiness and the pains I had taken in that situation-

5 From the time I was appointed Head Sheristadar by you, up to the

period

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

period the Summabundy report for fusly 1247 was written, you had no mis=trust in me- Wishing to obtain the high favor of the Government I conduct=ed myself strictly in the circar busi=ness without shewing any complai=sance towards any one and without any deceits taking effect because if I acted properly I was in hopes my salary would be increased 20 Pagodas at the end of fusly 1249 according to the Rules now in force- My conducting myself in this manner and your acting towards me witha favor could not be endured by some persons- In the mean time it happen=ed that after you went to and return=ed from Salem, some of the principal servants were changed from their situations- They considered that such changes were occasioned by me and conceived great enmity against me and with the intention of injuring me by any means that you may not have favor on me, and that they may re=gain their former situations, they caused some of the persons who used to come

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

come forely before you, to make false reports against me, and caused you to get angry- and to confirm what was so reported they gained over some of the principal servants and consult-ed to depose before you some fabricated circumstances, thereby to injure me. The persons who had so con-sulted being known to me, I mention-ed it to you once at Godvor. Having understood afterwards from some per-sons that some Kyfents had been caused to be delivered at the same place, I represented to you in writing at Godvor on the 11th March 1839 that my enemies are inventing against me things which I did not do, and request-ing that you would ascertain the be-thereof from me, when you could do after that what you please, and that I am ready to give explanations regarding the complaints brought against

Fort St George 24th December 1840-

against me, and also requesting that you would not alter the good opinion you had of me, but owing to my cruel misfortune you considered the false reports they had made to be true and was very angry without ascertaining any thing from me about the false re-ports which they made on examining in my presence the persons who had been examined- After you returned thence to Nellore you wrote to me on the 17th March, that from some circum-stances which had been mentioned to you by some persons, you suspected my conduct and directed me not to come to the Cutcherry till they were enquired into and decided —

6. On referring to the depositions now delivered to me, it appears that previous to that letter having been written to me, depositions had been taken only from Baur Bauboorau Yerrugoude party-

Yerrogoode pauty Nursiah, and Coondoola
Soobareddy and from Bynaboyenna Nar-
=rapah, who it appears gave his deposi-
=tion before Vanneedoodeekhan —

7. It having come to my
knowledge that the principal servants
taking advantage of the opportunity
which that letter forbidding my com-
=ing to the Cutcherry, afforded them
had through persuasion and threats
caused some persons, and also some
of the servants who had combined to
injure me as abovementioned to
give in false Hypeets against me, I rep-
=resented to you in writing on the 22d
of that month, that, if I were permitted,
I would appear before you and prove
those intriguing circumstances, but as
you did not afford me the opportunity
that you may ascertain the truth,
it was the cause of such false Hypeets
being caused to be delivered to you —

8. I was shortly afterwards
on the 29th March suspended. Fearing
that

that the intrigues they were carrying on
against me, would come under your
enquiry, they to induce you to be very
angry with me, and that witnesses may
be alarmed and no one be found to
speak the truth in my behalf they
brought an unjust accusation against
me, and caused me to be put into con-
=finement and to suffer every kind
of disgrace. and you know that I was
acquitted of this accusation —

9. With regard to the unjust
accusation that I am carrying on culti-
=vation privately which was brought
against me in order that you may be
displeased with me I have to explain
as follows —

10. Before I was appointed
Sheristadar of the 1st Division the
pay which I received being small
there was some cultivation in the
names of the people who were depend-
=ent on me, for their support as they were
people belonging to me, I caused the
Cumaratums

Cummatums which were in their names
to be publicly entered in the Circar ac-
counts as belonging to me, but I did
not conceal the circumstance of any
Cummatum - As there was much loss
on some of these Cummatums they
were given up long ago - With regard
to the remaining cultivation with
which I was connected, some were
given up before I was appointed
Head Sheristadar and some subsequently-

11. There was cultivation in
Codoor the name of Moodoombee Streenivasa
charlu from fusly 1233 to the time of
harvest of fusly 1244 when the connection
with that cultivation was relin-
=quished - It having been consid-
=ered for Cundoola Sorbareddy who
cultivated the Land next to that
which was thus relinquished, or
to join it with his lands and to
cultivate it, he at his own desire
obtained it from the circar and
cultivated that also from fusly 1245

paid

paid the circar thirt and enjoyed the
produce -

12. The the cattle which sup-
=plied Buttermilk for the use of my
family grazed during 16 years on the
pasture Land of the Cummatum which
had been given up in that Village and
the Circar Poolliary tax thereon was
paid - After the Cummatum was relin-
=quished, I represented to you that
I did not intend to keep the said
cattle in that Village and would sell
them - that I had built a shed for the
said cattle on a part of the Bunjer
Land attached to the Cummatum
which had been relinquished, and
that I had planted Cocoanut trees
&c. within the compound of the shed
as a shade for the cattle and that
the thirt of this Garden was included
in the Pottah of the Cummatum -
When you ordered that I could

keep

keep the she cattle there and also re-
=tain the Garden and that you had
so permitted me as mentioned in
the charge -

13. The persons called by me
and who were examined by you in my
presence, being the inhabitants and
Veesabuddylears of Codoor and the peo-
=ple who cultivate the lands adjain-
=ing that which had been given up
Viz. the Moonsiff of the Village, the
Curnums Ravanapah and Anantu-
=pa the Kristamah and other Veesabady
Ryots they have declared that they
state on oath, that neither I nor the
people belonging to me, had cultivation
of any kind in Codoor from fusly 1245, that from that time to
fusly 1247 the Cummatum Lands in
question were cultivated by Candoola
Soobareddy with his own 4
ploughs - and that he was
entitled to the produce and en-
=joyed both the Coras and Mode pandoo shares,

and

and that he paid the circar tax - that
the Head man who managed his culti-
=vation having died and he not hav-
=ing the means to carry on that cul-
=tivation and considering that he
would suffer a loss returned only the
two shares of the cultivation which he
had formerly, and relinquished the
Cultivation of the three shares of the
Cummatum which he had taken up subsequently that the
enombuck Vineatarama reddy took up the cultivation of this
land for fusly 1248, he alone enjoyed the profit
and loss and paid the tax thereon to
the circar - that there were no plough
-ing cattle or cultivators belonging
to me from fusly 1245, that the she ca
-ttle alone grazed on the Beedoo Land
of that Cummatum, that the Poolla
-ry on the cattle and the assessment of
the Garden were paid to the Circar -
Candoola Soobareddy also deposed that
he was entitled to the produce derived
therefrom, that he cultivated the Land
with

with his own ploughing cattle that the
head man who managed his cultivation
having died he gave up that cultivation.—
14 There must have been
a great profit derived from this cultiv-
vation to induce me to conceal it
from you but by the enquiry made
by you it has appeared that loss of
accrues by this cultivation and that
in good years the profit in that
Village does not amount to 4 Rupees
a month it cannot therefore be
supposed that a person like me
who receives a salary of Rupees 3,360
per Annum would, if it were known
to you that there was such a concealed
cultivation, endeavour to conceal it
to injure my character and lose my
employment. A person however sense-
less would not do so. If I had
thought it necessary to retain
this cultivation. I see no
objection to my requesting you
about it and to keep the cultivation
and while there is no objection, there can
be

be no necessity for me deceitfully to
retain the cultivation and deceive you—
15. If you were to take
the circumstances I shall state below
into consideration &
with tender pity, it
will be known to
you that I had acted
strictly in the manner
I had mentioned to
you about the cultiv-
vation. That some
of the principal &
servants mentioned
in the margin who
gave the depositions
of us which were de-
livered to me are
my enemies, which
is known to you—
that some of them
have combined with
others who are at
great enmity with me and formed a party
and for many reasons which they have in their
mind have deposed to unfounded circumstances
that

Names of the persons who gave depositions	Date of the Depositions
1 Bauer Baubarow	10th March 1839
2 Yerragoodpaty Narsiah	12th — " —
3 Rynaboyana Narrapah	13th — " —
4 Cundoola Soobareddy	
5 Puttree Krishnarow	19th — " —
6 Nalatoory Vurdachurbo	19th — " —
7 Coreem Pedda Soobiah	
8 Chaback Ammundarow	21st — " —
9 Pulla Krishnarow	
10 Maddoo patty Coreketum	22nd — " —
11 Neputty Lutchmenarsiah	23rd — " —
12 Aregala Narsimoolo	
13 Annanchala Ramana	27th — " —
14 Mancherreddy Pararedddy	30th — " —
15 Ramareddy Soobareddy	
16 Arja of Cunkatoor Paramarauze	3d April
17 Goondlapally Chittumbrum	
18 Vanoombaubrum Venkataraum reddy	8th — " —
19 Vajoor Andanaimainapoho typeal	11th — " —
20 Cootoor Venkatarawanah Arzee	13th — " —

that you may be displeased with me -

16 Although these depositions were taken without my being present at the time, it does not appear that any one deposed on oath - I requested that the depositions should be taken on oath, but you stated that the charge was not one which ought to be enquired into according to the Regulations, and therefore you had no authority to put them on their oath —

17. The deposition given on the 13th March by Byrabyenaick Narrapah, the Head man who superintended the River Channel Repairs appears to have been given before Hameedoodeen Khan the present Tahsildar of Nellore. Tahsildar This deposition bears the signatures of Narrapah and Coorem Peddu Teekah. An Abstract of the Villages in which the persons mentioned in the Margin as above have stated

Compd. J.R.

stated that I had cultivation, is written on the back of that deposition and it does not appear that that abstract was caused to be written by the person who gave the evidence; but appears to be a list which was caused to be written by Hameedoodeen Khan and others who are my enemies for the purpose of fabricating and informing you that I had cultivation, and it appears that agreeably to this list the Servants &c aforementioned were persuaded to give depositions, but it does not appear that any one complained against me at that time that I had without your knowledge retained Emmaturns or that thereby the Circar and Ryots suffered injury. It is also known to you by the enquiry held before the Commissioner that Hameedoodeen Khan who delivered this paper is my enemy. When

18th When Puthee Kistnarow the person No 5 mentioned in the Margin was Tahsildar of Nellore Talook, you enquired personally with out any having any concern in it through the Moonshee, into the irregularity which it appeared by the Arzee written by himself and the Kyfents given by the Treasury Commas=tah &ca he had committed about the Succavy advanced to Sisparauze Venkatpaidoo, a Puttadar of Canoo=pur tespandoo and ijured orders that the amount of the Succavy should be made good from Kistarow's salary. and it appears by his own deposition that he is at enmity with me from supposing that that order was ijured by my means. I did not act in the manner stated in his deposition.

19 This Kistnarow and the persons No. 1–8–9–16–4 & 20. mentioned in the Margin are near relations and connected to each other and may be considered

considered as belonging to one House—if any one of them suffer any injury it will be felt by all of them—it appears that Kistnarow's deposition was given previously to the depositions of all the others with the exception of that of the person No 1 Before he / Kistnarow / gave that deposition, I heard while you were at Coodoor that he came to Coodoor to give a deposition on the subject mentioned in his deposition, and as this deposition was given subsequently it would appear that it was given with the view of succeeding in the objects of his enmity against me—and that becoming subjects to the party, who were acting with great enmity towards me and all the others his relations being of one mind; he was in hopes that if I suffered any injury the others who gave depositions would be promoted in their employments, and as you first took depositions without my being present, it was the

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

the cause that the others fabricated some false reasons and gave depositions one after another, to confirm the depositions given by Kistaraw and Bauharaw.-

20.- It is known to you that some of the other persons mentioned in margin are my enemies, that some of them gave false evidence against me before the Commissioners Cutcherry, and that some of them had previously to that, presented false complaints against me before you. There can be no doubt for saying that while some of the principal servants stated false circumstances to you Viz: that I had cultivation, they persuaded the others and caused them to give depositions to confirm their statements. The persons No 14 and 16 mentioned above in the

2 Yerrapookepaty Narsiah
6 Nalatoory Vurdachalam
7 Coreni Pedda Soobiah
13 Annencherla Ramanah
16 Caukatoor Parumdauze
17 Goandlapully Chittumbrum
18 Vannambauka Venkatarau- reddy

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

the Margin named Mauchareddy Pararedday and Ramareddy Soobareddy were both again examined before me. They have stated that when they first gave their deposition in your Cutcherry, they then stated untruths that they have now deposed Viz: that I had not any cultivation in Godoor from fusly 1245, and that they will swear I have no cultivation.-

21.- As an instance of my having cultivation, it must be shewn that I had plowing, cattle and Servants in the respective Villages to carry on the cultivation, there is not only nothing like this, but the servants who gave depositions without appearing to know any thing of such circumstance appear by these depositions to have fabricated and stated some circumstances to make it be supposed that I had cultivation.-

22 Some of the persons who have stated that I have retained cultivation

cultivation privately have considered the circumstance of the name of the person belonging to me (who was formerly over the Codaur Cultivation) being in the Dittum Acct. from fusly 1245 as a proof of that circumstance- There will be no occasion for persons who are desirous of retaining cultivation privately to cause their names to be so entered in the Circar accounts- and therefore this reason is against the circumstance that cultivation was retained privately- and not in favor of it I shall state below whose names and on whats accounts they were entered in the Dittums.-

23.- When Baur Shashagerry Row who was then Tahsildar of the Nellore Talook formed the Dittum of the Village of Codaur for Fusly 1245; the Cultivation of that Cummatum having been previously relinquished by the people belonging to

to me and Cundoola Soobareddy having stated that he would take it up the dittum was made out accordingly; and there is a remark to the dittum account of that Village which was delivered into the Dooyan signed by the Tahsildar to the effect that Mondumby Streenevaschurloo having relinquished that Cummatum, it was given to the said Soobareddy- In the Chitta Accounts of Fusly 1245, also the name of Cundoola Soobareddy is entered- The dittums for fusly 1246 were transmitted by the then Tahsildar Vanoogunty Venkatarow- In the dittum first sent, it is stated in the same way as is mentioned in the dittum for fusly 1246 that Streenevaschurlos having relinquished his Cummatum, it was taken up by Cundoola Soobareddy- It being usual at the time of forming the dittums for the Ryots of the respective Villages

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

Villages who may be present to sign the dittums for themselves, and for those who are absent, with their consent it appeared that the Curnums then signed the dittums for Soobareddy.— On now referring to the dittum, it appears that the wards the cultivation has been relinquished is scared out.— another dittum was also delivered for that Village at the time of the Settlement, in the second dittum the names of Mooduma Kistamacharloo & Cundoola Soobareddy are entered. This Venkata Kistamacharloo is the younger brother of Streenevasa: charloo Curnum Ravanapah has caused to be written as that Streenevasacharloo having died the name of Venkata Kistamacharloo was entered. For the Lands of this and other Cummatums in the name of Cundooloo Soobareddy and for the Lands of that Cummatums of some

a true

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.—

others, the Dittum does not bear the signature of the parties.

The name of Venkata Kista 24 machariloo / who with Cundoolu Soobareddy, was entered in the 2d Dittum for fusly. 1246 which did not bear any signature / was entered in the dittum of Fusly 1247, without the name of Cundoolu Soobareddy, — who took up the cultivation in fusly 1245 and whose name was entered in the dittums of that and of fusly 1245 and who was entitled to the Profit and Loss / being entered in it, and it was signed by Vanoombarlu Venkatarama reddy— and the cause of its being so is explained in the deposition of Curnum Ravanapah— That Cundoolu Soobareddy was answerable for that dittum is evident from the Kyfeut which the Curnum had caused to be written at the time of Settlement.— In

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

25 . In the deposition given by Pulla Kistarow he stated that I considered it would not be good for me to keep cultivation in my name after I was appointed Head Sheristadar, and that he heard that I got it entered in the name of some one Pullakistarow died a short time after giving his deposition- In the deposition given by some of the others, it is stated that to make it appear that the cultivation was not mine, I caused the cultivation to be carried on through Soobareddy for three years, and afterwards through Venkataramareddy- In the deposition given by Nagunty Lutchmenarsu he stated that I having been appointed Head Sheristadar at the close of fasly 1244 I caused the name of Bandumby Streenivasachariar jointly with that of

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

of Cundoola Soobareddy to be entered in the dittum of Fasly 1245 for the reason that if the name of Streenevasachariar alone was entered, it would be known that the cummatam was mine- That being of opinion that if I got the name of Cundoola Soobareddy or that of his relative Goorama Vo. Soobareddy entered in the dittum of fasly 1247 they would have a right to claim the name of the said Venkatasiramma Chariar alone to be entered- That lest any one should complain that I have cultivation in that Village I took a kyfeut from the cummum of that Village specifying that Cundoola Soobareddy was entitled to the profit and Sist- and that the Venkatreddy Lands taken up from fasly 1246 were more in one year and less in another- It will appear that

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

that the joining of the names of a person who previously belonged to one with that of Cundavala Sambareddy is not a reason for supposing as stated by Lutchemenursoo Pantulu that I had no concern with the cultivation, if it be true that the name of Sambareddy also was entered to shew that the cultivation was not mine why would the name of Venkatakistama chariar alone be entered in fusly 1247. from this it will be observed that the reasons given by Lutchemenursoo do not agree with each other. With regard to there being an increase and decrease in the dittums, I have to observe that in each year each Ryot according to the usual practice for some reasons gives up some land or takes up new land for cultivation but there does not appear any thing particular in this.

The

1885

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

26. The dittums for fusly 1247 was formed by the said Chabacks Runnundarow and sent to the Huzzaur in the Settlement Chitta also the name of Venkatakistamma Chariar alone is entered. After the Chitta was written, on referring to the Thist form, or Statement of assessment, it was observed that the name of Cundavala Sambareddy as the cultivation of that Cummatum was not entered, and that the name of the former Cummatundar Venkata kistamma chariar alone was entered in the Cummums being enquired regarding this circumstance they stated that that name was entered by mistake, that the Cummatum belongs to Cundavala Sambareddy and gave a Kypeut in writing which was at the same

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

same time attached to the Statement of assessment. That the Moodumbeevanoo had relinquished the dittum land which it was in their names, and that Cunnadala Soobareddy took up the cultivation, has been entered in the dittum accounts of two years with remarks and Soobareddy's name is entered, but as by some mistake the Tahsildar had entered the name of Moodumbee Venkata Kistanwachurlos alone in the dittum of fusly 1247, that cannot be considered as a reason for supposing that I had caused that to be done, with the intention of depriving the said Soobareddy of his right. C. Annundarow who had formed that dittum has not stated in his deposition that I had told him to alter the names in the dittum. If I had caused

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

caused Venkatakistanwachurlos name to be entered, under the idea that I would thereby have a right to the Cummatum and caused that of Soobareddy to be taken out, there would have been no occasion for me to object to the alteration of the names in the Statement of assessment which was prepared at the time of Settlement, to make due enquiry regarding it and to take a Kyfeut and put it on public record. if it be said that I took this meeting lest any one would complain that the cultivation was mine, why could I not have taken this into consideration when the name was first entered in the dittum. Some of those above mentioned Viz. Pullay Kistarain &c. stated in the depositions given by them that after

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

after I had been appointed Head Sherestadar I considered that I should not retain the Cummanums and therefore took out those names and caused other names to be entered if this be true, and that I intended to deceive you, how could it have been practicable for me to retain the name of the person who was formerly said to have belonged to me, for the Coolcan Cummanum.— From this alone it will appear that this reason which is mentioned by them is not true— But there is a reason for the name of Venkatasa Kistamacharloo also being entered in the Dittums of the Accounts— as my cattle grazed on the Bodoo Lands of that Cummanum and the Garden is also included with the Land of that Cummanum, and as I paid the assessment of the Garden and the Poollary tax on account of the Cummanum, it must be considered that

Comp. S. R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

that the Curnams entered his name on that account. I consider this explanation sufficient, with regard to what the others abovementioned had deposed as about the names in the Dittums.

Poorsholum Puntooloo and

27.

Lutchemeursoo Puntooloo mentioned as above in the Margin, have stated in their depositions that their is entered in the Poollary account of fusly 1247 "Cummatum" of Moodumbee Venkata Kistamacharloo on account of Soondragherry Venkatarungum" and that the 4 cattle on account of the Ploughs of that Cummatum, and 4 cattle pr. family had been deducted, and this has been mentioned as a reason. My the cattle which co grazed on the Bedoo Lands of the Cummatum, and the cattle employed in ploughing the Land of that Cummatum are in Vesabeddy Villages counted as appertaining to that

Cummatum,

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Cummatum, and the he cattle deducted according to the number of ploughs, and for the remaining cattle Poollary is charged, and this practice generally prevails. In the two previous years also the name of the Cummatumdar was entered, from which the Ploughs were deducted and Poollary was charged on my cattle which grazes on the Beedoo Land. In forwarding the dittum account of fusly 1247, the name of Sooba=reddy was first omitted, as stated as above by me, and that of Venkata Kista=macharloo alone entered - and all the accounts had been made ready before I took the kyfeat from the Cutcherry on seeing the statement of assessment regarding the cummatum belonging to Soobareddy. In the Poollary account also the name of Venkatakistamacharloo alone was entered and my she cattle entered in the name of my elder brother's son the said Venkatarangum[illegible] it appears that ploughing cattles which

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

which he never had were deducted in his name. How this deduction came to be made Curnum Ravanapah has stated in the deposition given by him before you. In the deposition given by Goorrum Narrain reddy by the persuasion of the principal Cutcherry Servants who are my enemies as below mentioned he has decidedly stated that my ploughing cattle were not in that Village in fusly 1247. The Moonsiff of that Village and the Curnums & Vee Sabuddy Ryots of the Village also deposed that I had no ploughing cattle in that Village from fusly 1245. a deduction having been made in the Poollary account of fusly 1247 by mistake as above stated, although I had no ploughing cattle, I consider that you will be of opinion that this cannot which was mentioned as a reason for considering the cummatum as mine is not trustworthy.

you

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

28. you have appointed the ors Deputy Sheristadar and other Servants who have given depositions, to examine the Dittum accounts &c. which are received from the Talooks and the accounts which are prepared at the time of making the settlement, and it was ors made known to them that they were to see that the names &c. were not altered, It was also directed that the Goomastahs who prepare the accounts of any Village at the time of the settlement should sign those accounts as being correct. In case the Statement of assessment, Poollay account, Chittas &c. which are prepared with reference to the Dittum accounts not being regularly made out, and differ from each other the Goomastah who made them out and were appointed to examine them, are ors answerable for the same: It was not pointed out by any one that there was

x

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

a difference in this manner in the names, for the purpose of making me entitled to the Cummatum. It being ors known to the Principal Servants who have given these depositions that I ought not to have retained any cultivation after I had been appointed Head Sheristadar, and the circumstances which they ors have now invented and mentioned as proofs for their considering that I had cultivation, being known from the accounts from the beginning why did they not make these circumstances known to you when they occurred?-

29. Although many cattle which I had previously procured for the use of milk for my family had died, the few which remained being used to graze on the Beedoo land of that Cummatum and ors Soobareddy who undertook the cultivation of that land being a person who deals in young Bulls

and

and he having separate Beedoo land for his cattle, said that I could pay Poollary to the circar and graze my cattle on that Beedoo Land- that if the Bulls produced from my Cows are sold to him, he would himself pay the two servants who tend my cattle in two grain. and as he derived a profit from the sale of the young Bulls, and the grain given by him to the servants, and this proposal came from himself and as you approved of my Keeping my she cattle in that Village, I paid Poollary to the circar and caused my cattle to graze on that Beedoo land.-

30. In the deposition given by Poorsheteen Puntooloo Lutchemee-nurson Puntoolo and others they have stated that the cattle of the People who have no cultivation of their own are not allowed to graze on the Cummatum Beedoo Lands

Lands in Vesabreddy Villages, and that as my cattle grazed in the Beedoo Lands of that Cummatum, that was sufficient for supposing that the Cummatum was mine. The Inhabitants of that Village whose names are mentioned in the Margin have stated in their depositions that in the Village of Codoor and in that Cummatum the cattle of persons who have no cultivation, are grazing in some of the Cummatum Lands. In the same manner the Vesabuddy Ryots in many Villages receive the cattle of other people who do not reside in the Village, settle for the Poollary and allow them to graze in Vesabuddy Beedoo Land. this is generally and publickly done. There are many instances of this, and it is known to many persons. I have stated in the preceding

1. Tulpur Ranamapah-
2. Maramreddy Sooba-reddy.
3. Vellapollem Venkatareddy.
4. Annareddy Seetaramreddy.
5. Gundavatem Paupareddy.
6. Goodoor Vencatramareddy.

preceding para the circumstance of my
the cattle grazing in that Village.-
Pl.-

Goorumu Narrainreddy, the
sister's son of the above said Soobareddy
stated in his deposition, that the Cul-
-tivation which is stated to be mine
was jointly cultivated with his
cultivation, that I had Bullocks &c.,
in fusliees 1245 and 1246 to carry on the
cultivation, that not having Bullocks
in fusly 1247 and having suffered a
loss in Cultivation I gave up that
Cummutum. In the deposition given
by Soobareddy he stated decidedly that
from the time he took up that cultiva-
-tion in fusly 1245 my Bullocks or Servants
were not there. that he caused the
cultivation to be carried on with his Bullocks.
The Head Cauroe, Curnums &c. of Vaduddy
Ryots whom you examined in my presence
have stated in their depositions &c.
that there was no cultivation what-
ever on my account, that my plough-
cattle

cattle and servants are not in that Vil-
-lage, and that in the three years that
Soobareddy cultivated the Lands, he cul-
-tivated them with his own Bullocks.
It appears decidedly from the depo-
-sition of Vanumbauka Venkataram-
-reddy also that there were no ploughing
cattle of mine. Natatoory Vurdacharloo
who is the principal among those
who state falsehoods, has stated
in his deposition that I had no co
ploughing cattle in that Village. It
is stated in the Poollary account of
fusly 1245, that the ploughing cattle
deducted on account of that Cummutum
were Soobareddy's cattle. The said Narrainreddy
also had admitted that in the years in
which he cultivated that Land he was
entitled to the madepaulee share of the
produce. if the ploughing Bul-
-locks were mine, and as stated
by Narrainreddy and by Vurdacharloo
that the servants were on my account,
there

there would be no occasion for the Ma=
=depauloo to go to Narrain reddy. Vurda=
=charloo stated that the ploughs of other
Ryots were employed to plough that Land
if this were true there would be no
occasion for servants on my account.
By Narrainreddy stating that he is en=
entitled to Madepauloo, the assertion
of these persons, Viz.t that I had Bullocks
and Servants and of Vurdacharloo that
the Ploughs of other Ryots used to come
and plough the Land of that Cummatum
are shewn to be false. How could en=
those who receives Mandepauloo suffer
loss by my not having Bullocks. -
From this it will be observed that
Narrainreddy did not tell the truth
regarding these Circumstances.
92. Gorum Narrainreddy
stated that the resources from the
Coroo share was not sufficient to
discharge the Circar shist, that the
deficiency of the shist payable
by them was written down as a
Balance

Balance due by me arising from loss- en=
yerragoodepauty Narsiah deposed that he
heard that the Villagers paid the shist
of that Cummatum from fasly 1245
to 1247- but that he does not know who
told him so- The Villagers in the depo=
=sitions given by them before you en=
stated that they did not do so- In
the deposition given by Vurdacharloo
he stated that the Balance which re=
=mained due after paying what en=
was derived from the resources of
that cultivation was taken from the
amount paid in by the Ryots of the
Village and credited on account of
that Balance- Cundoola Soobareddy and
Gorum Narrain reddy stated that
they having suffered a loss, they relin=
=quished that Cummatum- If the en=
cattle of other Ryots came and ploughed
my Cummatum, and if the amount
paid in by other Ryots was taken on
account of the balance of that Cumm=
=matum, as stated by Vurdacharloo,
if the Villagers paid the assessment
thereof as stated by Narsiah, the en=
statement

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.-

Statement of Cuttrekistarow, Bauroo & Baburow and Chabuck Annundarow that Soobareddy told them that he suffered a loss on the Cummatum, cannot be true- and there can be no occasion for them to relinquish it. For all these reasons, it will appear that Narsiah and Kurdacharloo invented and stated falsehoods- Goondlapully Chittumbaram stated in his deposition that the thirty Rupees which were due to the Circar by Mancheredy Venkooreddy and paid in by him, were credited on account of the Shist of the Garden for fusly 1245. and that the assessment of that fusly stands as a Balance against that Ryot. He has also stated some falsehoods which did not occur. The Shist of the Garden for that fusly did not amount to so much- If the amount paid in by Venkooreddy had been credited on account of the assessment of my Garden, there ought to be a balance due by that

individual

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

individual to the Circar, but in the account of the balances due by individuals of that Village for that fusly transmitted by the Tahsildar, he has stated that there is no balance due by Venkareddy. Cundoola Soobareddy stated in his deposition that he paid the assessment of that Garden for that fusly on my account, and Curnum Ravanapah and Moonsiff Soobareddy &c. stated in their depositions that the said Soobareddy did pay the same- From the receipt delivered to me by Soobareddy it appears that he paid the amount on my account- No Ryots have complained that the amount paid in by them has been credited to my account- From this it will be observed that Chittumbarum had stated falsehoods-

Goorrum Narrainreddy

33.

stated that Soobareddy told him that he derived a profit of 1,000 Rupees annually from other items thro my means and that he gave away to me

or

or 8 months after he had relinquished the Cummatum, the account which was between me and Soobareddy shewing a balance of 5 or 600 Rupees on account of losses sustained in the Cummatum, without receiving the amount from me. If such an amount was due, and if it were true that he derived from me such a profit as to induce him to give up that account for nothing there would be no occasion for him to relinquish the Cummatum on account of loss, nor would there be any occasion for him to tell Puttee Kistarow Yeu that he suffered loss from that Cummatum. If what Narrain=reddy has stated is true, the State=ment of Kistarow, Baiboorow Yeu that there was enmity between me and Soobareddy must be considered as untrue.

34. Baibarow stated in his deposition that Soobareddy told him that

that the grain produced from that Cummatum was sent to me. but as Soobareddy has deposed before you that he did not send the grain produced from that Cummatum to me, it must be considered by you what truth there is in Baiboorow's state=ment, Viz. that Soobbareddy told him that the grain produced from that Cummatum was sent to me.

Vanumbauka Venkataramareddy

35. deposed that I desired him to cultivate the Lands of that Cummatum, that I promised to make good to him the loss and that there are no documents in regard to this. In the dittum of Fusly 1248 it is stated that Vanumbauka Venkataramareddy took up for the current year, the Cummatum of Moodumbee Venkatakistamacharloo and the same is written in the Chitta. The name of the said Venkatakistamacharloo alone having been entered in the dittum

of

of fasly 1247 the fasly previous to 1248 — in which Soobareddy the person who first took the Cummatum had relinquished it without his name having also been entered, that — was I think the reason for its being — stated in the dittum of fasly 1248, that Venkataramareddy took for the Current year, the Cummatum of Venkatakistama- -charloo. There was no compulsion — on the part of the Circar that I should hold this Cultivation and while it was so, what occasion was there for me to get this Cummatum Cultivated and to make up the loss to my injury as sta- -ted by Venkataramareddy and Narrainreddy. If you consider well this circumstance which has been stated by them it will appear that Venkataramareddy who took up thes Cultivation as his — own, has now stated untruths in — this manner from the persuasion of others. In the deposition which he gave before

before the Commissioner on oath, he stated that Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated the Cummatum in Codoor for three years, and that after he (Soobareddy) relin- -quished it, he, Venkataramreddy cultivate- -ed it for fasly 1248 - but he did not — state as he has now done that there was any promise to pay the loss. In the — deposition given by Carem Pedda Soobiah before you he stated decidedly that — Venkataramareddy sent Anjee people — for fasly 1248. In a deposition given — before you, he, Venkatramareddy, to make it appear that it was my Cummatum, stated that he did not send Anjee people — you will observe that there is as much truth in this as in what he had stated differing from his deposition before the Commissioner, Viz^t., that I promised to make good the loss to him —

This Venkataramareddy

30.

was first called with all the others in the month of March as he did not

at

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

of fasly 1247 the fasly previous to 1248 in which Soobareddy the person who first took the Cummatum had relinquished it without his name having also been entered, that was I think the reason for its being stated in the dittum of fasly 1248, that Vencataramareddy took for the Current year, the Cummatum of Vencatakistama-charloo. There was no compulsion on the part of the Circar that I should hold this Cultivation and while it was so, what occasion was there for me to get this Cummatum Cultivated and to make up the loss to my injury as stated by Vencataramareddy and Narrainreddy If you consider well this circumstance which has been stated by them it will appear that Vencataramareddy who took up thes Cultivation as his own, has now stated untruths in this manner from the persuasion of others. In the deposition which he gave

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

before the Commissioner on oath, he stated that Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated the Cummatum in Codoor for three years, and that after he (Soobareddy) relinquished it, he, Vencataramareddy cultivated it for fasly 1248. but he did not state as he has now done that there was any promise to pay the loss. In the deposition given by Carem Pedda Soobiah before you he stated decidedly that Vencataramareddy sent Anjee people for fasly 1248. In a deposition given before you, he, Vencatramareddy to make it appear that it was my Cummatum, stated that he did not send Anjee people. you will observe that there is as much truth in this as in what he had stated differing from his deposition before the Commissioner, Viz^t. that I promised to make good the loss to him.

This Vencataramareddy was first called with all the others in the month of March as he did not at

36.

of fasly 1247 the fasly previous to 1248 — in which Soobareddy the person who first took the Cummatum had relinquished it without his name having also been entered, that — was I think the reason for its being — stated in the dittum of fasly 1248. that Vencataramareddy took for the Current year the Cummatum of Vencatakistama — charlo. There was no compulsion — on the part of the Circar that I should hold this Cultivation and while it was so, what occasion was there for me to get this Cummatum Cultivated and to make up the loss to my injury as sta — ted by Vencataramareddy and Narrainreddy. If you consider well this circumstance which has been stated by them it will appear that Vencataramareddy who took up this Cultivation as his — own, has now stated untruths in — this manner from the persuasion of others. In the deposition which he gave before

before the Commissioner on oath he stated that Cundoola Soobareddy cultivated the Cummatum in Codoor for three years, and that after he (Soobareddy) relin — quished it, he, Vencataramareddy cultivate — ed it for fasly 1248. but he did not — state as he has now done that there was any promise to pay the loss. In the — deposition given by Carem Pedda Soobiah before you he stated decidedly that — Vencataramareddy sent Amjee people — for fasly 1248. In a deposition given before you, he, Vencatramareddy, to make it appear that it was my Cummatum, stated that he did not send Amjee people — you will observe that there is as much truth in this as in what he had stated differing from his deposition before the Commissioner, Viz:, that I promised to make good the loss to him.

36. This Vencataramareddy was first called with all the others in the month of March as he did not

at

at first agree according to the persuasion of my enemies to depose in the manner he has now done, he was placed under restraint for some time and persuaded and it appears that he has given his deposition before you according to their persuasion This circumstance is known to many persons. He was now obliged to state with reference to what he had formerly deposed, but he did not tell the truth. If it were true, as stated by Vencutramareddy, that I told him that I would be answerable for the profit and Loss of this Cummatum, he ought to have kept with him people belonging to me when he kyled the produce of fusly 1248 and the Cauros produce of fusly 1249 which he has taken away and to deliver the account thereof to me, there was nothing as stated by him to prevent him, or persons on his part to make this circumstance known to my

my people. if it were true that the loss and profit of this Cultivation was mine, he ought when the Circar demanded for the Shist of this Cultivation to have presented an arzee to the Circar mentioning that I was liable for the profit or loss, and that I must pay the Shist when the Circar would have received the money from me, but this did not only not take place but the Curnum and Moonsiff &c. of that Village have deposed that Vencutramareddy enjoyed the profit and loss of this Cummatum from fusly 1248. And when the dittums of fusly 1249 were formed if the Cummatum were mine he ought to have told me before he got the dittum for this Cummatum entered in his name, but it does not appear that he informed me. and having done every thing in the same manner as he would have done were he answerable for the Profit and Loss, it will be observed that he by the persuasion of some persons invented and stated that there were no one present when I told him that

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

that I would be answerable for the Profit and Loss.-

37. Corem Pedda Soobiah stated in his deposition that when Baur Sasheegerry row was Tahsildar in fusly 1245 the Channel was repaired, and that as that was my Cummatum no Amjee people came in fusies 1246 & 1247. In the depositions given by Cundoola Soobareddy Curnum Ravanapah, and the Village Moonsiff Mauremreddy Soobba-reddy they stated certain reasons for Amjee people on the part of Soobareddy not having come for fusies 1246 and 1247. If, as stated by Soobiah the Amjee people did not come in those fusies for the reason that the Cummatum was mine, how is it that there was not the same reasons for fusies 1245 and 1248. he having stated that Veneataramreddy who cultivated that Cummatum had sent Amjee people for fusly 1248 and having also admitted that Amjee work was done in Fusly 1245 also. If the Amjee people did not attend, it was the Tahsildars duty

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

duty to take care that they did. It is plain that Soobareddy did Amjee work in fusly 1245 the year in which Soobareddy agreed before the Tahsildar to the dittum of that fusly if Amjee people did not attend for the reason that the Cummatum was mine, what occasion was there for keeping an account of the number of days the Amjees did not attend. There would be no occasion also to take from the Village Collections the 30 Rupees being the fine on account of the non attendance of the Amjees and to write it against the Cummatum of Goorrum Vobbooreddy which is the Cummatum of Soobareddy. If Soobareddy were not answerable for the amount of this fine, there would have been no occasion to write it down as due against his Cummatum, therefore it will be observed that the reason mentioned by Coreem Peddah Soobiah is not true-

38. Yerragoodapaudy Nursiah stated in his deposition that he understood that

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

that I ought to pay the Balance of Fusly 1247 which is in the name of Kistamachariu In the Charge against me it is also stated that I had allowed Balances to remain against me. The balances against that Cummatum previous to fusly 1244 when it was under me and the Balance due from fusly 1245 after Soobareddy took up the Cultivation till fusly 1247, as stated by Curnum Ra- -vanapah is mentioned in the margin Rowanapah deposed that the Balance of fusly 1240 from Sooktee was Rupees 1,200 That Mr. Whish made an enquiry in regard to this Balance and did not collect the Amount as it ought to be remitted. That fusly 1242 was a year of famine. That the Circar have sold some grain on account of the Balance due against this Cummatum for that fusly, this Amoun remained due that there was some Natcheny in store in the Village on account of the balance that the then Tahsildar stated that the balance should be postponed. That the Balance of fusly 1244 was on account of Garden which rem- -ed uncultivated and on account of

Fusly 1240-65-15-10.
1241—"—"—"—.
1242—16—13-3.
1243—"—13-3.
1244—9—14—.
After Cundoola Soobareddy took the Cultivation.
Fusly 1247—46—14-1.

Roosoons

C.P. S.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Roosoons and that previous to fusly 1240 there were small balances in some fusliesand as these also were not just balances, they were not realiz- -ed. I was not employed in this Division till some time after the commencement of fusly 1246. I was employed in the Sub Division from some time in fusly 1239 till some time after the com- -mencement of fusly 1246, previous to that I was for a long time in the Zillah Court, therefore there could not have been any complaisance in re- -gard to me. Those balances remained uncollected with reference to the orders of the Gentle- -man of that period, as it was not just to col- -lect them but not for any other reason. I told the Inhabitants of that Village very often af- -ter I had been appointed Head Sherishtadar, that if there were any small balances which ought justly to be collected, they should de- -mand it from me, and Curnum Ravana- -pah admitted before you that I did tell so. as you for certain resons had the accounts of that Village brought to the Hoozoor and did not give them to the Curnums any small Balances which ought to have been collected, have for that reason remained uncollected, but they are not balances which I had kept

kept outstanding with the deceitful intention of
not paying them- The said Amount of Rupees
46 and odd appears due for fusly 1247- in that
fusly from Soobbareddy not having got his fee
work done, the fine of 30 Rupees on that account
was at first charged as a Balance on his old Cum-
=mutum, and afterwards charged to this Cummutum,
but if the payments and Balance on that account
of the Cummutum is seen, the correct Balance on ac-
=count of his Putta will only be Rupees 16 and odd.

39- With regard to the balance of Rupees
46 and odd charged against this Cummutum, Yerra-
=goodi paulty Narsiah has stated that it was caused
to be written that Venkatakistamacharloo the
man belonging to me and whose name was join-
=ed with that of Soobbareddy had absconded but
when Vanumbauka Venkataramareddy took up
that Cultivation in fusly 1248. it was not so written
in the Dittum accounts- As Soobareddy's name
was not entered in the Dittum and Chittah Vea
accounts of fusly 1247 and as he had relin-
=quished the Cummutum in fusly 1248. if Venka-
=takistamacharloo had been entered in this
incorrect account as having absconded, it
must be that it was so caused to be written under
the

the idea that Soobareddy would escape being made
answerable for that balance, but the account
was not written after making an enquiry and
therefore that account has been sent to be examined
again, and as Soobareddy who is answerable for that
Balance is present, it was the fault of Narsiah who
wrote and brought the account stating that the
man belonging to me, (whose name was retained
in the Accounts by the Curnums on account of the
Poollary, and the shist of the Garden) had absconded
=ed but not the fault of any other.-

40- For all these reasons, as stated by me, I
have no cultivation in that Village nor any agricul-
=tural Servants- I did not as stated by some of the
servants &c. who have given these depositions ap-
=point either Cundoola Soobareddy or Vanumbau-
=ka Venkataramreddy to manage the cultivation,
nor Cundoola Soobareddy to advance money on account
of the Cultivation as he ought to pay the Pool-
=lary tax of my she cattle which graze in
that Cummutum and the Assessment on
my garden which is in the same Cum-
=mutum, with the Amount payable by him to
the Circar for the said Cummutum, and as the ser-
=vants who tend my cattle reside in that Village, and were

said

Port St. George 21th December 1810

paid there, he used to take some of the young Bulls which are produced from my Cows and pay those charges this was done on account of his own ad=
=vantage but I did not keep him under me and carry on any dealings thro his means - This Sooba=
=reddy like others is Head Caupoo of the Village in which he resides, but is not the Head Caupoo of Codoor -

41 Chabuck Aurundarow stated that -
I owed this Soobareddy 1000 Rs. that I settled it at Indookoorpetta - and that Soobareddy informed him of this - Goorrum Narrainreddy stated that his fa=
=ther in law Soobareddy gave away to me for me=
=thing the account exhibiting a balance of 500 Rupees due to Soobareddy on account of the loss in the Cultivation you must take into con=
=sideration the difference between the Statements of these two persons, and who spoke the truth -
In the depositions given by Soobareddy twice, he stated that there was no other dealing between him and me, that he used to pay the Assessment of the Garden, the Poollary tax on the Cattle & the Wages of the Servants employed on the Cattle that this Amounted to 300 Rupees that after settling for the young Bulls which he received in the respective years there was Balance of 7 Rs and odd, and that he had also given receipts for Moreover he

stated

Port St. George 21th December 1810

stated decidedly in the deposition taken before you in my presence, that he paid the Poollary &c. in the respective years in which he received the young Bulls, but did not as mentioned in the charge make ad=
=vances on my account for three years and at last take young Bulls -

42 The abovementioned Narrainreddy admitted that the young Bulls were received, but has stated most falsely, that their value, which was given to Soobareddy for the money advanced by him for Poollary &c. on my account was taken in liquidation of the value of 10 Pootties of Grain which my elder brother Streeneva sparow borrowed from Soobareddy on account of the Codoor Cultivation, 8 or 10 years ago, when he was Tahsildar of the Nel=
=lore talook. This Soobareddy & Streeneeva sparow could never agree - this was admitted by Sooba=
=reddy - Streeneva sparow was not a person a=
who borrowed in this manner from any one and there was no occasion for him at that time to contract loans on account of the Codoor Cultiva=
=tion Soobareddy who is stated by Narrainreddy to have given the Paddy as a loan, has stated de=
=cidedly before you that he did not give the Grain Rowanapah the Curnum of that Village, the Moonsiff

Soobareddy

Soobareddy Vea stated in the depositions given by them, that Soobareddy used to receive young Bulls on account of the assessment of the Garden Vea and this is admitted by Soobareddy as it is true that young Bulls were received, it will be observed that Narrainreddy, to conceal his false statement invented and stated falsely that the my brother received 10 Pootties of Grain and that the value of the young Bulls was taken in liquida= =tion of the same.

43. In the deposition given by Narrain= =reddy he stated that according to a Tanaka of Soobareddy 7 Potties and odd of Grain were sent, as he recollects in charge of a Peon named Chenchoo as a present, on account of a marriage in my family. In the deposition given by Soobar= =reddy he stated that he did not give a Tanda= =ka and that he never sent any grain. Muddaly Ramanah who is stated by Narrainreddy to have taken a receipt and to measure the grain, stated in his deposition that he did not measure out the grain nor take a receipt that 20 days ago this Narrainreddy, Curnum Sectaramoodoo and a Peon whose name he does not know brought a receipt to him and forced him to sign it, but his father

in law Sanumpoody Soobannah did not consent to his signing a receipt about which he knew nothing and that he did not sign it as it was a circum= =stance about which he did not know any thing. Soobannah stated to the same effect as Ramanah Narrainreddy and Soobareddy state that there was a family dispute between them and that they lately separated. As Narrainreddy does not agree with Soobareddy, my enemies gained him over, fabricat= =ed a receipt and caused him to state in this manner. Soobareddy having stated that he did not write a Tanaka or give grain, it will be ob= =served by the depositions given by Ramanah and Soobanah, that they have caused Narrain= =reddy to state falsehoods, in order that that= might correspond with the deposition previ= =ously given before you, and that they also pro= =cured some witnesses.

44. The witnesses on my part who have been examined before you in my presence, and who are residents of that Village have stated de= =cidedly that there were no ploughing Cattle or servants which are principally required in cultivation belonging to me from fusly 1265. that Soobareddy was entitled to the profit and loss and took up the cultivation and

and carried it on with his Cattle till fusly 1217 and that he paid the Shist, that Vencataramareddy took up the Cultivation in fusly 1218 and carried it on himself and Sookareddy who took up the cultivation and carried it on himself stated that the profit and loss were his, that he conducted the cultivation with his cattle and servants, that there were no ploughing Bullocks or agricultural servants belonging to me, and the said Sookareddy and his son in law Narrainreddy who is now at variance with him have stated that they relingueished the Cummatum as they suffered a loss and Puttree Kistarow Aunundarow Yea have stated that they heard them say so - It appearing from the Statement of so many persons that there was no profit to be derived from this Cummatum, it is for you to consider whether I would as stated by Vencataramareddy and Narrainreddy keep such cultivation agreeing to pay even the loss and incur your displeasure - If these facts are fully taken into consideration it will, I trust, appear that I did not act deceitfully towards you, that my enemies in order to make you be displeased, intrigued and invented in this manner against me, but that it is not true and that not wishing for any profit, and

and keeping an eye on your favor, I had acted correctly, and that I am innocent -

With respect to the Statement that

Reddipollum 15

I have Cummatum in Reddipollum in the Talamunchey Talook, I have to explain that when you were Head Assistant Collector of this District in fusly 1231 that is in the year 1821, I commenced Cultivation - Afterwards during the Puttient Settlement in fusly 1232 when the Talamunchey Talook was under your management, you gave a sole kayam Puttah in the name of Nackalapullay Vencatanarasoo, my Sister's son - From that time till fusly 1245, the Cummatum of that Village was in the name of Vencatanarasoo - The Cultivation in Reddypollem was given up in Fusly 1246 as I had reported to you without having any concern in it - but I did not retain it, as mentioned in the charge - From Fusly 1246 the year in which I had relinquished the Cultivation of that Village, I did not retain Jareeb Cultivation of any description - Nor was Narrainreddy the younger brother of Moolamoody Veerareddy who took up the dittum of that Land, at any time employed as my agent to oversee that Cultivation - Nor did he manage the Cultivation of -

of Reddipollem Cummatum on my part the dittum being in the name of his elder brother Veerareddy, he became entitled to the Profit and loss, and took up the cultivation, but I did not use any endeavours to deceive you and retain the enjoyment of the produce of that cultivation by entering his name merely to say that the Cultivation was not mine.-

46- From the reasons I shall state below, it will appear clear that the persons who reported to you, that the cultivation was retained for me under a fictitious name, in order to excite your anger against me, had concealed the fact which had taken place, that injury may happen to me and have stated in that manner upon purpose and that I have not the Cultivation of that Village as I had represented to you.-

47- Mooloomoody Narrainreddy resides in Cherlopollem which is very near to Reddypollem. The lands of Cherlopollem which he cultivates and the lands of Reddypollem are adjoining- on my relinquishing that Cummatum, the Sabsildar of the Palock made it over to Narrainreddy and got the dittum made out for fusly 1246 in the name of his elder brother the said Veeareddy with whom he lives as one family-

48- Mooloomoody Narrainreddy one

of the persons of those who had been examined in regard to this cultivation in my presence and who took up this Cultivation stated in his deposition, that the Cummatum Land which was in the name of Nuckalapully Venkatanarasoo in Reddypollem having been relinquished by him in fusly 1246 Rubaula to Setchmenursoo the then Sabsildar of the Palock informed him 2 or 3 times that he should take up the lands of that Cummatum, that he agreed to it and got the dittum for it made out in the name of his elder brother Veerareddy, that from fusly 1246 he became entitled to the Profit and Loss and was paying the Shist thereof to the Circar and was enjoying the produce, that I have no cultivation even as an under cultivator, or any concern with the Profit and Loss and that the Ploughing Cattle &c. of that Cummatum were purchased by him- In the deposition given by Desaraiapa the Curnum of that Village, he stated that after Nuckalapully Venkatanarasoo relinquished that Cummatum

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Cummatum, Narrainreddy took it up, from fusly 1216, became entitled to the Profit and Loss, and got the Pattum for it entered in the name of his elder brother Veera-reddy and that he cultivated the lands himself, that I have not any concern in it, and that Narrainreddy purchased the Ploughing Cattle Yea of that Cummatum. Goonoopauty Ramareddy stated in his deposition that the Cummatum which belonged to me in that Village was relinquished four years ago, that from that time Mooloomoody Narrainreddy took it up, got the Pattum made out in the name of his elder brother Veerareddy, and became entitled to the Profit and Loss and Cultivated the Lands and is enjoying the produce himself, and that I am not concerned in any description of Cultivation.

49 In an Arjee which appears to have been written by Curamaraingi Curnum of Kodamalee

and

Comp. S.R.

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

and who is an enemy to me since a long time, it is stated that the then Tahsildar excluded from the accounts in fusly 1248 Eight Goortoos of Land, the Sheist of which was 150 Rupees. that in each year Land of the value 100 Rupees, is reduced. that he gave a deposition to this effect before Yerragood deputy Sarsiah. It appears from the Arjee written by him that Gotoor Venkataramaniah the 2d Assistant Sheristadar was sent to measure that Land and to receive proof of the Circumstance mentioned in that Arjee. he also stated that upon measurement some excess was found. as my Cummatum was relinquished from fusly 1246. Narrainreddy alone is answerable whether there be an excess or a deficiency in those Lands. In the time of the former Collectors also it was usual to measure the Lands of Reddipollam in each year in like manner with other Villages, and if there be any excess found, to add it to the Circar account. From fusly 1246. when I

I had relinquished the Cultivation, I did not enjoy any thing from it, and there could therefore be no occasion for me to tell the Tahsildar to make a reduction in the Lands. It has been understood that the said Narrainreddy presented an arjee Complaining that the measurement made upon the arjee of Paramrauze was not correct, and that the Servants of the Tahsk Remeasured the Lands according to your orders, when it appeared that the measurement made upon Paramrauzes arjee was not correct.

50. The said Paramrauze is Curnum of Codavalore, some persons having Complained that he made an embezzlement from the Village Collections and committed some irregularities, I brought that circumstance under enquiry when most part was proved, and therefore he bears enmity against me. as you were angry with me, the Servants who gave depositions to injure me, and the people who wish to injure me Collected

all

all those who are at enmity with me and persuaded them to present false arjees, and take Kyfeuts themselves from them; and this has therefore been the reason for believing that all the falsehood stated against me to be true. Moreover the said Paramrauze gave false evidence against me before the Commissioner.

51 It appears that when the subject of the Complaint made by Peramrauze was enquired into, Venkata-ramaniah got some accounts brought from the Curnums house. It is stated in the arjee written by Venkataramaniah, that although the Pottah for fusly 1246 was in the name of Vearreddy, the Cultivation &c was on account of Venkata-nursoo, that Narrainreddy advanced money for the Cultivation of 1246 fusly and the account was settled after the produce was reaped. In the accounts brought by Venkataramaniah, it is not only stated that in fusly 1246 the ploughing Cattle of Venkatanursoo, the seed Paddy which was

was stored in that Village and the grain kept for the wages of the Servants were purchased by Narrainreddy and the account settled, but that Narrainreddy paid the Shist Vc for that fusly. The Curnum Audenarrainapah and Narrainreddy deposed before you that the Cultivation for that fusly was Narrainreddy's and that Narrainreddy purchased the Ploughing Cattle Vc. In the deposition given by Bully Kistarow and some others it is stated that Narrainreddy advanced Money for the Cultivation of the Cummatum of this Village. The Curnum of that Village having been examined before you in regard to this, he stated that Narrainreddy and his relation the deceased Pauperedy used to contract for grain in the Villages on that side and to purchase it for resale, on which account he purchases upon contract the grain produced in Reddipolleu whenever he required it, and pays Money for it.

52 It is Stated in the Charge that

that I still have jareeb Cultivation in that Village and that I cannot dispute in an account which is stated to have been brought from the Curnum it being written that the Shist of a jareeb Garden for fusbies 1246 & 1247 must be paid by me, you might have Considered that I still have that Cultivation. During the time that I held Cultivation in that Village I made a small Cocoanut and Plantain Garden when I relinquished the Cummatum in that Village I did not retain any jareeb land for my use. In the deposition given by Narrainreddy he stated that the jareeb was under him, and that I do not enjoy any part of it or did not retain the jareeb Land for myself. Audenarrainapah the person who wrote the account stated in his deposition that without ascertaining from Narrainreddy he first wrote the account in that manner, that he afterwards understood the particulars from Narrainreddy, that from fusly 1246, I neither enjoyed the jareeb produce or paid the

the Shist and that Narrainreddy enjoyed the produce and paid the Shist. As this account was not regularly written in the respective fusles, and as the said Curnum admitted that the account above mentioned was not Correct. it will be clear that this account is not a fit document for Considering that Shave jareeb Cultivation.

33 In the deposition given by Baur Bauboorow it is stated that the Lands of Reddipollam are Cultivated with my own Sloughs. that Narrainreddy sends me 5 Bottles of Grain monthly for the expences of my Household, from the produce of that Cultivation, that the he Cattle were not sold, and that Narrainreddy pays the Shist of that Cunnuatum and receives the amount from me. In the deposition given by Yenagoodepauty Nursiah he stated that he heard from many persons that the old Cultivation which Shad in Reddypollam is still Continued by me but in the name of another person. In the deposition of Chabuck

Sumundarow

Sumundarow it is stated that he heard that after I was appointed Sheristadar, the dittum for the Cultivation which Shad in Reddy= pollam was made in the name of Mooloomoody Narrainreddy and that he does not know what engagements there are between us both. In the deposition given by Satiuty Lutchmenurso it is stated that the dittum for the Cultivation of Reddypollam for fusly 1246 was made out in the name of Mooloomoody Nerareddy the son of the brother of Mooloomoody Narrainreddy, and that it appears that I enjoy the Profit and Loss thereof. In the deposition of Boorshotum Puntalo it is stated that the Cunnuatum which Shad formerly in that Village was entered in the dittum of fusly 1246 in the name of Mooloomoody Nerareddy, and that Shave a Cocoanut & Plantain Garden in that Village. In the deposition of Bully Ristarow it is stated that after I was appointed Head Sheristadar as it would not be proper if that Cultivation was in my name, I Caused it

to

to be entered in the name of Verareddy.
What these persons have stated do not only
not agree, but it does not appear that they
have stated this Circumstance from their
own Knowledge - it decidedly appears that
they invented and caused their depositions
to be written as they pleased, because
it appears decidedly from the accounts
which the 2d Assistant Sheristadar Gotoor
Vencataramaniah brought from the house
of the Curnum of that Village, that the
ploughing Cattle Vs. had been sold to
Narrainreddy in Fusly 1246. Ramereddy who
Cultivates in that Cumnatum stated that
I had no Concern of any kind in it after
I had relinquished the Cultivation. The
Curnum of the Village and Narrainreddy
who took up that Cultivation have stated
that the he Cattle were sold to Narrain-
-reddy and that I had no Cultivation
from Fusly 1246 when I relinquished it.
in the arjee also written by the said
Vencataramaniah he, from some mis-
-take, Considered that I was Concerned
in

in the Cultivation for Fusly 1246. but stated
that from Fusly 1247. I had no Concern in
it. It is therefore for you to Consider
what truth there is in the assertion of
Banbarow who stated that I carried on
Cultivation with my own ploughs, that
the grain produced from that Cummatum
is sent to my house in each Month - and
in the assertion of the others that I
still have Cultivation. In the Charge
also you have shown that I had no
Cultivation from Fusly 1247 - In the
Deposition given by Pully Ristarow he
stated that Narrainreddy used to
tell him that I enjoy the produce of
the Cocanut and Plaintain Garden
which is in that Village, that he
does not know that I had sold the
ploughing Cattle to Narrainreddy, that
owing to the friendships that is between
me and Narrainreddy he will not state
things put upon oath, that the Cattle
were not sold to him. What truth Can
there be in the assertion of Pallay Ristarow,
who

who upon the alleged Statement that Narrain-
-reddy told him that I enjoyed the produce
of the Cocoanut and Plantain Garden, has
stated that I enjoyed the produce of the
Cultivation - The Circumstance of the Cattle
having been sold after I had relinquished
the Cultivation being known to Pullay
Ristarow was the reason for his stating that
owing to the friendship that is between me
and Narrainreddy, he Narrainreddy tho' put
upon oath and questioned about the sale of
the Cattle will not declare the truth -
Sutchenenursoo also stated that Narrain-
-reddy is Concerned in my private affairs,
and you will observe that they have stated
in this manner to support their false
assertions - I did not retain either the
Cocoanut or plantain Garden in that Village
if I had any wish to do so, I was aware that
there would be no objection to your permitting
me to do so, in like manner, as all other
Servants have been permitted - That
Narrainreddy is not Concerned in my private affairs
nor is there any occasion for him to state a

false

falsehoods upon oath to -
Naputty Sutchenenursoo Stated
54
in his deposition that the Maunium of the
Head Caupoo in that Village being Continued
in the name of Maunsing I can have
no ground for saying that that Cultivation
was not mine - It is for you alone to
Consider how it can be said that I
had Cultivation, merely from the
Maunium being Continued in the
name of Maunsing. Sutchenenursoo puntulu
stated that at first one Mootiaboo Su-
-perintended my Cultivation in that
Village, and afterwards Maunsing
Pullay. Ristarow stated in his deposition
that the Head man for that Cultivation
was Maunsing who belonged to me, a
that the Cultivation which he caused to
be Conducted was mine, and that every
one knew this, he however admitted
that Maunsing was not in that Village
but did not say from what time he
was not in the Village. Audenarraina-
-pah the Curnum of that Village, and

Malawady

Mooloomoody Narrainreddy who Cultivates the Land, stated in their depositions that Maunsing remained till the harvest of Fusly 1246 was over, that he did not remain in the Village afterwards, but proceeded to Madras with his family where he still resides with his family. that before I relinquished the Cummatum the man who superintended the Cultivation on my part was Goonoopanty Soobareddy While it appears from this that Maunsing was in that Village till the harvest of Fusly 1246 was over, the year in which the Cummatum had been given up, and that he was not there afterwards, and that there was another person who superintended the Cultivation, and that Shas no Cummatum in that Village as abovementioned it will be evident to you what truth there is in the assertion of Pullay Pistarow that it is "known to every one that the Cummatum superintended by Maunsing is mine," and the assertion of Lutchmenarsoo that "Maunsing was "superintending the Cultivation for me.

It

55 It is stated in the Charge that Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo, my sister's son, being a Servant of the Zillah Court, was for some years Moonsiff of the Village, and enjoyed the Head Caupoo Maunium and that afterwards Maunsing my private Servant who was formerly a Jail Peon was appointed Moonsiff before I was made Sheristadar. Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo was employed in the Court before you were pleased to give him the Pattah for Reddepollem this Head Caupoo Maunium was Continued to the person who Caused the Cultivation of the Village to be Conducted, but it was not given for the situation of Moonsiff. There are not many houses or individuals in that Village and as the Land of that Village lies in the beds of Tanks, it is necessary that the Lands should be Carefully brought into Cultivation, and as the duty of getting the Lands of that Village Cultivated remained with Vencatanursoo as above Stated, that Maunium, according to the permission of the Circar, was on his Charge. As it is specified in Section 3 Reg. IV of 1816 that in the event of the Renter of a Village or the Head Caupoo not always residing in it, the person who manages the Village under him should

should do the duties of Head of the Village according to that Regulation, and as there was no other fit Caupoo in that Village to do the duty of Moonsiff and Vencatanursoo being the sole Puttadar, he used to keep any one on his part to Conduct the duties of Head of Village, and the produce of the Maunieum was appropriated for the support of such person. During Mr. Whish's time it was his intention to Continue the Head Caupoo's Maunieums to the Moonsiff, and in fusly 1242 when that Gentleman appointed Moonsiff to some Village, he made some enquiry in regard to appointing a Moonsiff to this Village and appointed the above-mentioned Mootialoo, gave him the Sunnud of Moonsiff, and Continued the Maunieum to him - as long as he was alive, he enjoyed the produce of the Maunieum and he having died some time afterwards, and there being no fit Caupoo in the Village to be appointed Moonsiff and Maunsing having Consented to live in that Village and to enjoy the Maunieum and see the Police business of the Village, an arzee was sent to the Moonsiff by the Tahsildar of

of the Talook for appointing him Moonsiff, before I was made Head Sheristadar and according to his proposal Maunsing was appointed Moonsiff and the Maunieum was also Continued in his name - Madrapatty Boorshuttrapuntaloo and Naputty Lutchmenursoo puntulu have stated in the depositions given by them, that the produce of the Head Caupoo's Maunieum which was continued in the name of Mootialoo and of Maunsing was enjoyed by me - It does not appear that they had any principal Concern with that Village, to know who enjoyed the Head Caupoo's Maunieum, and in what years - It does not appear by their depositions that they were in those years in that Village, or by what means they were enabled to understand and state this Circumstance - Pullem Mootialoo resided in that Village from fusly 1242 till some time in fusly 1244 and after his death Maunsing and they enjoyed that Maunieum - and this Circumstance must be known to the Curnums of the Village and those who used to frequent that place - The Curnum deposed before you that Mootialoo and Maunsing enjoyed the

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

the Maunium, from this it will be evident that Lutchmenursoo &c deposed without Know-ing the facts. Moreover the Circumstance of this Maunium as stated in the Kyfeat of Curmum Audenarrainapah, and which appears to have been sent with the arzee written by Venkataramaniah who was sent to make the enquiry, is in accordance with what Poorshotum Buntooloo and Lutchmen-ursoo have stated. but when Audenarrain-apah was examined in your presence, he as stated in his deposition that the Maun-ium which was Continued on account of the Head Caupoo was enjoyed by Mootialoo who was appoint-ed Moonsiff when he was alive, and afterwards by Maunsing. Mooloomoody Narrainreddy also deposed to the same effect. With regards to the difference in the Kyfeat aforementioned, I co. Considered that you would question him and therefore did not ask him about it. I after-wards made a request that this Witness should be questioned on this subject. Aude-narrainapah and Narrainreddy have deposed that Maunsing took the produce of the Maunium for Fusly 1246, and afterwards left

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

left the Village, that the produce of the Maunium for Fusles 1247 and 1248 have been kept in deposit according to the Tahsildars orders, in consequence of the absence of Maunsing- the said Maunsing is not my private Servant.

56. It is stated in the charge that I am very irregularly receiving Paulevansy for the said Commatum in Reddypollem. The Circar allowed Paulevansy to Venkatanarsoo, like to all others, with reference to the rules regarding Pamyacary Paulevansy. From the time this Rule was Established, this Paulevansy was continued till Fusly 1244 and this was deducted in the Cowles which were given in each year. Paulevansy was continued like to all others according to the orders of the Gentlemen of that period. at that time I was not a Servant of this division. After you arrived as Principal Collector and after I was appointed Head Shenistadar, I represent-ed to you at the time of the Settlement of 1245 Fusly, the cir-cumstance of the said Paulevansy being allowed in Reddy-pollem, you directed that there was no occasion for it and it was discontinued.

57. There is a contradiction in the depo-sitions given by Pulley Kistarow and Chaback Amundarow

Anundarow regarding the debt said to be due by me to Narrainreddy, and neither of them appear to know the truth. In the deposition given by Narrain=reddy before you, and in that given before the Commissioner on Oath, he stated decidedly that I do not owe him any thing. If I owed him money as stated by Kistarow and Anundarow there would be no occasion for him to say in the public Cutcherry that I did not owe him money, and thereby deprive himself of the means of recovering it. It will be evident that all these persons who are Servants, com=bined together and stated in this manner upon guess what is not true, in order that you may believe it and be angry upon me.

58. With regard to the circumstance stated in the charge that my Sisters Son Ruckala= Goondlapollem. =pilly Venkatanursoo who lives in my house, has a share in the cultivation of the Zuffed Shotrium of Goodlapollem, I have to explain that the said Venkatanursoo is my Sisters Son and merely resides in my house, but I have no concern with his profits or his expenses.

He

59. He rented that Shotrium from the Shotriumdar of Goondlapollem for some years when he had Cultivation of his own in that Village. he also procured some Cattle and kept them in the same Village. Although the rent has expired, Venkatanursoo and Annoomareddy Raganareddy of that Village having had joint Cultivation, that Cultivation is still retained by Venkatanursoo. I had already informed you that Venkatanursoo had this Cultivation and was also concerned in some Metta and Bagauyet Cul=tivation in Nellore. It being stated in the Margin of the deposition taken from Byna=boyenna Narrapah by Hameedoodeenkhan that I had Cultivation in Goondlapollem also, it will be observed from the deposition given by Laboor Boocherauze, the Curnum of that Village, in my presence, that I have nothing to do with the profit and expenses of Venkatanursoo, that the Cultivation in Goondlapollem is his own, that I have nothing to do with Profit and Loss of that Cultivation, and that he only is entitled to it. and

that

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

Anundarow regarding the debt said to be due by me to Narrainreddy, and neither of them appear to know the truth. In the deposition given by Narrainreddy before you, and in that given before the Commissioner on Oath, he stated decidedly that I do not owe him any thing. If I owed him money as stated by Kistarow and Anundarow there would be no occasion for him to say in the public Cutcherry that I did not owe him money, and thereby deprive himself of the means of recovering it. It will be evident that all these persons who are Servants, combined together and stated in this manner upon guess what is not true, in order that you may believe it and be angry upon me.

58. With regard to the circumstances stated in the charge that my Sisters Son Ruckolapully Venkatanursoo who lives in my house, has a share in the cultivation of the Zinjeti Shotrium of Goodlapollem, I have to explain that the said Venkatanursoo is my Sisters Son and merely resides in my house, but I have no concern with his profits or his expenses.

Goodlapollem

He

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

59. He stated that Shotrium from the Shotriumdar of Goodlapollem for some years when he had Cultivation of his own in that Village. he also procured some Cattle and kept them in the same Village. Although the rent has expired, Venkatanursoo and Annoomareddy Raganareddy of that Village having had joint Cultivation, that Cultivation is still retained by Venkatanursoo. I had already informed you that Venkatanursoo had this Cultivation and was also concerned in some Metta and Baganyet Cultivation in Nellore. It being stated in the Margin of the deposition taken from Byna-boyenna Narrapah by Hameedoodeenkhan that I had Cultivation in Goodlapollem also, it will be observed from the deposition given by Laboo Boocherauze, the Curnum of that Village, in my presence, that I have nothing to do with the profit and expenses of Venkatanursoo, that the Cultivation in Goodlapollem is his own, that I have nothing to do with Profit and Loss of that Cultivation, and that he only is entitled to it. and

that

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

that as he writes the private account of Venkatanursoo he came to know this circumstance properly- In the deposition given by the said Annoomala Rayavareddy also he has stated that I have no Cultivation in that Village, that there is Cultivation from 8 Years on Venkatanursoo's own account and that I have nothing to do with the Profit and Loss of his Cultivation- In the deposition first taken by you, Banoos Banoorow has also stated that the Cultivation in Goondlapullem is Venkatanursoo's own and that he still has Cattle and sheep and Goats thereWhile these persons state that I have nothing to do with that cultivation, it is for you to consider what truth there is in what is written in the Margin of the deposition taken by Dawoodkeenkhan Vizt. that I have Cultivation in Goondlapollem- Some persons have stated that as I ought not to retain any Cultivation, I caused the Cultivation which was in the names of the people belonging

Fort St. George 24th. December 1840.

to me, to be entered in fictitious names- If as stated in the deposition of Naputty Lutchmenursoo found ed on Venkatanursoo's living with me that I had a concern in that Cummatum, why would Venkatanursoo's name be entered in the Circar accounts. From this also it will be observed, that there is no concern between me and Venkatanursoo and it will also be observed for the reasons above mentioned that his cultivation and his Cattle are not mine-

50. It is stated in the charge that

Nellore. the Cummatum of Gundum Narrainreddy in Nellore is certainly mine and that the Garden in the name of Colnacoory Venkatasoobiah is mine. I have no Cultivation in this Village. This Cultivation was at first during some years in the name of Moodumbee Streenevasacharloo on account of Venkatanursoo my Sister's Son and as there was no profit derived from it, it was relinquished

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

relinquished some time afterwards. The said Gundim Narrainreddy was previously a joint Cultivator of this Cummatum and as he conducted the Cultivation with his own people, he derived a profit and lived upon it. and the share of Venkatamurroo which was relinquished was also included in Narrainreddy's dittum from July 1243 and he became answerable for the Profit and Loss. When Venkatamurroo held the Cummatum, he expended money and constructed two large Wells and it being the practice for the persons who Cultivate under the irrigation of those wells to pay a share to the person who dug the Wells, and Narrainreddy having stated that he did not require that Land, it was entered in the dittum in the name of Venkatasoobiah. Calavacoory Venkatasoobiah is not the Poroheterdoo, or family priest of Venkatamurroo, but a dependent of his, and with the view of assisting him and that he might receive the share derivable on account of the Wells, this land was entered in the Dittum in his

Fort St. George 24th December 1840.

his name. this information has been obtained from Venkatamurroo. Some of the Cutcherry Servants have Baugayet Gardens in this and other Villages which you have permitted. I having requested you about the Cocoanut Garden I had in Cudoor, you allowed me to keep it. When you had allowed this. if that Cultivation had been mine and the Sareel Beetel Garden was for me, why would I not represent it to you if I had a Garden in Nellore where I reside and there would be no occasion for me to have it entered in the dittum in the name of Venkata Soobiah.

61. Narrainreddy in the deposition given by him stated that from the five years Venkatamurroo relinquished his Cultivation, the Land which was in the name of Moodoobe=warroo was taken up by him, and that neither I nor Venkatamurroo have any concern or share, that he alone is entitled to the Profit and Loss, and

that

that he is cultivating that Land - Kunta but-
-tooney Panpereddy, Chenna. Koorty Rungareddy
and Kundauroo Venkataramireddy stated in
the depositions given by them that after Venca-
-tanursoo gave up the dittum which was in the
name of Theenevasa Charlu it was taken up by
Guddum Narraimreddy who was a joint Cul-
-tivator of the Land, and the dittum was made
out in his name, that he became entitled to
the Profit and Loss, and Cultivated the Lands
with his own Cattle - that he takes the grain
produced therefrom, that neither I nor Venkata-
-nursoo have any Cultivation even as under
-cultivators, and that they can declare this
on Oath - One of these persons named Kunta
-tuttooney Panpooreddy stated that the Cultivation
was relinquished because there was a loss. Allis
Vencanyalapanty Nursannah knew decidedly
that Venkatanursoo has no Cultivation, and as he
is the Village Curnum and fearing that if

he stated the truth he would suffer injury from
my Enemies, stated that he did not know about
things which he Knew - Having understood that
he was thus put in fear and doubting his e-
evidence; I made the request that the persons
who had been examined / of those called by
me to speak regarding the subject of neither
I nor Venkatanursoo subsequently having any
Cultivation / were sufficient - but you have ex-
-amined him as being the Village Curnum -
On account of the fear he had in his mind,
he stated some circumstances which are not
true - Even in the deposition so given by him
he stated that the dittum and Puttah for
this Land was in the name of the said
Narraimreddy that he alone paid money
to the Circar, that from the first that e-
Cultivation was managed by Narraim-
-reddy and Venkatanursoo, and that
I did not enquire into it, that he does
not know properly who enjoyed the
profit

Profit and Loss derived therefrom, that he does not know who owns the Cattle which are employed in ploughing the Lands. that he does not know about Nuckalapally Vencata-
=nursoo being concerned in Mayany Cultivations that as Vencatanursoo got the Wells dug, from which the Mooloom and Jareed Lands are watered, and as if those lands were entered in the Dittum in the name of Narrainreddy he would become entitled to the Wells, he /Vencatanursoo/ got the lands separated in the dittum of Fusly 1247 and entered in the name of Calanckolloo Vencatasoobiah his Poorohetooloo or family priest. that he thinks that Shaving been appointed Head Sheristadar and Vencata Nursoo considering that no one belonging to me should hold cultivation in any Village, he gave up the Cultiva-
=tion that he had in this Village. Even by the ex-
deposition of Nursumiah who has concealed some facts from the fear of my Enemies, it appears clearly

clearly ——— that there is no cultivation on my account.-

62. In the deposition given by Napully Letchimenursoo it is stated that the Dittum Land which was up to Fusly 1244 in the name of Woodumbee Steenevasacharloo is even now entered in the Dittum in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy who managed that Cultivation that a Well was caused to be dug and the Bagayet Garden is continued in the name of my Poorohectoo-
=doo. In the deposition given by Poorshottum Puntooloo it is stated that the Cultivation which was up to Fusly 1244 in the name of Woodum-
=bee Steenevasacharloo, was from Fusly 1245 entered in the name of Guddum Narraidoo in the Dittum. That two Wells had been dug and that the Dittum for the Jareb Betel Garden is in the name of Calavakolla Vencata-
=soobiah. It is not mentioned even in their depositions that I have any Cultivation. In the deposition given

given by Yerragoodepanty Nursiah he stated that when he went to measure the Lands of Cauvoo-purtipandoo in last year, he enquired of the ex-Cultivators to the East of Nellore and understood that I had 2 Ploughs Cultivation. It does not appear by his deposition who informed him of it; the persons who cultivate that Land, and the persons who know that circumstance, have deposed in opposition to this deposition. In the deposition given by Bauroo Bauboorow he stated that I am carrying on Cultivation thro the means of some Ryots from Fusly 1246. It must be considered what truth there is in the assertion of Bauboorow who has stated in contradiction to the deposition of the others who are Servants, that I am carrying on Cultivation thro the means of some Ryots from Fusly 1246. In the deposition of Chabuck Sunnadarow he states that there is Banganjet Betel Cultivation in the name of Calavakollu Venkatasoobiah and he stated once that the Commission

which is in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy and the Garden and Mootoorm Land which is in the name of Calavakollu Venkatasoobiah are on my Account and at another time that they are Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo's that Curreem Moorterauze told him that the Ploughing Cattle of Nuckalapully Venkatanursoo which are in the Goondapollem Shotrium, come and plough the Cummatum Lands which are in the name of Guddum Narrainreddy and that the said Moorterauze informed him that the Cultivation is prevately mine. Moorterauze in the Deposition he has now given before you, stated that he did not say so, and that he only said that that land was Nuckalapully Venkatanursoos. Taboor Boocherauze who superintends the business of the Village of Gundlapollem has stated decidedly in his deposition that Venkatanursoo has no share in the Cultivation of Guddum Narrainreddy and that I have no concern whatever with the Profit and Loss of the Cultivation of Venkatanursoo

Moreover

Moreover Moorterauze stated in his deposition that the Puttah Land which was in the name of Moodoorinbee Streenevasachorlo from- is- fusly 1235 Nuckalapully Vencatanursoo got cultivated till fusly 1239 on his own account by employing Servants that from- fusly 1240 he joined Guddum Narrainreddy with himself and that he and Guddum- Narrainreddy carried on the Cultivation- that in fusly 1245 Streenevasachorlo gave- a writing relinquishing that Land- that G. Narrainreddy gave a writing to take- of the Land and after he gave the writing it was made over to him. That there being- Stone Wells which were dug by Vencatanursoo and Betel Gardens &c- which are included in the same dittery it was reported by the- Village Ryots and he also supposed that Vencatanursoo has Cultivation, but the Shist of the Land is paid by Narrainreddy and he receives the Puttah that he did not see with his eyes that Vencatanursoo had

agricultural servants and Ploughing Cattle- and that he cultivated the Land- but that- Narrainreddy said that they both enjoy the- produce. Narrainreddy who is alleged to have informed this Witness has stated decidedly before you, that he alone is enjoying the- Profit and Loss of this Cultivation that Vencata- -nursoo has no share in it. In the deposition of Moorterauze also it is not stated that that cultivation is on my account. From this you will observe that the assertion of Arundarow Viz- that Moorterauze told him that the Cultivation is privately mine is not true. Moorterauze is not the nominated Curnum- he is the Son of Curnum Nursunnah and lives with- him, if some circumstances which he- has stated be true, there is no reason why- his father Nursunnah who is the Curnum- and with whom he lives, should not know of the circumstance which he stated he knew- from the report of every one- you must- consider

consider what truth there is in the depositions of Moorteraize and Nursemmah when the latter stated that he does not know the circumstance which the former stated he knows.

63 In the Deposition given by Aregala Narsemooloo he stated that the lands which he formerly held were taken by me from 10 or 12 years without his having relinquished them and that I and Narrainreddy are enjoying them equally. that before I was appointed Sheristadar that cultivation was in my name, that I subsequently interposed Narrainreddy and he and I are enjoying it equally. He is not a person who comes to my house, nor is acquainted with me. It is stated decidedly in the depositions given by the Curnum and others that after Nursemooloo had given up the land which he had cultivated owing to loses and absconded, his fields were entered in the Dittum by the Circar in the names of several

persons, when some part of the Land was entered in the Dittum in the name of Moodumbee Streenevasachariar also. This circumstance which has happened as above stated has been concealed by Aregala Nursoo and it will be evident that his assertion that the Cultivation was on my account has been falsely stated by him through the persuasion of some persons.

It is stated in the charge

Sungiapollem 64 that it appears that I had Cultivation in Sungiapollem a Hamlet of Yelliapollem in the Nellore Talook to within the last 2 or 3 years that after I was appointed Head Serishtadar the Balance outstanding on account of that Cultivation to 1239 fusly was struck off and that the Balance of fusly 1240 was entered as irrecoverable with regard to which I beg to explain that Mettadody Streenevasooloo who has Cultivation in that Village and whom you examined and Veincatachellum. the nominated Curnum of that Village have deposed that neither

I

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

I nor my people had Cultivation in Sungiapallam from fusly 1242 and therefore it appears decidedly therefrom that I had no Cultivation in Sungiapollem from eight years.—

65. An Account of the irrecoverable Balances outstanding in this Killah to the end of fusly 1239 was prepared and sent to the Board as called for by them several times for the purpose of being written off and the Board having sanctioned the same the Balances were written off. The accounts which were then received from the Talookes in regard to these irrecoverable balances and the Accounts which had previously thereto been received were compared by the abovementioned Napully Lutchmeneroo and the principal head Goomastahs and an abstract account made out by them. It does not appear from the Talook Accounts that there was a separate balance outstanding against Sungiapollem

Fort St. George 24th December 1840

Sungiapollem for former years.

66. In the Accounts now shewn to me there is one which appears to have been newly written by Vencatakristiah (who is not a nominated burnum of Yelliapollem) on the 4th November that is two days previous to your delivering the Charge to me in which the outstanding Balances are entered as specified in the Margin. On referring to the Accounts which were received at the close of the respective Fuslies the individual Accounts of balances for Fusly 1237 shews that Rupees 91-6-8 are due by some Ryots of Yelliapollem. There is no balance entered as due by Nalatoory Tantacharloo the individual mentioned in the Margin. On referring to an Annual Account of Collections and Balance altho

Fusly 1237	Nalatoory Tatacharloo	109-6-9	
1238	Caumiabettoo	21-13-0	
1239	Do	36-10-0	
1240	Do	104-7-9	
1241	Do	0-0-0	

DESPATCH OFFICE

it

Fort St George 24th December 1840

it appears that the Balance against that Village is to a large amount, yet there does not appear to be an account of the Balances due individually. In the Talook account for Fusly 1238 there is no balance entered as outstanding against the Village. In the Talook account for fusly 1239 there is entered an irreconcrable balance due on account of Stulla curnums Rupoons to the amount of Rupees 32-9-3 and there is no other Balance entered in it. For this reason it is not possible to consider the account which has been now prepared by Vencatakistnamah to be true. Moreover on referring to the Book of annual Collections and Balances of Fusly 1240 it appears that Rupees 425 7-9 are outstanding against Yelliapolliem including Rupoons and no account of the individuals by whom it is due appears to have come from the Talook Cutcherry. But in the particulars of the individuals written in the Book of the Dowle of Fusly 1241, Toomalore Caumabottoo

Fort St George 24th December 1840

Caumabottoo name is entered as owing Rupees 104-7. The Collector and Serishtadar of that period must have postponed the collection of this balance for some cause, and there would be no occasion for postponing it without a cause and this balance has not been included in the amount which has been struck off for the amount to be received from Caumabottoo for fusly 1241 the resources at that place were sold through a Commissioner, and the collection was made without leaving a balance as appears from the new account written by the said Vencatakistnaiah, in that case if the balance of fusly 1241 had been justly due, why would not the Circar Servants have collected it.

A portion of old Cadjan by accounts of the collections and Balance of fusly 1237 to the 15th of June of that fusly, which was said to have been brought

brought from the Village in the Month of November has been shewn to me— This account does not bear the Signature of any one, and it is not known what Curnums account it is In this a balance is entered as due by Nalatoory Tautacharloo to the 15th of June— But no regular Account of the balances due by individuals for that fusly from the Accounts at the Hoofoor, has been shewn to me I did not / Knowing that there were balances against Seingia pollem on Account of past fusles / include them with those to be struck off If I had acted irregularly in this respect, why did not Letchmeenursoo and the others who prepared those accounts make the same known to you at the same time— I did not know of the balance of fusly 1241 and include it with the irrecoverable balances— Moreover when I was suspended from my situation and this Letchmeenursoo and others invented the same

some circumstances and gave depositions before you had any thing irregular been done by me in this they would have mentioned it— When the accounts for writing off these balances were prepared they were balances which had remained outstanding for nearly 10 years I was not a Servant of the Principal Division from fusly 1234 to some time in fusly 1244 and I have already stated that I had not any concern here during that period It appears that Toomaloor Caumabatloo died 6 or 7 years ago— These balances might have remained uncollected on the respective fusles from some cause ascertained by the enquiry of the Gentlemen and Serishtadar of that period and according to the orders issued by those Gentlemen, but this having occurred many years ago it is not possible for me to mention the particulars— and it will be evident that I did not knowingly practise

practise any deceit.

68 The Maniems belonging to Woodatavaru are not in my enjoyment nor did I forcibly take any ground in Hanoomuntarow's Garden as stated in the deposition of Naputty Lutchmenursoo Puntaloo. When the report about the Polygars was prepared and sent all their Maniems were entered in the Accounts which were sent and the same decision was came to in regard to them all but no circumstance was concealed I did not take any ground in the Nowlaka Garden as stated in the Bauboorows deposition as these circumstances are not stated in the charge I do not consider it necessary to enter into detail regarding them. There are some other circumstances which I have to state but I have omitted them as it might be considered too prolise. In my present state the Witnesses who know the truth fear to declare it.

69 I trust it will be evident from

from all the circumstances I have above stated that I have not as mentioned in the charge any cultivation and that I did not conduct myself deceitfully towards you. The situations of others are not such as I ought to wish for to induce me to act with enmity against any one. You know me well from the time you were Assistant Collector in this District up to this time, a period of about 20 Years, and after ascertaining my good conduct it was you who were pleased to favor me with the situation of Head Serishtadar and acted kindly towards me. This favor I always remembered and acted to the best of my knowledge without any irregularity. By the end of Fusly 1249 I will have completed five years in this situation and I trusted much that you would according to the rules obtain for me a Salary of 100 Pagodas and wishing for

18/35

Fort St George 24th December 1840

for your favor I conducted myself with every care I have been suspeanded from my employ nearly ten Months - There will be no end if I were to write of the Distress and disgrace which I and my family suffered, you are my Master and you must shew Compassion - I am a very old Servant at the proper time that I should be promoted this calamity has occurred to me who am innocent, by the intrigues of my enemies and from which I trust to be relieved on your taking with compassion, all the circumstances I have above written, into your favorable consideration and I also trust that you will observe that I am innocent and restore me to my Situation and protect me -

18th January 1840. /Signed/ T. Ramanoojarow

Suspended Hd. Serishtadar

Comp. J.R.