BIG

158

BAR

3282/79/AH

B/R

1747

15449 Fort St. George November 1841.

Diary.

Read Statement of Smuggled goods recommended for confiscation for the Month of July 1841. Submitted by the Principal Collector of Salem.

(1)

13th Aug.t in Cons.
30th Sept.r 1841

Proceedings thereon.

In the foregoing Statement the Seizure of 5 Cloths of the aggregate value of Rupees 32. is reported to have been made from one Uppajee Chettys Servants, because one of the cloths does not bear the Sayer Stamp.

2 If, as the Board suppose, the remaining four pieces are stamped, their Seizure under the circumstances stated is irregular, and the Board direct that they be restored to the owner.

3 The confiscation of the unstamped cloth is sanctioned.

REGISTERED

At

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

At a Meeting Present.

Thursday 4th November 1841

John Dent Esqre - Senior Member.
G. D. Drury Esqre - Second Member.
A. Robertson Esqre - Acting Third Member
and
Alexander Maclean Esqre - Temporary Member

Minutes of the last Meeting read and approved.

2

From the Act Sect to Government

Read the following Extract from the Minutes of Consultation Under date the 16th October 1841.

Transmitting copy of a letter from the Honble Court of Directors on the subject of the late Canara insurrection, with a copy of the resolution passed thereon.

Read the following

Political Department.

No. 2 of 1841.

Our Governor in Council at Fort St. George.

No. 355.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 14th September 1841.

Para 1st

We herewith transmit to you a copy of a Despatch which we have addressed to the Government of India on the subject of the enquiry into the origin of the late Canara Insurrection.

Ordered that the above despatch with its enclosure be

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

2. From that Despatch you will learn our sentiments respecting the disclosure / arising out of that Insurrection / of the state of disaffection prevailing not only in the districts recently severed from Coorg and annexed to Canara, but also / though perhaps not in an equal degree / in other parts of the Canara Collectorate.

Letter to Fort St. George Paras 4 to 9 & 12. Letter to Govt of India Para 18.

3. In the Districts formerly belonging to Coorg, the disaffection is apparently accounted for by the aversion of the Inhabitants to the new system of fiscal and Judicial administration,

to be communicated to the Revenue and Judicial Departments where the observations of the Honorable Court contained in the Paras noted in the margin will receive consideration and whence the Court of Foujdaree Udalut will be informed that it is the desire of Government to mitigate still further as many of the sentences as may be expedient, and to release such of the Prisoners as have received sufficient punishment for the purpose of example.

to which they had been subjected by being annexed to a Province already under the Company's Regulations.-

4 The precipitation with which this change was made without any previous enquiry into the circumstances of the Country, was at variance with the usual practice of our Government on the acquisition of New territory, and is altogether much to be regretted. To retrace this step however, is, for obvious reasons, impracticable, but it is highly desirable that those parts of the system which are repugnant to the feelings of the inhabitants, should be tempered in the administration as far as is consistent with the fundamental principles of the system itself.-

5. The Tobacco Monopoly must continue in these districts, while it is maintained in the remainder of the Province, but you should attentively consider whether the rules for its

enforcement

enforcement admit of any relaxation or improvement.-

6. The districts in question cannot be exempted from the jurisdiction of our Civil Courts, but Mr. Cotton admits that these are highly unpopular, not only these, but throughout the Province and for an evil which is general, the remedy should be general and demands the most anxious attention from all our Indian Governments and from ourselves.- In the mean time whatever is possible, should be done by local arrangements to diminish the inconvenience sustained either from the distance and expensiveness of our Courts, or from the inflexibility of the system which they administer, above all, the sale of lands in execution of Decrees, requires your serious consideration.-

7. With regard to the administration of the land Revenue, the total Summa is said to be some what less than in the time

of

of the Coorg Rajah, and the ancient Beriz has been made a fixed maximum of assessment which has been in no case exceeded. It appears also from Mr. Malthy's letter of the 14th July 1838. to the Board of Revenue that of 3,213. Estates in lower Coorg only 1,414 pay this maximum of assessment, the remaining 1,809 estates pay less, the aggregate deficiency amounting to Rupees 27,158. but the proprietors of these estates in all cases in which a permanent reduction of the maximum did not seem to be required, have been informed that their Immabundy would be raised to the maximum by certain annual instalments, and that they must consequently take measures for the more complete cultivation of their Estates. We perceive that the Board of Revenue, as well as Mr. Malthy are sensible of the necessity of relaxing this rule at least in lower Coorg, but the same reasons exist for

tempering

tempering its operation elsewhere.

8

"The discontinuance of the practice of granting small annual remissions to all classes of "Ryots" is also complained of, and not only it would appear, in lower Coorg, but throughout Canara. It is no doubt a natural and proper consequence of the Establishment of a fixed assessment, wherever that assessment is known to be moderate, that it should be collected in all years, and without abatement, or that remission should be granted only when the circumstances calling for it are such as the land-holders could not with their existing means and in their existing state of intelligence be expected to provide against. But this more rigid exaction of the full amount of the assessment should be introduced cautiously and gradually as the people can be made to understand the grounds of it, and become capable of acting in the manner which

of the Coorg Rajah, and the amount
Beriz, has been made a fixed
maximum of assessment which has
been in no case exceeded. It appears
also from Mr. Maltby's letter of the
14th July 1838. to the Board of Revenue
that of 3,213. Estates in Lower Coorg
only 1,414 pay this maximum of
assessment, the remaining 1,809. estates
pay less the aggregate deficiency
amounting to Rupees 27,158. but the
proprietors of these estates in all cases
in which a permanent reduction
of the maximum did not seem to
be required, have been informed that
their Immunabundy would be raised
to the maximum by certain annual
instalments, and that they must
consequently take measures for the
more complete cultivation of their
Estates. We perceive that the Board
of Revenue, as well as Mr. Maltby
are sensible of the necessity of relaxing
this rule at least in Lower Coorg,
but the same reasons exist for

tempering

tempering its operation elsewhere

8

"The discontenance
of the practice of granting small
"annual remissions to all classes of
"Ryots" is also complained of and not
only it would appear, in Lower Coorg,
but throughout Canara, It is no doubt
a natural and proper consequence
of the Establishment of a fixed
assessment, wherever that assessment
is known to be moderate, that it
should be collected in all years, and
without abatement, or that remission
should be granted only when the
circumstances calling for it are
such as the land-holders could not
with their existing means and in
their existing state of intelligence be
expected to provide against. But this
more rigid exaction of the full
amount of the assessment should
be introduced cautiously, and gradually
as the people can be made to
understand the grounds of it, and
become capable of acting in the manner

which

which this new obligation requires
from them.

9. The subjects of complaint
to which we have now adverted, are, it
must be observed, all of them common to
the whole of canara. It is natural that
they should be more severely felt in
the districts severed from Coorg, because
in these districts they are new and
because the inhabitants of upper
Coorg, with whom, as being so lately
under the same Government, the
people naturally compare themselves,
are not subject to them. yet as the
actual grievances existed, equally
though not introduced so recently,
in the rest of Canara, it is perhaps
not wonderful that the dissatisfaction
which commenced in Umr Soolea, and
Pootoor should have spread to
parts of the Country in which the
causes of complaint had existed from
an earlier date.

10. Something more however
is necessary in order to account
for the disaffection which it
seems

seems to be acknowledged, pervaded
all classes of the Inhabitants of
Mangalore, the principal Station in
the Province; and we would impress
upon you the necessity of a more
diligent enquiry than has yet taken
place, to ascertain what special causes
of discontent existed in that place.

11. With respect to the
conduct of the Civil and Military
authorities on the occasion of the
insurrection, we have to express our
regret that a Military Officer was
not attached to the commission, as
originally intended, and in the absence
of a report from a commission so
constituted we shall refrain from
giving any opinion on the subject.

12 On the trials of the
insurgents by the Special Commission
and by the Circuit Court, we have
still greater occasion for the remarks
already made by us in a letter
which has been communicated to
you by the Government of India,
that the number and severity of
the

the punishments appear beyond ~
the necessities of the case - No less ~
than 320 persons were convicted and
sentenced by the Special Commission
of whom 36. were sentenced to death,
and although Capital punishment ~
was only inflicted in five cases ~
/exclusive of those who had suffered
under sentences by the Court Martial./
and the sentences of the Commission
upon minor offenders were frequently
mitigated by your Government, yet ~
+ 56 persons have been consigned to
transportation or punishment ~
for life. @ 75 to imprisonment for
14 years - and # 86. to shorter periods ~
of imprisonment, without reckoning
those who were sentenced previously
by the Court Martial, and subse:
=quently by the Circuit Court, - or
those who died before sentence ~
was passed - The sufferings too, ~
occasioned by long detention, in
the gaol at Mangalore, - are ~
represented both by the Judges
and

+ Originally 62.
@ Originally 80.
# Originally 115.

and by the Magistrate to have
been very great, and in many
instances fatal - Those sufferings
were inflicted upon a large number
of innocent persons no less than 484
having been ultimately released by ~
the Magistrate without trial, exclusive
of those who died, and of those who
have been tried and acquitted - A
much smaller number both of
apprehensions and of convictions are
generally sufficient in such cases ~
for the ends of justice and of
policy - We are satisfied that on
reconsideration you will see the
propriety of a further mitigation
of many of the sentences and of
releasing such of the prisoners as ~
have suffered sufficient punishment
for the purpose of example - and ~
we trust that the testimonies which
abound in the papers before ~
us respecting the unwholesome ~
state of the Gaol at Mangalore
have induced you to adopt ~
effectual measures for remedying

so

so great an evil.

13. It remains to pronounce our decision on the renewed application from Mr. Dickinson and from Messrs. Bird, Dunnergue, and other servants of the Company who sustained loss of property by the attack upon Mangalore to be indemnified by Government for their loss.

14. Mr. Dickinson is in error in supposing that "it has "invariably been the custom whenever "the property of the servants of the "Government has been subject to loss "in consequence of the rebellion of its "subjects or the irruption of its enemies "that the Government have in their "liberality indemnified those servants "for their losses." On the contrary both your Government and the Supreme Government have repeatedly refused to admit claims of this description.

15. A precedent which it seems to us may properly be followed in the present instance is the case of the irruption of the Pindarries into the

the districts of Guntoor, Masulipatam, and Cuddapah, in March 1817. when claims to a large extent similar to the present, having been preferred, your predecessors declined to admit "the "expediency or necessity of holding "Government answerable for losses which "may ensue from the failure of its "protection over its subjects." but admitted "the claims preferred by certain European "Officers who neglected the object of "preserving their private property by "being engaged in the performance of "public duty." We observe that a similar allegation is made by the present Memorialists concerning certain of their number who it is affirmed "if they "had not felt themselves called upon "as public servants to attend to the "interest of Government in preference "to their own might on the 3d and 4th of April "have saved their private property by removing "it to a place of security in the immediate "neighbourhood of the Barrack."

16. If this statement be shewn to the satisfaction of the Supreme Government

Govt. St. George 4th November 1841.

Government to be well founded, we are willing to that extent, that the claims of the Gentlemen in question be taken into consideration, and a fair indemnification awarded to them.

17th

It is almost unnecessary to state that by these orders, we do not intend to authorize the grant of compensation for any property which was not susceptible of easy removal to a place of safety.-

London, ---
the 23d June 1841.

We are,
Your loving Friends.

Signed / George Lyall.
" J. K. Lushington.
" W. Wigram
" John Locke.
" R. Mills.
" John Cotton.
" F. Warden.
" A. Robertson.
" R. H. C. Plowden.
" H. Shank.
" William Young.
" W. H. Alexander.
" J. P. Muspratt.

Copy

Govt. St. George 4th November 1841.

Copy Political Letter to India
No. 19. dated 23d June 1841.

Late Insurrections in canara.
Political letters dated
26th June No. 30 / 1839.
31st December / No. 67 /
1st November / No. 86 / 1839.
8th May / No. 33 / --- 1840.
para 117.
Judicial letters dated
25th June / No. 9. / 1838
para 32.
10th September No. 12 /
para 19. to 20.
Political letters from Madras
dated 6th February.
/ No. 2 / 1838.
paras 12 & 14 to 17.
20th March / No. 3 / "
paras. 5 to 12
22d June / No. 5. / "
para 3.
12th Feby / No. 2 / 1839.
paras 2 and 3.
3d April / No. 4 / "
para. 16.
2d July. No. 5 ——— "
para. — 7.
27th August No. 6 --- "
para. 3
Judicial letters from Madras
dated 6th February / No. 2 / 1838.
23d June / No. 6 / — "
30th October / No. 10 / — "
paras 20-21- & 23.
1st October / No. 10 / 1839.
paras 22 and 23.
16th February / No. 9 / 1839.
Sec. 1. — "
12th March No. 15. — "
" Do. /
" — " — / No. 16 /
" Do. /

Para 1- We have enumerated in the Margin the unanswered communications from your Government of Madras on subjects connected with the late Canara Insurrections.-

2- The voluminious enclosures connected with these letters and paragraphs consist chiefly of trials by the Special commission at Mangalore, minute, and protracted investigations in Mysore, and Coorg, the Report of Mr. Cotton, the Officer appointed by the Madras Government to enquire into the causes of the Insurrection, several elaborate and comprehensive papers by Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, Communications from

from that Officer's Assistants, and from the Resident at Mysore, a Minute by Mr. Sullivan a Member of the Madras Government, and a Resolution of the President in Council, expressive of the opinion entertained by him on a deliberate review of the whole subject.

3. We shall address the Madras Government separately on the conduct of its servants, and on such other matters as more peculiarly concern that Presidency.

4. Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, with whom the President in Council concurs, has adopted a view of the character of the disturbances, differing widely from that of Mr. Cotton, and other Officers of the Madras Government, supported by Mr. Sullivan. The Madras Officers strenuously contend that the rebellion was for Coorg objects, and that there was disaffection in Coorg, but none in Canara; Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon maintains on the contrary that there was most extensive disaffection

disaffection in Canara, but none in Coorg.

5. Without entirely coinciding in either opinion we are satisfied that Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon's view of the matter is far nearer to the truth than that of the Madras Officers.

6. The Insurrection broke out and had its principal seat, in what has been termed Lower Coorg, that is in Pootoor, Umr Soolea and other Districts which, being below the Ghauts, and not inhabited by Coorgs though a portion of the late Kingdom of Coorg, were detached from it after the conquest and annexed to Canara. In these districts the insurrection may be said to have been universal, and their inhabitants, it is acknowledged had a local grievance consisting in their having been placed at once and prematurely under the revenue and judicial administration, prevailing in Canara, some parts of which administration, especially the Tobacco Monopoly

Monopoly the procedure of the Civil Courts, and above all the sale of lands in satisfaction of arrears of Revenue and of decrees of Court, were extremely disliked by them. They appear besides to have had some other grounds of complaint which we shall notice to the Madras Government.

7 As however the inhabitants of these Districts rebelled against our Government in the name of a pretended Member of the royal family of Coorg, it might, if the insurrection had been confined to them, have remained doubtful whether it originated in their grievances or in their attachment to their former rulers.

8 Mr. Cotton in whose opinion all the other Madras Authorities participate, maintains, that except the people of Lower Coorg and a portion of those of the adjacent district of Buntwal, who were intimately connected with the former, all other inhabitants of the Canara Collectorate who took part in the insurrection, did so from terror

terror alone, while on the contrary a determined spirit of the resistance to Government was manifested in Coorg itself.

9 The latter assertion is conclusively disproved by Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, while it must however be allowed that the adherence of the Coorgs to our Government does not seem to have been so entire and without allay, as we had in the first instance been led to believe.

10 On the first hearing of the disturbance, the Coorgs offered their services to Captain Lehardy for the purpose of suppressing it. The vigilant manner in which the insurgents guarded the passes into Coorg manifested clearly that they had no expectation of assistance from thence. When, however, the insurrection had gained its first successes, and the insurgents showed an intention of marching into Coorg, the Coorgs appeared to waver, and two numerous bodies of them actually joined the rebellion

rebellion. These were indeed won back
without actual hostilities. chiefly however
by the assurances of the faithful
Dewans, Poonapah and Bauboo
that the pretended Coorg prince was
an impostor and in one of the
two cases a promise was required
from Bauboo that the claims
of the pretender should be enquired
into and represented to Government.
From this time the Coorgs generally,
including even those who had joined
the insurrection, took a most active part
and rendered signal service in its
suppression. Captain Le Hardy however
deemed their attachment to the ancient
reigning family to be so strong that
if any insurrection were attempted by
a real representative of that family,
even by the Ex-Rajah of whose tyranny
so much was heard previous to
the conquest, he could not answer
for their not taking part in it.

Considering the strength
of that attachment, and the warlike

and

and high spirited character of
this peculiar people, we consider it
highly creditable to Lieutenant Colonel
Cubbon, to Captain Le Hardy, and
to the system of administration intro-
duced by Major General Fraser
and carried on by those Officers,
that under circumstances so well
calculated to call into activity any
spirit of disaffection which existed,
so little of that spirit shewed itself
and even that little was so
soon quelled while the Dewans and
other Officers, and the population
generally, gave the most valuable
proofs of active good-will to our
Government. The moderation and
forbearance with which our authority
has been exercised over these people,
both as to revenue and as to the
preservation of their habits and
usages, is now shewn to have been
as politic as it would, at all
events, have been benevolent.

and

and just.

12. The province of Canara exhibited a very different spectacle, whatever attempts may be made by Mr. Cotton, and by the local functionaries to represent the participation of the population generally as the result of terror, to which indeed there is no doubt that a certain portion of the support given to an insurrection is almost always to be attributed, it remains undenied, not only that multitudes from almost all parts of Southern Canara, did actually join and take an active part in the proceedings of the insurgents, but that nearly all the Village Officers, Government Peons and other Native Servants of Government, took part in it, while not one was found faithful enough to give information to Government of what had long been within the knowledge of many of them - The proceedings of

of the insurgents manifested as much apparent confidence in the good wishes of the people of Canara as apprehension of a contrary feeling in Coorg, and with respect to Mangalore, the Capital of the province, it is admitted that as the rebels approached, the European functionaries were deserted by almost all their Native subordinates, who as well as the greater part of the inhabitants left the town, many of them, there is reason to believe, to join the enemy, while those who remained, evinced at least a strong disposition to keep terms with the insurgents, if not as there is considerable reason to suspect, an actual understanding with them.

13. The existence of disaffection at Mangalore itself, is indeed distinctly implied in all Mr. Cotton's statements, although no reasons are assigned for it, except the imputed bad character of the inhabitants. We cannot receive this

this as a sufficient explanation and we shall again direct the attention of the Madras Government to the necessity of accounting better for what may be considered as an admitted fact as well as for that which although not admitted, is to us equally obvious the general disaffection in Southern Canara.

14. We proceed to express our opinion on those points of detail which more particularly concern your Government and its Officers.

15. The conduct of Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, and of Captain Le Hardy both at the time of the insurrection, and in conducting the investigations into the cause of it, merits the highest commendation and the conduct of Captain Le Hardy who was on the spot, and on whom rested the immediate responsibility of action in very trying circumstances has impressed us with a high opinion of his judgment, firmness and

and presence of mind.

16. Few of the persons concerned in the actual insurrection have been tried in Mysore or Coorg but two out of three pretenders to the Coorg blood-royal, have undergone trial and sentence by the Commissioner. The earliest in date who called himself Appasamparaiawmy, and in whose name (though then in confinement as a State prisoner at Tuchinopoly) the two other pretenders professed to act was tried for some previous seditious proceedings and has been judiciously treated as a common offender and sentenced to 14 years labour in Irons, the other Cullians Jungum who actually attempted to raise an insurrection in Coorg has been hanged and is the only person on whom Capital punishment has been inflicted in Mysore or Coorg. Several Servants and dependants of the Rajah of Mysore have

alteration in your conduct towards the Rajah would be justified by any facts which have been ascertained.

17 Lutchmee Narrain one of the Coorg Devans, but not himself a Coorg, has been tried on two charges. the first of having given false information to the Superintendent with a view to the ruin of Dewan Poonapah, and to other mischievous consequences. the second of being implicated in the Canara Insurrection, in which several of his relatives and connexions in the Soolia District took a direct part. He was acquitted by seven Members of the Punchayet and found guilty by one Member only, the Commissioner however considering the acquittal contrary to evidence condemned him, and the result is that he has been deprived of his Office and banished

have been sentenced to various penalties as accomplices of Calliana. Suspicion also rests upon Arapoor Buswapajee the Rajah's Principal Officer, and through him upon the Rajah himself, of having been cognizant of Cullianas plot which indeed the Rajah was the first to make known to Government, but in the opinion of Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, not till long after the information had reached him and even then in combination with mischievous falsehoods intended by him to throw suspicion upon Dewan Poonapah and others in Coorg against this imputation upon the Rajah. Major Stokes, the Resident, earnestly contends. Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon, has furnished you with a rejoinder to Major Stokes' reply, but with no decisive result; and we agree with you in thinking that no alteration

banished from Coorg, his professions there being moreover confiscated.

18 We consider Dewan Lutchmee Narrain to be guilty on the first charge, and to some extent on the second, although not to the extent contended for by Lieutenant Colonel Cubbon. He is clearly shewn to have received information of the plans of the conspirators from his brother Ramapah who was himself engaged in them, Ramapah was ultimately put to death by the insurgents themselves, on a charge of treachery founded on obstructions in organization and want of zeal in their cause, and we think it probable that neither the Dewan nor his brother had any settled purpose of taking part in the conspiracy, but at most of determining according to circumstances whether to aid it or to give information of it to Government.

Even this however was a breach of duty in an Officer of Government, which made it indispensable to deprive him of Office, and probably also to banish him from the Country. We feel more doubt respecting the confiscation, although if it extends (as we presume) only to his possessions in Coorg proper, which are stated to be of inconsiderable value and only recently granted him on a favorable tenure, this may be justifiable but the forfeiture ought not extend to his possessions in Una Soolia his native Country and the abode of his family and friends.

19. We shall transmit a Copy of the present Despatch to the Madras Government.

(True Extract and Copies)
(Signed) Robert Clerk.
Acting Chief Secretary

Ordered that the foregoing Extract be communicated to the Board of Revenue and Court of Faujdaree Udalut.

&c

for their early consideration and report.

To the President & Members of the Board of Revenue.

/ A true Extract /
/ Signed / Walter Elliot
Acting Secretary to Govt.

Order thereon. Ordered to be sent again for circulation.

Read again in Consn 9th Decr

2.3

Read the following Resolution.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation Dated 26th October 1841.

/ Board's Proceedings 26th October /

4

From the Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

Resolved, as recommended by the Board of Revenue, that authority be granted for the disbursement of Rupees 143-3- being the amount of the Estimate submitted with the above letter for demolishing and rebuilding a portion of a house and purchasing a piece of Ground to widen the road leading thro' St. Thome to the Adyar

Adyar river.

/ Signed / Robert Clerk.
Acting Chief Secretary

Ordered that the following letter be sent in cover for information.

4-5

To the Actg. Coll.r of Madras

To The Acting Coll.r of Madras

Sir

In reply to your letter of the 19th

15430 Fort St. George 4th November 1841

In Cons 21st Octr 1841

19th Ultimo I am

directed by the Board

of Revenue to state that

Government under

In Cons 4th Novr 1841

date the 26th October

have been pleased

to sanction the

disbursement of

Rupees — 143 — 3 — "

for the purpose therein specified

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
4th November, 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Arnottett
Secretary

Read

15431 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read the following letter.

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

(6)

From the Collr of Vizagapatam — Affording information relative to the Lands of Thoorangoparam

Sir

Para 1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Porters letter dated the 14th Instant requiring information whether the lands belonging to the Thoorangoparam Estate which are represented as yielding a Revenue of Rupees 28000.— per annum were entered as wet lands in the permanent settlement accounts, and if so from what source supposing the embankment across the Sandavah River existed at the time of the permanent Settlement those lands were irrigated and I am desired if possible to furnish this information by return of Post.—

2. These lands are entered as wet lands in the permanent Settlement accounts and they undoubtedly depend for their irrigation in a great degree on the supply of water furnished by the Mootah Calavah from the Sandavah River, but I must at the same time observe that the whole of the arguments of the Godicherlah Proprietor

in

in support of his right to raise the embank-
ment are founded on the assumption that
the bank in question would not in ordinary
circumstances prevent an adequate supply
of water from flowing to the Streerampooram
lands, and that if it would have that effect,
he would be acting in direct opposition to his
own interests in putting it up.—

3. It is only in years when there
is a great deficiency of rain that there
is not an ample supply of water for the
supply of both Channels.—

4. If the Board of Revenue
will refer to the plan which accompanied
my letter of the 22d Ultimo they will
observe that the Bhoomee Calavah is
very narrow in proportion to the bed of
the river, and that when the River comes
down only a very small portion of the water
can pass by that Channel.—

5 As soon therefore as the
water rises to the level of the top of the
mud embankment, it very soon washes
it away and a large proportion of the
water continues to flow down the ordinary
Channel

Channel of the River.—

6. In the present year for example
at the the embankment had been thoroughly
repaired at the Commencement of the
season, a very small portion of it was left
when we visited the spot and it
was universally admitted that the Cottum
and Streerampooram lands had received
a most abundant supply of water. On the
other hand if the embankment in question
had not been raised, very little water
would have flowed into the Bhoomee
Calavah, because the water of a river naturally
flows down its own channel, and because as
I have previously stated, the decent in the
Channel is not so great as in the bed of
the river.—

7. I have already stated that there
are two other undisputed embankments in
the Sandavah river which when there
is a scarcity of water must considerably
affect the supply to the Bhoomee Calavah.—

8. If the Proprietor of Godicherlah
establishes the right to raise the embank-
ment in question, it will undoubtedly
be.

be to the prejudice of the Streeramporum and Cottum Estates, but only in years when there is a scarcity of rain, but this seems a benefit which the Godicherlah Estate fairly enough derives from its more advantageous situation.—

9 On perusing the Office Copy of my letter dated the 22d Ultimo, there appears to be a ridiculous mistake in the 2d clause of the 9th para which ought to commence thus. "The decent in the Bhimnee Channel is not so steep as in the bed of the river consequently &c"

Vizagapatam District—
Bimlipatam ———
Coll.rs Circuit Cutchery—
21st October 1841———

/ Signed / W. M. Arbuthnot

Collector

Ordered that the following address be submitted in consequence.—

To The Acting Chief Secretary to Government

Sir

I am directed by the Board

Correspondence shewing the result of the measures taken by the Coll.rs of Rajahmundry & Vizagapatam in conformity with the instructions of Govt of the 14th July last with a view to the adjustment of a suit commenced by the owners of the Godicherlah and Streeramapooram Estates to establish their right to construct a dam in the Tandava river and recommending that the arrangement proposed for the settlement of the points in dispute may be acceded to—

Read Govt Order 5th Augt 1841

From Rajahmundry
16 inclosures 30th Septr 1841

From Vizagapatam
22d September
customs 14th Octr 1841

To Dr 14th October
From 21st October inclosures
4th November 1841

Board of Revenue, to request that you will submit for the consideration and orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the correspondence noted in the Margin shewing the result of the measures taken by the Collectors of Rajahmundry and Vizagapatam in conformity with the instructions conveyed in Mr. Chamier's letter of the 14th July last with a view to the adjustment of a suit commenced by the owner of the Godicherlah and Streeramporam Estates to establish her right to construct a dam in the Tadavah river.—

2 It will be seen that the Plaintiff in the suit above alluded to, has agreed to stay all further proceedings on condition that her right to erect a Temporary Bund & embankment across the Tandavah

15456 Fort St. George 4th November 1841

In Sandwich rives at the place indicated may be recognized and that the expences already incurred, which do not amount to more than Rupees 500. may be borne, in equal proportions by the defendant and herself.

It does not appear to the Board to be necessary to recapitulate the particulars of this case, as set forth in the letters now submitted It is sufficient to observe that under the circumstances represented in Mr. Arbuthnots letters of the 23d September & 21st Ultimo the Board consider that the arrangement proposed by the proprietor of the Goodecherlah &c. Estates for the settlement of the point at issue appears to be fair and reasonable and the Board recommend accordingly that it may be acceded to.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George 4th November 1841

(Signed) R. B. Arnollett
Secretary
Board

15457 Fort St. George 4th November 1841

Read the following letter

(8)

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

From the Pro. Collector of Nellore

Sir,

With reference to the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board dated 11th Instant transmitting Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 4th and its enclosures, I have the honor to forward copies of my letters to the Salt Agent at Chittagong of the 13th August and 17th and 21st September last from which it will be perceived that any quantity beyond 300,000 Bengal Maunds of Salt cannot be supplied from this District to Chittagong in the ensuing year. More salt would have been ready but the principal season of manufacture proved so wet that the Manufacture was liable to frequent interruption

2. I take this opportunity to state in reply to Mr. Porter's letter

15458 Fort St. George 4th November 1841

of the 11th Instant in regard to a supply of 2 lacks of Bengal Maunds for Calcutta in the ensuing year that it will not be possible for me to furnish a larger quantity than one lack and fifty thousand Maunds for the Calcutta Indent.— I shall be able to supply 3 Lacks of Maunds for Chittagong and a half Lacks for Calcutta but not more.—

Nellore
Prin.l Collector's Cutchery
19th October 1841.

Signed J. V. Stonehouse
Princ.l Collector

A
To The Salt Agent
Chittagong

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 26th Ultimo I have the honor to inform you that a quantity of two Lacks of Bengal Maunds of salt will be available for exportation from the Ports of this Collectorate to Chittagong by the 1st of February next exclusive of the balance of Salt due on account of the last Seasons indent.—

15459 Fort St. George 4th November 1841

2. In regard to making any arrangement as to the rate at which the article could be delivered at the Golahs of your District by the Madras Vessels I beg to refer you to my letter of the 23d of last month.—

Nellore
Pr. Collr's Cutchery
13th August 1841.

Signed J. V. Stonehouse
Pr. Collector

A. 109.

To The Salt Agent
Chittagong.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 29th Ultimo I have the honor to inform you that the balance uncleared of the last year's Indent is 97,800 Bengal Maunds and there is a certainty of exporting two Lacks of Maunds of salt on account of this year's Indent as communicated in my letter of the 13th Ultimo making in the aggregate 297,800 or in round numbers 300,000 Bengal Maunds which will be ready for exportation to Chittagong between January

January and May next. There remain likewise in store in the Ports of this Collectorate up to the present date a quantity of 137,220 Bengal Maunds of Salt uncleared on account of the Bengal Indent for 1840/41 which if not required by the Bengal Government can be supplied to the Vessels now engaged with, provided that I am permitted to do so by the authorities at Madras. These 137,000 Maunds cannot of course be calculated on at present as available for the Chittagong Indent.

Nellore
Pt. Coll.rs Cutcherry
17th September 1841

/Signed/ T. V. Stonehouse
Pt. Collector

No. III.

To The Salt Agent at Chittagong.

Sir,

1.— With reference to your letter of the 4th Instant I have the honor to inform you that as the season of manufacture has passed it will not be possible for me to supply

supply a larger quantity of Salt for exportation to Chittagong than that mentioned in my letter to you of the 17th of this month. If the Bengal Government can place at my disposal for supply to Chittagong the quantity of 137,000 Maunds now in store for the Bengal Indent of 1840/41 the full amount of your Indent of 1841/42 can be supplied, otherwise not.

2— Agreeably to your request copies of this and of my last communication to you have been forwarded to the Secretary to the Board of Customs Salt and Opium in Calcutta.

Nellore
Pt. Collectors Cutcherry
21st September 1841.

/Signed/ T. V. Stonehouse
Pt. Collector.

Read also the following letter

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

9

Sir,

From the Actg Collr of the Ft. Dt. of Arcot.

In reply to your Sub Secretary's letter of 11th Instant, I have the honor to state that I have sufficient Salt in store now to supply 2 Lacs of Maunds

Fort St. George 4th November 1841

Maunds for Bengal reserving enough to meet the ordinary demands expected previous to the manufacture of next year's Salt.

Cuddalore
Coll.rs Cutcherry
19th October 1841.

/Signed/ C. A. Hallett
Aff.o Collector.

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.

8-10

To The Acting Collector of South Arcot.

To the Aff.o Coll.rs of 1st Div.n of Arcot.
Infms.d 4th Novr. 1841.

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 19th Ultimo, I am directed by the Board of Revenue, to request that you will take measures for the manufacture of 50,000 Bengal Maunds of Salt for exportation to Calcutta in addition to the two Lacs already in Store to meet the demand for the ensuing year as it has been reported impracticable to supply the whole quantity ordered from Nellore in excess of the quantity required to be exported from that District to Chittagong.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
4th November 1841.

/Signed/ P. B. Smollett
Secretary.

Read

Fort St. George 4th November 1841

Read the following letters.

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

11

From the Sub Collector for the Div.n Coll.rs of Cuddapah

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 11th instant I have the honor to send herewith Copies of the Cowlnamahs and Hookoomnama which are now in force in this District.

Cuddapah Collector's Office
30th October 1841.

/Signed/ J. J. Cotton
Sub Collector for the Div.l Collector.

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

12

From the Coll.rs of Trichinapolly

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 11th Instant received today I have the honor to transmit Copies of the Hookoomnamah and Cowlenamahs which on taking charge of the Collectorate of Trichenopolly I found on the records of the Office

Office and copies of which were sent to the Board with Mr. Blair's letter of the 6th. of April 1835. but they never received the Board's sanction, and besides being exceedingly imperfect and in some important respects at variance with the actual practice of the district, they must not be considered as the standard rules for guidance in the management of the Land Revenue of the District.

Trichinopoly
Coll.rs Office
27th. October 1841. } Signed/ A. P. Onslow
Collector.

No. 1

Summabundy Hookoomnamah for the Settlement of Wet Talooks in Fusly 1244.

As it appears that the orders issued last year regarding the mode of Settlement to be followed in the wet Talooks were not fully understood, the following order is now sent which is to be strictly attended to in preparing the Summabundy Accounts.

The assessment is to be made on

on the Turm rate, according to the principles of Fusly 1231. and the practice which has improperly been followed, on some occasions, contrary to the instructions of the Board of Revenue, of altering the teerwah on the same land according to the crop that may happen to be grown, whether Peshanum or Car Vca. is entirely to be discontinued, whatever lands are cultivated with second crops this season over and above the extent so cultivated in fusly 1231, and which have only since paid the assessment as one crop land, they are to be brought to account and assessed at just so much as will make the aggregate teerwah on them equal to the assessment on lands of similar quality in the neighbourhood which are assessed for two Crops.—

In no case is the aggregate assessment on any particular field or fields to be made higher than that already fixed on such field or fields in the Turm Settlement of Fusly 1231. In cases where no second crop

crop teerwah has been previously fixed on land cultivated this year with two crops, then the assessment is to be fixed according to the rate prevailing on land of the like sort in the same Village. If turshy land is newly cultivated this year, then it is to be assessed with reference to the teerwah fixed on land of similar quality in the neighbourhood where the Meerasidars shall make it appear that second crops have been raised by them from water provided at their own escpence, without the assistance of the Circar, then no 2d crop teerwah is to be imposed on such lands.

Those lands which the Meerasidar from want of water, or other unavoidable causes shall have been unable to cultivate this year with second crops are to be deducted from the accounts, but the remission in such cases for the 2d crop shall be just so much as will reduce the assessment to a level with that fixed upon one crop land of like quality in the neighbourhood, so that if

if in a certain Village, the assessment for two crops on any particular field amounts to 12 Chuckrums per Cawny, and on another field in the same Village hitherto assessed; but for one crop the teerwah is 9 Chuckrums per Cawny, then if the second Crop on the former mentioned land is not cultivated the Assessment on the crop cultivated will be 9 Chuckrums.

[A true Extract]
[signed] H. M. Blair
Collector.

No. 2.

Translate of an Hookoomnamah for the Settlement of the dry Talooks in Fusly 1214.

The Settlement of fusly 1214

1.

is to be made in the actual cultivation only. The Puttadars and Curnums of each Village must use their best endeavours to recal those ryots who have fled from their Villages on account of former difficulties, and encourage all land-holders to

to exert their whole means in improving their lands to the utmost of their ability as they will not be called upon in future to pay for more land than they are able to cultivate, and as long as any ryot shall continue to pay the assessment fixed on the land he occupies, he shall be considered as the complete owner of it, and entitled to the full advantage of every increase in produce which may arise from his own industry.

2 Ryots who may wish to throw up any part of their Puttut land from inability to cultivate it, must give to the Tahsildar a Razeenamah in writing before the 30th June specifying in it the exctent they wish to relinquish, in order that the circumstance may be fully known in the Village. The Razeenamah must be signed by the Puttadar and Curnum of the Village, the Curnum being answerable for the correctness of it. The Tahsildars are to open a Register Book for the purpose of entering all the Razeenamahs. Copies of which are to be transmitted

6

to the Hoozzoor.

In relinquishing a portion of their Dittums it must be understood that Ryots cannot be allowed to throw up the worst land, retaining only the best, but must throw up the good with the bad to enable other Ryots to undertakes the cultivation of them.

4 No remission will be allowed for land left waste that is not relinquished in the manner prescribed above. Land so thrown up will be entirely at the disposal of the Circar, and the former occupier will not be permitted to interfere with it in any way whatever.

5. In the event of any Ryots being desirous to cultivate above his Dittum or Ryots from another Village or district applying for lands to cultivate, Puttahdars and Curnums are to allow them to take as much land as they may require from the fallow paying the full Teerwah fixed on the land.

6 Any extra land cultivated in one year may be relinquished in the neset

by

by means of a Razeenamah agreeably to the foregoing rules—

7. No remission can be allowed to any Ryot who may leave waste a portion of a Khet or Station of within one Canny of extent.

8. Land which the Circar may grant upon Cowle cannot be thrown up until the period of engagement in each instance is completed—

9 No Cowle will be granted to Ryots who do not cultivate to the full extent of their Dittums.—

10. No remission on Garden land left waste can be allowed unless sufficient reason be shewn for their not being cultivated.—

11. No remission will be allowed on inferior grains, such as Caramany, Cootty &c which may be cultivated on land capable of producing the highest Crops, and assessed as such—

12. All relinquished land not otherwise disposed of by the Circar

will

will be in common for the grazing of the Cattle of all the Ryots in the Village, and must not be appropriated by any one.—

/A true translate/

/signed/ W. M. Blair

Collector—

No. 3.

Translation of a Cowlenamah sent to the Talooks for the Cultivation of Jungle and waste land.—

If Shayecaul Tursey, or land waste for 3 years be cultivated, the teerwah for the 1st year upon it shall be 3/4—for the 2d year full teerwah to be charged.—

If Autos tursey or land not Ploughed for 5 years be cultivated 1/2 teerwah shall be charged for the 1st year, for the 2d year 3/4 for the 3d year full teerwah—

If Arady tursey or land not

Fort St. George 6th. November 1841.

not ploughed for more than 5 years
cultivated, the teerwah for the 1st year
shall be 1/4 for the 2d year 1/2 for the
3d year 3/4 and for the fourth year full
teerwah.—

If land covered with
jungle be cultivated, the teerwah for
1st year shall be 3/16 for the 2d year 6/16
the 3d year 1/2 for the 4th year 3/4 and for
the 5th year full teerwah.—

If the Parungaud or
land covered with high jungle be cul-
vated, the teerwah for the 1st year shall
be 3/16 for the 2d year 1/4 for the 3d year
6/16 for the 4th year 1/2 for the 5th year 3/4
and for the 6th year full teerwah.—

/ A true translation /

/ Signed / H. Ch. Blair

Collector

ordered to lie on the Table.

Proceedings

11 - 13

J.G.

Order on the 2 foregoing letters.

Fort St. George 6th. November 1841.

Proceedings.

Relative to the management of the Extra Sources of Revenue in the District of Chingleput for Fusly 1250.

15th Nov. 1841. Letter No. 14

14

Salt. 2.

The Board proceed to dispose of the Report by the Collector of Chingleput upon the management of the Extra Sources of Revenue in that District for Fusly 1250 contained in the letter noted in the margin.

The Salt Collections exhibit a decrease of Rupees 6,813-14-2 the result of a total decrease of Rupees 10,829-7-— in the Sales for home and inland consumption, and an increase of sales for exportation to Calcutta amounting to Rupees 4,015-8-10. The decrease in the Collections on account of home and inland sales is explained to have been owing to the suspension of the Sales at Cooleng from 26th January to 31st May that the Salt then in store might be reserved for exportation to Calcutta to meet an indent from the Supreme Government. The deficiency arising from this cause is stated to have been already more than compensated in the current Fusly

Fusly 1249—4,04,503-15-—
" 1250—3,97,695-—-10
6,813-14-2

the

the increase within the Month of July as compared with the sales for the same period in the preceding year being upwards of Rupees 12,000.

Rs. A. P.
x 7,010-1-9 3. In the x Salt Charges there was an increase of Rupees 8,642-3- which appears, on reference to Statement No. 1, to have been principally owing to the disbursement of Salt compensation to the Shotrimundar of Manaly which had been allowed to remain in deposit for several years in consequence of disputes between the Shotrimundar and others- the increase under this head alone was 7,140 Rs 13-8. The remainder was occasioned by an increased amount of disbursement on account of Coodeva: puns or Manufacturer's share, and for repairs of the roads leading to the platforms &c.

4. The Net revenue after deducting Charges amounted to Rupees 3,26,874-9-10 shewing a deficit of Rupees 15,341-6-10 as compared with the Net revenue of Fusly 1249.

In

Sayer. 5. In the Sayer demand there was an increase

Fusly 1250 — 55,019-7-9.
" 1249 — 53,805-12-9.
1,213-11-"

of Rupees 1,213-11- the greater part of which occurred in the rent of the duty on Betel leaves which exceeded that of fusly 1249. by Rupees

P 3. 920. The gross collections amounted to Rupees 54,126-10-6 and the Net revenue after deducting Charges to Rupees 46,370-15- being less by Rupees 163-7-8 than the net revenue of fusly 1249. This deficiency appears to be owing to their having been no arrears outstanding at the close of Fusly 1249 whereas the Collections of that year comprize a sum of Rupees 663-9-6 arrears of the year preceding.

There was a balance of 6. Rupees 979-14-1 due at the close of the fusly under review on account of the current demand which has been since brought to account.

Abkarry 7. The Abkarry rents exceeded those of fusly 1249. by Rupees 6,500- the demand for fusly 1250. being Rupees

Rupees 68,400 of which Rupees 66,036-9-11 were collected within the year and the remainder was brought to account subsequently. The net revenue from this source was Rupees 70,312-8-6 shewing a gain of Rupees 7,840-10-11 upon the net revenue of Fusly 1249.

Sundry Small Farms & Licenses 8.

Fusly 1249	19,518-13-6	
" 1250	16,907-14-1	
		2,610-15-5.

Owing to a decreased demand for firewood, and Cheypoot from Shee hari cottah, the Settlement under the head of Sundry Small Farms, and Licenses fell below that of Fusly 1249. by Rupees 2,610-15-5 the total revenue including extra Collections and Arrears amounted to Rupees 16,535-8-4; and in consequence of the Collections on account of Arrears being somewhat greater than in Fusly 1249- the decrease below the revenue of Fusly 1249 is reduced to Rupees 1,481-10-1.

9 Of the balance due on account of Sundry Small Farms and Licenses at the close of Fusly 1250

which

which amounted to Rupees 6,384-15-9 a portion amounting to Rupees 2,289-6-7 was realized by the date of the report under consideration and the remainder is stated to be in course of realization.

Stamps 10. The decrease under this head which amounts to Rupees 179²-6-9 is represented to be more nominal than real as the collections for Fusly 1249 include a sum of Rupees 2,734- realized from the sale of the property of a defaulting Stamp-vender. The entry under this head in the Statement annexed to Para 1 of the Collector's report shews the gross collections within the year, instead of the current collections noticed above. This is presumed to be a mistake as the Statement purports to shew the Settlement of the year. The net revenue after deducting Charges in which there was a small increase

Fusly 1249	15,103-5-3.
" 1250	13,310-14-6
	179²-6-9

× Pg. A. P. 76-4-10

of

of Rupees 66-5-5 amounted to Rs. 14,102-5-8. a. 0. shewing a decrease of Rupees 1,272-12-2 below the net revenue of Fusly 1249.

Moturpha 11.

In the Moturpha Fusly 1250—13,484-13-1. Settlement there was a small

" 1249—13,339-8-9 increase of Rupees 145-4-4

145-4-4 The Current Collections exceed: ed those of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 728-9-5 and the net revenue shews an increase of Rupees 1,333-4-1 the balance of Rupees 3,445-7-1 which was due on account of the Settlement of Fusly 1250, at the close of the year, has been reduced by subsequent collections to Rupees 833-6-3 which will be collected in due course.

Total 12.

In the Settlement of Fusly 1249—56,176-7-3. all the branches of extra

1250—54,818-2-3 revenue for Fusly 1250 there

3,358-5-" was a decrease of Rupees 3,358-5-" owing to increased Collections under the head of "Extra Collections and Arrears" the gross

Collections

collections within the year fell short of those in Fusly 1249 by Rupees 723-11-11 only. In the charges however there was an increase of Rupees 8,361-9-10 the cause of which is explained above, under the article "Salt". The result was a decrease in the Net revenue from all branches amounting to Rupees 9,085-5-9.

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 Government and that a transcript of the same be forwarded to the Collector of Chingleput for his information and guidance.

Chingleput

15498. Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Chingleput. Fusly 1250.

		Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250	Increase	Decrease
		Rs. As.	Rs. as.	Rs. as.	Rs. as.
Salt	Demand	4,04,508 15	3,97,695 10	" "	6,813 14 2
	Balance on the 11th July	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Current Collection	4,04,508 15	3,97,695 10	" "	6,813 14 2
	Extra Dc	75 " 5	189 10 9	114 10 4	" "
	Arrears	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Total	4,04,583 15 5	3,97,884 11 7	" "	6,699 3 10
	Charges	62,367 14 9	71,010 1 9	8,642 3 "	" "
	Net Revenue	342216 " 8	326,874 9 10	" "	15,341 6 10
Sayer	Demand	53,805 12 9	55,019 7 9	1,213 11 "	" "
	Balance on the 11th July	" "	979 14 1	979 14 1	" "
	Current Collection	53,805 12 9	54,039 9 8	233 12 11	" "
	Extra Dc	138 3 1	87 " 10	" "	51 2 3
	Arrears	663 9 4	" "	" "	663 9 4
	Total	54,607 9 2	54,126 10 6	" "	480 14 8
	Charges	3,073 2 6	7,755 11 6	" "	317 7 "
	Net Revenue	46,534 6 8	46,370 15 "	" "	163 7 8
Abkarry	Demand	64,900 " "	63,400 " "	6,500 " "	" "
	Balance on the 11th July	4,903 2 6	4,763 6 "	" "	139 12 6
	Current Collection	57,576 13 8	66,036 9 11	8,459 12 3	" "
	Extra Dc	" 10 6	" 5 10	" "	" 4 8
	Arrears	4,966 10 8	4,323 2 4	" "	643 8 "
	Total	62,544 2 10	70,360 2 1	7,815 15 3	" "
	Charges	72 5 3	47 9 7	" "	24 11 8
	Net Revenue	62,471 13 7	70,312 8 6	7,840 10 11	" "
Sundry Small Farms and Licenses	Demand	19,518 13 6	16,907 14 1	" "	2,610 15 5
	Balance on the 11th July	6,080 " 11	6,384 15 9	304 14 10	" "
	Current Collection	13,438 12 7	10,522 14 4	" "	2,915 14 3
	Extra Dc	50 " 2	45 " 11	" "	4 15 3
	Arrears	4,528 5 8	5,967 9 1	1,439 3 5	" "
	Total	18,017 2 5	16,535 8 4	" "	1,481 10 1
	Charges	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Net Revenue	18,017 2 5	16,535 8 4	" "	1,481 10 1
Stamps	Demand	15,103 5 3	13,310 14 6	" "	1,792 6 9
	Balance on the 11th July	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Current Collection	15,103 5 3	13,310 14 6	" "	1,792 6 9
	Extra Dc	881 12 "	1,467 12 "	586 " "	" "
	Arrears	" "	" "	" "	" "
	Total	15,985 1 3	14,778 10 6	" "	1,206 6 9
	Charges	609 15 5	676 4 10	66 5 5	" "
	Net Revenue	15,375 1 10	14,102 5 8	" "	1,272 12 2

15500

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read the following letters

To

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

15

From the Collector of Chingleput — Reporting the demise of Cavilly Vencata Subbiah and requesting authority to register the Sagbire in the name of Cavilly Venkata Boniah the eldest of the surviving sons of Cavilly Venkata Lutchmiah the late Sagbiredar of Timmanoor.

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to report for the information of the Board of Revenue the demise on the 10th September, of Cavilly Venkata Subbiah the eldest son of Cavilly Venkata Lutchmiah on whom the Sagbire of Timmanoor was conferred for 3 lives.

2. On the death of the Original Grantee I suggested that the Sagbire as is usual in such cases should be registered in the names of the sons of the deceased, which proposition met with the Boards approval, but that arrangement has, I am sorry to say, led to the remaining brothers now advancing a claim to the continuation of the Sagbire to them jointly, and to the survivor of them, as the 2nd life, and then that it should descend to their children in a similar manner. This I have distinctly informed them is not the correct interpretation of the Grant and that

x Vide letter from Board 13th September 1839.

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read

To

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to report for the information of the Board of Revenue the demise on the 10th September, of Cavilly Venkata Subbiah the eldest son of Cavilly Venkata Lutchmiah on whom the Sagbire of Timmanoor was conferred for 3 lives.

2. On the death of the Original Grantee I suggested that the Sagbire as is usual in such cases should be registered in the names of the sons of the deceased, which proposition met with the Boards approval, but that arrangement has, I am sorry to say, led to the remaining brothers now advancing a claim to the continuation of the Sagbire to them jointly, and to the survivor of them, as the 2nd life, and then that it should descend to their children in a similar manner. This I have distinctly informed them is not the correct interpretation of the Grant and that

15499.

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read

To

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to report for the information of the Board of Revenue the demise on the 10th September, of Cavilly Venkata Subbiah the eldest son of Cavilly Venkata Lutchmiah on whom the Sagbire of Timmanoor was conferred for 3 lives.

2. On the death of the Original Grantee I suggested that the Sagbire as is usual in such cases should be registered in the names of the sons of the deceased, which proposition met with the Boards approval, but that arrangement has, I am sorry to say, led to the remaining brothers now advancing a claim to the continuation of the Sagbire to them jointly, and to the survivor of them, as the 2nd life, and then that it should descend to their children in a similar manner. This I have distinctly informed them is not the correct interpretation of the Grant and that

Demand ___ Rs. 13,339 8 9
Balance on the 1st July ___ " 13,484 13 1
Current Collection ___ " 145 4 4
Extra Do ___ " 4029 12 2
Arrears ___ " 3446 7 1
Total ___ " 583 5 1

Charges ___ " 9,900 12 7
Net Revenue ___ " 250 12 7
" 3092 8 3

Demand ___ Rs. 14,068 6 0
Balance on the 1st July ___ " 13,819 7 3
Current Collection ___ " 248 10 9
Extra Do ___ " 3092 8 3

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

that the 2nd of the lives to which the grant was restricted lapsed with the life of the eldest son of the Grantee.

3.

As this last mentioned person has now died childless, I would suggest in order that the intentions of Government may be clearly defined that the Sayhire be registered in the name of Cavilly Venkata Boriah, the eldest of the surviving sons of the Grantee, with an intimation that the Government expect him to support the other Members of the family; or should the Board be of opinion that the Sayhire should be registered in the names of the two surviving brothers, that it be distinctly put on record whether the Sayhire is, or is not to revert to Government on the demise of Cavilly Venkata Boriah.

4.

The Village up to the demise of Cavilly Venkata Subbiah remained in the possession of the Mortgagee Sevasum Kaur Pondiah whose debts are not near liquidated; but as the surviving sons of the original Grantee have not by any personal act made themselves parties to the debt, the Sayhire must, I conceive now be made over to them.

The

Fort St. George 4th November 1842.

5.

The Mortgagee, when the Village was left in his possession, on the succession of Cavilly Venkata Subbiah, refused to enter into any compromise, and he might now be referred to the Courts to substantiate his claims against Cavilly Venkata Boriah and Cavilly Venkata Narrainpah, as heirs of Cavilly Venkata Lutchmiah, and members of an undivided family.

Chingleput District,
Collector's Cutcherry,
Pallecarnary 19th October, 1841.

/Signed/ A. Freese
Collector.

Order thereon.
(Read again in Cons 10th December.)

Ordered to be sent again in circulation.

15-16

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

From the Collector of Chingleput

Sir,

17

I have the honor to report for the information of the Board that although the Iron Ploughs from Porto Novo were twice put up to Auction, not a single offer could be obtained.

Chingleput District,
Collector's Cutcherry,
Pallecarnary 19th October 1841.

/Signed/ A. Freese
Collector

Order

15503 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Order thereon.

17.18

Ordered to be recorded.

To

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

From the Collector of Chingleput

Sir,

Para 1. With reference to an Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, under date the 30th Ultimo, I have the honor to state that the wish of the Cranadar of Caremmandalum is to relinquish in perpetuity that portion of the Maniyum land referred to in my former communication, a corresponding remission of Rupees 72-5-2. in his Quit Rent being allowed.

2. Of the 47 Cawnies of Nunjah land comprizing the Cavil Maniyum made over to the Cranadar in 1242 Fourteen are Shanjhal or cultivated, and 17 Cawnies are available for cultivation, but require to be surrounded by a dam to prevent inundation from the adjacent Salt River

19

15504 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

River by which the soil has already been greatly impoverished. The remaining 16 Cawnies of land which the Cranadar wishes to be relieved from, are totally unfit for cultivation of any kind or even for a plantation of Cocoanut Trees.

Chingleput District,
Collector's Cutcherry,
Pullecarnay 21st October, 1841.

/signed/ A. Frees
Collector.

Ordered that the following address be submitted in consequence.-

To

The Acting Chief Secretary
to Government.

19.20

To the Acting Chief Secretary to Govt.

Sir,

With reference to the accompanying correspondence from the Collector of Chingleput 9th in Cons 30th September 1841. Proceedings of the Board 28th Do. from the Collector 31st October in Cons 4th November 1841. which is herewith submitted for the consideration and orders.

orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council I am directed by the Board of Revenue, to request that sanction may be granted for a reduction in the Dist Rent payable by the Ercumdar of Carremundalum to the extent of Rupees 72-5-2 in consideration of his relinquishing 15 Cawnies of the Canil Maniam land made over to him in Fasly 1212. the said land having become totally unfit for Cultivation owing to an accumulation of sand upon it to the depth in some places of several feet.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
4th November, 1841.

Signed/ P. B. Smollett
Secretary/

P. B. S.

Read

Read the following letter.

To

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

21

From the Principal Collector of North Arcot forwarding copy of the Summud with translation of the Caramfankem Village called for in the Board's Proceedings of the 9th September 1841.

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to forward the Zemindar's Duftar copy of the Summud, with translate, conveying the Village of Caurapaukum to Venkataramiah, as called for in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under date the 9th Ultimo.

2. The Original Summud, the Zemindar reports, must be in the possession of the Original Grantees relations, but where they are, or who they are, he cannot tell.

3. The terms as appears by the Summud, under which the Village was granted is, that of Sadee-Enam.

4. I stated in the 5th para of my letter of the 26th August. that the surplus fund in deposit amounted to Rupees 6,146-13-11 this has since been discovered to have been erroneously entered

entered, the real sum in deposit being
only Rupees 5,583 - 5 - 9

North Arcot
Print.d Coll.rs Cert.d Cutchry
Palmanair, 19th Oct.r 1841

/Signed/ G. M. Ogilvie
Principal Collector.

Swastry Stree /Succes/ Vejayabudiah /may
good luck attend/. Translation of a
Bohoodanah Dunna Shashana Puttreey
or deed of Charity gift given by Stree.
madiney jauba Gotrum Oondia Rajah
Damara Comdrah Venkatapah Naidoo Bahadar,
Grandson of Comara Vekapah Naidoo,
and son of Timma Naidoo, to Cowsika
Gotrem Gennamandrum Vencatramiah,
Grandson of Vencatramiah and son
of Kistiah on the day of Bahdrapudah
Soodah Pournamy, your Vero-dewcaroo,
1713 Years after the birth of Sahliva-
hanah Sakeem, corresponding with A.D. 179[illegible]

Upon your requiring a
Village, exclusively for the purpose of
establishing an Anna Chuttrum (gratuitously
distributing of Rice) at Calastry in honor of
the deity of that place, I hereby grant you the

the Village of Carapaukum, of the Chilla-
inatoor Maganum in the Coomara Vejayana-
garum Talook attached to my Zemindary,
exclusive of the Dasab Brananah, Meraf,
Manium Swamiah, Sotuntra and Roosoom,
but you are to enjoy every thing besides,
such as the Caroo, Roosum, Dasian
&c.a. The gift is given in the name
of Money and water on this good
day of Mahapournamy, as charity
to be enjoyed in perpetuity; therefore
the privileges of the said Village shall
be enjoyed by you, your son, your grand
son and posterity, by maintaining the
institution. The Gift is granted so
long as the sun and moon endure.
He that protects and aids an act of benevolence,
merits greater praises, than he who bestowed
it, But he that abuses the progress of so
virtuous a deed, loses even the virtue
of any good he ever did.

The Signature of the present Zemindar

/True Translation/

/Signed/ G. M. Ogilvie
Principal Collector

Ordered

15512. Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Order thereon.
(Read again in Cons. 11th Novr number)

Ordered to be brought forward at a future day.

21 - 22

Read the following letter

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

From the Principal Collector of Salem

Sir,

23

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Extract from the Proceedings of the Board dated 7th October and in reply to inform the Board that there is no restriction to the people having access with me either by person or Vakeel. The notice formerly issued was for the purpose of bringing people personally before the Collector as when complaints were sent by tappal it was sometimes found that the ostensible senders knew nothing about them. This was found inconvenient and the notice forwarded with my letter of 24th September was issued. Of course the public tappal is open to all and now also the tatook - personal communication they have at all times had.

Salem Dillah,
Palevde
Asst. Collr. Cutchery
19th October 1841.

/Signed/ J. D. Gleig
Principal Collector.

Proceedings thereon.

23. 24

The Orders of the Board were meant to ensure that access should be had by all classes to the Principal Collector either personally or by Vakeel, or by Petitions whether forwarded by the Public Dawk or private tappal. If the system now in operation in Salem secures this, there no further instructions are required, but if otherwise, Mr. Gleig will do what is required to meet the orders now communicated to him.

Read

15513. Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read again letter from the Acting Collector of South Arcot dated 12th and entered in Consultation 25th Ultimo.

Ordered that the following address be submitted in consequence.

To
The Acting Chief Secretary to
Government.

25

To the Acting Chief Secy to Government
Submitting with reference to Para 2 of the Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 4th September last, a letter from the Acting Collector of South Arcot explaining the necessity for a larger advance of Tuccavy in that District than was customary during the current year with observations in reply to the enquiry of Government why advances are more required in South Arcot than in most other districts.

In Cons. 23rd Sept. 1841.

12th Nov. Cons. 25th October 1841.

Sir,

Para 1. With reference to the observations contained in Para 2 of the Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 4th September, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the accompanying Report from Mr. Hallett Acting Collector of South Arcot explaining the necessity that existed for a larger advance of Tuccavy in that District than was customary during the Current year.

2. The Acting Collector it will be

seen

15514 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

seen is of opinion that the disbursements under this head in ordinary seasons may be greatly reduced.

3. The Board annex a Statement of the Amount of Advances for Tuccavy in the nine years ending with Fusly 1249 with the amount actually disbursed on this account in each year and the recoveries from which it will be seen that the entire sum disbursed in each Fusly was invariably recovered within the same year.

4. In reference to the enquiry of Government why advances are more required in South Arcot than in most other Districts the Board observe that the amount sanctioned for this District during the last six Fusles

Fusles	Amount sanctioned for Bellary for 1 Arcot	Amount sanctioned Arpa dc.	
1245	1,21,500	1,10,700	
1246	1,08,000	1,10,000	
1247	1,03,500	1,10,000	
1248	1,04,000	1,06,000	
1249	1,00,000	73,600	
1250	1,00,000	60,000	

fall considerably short of that for the Bellary District although the Land Revenue of each is nearly the same and both are settled Ryotwar. In Districts settled Ryotwar where the Amount of Individual holdings is frequently very small it has hitherto been customary to make large advances for Tuccavy, but under the recent orders of the Government & the Court of Directors this Amount will be gradually diminished

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Signed / P. B. Smallett
Secretary.

15515

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Statement of Tuccavy for South Arcot from Fusly 1245 to 1249

	Amount sanctioned for Arpa dc.	Amount actually issued	Amount recovered within each Fusly.	Balance.	
Fusly 1245	1,10,700	72,750	72,750		
" 1246	1,10,000	96,200	96,200		
" 1247	1,10,000	122,362	84,762	37,600	Estimated Advances for Fusly 1250
" 1248	1,06,000	100,000	62,510	37,490	Ditto for this year
" 1249	73,600	42,270	42,270		
Rs.	5,10,300	4,33,582	3,58,492	75,090	
Fusly 1241	90,200	72,750	72,750		
" 1242	90,200	98,600	90,200	8,400	
" 1243	1,21,700	123,210	115,100	8,110	
" 1244	1,06,000	102,240	102,240		
" 1245	1,10,700	106,611	106,611		
" 1246	1,10,000	101,611	101,611		
" 1247	1,10,000	101,611	101,611		
" 1248	1,06,000	101,611	101,611		
" 1249	73,600	42,270	42,270		
Rs.	9,38,400	8,04,714	7,72,204	32,510	

Amount of Advances for Tuccavy in the nine years ending with Fusly 1249 with the amount actually disbursed on this account in each year and the recoveries from which it will be seen that the entire sum disbursed in each Fusly was invariably recovered within the same year.

Amount sanctioned for Arpa dc. for 1 Arcot

Amount sanctioned for Bellary for 1 Arcot

Amount actually issued

Amount recovered within each Fusly.

Balance.

Estimated Advances for Fusly 1250

Ditto for this year

Rs.

Fusly 1241

" 1242

" 1243

" 1244

" 1245

" 1246

" 1247

" 1248

" 1249

Rs.

Pondi.

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read the following letter.

To

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

(26)

From the Acting Coll.r of South Arcot.

Submitting his opinion relative to a contemplated change in the duties of Arrack and Toddy.

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of 29th July, relative to a contemplated change in the duties on Arrack and Toddy.

2. It has been asserted as an "established and well known fact" that crime would be much diminished in Nellore if "the sale of liquor were more restricted". This appears to have led to the discussion; and it is desirable therefore that it should be declared if the like can be said of other Districts.

3. When lately Acting as Magistrate in the Zillah of Cuddapah, on one side bordering with Nellore, where crime had been for some time, and was still, excessive, I paid most particular attention

to

to the state of the Police and to the origin and commission of crimes of every description and character, and I can most unhesitatingly decide, that never in cases of aggravated crimes could the use of intoxicating liquors be assigned as the cause and rarely in the many instances of Petty Offences.

4. My experience in South Arcot and my communications with all the Officers of Government under me, lead me to the very same conclusion.

5. In both districts (especially in this, where toddy is most unusually cheap), I of course allow that in consequence of intoxication there are trivial squabbles and disturbances, which only call for the interference of a Moonsiff or punishment by a Police Officer; but such I conceive are quite beside the question, tho' I cannot but think

that

that this description of crime it is, which has induced the opinion as regards Nellore; my own experience, of late in two Districts as a Magistrate, and formerly in a third as a Joint Magistrate, by no means permitting me to allow its truth as respects them.

6. The argument of the Court of Fouzdaree Udalut is entirely based on the assumption, that the use of spirituous liquors, and intoxication, are identical. That intoxication should be taxed and interdicted is no doubt the object of every good Government, but to do this there is no justice in at the same time inflicting a penalty upon a moderate and perhaps beneficial use of fermented liquors.

7. Possibly if Arrack and Toddy be made more expensive, intoxication will be somewhat prevented tho' there is reason to fear that smuggling will ever defeat this

end, the experience of every Country tells us that the result of a heavy duty and relative contracted consumption is ever a decrease, and not an increase, in the revenue. It therefore may be presumed that no gain to the revenues, can be looked for from such an alteration; and least of all can it be admitted that "if the revenue falls it must be from reduced consumption and less intoxication" for this would be at once to forget that the certain consequence of increasing the value of an article in such common use, would be the encouragement of illicit manufacture and smuggling of every kind, which would be very successful in providing for the present demand and consumption.

8. It is this danger which it would be requisite to guard against, for

for while I firmly believe that intoxication would not be put down, inasmuch as people would indulge to greater excess when obtaining the spirit clandestinely, the Offences of smuggling and unlicensed retailing (generally leading to more serious crimes) would be most alarmingly increased.

9. The same vigilance, which is exercised with regard to other descriptions of crime, would of course be extended towards checking an increase of smuggling but the gain being great, the risk would always be incurred.

10. Arrack and Toddy are now invariably sold far below the authorized rate, as it is manufactured by the renters so cheaply. This practice it is very difficult to prevent; it has already been considered by me - and tho' an

excellent remedy suggests itself as to Arrack Viz.t. to allow no private stills whatever, but the Government to supply the renters at a fixed price, I am not prepared to point out in this communication any equally sure mode of keeping to a certain mark the retail of Toddy.

11. Probably efficient means however can be devised for ensuring at a steady price, proportioned to the existing duties, the retail of both liquors.

12. But as to the question now under discussion, I am of opinion, that, if the tax be raised on intoxicating liquors so as to render them available only to the wealthier classes, intoxication and consequent Petty Offences will not be materially decreased, and crime will not be lessened - while the people will be deprived

deprived of the enjoyment and benefit of their moderate use, the Revenues will be most seriously affected, and a determined disposition to smuggle and to manufacture illicitly will be promoted, ultimately leaving a more injurious effect upon the morals of the people, than even the abuse of those spirits under the present system.

Cuddalore. Collectors Cutcherry, 1st November, 1841. } /Signed/ C. H. Hallett Acting Collector.

Order thereon (Read again in cons 11th November) Ordered to be brought forward at a future meeting.

(26. 27)

Read the following letter

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

(28)

Sir

From the Princ. Coll. of Madura — }

In returning Petition No. 1399 of 1841, forwarded with your letter of the 7th Instant, and received yesterday,

I have the honor to inform you my decision of the 28th July was passed under Section XI of Regulation V of 1822. Petitioners proper course if dissatisfied with my order was an appeal to the Zillah Court under Section XVI of the same Regulation. As the Petitioner has furnished the Board with a copy of my decision I am unaware of the nature of the report you ask for.

Madura, Manapliar, 20th October, 1841 } /Signed/ J. Blackburne Principal Collector.

Proceedings thereon, (28. 29)

The Board of Revenue were desirous of perusing the diary and evidence, oral and documentary on which the Principal Collector's order complained of, was founded. but as it appears that the decision in question was passed under the Provisions of Regulation V of 1822, the Petitioner's proper

course

course was to appeal to the Zillah Court.

Ordered accordingly that the following Endorsement be passed upon the original Petition No. 1399 of 1841 and that it be returned for delivery to the Party concerned thro' the Principal Collector of Madura—

"The Board of Revenue have ascertained from the local Officer that the decision complained of in this address was passed under the authority of Section XI Regulation V of 1822. Under Section XVI of that enactment an appeal from the Collector's judgment lies to the Zillah Court and not to the Board of Revenue and Petitioner is instructed to proceed accordingly."

30

From the Principal Collr. of Madura.

transmitting as required Statement of Contingent Charges incurred in Fasly 1250 and a portion of Fasly

Read letter,

30 - 31

Fasly 1249.

Order thereon.

Ordered to lie over.

Read the following letter.

To

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

32

From the Asst. Collr. of Canara—

Sir,

In reference to my letter of date the 29th of September 1840, I have the honor to forward accounts

*Mangalore 1231 to 1848
Bekul — ditto —
Udipi — ditto — the five *Talooks noted in the mar-
Barcoor — ditto —
Honore — ditto — gin, as requested in the Circular letter

dated 21st October 1839.

The Accounts of the remaining Talooks will be forwarded so soon as they are ready.

Asst. Collr's Cutcherry,
Mangalore,
27th October, 1841.

/signed/ H. M. Blair
Principal Collector.

Order thereon.

Ordered to be recorded.

32 - 33

Read the following letter.

To

15526 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

To

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

(34)

From the Collector of Malabar, Para 1.

Sir,

In reply to my letter of the 17th October 1840, the Board of Revenue declined (under date the 12th November of the same year) "to recommend compliance with Kristna Row's "request that the period which intervened from his dismissal in Canara "to his appointment in Malabar as "Head Sheristadar should be reckoned "as service, in calculating the pay he "should draw, but observed that if the Home Government "should consider Kristna Row entitled to the allowance of the Office during the above period, he would then seem properly entitled to what he solicited.

2 The Court of Directors having under

15527 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

under date the 20th January last, apparently made this concession by directing that Kristna Row be granted such amount of pay as was, in their opinion, in their power to bestow. I take the liberty of again bringing his case to the notice of the Board, and requesting that his application forwarded with my letter of the 17th October 1840 may be reconsidered.

3. There may be difficulties in complying with Kristna Row's prayer, as far as arrears are concerned, but none, I should hope, in allowing him to draw the highest rate of allowance viz. 700 Rupees a Month from the date of the receipt of the Court's despatch.

Malabar Collector's Office,
On Circuit, Markallom,
16th October, 1841.

Signed / H. V. Conolly
Collector

Ordered

Ordered that the fol: lowing address be submitted in consequence.

To

The Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

34-35

Sir

1

To the Acting Chief Secy. to Government. Para 1.

Submitting a correspondence having reference to a claim advanced by Kristna Row Head Sheristadar of Malabar that the period which intervened from his dismissal in Canara to his re-appointment as Head Sheristadar in Malabar should be reckoned as service in calculating the pay he should now draw and stating that Mr. Conolly solicits that if there be any difficulty in admitting the payment of arrears the highest rate of allowance to which the Sheristadar is entitled Rupees 700 per mensem may be granted to him from the date of the receipt of the Honble Courts Despatch authorizing payment of Rs. 15,563-14-5 as compensation to Kristna Row for his unmerited dismissal.

The Board of Revenue direct me to request you will lay before Government for orders the correspondence noted in the margin having reference to a claim advanced by Kristna Row Head Sheristadar of Malabar that the period which intervened from his dismissal in Canara to his re-appointment as Head Sheristadar of Malabar should be reckoned as service in calculating the pay he should now draw.

2.

When this request was submitted by Mr. Conolly in the first instance, the Board refused to entertain it. They observed that Kristna Row's claim to

the allowances of his former Official station had been forwarded for the consideration of the Home authorities, and remarked that if this was conceded then his present application might be complied with, while if it was rejected the ordinary rules that regulate the pay of Servants of his class must strictly be enforced.

3. It is in consequence of the Honorable Courts despatch of date the 20th January 1841, which authorized the payment of Rupees 15,563-14-5 as compensation to Kristna Row for his unmerited dismissal that the present request is again preferred. Its effect if complied with, will be to acknowledge Kristna Row's title to the difference between Pagodas 125 and 150, or Rupees 87/2 per Mensem, from the 17th April 1839 when he was appointed to Malabar to

the

the 1st. November 1840, and from that date forward to pay at the rate of 200 Pagodas per Mensem. Mr. Conolly it will be seen supports his Head Native Servants claim, and solicits if there be any difficulty in admitting the payment of arrears that at all events the highest rate of allowance Rupees 700 per Mensem may be granted to him from the date of the receipt of the Honorable Courts despatch.

4. It will give the Board much pleasure, I am instructed to add if Government under the circumstances of the case are enabled to comply with the recommend-

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
4th. November, 1841.

Signed J. P. B. Lindlett
Secretary

Read the following Letter

To

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

36

Sir,

From the Collector of Malabar

With reference to the latter part of the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue under date the 6th. Ultimo, I have the honor to return herewith the 1st. Edition of the Law relating

PHOTOGRAPHIC ORIGINAL RESTRICTED

15532 Fort St. George 4th November 18

relating to India received with Mr. Porter's letter dated the 15th April last.

Malabar, Collector's Office, On Circuit Markallom, 25th October, 1841.

Signed H. [illegible] Collector

36 . 37

Ordered to be on the table.

Order thereon.

38

From the Register of Government Grants.

Read Extract from the Register of Certificates issued to individuals for the Quarter ending 11th October last.

Ordered to be recorded.

Order thereon.

38 - 39

J.G.B.

Read

15533 Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

Read the following letter.

To The President and Members of the Board of Revenue.

40

From the Supt. of Stamps.

Gentlemen,

I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, giving cover to translation of an Arzee from Cooday Soorie Narrain Row, requesting that Rupees 1,000 the value of a stampt Paper purchased under a misconception that a Stamp of that value was requisite for filing a supplemental suit in the Court of the Governor's Agent, may be returned to him.

As there does not appear to be any reason to doubt the correctness of Narrain Row's statements, I beg to solicit the sanction of your Board for the refund of the amount, and for destroying the stamp in question.

Fort St. George, Genl. Stamp Office, 26th October, 1841.

Signed J.C. Morris Superintendent of Stamps

To,

Fort St. George 4th November 1841

A

To the Superintendent of Stamps.

Sir,

Fort St. George.

I have the honor to forward Translation of an Arzee addressed to me by Gooty Loorea Narain Row, requesting that Rupees 1000 the Value of a Stamp paper erroneously purchased by him may be repunded, and I request your instructions on the subject.

Vizagapatam District Collector's Circuit Cutcherry, 16th October 1841.

I have &c.
(Signed) W. Arbuthnot
Collector

No. 1 in A.

Translation of a letter from Gooty Looria Narain Row to W. Arbuthnot Esqr. Collector in the Zillah of Vizagapatam.

Having had occasion to present a supplemental Plaint in cause No. 138 of 1841 on the file of the Vizagapatam District, in which I am Plaintiff & on the 2nd Instant inadvertently

Fort St. George 4th November 1841

inadvertently purchased a Stampt paper of 1,000 Rupees Value in your Office in addition to the one of the same value which I have used for my first Plaint. But some people acquainted with the Judicial Law having advised me that if I use that paper for the supplemental Plaint, the Court would not declare the Value thereof to be reimbursed to me by the Defendant in as much as what I have to state in the Supplemental Plaint does not exceed the amount claimed in my original one. I therefore wrote the supplemental Plaint on a Stampt paper of 4 Rupees Value instead of the said paper of 1,000 Rupees and presented the same, Consequently the paper of 1,000 Rupees has been remaining with me in vain. The vender having with reference to the orders of the Board of Revenue endorsed on the back of that paper that it was sold for supplemental Arzee

in

in Cause No. 138 of 1841. it will not be so available for any other purpose at any period, Nor do I at present find any occasion to bring a suit for so much amount as to require a paper of 1,000 Rupees value, with a view to the convenience of individuals the Government declared in the Governor Agents Rules that if any suit brought before the Governor's Agent is settled either by an answer admitting the claim or by a Razeenamah, the Value of the Plaint should be refunded to the Plaintiffs, and you have accordingly been pay returning such amount; As I trust that the Government would liberally protect the individuals against any loss that may ensue to them through their error, I hope you will be pleased to recommend to and obtain the sanction of the Board of Revenue for the purpose of returning to me the sum of 1,000 Rupees, being the

the Value of the said paper, which I enclose herein, that you and the Board may inspect it.

9th October, 1841. (Signed) Goday Seeva Narrain Row.

Order thereon.

(40 - 41)

Ordered that a Copy of the foregoing letter, with its Enclosures be submitted for the consideration and orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, with the Board's recommendation that the request of G. S. Narrain Row for the refund of Rupees 1000, the value of a stamp paper purchased by him under a misconception, the nature of which is explained in his Petition, may be complied with.

Read the following letter.

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue

(42)

From the Advocate General.

Replying to the Board's Proceedings of the 4th Instant on the subject of carrying into effect Patcheyappah Moodelly's Charities in the Provinces under this Presidency and

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of an Extract of Proceedings of your Board dated 4th instant, and the transcript of the Deed therein referred to, with a view to my having it properly engrossed for the execution

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

and the execution of a Deed for that purpose by the Bd of Revenue.—

execution by your Board,

2. I beg to inform the Board that any instruction of mine as in that document mentioned, by which the Committee of Pacheappah's Charities are to be guided, will have no legal or binding validity unless sanctioned and approved of by your Board, under authority of Regulation VIII of 1817, with whom alone according to the Decree, rests the authority of providing that these among other public Charities in the Provinces should be properly carried into effect.

3. I presume the instructions of mine which your Board directs are to be pursued by the Committee, are those of which I placed a Draft before the Board many Months ago, in the form of a document to be executed by them, and purporting to emanate from them. I understood the Board as desirous of treating this document

Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

document which in fact contains nothing more than a recital of the various decretal orders and, an echo of the scheme as approved of by the Court for Triplicane, as a body of instructions composed by me - and the Draft Deed I saw and understood as about to be submitted to Government by your Board as that which was to be executed by them referred to and adopted that document as "instructions of the Advocate General hereunto annexed." altho I thought the Form as suggested by me, Viz. an appointment and directions immediately from and in your Board's name as the most fitting. Yet, not conceiving the Course proposed made any essential difference I expressed as much. If, however, your Board do in fact mean that the Committee are to be guided by the instructions as contained in that Document submitted to them and not to direct that they are to be guided by any instructions I may choose to give, which

which I do not think they have legal authority to do. it is necessary that these instructions as contained in the document should be identified in some way or other by your Board as by the terms "herewith annexed", or in some other words as forwarded.

4. It is for your Board to decide whether they will sanction for operation in the Provinces that scheme which has been approved of and decreed by the Court as far as regards Triplicane, or to reject it in favor of some other. If you resolve on any other, of course it becomes necessary that your Board should draw it up, and submit it to the consideration of Government. If the Board are satisfied, as I understood the Board were in 1834 as well as Government and the Court of Directors, that the same scheme should be carried into effect in the Provinces, as is decreed to be in Triplicane, then I conceive the draft document

I submitted to them / and which is the same as was submitted to and approved of by the former Board / will suffice for that purpose, whether considered as instructions drawn up by me, or emanating directly from your Board.

5. In the meantime as the Decree has issued for the Committee to receive the interest of all the Trust funds, I have issued to them the instructions in question, in the way of advice from me. as the Committee stood in need of some guidance on the subject.

Fort St. George, 12th October, 1841. } / Signed / G. Norton. Advocate General.

Order thereon.

(Read again above 23d Nov.)

42. 43

Ordered to be brought forward at a future meeting.

The Board proceed to take into consideration the statements noted below and to record their remarks thereon.

Extract

15542. Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

From the Coll.r of Masulipatam. Extract from the Returns
(44) ments of Accounts for July 1949.

From the Pun.l Coll.r of Combatore. Estimate of Extra charge
(45) proposed to be disbursed for July 1951.

Order on the 2 abovementioned
(44-46) Statements. } Ordered that the
necessary remarks of the Board
be inserted in the proper Column
of the Statement and submitted
for the orders of Government.
(47) : tioned Statements.

From the Coll.r of Masulipatam. Extract from the
(48) Rendit on the accounts for July 1949.

From the Superintendent of
Stamps. } Statement of Contingent
charges incurred in the Stamp Office
(49) for the Month of September last.

From the Sub Treasurer. Statement of Contingent
Charges incurred in the General
Treasury during the Month of
September last.

Statements

15543. Fort St. George 4th November 1841.

From the Supt.t and Treasurer
(50) of Government Bank. } Statement of contingent
charges incurred during the Month of
September last.

Order on the 4 abovementioned
(47-51) Statements } Ordered to be sanctioned
accordingly.

Read the undermentioned

Registers.

From the Pun.l Coll.r of Tanjore. Register of Petitions bear-
(52) ing the Board's Endorsements presented
to him in the Month of July last.

From the Pun.l Coll.r of Tanjore. Register of Petitions bear-
(53) ing the Board's Endorsements present-
ed to him for the Month of August
last.

From the Pun.l Coll.r of Coimbatore. Register of Petitions
(54) bearing the Board's Endorsements
presented to him for the Month
of September last.

Order on the three abovementioned
(52-55) Registers. } Ordered to be lodged
in

persons were confined in Jail under
Regulation IX of 1822 for the Month of
September last.

(62)
From the Pnt. Collector of North Arcot. — Return of Village Officers suspended or dismissed from employment under Regulation VII of 1831 for the Month of September last.

(63)
From the Actg. Collector of South Arcot. — Abstract of Demand, Collection and Balance from 12th to 31st July last.

(64)
From the Actg. Collector of South Arcot. — Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of July last.

(65)
From the Pnt. Collector of Coimbatore. — Return of Smuggled Tobacco for the Month of September last is not sent, there being no entry to make.

(66)
From the Collr. of Madras. — Stating that no endorsement was made on any of the petitions referred to him by the Board for investigation during the Month of Oct. last.

Stating

in the Office.

(56)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Received the undermentioned Miscellaneous Letters and Statements.

(56-57)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Requesting a supply of 1,000 Salt Runnahs.

Order thereon.

(58)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Ordered to be supplied accordingly.

(59)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Return of Fines imposed and stoppages made from the pay of the Public Servants from 1st July to 30th September last.

(60)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Return of alterations that have occurred in the list of Fines and stoppages from 1st July to 30th September last.

(61)
From the Pnt. Collectors of North Arcot &c. — Return of persons charged with offences under Regulation IX of 1822 for the Month of September last.

Reporting that no persons

Fort St. George 8th November 1848.

Customs will be found to have occasioned a considerable portion of this decrease. The other items do not require any particular remark.

4 to 6 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Cudd. dated for Fasly 1247.

4. In this District there was an increase in every item of Revenue except Sayer under which head there appears a Net deficiency of Rupees 62,413. The causes of the falling off are however satisfactorily explained by the Collector.

Net Revenue Fasly 1246 Rs 447771.
1247 " 339892.

7 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Rajahmundry for Fasly 1247.

Net Revenue Fasly 1245 Rs 331035.
1246 " 444727.
1247 " 354279.

5. The decrease in this year is attributable to the discontinuance of the export of Salt to Calcutta and to the change in the mode of Collecting the Sayer duties and the limitation of the articles subject to duty to thirty six, which

draw to the observation of the Honble Court. fairly contained in paras 8-7-8 18-23-30 31 and will be requisite to communicate the commutation sanctioned on Mysre Clerks and Peons

and Thereby management of the Revenues of the Districts respectively

Fort St. George 8th November 1848.

has occasioned in this as in the other Collectorates a reduction in the receipts from that source affording at the same time it is to be hoped a more than equivalent relief to the people at large.

8 to 10 Settlement of the Land and Extra Revenues of Trichinopoly for Fasly 1247.

Net Land Revenue
Fasly 1246 Rs 1,409,970
1245 " 1,428,855
1246 " 1,414,336
1247 " 1,413,717

6 The season is represented to have been generally favorable, in consequence of which the settlement considerably exceeded that of the year immediately preceding and approached nearly to the average of Fasles 1246 and 1245. The Collections were made with praiseworthy punctuality the balance at the close of the Fasly being only Rupees 12,225 which by the end of September was reduced to Rs 4,000.

7 We entirely approve the refusal of the Board of Revenue to sanction without more particular information the

the sale of the lands of certain defaulters for the recovery of balances stated to have accrued between Fuslies 1233 and 1245, such a measure as you observe, should be resorted to with extreme caution and only in cases of the last necessity. With reference to the old date of some of the balances in question, you very properly recalled the attention of the Board to the orders of Government issued by your Honourable as well as by ourselves for an annual enquiry into all balances outstanding against Ryots with a view to their immediate disposal

Net Revenue Fusly 1245 Rs. 191,695
1247 " 76,273

8 The decrease in the extra revenues was in the Collectorate on account of Inland Customs arising from

from the same cause as we have already had occasion to notice in removing the settlement of other Collectorates.

1/12 Settlement of the Extra Revenue of Madura for Fusly 1247.

9 The defalcation in the Sayer receipts of this District amounted to Rupees 11,601 and although this result is mainly owing to the recent measures which have produced like effects in other Collectorates it is believed to have been in some degree aggravated by an injudicious curtailment of the Sayer establishment owing to a misapprehension on the part of the Collector of the orders of the Board of Revenue you properly directed the immediate application of a remedy to this evil of it still existed.

Net Revenue Fusly 1245 Rs. 384,518
1247 " 477,016

15th Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Coimbatore for Fusly 1247.

10 The foregoing remarks apply equally to this District where

Fort St. George 8th November 1845.

the sale of the lands of certain defaulters for the recovery of balances stated to have accrued between Fasliee 1233 and 1245, such a measure as you observe, should be resorted to with extreme caution and only in cases of the last necessity. With reference to the old date of some of the balances in question, you very properly recalled the attention of the Board to the orders frequently issued by your Government as well as by ourselves, for an annual enquiry into all balances outstanding against Ryots with a view to their immediate disposal.

Net Revenue Fasly 1248 Rupees 1,91,695
1247 " 1,64,273
} 8

The decrease in the extra revenues was in the Collections on account of Inland Customs arising

Fort St. George 8th November 1845.

from the same cause as we have already had occasion to notice in reviewing the settlement of other Collectorates.

1812 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Madura for Fasly 1247. } 9

The deficiency in the Sayer receipts of this District amounted to Rupees 116401 and although this result is mainly owing to the recent measures which have produced the effects in other Collectorates it is believed to have been in some degree aggravated by an injudicious curtailment of the Sayer establishment owing to a misapprehension on the part of the Collector of the orders of the Board of Revenue you properly directed the immediate application of a remedy to this evil of it still existed.

Net Revenue Fasly 1248 Rupees 8,84,518
1247 " 4,77,016

1361 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Coimbatore for Fasly 1247. } 10

The preceding remarks apply equally to this District where

Fort St. George 8th November 1847.

Net Revenue
Fasly 1246 Rs 366,316
1247 " 263,650

were out of a total deficiency of Rupees 112,662 no less than Rupees 97,479 occurred under the head of Sayer.

1846-47 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Tanjore for Fasly 1247

Net Revenue.
Fasly 1246 Rs 875,793
1247 " 842,165

12. The decrease in the Net Sayer Revenue of this year as compared with the preceding year amounted to Rupees 1,33,628 but in consequence of an increase under other heads the Net decrease from all sources Amounted only to Rupees 33,628. This would appear to be on the whole satisfactory.

22 to 24 abstracts
&c of letter dated
14 January 1848
13 Settlement of
the Land and Extra
Revenues of Salem
for Fasly 1247.

Net Land Revenue
Fasly 1242 Rs 1,09,774
1243 " 1,38,728
1244 " 1,09,925
1245 " 1,04,713
1246 " 1,19,405
1247 " 1,53,903

The season is stated to have been tolerably favorable, particularly for the wet cultivation, and the results of the year may in our opinion be regarded as satisfactory.

14. We have perused with a view to review the proceedings of the Board of Revenue directing the system in force

Fort St. George 8th November 1847.

in this District in regard to Ryots cultivating Enam to the neglect of their Patent lands. The Board state that the rules interfere with freedom of Cultivation no further than to prevent the Ryot from abandoning his Patent land at such an unseasonable time and in such an irregular manner as would prevent any other Ryot from occupying the rejected land or would put it out of the power of the Government Officers to provide a new tenant. The Ryot is in fact at perfect liberty to relinquish the whole or part of his Patent lands at the proper season and upon due notice and we have the assurance of the Principal Collector that no hardship or inconvenience is experienced under the existing Regulations which have long been

Fort S. George 8th November 1847.

...ce in force in this and the neighbouring districts. Under these circumstances we approve your having abstained from interference with the present system to which it does not appear that any practical objection attaches.

Net Revenue
Fasly 1245 Rs. 2,16,649
" 1246 " 2,07,035
" 1247 " 2,04,784

18 The decrease in the aggregate Net Revenue derived from Extra sources was Rupees 12,251. The decrease in the Land receipts was Rupees 1,775 arising from the same causes as have affected this branch of Revenue in the other Collectorates.

17 The decrease in the Net Revenue of this year is satisfactorily accounted for. The diminution in the Salt Revenue was Rupees 10,578 owing to a smaller demand for the supply of Chittagong while the Sayer was less than in the preceding year by Rupees 2596. It is observed that the

27 & 28 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Bellore for Fasly 1247

Net Revenue
Fasly 1245 Rs. 4,42,503
" 1246 " 4,39,611
" 1247 " 4,44,216

Fort S. George 8th November 1847.

Net Revenue derived from the Sayer duties in this year was just equal to the receipts from the same source when that branch of Revenue was last under Annual deducting the Amount levied on the articles recently struck out of the Tariff a circumstance which is apparently in favor of the working of the new system in this District.

20 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Hunters for Fasly 1247

Net Revenue
Fasly 1245 Rs. 3,24,042
" 1246 " 3,26,912
" 1247 " 3,32,285

18 There was an increase in this District under every head of Extra Revenue more especially under those of Salt and Abkarry which we regard with you as very satisfactory and as indicative of an improvement in the state of the District. In the Sayer receipts there was a Net increase of Rupees 1799. We should have been glad to have seen it more clearly explained how this result took place with a reduced Establishment for collecting the duties and a restricted list of articles liable to them.

The

Fort St. George 8th November 1848.

30 to 35 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Malabar for Fasly 1247. — 20. The continued increase in the Revenues of this District notwithstanding a falling off of Rupees 19802 in the Sayer receipts is satisfactory and creditable to Mr. Clementi's management.

Net Revenue
Fasly 1245 Rs 11,39,465
1246 " 11,85,364
1247 " 11,87,901

30 to 35 Settlement of the Land Revenue of Malabar for Fasly 1247. — 21. The season was this year very favorable and occasioned an increase in the total Settlement of Rupees 19,339.

Settlement
Fasly 1242 Rs 15,84,509
1243 " 16,02,166
1244 " 16,06,121
1245 " 16,13,314
1246 " 16,11,384
1247 " 16,32,883

We notice with much satisfaction the steady increase in the resources of this province as well as the punctuality with which the Revenues are realized. The Collections within the Fasly amounted to Rupees 16,16,858 besides Rupees 3798 on account of former years, the subsequent Collections amounted to Rupees 9563 leaving an outstanding balance of only Rupees 817.—

42 Proposal of the Principal Collector of South Arcot to resume certain Villages held by the Family of the Polygar of Tedhandapchauvadi not acceded to. — 23. We entirely agree however having declined to accede

Fort St. George 8th November 1848.

to the Collector's proposal for the resumption of those Villages which are stated in correspondence dated so far back as the year 1778 to have been held immemorially by the Polygar and his Ancestors on Inaikapa or Shotrium tenure on a fixed quit rent and which have ever since been in the possession of the family.

47 Result of the Sales of Stamped Papers for Fasly 1247. — 25. The gradual and steady improvement which has been for some years manifest in this branch of Revenue is satisfactory.

Net Stamp Revenue
Fasly 1241 Rs 3,47,066
1241 " 3,54,922
1242 " 6,22,493
1243 " 3,19,772
1244 " 6,62,876
1245 " 3,73,949
1246 " 3,93,543
1247 " 4,16,185

48 to 52 Result of the Extra Revenues of the Madras Collectorate for Fasly 1247. — 26. We agree with you that the receipts of the Extra Revenues of this Collectorate are creditable to the Management of the Collector Mr. A Robertson we notice with satisfaction the successful issue

Fort St. George 8th November 1848

ipose of the arrangements made for the manage= =ment of Cocharend Land after payment of all charges including the rent due to the Lyker, the Net profit derived by Government from this source was Rupees 8965.

2-3 Settlement of the Extra Reve= =nues of Gradu= =lpatam for Fusly 1247 — 28

Fusly 1245	Rs	3178 41
1246	"	6842 35
1247	"	3648 20

The demand for Sett= =lement in the preceding Fusly which a decrease in the Net receipts from that Article to the Extent of Rupees 18165 was accompanied. In the Sayer receipts there was also a decrease of Rupees 24119 arising principally from the increased charge of management under January and the reduction in the number of Articles subject to duty. Under the other heads there was generally an increase and we consider the results of the year to be on the whole satisfactory.

Fort St. George 8th November 1848

4 to 7 Settlement of the Land Reve= =nue of Fusly for Fusly 1247 — 29

The Net Settlement of the Land revenue exceeded that of the preceding year in the sum of Rupees 189312 and exhibits an in= =crease over that of every year since Fusly 1236. The total demand including of Cuttums and Tank Inams and deposits was Rupees 2,66,669 of which Rupees 1,69,277 were collected previously to the close of the Fusly and by the following February the outstanding balance was reduced to Rupees 19,970. These re= =sults are very creditable to the management of the Acting Collector Mr. Thompson.

	Fusly 1246	Fusly 1247
Net Settlement	Rs 133,082	Rs 151,250
Sholavums	" 4257	" 4270
Peshcush	" 31838	" 31838
Total	169277	187358

30 With reference to the remarks contained in Paras 16 and 17 of our Dispatch dated the 16th December 1846 No 18/1846 we observe from para 27 of the Collectors report that the Berz on land cultivated with Sugar Cane has been reduced to the ordinary Rate

rate in conformity with our orders. He states however that in two Villages of the Tenceany Talook he found the Sugar Cane Taxed less than the Runjah the former being Rupees 35-15-7 per Cottah and the latter Rupees 54-8, in this case he remarks that he took the spirit of the order of Government "and assessed the Land with "the Teeriah hitherto paid "and with the Runjah Tarum"

31 The Board of Revenue have properly noticed that this proceeding was inconsistent with the orders referred to which were that land bearing this Crop should be subject to the same Assessment as Land of similar quality and advantaged under ordinary crops, and have required a further explanation of the principle on which the Assessment was to fixed to be conducted.

8 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Tinnevelly for Fusly 1247.

32 The decrease in the revenues of this year is stated to

Net Revenue
Fusly 1245 Rs 621740
1246 " 666322
1247 " 571290

to have been almost entirely caused by the change in the mode of collecting the Inland Customs under which head alone there occurred a deficiency as compared with the preceding year of Rupees 105771.

1840 Settlement of the Extra Revenues of Tanjore for Fusly 1247.

34 The large increase in the Revenue derived from Salt (Rupees 36215) more than compensated for the deficiency occurring under other heads which, as might be anticipated was the largest under that of Sayer amounting to Rupees 24470.

Net Revenue
Fusly 1245 Rs 345695
1246 " 362593
1247 " 372657

(19) Proceedings relating to the right assumed by the Zemindar of Vordiaspollam to collect Cavil fees in the District of Trichinopoly and Settlement transmitted

Para 42. It appears clear that by the arrangement made with the Vordiaspollam Zemindar in 1817 he was precluded from collecting Cavil fees in any of the Villages in Trichinopoly except those of the Zemindary then conveyed on him It is therefore unaccountable

unaccountable how he should have continued to collect fees in the Circar Villages (for which fees he had received a full equivalent in land) for so long a course of years without discovery by the local Officers. There appears to be no valid reason why this emolument should not be immediately resumed.

In the year 1806 Government ordered the resumption of all the Canil lands in South Arcot and granted to the Canilgars in lieu thereof a Money Allowance equal to 5 per Cent of their Emoluments. At this time the Zemindar of Woodiarpollam resumed lands of this description in the three Talooks of Viridachellum Chellumbrum and Manargoody. In the former of these the Lands were resumed and a Money allowance of Pagodas 910 assigned to the Zemindary in lieu

but in the two latter having been only in that year transferred from Trichinopoly to South Arcot the orders for the resumption were not carried into effect. It appears indeed that in 1807 the Collector Mr Ravenshaw pointed out to this circumstance to the Board of Revenue & requested to know whether the lands in question should be resumed as in the other portion of the District no reply however was ever sent to his letter and the parties have been tacitly permitted to continue in the enjoyment of their lands up to the present time.

44.— Of the strict right of the Government to resume these lands which are stated to bear a total Berij of Rupees 19172-3-4 I see no apprehend there can be any question. It would appear

appear however that a considerable portion has been assigned as Dutta Mannium to Brahmins, Pagodas and other charitable uses, the immediate resumption of which might operate as a hardship on the parties now in the enjoyment of them. Under these circumstances we approve your having directed further information to be furnished with respect to the parties in actual possession and we desire that in the final arrangements to be adopted on the receipt of this information a liberal consideration may be given to the claims of the parties who have held land undisturbed although unauthorized, possession of their lands.

4 5 From the Statement in the margin it will be observed that

208-21 / Settlements of the Land Revenue of North Arcot for Fusly 1247

Settlements for Fusly 1240 Rs 19,30,466
1241 " 20,41,469
1242 " 8,13,102
1243 " 14,87,203
1244 " 19,71,147
1245 " 18,75,486
1246 " 18,66,518
1247 " 19,74,657

that the Settlement of this year exceeded that of any year since Fusly 1241 (the best known in the district since Fusly 1232) a result which is attributed to an unusually favorable season. The Settlement would in all probability have been still greater but for the necessity of draining off the water from the Cauvery-pauk Tanks for the purpose of repair, from which land producing a revenue of more than Rupees 4,000 is usually irrigated. The whole amount of the land revenue was realized by the end of September with the exception of Rs. 118,574 of which sum Rs 112,552 were due from the Calastry and Cave Inuggur Zemindaries for the liquidation of which, special arrangements were in progress.

communicated to the Board of Revenue.

Calastry = Rs 50,000
Zemindary Cavetinuggur — 62,552

124 to 32 / Management of the Land Revenue of Vizagapatam for Fusly 1247

47 The season is stated to

Para 4 This paragraph will be communicated

=manent Peshcush originally
settled on them in the sum
of Rs 4,47,570 & that expecta=
tions are entertained of a large
accession to the revenues of
the Golgondah Zemindary
The settlement of this
year amounted to Rupees
8,83,793 exceeding that of Fusly
1246 by Rs 10,200 — The Collections
on account of the current
Fusly amounted to Rs 7,89,693
and inclusive of the
balances due from former
years, to Rs 9,51,105 — We are glad
to observe that this favora=
ble result enabled the
Collector not only to discharge
the current Peshcush & the
arrear outstanding on that
account at the commencement
of the year, besides charges of
collection & Zemindars sub=
sistence, but to reduce the
bonded debt from Rs 4,95,000
to four lacs Rupees —

/28/ Management of the Vizianagram Zemindary in Vizagapatam for Fusly 1247 — } 29

We observe with satis=
faction that the Estate of
Marinjy is wholly freed from

/30/ Management of the Minor Estate of Marinjy Singum Venkiah & Seeres Soorum in Vizagapatam by the Court of Wards for Fusly 1247 — } 30

=to have been more favora=
ble for the dry than the
wet cultivation, but the
prevalence of high prices
enabled the Collector to
effect a considerable
increase in the settlement. —

The Golgonda
Zemindary
/subject to a
Peshcush of
Rupees 10,000/
was acquired
this year, and
the amount for which it
was settled, Rs 22,836 / inca so=
=rated with the Revenues of the
Government lands. The real
increase may therefore be
stated at Rupees 21,868 —

Pursg These Paras will be commu=nicated to the Board of Revenue for their information.

48 The revenues both of
the Government lands
and of the Zemindaries
& Proprietary Estates were
realized with great punc=
=tuality, and we notice
with satisfaction that
the net Revenues of the
former exceeded the per=
=manent

Fusly 1245		
Permanently Settled	Rupees 10,57,450	
Annany &c^a	1,87,480	Rs 12,44,931
Fusly 1246 —		
Permanently Settled	10,57,450	
Annany &c^a	1,44,250	
		12,06,008
Fusly 1247 —		
Permanently Settled	10,47,750	
Annany &c^a	1,92,964	
		12,40,714

from its embarrassments while from the surplus revenues of that of Singareni a large sum has been invested in public securities. The Estate of Seeree Poorum has been sold under a decree of the Zillah Court, and the arrears of Peishcush recovered from the proceeds of the sale.

/31/ An application from the Zemindar of Saloor in Vizagapatam to enter over his Estate to the Collectors Management for five years has acceded to.- 51 We approve your having declined to comply with this request no sufficient reason having been assigned for preferring it.-

/36 to 39/ Settlements of the Extra Revenues of South Arcot for Fusly 1247 55

It is satisfactory to see that the Revenues of this year exceeded consider-ably those of any preceding year since Fusly 1240 The increase arose from an augmented demand for Salt the excess receipts on which account amounted to Rupees 173,310/ as under all the other heads of Extra revenue /with

11 Will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.-

with the exception of Masturpha — which exhibits a slight increase / there was a diminished collection.-

/36 to 44/ Settlements of the Extra Revenue of Canara for Fus-ly 1247 54

Net Revenue

Fusly	1241	Rs 808,364
	1242	" 457,423
	1243	" 804,669
	1244	" 884,076
	1245	" 816,349
	1246	" 929,084
	1247	" 1,144,640

The large decrease observable in the revenue of this year occurred principally under the heads of land and sea Customs and Tobacco. In the Sea Customs there was a deficit of Rupees 57,699 in the duty on Cotton, arising to a stagnation in the demand for that article in Bombay, and an increase of charge on account of drawback to the extent of Rupees 68,556. Of this latter sum how-ever Rupees 41,859 property belonging to the preceding year, although brought to account in the Fusly under review with the correction, the deficit of the year would be only Rupees 67,429 an amount less that the decrease which

13 A Copy of this Para will be furnished to the Board of Revenue.-

Fusly 1245 Rs 88,228
Fusly 1247 " 38,199

15570

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

which took place in the Sayer and Tobacco Revenues.-

Sayer Rs 30,000
Tobacco " 12,000

[46–46] Settlement of the Land Revenue of Madura for Fusly 1247.-

58 We observe with much satisfaction that the disastrous season of Fusly 1241 was succeeded by one much more favourable, and although the Settlement did not reach that of Fusly 1245 (the largest Thabilies ever been realized since the Province came under the Company's Government) it considerably exceeded the average of the five preceding years. The Collections were made with great punctuality the total amounts of the balances both Ayen & Kenimary, outstanding at the Close of the Fusly being only Rupees 4429 we consider these results to be highly satisfactory & creditable to the Management of Mr Blackburne.

Settlement

Fusly	1241	Rs 1,43,301/4
	1242	" 1,54,425 3
	1243	" 1,60,5212
	1244	" 1,63,8810
	1245	" 1,75,0719
	1246	" 1,63,9883
	1247	" 1,33,630

(True Extract)
(Signed) Walter Elliott
A.C. Secy to Govt

To the President & Members of the Board of Revenue.-

Order thereon-
(Vide Proceedings of B.R. 29th Novr 1841)

ordered to be sent again in circulation.

1.2

15571

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

From the Sec. to Govt.

3

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 25th October 1841.

Read the following letter
Judicial Department.

To The Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Sir

I have the honor to request the sanction for disbursement of Rupees Thirty one Annas Six [Rs. 30–6–0] for destruction of 243 dogs at 2 Annas each, ordered on Verbal representation of the Assistant Surgeon and on my own knowledge of their great number and half famished state within the Fort of Madura and its environs.-

[Signed] J. Blackburne
Magistrate.

Madura
28th September 1841

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council in sanctioning the charge incurred by the Magistrate of Madura for the destruction of 243 Dogs amounting to Rupees [30 0 0] Thirty and Six Annas observes that no extra expenditure is required for such

such purpose but that whenever a measure of this kind may be considered necessary a party of peons should be employed to effect it.—

/Signed/ Walter Elliot
Actg. Secy. to Government

3-4

Order thereon.—

Ordered that Copy of the foregoing order of Government be furnished to the Principal Collector of Madura with reference to Mr. Blackburne's direct communication to the Secretary to Government under date the 20th September last.—

5

From the Actg. Secy. to Government

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 20th October 1841

Read the following letter from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue.—

/Here enter 20th September 1841 No 382/

Para 1— The Right Honorable the Governor in Council regrets to observe that Mr. Elliot should have thought proper to appoint an individual to a situation in the public

service after the strong disapprobation expressed both by the Principal Collector and the Board of Revenue of the propriety of such a proceeding in conveying the expression of his marked displeasure of such conduct directs that he be ordered immediately to cancel that arrangement.

As all amicable intercourse

2— between the Principal Collector and his subordinate appears to have ceased and it is not likely that the interests of the public service will be promoted by their continuing in the same District His Lordship in Council will take an early opportunity of employing Mr. Elliot in some other situation.—

To
The President & Members
of the Board of Revenue

/A true Extract/
/Signed/ Walter Elliot
Actg. Secy. to Govt.

5-6

Order thereon.—

Ordered that transcript of the foregoing Extract from the Minutes of Consultation with Copy of the letter to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government under date the 20th September last be furnished to the Principal Collector of Salem for his information

information and guidance with reference to
his communications of the 21st July and
Jn Cons: 25th Feb: 1841 12th August.

Mr Gleig will furnish
Mr Elliot his late subordinate with an
Extract from the orders of Government and
will take such steps as may be necessary
for removing the Native Ramaswamy from
his situation on the Sub Collector's Establish-
ment if this should not have been
already done.

7

From the Ag Sec.y to Government

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
under date the 30th October 1841.

Read the following Extract
from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

[Here enter 30th September 1841 No 4071.]

Para 1. His Lordship in Council
observes with much satisfaction the general
improvement in this Estate during the year
under review as exhibited in the Report
from the Principal Collector of Nellore
and the accompanying Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue.

The

2. The season was favorable
to all descriptions of Cultivation which raised
the Settlement of the year in excess of that of
the preceding Fusly.

3. The Current demand was
realized with greater punctuality than in
Fusly 1248. and of the amount outstanding
at the date of the Collector's report Mr
Stenhouse states that measures has been taken
"for the recovery of the realizable portion of
the balance."

4. The financial condition of the
Estate at the close of the Fusly under observation
as exhibited in para 8. of these Proceedings it
appears that inclusive of the Surplus of Fusly 1248
and the actual Collections up to the 16th of June last
the amount of the Credit of the Estate was Rupees
93707-5-10. up to which date the disbursements
amounted to Rs 53249-5-3. leaving a balance
of Rupees 40458-1-7. in deposit for the benefit
of the Estate. The particulars of which are ex-
hibited in the accompanying Table as far as
they can be ascertained from the information
contained in the Report of the Princ.l Collector para
12. and in the enclosure No 6. which accompanied it.

Surplus 1248 - 27844-0-11
Collection — 65863-5-11
93707-5-10
53249-5-3
40458-1-7

Chandy

15576

Fort St George 8th November 1841.

Choondy Zemmindary in Nellore.

As per Statement No. 6.

Total Collections of Fasly 1249 including arrears Rs. 31,709 9

Extra Revenue ____ 4 12 8

31,781 6 5

Collections of Fasly 1250 Rupees ____ 28,331 15 6

Amount pure credited ____ 5750 " "

68,863 5 11

Deposits ____ 27,844 " 11

96,707 5 10

Deduct Charges

Amount credited on Acct of Peshcash 25,839 " "

Wages of zaffty Sibbendy &c. and Extra Charges } 5,086 7 1

Pension to the family of the deceased Zemindar 10,295 13 6

Amount of Commission to the Pesh Collr 844 15 11

Advance for Tank &ca Repairs 457 " 8

Value of Stamps ____ 10 " "

Amount paid on Account of debts 709 5 1

52,249 5 3

Remaining in Deposit ____ 44,458 1 7

As per Collectors Report Para 12.

Collections to the close of Fasly 1249. 30,802 8 6

Extra Collections ____ 1 15 "

30,804 7 6.

Collections of Arrears ____

Total ___ 31,095 5 1.

Collections of Fasly 1251 ____ 28,331 15 6

Amount pure credited ____ 5750 " "

Deposits ____ 27,844 " 11

61,926 " 5

Subsequent Collections of Fasly 1249 as per Report para 9. ____ 683 3 9.

Extra Collections of Fasly 1250. ____ 2 [illegible]

Deduct Charges

	Fasly 1249	Fasly 1250
Peshcash ____	17,839 " "	18,000 " "
Establishment &ca ____	3,330 11 10	4,755 11 3
allowance to the Zemindar's family	2,820 " "	7,675 13 6
Amount of Commission to the Pr Collr	" " "	844 15 11
Tank Repairs ____	35 8 8	105 3 "
Amount paid to Creditors of the Zemindars }	709 5 1	" " "
Total ___	25,051 9 7	28,197 11 8

Remaining in deposit 6,043 11 5 34,414 6 2

Pis

Fort St George 8th November 1841

5.— His Lordship in Council however observes that the mode of exhibiting the condition of the property by including the resources of the first six Months of the year subsequent to that immediately under review is inconvenient and desires that in future the revenue and charges of each Fusly may be shown separately.—

6. His Lordship in Council will be happy to have before him the copy of the Summons Settlement & Statement where furnished by Mr Monbrouse as called for in the concluding para of these Proceedings.

To The President & Members of the Board of Revenue

/ A true Extract /
/ Signed / Walter Elliot
Ag Secy to Govt

7-8

Order thereon.—

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing Extract from the Minutes of Consultation be furnished to the Principal Collector of Nellore with reference to the Extract from the Board's Proceedings of the 30th September

Fort St George 8th November 1841

September on the management of the Chroondy Estate for Fusly 1249.

9

From the Asst to Govt

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 30th Octr 1841

Read the following Letter from the Sub Secretary to the Board of Revenue—

/ True extr 7th Octr 1841 No 412.—

Para 1 The Right Honorable the Governor in Council grants authority for giving the allowance proposed for the Chokumpetty family at Rupees 848-12-11 per annum. Of this sum Rupees 2,400 per annum will be deducted on account of the allowance of the Ex-zemindar leaving Rupees 5,018-12-11 which will be made over to his son for the support of himself and the other Members of the family who have just demand upon him.—

2 His Lordship in Council is not aware that any other Member of the family besides the Ex Zemindar is in the receipt of allowances from Government but should there be any such the allowance will of course be less there are sufficient reasons for continuing them and the party be referred to the son of the Ex-Zemindar for support.—

To The President and Members of the Board of Revenue

/ A true Extract /
/ Signed / Walter Elliot
Ag Secy to Govt
Ordered

Fort St George 8th November 1841

Order thereon.

9-10

Ordered that transcript of the foregoing Extract from the Minutes of Consultation with Copy of the letter to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government on which it is founded under date the 7th October be furnished to the Collector of Tinnevelly for his information and guidance with reference to his Communication of the 11th September last—

In Cons: 31st Octr 1841

Sir H. Montgomery will intimate the orders of Government to the Family of the Ex-Zemindar of Chokkumputty and will make any necessary communication to the Collector and Magistrate of Tinnevelly. He will also report from what date he will propose that the allowance now assigned to the Chokkumputty Family should be calculated.—

Extract

Fort St George 8th November 1841

From the Sec.y to Govt

11

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 1st November 1841.—

Read the following

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.—

/ Vew enter 7th October 1841 No 419.—/

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the charges reported in the foregoing proceedings amounting to Rupees /441-10-10/ Four hundred and forty one Annas ten and pice ten.—

/ A true Extract /
/ signed / Walter Elliot
A Sec.y to Govt

To The President & Members of the Board of Revenue.

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.—

To The Principal Collector of Madura.

11-12

Sir.

To The Pnl Coll.r of Madura

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acquaint you that Government have sanctioned the charge of Rupees 441-10-10 being

15581

Fort St George 8th November 1841

being the cost price and freight to Tondi of forty Porto Nova Ploughs supplied in 1840 adverted to in your letter of the 22nd September last.

In Cons. 7th October 1841

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
8th November 1841.

(Signed) C. B. Smollett
Secretary.

Read the following resolutions

13

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 30th October 1841.

(From Bd. 11th Octr.)

From the Jt. Secretary to Govt.

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council observes that the Proceedings of the 11th October 1841 referred to above relate to an arrangement for improving the Police Establishment of the Vizagapatam District which will be seperately considered in this Department.

Ordered that the foregoing Proceedings and resolution be communicated to the Military Department in reference to an Extract from the Minutes of Consultation in that Department dated 13th April 1841 No. 1491 and the Revenue order No. 688 dated 21st May 1841.

(Signed) Walter Elliot
Jt. Secy to Govt.

Ordered

D. of S. George
30th October 1841

15582.

Fort St George 8th November 1841

ORIGINAL DESTROYED

Ordered to be recorded.

Order thereon.

13. 14

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 30th October 1841.

(From Board 11th October)

From the Jt. Secy to Govt.

The Right Honble

15.

-able the Governor in Council authorizes the Collector of Tuticorin Poly to disburse a sum not exceeding one hundred and twenty Rupees for making three Bureaus for the use of his recd Office.

(Signed) Walter Elliot
Acting Secy to Govt.

Order thereon

Ordered that a Copy of

15. 16

the foregoing resolution of Government be transmitted to the Collector of Tuticorin Poly for his information and guidance.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 30th October 1841.

(From Board 14th October 1841.)

From the Jt. Secy to Government.

The Right

17

Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the charges reported in the foregoing letter amounting to Rupees

Fort St George 8th November 1841.

Rupees /9926-12-4/. Nine Thousand and twenty six Annas twelve and piece four.

/Signed/ Walter Elliot
Jt Secy to Government

17. 18

Order thereon.—

Ordered that transcript of the foregoing resolution with Copy of the letter to the Chief Secretary to Government under date the 11th October be forwarded to the Principal Collector of Coimbatore with reference to his communication of the 17th September last.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 30th October 1841.

/From Bd 7th October 1841/

19

From the Acting Secretary to Govt

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council grants special sanction for the sum responded to Utchavata Mooppa amounting as reported in the foregoing Proceedings to Rupees /1254-12-3/ One thousand two hundred and fifty four Annas twelve and piece three

Fort St George 8th November 1841.

three.—

/signed/ Walter Elliot
Acting Secy to Govt

19. 20

Order thereon.—

Ordered that a Copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the Collector of Malabar for his information and guidance.—

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 30th October 1841.

/From Board 11th October/

21

From the Acting Secy to Government.—

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council confirms the sale of the Ground referred to in the foregoing Proceedings to Sabapathy Chitty for the sum of Rupees /43/ Forty Three.—

/signed/ Walter Elliot
Acting Secy to Govt

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.—

21. 22

To The Acting Collector of Madras.

To The Acting Collector of Madras

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 5th Instant

15586

Fort St George 8th November 1841

Ultimo I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acquaint you that the sale of the Ground therein referred to to Sabapathy Chitty has been confirmed by Government and you will give him possession accordingly.—

31st Oct. in Cons. 8th Nov. 1841.—

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St George,
8th November 1841.

(Signed) D. B. Smollett
Secretary

Read the following letter.

23

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

From the Civil Auditor

Sir,

With reference to the General rules relating to Civil Pensions published at Page 74 of the Fort St George Gazette of the 3d of February 1836 I have the honor to request you will, in conformity to the regulation contained in Section 12 thereof transmit to this Office at the earliest practicable period a Register in the accompanying Form for Fasly 1249 furnishing therein an accurate personal description of each Pensioner belonging to the Class of Civil Pensions unconnected with

15586

Fort St George 8th November 1841

with the Native Pension Fund or with the Superannuation Pensions, specifying his Age and height, and noticing all indelible marks and personal defects with the date of the grant and the Department of Government in which it is made.—

The Register now called for should include the names of all individuals who were borne as Pensioners under this Head on the 12th of July 1839 and since that date to the 11th of July 1840 and all lapses which may have occurred during the period intervening between those two dates should be carefully noted with the dates thereof.—

2.

I request you will at the same time furnish me with a separate and distinct Register of all Civil Pensions granted and lapsed during Fasly 1250, or from the 12th of July 1840 to the 11th of July 1841 containing all such particulars as are required to be specified in the Register of Fasly 1249 and that you will continue to furnish me with a similar Register at the close of every succeeding

3.

Fort St George 8th November 1841

succeeding July and in the event of no Civil Pension of the description herein required having been paid on your Establishment during any July that you will intimate the same to this Office by the close of that Period.—

4— With a view to obviate any mis-understanding as to the Pensions embraced under the Head of Civil Pensions I beg to subjoin for your information and guidance a Memorandum of the Pensions that ought not to be included in the Registers now called for.—

1. Superannuation Pensions
2. Pensions connected with the Native Pension Fund.—
3. All hereditary Allowances
4. Charitable Grants
5. Service or conditional Grants
6. Mysore Pensions
7. Compensation of Salt Reposnes
8. Razeenadar's Pension
9. Carnatic Stipends
10. Nabob's family Pensions
11. Pagoda and Mosque allowances
12. Compensation in lieu of presumed Land Offices and privileges.—

Pensions

Fort St George 8th November 1841

13. Pensions and Charitable allowances

Chargeable on the Revenues.

14. Revenue allowances to Village Officers and Enamdars.—

5— As much importance is attached both by the Honorable the Court of Directors and by the Government to this branch of expenditure and this Office is required to exercise a vigilant control over all disbursements of Pensions I trust I may be excused in expressing a hope that proper care and attention will be paid to the preparation of the Registers of Civil Pensions which you are now called upon to furnish and which you will observe are required to enable me to prepare for submission to Government the comparative Statement and report called for in the 15th Clause of the Pension Rules I. which is by clause II of the Rules III extended to all Civil Pensions.—

Fort St George
Civil Audrs Office
30th October 1841—

Signed J. C. Morris
Civil Auditor—

Register

Ordered.

Name of Certificate

Date of Certificate

Date of Certificate

Date of Certificate

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

in comparison with

Fusly 1249 and of the

last quarter of 1249 in

comparison of the

of Fusly 1248.—

(26)

From the Principal Collr.

of Combatore ——— } Submitting

Statements of Contingent charges &c.

sanctioned by the Board in

Fuslies 1249 and 1250.—

(25-27)

Order on the two above cd letters.— Ordered to lie over.

Read

Compd.
J.G.B.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Read the following Letter

To the Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

(28)

From the Collr of Guntoor

Submitting Report on the Extra Sources of Revenue in the Zillah of Guntoor for Fusly 1250

Sir

Para 1st I have the honor to submit the report for Fusly 1250 on the Extra Sources of Revenue, together with the following Statements

1 Comparative Statement between Fuslies 1248, 1249, and 1250 in triplicate—

2 Statement of Demand Collection, and Balance for Fuslies 1249 and 1250—

3 Statement shewing the Arrears—

4 Statement of Extra Collections—

5 Statement shewing the quantity of Salt sold in Fusly 1250, together with the number of Rowanahs issued for its transportation to the Inland Districts—

6 Statement shewing the quantity of Salt manufactured, and the amount of Salt sold for Fusly 1250, in Comparision with Fusly 1249—

The following Statement —

2 exhibits a comparative view of the settlement of the Extra Sources of Revenue for Fuslies 1249 and 1250—

3rd

15593 Fort St George 8th November 1841

No.	Items	Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250	Increase	Decrease
1	Salt	353955 . 7	291939 12 1	" " "	62015 4 6
2	Sayer	62381 5 10	64385 3 6	2003 13 8	" "
3	Sea Customs	2777 12 6	2457 7 8	" " "	320 4 10
4	Abkarry	12589 8 .	12859 7 .	269 15 .	" " "
5	Sundry Small Farms and Licenses	9688 7 3	9712 9 3	24 2 "	" " "
6	Moturpha	44260 1 7	39134 . 7	" " "	5126 1 .
7	Stamps	8421 4 5	14398 3 11	5976 15 6	[illegible]
	Total	4,94,073 8 2	4,34,886 12 .	8274 14 2	67461 10 4
				Deduct increase	8274 14 2
				Net decrease	59186 12 2

15594 Fort St George 8th November 1841

Sale 3 Mr Salt Revenue —

Decrease Rupees 62015 4 6

Fusly 1250 exhibits a decrease of Rupees 62015 — 4 — 6 which is comprised of a decrease of Rupees 114453 — 7 — 3 on account of duties from Coimbatore — of Salt sold for exportation — and an increase of Rupees 52437 — 13 — 3 on account of Salt sold for consumption — the following Collectorates are concerned in the Statement —

Coimbatore
Madura

15595 Fort St George 8th November 1841

Salt Revenue

Particulars of Cols 2 and 3 Exports Total

Home Consumption Consumption Revenue

Exportation

Years

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1245	96,205 15 4	25,749 1 3	1,21,954 16 7	3081 . 10	280 8 3	153955 . 7	1871 13 1	355826 13 8
1250	84,762 8 1	29,177 4 .	1,13,939 12 1	2209 2 3	10	291939 12 1	1658 12 2	293598 8 3
Decrease	11,443 7 3	50,571 13 2	2,015 4 6	213 . 11	62228 5 5			

The

15596 Fort St George 8th November 1841

Home Consumption 4
Decrease Rs 11,443-7-3

The decrease in the sales of Salt for home consumption, includes Rupees 2062-8-7. on account of Salt sold for consumption in this Zillah - The total decrease Rupees 11443-7-3 on account of home consumption, arises from the prevalence of small pox both in this and the neighbouring Zillahs: the whole District was inflicted particularly during the Months of March and April 1841 - and the home trade in salt experienced a considerable check in consequence -

See Report of the Season in the Demand, Collection and Balance Statements for March and April 1841

Exportation 5
Decrease Rs 50,571-13-3

In the sales of Salt to Lambadies for exportation by the land frontier there is a decrease of Rupees 50,571-13-3. arising almost entirely from the Salt Sandahs having proceeded to the neighbouring Districts for the purchase of this Article

The

The particulars composing this decrease are as follow

	Ckl.	a.	P.
Sandahs which came to the Guntoor Cotaurs in Fusly 1249 and proceeded to those in the Masulipatam District in Fusly 1250	31112	4	7
Do. Do. Do. to the Nellore Cotaurs in Fusly 1250	15168	10	3
Kistna Trade	2019	15	.
Difference on account of salt sold to Meer Cassimally for exportation by sea which was relanded from stress of weather at Rajahmundry and sold there	315	.	.
Increase	78,615	13	11
From new Sandahs and from old Sandahs taking an additional quantity	28011	.	7
	50,571	13	3

6 The use of the Parah for measuring salt in the Masulipatam Cotaurs will always prove an attraction to many Sandahs: In the Nellore Cotaurs, it is understood

understood, attention has been paid to the state of the Marcals Vzs that they may contain the full quantity of 12 Seers: hence the increased resort of the Lambadies to those Cotaurs-

✠ This item was included in Fusly 1249, as is usual under the head of Salt sold to Brinjaries, and did not appear as a separate item in consequence in that fusly--

✠ The Kistna Trade was suspended in fusly 1250, as the dearness of Grain in Rajahmundry drew off the traders. The difference credited on account of Meer Cassimally, is the difference between the price of Salt sold for exportation by Sea and the Monopoly price--

In the Extra Revenue there is a decrease of Rupees 213-..-11 arising chiefly from the recovery on account of advances for the manufacture of Salt being less-

Sayer 8

Increase R 2,003-13-8.

The following Statement exhibits the Sayer revenue for Fusly 1250 in comparison with Fusly 1249-

Articles.

15599 Fort St George 8th November 1841

Articles	Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250	Increase	Decrease
Exports: Salt petre, Lamp Oil Seeds, Iron, Snuff &c.a Gruff goods	11,644 6 5	13003 4 7	1,358 14 2	" " "
Cloths and Cambalins	31,907 3 2	32,044 5 8	137 2 6	" " "
Tobacco	13,679 2 2	14,563 11 3	884 9 1	" " "
Betel	2,677 10 7	2,915 9 5	237 14 10	" " "
Ganjah	172 3 4	241 13 "	69 9 8	" " "
Bhang	12 10 1	15 11 2	3 1 1	" " "
Grains	320 1 11	62 1 7	" " "	258 " 4
Cotton and thread	716 10 9	589 6 4	" " "	127 4 5
Poll tax	129 5 5	126 2 10	" " "	3 2 7
Total	61,259 5 10	63,562 1 10	2,691 3 4	388 7 4
Imports: Lamp Oil Seeds, Dying bark, Chay root &c.a Gruff goods	601 13 7	470 " 3	" " "	131 13 4
Cloths	362 1 1	220 1 1	" " "	142 " "
Tobacco	1 12 9	" 4 7	" " "	1 8 2
Gunja	18 5 "	1 4 "	" " "	17 1 "
Poll tax	137 15 7	131 7 9	" " "	6 7 10
Total	1,122 " "	823 1 8	" " "	298 14 4
Grand Total	62,381 5 10	64,385 3 6	2,691 3 4	687 5 8
Deduct decrease			687 5 8	
Net increase			2,003 13 8	

On account of extra revenue

Fusly 1249	" "	85 6 7	
1250	78 9 "		6 13 7
			1997 " 1

In

9

Exports

Increase	2691-3-4	
Decrease	388-7-4	2302-12--
Net increase.	2302-12--	

Increase

+ Castor oil seeds	1513-9-9	
Salt petre	306-1-6	
Sundry items	259-10-2	
	2079-5-5	
Deduct decrease		
Ghee	299-5-3	
Tamarind	299-8-1	
Sundry items	121-9-11	
	720-7-3	
	1358-14-2	
+ Tobacco to Hydrabad	729-3-5	
D: in this Zillah	155-5-8	
	884-9-1	

In the Exports there is a net increase of Rupees 2302-12-- arising -- chiefly from an increased exportation of + Castor Oil Seeds, the produce of the preceding year also from an increase under the heads of Salt petre, and Tobacco -- the former from -- purchases made by the house of Messrs Auchterlony and Co, and the latter from increased exportation to + Hyderabad, as well as an increased consumption in this Zillah.

10 The items composing the decrease

decrease of Rupees 388-7-4 are ordinary fluctuations and do not call for remark-

Imports
Decrease 298-14-4

11 The decrease in the imports amounts to Rupees 298-14-4- these items do not call for particular remark-

12 There is a decrease of Rupees 6-13-7- in the extra revenue, which does not call for remark-

Sea Customs
Decrease R 320-1-10

13 The following comparative Statement shews the revenue from -- Sea Customs for Fuslies 1249 and 1250 being a decrease of Rupees 320-1-10- in the latter year-

Names-

15602 Fort St George 8th November 1841

Names of Articles	Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250	Increase	Decrease
Exports				
Lamp oil seeds, Twine and Salt petre Wte	573 1 -	918 7 10	345 6 10	- - -
Pulse	1402 10 11	539 6 9	- - -	863 4 2
Grain	73 10 3	818 6 5	744 12 2	- - -
Cloths	57 3 4	16 15 3	- - -	40 4 1
Tobacco	9 10 8	10 - 8	- 6 -	- - -
Coriander seeds	383 5 7	28 1 9	- - -	355 3 10
Chayroot	122 10 5	31 14 9	- - -	90 11 8
Materials	58 1 5	37 7 10	- - -	20 9 7
Total	2680 5 7	2400 13 3	1090 9 -	1370 1 4
Imports				
Cocoanuts Wte	76 9 11	32 9 2	- - -	44 - 9
Materials	20 13 -	24 1 3	3 4 3	- - -
Total	97 6 11	56 10 5	3 4 3	44 - 9
Grand Total	2777 12 6	2457 7 8	1093 13 3	1414 2 1
		Deduct increase		1093 13 3
		Net decrease		320 4 10
On account of Extra revenue				
Fusly 1249	290 - 5			
Fusly 1250	320 8 -			
		Increase		30 7 7
		Net decrease		289 13 3

In

Exports 14

Decrease——— 1370-1-4
Increase——— 1090-9-"
Net decrease— 279-8-4

In the exports there is a net decrease of Rupees 279-8-4 The principal items composing the Gross decrease are, Lamp Oil seeds, and Grain, the former to Madras and the latter to the Rajahmundry Zillah, from the high price obtained in that District - The Chief items of decrease are Pulse and Coriander Seed, both arising from a diminished export to Madras.

Imports 15

Decrease——— 44-"-9
Increase——— 3-4-3
Net decrease— 40-12-6

The net decrease in the Imports is Rupees 40-12-6 arising from a decreased import of Cocoanuts Vgs. from the Maldives -

16 In the extra revenue there is an increase of Rupees 30-7-7 arising from the sale of Opium washed ashore -

Abkary Increase 269-15-"

17 The Abkary revenue exhibits an increase of Rupees 269-15-" from the improved state of the District. The settlement was made in detail for each station and the whole was under rent -

The

The Dowl or aggregate of rents for Fusly 1250 was Rupees 12,859-7-" The Collections within the Fusly amounted to Rupees 12,718-5-5 leaving a balance of Rupees 141-1-7 at the close of the Fusly, of this Rupees 116-12-2 have been subsequently collected, and the remainder will be speedily realized. —

	Rs	A	P
Dowl for Fusly 1250	12859	7	"
Collections within the fusly	12718	5	5
Balance	141	1	7
Collections subsequently up to 15th August 1841	116	12	2
Balance	24	5	5

18. The arrears at the commencement of Fusly 1250 amounted to Rupees 170-8-10. of this Rupees 150-8-10. were collected in the course of the Fusly under report, and Rupees 4-"-"- subsequently, leaving a balance of Rupees 16-"-"- distributed as follows. —

The balance of fusly 1248 was mentioned by mistake as the balance of fusly 1247 in last years Report on the Extra sources. Para 36-

Fusly 1248	15	6 "
1249	"	10 "
	16	" "

19 The extra revenue under this

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

this head exhibits a decrease of Rupees 116—2—4, arising chiefly from a decreased sale of Palmira Trees.—

Fusly-1249	287. 11 9.	
" — 1250	171. 9 5.	
	116. 2 4	

Sundry Small farms & Licences.

Increase—24-2—

20. The revenue from sundry small farms and licences, exhibits an increase of Rupees 24—2—. from the favorable character of the year. The Dowl is Rupees 9,712—9—3 which is composed as follows.—

Licences for drawing Toddy from Palmyra & date trees	463. 2 "
Bootporoshy	248. 3 "
Rent of young date trees the twigs being used in making baskets	474. 14 "
Rent of Palmyra trees yielding fruit	444. 4. "
D° Tamarind trees &c.	154. 4 "
Dursee & Cotcherlacota roofsooms	1927. 14. 3.
	9712. 9 3.

21 The Collections within the Fasly amounted to Rupees 9223—14—8. the sum of Rupees 266—12—7 has been subsequently Collected

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Collected up to 15th August 1841. leaving a balance of Rupees 221—14—., which will be duly realized.—

22 The arrears at the commencement of Fusly 1250. amounted to Rupees 1901—3—7, of this Rupees 752—9—10. were realized within the Fusly, a further sum of Rupees 11—12—11. has been collected up to 15th august 1841. The balance outstanding is composed as follows.—

Fusly 1246	18 11 7.
" — 1248	208 12 3
" — 1249	9 4 "
	236 11 10.

23. The extra revenue shews an

Fusly 1249	8	7	10.
" 1250	12	9	11
Increase	4.	2	1

increase of Rupees 4+2+1.—

Moturpha. 24. The Moturpha revenue exhibits

Decrease 5126—1—. a decrease of Rupees 5,126—1—. The following Statement shews the revenue from this source for fusly 1250, in comparison with fusly 1249.

Items

15608 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

25 The decrease of Rupees 5,791–11–1 under the head of "Sheep" arises from the reduction of the tax from Rupees 6. per 100. to Rupees 3.–12–0 under the orders of Government conveyed in minutes of Consultation under date 23rd March 1841.

Para 7. The increase of Rupees 665–10–1 arises from a generally improved state of the District.–

26. The collections within the fusly amounted to Rupees 31,785–4–8– a further sum of Rupees 3,618–15–10. has been collected up to 15th August 1841, and the remainder is in a course of realization.–

Arrears. 27. The arrears at the commencement of fusly. 1250. were Rupees 10,986–4–7– of this sum Rupees 10,317–2–5.– were collected within the fusly., and Rupees 36–1–8. subsequently to the 15th August, leaving a balance of Rupees 633–0–6 distributed as follows.–

Fusly	1246	24	15 8.
"	1247.	107	13 7
"	1248.	231	5 9.
"	1249	268	13 6.
		633.	0 6.

†Fusly. 1249.–"–"– 28. In the extra revenue, there is an increase
" 1250. 40–3–9. of Rupees† 40–3–9.–

Stamps. 29. The stamp revenue has an increase of
Increase R# 5976,15,6 Rupees 5976–15–6, the particulars are as follows.–

The

15608 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Items.	Fusly 1249.	Fusly 1250.	Increase.	Decrease.
1 Shops.	8,333–7	8,335. 1	2.	"
2 Looms.	13,005. 3	13,289. "	10.	283. 13 7
3 Sheep.	10,633. 7	10,841. 12	4.	" " 5791. 11 1.
4 Cattle	623. 8 "	659. 14 "	36.	" "
5 Shrotrs, Castes.	5,684. 7	5088. 4 "	323. 12	" "
Total	44,260 1 7	39,134. " 7	665. 10 1.	5,791. 11 1.

Deduct increase 665. 10 1.

Net decrease 5,126. 1 0.

15610 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

30. The increase, has arisen almost entirely from stamps sold to Vuppereddy Ramanadababoo, Zemindar, on account of suits before the Sudr Adalut. this item is Rupees, 5809 — " — .. The decrease of Rupees 321 — 4 — " under the head of Rawanahs arises from the discontinuance of the practice of compelling every person purchasing goods for consumption within the Zillah to take a Rawanah. This practice being at variance with Clause 4. Section 17. Regulation I of 1812, and the orders of the Board dated 19th February 1827, has been ordered to be discontinued. —

31. The particulars of stamps sold during Fusles 1249 and 1250 with the increase and decrease in each description, are shown in the following Statement. —

Description

15609 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Stamp duty. Sale proceeds an account of Madras Fusles.

Names of Fusles.	Europe paper for Sold.	Moneypatties.	Sanatties.	Rawanah.	Stamp duty. Sale proceeds an account of Madras Fusles.
1249	2 11 5. 3	149. "	457. 9. "	187. 8. "	10 7 11. " " " 642. 4 5.
1250	4 9 6. 9	660. "	4250. 5. "	352. 8. "	13 1. 14 8. 8 14 9. 4398. 3 11.
Increase	1 14 "	511. "			" " " " " " " " " "
Decrease					" " " " " " " " " "
					Net increase 5756. 15 6.

15611

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Description of Stamps.	Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250.	Increase	Decrease
Of 4 annas value	78 8 "	77. 8 "	" " "	1 " "
Do. 8 annas Do.	686 " "	907. " "	221 " "	" " "
Do. 1 Rupee Do.	1218 " "	1460. " "	242. " "	" " "
Do. 2 " Do.	208 " "	182 " "	" " "	26 " "
Do. 4 " Do.	220. " "	320. " "	100. " "	" " "
Do. 8 " Do.	232 " "	224. " "	" " "	8 " "
Do. 16 " Do.	224. " "	352. " "	128. " "	" " "
Do. 32 " Do.	480. " "	224. " "	" " "	256 " "
Do. 50 " Do.	150. " "	200. " "	50. " "	" " "
Do. 100 " Do.	100. " "	200. " "	100. " "	" " "
Do. 350 " Do.	" " "	700. " "	700. " "	" " "
Do. 750 " Do.	" " "	750. " "	750. " "	" " "
Do. 1000. " Do.	" " "	4,000. " "	4,000. " "	" " "
Total	3596 8. "	9,596. 8 "	6,291. " "	291 " "
Europe paper for decrees.				
Of 8 annas value	14 8 "	10. 8 "	" " "	4 " "
Do. 1 Rupee Do.	38 " "	53. " "	15 " "	" " "
Total	52 8 "	63. 8. "	15 " "	4 " "
Europe Stamp paper.				
Of 4 annas value	1 2 "	1. 4. "	" "	2 " " "
Do. 8 Do.	1 9 6	3. " "	1 6 6.	" " "
Fees Collected in excess	" " "	" 5 6.	" 5 6.	" " "
Total	2 11 6.	4. 9 6.	1 14 6	" " "
Penalties	187. 6. "	352. 8 "	165 ½ "	" " "
On account of Pauper Suites	10. 7 11.	121. 14 8.	111. 6 9.	" " "
Total	197. 15 11.	474. 6 8.	276. 6 9	" " "
Grand Total of Stamps	3,849. 11 5.	10,139. " 2.	6,584. 4 9.	295. " "
Of Sayer and Sea Custom Rawanahs	4,571. 9 "	4,250. 5 "	[illegible]	331. 4 "
Maufee Do.	" " "	8. 14 9.	8 14 9.	" " "
Total	4,571. 9. "	4,259. 3 9.	8 14 9.	321. 4 "
Grand Total including Stamps	8,421. 4 5.	14,398. 3 11.	6,593. 13 6.	616 4 "
			Deduct Decrease	616. 4 "
			Net Increase	5,976. 15 6.

In

15612 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

33 On the extra revenue,
there is a decrease of Rupees
9 " 2 1 owing to the value of
blank Pagodas sold to the ren-
tor of Betel gardens having
longer credited under this head.—

33 The charges Collection
in excess of the extra Revenue
of, revenue, are shown in the following
2 sheets Comparative Statement.—

Sd/ Hons.

15613 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Items.	Fusly 1249.	Fusly 1250.	Increase.	Decrease.
Salt	45,633. 3 7.	43,746. 1 11.	" " "	1887 1 8
Sayer	13,887. 8 "	13,619. 5 11.	" " "	268 2 1
Seacustoms	507. 8 3.	504. " "	" " "	3 8 3
Abkarry	336. 6 4	341. " 1.	4 9 9.	" " "
Sundry small farms	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
Moturpha	3,318. 2 5.	3,322. 5 7.	4 3 2	" " "
Stamp	427. 13 8.	714. 5 9.	286 8 1.	" " "
Total	64,110. 10 3.	62,247. 3 3.	295 5 "	2,158 12 "

Increase 295 5 "
Net Decrease 1863 7 "

Sd

Salt Charges.

34. The Salt charges are composed of a gross decrease of Rupees 3,944 " — 8 — and a gross increase of Rupees 1156. 15 — ". The principal items composing the decrease are, Rupees 2,571 — 6 — 1 share paid to the manufacturers, from a less quantity of salt being received into store during the period in question, and Rupees 372 — 1 — 6. for covering Salt heaps. The principal items of increase are Rupees 556 — 11 — 10. on account of advances for manufacturing Salt, arising from the manufacture having been carried on in the 4 Cotaurs in Fusly 1250. whereas in Fusly 1249. no manufacture took place in the Nezampatam Cotaurs. Rupees 281 11 — 1 on account of repairs of phat. 2 sooms, which is an ordinary charge, and Rupees 168 — — — 6. for repairs of Tanks at the Cotaurs for the Cattle of the Lambadies. —

These

Sayer Charges.

35. These charges exhibit a net decrease of Rupees 268 — 2 — 1, arising chiefly from less repairs of buildings. —

Sea Custom. Abkarry and Moturpha Stamp Charges.

36. The charges under the heads noted in the margin, do not call for remarks. —

37. The increase in the stamps is owing to the increased sales. —

38. In conclusion, it is proper to bring to the notice of the Board the tax called Bootsoorashy or "Boot Parastish" as it should be written. This tax is demanded from shepherds, Potmakers, Washermans Parias, Chucklers, Mendicants, called Pambala, Basketmakers, Boatmen, Soodala vaundloo or story tellers, wandering Blacksmiths, and the yarocoola caste. This tax is also collected from the Toddy drawers and is included under the head of sundry small farms. The tax is regulated with reference to the number of persons in the house or on the instrument of the artisan

artisan, or on the profits of the particular class. Shepherds, Washerman, and Parias are taxed according to the number in the house. sometimes a Bilmachah or defined amount for the whole caste is fixed. Potmakers pay so much for each wheel, Chucklers pay for each wooden mallet. The aggregate collections per annum have exceeded Rupees 4000 In fusly 1250. the Dowl was Rupees 4,437 — 15 — 6. in Guntoor, and Rupees 8 — 8 — 0 in the Palnaud. This tax does not exist in the Palnaud, except in the Village of Dachapully, where Rupees 8-8-0 are collected in each year from the persons who search drains, the ashes thrown out by Goldsmiths &c. for the precious metals. My attention has been drawn to this tax from the Village Vetties having been exempted by former Collectors in certain Villages near the high road, where the charge of trees in the avenue was required

See the accompanying Statement marked A.

required from them, and from it's appearing that the Collection of the tax operated with much hardship in the case of Village Vetties and Parias generally. The tax appears to have originated with the Moghol Government and is, as the name indicates, a permission to worship the Boot or idol, in consideration of which the tax is demanded. Adverting to the origin of the Tax and to the circumstance of it's Collection being oppressive to the poorer classes, it has appeared proper to bring the subject before the Board, in order that such relief may be given as the circumstances of the case point out. The shepherds, it will be in the recollection of the Board pay a Moturpha tax regulated by the number of sheep and Goats they possess. It does not appear that any tax under the denomination "Moturpha" is paid by the other

Castes

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

castes enumerated above, except the Parias, who pay a loom tax under the head Moturpha. As shepherds and Parias pay a moturpha tax besides the "Boot parastish," there will be no question, setting aside the origin of the tax, that these should be exempted. The Toddy drawers also pay a tax for drawing Toddy, and are equally entitled to the exemption. The other castes, with the exception of the Washerman, have claims to relief from their poverty. The amount Dowl under this head in Fusly 1250 for the Washerman is Rupees 917—15—5. It appears proper that, the head "Boot Parastish" should be excluded altogether from the accounts, that the collection of this tax should be discontinued in every case infuture, excepting Washerman; if washerman are found to pay a moturpha tax in other districts the Board may consider it proper

Fort St. George 8th. November 1841

proper that they should still be liable to a Moturpha tax under the general head Moturpha; on the other hand, if Washermen are not generally liable to Moturpha else where, there can be no grounds why the exemption now proposed should not be extended to them. Adverting, however, to the circumstance that the tax on Washermen is the "Boot Parastish" Tax, I would beg to recommend that they should be relieved equally with the other classes.

Guntoor,
Coll'rs Cutcherry,
20th October 1841.

[Signed] J. Goldingham.
Collector

Statement.

15620

STATEMENT *shewing the Gross Collections, Charges and Net Revenue of all Branches of Revenue, Land Revenue excepted, for Fuslies 1248, 1249, and 1250.*

	For the last three Years.									Comparison of the Last two Fuslies.						REMARKS.
	Fusly 1248			Fusly 1249			Fusly 1250.			Increase.			Decrease.			
SALT.	Rups	A	P.	Rups	A.	P.	Rups.	A.	P.	Rups.	A.	P.	Rups.	A.	P.	
Gross Collections	34119	5	2	35582	13	8	29359	8	3	-	-	-	6222	5	5	
Charges for Purchase or Manufacture	18707	13	-	30217	11	10	27646	5	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Do. Superintendence and Sale, &c.	17134	3	5	15415	7	9	16099	12	2	684	4	5	2571	6	1	
Total Charges	35842	-	5	45633	3	7	43746	1	11	684	4	5	2571	6	1	
Net Revenue	30565	4	9	31293	10	1	24985	6	4	-	-	-	6341	3	9	
Per Centage of the Charges	10	7	14/100	12	13	2/100	14	14	20/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOBACCO MONOPOLY.																
Gross Collections	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Charges for Purchase	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Do. Superintendence and Sale, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Net Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Per Centage of the Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
LAND CUSTOMS.																
Gross Collections	59434	2	8	62466	12	5	64463	12	6	1997	-	1	-	-	-	
Charges of Collection	11319	5	2	13887	8	-	13619	5	11	-	-	-	268	2	1	
Charges ,, Commission	347	6	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Charges ,, Drawback	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	11666	10	11	13887	8	-	13619	5	11	-	-	-	268	2	1	
Net Revenue	44767	7	9	48579	4	5	50844	6	7	2265	2	2	-	-	-	
Per Centage of the Charges	24	10	62/100	22	3	60/100	21	2	62/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SEA CUSTOMS.																
Gross Collections	2762	11	2	3067	12	11	2777	15	8	-	-	-	289	13	3	
Charges of Collection	506	-	-	507	8	3	504	-	-	-	-	-	3	8	3	
Charges ,, Commission	29	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Charges ,, Drawback	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	535	1	5	507	8	3	504	-	-	-	-	-	3	8	3	
Net Revenue	2227	9	9	2560	4	8	2273	15	8	-	-	-	286	5	-	
Per Centage of the Charges	19	5	75/100	16	8	28/100	18	2	37/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ABKARY.																
Gross Collections	12928	-	4	13052	2	8	13040	7	8	-	-	-	11	11	-	
Charges	437	10	9	386	6	4	341	-	1	4	9	9	-	-	-	
Net Revenue	12490	5	7	12715	12	4	12699	7	7	-	-	-	16	4	9	
Per Centage of the Charges	3	6	2/100	2	9	2/100	2	9	10/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SUNDRY SMALL FARMS and LICENSES.																
Gross Collections	11595	9	-	9605	14	-	9989	2	5	383	4	5	-	-	-	
Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Net Revenue	11595	9	-	9605	14	-	9989	2	5	383	4	5	-	-	-	
Per Centage of the Charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
(Here enter all other items of Extra Revenue peculiar to the District.)																
Stamp Revenue																
Gross Collections	7832	1	11	8430	4	7	14398	3	11	5967	15	4	-	-	-	
Charges	537	15	2	427	13	8	714	5	9	286	8	1	-	-	-	
Net Revenue	7294	2	9	8002	6	11	13683	14	2	5681	7	3	-	-	-	
Percentage of the Charges	7	-	6	5	1	41/100	4	15	93/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
VISSABUDDEE and MOHTURPHA.																
Gross Collections	51934	4	8	37723	11	11	42142	10	10	4418	14	11	-	-	-	
Charges	3646	7	-	3318	2	5	3322	5	7	4	3	2	-	-	-	
Net Revenue	48287	13	8	34405	9	6	38820	5	3	4414	11	9	-	-	-	
Per Centage of the Charges	7	-	4 3/100	8	12	82/100	7	14	1/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
GRAND TOTAL.																
Gross Collections	437984	2	11	490173	8	2	440410	13	3	-	-	-	49762	10	11	
Charges	55665	13	8	64110	10	3	62247	3	3	-	-	-	1863	7	-	
Net Revenue	432318	5	3	426062	13	11	378163	10	-	-	-	-	47899	3	11	
Per Centage of the Charges	11	6	62/100	13	1	32/100	14	2	17/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
GRAND TOTAL.																
Gross Collections after deductions for Manufacture or Purchase of Salt and Tobacco	469276	5	11	457953	12	4	412764	7	6	-	-	-	47191	4	10	
Charges after deductions for Do.	36958	-	8	33892	4	5	34600	13	6	707	15	1	-	-	-	
Per Centage of the Charges on the Gross Collections after deductions	7	14	10/100	7	5	40/100	8	6	28/100	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Guntoor
Collector's Cutcherry
26th Octobre 1841

E. E. per

Collector

Ed
A. R.
Dy Asst

15621

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

No 2

Statement Shewing the Demands, Collection and Balance under each head of Extra Revenue in the Zillah of Guntoor

Numbers.		Settlement of Fusly 1249.	Collections to 11th July 1840.	Balance of Fusly 1249. on the 12th July 1840.	Settlement of Fusly 1250.	Collections to 11th July 1841.	Extraordinary Extra Collections.	Total Collections of Fusly 1250.	Balance of Current Revenue on the 12th July 1841.
		Extraordinary Extra Collections.	Total Collections of Fusly 1249.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p
1	Salt	3,53,955. 7	3,53,955. 7						
2	Sayer	62,381 5 10	62,381. 5 10						
3	Sea Customs	2,777. 12 6.	2,777. 12 6.						
4	Abkarry	12,589. 8 .	12,499. 8 10.						
5	Sundry Small farms and Licenses	9,688 7 3.	9,216. 10 9.						
6	Stamps	8,421 4 5.	8,421 4 5.						
7	Moturpha	44,260. 1 7.	34,092. 2 5.	1,87 13 1.	3,56,826 13 8	. .	291,939. 12 1.	291,939 12 1.	1,658 12 2
				85 6 7.	62,466 12 5.	. .	64,385. 3 6.	64,385. 2 6.	789 .
				290 . 5	3,067. 12 11.	. .	2,457. 7 8.	2,457. 7 8	328 .
				287 11 9.	12,787. 4 7.	89 15 2	12,859. 7 .	12,718 5 5	1,719 5
				8 7 10.	9,224 2 7.	472 12 6.	9,712 9 3.	9,220 14 6	129 11
				9 . 2	8,430. 4 7.	. .	14,398. 3 11.	14,398 3 11.	. .
				. .	34,092. 2 5.	1,167 11 2	39,134 . 7.	31,785. 4 8	10 3 9.
Total Rupees		49,407 3 . 8	2,83,342. 11 4.	2,552 7 10	4,85,895 6 2.	10,730 9 10.	4,34,886. 12 .	4,26,908 3 11	2,252 4 3

Guntoor, Collectors Cutcherry, 26th October 1841. E E

Sd/ Illegible

Tillah of Gyantoot for fusles 1249. and 1250.

Total Collections fusly 1250.	Balance of Current revenue on the 12th July 1841	Comparison of the Settlement of fusly 1250. with that of fusly 1249. Increase.	Comparison of the Settlement of fusly 1250. with that of fusly 1249. Decrease.	Comparison of Total Collections of fusly 1250. with that of fusly 1249. Increase.	Comparison of Total Collections of fusly 1250. with that of fusly 1249. Decrease.
11	12	13	14	15	16
Crs a/c	Crs a/c	Crs a/c	Crs a/c	Crs a/c	Crs a/c
29,358.6 3	" "	" "	6,015. 4 6.	" "	" "
64,463.12 6.	" "	2,003 13 8.	" "	" "	6,015. 4 6.
2,777 15 8.	" "	" "	2,003 13 8.	" "	" "
12,889.14 10.	141 17	269. 15 "	" "	320. 4 10.	" "
9,236. 8 7.	488 10 7	24 2 "	" "	218 12 7.	" "
14,398. 3 11.	" "	5,976. 15 6.	" "	8 3 11	" "
31,825. 8 5.	7,348 11 11.	" "	5,126. 1 "	" "	5,976. 15 6.
					2,306. 14 9.
4,29190. 8 2	7,978 8 1.	8,274 14 2	67,461 10 4.	8,207 13 8	64,642 8 1

#. / Signed J. Goldingham.
Collr

15622

8th November 1841

Statement shewing the Demand, Collection and Balance of arrears of Extra Revenue due at Fort St. George No. 3 account of former fa

Sl. No.	Sundries	Total Demands on account of old arrears at the close of Fusly 1249.	Fusly 1246. Demand.	Collection.	Balance.	Fusly 1247. Demand.	Collection.	Balance.	Fusly 12 Demand.	Collection	Balance.	Demand.	Collection.	Balance.
		Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.	Cr. a. p.
1	Salt													
2	Sayer													
3	Sea Customs													
4	Abkarry	170 8 10	12 . .	12 . .	. . .									
5	Sundry Small farms and Licenses	1001 27 5	1 1 7	32 6 .	18 11 7	29 4 .	29 4 .	. . .				68 9 8	63 0 6	5 9 2
6	Stamps											448 . 6	237 7 11	220 9 2
7	Moturpha	10,986 47 5	50 7 9	25 31	25 4 6	154 . 10	45 14 3	108 2 7	613 12 10					
	Total Rupees	12,158 . .	113 9 4	69 9 1	44 . 3	183 4 10	75 2 3	108 2 7	1130 8 .	652 5 4	477 2 8	10,730 9 10		

Guntoor Collector's Cutcherry
26th October 1841

E E

Signed J. Goldi

8th November 1841

account of former fusleis for fusly 1250.

	fusly 1249.			Total Collections of old arrears in fusly 1250.	
Balance.	Demands.	Collection.	Balance		Balance
Crs a p	Crs a p	Crs a p	Crs a p	Crs a p	Crs a p
.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..
.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..
.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..
15 6 .	89. 15 2	85. 5 2.	4 10 6	152. 8 10.	20 . .
220 9 2	4,72.12 6.	463. 8 6.	9. 4 .	752. 9 10.	248 8 9.
.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..	.. .. ..
241 3 6	10,167. 11 2.	9,873. 6 9.	294. 7 5.	10,317. 2 5.	669. 2 2
477 2 8	10,731. 9 10.	10,422. 4 5.	308. 5 5.	11,220. 5 1.	937. 10 11.

Signed J. Goldingham.
Coll.

15623.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

No 4

Account particulars of Extra Collections under each head of the Extra branches of Revenue in the Zillah of Guntoor and the District of Palnaud for fusly 1250.

	Rs	a	P	Rs	a	P	Rs	a	P
Salt Department.									
Recoveries of advances for the manufacture of Salt									
Fusly 1248		"	"		2	4			
" 1249		"	"		160	"			
" 1250		"	"	56	11	10			
							1656.	12	2
Sayer and Frontier Departments.									
Extra Revenue.									
Excess sum found in the box of Collections		"	9	9					
Share on the sale proceeds of Confiscated Goods to the Collector and Head Assistant		20	15	2					
Sale proceeds of Confiscated Goods belonging to persons who were absent		50.	8	4					
					72	1	3.		
Amount refunded as follows.									
Wages		1	15	"					
Buildings revenue		4	5	1.					
					6	4	1.		
Interest collected from the renters of Betel Gardens		"	"	"	38.				
							78.	9	"
Sea Custom Department.									
Extra Revenue.									
Sale proceeds of Drift wood		"	"	"	52	12	"		
Sale proceeds of Opium Boxes washed ashore		"	"	"	266.	12	"		
							320.	8	"
Abkarry Department.									
Extra Revenue.									
Sale proceeds of Palmira Trees		130.	6	10.					
Do Do of Palmira Leaves		37.	2	"					
Fines		"	4	"					
					167.	12	10.		
Interest account		"	"	"	3	12	7		
							171.	9	5.
Carried forward							2229.	6	7.

15624 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Brought forward ---------- 2229 6 7.

Sunday Small Farms & Licenses.

Extra Revenue.

Amount of Tax Collected on Palmira trees yielding fruit not included in the Dowle ---------- " " " 6 12 "

Interest account ---------- " " 5 13 11

12 9 11.

Maturpha Department.

Extra Revenue.

Amount recovered from the late Police Peishcar of Polaveram Sanah being the sum received by him as bribe from the weavers of Rajahpetta Sanah ---------- " " " 40 " "

Excess Collections ---------- " " " 39

40 2 9.

Total Company's Rupees two thousand two hundred and eighty two annas four and pice three ---------- 2282 4 3

Guntoor,
Collector's Cutchery,
26th October 1841.

E. E. F. / Signed J. Goldingham.
Collector.

15625.

Statement shewing the quantity of Salt sold in July 1250. together with the number of

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

No 5.

Number		Sales to Brinjaries.				Chinna Ganjam Sales to sundry dealers.				Total Sales to Brinjaries.			
		No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Candies	Collections. Rs	As	No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Candies	Collections. Rs	As	No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Candies	Collections. Rs	As
1	Guntoor Zillah					5,850.	335	178	35,221.	11	6.		
2	Masulipatam Dº					4	84	22.	9				
3	Nellore Dº					165.	7	318.	818	8			
4	Cuddapah Dº					202.	21	321.	2,289	4	3.		
	Total of Salt conveyed into the Company's Jurisdiction					6,221.	365	101.	38,357.	8	5.		
	Hydrabad & c. of Nizam's Country	195	1,184	16	12,101	11.	14	1.	45.	27.	250.	2,900	9	10.
	Grand Total	195	1,184	16	12,101	11.	14	1.	6,266.	392	351.	41,252	2	3

Number		Sales to Brinjaries.				Cottah Sales to Brinjaries.			
		No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Candies	Collections. Rs	As	No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Candies	Collections. Rs	As
1	Guntoor Zillah	5,850.	335	178	35,221.	11	6.		
2	Masulipatam Dº	4	84	22.	9				
3	Nellore Dº	165.	7	318.	818	8			
4	Cuddapah Dº	202.	21	321.	2,289	4	3.		
	Total of Salt conveyed into the Company's Jurisdiction	6,221.	365	101.	38,357.	8	5.		
	Hydrabad & c. of Nizam's Country	240.	1,211	266.	12,391.	7	11	107	666	378	67,379.	3	9
	Grand Total	6,461	1,576.	367.	162,264.	4		107	666	378	67,379	3	9

15626

Fort St. George

8th. November 1841.

Rowanahs issued for the transportation to the Inland Districts exhibiting both the Home and Inland

Vedda Ganjam & Cottack

Sales to Sundry dealers.						Total.					
No. of Rowanahs.	Salt.		Collections.			No. of Rowanahs.	Salt.		Collections.		
	Md	Sr	Rs	a	P		Md	Sr	Rs	a	P
357	72	69.	7,578.	1	8.	357	72	69.	7,578.	1	8.
588	18	216.	1946.	11	4	588.	18	216.	1946.	11	4
178	40	147.	4,238.	9	4	178.	40	147.	4238.	9	4
1123	131	32	13,763.	6	4	1123	131.	32	13,763.	6	4
39	13	105.	1392.	8	11	146.	680	83	68,771.	12	8.
1162	144	137.	15,155.	15	0	1269.	811.	115	82,535.	3	0

Nezampatam Cottack

Sales to Brinjaries						Sales to Sundry dealers.					
No. of Rowanahs.	Salt.		Collections.			No. of Rowanahs.	Salt.		Collections.		
	Md	Sr	Rs	a	P		Md	Sr	Rs	a	P
"	"	"	"	"	"	2557.	158	280	16,083.	8	1.
"	"	"	"	"	"	2,557	158	280	16,083.	8	1.
13	65	148	6,663.	12	7	1	1	117	135	11	5
13	65	148	6,663.	12	7	2558	159	397	16799	3	6.

Fort St. George

Consumption as well as the Collections as also

Nazampatam Cottaur (Contd)

Totab.

Sales to Brinjaries.

Pauler

No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Mds	Collections. Mds	Rs	a/	P	No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Mds	Collections. Mds	Rs	a/	P
2,557.	158	280	16663.	8	1.						
2557	158	280.	16663.	8	1.						
14	66	265.	6799.			39	118	123	12122	4	7
2571	225	145.	23463.	1	1	39	118	123	12122	4	7

8th November 1841

the route by which the Salt was Conveyed.

Cottaur.

Sales to sundry dealers.

Totab.

No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Mds	Collections. Mds	Rs	a/	P	No. of Rowanahs.	Salt. Mds	Collections. Mds	Rs	a/	P
1490	109	267	11515	1	4	1490	109	267	11515	1	4
1490	109	267	11515	1	4	1490	109	267	11515	1	4
						39.	118	123	12122	4	7
1490	109	267	11515	1	4	1529.	227	390	23637.	5	11

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Sales to Brinjaries. No. of Rowanahs.	Satt.	Collections.	Grand Total Sales to Sundry dealers. No. of Rowanahs.	Satt.	Collections.	Total. No. of Rowanahs.	Satt.	Collection.
							Md.	Rs. a. p.
			10,254.	675	394	10,978.	6	6.
			4	84	22	9.	2	
			753.	26	134	2,765.	3	4.
			380.	62	68	6,527.	13	7.
			11,391.	764	280	80,293.	8	2
354	2,034	265	207.177.	4	85.	42	72	4,428
354	2,034	265	207.177	4	11,476.	806	352	84,722
Confiscated Satt						44 3/4	11	10
Sale of manufactured Satt sent for pattern						16 2	4	3 11
Fines levied from men & on cattle &c.							24	3 10
						807	12 5/4	84,762 8 1

Total. No. of Rowanahs.	Satt.	Collection.	
	Md.	Rs. a. p.	
10,254.	675	394	10,978. 6 6.
4	84	22	9. 2
753.	26	134	2,765. 3 4.
380.	62	68	6,527. 13 7.
11,391.	764	280	80,293. 8 2
439	2,076	337	211,606. 2 2
11,830.	2,841	217	291,899. 10 4.
		44 3/4	11 10
		16 2	4 3 11.
			24 3 10.
	2,841	277 5/4	291,939. 12 1

No. 1. The Merchants Convoy Satt Cuntawoor Imbo
Coadoorai, Cuntawoor Imbo
Baupatla & Generally where it is
The Merchants Convoy Satt
custom coadoorai, Ventapolli
cumbanapoody &c.
The Merchants convoy Satt
Annavanade, Chintapumpa
The Merchants convoy Satt
Dustoracoor, Nojupudapolly &c.
The Merchants Convoy Satt
Bhavanaram, Imballoor
Bondigul, Gattimanoor
Nojupallapolly, Cumbum
=pad, Mullanoor, Nandiwapilli
Mantoor, Naravanapilli
&pad &c.

Cuntoor
Collectors Chuttchcary.
26th October 1841.

E. C. Jr.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

No. of Rowanahs.	Salt.	Collection.				Remarks.
	Md.	Rs.	Rs	a	P	
10,254.	675	394	70978.	6	6.	No. 1. The Merchants Convey salt to the Guntoor District via Cud coodaroo, Suntaravoor, Inkolee, Pamvaloor, Vellore, Podapelly, &c Baupuddy & Generally where it is in demand.
4	-	84	22	-	9.	2. The Merchants Convey salt to the Masulipatam Zillah via cuddacoodaroo, Ventapallem, Parallah, Pujjem, Potamaraze cocconapoody &c.
753.	26	134	2765	3	4.	3. The Merchants convey salt to the Nellore District via Woopucondoo Annamanaide, Chintajoompully, Gunasapoody, Andepoody &c.
381.	62	68	6527.	13	7.	4. The Merchants Convey salt to the Cuddapah District via Cudcamoor Dodoocoor, Koojundlapully &c.
1139.	764	280	80293.	8	2	5. The Merchants Convey salt to Hydrabad country via cuddacoodaroo Bheemavarum, Inkollos, Pamvaloor, Karimb, Pedigunah, &c Bendigul, Gutteenoorala, and also by Edamoddy, Dodoocoor. Koojullapully, Commaulpaud by Gundy gananalah Deogly Cumb =paud, Mullavarum, Nakinambadah, as well as Baupuddah, Koopoo Maustaar, Narasarawpettah, Atchammapettah, Chintapully, Ma depaud &c.
439	2,076	337	21,606.	2	2	
11,830.	2841	217	291,899.	10	4.	
-	-	44 3/4		11	10	-
-	-	162		4	3	11.
-	-	-		24	3	10.
-	2841	277 5/4	291,939.	12	1	

Guntoor Collector's Cutcherry. 26th October 1841.

E. E. Jr. / Signed J. Goldingham. Coll.

15629.

Fort St. George
No 6

Statement Shewing the Quantity of Salt Manufactured and the amount of Salt sold in each Cottaur or place

No.	Names of the Cottaurs or Place of Manufacture.	Fasly 1249. Quantity of Salt Manufactured.		Quantity sold.		Rate per Garce.	Value.		Fasly 1250 Quantity of Salt Manufactured.		Quantity sold.		Rate per Garce.	Value.	
		G	M	G	M	Rs	Rs	a p	G	M	G	M	Rs	Rs	a p
1	Chinna Ganjam	2,935	109	737	225	105	195	32 12	2,876	103	914	187	105	162	364 4
				1,180	385	100					662	185	100		
2	Pedda Ganjam	951	154	463	63	105	94	31 8	775	52	281	115	105	82	535 3
				460	"	100					530	"	100		
3	Nezampatam	249	46	254	148	105	28	708 13 6	"	"	185	145	105	23	463 1
				20	"	100					40	"	100		
4	Paulur	181	19	254	115	105	34	700 3 "	298	39	167	390	105	23	697 5 11
				80	"	100					60	"	100		
	Confiscated & spontaneous Salt	4,316	328	3,450	106	"	3	573 5 10	3,949	192	2,841	217	"	2	899 11 11
	Sale of Manufactured Salt sent for pattern	"	"	"	172	"		45 1 2	"	"	"	44 3/4	"		11 11
	For difference of price of 6 Garce of Salt between 105 & 42 Rupees sold in total at Rajahmundy Zillah by Meer Cassimally Onerchand, the same having been shipped by him at Nezampatam but for arrears and afterwards landed in the Rajahmundy District from stress of weather Fines levied from men & sent to work	"	"	"	"	"		315 " "	"	"	"	16 2	"		4 3 11
	Total	4,316	328	3,450	278	"	3	539 55 "	3,949	192	2,841	277 1/4	"	2	919 8 11
												24 3/4	"		24 3 11
														2	943 12 10

Guntoor, Coll.r's Cutcherry, 26th October 1841. S. S.

1562g.

Fort St. George
No 6

Statement Showing the Quantity of Salt Manufactured and the amount of Salt Sold in each Cottaur or place

No.	Names of the Cottaurs or place of Manufacture.	Fusly 1249. Quantity of Salt Manufactured.	Quantity Sold.	Rate per Garce.	Value.	Fusly 1250. Quantity of Salt Manufactured.	Quantity Sold.	Rate per Garce.	Value.
		G In	G In	Rs	Rs a p	G In	G In	Rs	Rs a p
1	Chinna Gunjam	2,935 100	737 225	105	195,522 12 10.	2,876 100	914 183	105	162,264 . 4
			1180 355	100			662 185.	100	
2	Pedda Gunjam	951 154	463 63	105	94,631. 8 6.	775. 50	281 115.	105	82,535. 3 .
			460 .	100			530 .	100	
3	Nazampatam	249 46	254 148	105	28,708. 13 6.	. .	185 145.	105	23,463. 1 1
			20 .	100			40 .	100	
4	Paulee	181 19	254 115	105	34,701. 3 .	298. 39	167. 390.	105	2,363. 5 1
			80 .	100			60 .	100	
		4,316 328	3,450 106	.	3,52,573. 5 10.	3,949 192	2,841 217.	.	29,599 . 1
	Confiscated Spontaneous Salt	. .	. 172	.	45 1 2				11 .
	Sale of Manufactured Salt sent for pattern	. .	. .	.					4 3
		4,316 328	3,450 278	.	3,53,618. 7 .	3,949. 192.	2,841 277 1/4	.	29,915. 2 1
	For difference of price of 6 Garces of Salt between 108 1/2 Rupees sold in Estate at Rajahmundry Zillah by Meer Casimally Merchant, the same having been shipped by him at Nazampatam Port for arrears, and afterwards landed in the Rajahmundry District from stress of weather Fires hired from men & from Cattle &c.				315 . .				
	Total	4,316 328	3,450 278	.	3,53,933. .	3,949. 192.	2,841 277 1/4	.	29,929. 2 1

Guntoor, Collr's Cutcherry, 26th October 1841.

Fort St. George

No 6

8th November 1841.

the amount of Salt sold in each Cottaur or place of Manufacture in the Zillah of Guntoor in Fusly 1250 in Comparison with Fusly 1249.

1249.					1250.			Quantity.		
Rate per Garce.	Value.	Quantity of Salt Manufactured.	Quantity sold.	Rate per Garce.	Value.	Increase.	Decrease.	Remarks.
Rs	Rs a p	G	m	G	m	Rs	Rs a p	G	m	G	m	
105	195,532	12	10.	2,876	102	914.	182					
100												
					662	185.		105	1,62,364	0	4	
								100				
105	94,131.	8	6.	775.	52							
100						281	115.					
								105	82,535.	3	"	
					530	"		100				
105	28,708.	13	6.	"	"							
100						185	145.					
								105	23,463.	1	1	
					40	"		100				
105	34,702	3	"	298.	39	167.	390.					
100						60	"					
"	3,52,573.	5	10.	3,949.	192	2,841	217.	105	2,363.	5	11	
								100				
"	45	1	2				2		29,899.	10	4	
						44¾						
						16-2			11	10	"	
"	3,53,618.	7	"	3,949.	192.	2,841	27¾					
									4	3	11.	
"	315	"	"									
									29,915.	8	3.	
	21	9	7.	"	"	"	"					
"	3,53,955.	7	3,949.	192.	2,841	27¾						
									24	3	10.	
									29,939.	12	1.	

Guntoor Collr's Cutcherry, 26th October 1841. S. E.

117	20	"	484	156	"							
"	"	"	"	"	"	59	6	"	No 1. 2. & 3 A sufficient quantity of Salt being on hand for sale at the time of Manufacture, in consequently a little quantity was manufactured, hence the decrease.
"	"	"	"	"	"	176	10½	"	
"	"	"	"	"	"	249	16	"	
117	20	"	"	"	"				No 4. an increased quantity of Salt was Manufactured inconsequence of a limited portion being on hand at the time of Manufacture, to meet the future demand.
117	20	"	484	166	"				
117	20	"	484	156	"				
117	20	"	484	156	"				

(Signed) G. Golding Lawe. Collr.

15630.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

A.

Statement shewing the demands and Collections of Boatferoshy in the Zillah of Guntoor from Fusly 1234 to 1250.

No.	Fusly	Demand. Guntoor. Rs a P	Demand. Palnaud. Rs a	Collections in Guntoor district. Current. Rs a	Arrears. Rs a	Total. Rs a	Ds in Palnaud District. Rs a
1	Fusly 1234	6,331 13 4	8 8	4,164 3 4.	2,293 6 2	6,457.9 6	8 8
2	1235	6,299 7 -	8 8	5,277 6 -	2,351 12 8	7,729 2 5.	8 8
3	1236	6,509 8 5	8 8	6,156 2 1.	1,145 1 2	7,330 3 3.	8 8
4	1237	6,605 2 9	8 8	6,425 2 9.	258. 9 10	6,684 12 7	8 8
5	1238	6,825 12 7	8 8	6,518 15 2	152. 3 4	6,672. 2 3	8 8
6	1239	7,057 11 6	8 8	6,524 7 10.	462 7 4	6987 15 2	8 8
7	1240	7013 7 2	8 8	6,390. 8 10.	583. 5 10	6973.14 8	8 8
8	1241	6,854 9 3	8 8	6,314 3 11.	459 3 -	6773.6 11	8 8
9	1242	5,415 - 2	8 8	3,112 2 10.	318 3 10	3,430 6 8	8 8
10	1243	3275 1 8	8 8	1604 2 6	98 12 -	1702 14 6	8 8

11	1244	2937	15	4	8	8	1,680	13	6.	205	12	8.	1,886	10	1.	8 8
12	1245	2912	7	10	8	8	2,262	6	7.	348	11	10.	2,611	2	5.	8 8
13	1246	2320	15	10	8	8	2644	15	-	767.	2	5.	3412	1	5.	8 8
14	1247	3,852	9	1.	8	8	3,108	13	9	2159.	15	1.	5268	12	10.	8 8
15	1248	4,102	7	11.	8	8	3570	4	6.	1763	1	4	5,333.	5	9.	8 8
16	1249	4,255	2	-	8	8	3156.	15	-	427.	12	9,	3584	11	9.	8 8
17	1250	4,437	15	6	8	8	3574.	10	5.	1,061	14	4	4,635.	8	9	8 8

Particulars of the Demand for fusly 1250 including Palmyra

Chuklers	1143	4 -
Parias	1259.	- -
Washermen	917.	15 5.
Shepherds	674	1 8.
Pot makers	336	- 6.
Punhala Byrade and Kommodanandlo or mendicants	205	1 10.
Basket makers	25	14 -
Yaroodala people	17	8 -
Boatmen	26	12 -
Saddoolavandlos	7	13 -
Wandering Black Smiths	23	- 4
Jalagadugoolaraundlos	8	8 -
Excess Collections	-	14 -
	4446	7 6

Guntoor Collr's Cutcherry 26th October 1841 - E.E. Jr / Signed / J. Goldingham
Collr

15631.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Order thereon.

(28.29)

Ordered to be sent again in circulation.

Read the following letters

To

The Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St. George.

From the Coll.r of Cuddapah.

Sir,

I have the honor to report, having delivered over charge of the District on the 1st instant to J. J. Cotton Esq.r whose receipt for the balance of Cash remaining in the Treasury amounting to Rupees (3,19,741 — 4) three Lacs, nineteen thousand, seven hundred and forty one, & Pice four, is herein enclosed

(30)

Cuddapah District,
Pr. Coll.r's Office,
Baulpully, 1st Nov.r 1841.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
(Signed) W. Ashton
Pr. Collector.

Received,

15632.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Received from W. Ashton Esq.re Principal Collector of Cuddapah, in the undermentioned Coins the Balance of Company's Rupees 3,19,741 — 4 being the balance of Cash with this date according to the Accounts of the Treasury.

		Rate of Conversion			
40	Cash Pieces	1	1		
20	Ditto Ditto	3	14	8	
10	Ditto Ditto	1	15	9	
5	Ditto Ditto	29	18	2	9
		32	79	25.	103.11 10.

Total Rupees — 3,19,741. 4

(Signed) J. J. Cotton
Pr. Coll.r on Charge

Cuddapah,
Pr. Coll.r's Office,
1st November 1841.

1536.

Parish of St George & St Ann Bristol 1841.

Assessed Taxes for Lighting & Watching Streets &c. under the Act 3 & 4 Wm. IV. Cap. 90.

Sums due from Occupiers of Dwelling Houses, Shops, Warehouses, Counting Houses, Offices, Coach Houses, Stables, Carriages, Horses, Mules, Asses, Carts, Dogs, Male Servants, Hair Powder, Armorial Bearings, Game Certificates, Persons keeping Armorial Bearings, Persons keeping Game, Persons keeping Dogs, Persons keeping Carriages, Persons keeping Horses, Mules, Asses, Persons keeping Male Servants, Persons using Hair Powder, Persons keeping Carts

15633. Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

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

31

From the Sub Collr.
In charge of Cuddapah.

Sir,

I have the honor to report
having this day taken charge of the District and pass
my receipt in duplicate to W. Ashton Esqr.
for the balance of cash remaining in the
Treasury Amounting to Rupees (3,19,741 - 4)
Three Lacs, nineteen thousand seven hundred
forty one, and Pice four.

Cuddapah,
Collr's Office,
1st November 1841.

Signed J. J. Cotton
Sub Collr in Charge.

Order on the two foregoing letters.

30-32

Ordered to be submitted
for the information of Government.

Read again letter from the
Collector of Chingleput dated 18th August and
entered in Consultation 2d September last.

Proceedings thereon, para 1.

33

In every arrangement
proposed for the future management of
the Pagodas in Chingleput, the feelings
of the people should be attended
to, and if the appointment of
any Committee or Assemblage
as a "Sabah" with authority over one
or more Pagodas is acceptable to
the

15634 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

the Native community interested in their
due maintenance, there seems no reason
why it should not take place. Village
Pagodas should in the opinion of the
Board be left under the control, as is
already the case in many Districts, of the
Head inhabitants of the Village.

2 With respect to the second
point referred in the Collector's letter,
it is obvious that so long as any
Collections can be made of the funds
set apart for the support of a Pagoda,
it ought not to fall into decay - and
it will be for the parties undertaking
the management of the Pagoda to appro-
priate the funds, so as to prevent such an
occurrence - The Officers of Government
will not be required to interfere in
any respect whatever.

3 The Collector should
submit his proposed arrangements with
reference to each Religious Institution
any

15036 (34) Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Statement of Salt for exportation to Calcutta from the Port of Covelong in the Zillah of Chingleput upto 2nd November 1841.

Quantity of Salt permitted to be exported	Quantity already exported	Quantity remaining to be exported	Quantity actually in store ready for exportation on the Beach	Quantity ready in the Colaurs	Remarks
For 1841/42 Bengal Maunds					
5,00,000	"	5,00,000	98,739	1,07,415	

Chingleput District
Collector's Cutcherry.
Pulleeanay 8th November 1841.

/Signed/ A. Freeze
Collector

Statement

DESTROYED ORIGINAL

15637

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Statement of Salt for Exportation to Calcutta from the Port of Murkanum in the District of the Southern Division of Arcot up to 30th October 1841.

35

Quantity of Salt permitted to be exported to Calcutta in the year 1841.	Quantity already Exported	Quantity remaining to be exported	Quantity actually in store and ready for exportation	Remarks.
Bengal Maunds	Bengal Maunds	Bengal Maunds	Bengal Maunds	
2,00,000	"	2,00,000	2,00,000	

/Signed/ C. H. Hallett
Acting Collector

Cuddalore Collector's Cutcherry
5th November 1841

Murkanum is about 20 miles North of Pondicherry and for the guidance of Vessels in making the place, a temporary Flag Staff will be erected on the beach and the Union Jack kept flying from sun rise to sun set

Applications for Salt to be addressed to the Collector at Cuddalore superscribed "Calcutta Salt Export" and it is requested that the probable date of the arrival of the Vessel at Murkanum may be stated.

It will be optional for parties taking Salt to pay for the same at the Collector's Cutcherry or to the Tahsildar at Murkanum.

/Signed/ C. H. Hallett
Acting Collector

Ordered.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Order on the two foregoing Statements } Ordered to be recorded.

(34 - 36)

Read the following letters.

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

(37)

From the Bd. Colr. of North Arcot } Sir, Para 1.

With reference to your letter of the 21st Instant, requiring further information in the case of the Petitioner "Chevroden" a Joty in the Village of Pareyacavanoor in the Santighur Talook, I have the honor to state, all that I can learn of the matter, which is this — The Joty Meerasy is divided into 36 shares, and a third of one of these shares the Petitioner Chavroden claims of his Mother "Ellee," the other two-thirds were enjoyed by Joties Navarah and Cavatadeu the latter being own Brother to Ellee — In due course Navarah and Cavatadeu died without sons — Navarah however left a Daughter who married one Cundeu who became Heir to all Navarah's possessions — Ellee being excluded

Reporting that the native assessor to whom the claim of the Petitioner in No 686 of 1840 was referred, to have awarded against the hereditary right of the Petitioners.

Section No 1 of 1840 Received & returned

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

excluded from her Caste as an adultress, and per son, the Petitioner, in consequence of her Mother's misdeeds, suffering with her as the Punchayet awarded, which was ordered to re assemble to try the case in accordance with clause III, Section IV, Regulation VII of 1831.

2 It was impossible for me to bring the dispute to an amicable settlement which I might have wished to have done, and which Section IV of the Regulation empowered me to do, but the opposite party would not hear of it, therefore I had no alternative to try the Petitioner's right to possession of succession to the Village office, than by sending his claim before native assessors for investigation.

3 This dispute commenced twelve years ago, and the award of the Punchayet has been given in five years ago, against the Petitioner.

North Arcot. — — — —
Princ. Coll. Cs Cutcherry.
Palmanair 26th October 1841. } /Signed/ G. M. Ogilvie
Principal Collector

Ordered

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Order thereon— Ordered that the following Endorsement be passed upon Original Petition No 664 of 1840, and that the same be returned to the party concerned thro' the Principal Collector, Northern Division of Arcot.

(37-38)

The Board of Revenue having ascertained by reference to the Principal Collector of North Arcot that the Petitioner's claim to a share in the Forty Inearvie to which this address relates was decided adversely so far back as five years ago, decline now interfering in his behalf.

To The Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

(39)

From the Princ. Collr of North Arcot — Para 1

Reporting the dismissal of Shanaghanny row Tahsildar of the Sutwaid Talook.

Sir,

I have the honor to report for the information of the Board of Revenue the removal from Office of Sashaghenny row the Tahsildar of Sutwaid.

2 This man is an old servant of 28 years standing but now a most useless one. It was with reluctance that I removed him from his charge as

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

as he is the first Tahsildar I have had occasion to dismiss since I joined the District five years ago, but the public service required this step to be taken — He has long been infirm and almost bed ridden and to be relieved from his arduous duties I believe was not altogether against his wish.

3 When I visited his Talook nine months ago, I found him quite unable for business, but as he assured me that this was caused chiefly by his weak state of body, I allowed him to continue on until the end of the Fasly in hopes that he might be able to recover his strength and conduct the duties required of him — Two months after the Fasly had expired, there was a large balance of nearly 13,000 Rupees outstanding in his Talook which he either could not or was not able, from continued infirmity, to realize, and another person was deputed to assist him, and who succeeded in collecting the balance within fifteen days.

4 The Return which accompanies will shew further the reason why his removal was necessary.

5 It is my intention to make application for a Pension being granted to Sashaghenny Row.

North Arcot, Princ. Collr's Cutcherry, Palmanair 28th October 1841

/Signed/ G. M. Ogilvie
Principal Collector
Return

15642

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Return of Public Servants suspended or Dismissed from Employment in the Collectorate of the Northern Division of Arcot from 1st July to 30th September 1841.

Names of the Persons suspended or dismissed	Employ'd whether in the Hoozoor or in Talooks	Amount Pay Pr Month	Date of suspension or dismissal	Cause of Suspension or Dismissal	Date of appointment to this Office from which he is suspended or dismissed	Whole period of employment in the Public service	Remarks
						years m D	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Principal Collector							
Sashagerry Row Tahsildar of Sultaid Talook	63 Rupees		Dismissed on the 15th September 1841.	Long continued ill health, and quite unable to make a Circuit of his Talook Leaving a sum of nearly Rs 13000 of July 1250 uncollected, order after order being sent to him to realize it, but without effect — another individual being sent on this special duty collecting the balance within fifteen Days. — The maramut of his Talook entirely neglected — The same being reported upon by the Head Assistant Collector, who was deputed for that purpose — The necessary advances, for works requiring immediate repair being long in his possession, but not disbursed. — Neglecting his duty altogether in the keeping of Salt at the Pans, his health not permitting him to be present — The Salt Merchants in consequence returning without making purchases. — His Police duties entirely neglected. —	18th June 1835	28 — 7 — 11	His Office has been filled by Basha Row formerly Tahsildar of the Cuddapanum Talook —
Sub Collector				"	"	"	"

/ Signed / Gn. Mc. Cgilvie
Principal Collector

North Arcot, Pr. Collector's Cutcherry
Palmanair 28th October 1841

The

15643 Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Proceedings thereon. The Board do not doubt from the foregoing Report that the Tahsildar of Sutwaid was properly removed being inefficient for his duties thro' old age and infirmities. But Mr. Ogilvie will bear in mind that in applying for a pension, it is required that the party for whom the recommendation is made shall be in official employment at the date of application.

Read.

39-40

15644 Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Read the following letter

To,

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

41

From the Sub. Collr. of Salem

Sir,

I have the honor to request you will obtain the sanction of Government for the sum of Rupees 133-13- being the value of Stationery purchased for the use of my Cutchery from July to September last, this period during which no Stationery was received from the Presidency. A Memorandum of the charges accompanies.

[Signed] J. D. Gleig
Principal Collector.

Salem Zillah, Salem
Principal Collector's Cutchery
29th October 1841.

Memorandum.

15645 Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Memorandum of Stationery purchased for the use of the Principal Collector's Office from July to September 1841

No.	Particulars	Amount Rupees	As	P
32	Quires of Foolscap paper at 12-3/16 pr. Quire	24	9	.
19 1/2	Ditto of Demy Do. at 1-4 5/16 Do.	24	7	.
2	Ditto of Quartersheet Do. at 8 Do.	1	.	.
9	Ditto of Medium Do. at 2-4 Do.	20	4	.
10	Ditto of Royal Do. at 3-4 Do.	32	8	.
1	Ditto of Cartridge Do.	1	4	.
12	Papers of Ink powder at 3 annas pr. Paper	2	4	.
13	Pencils at 3 annas and 3 to Die pr. each	2	11	.
19	Bundles of Quills at 12 annas pr. Bundle	14	4	.
2	Skeins of Silk thread at 2 annas pr. Skein	.	4	.
1	Cooly from Bangalore to Ofoor	.	6	.
	Total Rupees	123	13	.

Signed J.D. Gleig

Principal Collector

31st October 1841

Order

15646 Fort St. George 8th November 1841

Order thereon

41.42

Ordered that the foregoing letter be submitted to Government with a request that Government will be pleased to grant sanction for the charge of Rupees 123.13 expended by Mr Gleig in the purchase of Stationery as shewn in the Memorandum which accompanies the letter of the Principal Collector of Salem.

The Government have been already informed that from some neglect in the servants of the department communication with the Principal Collector of Salem was interrupted and hence the cause of the non supply of the Government Stationery indented for.—

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

43

From the Pl. Collr of Salem

Sir

With reference to the Extract from the Proceedings of the Board dated 11th Instant I have the honor to inform you that Dussadar Hussain Khan was hired

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

fined in the first instance for having apprehended certain individuals while employed in apprehending robbers without stating as was stated either a warrant or orders from the Tahsildar for their seizure in the sum of Rupees five: but on further enquiry it having appeared that he had acted under written instructions from the Tahsildar I have considered it necessary to remit the fine levied on him – The above amount has been deducted from the Duffadars pay for the Month of July and shewn in the account particulars of Land Revenue charges for August last Submitted to the Civil Auditor

Salem, – – – – – –
Pr. Collectors Cutcherry
30th October 1841. –

Signed / J. D. Gleig
Principal Collector

Ordered that the following address be submitted with the foregoing letter

To

The Acting Chief Secretary to Government

Sir.

I am directed by the Board of

43 - 44

To the Actg. Chief Secy. to Government –

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

of Revenue to request you will lay before Government the correspondence with the Principal Collector of Salem noted in the Margen and obtain a Sanction under the circumstances therein stated for the refund of Rs. five being the amount of a fine erroneously levied from a Duffadar named Heirsam Khan,

From the Pr. Collr. 30th Septr. in Cons. 11th Octr. 1841 Proceedings of the Bd. 11th Cts. From the Pr. Collr. 28th Octr. in Cons. 8th November.

Revenue Board Office Fort St. George – – – – 8th November 1841.

[Signed] H. B. Smollett. Secretary

Read the following letter from the Collector of Trichinopoly, reporting upon the management of the Extra Sources of revenue in that District for Fasly 1250.

In Cons. 30th Septr. 1841

45

Proceedings Relative to the management of the Extra Sources of revenue of the Trichinopoly District for Fasly 1250

Paras 36 &c.

Sayer Para 1. The demand under this head amounted to Rupees 1,34,119-8-9 of which Rs. 86,079-8-9 comprised the Sayer Collections under amanie and Rs. 44,940 the rent of the duty on Betel. In the former there was a decrease of Rupees 2,09,136 occasioned principally by a diminution in the demand for

For cloth in the part of the coast Merchant
In the latter there was an increase of
Rupees 2705 in consequence of a greater
competition amongst the bidders. The
Increase in Betel rents 2705 — — total demand thus
Deduct net Decrease in Amanie Sayer 695 2 6 exhibits a net increase
695 2 6 of Rs 695 2 6.

+ Rs 12,972 4 7 2 2 The + current Collections ex-
ceeded those of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 3399-6
but in consequence of there being a
smaller amount of arrears to be brought
to account in the Fusly under review
than in the preceding year the gross
Gross Collns Rs 13,665-6 8 Collections exhibit a decrease of Rs 1953-
6-5 The net revenue after deducting
8805-14 9 charges which were less than those of
Fusly 1249 by Rupees 120-7 amounted to
Rupees 12,859-7-11 being Rupees 1832-15-5
below the net revenue of Fusly 1249 —
there was a balance of Rs 1,795-1-7 due
on account of the Current demand
for Fusly 1250 the whole of which has
been Collected since the close of the
year.

Abkarry 3 In the amount of Abkarry

Fusly 1250 13050
1249 13,000
2050

* 13372-11-0

rents for Fusly 1250 there was an increase of
Rupees 2,050 The + Collections however —
fell short of those in Fusly 1249 by —
Rupees 1387-13-5 owing to there having
been no arrears collected in the Fusly
under review as was the case in
Fusly 1249 There was a balance of —
Rupees 1677-2 due at the close of —
Fusly 1250 which the Collector states
will be realized shortly.

Sundry Small Farms & Licenses

The demand under this
head exhibits a decrease of Rs 1931-
the amount being Rs 3798-1-4 of —
which Rs 2904-—-6 were brought to
account within the year and Rupees
421-2-6 have been collected subsequently
leaving a balance of Rupees 472-14-4
still due which the Collector expects
to realize hereafter. The total Collections
inclusive of arrears amounted to Rs 3330
6 11 being Rupees 759-12-10 below the —
Collections of Fusly 1249 there were no
charges on account of this branch.

Para 11.

Stamps 5 In the Stamp Collections
there was an increase of Rupees 900-6

the

Fort St George 8th November 1841.

The amount realized in Fusly 1249 being Rs. 22,364-11 and in Fusly 1250 Rs. 23,264-11-6 The Charges under this head exhibit an increase of Rupees 7381 regarding which no explanation is afforded either in the report or the printed Statement which accompanies it this should have been done as the amount is just double that of the Charges in Fusly 1249 owing to this cause the net revenue derived from Stamps was only Rs. 116-8-5 in excess of the net revenue of the preceding year as shewn in the margin.

Charges
Fusly 1249-780-14-10
1250-1364-6-11

Net Revenue
Fusly 1250-2700-4-7
1249-2158-12-2
116-8-5

Motorpha 6

In the Motorpha demand there was a decrease of Rupees 158-11-3 which the Collector attributes to the transfer of an Island in the Cauvery in which there is a fishery to the District of Tanjore. The net revenue from this source amounted to Rs. 6084-12-2 being Rupees 8-13-4 above the net revenue of Fusly 1249. The balance of Rs. 118-13-4 due at the close of the Fusly under review has

Fort St George 8th November 1841.

has been subsequently brought to Account.

Total 7 The Demand on account of all branches of Extra revenue for Fusly 1250 amounted to Rupees 79187-11-6 being Rupees 2,993-6-9 in excess of the Settlement of Fusly 1249. The net Collections however were less than those of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 3855-3-11 which is owing to the Collections of the last mentioned Fusly including a much larger Amount of arrears than those of Fusly 1250. The Net revenue of the year under review was Rupees 1,69,347-13-7 and that of Fusly 1249 Rupees 1,73,203-1-6.

8 The amount of arrears on account of Fuslies prior to 1250 is shewn by statement No. 5 to have been Rupees 7,165-1-11-0 of this Rupees 5,015-9-6 were Collected within the year and Rupees 480 have been subsequently realized leaving a balance of Rs. 469-8-5 still due. Of the last mentioned sum the Collector

Rates.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

states that Rupees 861-14-2 must be considered
doubtful but that for the remainder
Rupees 807-10-3 ample Security has
been taken - If this item is as appears
probable from the
Statement above
referred to, the out-
standing balance on account of the Sayer
of Fusly 1243 the Board think that measures
should be taken for realizing it from
the securities of the Collector contemplated
realizing it at all as it has been
now allowed to be over for upwards
of 8 years. The Collector is
requested to report what is the nature

Stat: 5
Columns 5

Balance of Fusly 1243	487	10	3
Cd: 24 Collections on account of the above	480	"	"
Still due	807	10	3

Fort St. George 8th November 1841

of the Security for this balance -
how it happens to have been
allowed to remain so long outstanding -

Ordered that a Copy
of the foregoing Extract from the
Boards Proceedings with the annexed
Comparative Statement of the
Collections Charges and net Revenue
be submitted to Government and a
transcript of the same be forwarded
to the Collector of Trichinopoly for
his information and guidance -

Trichinopoly

15655

Fort St George 8th November 1850

Tuticorin Poly July 1250

Demand	22364	11	-	23264	11	6	900	-	6	"	"
Balance on the 12th July	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Current Collection	22364	11	-	23264	11	6	900	-	6	"	"
Extra Do											
Total	22,304	11	-	23,204	11	0	900	-	0	"	"
Charges	780	14	10	4564	6	11	753	8	1	"	"
Net Revenue	21,523	12	2	21,700	4	7	116	8	5	"	"
Demand	6,214	1	2	6,055	11	-	"	"	"	158	11	3
Balance on the 12th July	148	3	7	118	13	4	"	"	"	29	6	3
Current Collection	6,065	13	7	5936	8	7	"	"	"	129	5	"
Extra Do	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Arrears	16	10	-	148	3	7	131	9	7	"	"	"
Total	6,082	7	7	6084	12	2	2	4	7	"	"	"
Charges	6	8	9	"	"	"	"	"	"	6	8	9
Net Revenue	6,075	14	10	6,084	12	2	8	13	4	"	"	"
Demand	176,194	4	9	179187	11	6	2993	6	9	"	"	"
Balance on the 12th July	5,143	9	1	4485	1	9	"	"	"	658	7	4
Current Collection	171,050	11	8	174,702	9	9	3651	14	7	"	"	"
Extra Do	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Arrears	12,379	7	9	5015	9	6	"	"	"	7363	14	3
Total	183,430	3	5	179,718	3	3	"	"	"	3712	-	2
Charges	10,227	1	11	10,370	5	8	143	3	9	"	"	"
Net Revenue	173,203	1	6	169,347	13	7	"	"	"	3855	3	11

Read

1853

Port St Lucie 8th November 1851

Distributed by Study 250

	Study 1249	Study 1250	Remarks	Carried
Ox. a.	Br. a.	Sh. a.	Ox. a.	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

1565/6/9 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Tillah for Fusly:

1250.-

Print. Coll.r Canara

Mangalore,

28th October 1841.

Signed / H. M. Blair

Principal Collector.

Summabandy.

1565 Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

Read the following letter.

To

The Secretary

to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

Sir,

46

From the Print.

Collector of

Canara.

I have the

honor to submit State-

ments of the Devastanum

Settlements of these

Tillah

15660.

Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

No. 1.

Summabundy and Kistbundy of the Devastanum Revenue in the Tillah of Canara for F

1250

Heads of Revenue.

Talooks.	2 Amount Melbosey Land. Rs. A. P.	3 Amount Wall Dharmah Rs. A. P.	4 Amount Kye Dharmah Rs. A. P.	5 Amount Grama Dharmah Rs. A. P.	6 Amount Bala. tom Dharmah Rs. A. P.	7 Amount Karn Vrs. Auddy Rs. A. P.	8 Total Revenue 1841. Rs. A. P.	9 1st Kist January 1841 Rs. A. P.	10 2d Kist February 1841 Rs. A. P.	11 3d Kist March Rs. A. P.
1.										
Mangalore	3,942 4 4	1,717 10 11	33 5 7	" " "	283 6 4	" " "	5976 7 2	1,494 1 9	1,494 1 9	1,195 4 5
Bekul	10,111 9 2	1,545 1 7	1,005 5 "	" " "	167 9 2	" " "	12829 4 4	3207 5 1	3207 5 1	2565 13 8
Buntwal	3,186 12 1	1,193 " 5	655 10 4	" " "	50 2 5	117 8 "	15203 1 2	3800 12 "	3800 12 "	3040 9 10
Oodipy	11,018 6 8	3,965 3 3	2258 8 5	" " "	375 12 10	" " "	17,614 15 2	4,403 11 9	4403 11 9	3532 15 10
Barcoor	11,420 7 8	3,936 3 7	1,296 12 5	" " "	48 13 7	" " "	16,702 5 3	4175 9 4	4175 9 4	3340 7 5
Coondapoor	9,120 4 4	3,653 9 2	2,331 7 2	305 2 5	78 4 10	" " "	15,488 12 "	3872 3 "	3872 3 "	3097 12 "
Honore	3,365 13 7	1,425 7 7	651 4 5	" " "	" " "	" " "	5,442 9 7	1,360 10 5	1,360 10 5	1088 8 4
Ankola	1,181 3 2	184 8 10	16 " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	1381 12 "	345 7 "	345 7 "	276 5 6
Soopah	3,433 10 5	180 " "	" " "	145 8 "	" " "	" " "	3759 2 5	939 12 5	939 12 5	751 13 2
Soondah	10,410 " 4	200 " 5	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	10,610 " 9	2652 " 5	2652 " 5	2122 " 3
Bilghie	538 11 8	376 9 2	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	915 4 10	228 13 2	228 13 2	183 " 11
Total	77,725 15 5	18,377 6 11	8,748 " 10	450 10 5	1004 1 2	117 8 "	105,923 10 9	26,480 14 8	26,480 14 8	21,184 11 7

Mangalore, 28th October 1841

[Signed] H.
Chief

15660. 1841.

No. 1.

Summlah of Canara for Fasly 1250.

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
	Faloskanry	February	March	April	May
	1841		1841	1841	1841
	1.	10	11	12	13.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Mangalore	94 1 9	1,494 1 9	1,195 4 8	1,195 4 8	597 10 4
Bekul	207 5 1.	3,207 5 1	2,565 13 8	2,565 13 8	1,282 4 10
Buntwa	3,800 12 "	3,800 12 4	3,040 9 10	3,040 9 10	1,520 14 11
Oodip	4,403 11 9	4,403 11 9	3,522 15 10	3,522 15 10	1,761 8 "
B	4,175 9 4	4,475 9 4	3,340 7 5	3,340 7 5	1,670 3 9.
"	3,872 3 "	3,872 3 "	3,097 12 "	3,097 12 "	1,548 14 "
7.	1,360 10 5	1,360 10 5	1,088 8 4	1,088 8 4	544 4 1.
2 "	345 7 "	345 7 "	276 5 6	276 5 6	138 3 "
25	939 12 5	939 12 5	751 13 2	751 13 2	375 15 3.
10 " 9	2,652 3 5	2,652 3 5	2,122 " 3	2,122 " 3	1,060 15 5
915 4 10	228 13 2.	228 13 2.	183 " 11	183 " 11	91 8 8.
Total	105,923 10 9.	26,480 14 8.	21,184 11 7.	21,184 11 7	10,592 6 3.

Mare, 28th October 1841

/Signed/ H. M. Blair
Principal Collector.

Comparative

15662. Fort St. George 8th. November 1841.

Order thereon. (46-47) Ordered to lie on the table.

From the Collector of Rajahmundry. Read Regis-

(48) ter of Petitions bearing the Board's Endorsements presented to him for the Month of September last.

Ordered to be lodged

Order thereon. in the Office.

(48-49) Resolved that the following letter be dispatched together with the petition therein referred to.

To

The Acting Collector in the Southern Division of Arcot.

(50)

To the Actg Collr in the So. Dn. of Arcot.

Sir,

1885 of 1841. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to transmit for your report the accompanying Petition from Lall Khan Vakeel to Dawood Mahomed Khan Jaghiredar of Pollieroottah and Sunkarapooram in your district, claiming certain Burial Grounds, stated to have been incorporated with the Government lands, and request you will be pleased to report thereon at your earliest

15661. Fort St. George 8th November 1841.

No. 2. Comparative Statement of the Duty Collections for Fusli 1249/50.

Talooks. Total Settlement of Peishcush Demands. Amount of Arrears Decreased. Amount of Arrears Increased. Total Amount of Collections for Fusli 1249/50. Remarks.

Talooks.	Total Settlement of Peishcush Demands.	Amount of Arrears Decreased.	Amount of Arrears Increased.	Total Amount of Collections for Fusli 1249/50.	Remarks.
Manargoody	5916 12				
Vellore	12852 4				
Punganoor	15203 1				
Vellore	17612 15				
Punganoor	16102 5				
Cumbum	15488 12				
Kunnee	5443 7				
Vellore	13981 12				
Sholinghur	5159 2				
Tripatoor	10610 10				
Tripatoor	9155 10				
Polliore	10[illegible]923 23	10[illegible]9	10[illegible]923 23	28[illegible]	
Total	10[illegible]923 23	10[illegible]9	10[illegible]923 23	28[illegible]	

Madras Collectorate Office 8th October 1841. (Signed) H. G. Ogilvie Asst. to Collr.

Order

earliest convenience.

Revd. Board Office,
Fort St. George,
8th. November, 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett
Secretary.

Resolved that the following letter be dispatched.

To

The Collector of
Tinnevelly.

51

To the Collector of Tinnevelly. Sir

No. 1846 of 1841.

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to transmit to you the accompanying original letter from Mr. A. A. Hill and with reference to the communication from this Office under date the 9th September last to request that your report on the Charity Choultry at Sungoondapooram may be furnished as soon as practicable.

Revd. Board Office,
Fort St. George,
8th. November, 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett
Secretary.

52

Received the under-mentioned Miscellaneous letters and Statements.

From the Actg. Collector in the Southern Division of Arcot. } Statement of Sayer Smuggled

Smuggled Articles in the Sayer Chunkey of Cottacoopum recommended for confiscation.

53

From the Presidt. Collr. of Canara. Transmitting Statements of Tobacco seizures and increased duty as fine for the Month of June last and stating that no goods were confiscated during the same period.

54

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Submitting a Statement of Smuggled Salt seized from 1st to 30th September last and requesting sanction for its confiscation.

52. 55

Order on the three above mentioned Statements } Ordered that the Confiscation and sale of Smuggled Articles, Tobacco, and Salt as well as the levy of Extra duty enumerated in the Statements be authorized.

56

From the Collector of Bellary. Abstract of Demand Collection and Balance for the Month of September last.

57

From the Sub Collr. in charge of Cuddapah } Statement of Demand Collection and Balance for the Month of September last.

Abstract

From the Collector of Guntoor.
(58) Abstract of Demand Collection and Balance for the Month of September last.

From the Princ.l Coll.r of Nellore.
(59) Abstract of Demand Collection and Balance for the Month of September last.

From the Princ.l Coll.r of Tanjore.
(60) Abstract of Demand Collection and Balance for the Month of September last.

From the Princ.l Coll.r of Tanjore.
(61) Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.

From the Coll.r of Bellary
(62) Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.

From the Asst. Collector in charge of Cuddapah
(63) Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.

Statement

From the Collector of Guntoor.
(64) Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.

From the Princ.l Coll.r of Nellore.
(65) Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.

From the Collector of Chingleput.
(66) Salt and Money account Current for the quarter ending 30th. September last.

From the Collector of Guntoor.
(67) Salt Account Current for the quarter ending 30th. September last.

From the Collector of Guntoor.
(68) Return of persons charged with offences under Regulation IX of 1822 for the Month of September last

From the Collector of Guntoor.
(69) Stating that the Return of Village Officers suspended or dismissed under the Provisions of Regulation XI of 1831 for the Month of October last is not sent, there being no entry to make.

Indent

From the Collector of Masulipatam. Indent for Station-
(70) ery and Sundries required for the use
of the Collector and Magistrate offices
for the Year 1842.

From the Collector of Tinnevelly. Extra Indent for
(71) the Sundry Articles of Stationery required
for the use of his Office.

Order on the 2 above mentioned Indents. Ordered that
(70.72) the Indents be compared Countersigned
and transmitted to the Military
Board.

From the Princ. Collr. of Nellore. Stating that
(73) the Returns of Persons charged with
offences and of Persons convicted and
in confinement under Regulation IX
of 1822 for the Month of September
last are not sent, there being no entry
to make.

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Salt Account
(74) for the quarter ending 30th
September last.

From the Superintendent [illegible]

Pettah Condapah Moodely for Paper
and Cadjans supplied for the use of
his Department and requesting that
(75.76) it may be passed and returned.

Order thereon. Ordered to be passed and
returned.

From the Princ. Collr. of Tanjore. Stating that no
(77) goods were recommended for confisca-
tion during the Month of Septem-
ber last.

From the Princ. Collr. of Tanjore. Register of the
(78) state of the River Cauvery at the
Anicut for the Month of September
last.

From the Collector of Trichinopoly. Return of Persons
(79) suspended or dismissed under the pro-
visions of Regulation VI of 1831 for
the Month of September last.

From the Collector of Tinnevelly. Return of Fines
(80) imposed and Stoppages made from
the pay of the public Servants from

1566q. Fort St. George 8th. November 1841.

that have occurred in the list of fines and stoppages from 1st. July to 30th. September last.

(82)

From the Collector of Tinnevelly. Return of public Servants suspended or dismissed from Employment from 1st. July to 30th. September last.

" J. Grant,

" J. D. Drury

" A. Robertson

" A. Maclean

Compd. J. G. Boyle

1567o. Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

No Diary

At a Meeting Present

Thursday 11th. November 1841. } John Dent Esqre. Senior Member
G: D: Drury Esqre. Second Member
A: Robertson Esqre. Acting Third Member
and
Alexander Maclean Esqre. Temporary Member

Minutes of the last

Meeting read and approved.

Read the following Resolutions

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 3d. November 1841.
(From Board 11th. October)

(1)

From the Sec. to Govt. } The Right Honorable the Governor in Council sanctions the charge reported in the foregoing letter Amounting to Rupees (77- 8) Seventy seven and annas Eight.

(Signed) Walter Elliot
Sec. to Govt.

Ordered

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.

(1-2)

To The Principal Collector of Salem

To the Pl. Coll.r of Salem

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acquaint you that in Cons.s 11th Nov.r 1841 Government under date the 3rd November have been pleased to sanction the charge submitted with your letter of in Cons.s 11th Oct.r 1841 the 24th September Viz.t Rupees 77 8 incurred in the purchase and transport of Cotton to Madras.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
11th November 1841.

/Signed/ P. B. Smollett
Secretary

From the Coll.r of Ganjam.

(3)

Extra tent allowances for July 1250.

Proceedings thereon.

(3-4)

Read Statement of Extra tent allowances for July 1250.

ORIGINAL DESTROYED

Board sanction the Amount of Extra tent allowance drawn by Major S. Campbell and the other Assistants to the Collector of Ganjam

Major S. Campbell 1st Asst. Coll.r 365
Capt.n R. Hall 1st Do. N } 26
Mr. Sutherland 2nd Do. 376 9
Deduct Days passed at Chatterpore } 9
Sanctioned 64

Ganjam for the number of days noted in the margin with the exception of 9 days during which Mr. A. Sutherland Junior Assistant Resident at Chatterpore the Huzzoor Station where he ought to have been provided with accommodation in the Huzzoor Cutcherry.

Order thereon,

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing proceedings be transmitted for the information of the Civil Auditor.

Read the following letters.

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

(5)

From the Coll.r of Vizagapatam

Sir,

ORIGINAL DESTROYED

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Porter's letter of the 11th Ultimo and to inform you that no charges of the description therein alluded to have been incurred in this

Zillah

Ordered

Zillah during Fuslies 1249/50.

Vizagapatam District ---
Bimlipatam Collectors
Circuit Cutcherry
4th November 1841.

/Signed/ W. M. Arbuthnot
Coll.r

Order thereon.

(5-6)

Ordered to be recorded.

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

(7)

From the Coll.r of Vizagapatam

Sir,

I have the honor to acknow=
=ledge the receipt of Mr. Porter's
letter dated the 30th September last
and to state in reply that the
System of a division of produce
between the Ryots and the Government
has been for several years discontinu=
=ed in this Zillah, but as the sist is
fixed with reference to the estimated
produce of the land, and the circumstances
of the ryot, he is not allowed to remove his pro=
=duce till the permission of the Circar has been
obtained. In the event of his doing so the
full
Head

full Sist and Succaveyl due by him is
at once relized without reference
to the extent of Crop, but the prac=
=tice of levying fines has never
been in practice in this District.

Vizagapatam District
Bimlipatam Coll.rs
Circuit Cutcherry
4th November 1841.

/Signed/ W. M. Arbuthnot
Coll.r

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

(8)

From the Coll.r of Guntoor

Sir,

I have the honor to ac=
=knowledge the receipt of your letter
dated 30th September last - a fine under
the designation of "Sherana" obtains in
this District and is fixed as follows -

2- Dubs for each Head of grain taken away -
1- Rupee for each Seer -
20 Rupees for a Moongum or Bundle
of ears -

In Fusly 1244 one -

Paupabattony

Paupabuttoony Reddy a ryot of Buttepole
Candy Seers Marcals.
concealed 1 — 6 — 8½ of grain before
a division of the produce took place;
he was required to forfeit his share
of the Produce as a fine. Similar cases
appear to have been very rare, a —
fine under the designation of "Bun=
=dary" is collected on Cattle trespass=
=ing in the fields. The Collection
of Bundary and Sheruna during the —
last 5 years in the whole of the —
Mulraunze Estate has been in=
Fasly. =considerable. The Amount Collected
1248-112-11
1249-82-15-1 in each Fasly is shewn in the Margin
1250-98-7-7 about ¾ths of this Amount is Bunda=
=ry and ¼ Sheranah.

Guntoor, - - - - - - -
Collrs Cutcherry
4th November 1841.

/ Signed / J. Goldingham
Collr

Order on the 2 foregoing letters.

(7-9)

Ordered to lie on the Table.

Read

Read the following letter

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

(10)

From the Collr of Rajahmundry
Dd 8th Sept 1841
Rd 19th Augt 1841.
To Bd 13th Sept 1841
From Dd 11th Oct 1841

Sir

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin I have the honor to request, that I may be informed whether it is the wish of the Board, that the Salt, which may be available for Export to Calcutta about the end of January, the period at which the Native Craft are able to proceed thither should be sold by Public Auction as formerly was the rule in this District.

Zillah Rajahmundry,
Collrs Circuit Cutcherry
Samulcottah - - - - -
26th October 1841.

/ Signed / G. K. Smith
Collr

Resolution thereon.

(10-11)

The Board authorize the Collector of Rajahmundry to dispose of the Salt required to be exported to Calcutta in

15677 Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

in part of the Indent for the year 1842, in the manner suggested in the foregoing letter.-

After the completion of the sales the result will be reported for the information of the Board.-

(12)

From the Coll.r of Rajahmundry.- Read Statement of Extra Tent allowance for Fusly 1250.-

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.-

To The Collector of Rajahmundry

(12-13)

To the Coll.r of Rajahmundry

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of the Statement of Extra tent allowance for Fusly 1250 submitted by you under date the 11th. September last and to convey sanction for the Amount drawn by yourself and Subordinate Officers respectively for the number of days noted in the margin.-

Mr. G. A. Smith Coll.r 194
Mr. W.m Knox Collr 153
Mr. T. J. Knox Asst. 12

Sanctioned 11th. Nov.r 1841

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
11th. November 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett
Secretary

Order thereon, Ordered that a copy of the foregoing letter be transmitted to the Civil Auditor.

Read

L.B.

15678 Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

Read the following letter

To

The Secretary to the Board of Revenue Fort St. George

(14)

From the Coll.r of Guntoor

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to submit the Deposition of Nopulty Sashegerrow, the Head Sheristadar, containing his explanation of the charges against him, together with the Depositions and Accounts as per List accompanying, referred to in the Deposition of the Head Sheristadar and my remarks thereon. As my remarks are full, little remains to be said in this place.-

To the Bd. 25th. Nov.r 1840
From Dr. 15th. December 1840.

Submitting the deposition of N. Sashegerrow Read Sheristadar with his remarks thereon together with the depositions &c. alluded to respecting the Charges against him.-

The following facts it will be observed have been Established.-

First. The Head Sheristadar was a party either from design or ignorance to the fraudulent attempt made in Fusly 1248 & 1249 to postpone the Collection of a large portion of the current Revenue of those years in the Paulnaud.-

Second

Seconds- That he is incapable of discharging the duties of Head Sheristadar. Besides the deposition of the Head Moonshee relative to the Head Sheristadar, requesting the Naib to carry on the current business himself, it is known that the Head Sheristadar, conscious of his inability, threw down his Sunnud of appointment before the Naib, with a request that he would discharge the duties of the Sherista Department, that otherwise he could not retain his place. I omitted to take the evidence on this point at the time partly from being wearied with the subject and the evidence was purposely not taken afterwards, because the Deposition in regard to that point was closed. The Current business, according to the Deponents own shewing, passed out of his hands very soon after his appointment as Head Sheristadar. In my letter dated 25th. Novr. 1840, I stated that the arrears which had accumulated with the Head Sheristadar since Naputty Sashegerrow's appointment

to

to that office in October 1838 to February 1840, amounted to 212 cases, that on the appointment of the present Naib in February 1840, 104 cases were given to Sashegerrow and that up to November 1840, he had disposed of 5 cases only leaving 99 cases untouched. Of these 99 cases 85 cases still remain in his hands. again, the proposition in regard to the Substitution of the Indian Maured for the Madras Garce was referred to him after keeping it 3 months, a Hookeem to the Ameens under his Signature was brought to me, while the information required was in the Office. It is waste of time to bring forward other instances.

Third- That he purposely withheld all allusion to arzee No. 89 in the Case of the Sayer Gromastah Polwoy Kistnarow wishing that the recommendation already made in his favor might stand.

Fourthly- That he has intrigued with his relations

relations and others against the Nair Intrigue —
following Intrigue being greatly to the detriment of
public business and the fact of offerings being made
to secure the agency of Evil spirits being disgraceful
and reflecting on the character of the office.-

Fifthly- That he has intrigued with —
Coturno Royal Naid, who forwarded a Petition
to the Government which has been rejected by the Board

Sixthly- That he has adopted a highly im-
-proper course of conduct in forwarding in a clan-
-destine manner through the Post Offices in the Nellore
District, to the Board, Petitions relative to the state
of the management in this District, and a highly
improper tone in declining to make known —
their contents to the Collector and declaining an
investigation on the subject- The impropriety of
such conduct greatly aggravated by the circumstance
that these Petitions proceeded from a vindictive spirit
without regard to truth.-

Seventhly- That the same inability and inatten-
-tion as are manifest in the general business have been

shewn

shewn in the case of the Record Dept. with this further
aggravation that he was aware of the state of that
Department and never reported it even after being
specially nominated to investigate the subject.-

3. In addition to the foregoing the —
Head Sheristadar was desired to proceed in —
December 1840 to the Summabundy of Inna-
-condah, which is under Mr. Forbes- He de-
-layed to proceed thither for upwards of a Month,
and his proceedings after his arrival there, were
so incorrect that they had to be revised-
He has not been questioned by me on this point
because the Memorandum of Talukdars at the Summah-
-bundy with the revisions is under his signature and
every case was argued before Mr. Forbes-

4 In conclusion, I regret much the
great annoyance, waste of time and impediment
to business which this case has involved- If the
Statement contained in my letter under date
the 25th. November 1840 was worthy of belief the case
might well have been left in the position in —
which I placed it threw a covering over it as —
regards the Head Sheristadar so far as the public

interests

ins[t] rests called upon me to act; this covering has been removed by the Board by their order to take the explanation of Naputtly Sashegerrow and a mass of unclean matter exposed as regards Stshegerrow, no doubt can now be entertained in regard to his inability to discharge the duties of the Sheristadar Department. He has injured himself much by listening to bad advice.-

Guntoor
Coll[r] Cutcherry
19th October 1841

/ Signed / J. Goldingham
Coll[r]

A

Declaration given by Naputtly Sashagerrow Row Head Seristadar of the Collectors Cutcherry of the Zillah of Guntoor on Friday the 13th August 1841 or 11th Decreasing Moon of Shavasanm year Plavee.-

2 How did you make the Summabundy of the Paulnaud District in Fusly 1248 / 1849

A. I make the settlement by fixing sist on the lands on which the seed was sown, and remitting the sist on the Lands on which seed was not sown, according to the accounts shewing the land relinquished and taken up. On reference being made

made to the account, the amount will be known.

2. 2. To what amount did you postpone the Sists in those two Fusslies.-

Remarks of the Collector

Questions 2- A. I did not post

Two courses were open to me any- In Fusly in the Defence either to 1248 I went first for state what really occurred the Summaubundy or to deny the same- The while I was there, the latter has been adopted and Aumeens considering it is now to be seen what that, if the sist were inconsistencies the Head fully collected, the Cutsherry Sheristadar has fallen = tivation would not into from taking the line be carried on in fu= of defence, knowing as he = ture, as the produce does, that every thing occur= of certain Ryots fell red in my presence, it far short in some = is a matter of surprise = Villages, did not fully that he should = collect the Sists of the have adopted this = Ryots whose produce course. He was aware of had fallen short, and my sentiments and = who were poor, but told proceedings on finding me that, they had been that the Head of the but= collecting Sists with = cherry had brough = reference to the = ignorance or fraud state and produce of allowed the 2 Aumeens the Ryots and that to secure a large postpone they had prepared = ment of the Land Revenue accounts to show the

Having resources

having boldly passed the resources &c. of the Pyot
the line of truth at the of such Villages, and ac=
commencement, it is not =cordingly produced
to be wondered at that before them certain
truth should be set accounts [inspected the accounts
aside afterwards to relative to the Pyots whose lists
support the position are not fully collected, &c.
taken up at first should be shewn by
In the answer to you to the Gentleman
Question 2 he admits after he comes for dis=
that the Aumeens =tributing bowles, but
had prepared a pro= I cannot give any order
=posed Postponement and in regard to postponing
that he told the Aumeens any portion of the list"
"that the accounts rela= afterwards, your honor
=tive to the Ryots whose wrote an English Note
lists are not fully Col= to me, in which it is
=lected should be shewn stated that you under=
by you to the Gentleman =stood that "the Aumeen
after he comes for distrs of the Timmercottah
=buting bowles" "Here is Tanah had adopted the
=concurrence on the part System of "Chellanenna=
of the Head Serishtadar =yem" which had been
in the proposal of detrimental to the
the Aumeens and fur= Eastern Taulooks"
=ther on in the &c that he ought not

Same to

same answer he states to have done so, and
that he has reported adding some other
to me by letter in Eng= similar things. In my
=lish that their conduct Answer, in English,
was not open to objection I stated that on my
and yet in the conclud= enquiry of the Aumeens
=ing part of this answer &c. it is not proved
he says that he prepar= that either of the two
=ed Tookoons in which Aumeens of the Talnaud
the Aumeens were told District had adopted
that the accounts the system of "Chella=
were "not to be depended =hernayem" which has
upon" and that "certain been detrimental to
objections" were made the Eastern Taulooks,
to their management but that, in Fusly
Thus it will be seen 1248, the produce of
that the Deponent has certain Ryots of cer=
himself exposed the =tain Villages having
falsehood of his Defence fallen far short, the
Aumeens said that they
would postpone so much as
might be deemed proper of the lists
of each of the above Ryots and
Collect the same in the ensuing Fusly
"in order to save them from being ruined."

they

they appeared to me and said to have been acting accordingly, and that postponing so much as may be deemed proper and collecting the same in future Fusslies in order to save the Ryots, who would otherwise be ruined through poverty appeared to me to be desirable 3 or 4 days afterwards you arrived at Dauteckpully and there ordered the Auneens to deliver in the Accounts, and they accordingly delivered them in upon which, as I recollect Hookoms were caused to be written, in which it was stated "the Accounts delivered in by you are not to be depended upon," the responsibility of collecting the revenue, which is recoverable without leaving a single Dub, and without ruining the Ryots, rests on you, and making certain objections to their management. Thus prepared Hookoms to the two Auneens, and having signed myself, forwarded them to the Deputy Serishtadar from Innacondah for your signature. It is not mentioned in them that so much revenue was postponed.

In

Q. 3. In stating that it appeared to you that the Auneens had postponed so much of the Sist of the poor Ryots as appeared proper, did you Examine or not the state of those particular Ryots, on account of whom the Auneens had postponed the Collections also whether the Auneens had fixed the Amount with reference to this condition or in Cossjs- Remark of the Collector
Questions 3-4-5-6-7 A From circumstances which came to my notice during the Summahbundy made by me, it appeared to me that the Auneens had been postponing a reasonable portion of the Sist on account of those Ryots, who have been received of the Sist at last stated in were fully collected but it did not seem to me that they had joined with the Ryots, and recommended a postponement on

Villages which were brought to me by them from which it appeared right" supposing it to be true that the Anchanna Zaubitahs were brought and examined, and the proposed postponement found to be right, as is here alleged, the Head Sheristadar shewed much ignorance of his duty in admitting these accounts as conclusive. The Talnaud is Ryotwary and regular accounts of produce are not kept, the Sheristadar that it Anchana Zaubitahs was necessary to do referred to, are those prepared by the Curnum and Samootadars, in a question of general postponement it is obvious that these Accounts transmitted by me without being checked, from which are not to be depended upon.

on account of those and also who could pay 3 days after I addressed a letter to your honor as you arrived at Dantchapully I represented to you to depute some persons to inspect certain lands in those Villages, where the Ameens said that produce was short to a great Extent, but your honor intimated to me thro' the Deputy Sheristadar that it was necessary to do so, and that orders should be prepared to this effect, but as the Draft of the Hurkaras was postponed it is obvious that these accounts were prepared and transmitted by me without being checked from which no dependance was prepared upon.

and

upon. It is probable that the deponent would not have thought of Anchana Zaubitahs corrected to a certain had it not been stated in the Question caused to be written This will appear more fully when question 10 and its answer are considered.

But the answer to question 6 further unfolds the difficulties into which the Head Sheristadar has fallen from adopting the course before me of denying what actually occurred. In this answer he says "the Ameens did not produce to me the accounts of all the Villages not did they apply that information a specific amount the Summabundy should be suspended. It is singularly that not and committing irregularities

and sent to me by the Deputy Serishtadar which I have thought of extent, and having caused to be written sent them with my signature and its answer are D. 4. You have not given a reply to the question. Did you Examine into which the Head that account before it was delivered in to me? which set forth that so much revenue should be postponed? From the circumstances regarding which I collected during the Summabundy, I perceived that the Ameen had been acting regularly, that they were

that the Head Serishtadar irregularities; but I did
should prefer the accounts not deputed persons to
of proposed postpone- make a due investigation
-ment to me as set forth for ascertaining to what
in answer to Question extent the produce had
2 without previous- failed in regard to each
examination. It is of the Ryots with reference
also singular that it to the accounts prepared
should be here stated by them. Consequently, soon
that a "specific sum" after your honor arrived,
was not applied for I asked "whether or not you
by the Aumeens, while thought it was neces-sary
it is urged that ac- to make such an investi-
-counts were produced; -gation" and you having
-ed and examined thought it
-necessary order-
and found "right" what-ed me to prepare Yookum
could be the nature of in the above Manner-
accounts which con- 2 5. You did not
-tained nothing spec- depute persons into
-cific. the Villages, this is of no
It is admitted consequence. Did
in the concluding part you ascertain the
of the Answer to Para 6 correctness or incor-
that the accounts deliver-rectness of the Chella
-ed in were not depended Kernayem" made by them
on and yet the Head Serish with reference to the
-tadar has stated above that Anchana Zaubitah, pro-
-duced them "right."

Accounts-

accounts?-

A. The Ameens brought and shewed An-
-chana Zaubitah to explain the extent of the
resources as exhibited in the Accounts of the
Villages, which were brought to me by them
from which it appeared right.-

Q 6. Did you investigate in this
way for all the Villages in which postponement
was required?-

A. The Aumeens did not produce
to me the accounts of all the Villages, nor did
they apply that a specific amount should
be suspended. The Aumeens said that "since
the failure of produce it was necessary to sus-
-pend the Collections in certain Villages" and that
they had prepared an account, they brought and
shewed the account of certain Villages, when they
shewed this Account they
also shewed the Anchana Zaubitah as refer-
-ence for that account, in which a great differ-
-ence was found from which it did not ap-
-pear that their was fraud on their part- but before
your arrival their, they (the Aumeens) did not shew
the account of all the Villages and ask me to obtain
sanction for the Amount required to be suspended-

after

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

after your honor's arrival, all the accounts were delivered in, which you did not depend upon, but ordered a Bookroom in the above manner to be prepared.-

Q.7.- When the Runneers produced to you the accounts of one Village, did you ascertain that they had made postponement with respect to that Village only, or did you understand that they had made a similar postponement relative to the other Villages also? if so why did you not send for the accounts of those Villages, and investigate the case of postponement with respect to the whole Taunah?

A.- At the period at which they were collecting the revenue was the time I was making Summaubundy, they brought and shewed me the accounts which were prepared of each Village with the Villager of which they had spoken, but they did not produce to me the accounts of all the Villages at once. They brought and shewed the accounts of 4 or 5 Villages at a time. I recollect that the accounts of some

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

some of the Villages, on account of which postponement was made, were not prepared by the time your honor arrived there. I asked for them afterwards, they produced them also. I did not compare them with the Anahana Jamabundy. As I was ordered to prepare a Bookroom in the above manner, there was no necessity to see them.-

Q.8 You have stated that you represented to me that people should be deputed to inspect the produce of certain Villages in that Taulq. I do not recollect that you spoke to me in that manner further, you have stated that you were of opinion that there was no fraud in the postponement made by the Runneers. If you had no suspicion, what was the reason of your having told me that people should be deputed for inspection.-

A.- From the circumstances regarding which I collected information during the Summaubundy from my having compared the Accounts of the Villages which I inspected with the

Remarks of the Collector.-
Questions 8-9-10.-
These perhaps do not call for particular remark further than to state that no Assawvny war accounts has been prepared when I arrived in the Paharud for the Summaubundy this

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

thus the Statement of the Head Sheristadar that he examined the Ausamywar Accounts is without foundation.—

The undue weight has attached to the "Anchava Yambitats" is here prominent. also it did not occur to the Head Sheristadar to state all the resources of a Ryot till suggested to him by Question 10.—

the Anchava Yambitat promising having inspected in person certain Villages situated in the vicinity of Coorooyambuken the Jemaubundy was going on, and as I was acquainted with the state of the management of the then two Annuens I was of opinion that there was no standing the postponement made by them Notwithstanding which, as I did not send people to every Village for inspection, I considered that perhaps you would think it unnecessary that people should be deputed, and with this impression I represented so.—

29.— In your examining the Accounts of the Annuens with reference to the Anchava Yambitats did you examine only the aggregate of the Villages, or did you ascertain the assessment resources of individually?

As

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

A.— As the produce of certain Ryots fell short, if any Ryot had no resources from the too great failure of produce, so much only would be suspended as was deemed proper, with reference to the produce and resources of that Ryot individually, but it would not be convenient to make any postponement on the aggregate of the Village. Besides although the produce fell short yet where there were resources the Annuens did not make the postponement merely with reference to the produce. Although the produce fell short yet in cases where there were resources, collection was made more than the produce would admit while the amount postponed was thus small; that is in cases where a Ryot, who had means, had to pay a sist of 40 Rupees it was fully collected tho his produce was found to be 20 Rupees. again if a Ryot had produce to the extent of 20 Rupees with reference to his condition 30 Rs were collected and 10 Rupees postponed, and in some cases only 5 Rupees were suspended, it was postponed according to the state of each Ryot, but not merely with reference to his produce. In perusing such accounts, I examined in order to ascertain what was inserted in the Anchavanna Yambitat with regard to the resources of such an individual, whose item, was seen by me, but there

Fort St. George 15th November 1841.

there was no occasion to see the total of the Villages, nor was there any use in seeing so in perusing those accounts. I took into consideration the Anchana Saubitahs, as well as the circumstances which I was acquainted with through the Auneens &c. relative to the state of each of the Ryats, but it was not a business of seeing the total of the Village.

2 10 From the above answer it appears that when the item of each of the Ryats was investigated, it was examined with reference to the Anchana Saubitah of such Ryat, & each of the Ryats there were resources derived from the wet lands &c. which were not inserted in that Saubitah also from lands cultivated in other Villages as Pykaries and from Enam Lands cultivated by them. This being the case, how could the whole state of that Ryat be known on referring to his resources as shewn in the Anchana Saubitah.

A Examination was made of the Anchana Saubitahs to ascertain the truth to what

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

what extent the resources of each Ryat were inserted in that Account. The Auneens gave remarks in those Accounts on the resources derivable from kisave & cultivation, as well as on the other resources alluded to in your Question, besides the resources derived from Dry cultivation. I put such questions as I thought necessary and observed accordingly with respect to those Ryats from whom revenues to be collected according to the Accounts although their Dry produce & wet produce &c. fell short of that amount, I considered their state & thus obtained the necessary information of all the circumstances, but I did not examine merely with reference to the Anchana Saubitahs. In regard to those Ryats, who were not mentioned as possessing resources according to the Accounts prepared by them (Auneens) I put the necessary questions and ascertained the truth.

2 11. From the above reply it appears that you put questions on the remarks given by the Auneens relative to the other resources, of which

which no mention was made in those Anchana Jambitahs, and also regarding those cases for which remarks were not given - why did you put questions merely without looking over the accounts particular Vizt. Anchana Jambitahs &c. of the other resources mentioned in the remarks?

A. — When I put questions to ascertain the truth, I saw the requisite papers also during this inquiring I did not satisfy myself without seeing such Documents.

Q. 12. — How was the Examination made relative to those Crops the Anchana Jambitahs of which had not been received at the habitations?

A. The Aumeens & Sarvantdars having been present, told me that they

Remarks of the Collector —

Question 11.

The answer is made to take up the matter in the Question as he could not state any thing regarding the Anchana Jabitahs until suggested by Questions 6 and 10 it will be apparent by the accompaniments that the detailed accounts were not made out at all before my arrival at Dantchapully.

Question 12. —

It will appear in question 13 that the Head Sirstadar

Remarks of the Collector

dar should be so easily satisfied in a Question of such importance particularly as he had been in the Paluand one Month and upwards ample time had been afforded to ascertain the accuracy of the proposed Patte assessment if there had been either will or liability to know the same —

Question 13 — 14 — 15 — 16

In the answer to Question 13 it is stated that "fresh accounts were not prepared after my arrival in the Paluand — This is easily disposed of as it occurred before me the Accounts are rather abstract memorandums of proposed

they saw by this I understood —

Q. 13. Was the amounts proposed to be posted in each Village which was exhibited in the Accounts shewn to you by the Aumeens before my arrival at Dantchapully in Fasly. 1248. the same as that inserted in the Accounts shewn to me after my arrival or was any portion thereof decreased —

A. The same Accounts as were shewn to me were delivered in after your arrival — they did not prepare fresh Accounts after your arrival, besides, those first prepared, afterwards I heard that certain Hookums

15701 Fort St. George 18th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

proposed postponement were rejected by me, on which fresh accounts were prepared - see also the arzees of the 2 present Nuneens and the 2 Fryfeys of the late Nuneen of Tinnevelly and the present Nuneen of Dalchapully - also the Depositions solemnly affirmed of the late Peishcar of Tinnevelly and of the Muddutgar of Dantchapully -

2d Fresh matter is here introduced by the Head Seristadar viz. that the Naib Seristadar is his enemy that he Head Seristadar has complaint to prefer against him but will not

Hookroomes were issued to the Nuneens without my knowledge relative to the postponement of Tuesday 12th, and that one of the two Nuneens, it is not known which, had addressed arzees stating that I had first suspended a certain portion of the [illegible] that after your arrival, a portion was reduced in the same, and adding other similar falsehoods but I am not acquainted with the real facts of the same I did not see the Hookroom or arzees in question - If any Nuneen has subsequently addressed Arzees to you

for

15702 Fort St. George 18th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

not do so as he will fail addducing the necessary proof and that the persons who are to give evidence will not state the truth, fearing the Naib - The consideration of what is here adduced will be disposed of afterwards - The statement of the Head Sirstadar that he has complaints to make but that he will not bring them forward must appear very singular. 2d Further this admission gives a presumption that he has already made complaints in the course of his intrigues whether through the means

of

honor declaring forth that I had determined to postpone a certain portion of the amount and that after you came there, a portion of the same was decreased - such Arzees or accounts must be considered as having been sent for by the intrigues of certain persons who are at enmity with me in the Kuzzyvor but they cannot be considered to be genuine -

2d By whom did you understand the circumstance of Arzees having come thus -

A Sheard in the Cutcherry that certain Hookrooms were issued and

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

Remarks of the Collector.-

of others or anonymously or in his own name; but this will be noticed fully in its proper place.-

and certain Arzees have come on the subject. I do not recollect that such a person talked me-

2.15.- You have stated that, by the intrigues of certain persons who are at enmity with you, those Arzees were sent for- who are they?- what is the reason of their having enmity.-

A.- You know who the persons are who are at variance with me; your mind has already been acquainted with the reasons of their having enmity- In the event of my stating fully on that point, it will be the cause of your growing more angry with me- I must represent it at that time when it will be proper, but at present I do not say much on the subject- because, the same persons, who have enmity have created much anger in you towards me- In this ward you have great reliance at present by my representing unfavorable things against

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

against them I shall expose myself to increase displeasure; and your favor will not restrain me, moreover, I cannot at present adduce sufficient proof in substantiation of that which I have to represent, because you have great favor towards those persons who are at variance with me consequently every one will fear to depose the truth which is unfavorable to them- I therefore cannot state any thing relative to those circumstances.-

2.16 Why did you answer disrespectfully in the above manner to the questions put by me?- why should you fear?- why will not the truth be proved?- Explain yourself fully in detail.-

A.- I did not give answer disrespectfully- As you already know that Subbiraya Venkatakrishnaiah Row the Deputy Sirishtadar is my enemy, I said that you know I have no cause to fear, as to the proofs of the statement which I have to set forth, the persons, who are to give evidence will not state the truth fearing the said Venkatakrishnaiah Row Pantulu-

I have represented the real facts but am while I am your servant & what power have I to answer disrespectfully.-

2 17.- In July 1838. how long did you remain engaged in the Tannaubundy business of the Palmaud District?-

A I recollect that I remained for about one month.-

2 18 On your departure for the Tannaubundy I stated in my note to you dated 21st January 1839, that the Auneen of the Tinnevercattah Tannah had been acting in a strange manner, and that the Balance of Dansaf pah were not to be approved of- In the note under dated the 4th March, which was sent to you when you were in the Palmaud, I stated that I understood that the Auneen of the Tinnevercattah Tanah had been making a "Chella nemayem" & that you were to prevent him from doing so" and that he "would be removed"- There is an interval of one Month and 9 days between those two notes- In the meantime when the Auneen shewed to you the accounts unfit to be prepared

prepared by them for postponing the revenue how could you interfere therein without my permission. How could you determine that it should be done in that manner after examining those Accounts contrary to my note why did you not report to me on that subject before that time?-

Remarks of the Collector.-
Questions 18-19-20-21.-

Questions 20 & 21 With their answers will shew that the Head Sirstadarr was distinctly warned of the objects of the 2 Auneens to secure a large postponement & yet he states that he found nothing irregular in their conduct thus shewing that he either did not know what was going on or was a party to the proposed postponement- The former is impossible whatever his inaptitude to the

A. After you have shewed me the reply which I wrote to your second note I will give an answer to this.-

19- I do not know where the answer which you wrote is. It is not to be found- you are to reply to the question put by me.-

A At my departure for the Palmaud your Honor wrote a note in which it is stated that the Auneen of the Tinnevercattah Tannah had been acting in a strange

Remarks of the Collector
to duties of the First
Department may be—
The same sources of infor-
=mation were open to him
as to the Collector and
there is no doubt that
his impressions of the
good conduct of the
Nuneens sprung from
the good understanding
that existed between him
and them—

The Head Sristadar
in answer to Question
20 states methods
contrary to that all the
Dubash had been approv-
ed of by me To have
made this statement
before another person
who was unacquaint-
=ed with what had
passed would not
have been very
surprising, to make
it before me evinces
a determination to set
aside

strange manner
after I went there
and saw him, it
did not appear to
me that he had
been acting in a strange
manner—he appeared
to have been acting
regularly—In that
note, it is stated that
Dandapaties balance
that is the balance
of the Nuneen of the
Dantekapully Tannah
would not be approved
of by you In order to
know whether
his Balance
was worthy of
approval or not
it occasioned
me to see the
accounts prepar-
=ed by the Nuneen
for suspending
a portion of the
rent of certain
individuals

Remarks of the Collector
aside truth altogether—
This departure from
truth at any sacri-
=fice will be appa-
=rent throughout
the defence—

But the Head
Sristadar has stated
in other places that
the accounts of pro-
posed postponement
which the Nu-
=neens produced
and which he
(Head Sristadar)
found "right" &
were rejected by me
as not to be depend
=ed upon and that
he (Head Sristadar)
prepared a Hookoom
to that effect, he
seems to have gar-
=gotten this in the
present answer
but fills up the interval

individuals, and to
take information
relative to their
truth, but I did not
determine that
such an amount
should be post-
=poned as to the
determination, I
thought it proper
to represent the
whole of the exist-
ing circumstances
after your arrival at
Palmaud and act
according to your
orders, but all this
I was of opinion that
the postponement
made by them at
that time was
proper yet I did not
take independently
authority to sanction
the same and to
determine that the
whole

Fort St. George 14th November 1821

Remarks of the Collector

interval between my rejection of the Accounts and the preparation of the order to that effect with a complete approbation on my part of all that he had first and had done. If the first to found the Accounts "right" and the Collector approved of them why should the first not prepare an order under the directions of the Collector rejecting the Accounts as false and further objecting to the management of

whole amount to be postponed was so much. In the second note it is stated that you understood that the Annuen of Timmercottah had been making Chellanemmayen resettlement on resources that that must be prevented by me, & that by Chellanemmayen & the eastern Talooks had been ruined. In my answer to this I stated that neither of these 2 Annuens had been making the settlement on resources which had injured the Eastern Talooks that not only the Annuen of Timmercottah but the other 2 Annuens had been making postponement to such extent, as not to injure the Ryots to the Ryots who

Fort St. George 14th November 1821

of the Annuen-

As a portion

of the proposed postpone-

ment was struck off

and collected without

injury to the Ryot, as

will be manifest here-

after, the answer to

Question 21 does not

call for further remark.

who were destitute from the great failure of produce; that as the good state of a Ryot is as important as the collection of the Revenue of the Circar, without leaving a balance, and as the balance to be postponed would be suspended on the condition of it's being collected in the next year and not other

wise. I thought the postpone-

ment thus made was proper

and that, as you were about to

proceed shortly to the Palnaud, you

would there understand the whole

of the circumstances. you came soon

accordingly, & observed the whole of the cir-

cumstances. you approved of my opinion which

I expressed in my answer, you did not object to it As

you were about to come there shortly I represented the

whole of the circumstance after your arrival. I had

nothing to represent before hand. I did not give

sanction

sanction before hand for the amount to be suspended
you have mentioned in the question that I took part in this
The Aumeen having told me that they would make a
postponement with reference to their circumstances to
the poor Ryots whose produce had been spoiled, and
make collection accordingly I considered that it was
important to see the accounts prepared by them, and
observing the truth or otherwise to represent the whole
of the circumstances to you on your arrival, &
I saw those Accounts accordingly, but I did not see
them with any other intent. altho' I saw those
accounts, yet I told them that sanction would
be given for the postponement after you came, and
approved of the same, but not otherwise. If I had
not seen them and ascertained the truth, It
would not be convenient for me to represent after your
arrival, to say to them that postponement should
not be made at all is not proper, consequently I
told them that the business of the collection
should be carried on without hindrance according to the
accounts prepared by them and approved of by me, and that as

to

to the postponement it would be done as might be
ordered by you after you arrived and saw the whole
state of the case, but I did not sanction the amount
to be postponed independently. all the circumstances
passed by me, I represented to you on your arrival
The Aumeen likewise represented the same. If
there was any thing objectionable in the circumstances
passed by me, you would have given me instruc-
-ons thereon as the case called for, at the very
same time. Nothing was objected. you approved of
the whole of the circumstances passed by me at that
time.

Q. 10. In the note written by me to
you on the 21st January is it stated that it
was intended by me to postpone a certain sum
of money, or that you should before hand
enquire about it?

A. The word "the balances of the Aumeens
of the Dalchapully Tanneah will not be approved
of by me" is contained in your note - at my
departure for Palnaud, I asked for your opinion
on the subject. From the circumstances which were

told

told to me by your honor, I meant that in Cases where the Ryot would be ruined, postponement should be made without suspending the balances which were not worthy of this indulgence. but I did not conceive that a postponement should not be made at all. The postponement so made in that year was important, and not otherwise. At the conclusion of that note, it is stated that you will see every thing and get "all passed regularly" In your telling me verbally, your honor ordered that I should take care that the Aumeens might not combine and make postponement I understood the truth of the circumstances of the aumeens not having combined and made an irregular postponement. that is, I understood from the circumstances of which I collected information at the time of my examining the accounts in question.

2 21. From your reply, it appears that you had observed my opinion relative to the postponement of Revenue. In my two Notes is it mentioned that I approved of the postponement? or that the system of "Chilla nernayem" or settlement on resources was unnecessary

From

A From the Note which was written by you and from the conversation held at the time of my taking leave of you after I received that note, I was of opinion that the system of "chella nernayem" should not be introduced and that in the event of Ryots being received, the necessary postponement should be made altho' it is not mentioned in your notes that you had ordered the postponement, yet from the coversation held at the time of my taking leave of you, I observed your opinion to be that postponement to such an extent as to save a Ryot, who would otherwise be ruined if the sist were fully realized, was important. making a postponement in that manner is usual. If the Ryot were ruined from not making postponement in that manner, it would be detrimental to the management. Consequently, it is always going on in the above manner.

2 22. Did you consider that the amount required by the aumeens to be postponed was large or not?

Remarks of the Collector.

The Answer to this Question sets forth that I did not consider the amount of proposed postponement

A. As the Lands of the Ryots which were reported to have not produced were not inspected, your

large

honor

large, and yet that "strict order" as already stated were issued to the au-meens. If the amount was not considered a "large" why "strict orders"? why reject the accounts as "not to be depended on" why make "objections" to the manage-ment of the Amneens.

honor gave your opinion in regard to the postpone-ment as proposed by the accounts of the Amneens that if the responsibility of collecting the revenue that might be realized without injury to the Ryot rested with the Amneens they would have a great fear and take care that the a-mount required to be postponed should not be large-and as I also thought this in this same manner, a Kooroom was issued accordingly. As to the question put to me whether I thought the amount was large- I did not think the amount which was then exhibited by these in the accounts was too large. from the then circumstances you also did not think so nevertheless strict

strict orders were issued to the Amneens as above to remove such doubt.

Question 23. It will ap-pear very extraordinary that the Sheristadar should not have consi-dered the amount of proposed postponement large, and that so ma-ny Ryots being sud-denly without means under ordinary circum-stances was not a cir-cumstance to excite astonish-ment.

2. 23 Did you not think the circumstances of their being so many Ryots who had no means in that year astonishing.

A. I did not think it astonishing the ac-counts prepared by them with reference to their [Ryots] stated at that time, appeared to me to have been prepared in considerations of their conditions but they did appear to have been prepared irregular-ly.

[Signed] N. Sashagherry Pur
Head Shanstaar

Before me this 13th August 1841.

[Signed] J. Goldingham
Collector

Further

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Further Enquiry held on the 14th Aug

2. 24 On my looking at the accounts which were said to have been first inspected examined and agreed to by you for the suspension of the sist for Fusly 1248, as it was found that a large sum of Money was unnecessarily entered in the same to be postponed I did not approve of them and so caused fresh accounts to be prepared leaving at the same time a portion of the said amount as recoverable Thus circumstance is in my perfect recollection, but in one of your answers aforementioned you say that you advised the Auneens to carry on the Collections without hindrance, according to the accounts, of which the truth had been ascertained by you; you appear, therefore to have given advice not to collect at that time the amount proposed to be postponed in those accounts thus the Auneens and Ryots were led to expect that the amount in question would be postponed, because you, the Head Sheristadar, had said thus much. The produce was taken possession of in the first instance. Had I caused the

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

accounts which were Examined by you during a Month and a half to be re-examined it would have taken much time. Further the time of ploughing for the next year was approaching at that time. although I might fix a certain portion of the said amount to be recoverable, yet, are you aware or not with what difficulty it must be recovered, If you are aware, how was it that you advised the Auneens previously to continue to make collections according to those accounts.

2. 24. The Head Sheristadar was in the Palnaud some weeks before I reached it during this period, as appears from his own shewing he told the Auneens not to make the Collections of the sist which had reference to the proposed postponement, thus

A. They prepared accounts shewing the sum of money to be postponed on account of a Ryot who had neither ability nor produce to pay the full sist and having shewn them to me I told them to postpone the amount the Collection of which they proposed to be suspended / until

yours

Fort St. George 11th November 1814

thus the season
Viz. January and
February when a
large collections
are made was
lost and the grain
was carried away
and dispased
of before the circar
dues were discharged

The facts
of the case having
been laid before
the Board further
remarks on this c
answer appear
unnecessary.

your Honors arriva
which was expecte
in 10 or 5 days, an
then to act accordi
to your instructions.
This advise, I think
is not improper
while your honor wa
expected in 10 or 5 da
had I desired them
to collect the amoun
also which would
tend to bring the Ryo
into a distressed condit
before that time
would of course be the
occasion of ruin to the
Ryot, consequently, I
thought the same t
be inadvisable. Even
the above advice for
postponing, until you
arrival the collecti
of the amount a
which would
bring the Ryots
an Embarrassed
state was given
by me being aware
that

S.G.B.

Fort St. George 12th November 1814

that it would be consistent with your opinion expressed
in the conversation that took place between us at the
time of my going to the Palnaud, but not otherwise.
After your honors arrival there, if the amount
proposed to be postponed was excessive, and if the
same was considered by your Honor as excessive,
and if it was your opinion that the balance should
also be collected by force from the Ryots, the Aameen
could have collected the same as it was the middle
of March, but it would have occasioned the
Ryots to be ruined. With the same view, your
honor also were not pleased to say that the
postponement was not required. But as your
honor considered it proper to issue orders to the
Aumeen holding them responsible for realizing
the recoverable amount without any Balance,
and for preserving at the same time the Ryots
from being ruined, and as your honor thought
it preferable to my proposal that people
should be deputed into the Villages for inspecting
the lands, wherein the Crops had failed,
and as the issuing orders in the above
Manner was deemed proper by
myself, and by the Deputy Sirestadar,
orders were issued according ly.
Even after your Honors arrival, had it been
your

your opinion that such balance should also be realized, the advice given for postponing it until your arrival, could not have at all prevented it's realization subsequently, even the time had not elapsed. With respect to the circumstance of the produce having been taken possession of by that time, as the Auneens have in their accounts proposed the postponement for such Ryots only, whose produce is scanty, and as they had after making collection with reference to the produce, postponed in proportion to the condition of the Ryot only in cases where there was no produce, & not in cases where there was produce, whatever might be the poor condition of the Ryot, there is no ground for the objection that the produce was taken possession of, and postponement made, until your honor's arrival, of the amount the collection of which would ruin the Ryot. In the question it is mentioned that the amount recommended to be postponed in the accounts which were given in by the Auneens after your honor's arrival was Excessive, that since your honor's arrival a certain portion of the said amount decreased

decreased, and thus fresh accounts were caused to be prepared. but, this is not the case at all. Had it been done so, it would have been mentioned in the order issued to the Auneens that they had recommended such an amount which having been found excessive, had been decreased, and that permission was given for the remainder. Far from this, it is stated in the orders issued that no dependence was placed on the accounts filed by them, and that the obligation of collecting the recoverable amount without leaving even a single Dub, and of preserving the Ryot from running into distress & ea. con rested with them. Therefore, no separate account was prepared, lessening the amount (Without ability). It is desired (by deponent.) that the ward (without ability) mentioned in this parenthesis should be struck out.

225. You proceeded for the settlement of the Jemaubundy of that District for Fusly 1249 also. Did you hear that any Ryot had become poor and in consequence distressed from the collections made on account of Fusly 1248.

Questions 25. 26. 27. 28.

The Board will A. It is asked if I

perceive had

Remarks of the Collector

perceive how the Deponent has had heard whether any
evaded the Question put to him Ryot had turned poor
and introduces, as he has done, and distressed in consequence
throughout other matter. as a of collections having been
considerable sum had been made out of the amou
collected out of the amount proposed to be postponed
proposed to be postponed on account of Fasly 1248
by the Deponent and up to what period
the Dumeen's the Deponent have these collections
is asked whether during referenced-
the Jemaubundy of the 2.26. My co
following year he heard meaning is the col
of any distress having =lections that were
been occasioned by such made within or
collections after much after the Expiration
evasion he says/A 28/"at of Fusly 1248, on ac
"that time nothing occurred =count of the same Fasly
"of the circumstances mentioned. A. If your honor
"tioned in the Question" and shew me the accounts
A: 28/"Nothing occurred on that which exhibit what
head" unwilling to admit portion was collected
the truth, his reply is general within Fusly 1248 &
and ambiguous as however out of the amou
"nothing occurred on that recommended to be
Head" it may be inferred postponed according
from Deponents' own

shewing to

Shewing that the collections to the accounts
in question did not filed by the Dumeens
occasion distress. for Fusly 1248, I.
will peruse them and
represent on that head.

Q. 27. In Fusly 1249, when
you were there for the Jemaubundy
did you understand from the reports
that reached your ear that any one had
turned to poverty-

A. I do not Know that collections
were made within that Fusly out of the
amount recommended to be postponed nor,
am I aware of any Ryot having fallen
into a poor condition, moreover the circumstance of
my having proceeded for the Jemaubundy of Fusly
1249 is thus, on the receipt of the order from
your honor at Madras, I left Guntoor for Co
Goorozal, and having taken the necessary
measures in ordering the Curnums to prepare
Accounts and in employing the required
number of Goomastahs for preparing co
the Jamaubundy accounts, I remain
=ed 4 or 5 days there and returned to
Guntoor

Guntoor for performing a certain Ceremony in my House. Before my returning thither, your honor also arrived in the Palnaud from Madras. your honor knows all the circumstances which took place afterwards. During the Jemaubundy of that Fusly, I did not remain there alone with the exception of 4 or 5 days. at that time nothing occurred of the circumstance mentioned in the question.

2. 28. you say that I arrived in the Palnaud by the time of your returning from Guntoor, In what Village did I arrive where was the Jummaubundy going on, How many days since your return did I arrive at the place where the Jemaubundy was going on?

A. While your honor was at Pedugoral, I visited them on my return from Guntoor. After my remaining there half a day, you were pleased to say that you would come in two or three days and that the Cowles should be prepared soon. Consequently, I went on first and caused the

the Cowles to be prepared, your honor accordingly arrived in 3 or 4 days, afterwards, I cannot recollect exactly. The distribution of the Cowles was finished soon, and we quitted that place, during our stay, nothing occurred on that head.

2. 29. Was the whole of the amount recommended to be postponed in the accounts shewn to you by the Ameens in the first instance during the Jummaubundy of Fusly 1248, calculated to turn the Ryot to a poor condition and distress, if any portion of the above amount had been realized from any Ryot?

Remarks of the Collector.

Questions 29. 30. 31. 32.

/A. 29./ It is admitted as Ans. In a District in a former answer like the Palnaud on that the amount of which produces a postponement proposed Settlement of one lac by the Ameens and and thirty thousand, Deponent was not or one lac and Specific. It will be forty thousand, or remembered also, as about two lacs in good opposed to this, that Seasons, the making the collection

the Deponent has set- collection of some thing
-forth that the accounts small from a Ryot
of proposed postponement out of the amount
were answerable with postponed for the pre-
a statement of all the -servation of the Ryots,
resources of each Ryot- in consideration of their

In the answer condition and produce
to Question 31, Deponent respectively in a season
says "such amount en during which the
only as would be -Crops failed in
considered ruinous to certain Villages, and
the Ryot if collected," -ing certain Ryots to
would be entered in become too poor, is
the statement of pro- not a great thing,
-posed postponement, because, the amount
and yet in the answer postponed would
to Question 29 it is be five Rupees for
stated a small portion a Ryot paying
may be recoverable a sist of forty-
in some cases and Rupees, according
in others a little his condition. In the
more than entered order since of
will need to been issued, those
postponed. The discrepancy accounts were
here not

here will be apparent- not depended upon, but
But supposing the account on the contrary, it
to have been drawn was mentioned
up in this way, it that collections should
appears from Deponents be made as far as
own Statement in the practicable There-
concluding part of an- fore, out of the
-swer 31, that such an Sum of 5 Rupees
account is "uncommon" thus postponed any
Hence it is not surpris- portion say, one
-ing that the Deponent Rupee or more or
was neither willing nor less might have
able to state what on been collected. It
Sums would be recover- would therefore be
-able in such an account, difficult to say
Such kind of "col- with confidence that
-lection" being as to Such a collection
says "uncommon." would bring a Ryot
Notwithstand- into a poor condition
-ing the above admis- or otherwise. Under
-sion of "uncommon" this circumstance
it is stated in answer it is not practicable
to question 32 with reference to give any other
to these collections that answer, but the one
these things commonly occur. I have just dictated.

In 2

In the answers 2. 30. What is the amount to Questions 31 and 32, for the two Taunahs that it is admitted that may be recoverable the amount of post= in the above manner =ponement for fuly without prejudice 1240 required by him. to the Ryot, out of =self and the Aumeens, the amount they was of such a chac recommended to be =racter that if collect. postponed in the ce =d, the Ryot would first instance. be impoverished. Ins A. Such amount answer to Question only as was recom= 27. Deponent admits =mended to be postpon= that during the Jam= =ed for each Ryot =mabandy of Fusly 1249 in the accounts ce it did not come to his prepared by the au= knowledge that any =meens, would stand Ryot had been impos against them rest= =verished from the =pectively, the ce collections made during remainder Fusly 1248. It will be would appear seen on reference to as realized the With

the arzees of the two With reference to the Aumeens Marginal Example above given by B. and C. with their me, items of a small Enclosures that the amount collected would amount proposed for be included in the postponement was amount inserted to Rupees 35,133. 5. 4 - the be postponed: there amount outstanding would also be certain at the close of the Fusly items outstanding in being Rupees 24,133 - excess to those entered 15. 1. the difference or in the above ac= Rupees 21,019. 6. 3 - were =counts. But it is collected above the to be known by sum proposed by the the accounts what Deponent. as this portion was collected sum was collected within fusly 1248 on without distress to account of such the Ryot, it follows items, and what that the Deponent portion is outstanding followed a bad course in Excess, it would in regard to the be difficult to pre= postponement or =pare accounts without did not discover those items of decrease whether the postpo= ment Excess The total necessary amount of the two or Taunahs.

or not.

Sunahs as requried in your Question ought to be known also from the accounts

2.31. The accounts will exhibit what portion was collected, and what portion is outstanding. If I require it I can send for those accounts, state as co your Experience permits, what portion is recoverable without prejudice to the Ryot, for the two Sunahs in the amount recommended to be postponed in the accounts that were Examined by you, which set forth that the Ryot would be empoverished unless the collection of the same is really suspended.

A. The collection made on that account within the Fusly ought to be known from the accounts of collections. Both in the preparation of the accounts of postponement, as well as during the Examination of the same, such amount only as would be considered ruinous to the Ryot if collected will be entered, and such portion as can be realized without prejudice to the Ryot, or cannot be included in that which was intended to be postponed. While this is the case why should

should such portion as is recoverable without prejudice to the Ryot be entered in that as amount which was recommended to be postponed under the grounds that the Ryot would be impoverished if the same is collected. If any portion has been collected from any Ryot according to the Example I have given above, the same must be known from the accounts, but as such kind of collection is uncommon, it is difficult to say that, that amount would be so much-

2.32. In that case is it your opinion that the whole of the amount recommended by the Ameens to be postponed in their accounts, which were Examined and approved of by you was not recoverable. Did you on make up your mind that the Ryot would be impoverished should any portion of the same be realized.-

A. When I inspected the accounts (which I have examined) the amount recommended in them to be postponed, I considered important, as calculated, from the information I had obtained, to ruin the Ryot if collected within that Fusly. But with reference

to

to my above said Example, your honor must consider that the circumstance of collecting any small portion, out of the amount post=poned as well as the circumstance of a small amount being in excess of that post=poned, are not of great consequence, and that those things would commonly occur according to circumstances during the period of making collections in some years.

2. 33. You say, "from the information that you had collected." Did you collect the required information fully or was there any deficiency, you mention "the postponement entered in the accounts you Examined, are there any marks on them so that without difficulty they may be Known, or were they prepared like other Accounts?

Questions 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. A. I have already stated that I had collected all the necessary information with the exception of sending to shew what those accounts were which were examined by me. The accounts I Examined are on of the fields. The Deponent is unable to state any particulars or marks to distinguish people for the Examined accounts

examined by him. The accounts I Examined are has opened a fresh point those of certain Villages and states that he out of those presented entertains a suspi= by the Ameens during =cion of the genuineness your stay, with the of the accounts exhibits exception of those Villages =ing the proposed post which did not come =ponement which were for my Examination. =received from the before your Honor's arrival Ameens. His sus= I Examined the others. =picion seems to rest 2. 34. I repeat the on the circumstance above question by what as he alleges, that the Marks can you recognise accounts were sent for = those accounts. do they "Secretly" that is "with bear any marks? out his Knowledge" A. Although they do although he here urges = not bear any marks that the accounts yet they are the same were sent for "secretly" as were given in on "without his Knowledge" your Honor's arrival, but still, it appears from I am not aware of any his own state = other accounts =ment that he having been at was quite aware any time received at that they had been the Huzzoor on that sent head

Sent for. I have been informed "subsequently" he says (answer 34.) "that certain arzees and accounts were received" Every order is issued publickly and Deponent as Head Sheristadar had only to send for and peruse the arzees in the Moonshy department as well as had taken place with in his own. Without my knowledge admits in a subsequent answer that defence that there is no difficulty of access to his own Records, and the Moonshy given in on your Shee have deposed that whatever he requires at the time from their department when your honor is sent to him. She prepared the allegation of Deponent - inasmuch that the Cookroom were issued

head. But, as I have been informed subsequently that certain arzees and accounts were received according to orders issued without my knowledge and as the circumstance of the above orders having been issued, and of the receipt of the arzees or accounts, in question, I have no knowledge whatever, and as the Moonshy Department is under my charge, I am responsible for the proper conduct of the business transacted therein, and I am ready to answer for any irregularity that may have occurred in the Moonshy Department, but I have no knowledge of the above circumstances, and I have not received any bribe or present from any person whatever, and I have not received any bribe or present from any person whatever, and I have not received any bribe or present from any person whatever

the Deponent originals of their Depositions with Translations marked H, I, J, K, L, ... herewith accompany it. will been seen from these that no secrecy was observed, that the whole Moonshey Department were concerned in the issue of the orders, one writes the order, another enters it in the Diary, another registers and the Head Moonshey examines the whole. Here is no secrecy and if there was any thing in the proceeding which required secrecy, the Brother in law of the Head Sheristadar reason, been obliged to mention separately in my defence thus "the accounts I examined. I had only seen these accounts in the Cutcherry in that Fusly, and have not seen any occasion for my looking at them again at any time. Under this reason, I am at present unable to say that they bear such and such marks. 2.35. When I was in the Cutcherry in Fusly 1248, were the whole of the accounts relative to the settlement of that Fusly both the particulars of the proposed postponement as well as the aggregate amount, given in there at

Sheristadar would not have been made acquainted with the issue of the orders.

In the answer to Question 34 the Deponent also expresses a suspicion that "certain accounts &c. were caused to be fabricated" This subject will be fully considered afterwards.

In the answer to Question 35 it is stated that the Cutcherry servants are afraid of the Rait and will not attend to the Head Serstadar. this will be disposed of hereafter.

In answer 35 the Deponent says that I "approved" of all the business and "shewed much favor at that time or were there any still remaining to be given in. you say that you have suspicion on that head being ignorant what accounts were received. What is the nature of your suspicion? Had you suspected, what induced you not to report it me of it in due time your mention that the orders issued, and the Arzees received were kept secret by. What is your meaning of the word "secret"?

A. I recollect that some of the accounts I cannot recollect such and such accounts relative to the settlement remained

favor" and yet in a former answer he says that he drew out an order rejecting the accounts as unworthy of credit and expressing disapprobation of the management of the Aumeens.

Deponent further states that had I disapproved I should have mentioned the same in the Jamaunbundy Report it is always customary to mention the conduct of and assistance afforded by the Head Sirstadar in the Jamabundy report. If the Collector is silent, it shews that something is wrong and that

remained with the Aumeens whether for preparing Copies for the Aumeens or for some other cause, and that they were received since. With respect to the accounts of postponement, I recollect that they were all given in at Pedugavalli. The impression that suspicion has occurred to me in consequence of my being ignorant what accounts were received, has no reference to the Jamaunbundy accounts. I saw the accounts of postponement which were given in on your honors arrival at the Palaun I have stated above that I

that this was really the case as will be seen on reference to the Jamaunbundy Reports, for since the Deponent became Head Sirstadar there is no mention made of him.

In the concluding part of answer 35, it is said "even then I heard as flying report, but none of the servants informed me". Thus what was secret as is alleged in the Cutcherry was known outside. for, Deponent was informed by others and what was kept purposely from him as is alleged was

I heard of certain accounts and Arzees having been received relative to the said postponement, before commencing the preparation of the Jamaunbundy report for Fusly 1249 as I have only heard of them but I have not seen them, and as such orders and Arzees were prepared without my knowledge, I mentioned that I entertained suspicion on that head. With respect to the question made in the question "why I did not report to your honor should suspicion occur to me" Even at the time of preparing the Jamaunbundy report in Selogoo for Fusly 1249.

it

was known to him "even then" or the period when the accounts were sent for from the Aumeens.

In answer to Question 35 the Deponent says the Head writer would not give him the Jemabundy report. The English Records being taken by the other Departments great confusion as well as irregularity ensued, in consequence the English Writer has a general order not to allow the English Records to be taken or seen by the Gentoo Departments, but to furnish Translations on those points on

it was done without my knowledge. your honor did neither call nor ask me a word when the English was made out. I recollect that the accounts only which accompanied the above Report were sent for my signature on the night the Report was despatched. As your honor carried on the whole of the above business through the Deputy Siristadar and as he had not informed me what accounts were then sent for from Cutcherry regarding the accounts & postponement above said, and what was mentioned in the Report on that head,

and

on which information is required. If the English Record itself is wanted then a reference is to be made to me but the Deponent omitted to do so this as is admitted by him in answer to Question 60

In answer to Question 35, the Deponent observes that the rule at first observed of the Head of the Cutcherry doing the business together was discontinued afterwards. This is the Deponents own failure. Reference to the Depositions of the Sirstadar Head Muddelgar Parija Raumanah the Salt

as I thought that he would not inform me, tho' I asked in a cave where I had a suspicion in consequence of the same having been carried on without my knowledge I have not asked about it. I prepared the whole of the Gentoo Jemabundy Report for Fusly 1248, and read it to your honor, who took it and prepared the English. When your honor prepared the English, you gave the Gentoo to the Deputy Sirstadar. I was informed that he caused certain corrections to be made in it. on my sending word to the Writer to allow me to look at the fair

Salli Head Mootasuddy Edosposloor Rammanah and the Head Moonshey Vamooguntty Ramadoss as well as to the notes written by Deponent when he proceeded to the Palmyra will suffice on this point.

Deponent states that he addressed an Arzee to me which has not been answered. He was lately reprimanded for his negligence in not disposing of the cases referred to him which had greatly accumulated. He replies to this and stated other circumstances but no notice was considered necessary as the Deposition

fair copy of the English, in order that I may understand what corrections were at last made on the report prepared by me in the first instance, he said that he had no orders to shew the same since that time being satisfied that it would be in vain, the wished business being carried on without my knowledge, I refrained from asking such things for my information, but employed myself only in the business referred to me as well as in that carried on with my knowledge. That is being convinced that there would be no use even if I desired it, I refrained

Deposition was about to be taken.

In answer to Question 36 the Deponent states that the Question of the postponement was not stated in the order removing him from the Office of Head Sirestadar. It is simply necessary to state that that order was purposely general the object being merely to shew that the duties of the Office could not be carried on through him.

refrained. at the time of your honor appointing me to be Head Sirestadar, you were pleased to say that I and the Deputy Sirestadar, should carry on the business together, that he should put dates on the orders &c. and that I should affix my signature thereto I obeyed your orders after some Months had elapsed in that manner. at the time of my proceeding to the Palmyra, it was settled that all the urgent orders &c. should be passed with his signature alone, and that those of an important nature should be sent to the place where

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

where I was for my signature. that is it was determined to pursue the above custom during a period when I and your honor were in different places respectively. after which since the return of all to Guntoor from the District the orders which were first given by your honor that he should put dates on all the orders and that I should affix my signature thereto have not been carried into effect generally some cases were sent to me, while others were not. Even after he was employed as Head Moonshey with the exception of those that were prepared and sent by me, he was in the habit of either sending or not to me, some of those prepared by himself. It was also the custom to despatch without my signature, those written to the Zemindars and Ameens in the Land Revenue Depart-ment. Those prepared by me, have not been despatched without being sent to him and getting his signature on them during the time he was Deputy Seristadar, and when he was Head Moonshey. Even during the time your honor was absent at Madras, certain Engy transmits which

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

which were prepared by me to the Zemindars were set aside without being despatched until the arrival of Kristnarow Pantoolooguroo, by the person who was then officiating for the Head Moonshey. I believe that instructions were given in that manner as for mentioning to your honor such things as these, it has been found inconvenient to bring any complaints against him before your honor, who has great confidence and favour in him. as there is a likelihood of drawing your anger on my head in the event of my doing so, and as I considered it better to act with reference to your pleasure, I spent my time in discharging the business that was referred to me and affixing my signature to those papers which were sent to me. Subsequently, even the orders issued to the Cash keeper for paying money from the Treasury have not been received for my signature. since I returned from Innacondah, to which place I proceeded for the Sonabundy in last July 1250, it has been the custom of the Deputy Serishtadar to refer Arzees, without my knowledge, to my Goomastah Pariya Rammanah for preparing

even

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

even those usual orders &c. which were formerly made out by me, and the said Goomastah submits the orders prepared by him to the Deputy Serishtadar with his yadast. After I returned from Immacondah, the Deputy Serishtadar sent for the Cash Reports and Barawards without my signature. Having then asked my Goomastah he told me that he was acting in this way in accordance with the directions of the Deputy Serishtadar again since some time he has given the Cash Reports for my signature, saying that the Deputy Serishtadar gave directions since some time, also the Barawards &c. are coming for my signature. At present the orders issued to the Cash Keeper are not coming for my signature, with the exception of those that accompany the Barawards. I had informed the same in an Arzee lately sent to your honor. Even then, your honor were not pleased to give any orders as every servant has been from the beginning acting in obedience to the Deputy Serishtadar but not otherwise, and as every servant is fearful lest he should be dismissed in the event of his acting in any other way in consequence of your favour towards the

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

the Deputy Sheristadar, no one has acted against the wishes of the Deputy Sheristadar. Now, if I have any order to make out, it happens that I must by myself examine and write or cause it to be written by any other person but my Goomastah Parigee Rommanah and others will not look after that business. As things are going on in the manner above mentioned the suspicions which are in my mind about the postponement for Fusly 1248, as well as the accounts sent for without my knowledge before the preparation of the Semaubundy Report for Fusly 49, have not been brought to your notice because thinking that in the event of my representing the same to your honor at that time, it would only occasion your honor to think as if a complaint was made against the Deputy Sheristadar and so excite anger, but no other benefit would result. With respect to the question "as to the kind of suspicion I have" I beg to represent that, the accounts of postponement for Fusly 1248 were given in on the Palmand, and the circumstances connected with that subject were brought into your consideration

while

while your honor remained on the same place
Then your honor was not of opinion that I
had done any thing liable to objection. Had
your honor felt so, you would not have
been silent without issuing to me an Enquiri
-ramah, shewing the objections on that head. your
honor approved of all the business I performed
during that Semaunbundy, and shewed much favor
Had you in any way doubted in that respect ever
subsequently you would have caused an E
Enquetramah to be issued to me shewing the
objections. even during the time of your preparing
the Semaunbundy Report of that Fusly, you would
have mentioned even in that Report that an objec
-nable business was done by me. While there
was no doubt since that time, I was informed
that, after a period of about 18 Months had
elapsed or before commencing the Semaunbundy
Report of Fusly 1249, orders were issued to the
Aumeens of Palvaud without my knowledge
in relation to the said postponement that
certain Arzees and accounts were received from
the Aumeens shewing as if I had postponed
a certain amount, and as if your honor had
decreased a certain portion of it at the

very

very time when your honor proceeded to the Paulnaud
consequently, I thought that the Deputy Sheristadar
had played an intrigue in order to accuse me in
that matter. under this reason, I mentioned that
suspicion had arisen with me. With respect to my
saying that the orders issued and the arzees received
in that matter were placed secretly; my meaning is
that I heard subsequently, that orders had been issued
without my knowledge, that arzees, accounts &c. had
been received, and that I was doubtful whether your
honor sent them with or mentioned their contents in
the letter which was sent to the Board respecting
my removal from the Head Sheristadar's situation
to that of Assistant Sheristadar, or in the Sum-
-mabundy report for Fusly 1249. Even then, I heard
a flying report, but none of the servants informed
me. For these reasons, I mentioned that they were
placed secretly.

2. 36. The above orders and arzees were
prepared in the Public Cutcherry. To your ignorance
in regard to them the cause of your suspicion, or are
there any reasons.

A. If those orders were issued publicly
in common with other orders, some of the servants
would have reported to me of their having been des-
-patched, moreover as I proceeded for the Summah-
-bundy of that fusly, and as those orders were issued
regarding that postponement it would not have hap-
-pened that I should be unacquainted with the cir-
-cumstance in due time, unless the Deputy Sheris-
-tadar had used the necessary precautions to that effect
I have not understood the actual circumstance were to
this time whether or not your honor addressed the
Board

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Board on the objections against me in relation to the postponement. This reason was not mentioned in the Cheyttanah ijsued to me when I was removed from the situation of Head Sheristadar I only heard that mention had been made to the Board. In consequence of my having been informed that mention had been made to the Board without mention of the same in the Cheyttanah ijsued to me, it occurred to me to think from the time the above orders were written without my knowledge, that the deputy Sheristadar had taken care that the said circumstance should be concealed from me. —

2.37. Have you or not any other reasons beside this respecting your suspicion. —

A. The reasons abovementioned are more there are no other reasons.

2.38. You have said above that unless the accounts are seen, you cannot tell what portion of the amount recommended by the amuent to be postponed in the accounts which were given for your Examination, can be recovered without detriment to the Ryots: The accounts are in the Sheristo Department. Have you not seen them at different times what has prevented your perusing them. —

A. I could not say so what I said is this the amount recommended to be postponed for each ryot in the accounts determined by me, being considered, to cause such ryot to become poor if collected. I mentioned that that amount was retained in the above accounts, but as it was asked in the question whether the Ryot became poor from Collection being made within Jusly 48 on that account I said that with reference to the foregoing Example

Questions 38 & 39. These do not appear to call for particular remarks.

J.B.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

foregoing Example given by me, one Rupee or a little more or less than the same, might have been collected out of five Rupees postponed against any Ryot in the accounts referred to, that in certain cases a little more than the amount recommended to be postponed might have been uncollected, that such a small collections, or such a small amount outstanding in excess are not of consequence, and that any collections made under that head ought to be known from the accounts of collections. — But it is not my meaning that the amount recommended to be postponed in the accounts I examined comprizes a certain sum that is recoverable. I will peruse the accounts of collections and represent the amount that has been realized. There has been no hindrance to my perusing those accounts upto this time. —

2.39. You have said above that, the circumstance of the postponement made for Fusly 1248 in Palnaud District, not having been mentioned in the order ijsued when you were removed from the situation of Head Sirstadaur to that of Assistant Sirstadaur —

it

it induced you to entertain suspicion in regard to the orders issued to, and the Arzee and Accounts received from the Aumeers on the above subject, were any reasons assigned in detail in the above order, or was it simply mentioned that you were removed owing to the difficulty experienced in carrying on the business thro' your means.

A. Certain reasons were specified

The Signature of N. Shashagerry

Head Sirstadaur

Before me this 14th August 1841.

(Signed) J. Goldingham.

Collector.

Enquiry held on the 16th August.

2 40. You have mentioned above that had the orders made out to the Aumeers of Timmerecottah and Dalchapilly Zamauts in last year respecting the postponement of Fuslies 1248 and 49 been despatched publickly in common with other orders, any one of the servants would have reported to you of this having been despatched, that it would have come to your knowledge, unless the Deputy Sirstadaur had taken the necessary precautionary measures, and that

those orders were despatched secretly. From the enquiry now made in your presence, it is evident that the said orders and anzees were prepared in common with other orders and Arzees, that each of the Mootasuddies in the Moonshey-Department took part in the above business, that the assistant Jawabnewis, Dubbeer Venkatappeah, who is your brother-in-law, also knows the same, and that the Deputy Sirstadaur had not advised any one to conceal the matter from your knowledge. Thus, how can you say that the Deputy Sirstadaur had taken care to conceal the matter from your knowledge, and that they were not issued publickly.

Questions 40 41 42. A It is evident from the depositions themselves taken now from the servants in the Moonshey Department that no one informed me the circumstance of the above orders having been despatched, or of the Arzees having been received. Being informed

The consideration of the Question involved in these answers to those questions has been disposed of already.

It is much to be regretted that Deponent should thus inconsiderately charge so respectable

respectable a person as Vanoogunty Ramadoss the Head Moonshey and others with perjury.

informed of the above circumstance since the despatch of the Jemabundy Report of Fusly 1249. but not in due time. I said that they were sent without my knowledge.

2 44. No answer is given to the question. How can you say that these orders were not issued publickly, and that the Deputy Sirstadaur had taken care so that you may not be informed of the circumstance?

A The cause of the Moolasuddies in the moonshey Department not informing me the circumstance of the Deputy Sirstadaur having taken care at that time so that I may not be informed of the said orders and arzees is attributable to the fear they are exposed to, as the same is against the will of the Deputy Sirstadaur.

2 42. How did you know that the Deputy Sirstadaur had taken care as above stated?

A The same is my opinion. At the time when the true statement comes to light, the circumstance of his having taken such

such care will also be manifest

2 43. What is the meaning of the Expression "at the time when the true Statement comes to light"?

Questions 43, 44, 45. A. It is the same as the word indicates.

These do not call for remark. 2 44. What meaning does it give? what is in your mind? When will the true statement come to light. what hindrance is there now, why the truth should not come to light?

A I have mentioned in my answer that no one would venture to say a word against the Deputy Sirstadaur.

2 45. You say that you were informed of the circumstance of the said orders having been issued. What hindrance did you experience if you wished to see those Books on your being informed of the same.

A As I was informed of the said circumstance since the despatch of the Jemaubundy Report for Fusly 1249, I imagined that the said Arzees were received thro' conspiracy, and thus have not wished to send for and peruse them, thinking at the same time that it would be in vain, as the case was already sent to the Board.

You

2 46 You say that no one would now say a word against the Deputy Sirstadaur. At what other time do you think they will tell?
Questions 46-47-48-49-50-51-

It will be seen how the Head Sirstadaur evades bringing forward a specific charge against the Nair. In the answer to Question 48 he will not look at the Question put to him at all, at last in the Answer to Question 50 he is brought to meet the point and that answer does not call for remark from me -

The answer to Question 51. deserves particular notice. It sets forth 1st that the Head Sirstadaur and the Nair have not been

A As the contents of the orders sent to the Deputy Shirstadaur for your honors' signature from Tunaconda respecting the postponement of Fusly 1248 are to be known, be pleased to send for now, the Books containing the Copies of the orders for me to peruse them, I have to peruse those Books and represent certain circumstance after having done this, I will give answer to the above question.

2 47 What connexion is there between the said question and your answer?

There

been kept in their proper relative position and 2dly the grounds why a specific charge cannot be brought forward against the Nair. The Board will find the first point disposed of in another place. In regard to the second it is urged that "as the principal business is now going on through him / the Deputy Sirstadaur. / " it prevents no connexion, it is the Head Sirstadaur astonishing that from possessing knowledge of his irregularities in due time" and "as I was not" it is further urged "in possession of his irregularities.

A There is no connexion between that Question and my answer. As I have something to represent before hand after perusing those orders, I only replied that I will do it first and then give my answer to the other queries, but there is no connexion between them.

2 48 As there is no connexion, it is astonishing that you did not give an answer to the questions. you must give an answer to it.

A I will give answer, but as I have a necessity to go through the Books Containing

irregularities I have not represented the same" Thus it is distinctly stated by Deponent that he is not in possession of "irregularities" committed by the Naib, and yet throughout he accuses the Naib But this same answer sets forth "that should he (deponent) represent to the Collector such circumstances as come to his knowledge, it will then be necessary for him to give proof in support of the same" and this Deponent urges is unattainable because the servants will not

Containing those orders before hand, Represented the same in the first instance.

249. While the question put by me relates to a separate point, it is irregular in you to bring forward circumstances which have no connexion with it, and not to give an answer. Therefore give your answer to the above question in the first instance.

A. On my stating that no one would say at present a word against the Deputy Shirstadar, it is asked at what time will they say as

not give evidence in consideration of the "great favor" shewn "towards the Deputy Sirstadar" Thus in the same answer it is stated that no irregularities have come to Deponents notice and yet it is insinuated that irregularities are not

as every one knows that he has your favour, they cannot say before your honor a word against him, although the same is true - as to your question "when they are to say" I reply that they will say at that time when God has determined to bring the fact to light.

250. Do you think that any injustice will take place during my Enquiry, that complaints are

not brought to
the Collector's
notice by Depon=
=ent because for
reasons stated
evidence would
not be forthcoming.
The peculiar cha=
=racter of this
answer is very strik=
=ing. The animus
of

are then to be preferred
and who are there
to give evidence. If this is
true, what made you
to conceal the same
from me.

A. Your honor is not
a person to do injustice,
your honor having had no
regard towards the Deputy
Sirstadar they would not
say a word, although it is
true, against him before
your honor, consequently, no
justice will follow. Being my=
=self aware that they would not
set forth the truth, at this
time in respect to the com=
=plaints to be preferred, I think
that there will be no use
by my declaring them=
251. If any irregularities were
Committed=

of Deponent is fully
developed.
committed by the Deputy
Sheristadar in the Circar's
business, and had you
known them, what was
the reason of your not report=
=ing the same to me immedi=
=ately; since it is incumbent on
me to make the necessary investi=
=tion into the matter, and dispose of the
case judicially, what made you not to
bring to my notice in due time the circum=
=stances you are aware of= Do you thus neglect
the interests of the Circar?

A Had we Viz^t the Head Sersladar,
and the Deputy Shirstadar, been retained in such
position as we are entitled to respectively, there could
not be any room for the Deputy shirstadar to commit
any irregularity without the knowledge of the Head
Sheristadar. Should be commit any there would
be no hindrance to bring the same immediately
to the notice of the Collector that the same may be
disposed of Judiccally= as the principal busines
is now going on thro' him /the Deputy Sersladar/

owing

owing to the great favor retained by your honor towards him it prevents the Head Sirstadaur from posessing knowledge of his irregularities in due time- Should he represent to the Collector such circumstances as came to his knowledge, it will then be necessary for him to give proof in support of the same, or else the Head Sirstadaur who represented it, will be called a liar, and nothing else would follow. To give such proofs, the persons who are to give such evidence, will not say the same in consideration of your honors great favor towards the Deputy Sirstadaur- Therefore they were not brought to your notice as I was not in possession of his irregularities, I have not represented the same, it cannot be said that I had neglected my duty-

(The signature of C. V. Sashagherry Row Head Sirstadaur.)

Before me this 10th. August 1841
(signed) J. Goldingham
Collector.

The Books required by the Head Sirstadaur have been this day given to him 17th. August 1841.
(signed) J. Goldingham
Collector.

18th. August 1841.

D. 52 You having stated that the Deputy Sirstadaur had taken care that the Hookoms issued to the Aumeens of the Palnaud District, and the arzees addressed by them, relative to the postponement on account of Jusdies 1248 & 49, might not be known to you, you were asked "how could you know that he had taken care in that manner." upon which you said that such was your opinion Was it your influence that he had taken care in that manner or did any person tell you? who told you?

A. What I have stated above should be shewn to me.

D. 53. The above question will again be put to you- Is it your opinion that he had taken care in that manner or did any person tell you so?

Questions 52-53-

These do not appear to call for remark-

A. Some of the orders which went to the Aumeens of the Palnaud relative to the revenue affairs came to me for my signature- and some of the arzees which were received likewise came to me. These Hookoms did

did not come to me. Even one of the arzees which were received did not come to me - When you were reporting to the Board you did not send for and ask me even one word on the subject - nor did any person tell me at that time - After the Report had gone to the Board, I had a slight intimation of the same - I do not recollect that such a person told me - In the Hookoom also of my removal, this cause was not assigned. - As I did not understand at the time, and as even at the time of your writing to the Board you did not send for and ask me and then write with reference to my answer, and as you did not mention that circumstance in the Hookoom issued to me, when as it was mentioned in the Report to the Board, I imagined that the circumstance of the Hookoms being issued to the Auneens in the first instance, as well as the circumstance of arzees being received and of a report being sent to the Board had entirely been kept secret. Besides, I did not see the arzees addressed by the Auneens, but from the Questions which are now put to me by your honor, it appears that when I went first for the Jemaubundy for Fusles 1248 and 1249

I

I had caused accounts to be drawn up for - postponing a great portion of the List of those Fusles, that after you came for the Jemaubundy, you reduced a great portion in that amount, - and caused fresh accounts to be prepared - I did not cause accounts to be written for such an unreasonable postponement. If you be pleased to favor me with the arzees addressed by the Auneen. I will see and further represent on the subject -

2. 5th. you have stated above, that the degree which ought to have been observed between you and the Deputy Shirstadar has not been preserved. Do you remember what doubts were expressed relative to your capability in the Sunned granted to you for the situation of Head Sirstadaur, how the Records [in certain cases] grew in arrears with you, how the moiety taken up by you of the said Records which were equally shared between you and the Deputy Shirstadaur either in the month of March or April 1840 still remains undisposed of, while the moiety of the Deputy Shirstadaur was disposed of at the same time

time and how you could not despatch the
current business when I made experiment?
Question 54.-
The greater part of the matter in the answer to this Question is recapitulation and is disposed of elsewhere. In Page 2 of the sheet № 18 it is stated that there was a desire to have him/the Head Sirstadar/removed, and with this view the accounts of the Village of Oleroo were sent for, these accounts were sent for with a different view and were given to the Deponent as Head Sirstadar to examine- they bear either his signature or his initials

A. I do not see any incapability on my part in discharging the current business. The meaning of my statement that you did not place us at the degree which ought to have been observed between me and the Deputy Shirstadaur is that, when you first appointed me Head Sirstadaur, you told me that every business should be jointly carried on by both of us; that every paper should bear my signature; that he should put the date, and that in any case if we entertained doubts

initials The desire for his removal has been very strong since it has been shewn how unfit he is for his situation. In regard to the seizure of the note I was displeased with the person who seized it and it was only on the Head Sirstadaur wishing that it might be opened in my presence that I allowed him to do so.

The documents marked L. M. O will furnish information in regard to Deponent's capacity to discharge the current business.

In the appointment of Servants, the observations of the Deponent

doubts we should both come and ask your honor- and this accordingly passed for a few months- after I went to the Palnaud, some affairs came to me while some were conducted by him after we all came back to Guntoor, it ought to have been that every paper should bear my signature and every business should be carried on jointly by both of us; it has not been so. but some Hookaums only came for my signature, while others do not come; the principal affairs were

Deponent are shewn to be worthless by his inability to point out a single instance of an improper nomination when asked by Questions 80 and 81.

The subject of the records will be disposed of in another place- Deponents complaint that the 2 Goomastahs whom he names not being with him is rendered worthless by the fact that the Goomastahs in the Shirsta Department are all with him.

Deponent says that 8 months have been allowed to pass without taking this Deposition. It was purposely delayed as

were managed by your honor through his means without my knowledge- The appointments and dismissals took place through his means; the persons who were Employed were those recommended by him- consequently all the servants act according to his pleasure- Every one being afraid that he would be dismissed if he should act so against his will. all the Goomastahs who can discharge their duties will act as instructed by him: hence my being ignorant of the manner in which some of the

affairs

as already explained to the Board-

affairs were managed by him- As to the Arzes in arrears, some of the Arzees which were in arrears by the time I was appointed were taken with me- as I went to the Palnaud, where I disposed of now and then, such number as my leisure from the affairs of the Jemmaubundy might permit, and having prepared Hookooms sent them to the Deputy Shirstadaur for your signature- In April fusly 1249- after we all went to Pennoor, I came to Guntoor with your honor for an investigation in the stamp Department- On your return to Pennoor, you ordered me to remain here, and went with the Deputy Shirstadaur only- On your ordering me to remain here you directed Davursoo Lutchemenarayanappah, and Aucola Munnaty Ramasawmy to remain under my command, and instructed me to examine the Records through their means- a fewdays afterwards, Lutchemenarayenappa haveng been removed as Satt Jannadaur, several yaddists were written by me to the Deputy Sustadar desiring him

to

to request your honor to employ another person in his stead. and to issue a Hookoom on the subject, — as it was not a business to be transacted by — others indescriminately with confidence - but without effect. At that time, your honor having come once to Guntoor. I represented to you also /on the subject/ you replied. "very well" but a Hookoom was not issued - at the same time, some of the arzees which were left in arrears at Pennoor were taken up by the Deputy Shirstadaur, while some which required reference to a large — portion of the Record for disposal, were — sent to me - the Goomastah by name Sooriah, who had been looking after the business of the arzees with me before that time, was retained at Pennoor by the Deputy Shirstadaur, Raumarow saw [this business] for some time and after his return from Nellore to Guntoor. I frequently told the Deputy Shirstadaur who came to Guntoor at that time. that if he should keep him — /Ramarow/ with me. the arrears in question — would soon be brought up but he took him also with

with him. One Sambamah used to see some times. the business of arzees in Guntoor, but owing to the deficiency in the number of Goomastas the said Sambanah used to see the business of — the accounts required at Pennoor. from the — Record as well as the current business under the Head muddutgaur: consequently, it was incon: :venient for him to confine himself to the bu: :siness of arzees - I therefore used to send for Papers from the Record, make reference in person, to such papers as were requisite in each case, and write accordingly - under these circumstances, the busi: :ness of arzees was carried on to such an extent as the leisure I had from other duties permitted, but not to a great extent - The Deputy Sirstadaur in order to prevent the duties in my hand from being discharged fairly. caused the suitable hands not to see business with me in the above manner but, as complaining frequently against him, will become a cause of my being exposed to your — displeasure. I did not do so. The reason for — this all having passed thus, is that, you have great favor towards him. your honor at first appointed

appointed him Head Sirstadaur. after some time had passed. the Board not having approved of his appointment. your honor appointed me. but not with favor towards me. you were desirous since the begenning. to appoint him again to my situation when opportunity may offer. as it is inconvenient to appoint him so. unless some faults are established against me. the Deputy Sirstadaur in order to establish such faults against me. took care in the above manner that suitable persons might not remain with me. on account of the arzees in arrears. Had you not such desire. you would have caused every business to be carried on by both of us. as directed by you when you first appointed me. as all the principal affairs have been managed thro' his means without my knowledge, and in making new appointments, as you acted according to his advice, without my entire knowledge, his authority has been in force, while mine is otherwise. consequently, I have represented that you did not place us according to our respective rank. It having been thus. I did not understand the circumstance of the Hookoom having

having been issued and the arzees received relative to the postponement in the Salnaud on account of Fusles 1248 & 49. I have represented above the causes from which it is inferred that he had managed without my knowledge, as a strong ground for my being removed from the situation of Head Sirstadaur, you wrote to the Board that I had committed a fault in the case of postponement, which does not appear to be true, but an invention to be traced to the Deputy Sirstadaur having caused Hookooms and arzees to be issued and sent for in the said manner, and represented to you certain circumstances from which you have perhaps inferred that it was a real fact. but I do not think that you would have written if you had been fully aware that it was not a real fact. If the circumstance of my having first caused accounts to be written. shewing a large amount to be postponed on account of fusly 1248. of your having thought it a large amount on your examining the same, and of your having reduced some thousands and caused fresh accounts to be drawn, is true. I am to be reprimanded for having intended to throw

throw away the circars Revenue in vain. Had I committed such a fault, you would not have remained quiet without inflicting on me a punishment suitably at the same time that you become acquainted with the fault. Besides myself, if the Aumeens committed frauds, suitable punishment would have been inflicted on them. Nothing was done by you in that manner. The Hookoums mentioned by me in the above reply are those which were caused by me to be written and sent for your signature resting on the Aumeens the responsibility of collecting the revenue without leaving a single Dul and without injuring the Ryots. The above Hookoums I conclude were signed and sent by you. In the reply given by me the day before yesterday I earnestly requested that copies of these Hookoums in the Books should be shewn to me, but you did not send for them on that day. yesterday you showed me those Books, I saw them, but that Hookoum is not to be found in them. supposing that, that Hookoum was perhaps set aside, and a fresh one written in another way without my knowledge, in the Book of

of the Dantchapully Tannah which I inspected, it does not appear a Hookoom was issued with respect to the postponement on account of Fusly 1248. In the event of frauds having been committed both by myself and the Aumeens relative to the postponement in the above manner, even you would have taken strict notice and issued Hookoums to me as well as to the Aumeens on the subject. altho' a suitable punishment was not inflicted on us. If a fraud was committed by me in the said manner, and if the same was discovered by your honor in that Fusly, would I and the Aumeens dare to commit a fraud again in Fusly 1249. Had we committed, would you have suffered us to remain still in the service. Even after the Semmaubundy for Fusly 1249 was over, would you remain without issuing Hookoums strictly noticing to me and the Aumeens; would you, who did nothing in that manner at that time, think subsequently, that is about the time of preparing the Semmaubundy Report for Fusly 1249, that fraud was committed by me in the case in question in those two Fusties. you did not think

think so- you should therefore infer that the intrigue of writing Hookoums and sending for arzees &c in that way in order to make you think so was plotted by the Deputy Sirstadaur. Each of the servants fears that, if he should depose inconsistently with the opinion of the Deputy Shirstadar he would lose his service- therefore, they will not depose the truth- the circumstance of frauds having been committed by me in the case of the postponement in question, is not true. I have therefore inferred that, that circumstance was mentioned in the Report to the Board: yet the same was not stated in the Hookoum by which I was removed by the Deputy Shirstadar: otherwise, why was a fraud not assigned as a reason in the Hookoum, for my removal from the situation of Head Sirstadaur. It is not to be inferred that you did not mention the same in it from favor towards me- a short time after you appointed me Head Sirstadaur, you have been looking after the means of again removing me from that

situation

situation, and reinstowing the same on the Deputy Shirstadar, that is, a few days after my appointment took place, you with an intention to find some fault on my part, caused the accounts of the Curnums of former years, of the Volaroo &c Villages to be seized and brought and sifted in the Village of Poolevanoo, but my name was no where to be found: when I addressed and dispatched a letter by Tappaul to a person belonging to the Zemendar at Narsaraupettah on account of medicine, you caused that letter to be seized and brought with an impression that it would contain something tending to implicate me in some thing wrong. Even from this, nothing resulted. Notwithstanding which no fault has been found with me as I have not a disposition to commit frauds, on the contrary, during the period of my Service of 30 years I behaved with propriety, and former Gentlemen treated me with dignity- since I was appointed Head Shirstadaur you have been looking for my fault in the above manner. If the circumstance of frauds having been committed by me in the case of postponement on

account

account of Fishes 1248 ℔ was true you would not have with-held from mentioning such a serious fault in the Hookoom by which I was removed, therefore it must be inferred that as this is not a real cause you have mentioned this reason to the Board - In the Hookoom issued to me reinstating me to my situation according to the orders of the Board, it was mentioned that the Board had required further Explanation - If the circumstance of frauds having been committed by me in the case of postponement was true, I do not think that you would allow 8 months to pass after I was reinstated in my situation without taking a defence from me, and discovering the truth at the same time; hence, I think that the Deputy Shirstadaur has caused it to be put off in order to establish some more faults against me - I heard that he has been endeavouring for these 8 months past to find faults with me - From what I now hear, it appears that, he has been endeavouring to send for more argees against me from somewhere or other - as I have understood so, I is thought it proper to represent and accordingly as represented

represented it to you.

2. 55. What endeavours has the Deputy Shirstadaur been using to procure Complaints against you? By whom did you understand this? The answer to this question is unintelligible as no such Petition as is mentioned has been received. The deponent will not state whence he obtains his information that such person will not give his evidence - The endeavour used by him is that, he caused arzees to be addressed to you by some Villagers &c., stating that a fraud had been committed by me thro' the means of some of the Cunneens - I have slightly heard that he has been using such Endeavours - It is not to be stated that such a person has told me. as the person who tells me will not come forward and give Evidence - I have already represented that no one would tell an unfavorable word against the Deputy Shirstadaur - For the same reason, they will not come and give evidence - You

236.— You have stated above that all the business which was done by you during the time of the Semmabundy for Fusly 1248, had been approved of by me, otherwise that a Hookoom would have been issued making objections. I recollect that you were repremanded for causing accounts to be drawn relative to the postponement of a large amount. For what reason do you say that the business done by you had been approved of? Did I write to you at any time that I had approved of it? If a Hookoom was not necessary when I approved, why did you say that a Hookoom was not issued when objections were made?

Calls for no particular remark in this place.—

A. If the business entrusted to me was transacted by me regularly, the former Collectors used to remain quite without making any objection which was considered as an approbation itself, but it

it was not customary to issue a separate Hookoom every fusly that it was approved of. If any objections existed, it was usual to issue Hookoom, taking strict notice against the recurrence of such objectionable thing being done and not otherwise. Verbal admonition will do if on ordinary occasions, but the causing accounts to be drawn out and for causing some thousands of Rupees recoverable to the Circar to be postponed, is not a crime to be pardoned by any Gentleman for such a crime, you would have issued a Hookoom taking strict notice. If such a crime was really committed, you would not have passed it over merely by verbal admonition, you did not reprimand me verbally nor was such a crime committed by me.

257— You have stated above that the amount required to be postponed on account of fusly 1248 belonged to those who had not any produce. Before your causing accounts to be prepared relative to the postponement, did you obtain accounts to show how much of the produce was taken

profession

possession of and how much remained?

The facts of the case & By that time,
and the Kyfeyet of the the Produce of Nunjah
Auneens will shew — and Jonnah was for —
that the matter contain- the most part taken
-ed in the answer to this possession of the pro-
Question is altogether — -duce of Cotton &c. was
without foundation. No to be permitted to be
individual accounts — taken; the Cotton pro-
existed. -duce in that year was
short. In some Villages
the produce of certain Ryots
having fallen far short, it
was impossible for the Auneen
to collect the sist in full. The
Auneens in shewing me the indi-
vidual accounts of each Village, refer
me to the items of produce of such persons as
were inserted in the accounts on account of
postponement, the portion to be postponed
of the sist to which there were not
resources was inserted in the accounts on

account

account of each Ryot, with reference to this
condition but nothing was postponed in cases
where there was produce. In cases where there
was no produce, a small portion was insert-
-ed in the accounts to be postponed on account
of those who had property or ability, while no
-ther more was exhibited on account of those
who had not property or ability. The accounts
which were seen by me were those which exhibit-
-ed the resources, which also had been taken
possession of. It was not mentioned in those
accounts that the quantity of produce was so
much, and that the quantity which was to be
taken possession of was so much. when those
accounts were produced to me, the auneen
Shewed to me saying "the Jonnah produce is so
much." "The Suzza produce is so much." "the
cotton produce is so much" and pointed out to
me at the same time each item which was
taken possession of and which was recoverable,
and how much remained to be taken possession
of. I therefore with reference to the above circum-
-stances

possession

=stances, observed the correctness and incorrect=
=ness of the amount proposed to be postponed=
2 58— Yo have stated above that
nothing was asked of you when I was co=
=uriting the Jemmabundy Report for Fusly
1249. The Statements which were to accom=
=pany that Report having be=signed by you, did
you see any irregular Items inserted in them?
Questions 58.59. 60. A. No irregularities
These do not call for were apparent, but
much remark as as it is more than
it is admitted by one year since,
the Deponent that I will see the accounts
he understood that and then represent=
I had made altera= 2–59– You have
=tions in his Teloogoo stated that you had
yadast regarding the given a Yadast on
Jemmabundy for= account of the Re=
=Fusly 1248 it will be =port for Fusly 1248,
easily inferred by Do you recollect that
the Board that I found I was obliged to correct
that certain

that yadast an useless certain memoranda
document.— which were drawn =
In answer to= out by you incrrectly
Question 58 it is stated in that Yadast?
that "no irregularities A. After I had
were apparent" in the prepared co Gen=
accounts— this will be =tos, I read it to you
further dwelt upon in to some ecctent, and
another place.— then having been
directed to give it into
your hands, I did so. In
order to know what alterati=
=ons were made by you I
wished to see the English =
Report— but the writers said
that had no order to shew me the
English Report, which circumstance,
I have already represented in my replies above.
If I had drawn some memoranda incorrectly in that
Report, you should have sent for and asked=
me the cause of it: you did not ask me so,
nor did I draw any thing incorrectly— If you
will

will permit me I will represent now.—

260. When you asked the writer to shew the Report, if he did not give it why did you not ask me?

A. After I was told that he was forbidden to shew it, I did not ask why he was thus directed, nor did I tell you of it because, I understood that after the English Report was prepared by you the Gentoos and English were both given to the care of the Deputy Shirstadaur and that some alterations were caused to be made by him, and I consequently inferred that he had given directions not to shew it to me in order to make me to be unacquainted with what alterations were made by him. As I knew that it would not be shewn to me altho' I represented to you, but that it would only become a complaint against the Deputy Shirstadaur, I did not make any representation on the subject.—

You

261. You have stated above that you had caused certain Enayetnamahs to be written to the address of certain Zemindars after I had proceeded to Madras, and that they had been detained from being despatched till after the arrival of Vencata Kistna Row Puntoolu, the then Head Moonshy. In what cases were those Enayetnamahs written. If the then officiating moonshy detained them, why did you not represent to the then Head Assistant Collector in charge after my arrival, while I was the person to issue them if necessary, what is the reason of your having stated that they had been postponed till after the arrival of Vencata Kistna Puntoolu?

A. The Enayetnamahs in question were those which were written about accounts relative to the errors

Questions 61-62

were kept tell after my return from Madras. Deponent says that it was an immaterial thing keeping them tell my return but states that he introduces the circumstance here to shew the fear which the Moonshies of Venkatakistnarow Pun-
-tooloo, is rather to be inferred that the acting moonshy was afraid to pass through his cutcherry documents the accuracy of the Statements in which might be called in question

afterwards

errors in the accounts Submitted by the Ze-
-mindars as to their despatch, the person who was then Offici-
-ting for the Head Moonshy represented to the Collector in charge in the above manner in my presence - I did not know what you had told that Collector in charge at your departure, or what was the cause of it - but as soon as the officiating Head Moonshy thus repre-
-sented he/ the Head Assistant Collector in charge/

replied

afterwards -

replied that they might be detained till after your arrival accordingly - as it - was not - any - business tend-
-ing to prove detrimental if they had not been dispatched before your arrival, - I did not argue with the Collector in charge on the Subject - If you question me why did I - mention the above circumstances, I beg to state that I have mentioned the same to shew the fear borne by the Moonshees and others towards - Vencata Kistna Row Puntoolo. -

2.62. You have stated that every one of the Servants fears that he would be dismissed if he should not act - according to the pleasure of the Deputy Sirstadaur, Who has told you that he has this fear?

A. It is not necessary that one should tell me - I observed my self if they

they had no such fear the Moostasuddies, who gave depositions yesterday before your Honor. would not have deposed as they did.-

263. You have stated above that, at present you yourself write every paper, and that none of the Goomastahs will see the business which might be dictated by you.- Some of the papers which were caused to be prepared and submitted by you will be shewn to you- you must see them, and tell me in whose hand writing each of them is written.

Questions 63-64-65-

The Deponents answer to these Questions contain a sufficient refutation to his allegation that the Goomastahs will not obey him and that able Goomastahs are not with him.-

The

The names of the several Goomastahs are mentioned by the Deponent as attending him- it is sufficient to observe that Edooporoory Ramanmah is the Head Salt Water and Parigar Raumanah who closes the Bookoom &c. prepared by him, is the Head Muddelgar- Heere are two of the principal individuals besides other Goomastahs But Deponent says his meaning that they will not write such large Bookooms as were written by Raumacotiah

the

issued to the Ameen of Poolool Tanna relative to the Village of Lookavaram, the Endorsements made on the Arzees regarding the Shroff of Cooncalah Goonta Subject to the Innaconda Tannah, and the Bookoom issued to the Ameen in that case, were caused by me to be written by Raumna Cotiah a Volunteer, who used to come to me- It can be observed that the large Bookooms also which were lately sent by me relative to Naty Vencayah &c. Enamdars at Collour were written by him.

The

the Volunteer" I believe this may be left without comment further than to state that the present Deposition is an Example of the length, inaccuracy and introduction of coetraneous matter of some orders which were prepared by the Deponent and returned by me.

In answer to Question 65 it is left by Deponent to be inferred that the Head Muddutgar ceased to look into the business under him at the order of the

The Endorsement made on the Arzee addressed by the aggrahaurumdaur of Sonna Saudy, the Hookoom which was issued to the Aumeen of Innaconda with regard to Naine pully, and the Endorsement made on the arzee of the Aggraharumdaur of Goorossapully were also written by the same Volunteer, the orthers Viz. the endorsement made on the Arzee of Vencumnah, the Enamdaur of Joopordy, the Hookoom issued to the Aumeen of the Bellumcondah Tannah

Stating

the Deputy Shoristadaur The Deposition of the Muddutgar herewith accompanies. It will be seen that the circumstance desired to be inferred is without foundation.

Stating that the arzee addressed by the Aggraharumdaur of Gorumtlah was sent, the Endorsement made on the arzee of the archeka of Mooktaswara Swamy the Hookoom issued Stating, that the above was forwarded, the Hookoom stating that the arzee Endorsed of Cottapolem, a Hamlet under Poowadah, and the Endorsement made on the arzee of Copully Nuw= =siah were written by Aanoomuntarow= The Hookooms issued to the Aumeen of Bellumcondah relative to the aggraharum of Anuntavarum, was written by the above mentioned Volunteer. The Hookoom issued to the aumeen of Timmercottah

Tanah

Tanah relative to the Serauzety dauns of Taralah was written by Bhagavuntarow. The Endorsement made on the arzee of Moondraty Venkatadry was written by Antiah. the Hoolroom in which the above was sent was written by Hanoomantarow. The Hoolroom issued to the Aumeen of Vellalore regarding to the Curnums of Mavarum was written by Antiah. The Endorsement made on the arzee of the Curnum was written by Edoopooloory Raumunnah Puntolon. The Endorsement made on the arzee addressed by Vuddla Moody Raumiah and the Hoolroom with which the above was sent were written by Edoopooloory Raumannah Puntolon. the Endorsement on the arzee addressed by the Aggrahaurundar of Chennoopully and the Hoolroom with which the above was sent were written by Edoopooloory Ramannah Puntolon. The Hoolroom issued to the Record Keepers stating that the papers relative to the Inamium of Mooktaswaraswamy were sent to them, the Hoolroom

Hoolroom issued to the above officers stating that the Anchena Jaubitas of Goreguppoody were forwarded to them, the Endorsement on the arzee of Cautrapanty Shasachellum the Hoolroom to the aumeen of Innacondah Shanah relative to Raumiah, the Curnum of Chintala Chervoo, the yadast to the Deputy Shirastadaur respecting the arzee of the Petty people of Jennapad, and the Hoolroom to the aumeen of Jenauly with regard to the Curnums of Collepara were written by Antiah. The Endorsement on the arzee of Mancheraauze Bhoojungarow was written by myself. The Hoolroom with which the above was sent was written by Gavaravarapoo Lutchemenursoo, the Endorsement on the arzee of the Shep= herds of Sullapand was written by Edoopoo= =loor Raumannah Puntolon, the Hoolroom sent with it was written by Bha= =gavuntarow, the Hoolroom which was sent with the Endorsement

on the arzee of the Cunnum of Bhuttiprole was written by Edoopooloory Raumanah Pun:=tooloo and the Enayetnamahs issued to Raw:=manadha Bauboo and the Zemindaur of Suttanapulley were written by Numboory Raumiah. I do not mean to say that when=ever there is occasion to write such small Rookoums and Endorsements, they would not write them. I do not mean to say that they would not listen to my words at all. I mean to say that they would not give their attention to write such large Rookoums as were written by Raumacotiah, the Volenteer above=mentioned in the case of grants of Roopiahs=goontahs and in perusing those cases to remain with me and make reference to the accounts &c. sent for from the Record. but, I do not mean to say that they would disregard me when I told them to write small things=the Endorsements &c. which were written by the servants were not all written on one and the same

same day. they were written on different dates. If I told them they will not refuse to write such things.

D 64. Who closed all the Rookoums &c. abovementioned?

A. The Head Muddatgaur Raumanah closed them. that is although I caused them to be prepared by the Volunteer, yet, as it was usual for the Head Muddatgaur to close the Rookoums which were caused by me to be written, he only closed and dated them. but he did nothing more. He told me that lately, when the Deputy Sirstadaur came to Guntoor he asked him whether he had been seeing the business of arzees in arrears, since that time he has ceased to close them.

D 65. You have stated above that the Deputy Shirstadaur did not keep with you suitable Goomastahs who are the Goomastahs in both the Sirsta and Sayer Departments

Departments are there any unfit persons among them to do the business. who are they.?

A. All of them are fit to do the business, but they used to write Rookroons in answer to the arzees sent to them directly, by the Deputy Sirstadaur, and prepare accounts &c. It is not to be observed that they would see the business of arzees. but as I have stated above, they would write fair small Rookroons if I draw out and give Drafts. they would likewise write Endersements if I dictate thus, they would do so much business when occasion calls for it, but they would not confine themselves to the business of arzees as mentioned above. the Goomastahs who see the business of arzees should confine themselves to that business only. the persons who see the business of accounts will confine themselves to the same. as the Head Mudduty acts according to the pleasure of the Deputy sirstadaur, I do not tell any one that he should come and

and see this business. conferring himself to the same. If I tell they will refuse and urge that they are writing accounts &c. but will not attend thus they will do according to the pleasure of the Deputy Sirstadaur.

Q. 66. Do you recollect the circumstances of you and the Aumeens having first intended during the time of Jemanbundy of the Palnaud District for justly 1249. to postpone a large amount, and produced to me an account after my arrival, of my not having approved of that account, of the Aumeens having afterwards reduced a portion and prepared a fresh account, and of my having disapproved of the same, and issued Rookroons to the Aumeens resting on them the responsibility of collecting the amount recoverable, with reference to the resources as exhibited in the anchnawas jambitahs of the after crops.?

A. I will see those

Questions.

Questions. 66. 67. 68.

These have reference to the Semmaur=bundy of Trusly 1249. The Statement of the Deponent is to be Con=trasted with the facts of the case, with the Kyfeyet of the Aumeens and the accounts of proposed postponement as prepared before my arrival in the Palnaud District

those Hookeems and arzees and then I represent. What I recollect is that, for the Semmaubundy for Trusly 49, I went first and remaining four or five days at Goorazal, caused all the Curnums to begin to write ac=counts, and then on account of a ceremony in my House - I came to Guntoor which circumstance I have stated above. By the time I returned, you arrived at Pedugoorala in the Palnaud District where you directed me to go first to Goorazaul for the purpose of getting Cowles prepared soon. Having framed the forms of the Cowles in a concise manner

manner, in your presence went first and caused the Cowles to be prepared by the time you arrived there - You came on the 3rd or 4th day - The Deputy Sirristadaur also came after your arrival - Before your and the Deputy Shiristadars arrival, the circumstance of postponement was not mentioned by any person, the business of writing the Semaw=bundy accounts and Cowles only was being performed. No account whatever relative to the postponement was shewn to me by any person - nor did I mention to any person on the subject, on a day preceding our departure from Goorazaul while I and the Deputy Shirstadaur were sitting down in the Northern Compartment of the Cutcherry House, the Aumeens of Timmer=cottah Tannah & Patchapully Tannah, come with a small paper containing the amount pro=posed to be postponed, but I cannot recollect whether it was on account of the whole Tannah or a Purganah. The Deputy Shirstadaur having seen for himself

himself and shewn it to me, we both then made anger saying Last year a portion was postponed, you have inserted a large amount for this time. It is not proper for you to act thus. afterwards they drew out and brought a memorandum on account of the Two Tannahs again. They did not produce any account whatever shewing the details of the Ryots of each Village. This is what I recollect I will represent after seeing those arzees and Hookooms.

D. 67. The munsiff of the Thinnivelly Tannah came and represented to me at the time of the Jemmabundy for that Fusly, that you had first caused a list to be prepared on account of the post=ponement of a certain portion of Revenue and shewn the same to him, saying, that he and you both should jointly recommend to me for the postponement, that your saying so was very hard for him, that it would be very difficult for him to collect money after you had mentioned such a circumstance, that he had replied to you

you that he could not follow you, and recommend for the postponement of such a large amount, subsequently he reported the same circumstance by an arzee. what do you state in reply to this?

A What arzee is it by which it is said to have been subsequently reported. I have stated above that the Deputy Sirestadar had, before the Report for Fusly 1249 was despatched, caused Hookooms to be issued and sent for arzees. Is that arzee one of them, or is it another.

D. 68. That arzee is the same which came before the Report for Fusly 1249 was despatched, but that arzee came in reply to a Hookoom issued regarding the circumstances which passed before me at the time of the Jemmabundy for Fusly 1249.

it was not sent for by the Deputy Sirestadar, he causing a Hookoom to be issued as stated by you?

A The meaning of the expression the Deputy Sirestadar had caused Hookooms to be issued, and sent for arzees is that, the Hookooms which are caused to be prepared by him will be signed

Signed by you, and despatched according to your order. You have therefore said that, that Rookroom was issued by you. My meaning is that, from the circumstance mentioned by you above, it appears that the Deputy Shirstadaar, had without my knowledge, caused Rookroom to be written in the case of postponement on account of Fusly 1243 & 44 and the same had been despatched with your signature. Consequently I infer that these orders had come thro' the intrigue of the Deputy Sirstadaar. You have now mentioned that the Aumeen of the Tinnivercottah Shannah told you at the very time of the Semanbundy that I had said to him that recommendation for the postponement of a large amount should be made. As it was mentioned in the Rookroom caused to be prepared by the Deputy Sirstadaar that the aumeen had said so at the time of the Semanbundy you would perhaps have inferred that the aumeen had told you in that manner at the time of the Semanbundy but you did not mention to me at that time that the aumeen had represented to you in that manner. Nor did I say to the aumeen

aumeen that we should recommend for postponement. Before the circumstance the aumeen having, at one and at the same time brought and shewn a paper both to me and the Deputy Shirstadaar, and of our having expressed displeasure, took place. No conversation was held between me and him relative to the postponement. If the aumeen had represented to you in that manner, at the time of the Semanbundy you would have called and asked me, and the truth of the fact would have broken out at the very same time. After your honor came for distributing Cowles, the Aumeen having delivered in, to me, the Village accounts which were shewn to me at the time of the Semanbundy for postponement, on account of Fusly 1248, your honor without depending on them, ordered me to write a Rookroom resting on the aumeen themselves the responsibility of collecting the Revenue recoverable, without leaving a Balance & without injuring the Ryot. While this was the case in what occasion would there be for my saying to the Aumeen that we should recommend for the

postponement

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

postponement of such a large amount on account of Fusly 1249. also before your arri:=val, how could I say that we should recom:=mend for the postponement of so much amount, before the circumstance of each individual was known, and without the accounts shewing the ability and inability, resources &c.— If I had said so would you approve of it, would I infer that you would approve of it. It is not a circumstance which took place at all. In my reply in Page 3d of the 15th Sheet in the case of the postponement on account of Fusly 1248, I have mentioned that the Aumeens had inserted in the accounts a small amount for the person who was able, and rather a large amount on account of the person who was destitute, that is, they inserted the full sist to be collected from the person who was fully able, although his produce fell short. a small amount to be postponed on account of the person who was some:==what able, and a large amount to be postponed on account of the person who was altogether

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

altogether unable. This is what I meant.

(Signed) N. Sashagery Rao.
Head Sirstadaur.

Before me this 18th August 1841.

(Signed) I. Goldingham.
Collector.

Investigation held on the 21st August 1841.

D. by. I shall shew you certain Yadoots addressed to you by the Deputy Sirstadar stating his objections on the orders prepared by you in the performance of the current business since the return of all from circuit at the commencement of Fusly 1249. See and state after calling to mind every thing that passed?

The Yadoots referred to here were written by the Sailors in regard to certain Hookrooms prepared by the Head Sirstadaur which were defective. It is not

A. I do not re:=collect to have seen the Sailors regard to these Yadoots. whatever I may say in relation to the current business, the different Servants only say before your honor such

Statement

not necessary to refer to the subject further than to point out how the Deponent leaves the subject of the Question and goes off at some length to the postponement question.

Deponent brings forward a very grave assertion. he says that the order issued for the postponement of Fasly 1248 which he prepared and sent from Innacondah "are not to be seen" in the Diaries, and he adds "I have before once or twice seen them in these Diaries. It is very astonishing that they are not to be found now." That Deponent never saw such order is in the Diaries will be

Statement as they were as taught by the Deputy Sirestadaur, but not the truth. I have already stated that no one would say the truth lest he should lose his service in the event of his declaring contrary to his (Deputy Serestadar's) consent. So in taking a deposition from me, the principal charge brought forward against me is "that I had caused account "of postponement "to be prepared to a "large amount for "fasslies 48 & 49 in Col "Balnaud, and that when "your honor came "for distributing "the Cowles, you were "pleased to deduct a certain "portion from the same, "and caused fresh accounts to be

Remarks of the Collector.

manifest from his own remarks in the next sentence for he says if the orders prepared and sent by me respecting the postponement of that Fasly were not despatched, yet it appears to me that orders in some other way ought to have been dispatched in their stead in due time, but even such other order does not appear in the Diaries," Here he admits the probability that the order as prepared by him might not have been sent and yet in the former sentence he asserts that he had seen that very order "once or twice" in the Diary.

Surely

be prepared "your honor only mention in the Questions the orders said to have been since issued to the Ameens on the above subject as well as the orders said to have been addressed by them in answer thereto, them to me. your honor have been pleased to say that my answer to your English letter respecting the Remembundy accounts of Fasly 48 which I now wanted to peruse, is mislaid, and it is not shewn to me. I requested your honor to.

Surely the public time ought not to be wasted by taking down Deposi= =tions of this Character. The Proceedings might well have closed here.

It may not be improper to state here that no written order were issued to the Auneens relative to the postponement of the Collections of Fusly 1248. The Draft of an order on the subject was prepared by the Head Shirista= =dar but it was worded in such an improper manner that it was determined that a written order should not be sent, my instructions were given to send for the Diaries in order that I might see the Copies of the orders prepared and sent by me from Inna condah for your honors signature, according to the Draft sent to me by the Deputy Sheristadar with re= =ference to your Decision declared at the time of distributing the Cowles respecting the postponement of the said Fusly, but your honor were not pleased to do so on the day I made the request. They were sent for on the following day

given personally on the spot to the Auneens. The Deponent knows all this very well.

day - on my perusing the said Diaries after they were sent for by your honor, those orders are not to be seen. I have before once or twice seen them in these Diaries. It is very astonishing that they are not to be found now. If the orders prepared and sent by me respecting the postponement of that fusly were not dispatched, yet it appears to me that orders in some other way ought to have been dispatched in their stead in due time, but even such order does not appear in the Diaries. I had also despatched an yadost to the Deputy Sheristadar with the above orders. The disappearance of the orders sent up by me in the Diaries, as well as of my answer sent to your honor in English I am induced me to think that my Enemies have committed much fraud in this matter. In regard to the charge brought forward against

me

me by your Questions on the subject of &c
postponement referred to, you have been
pleased to take depositions from certain
other persons- Even they have deposed in
conformity with the intention of the Deputy
Sheristadar, but not the truth- I have
already said that none of the said persons
will set forth the true account at present
should your honor consider the Depositions
of these persons (which were given accord-
-ing to the persuasion of the Deputy Sheris-
tadar) correct, it is to be considered
that no truth has come out but false-
-hood - If there was no fear of the Deputy
Sheristadar my statement would have
been fairly proved by all as true, Even
your honor will on consideration be of
opinion that an order prepared in
some way was dispatched at that
time in relation to the postponement of
the said suit and that the case would
not remain undisposed of without
an order being issued - Thus, your
honor must consider that much
fraud

fraud has occurred in the said subject
in consequence of the Diaries shewing that
no order was issued on that head.-

The Signature of N. Savahagery
Raw. Head Sheristadar-

2d. Did you not see
before me on the 17th.
august the copies of &c
the orders in the Diaries
which were issued to the
Ameens of Salinand District
respecting the postponement
for Fusilies 1248 and 49.-

Read & keep the Collector
Does not call for A. At the time
remark &c.- when your honor
shewed those Diaries
to the Moonshies and
put questions to them,
I perused a certain part
of a Diary which contains the
Orders issued to the Datchapully
Thanah - I have not seen it completely
Inished to peruse the remaining Orders
as well as the argees on that subject, but
Your

your honor said that I may peruse them hereafter, I again requested for them on the 18th. They were not shewn, Consequently, I mentioned to day in my defence the necessity I have to peruse them.-

The Signature of N. Lashagery
Row. Head Sheristadar.

Before me this 21st August 1841.
/Signed/ L Goldingham
Collector

Investigation held on the 25th August 1841.

271. You say that you have before once or twice seen the Copies of the orders in the Diary which were issued to the Ameens of the Palnaud District in relation to the postponement of July 1248. and that the disappearance of them at present induced you to Consider that fraud was committed by your Enemies- Who do as you say has committed fraud and had caused the above orders to disappear from the Diary.-

The

Questions 71-72-73

The fact that no order was issued rests at rest the Question here mooted. But without the fact. Deponent is fully answered by the circumstances of the case- the Diaries are in the hand writing of several writers the numbers all consecutive, and my initials at the close of each day's entry.- There is thus no room from the internal respect to infer fraud; add to this circumstance of the Deputy Moonshy being the Brother inlaw of the Deponent and the further circumstance that if fraud had been practiced, the whole moonshey Depart-ment

A The circumstance of my having prepared and sent the above orders is true - If those orders were not despatched, an order in some other way ought to have been issued on that subject. while this is the case, it does not appear from the Diary shewn to me by your honor that any other order of the above kind was issued- I recollect that certain other circumstances were also mentioned in the orders prepared and sent by me- No one would give credit to the assertion that there has not been

Department must have been of one mind to effect the abject. It is not to be supposed that the whole Department would be tampered with in this way particularly as one of the member was on the look out to observe any thing improper that might occur. This Question has been also discussed in the answer to Question:—

But supposing the whole monshey Department had been of one mind, the circumstance of my initials being at the close of each days Entry is conclusive that the allegations of

been any kind of order issued in relation to the postponement amounting to twenty thousand Rupees. on my considering the circumstance of your honor bringing forward against me a charge relative to the said postponement as well as the disappearance of the above orders in the Diary which were issued on the said Subject, and of my Arzee in English, it occurs to me that the Deputy Sheristadar who framed this Charge might have caused the orders on the subject as

of Deponent are false.

74 Ist stating from me your note informing me at the same time that the English arzee was given to him by your honor is not a particular case. Deponent says that it is not a "particular case" and yet he has urged it as a ground of grand. Whether an English arzee was written to me or not is of no consequence. it is not improbable that one was written and it appears that nothing was in it further than that the Deputy found all "right" whereas all was wrong. If an English arzee was written it must have been torn up by me as these English arzees are never kept unless some particular necessity exists. Whether written or

as well as the said arzee in English to be concealed with the view to support the charge against me.

2.71. I do not recollect that the English arzee addressed by you was given by me to the Deputy Sheristadar. Therefore it cannot be said that the Deputy Sheristadar had done any thing about the said arzee. I shall shew you the Diaries containing the Copies of the orders issued to the dumanees of Dat: chapully and Tinnevelly Tanahs in July 1248. See them. In these Diaries there is the signature of the Examiner at the

Conclusion

or not, or if written and torn up it has no bearing on the Case..

conclusion of every order, the orders bears numbers consecutively - my signature is affixed to the Diary of each day - How do you say that the Deputy Sheristadar has Committed fraud respecting those orders and what enquiry do you wish to be made on that head?

A. Your honor are pleased to say that you had no recollection of the English Arzee addressed by me - having been given to the Deputy Sheristadar - What I know is that your honor and the Deputy Shiristadar came to Dantchapully for the distribution of Cowles four or five days only after I had addressed the said Arzee - on my visiting the Deputy Shirastadar in the Cutcherry he told me that Mr. (Collector) gave me the English Arzee addressed by you in answer to his English note and that he would please the same in the Records together with the said note, if it should be given by me - I therefore gave him the note also - It is astonishing to find the said

said note only without the Arzee addressed by me - I have perused the Diaries of Mookoomo which were shewn by your honor - It is true as your honor says, that there are initials beneath the orders of those who Examined them, numbers, and your initials for the whole of the orders issued as every day respectively, but for the foregoing reasons stated by me, there must be an order issued in that Gooly in relation to the post-ponement and not otherwise - If the orders containing many Circumstances which were pre-pared and sent by me were not approved of, the Deputy Shiristadar would have informed me the reason under which they were not approved and the manner in which fresh orders were issued - He never informed me so - It is stated that the Arzee addressed by me in English is not forthcoming - under these circumstances, as well as from the Charge brought & formed against me not being true - I think that fraud might have been Committed by concealing the orders from the Diary in order to support the said charge - Your honor have been pleased to say that "it is impracticable to commit fraud while there are initials

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

initials of the Examiner beneath each order. In the event of his being prepared to commit such fraud he would not do it himself. The servant whose assistance is required to effect the above fraud being unable to act against his intention, the fraud might have been committed by the aid of such servant. But as I had not seen the fraud when it was committed I cannot say how and by whose assistance and at what time the same was committed. On considering the whole of the foregoing circumstances it is proper to think that fraud may have been committed. your honor have questioned me "what enquiry do you wish to be made in this subject" to which I beg to reply that as none of the servants would say now the truth against the Deputy Shirestadar, and as they are certainly fearful that they would lose their services in the event of their saying contrary to the lessons given by him, the truth will not come out before your honor, although I request that an enquiry may be made.

Q 73. You say that the Deputy Shirestadar had

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

had informed you in the Dautchapully Cutcherry that I delivered to him the English Arzee which was addressed by you to me from Palnaud in Fusly 1248 who heard him say so? you have mentioned also that you had subsequently seen in the Diary the orders issued to the aumeens of the Palnaud District in fusly 1248 respecting the postponement. If you have seen them subsequently the fraud must have been committed since. If fraud was perpetrated in that way, the numbers of the orders would have been altered up to the close of the year or some numbers would be wanting. Are there any such signs in the Diaries or is there any other proof that fraud has been perpetrated?"

A. Your honor questioned me "Who heard the Deputy Shirestadar say with you in the Dautchapully Cutcherry that I delivered to him the English Arzee." This circumstance took place about 30 Months since. His taking from me your note, informing me at the same time that the English arzee was given to him by your honor, is not a particular case. Therefore it is not a matter which demands my recollection of the persons, who were present and heard of the same, moreover it

cannot

cannot be remembered in consideration of the time that has elapsed. Respecting the postponement orders were made out and sent by me about 30 months ago. I have seen them since, but cannot recollect when and on what occasion. With reference to your question that if fraud had taken place subsequently the numbers must have been altered up to the close of the Fusly. I cannot say not being an Eye witness whether the necessary measures were taken to give effect to the fraud without the necessity of altering the whole of the numbers up to the close of the Fusly or in what other manner. As to your question whether signs of fraud exist, I do not think that persons who are able to perpetrate fraud would make such marks of fraud appear in the Book. Therefore the Book does not bear such marks. I have not in my possession any other instances up to this time.

2. 7/4 You say that as this case took place about 30 months ago it has slipped out of your memory. What persons were present when the Deputy Registrar mentioned that your English letter came to his hands, while you [illegible]

a person of good memory have mentioned many circumstances purporting to have taken place between him and you what is the reason of your not recollecting to memory this single point

Does not call for remark

A. I had not sent to him the English note which was addressed to me by your honor up to that time when he came to me with the view to take the same from me he told me that the circumstance of your honor having written to me the said note was understood by him in consequence of your honor having given to his hands my Arzee and so asked & took from me the note too. Consequently I have retained the same in my good memory. It is also to be considered that he must have understood the circumstances of the note being in my possession as you have given to him my Arzee. In respect to keeping in memory who were present and heard the circumstances at that time, it would be impossible for any one to preserve such a recollection in every instance as it is customary among Mostasuedies such as ourselves, to give and receive papers

papers when required.

Q. 75. You say that the Deputy Sheristadar had in his possession the said Arzee and was aware of the note which was accepted before being in your possession and was thus obliged to ask and take the same from you. Were you at that time in the habit of giving him generally the whole of the English notes written to you by me, or have you given the note only abovementioned to be placed in the Records under reason of his having asked for the same.

Remarks of the Court.

Does not call for remark. A. It is customary to give into the Records such notes as are addressed by your Honor after having settled the business therein alluded to. The Deputy Sheristadar was not present when the above note was received by me. I addressed my answer to your Honor & kept the note with me with the view to speak to your Honor who was expected there in 3 or 4 days regarding certain points alluded to. Before speaking to your Honor, he

he asked for the note informing me at the same time that English Arzee was given into his hands, consequently I gave it to him. I had on the very day spoken to your Honor relative to the points above-mentioned.

Q. 76. You allude frequently to the Arzees addressed by you in English. Does it contain any other points besides those already stated by you. Whether you wrote such an Arzee or not what connection is there between that & the present case.

The English Arzee referred to, reported it is stated the preparation of the accounts of postponement. The deponent again admits in the present answer that in the order that were issued, the Ameens were told that they should not pay attention to the accounts presented by them. Thus the Head Sheristadar reported that all was correct by his English Arzee and

A. I mentioned in that Arzee the reasons under which the Ameens were then preparing accounts recommending the postponement of a portion of the Sicut due by certain Ryots in that Taluq. As your Honor was also expected there in 3 or 4 days for distributing Cowles & mentioned in it that your Honor may

and yet orders were issued condemning every thing- may find the truth of the above reasons after your arrival-

If Arzee also contains certain other circumstances accordingly your honor came in 3 or 4 days, and found the truth of the reasons alluded to in the Arzee, and gave orders to make out orders as above mentioned- It was mentioned in those order that they should not pay attention to the Accounts presented by them, and that they should collect without leaving even a single Dub- all the amount that was recoverable without prejudice to the Ryot- From this it will be manifest that the charge which has been brought forward against me is false Viz.t that "Accounts were prepared recommending the postponement of the Collection of a large sum before your honor's arrival for the distribution of the Cowles, and that after your honor's arrival you were pleased to decrease the above amount and cause fresh accounts to be prepared consequently the orders as well as the English Arzee above adverted to have a connection with the present point, but not

not otherwise-

2-77 You have mentioned that you would represent certain circumstances if I would shew you the Arzees addressed in last year by the Auncens of Dantchapully and Timmerottah respecting the postponement of Fasles 1248 and 49- I shall shew you the Arzee No. 58 and 73 addressed by the Dantchapully Auncen and No. 78 by the Auncen of Timmerottah Tanah together with this Enclosures- Peruse them, and say what you have to state-

Remarks upon the Arzees

Questions 77-78

The facts of the case being before the Board the answers to these Questions do not call for much remark- 2-78 When the Dantchapully Auncen was called upon by Yorkoom No. 61 to send up the accounts as they were first prepared he in reply appeared to avoid doing so, but being required by a second order Dr. 7th

I also want to peruse the Diaries which contain Copies of the orders issued regarding these Arzees- Those Diaries are also here- peruse them and state what you have to say- I have perused them- I will first mention about the Dantchapully Tanah It-

transmit-

transmit the accounts they were forwarded accordingly. It is evident from the reply to the first Roobkoom No:58 that the Aumeen wished to keep back the accounts probably because he was particeps criminis as Deponent says that the said account, which is so stated by him to be a fabrication was not shewn to him at the time the Dauchapully Aumeen was sent for and a Kyfeyet was taken from him; from this it will be seen that an abstract Statement of postponement was first prepared and shewn to the Head Sheristadar the same which was laid before me it is also stated by this Aumeen that as this Statement was not

It is mentioned in the order dated 7th October 1840 fusly 1250, issued to the Aumeen of that Zanad that when the Head Sheristadar proceeded for the Summahbundy of Fusly 48, he caused accounts to be prepared recommending a certain portion of the Shist against the Ryots to be postponed, that when the Gentleman [Collector] proceeded thither, he caused fresh Accounts to be prepared, deducting at the same time a certain portion from the above Amount as recoverable, that the Accounts of the said two descriptions were in the

not acted upon, it did not occur to him to forward according to Roobkoom No:61. Both the Dauchapully Aumeen and the late Aumeen of Timmercottah whose Kyfeyets are marked D and E, would not state more than they felt themselves called upon to mention, both however shew that an abstract account for a large amount was at first prepared according to the directions of the Head Sheristadar, and shewn to him, & both state that this Statement was an abstract & not an answer to the Dauchapully Ameen calls it an Estimate, & this the Statement

the Zanah but not received in the Huzzoor Cutcherry and that they together with their abstracts should be sent. In answer to which the Aumeen stated in his Arzee No:56, dated 10th of the same month, that as the resources of the Ryots were known in consequence of all the Estimates of the Cotton crop having been received at the Summahbundy for fusly 48 & Assessment Accounts for each Village were prepared in the first instance, that after the arrival of the Gentleman the accounts which were

Statement of the Deponent
that in Ausawmywar Accounts
for each Village regarding
the postponements were
shewn to him is false-

It is hardly necessary
to state with reference
to the observations of De-
-ponent, that the Accounts
which were sent for were
those at first prepared
under the direction of De-
-ponent- The Ausawmywar
Accounts prepared after
my arrival in the Paulnaud,
were in the Huzzoor & were
not called for in the orders-

Deponent
objects to the
Nuzeen of
Timmercottah, stating
that a certain
sum

were first prepared
were approved that the
said Accounts were
delivered over in the
Huzzoor Cutcherry, while
it was at Pedugoorah
and that he only
forwarded the Abstract
Account as he deemed
it unnecessary to send
Ausawmywar Accounts-
It appears from the
Abstract account
in question, that a
Sum of Rs. 6213-12-10
was entered under the
Head of postponement for
that Fusly in that Ja-
-nah- The Nuzeen's
Statement in that Arze
respecting the postponement
for Fusly 48 is correct- This
corroborates the

Circumstance

sum was reduced
after my Arrival at
Gooroozal as I did not
go to Gooroozal that
year- This Nuzeen
is not the same as the
one in Fusly 1248, be-
-sides the Summabundy
is always held at Goo-
-rooza, a building
having been erected
there for the purpose
the want of water for
so great a multi-
-tude, made me go
to Dautchapully
instead of Goorooza
this could not be known
to the New Nuzeen
and the objection is
unworthy of notice-

Circumstances I have
mentioned in my former Answers
on this subject- The
Accounts presented
after the arrival of
the Gentleman, are the
same that were pre-
-pared & shewn to me
by the Nuzeens before
his arrival- The Ac-
-counts are Ausawmy-
-war Accounts, and
Abstract Accounts-
The one which has
been now sent by
the Nuzeen is the
copy of the Abstract
Account presented
at that time- The
Ausawmywary Ac-
-counts as well as
abstracts, which were pre-
-sented at that time, are in
the Huzzoor While this is the case,
it

15833 Fort St George 11th November 1841.

it was mentioned in the order No 61 issued to him, that the Head Sheristadar first caused certain Accounts to be prepared, that after your Honor's arrival, you were pleased to deduct a certain portion out of that Amount, and thus caused fresh Accounts to be prepared, and that the accounts of the said two Descriptions remained in the Zanah but not in the Huzzoor All the Statement is totally false, fabricated by the Deputy Sheristadar but is not correct. The Amount recommended to be postponed is Rupees 6,213-12-10 according to the Abstract accounts sent by the Sumeen with the said Arzee, as well as to the Ausawmywary Abstract Statements which were prepared by the Sumeens during the Summahbundy of that Gudy & presented after the arrival of the Gentleman. It was directed that he should not pay attention to the said Accounts, & that collections should be made out of the Amount in question as far as practicable without prejudice to the Ryot consequently a sum of Rs 137-10-1 was collected out of the above Amount within the Gudy 48. A

15834 Fort St George 11th November 1841.

A sum of Rupees 164-2-10 is still outstanding out of the amount determined to be collected according to the said accounts. This is the circumstance that actually took place. Although the Sumeen mentioned a true account in the said Arzee yet in the order No 71. issued again to the Sumeen under date the 21st October it is mentioned that the contents of that arzee are not correct, that your Honor had a distinct recollection of having fixed a certain portion as recoverable out of the amount recommended to be postponed in the first instance and that he should therefore remember and look for the accounts with attention and report the true account in two days, forwarding at the same time the required accounts while the Sumeen forwarded a true account with his Arzee, a fresh order as above said having been issued with false words it is to be inferred that the Deputy Sheristadar has caused these two orders to be issued with the view to send for an Account to shew that the Head Sheristadar had caused certain accounts

accounts to be prepared recommend-
=ing the postponement of a certain
amount over and above the sum of Rupees
6,213-12-10. beforementioned, but the
contents of this order are not true. From
the style of this order it is to be inferred
that the Deputy Seristadar had also
given a hint privately to the Ameen
for the purpose of sending an account
shewing a large sum of Money. In the
Arzee No. 73. dated 26th October which
was sent by the Ameen in answer
to the second order, it is stated that
he has on the receipt of the second
order in question recollected the past
circumstances, that it having come
to his recollection that a certain
account was made out in the first
instance during the Jamabundy
he has caused a search to be
made among rough Papers and
Duftors and found a rough State-
=ment for Rupees 8,660 – for fusly
48, and that he now forwarded
the same after having copied
it out fair. Thus he forwarded a Statement

for

for Rupees 8860 shewing only the total
amount of each Village. During the
time of the Jamaabundy they shewed to
me Ausawmyawary Accounts for each
Village regarding the postponement.
They never shewed me an abstract
Statement of the above description
which do not exhibit the Ausawmy-
=war details. Even in the Arzee sub-
=mitted by the Ameen it is not
mentioned that the abstract
Statement was shewn to me. There
seems no occasion even for the
Ameen to make out and keep
with him an abstract State-
=ment of the above nature. For in
proposing a postponement it
ought to be known in the first
instance what is the list, the re-
=sources and the condition of each
Ryot and then fix the postpone-
=ment according to their circum-
=stances respectively. After having
finished the Ausawmyawary accounts
in this manner the total amount
for each Village can be known. Abstract
Statement cannot be prepared
without an Ausawmyawary
Account

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

account of the Village - an abstract of the above description is not useful when the Collections are to be made - under these reasons, I cannot belive that even the Ameen had made out this Statement during the Jemmanbundy and kept the same with him - I imagine that the ameen has fabricated and forwarded the above Statement for a large Sum of money Viz.t Rupees 8660 - without shewing the Assawny-wary details - Either from his having construed from the style of the second order that a Statement for a large Sum is required, or from his having privately received a hint from the Deputy Sirstadar to that effect - On referring to the Book which contains the orders issued to the Timmercottah Tannah, it appears that an order No. 66 was also issued to that ameen in the same way as to the Ameen of Dauletchapully Tannah - In that order too, it is mentioned that the Head Sirstadar first caused certain accounts of postponement to be prepared, and that your honor when arrived there, was pleased to

decrease

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

decrease a certain portion of the above amount and thus caused fresh accounts to be prepared - But this ameen instead of making a true report as the Ameen of Dauletchapully did in his first arzee, he stated in his arzee No. 78 dated 10th October, that it seems that the Head Sirstadar had first caused accounts of postponement to the amount of Rupees 2,6473-5-4 according to the request of the Curnam Vecca that your honor and the Deputy Sirstadar having since arrived, revoked the above accounts and fixed a sum of Rs. 9655-11-8 as recoverable out of the above amount, causing at the same time accounts to be prepared for Rupees 16818-4-8 that he was not the person who then managed these affairs that the Records dont exhibit detailed information and that he had forwarded the Statement of postponement which the Headsirstadar first caused to be prepared, having entered on the same as far as practicable the amount determined by your honor together with increase and decrease - Thus he forwarded a Statement to corroborate the foregoing circumstances - Even this Statement exhibits only the total amount of each Village - The ameen acknowledged in his own arzee that the records do not exhibit much information for the same - Consequently it is to be

determined

Fort St. George 11. November 1841.

to be postponed for that Taunah is Rupees 16,818-4-8 according to the Awsawmyneerry accounts which were shewn to me by the Aumeen before your honor's arrival and presented to your honor at Padoogooral and which are still remaining in the Buzzoor. When your Honor received those accounts you were pleased to issue orders directing to make collections as far as practicable without pre= judice to the Ryots and without paying attention to the above accounts Therefore a sum of Rupees 226-1-3 out of the abovementioned amount Viz Rupees 16,818-4-8 was so collected within that fusly but not any more. Moreover a sum of Rupees 1281-6-1. is outstanding out of the amount fixed

Fort St. George 11. November 1841.

fixed as recoverable for the Taunah. The total amount proposed to be postponed for these two Taunahs is Rupees 23,032-1-6 according to the accounts prepared before your honor's arrival and presented at Padoogooral since your arrival. Out of the amount in question a sum of Rupees 363-11-4 only was collected within that fusly but not any more. Even in the sum entered in those accounts as recoverable Rupees 1,145-8-11. are outstanding. While circumstances in reality thus took place, abstract Statements were called for from the Aumeens to shew that the Head Seristadar had first caused accounts of Postponement to be prepared for a large sum during the Jamaubundy (Viz.) Rupees 26,473-5-4 for Timmercottah Taunah

Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

Tannah and Rupees 8,660- for Dantchapully Tannah, making in the aggregate Rupees 35,133- 5- 4. and that your honor deducted therefrom Rupees 12,101- 3- 10. and caused fresh accounts to be made out for Rupees 23,032- 1- 6- From this, it is to be considered that the Deputy Seristadar had with an intention to bring forward against me a charge of my having entered under the Head of Postponements of

J.B.

Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

of Rupees 12,000 and odd which was recovarable and orders to be issued in the above manner, besides giving a hint privately, and tho' intrigue, sent for the said Statement to that end, but these accounts are not to be considered as genuine-

The signature of N Sashaghery Row. Head Sirestadar - Before me this 25th August 1841.

(Signed) J. Goldingham.
Collector,

Investigation on 26th August 1841-

Q. 79. Relate what you have still to state in reply to yesterday's Question?

This refers to the attempt at Postponement for Fusly 1219. The "facts" of the case with the statements of the Amuens and Motasuddies are before the Board. Further remarks appear Unnecessary

A. As you shewed me the Hookoom issued to the Amuens as well as the arguments addressed by them in Fusly 50. Relative to the postponement on account of Fusles 1218- and

and 1249. I represented the circumstances which I had to represent yesterday relative to the Case of Fusly 48. In the Case of postponement on account of Fusly 49. I have already represented that before your arrival, I remained there but for a few days, that the circumstance of postponement was not mentioned to me at that time, that after your honor and the Deputy Sirstadar had arrived, while I and the Deputy Shirstadar were sitting down, the Aumeen came with a paper shewing a Certain amount to be postponed, and shewed it to us we both expressed our displeasure saying that so large an amount to be postponed was not necessary on account of that Fusly. and I recollect that a Memorandum was drawn out and given in by them, shewing an Estimated amount to be postponed. In the Hookum Nº 61. issued to the Aumeen of the Dantchypalley Shannak in Fusly 50. it is stated that I had caused accounts to be prepared proposing to postpone a certain Amount also in the Semanbundy of Fusly 49 - that your honor had reduced a portion

portion in that amount and Caused fresh accounts to be drawn out, and that those 2 accounts should be forwarded. — I did not Cause accounts to be written in that Manner at all nor was it mentioned in the Arzee addressed by the Aumeen in reply thereto that I had caused an account to be drawn out, or that he had shewn a certain account to me in that Case. He /the Aumeen/ mentioned in it that "by the time of the Semanbundy for that Fusly, the Anchada "of the Cotton produce not having been "received, it was inconvenient for him to "write the individual account, that consequently he caused first an Estimated "account to be drawn out, shewing the "Total amount of each Village, and that "after your arrival, he having reduced "650 Rupees in the amount of Rupees 5,980 exhibited in the account in question, drew out and "delivered in a fresh account, and he accordingly "sent those two accounts." From the above Cited expressions, it appears that the very same account exhibiting

exhibiting the amount of Rupees 5,980 was brought and shewn to us, while I and the Deputy Sheristadar were both sitting down, as I have stated above, and that after we both had expressed our anger, a fresh account exhibiting Rupees 5,300./ Rupees 680 being reduced./ was drawn out and shewn to us. At that time, that is after we both had expressed our displeasure I obtained a Memorandum with reference to the account written by the Auneen, making a reduction In that account also, the amount of Rupees 5,300 was inserted on account of the Datchapullay Thannah Consequently the expressions made by this Auneen in this argee on the subject, should be considered true both the Estimate which was first shewn in that Instly and that which was afterwards drawn out making a reduction, were at one and the same time shewn to me and the Deputy sirstadaur, but this circumstance was not mentioned to me previous thereto. Al= =though the Auneen stated the truth in this

manner

Manner in reply to the Hookoom first issued, yet thereupon a further Hookoom No. 77. was issued stating that "you having proposed to "postpone a larger amount than Rupees 5980. "I recollect that a larger amount than "Rupees 680 was reduced, you should fully "recollect and report on the same." These expressions intended to show that Submitting an Account Shewing a large amount was Necessary, whether from this or whether by the hint privately given by the Deputy sirstadaur, the Auneen submitted a Villages =war statement for the Rupees 8,100 with the Argee No. 73 addressed in answer to this Hookoom, he also stated in the said Argee that he recollected that a statement in same way was first prepared at the time of the Seman= =bundy, and that on searching the Duftar of scraps of papers, the paper Shewing the amount of Rupees 8,100 was found, and that Consequent= =ly he had caused it to be

written

written fair, and transmitted. In the Hookoom, which was sent from hence, it was mentioned that an account shewing a large Amount was shewn to your honor at that time. If it had been so, shewn to you, the Aumeen would have shewn an account written fair. If your honor had reduced a large portion in that amount and Caused a fresh account to be drawn out, the Aumeen would at that very same time have delivered in those two accounts. Moreover regular Copies of these would have been in the posession of the Aumeen. But there would be no occasion that the statement exhibiting a large amount which was shewn to your honor should remain in the Duffter of Scraps of paper instead of in the regular Duffters. From all these circumstances, it must be inferred that the expressions made by the Aumeen in this second

second arzee are not true, and that although the truth was mentioned in the first arzee, yet on further Hookoom having been issued requiring a statement exhibitining a large amount, a fresh statement was invented and submitted shewing an Amount of Rupees 8,100. It must be inferred that, in order to corroborate the accusation brought forward against me that I had caused an account to be drawn out shewing a large amount to be postponed in the Jemaubundy, the Deputy Sirstadaur had Caused the second Hookoom to be issued, and had also hinted to him privately, and that the Aumeen had Consequently fabricated and submitted the Statement for Rupees 8100, but I have never seen such a Statement as this, nor is it mentioned by the Aumeen in his arzee that the same was shewn to me. In the Hookoom No. 64 dated 7th October issued to the Aumeen of the Simmercottah Tannah in Fusly 50 on account of Fusly 1249, it is stated that at the

the time of the Jemaubundy, I had caused certain accounts to be prepared on account of postponement, that you having been informed by him, that is by the Auneen, that the postponement of so large an amount was unnecessary reduced a portion in the same, that a Memorandum should be drawn out and submitted, shewing the amount proposed by me to be postponed as exhibited in the account which was first caused by me to be written, as well as the amount which was fixed by your honor to be realized, and that the accounts which were at that time caused to be prepared should also be submitted. If I had first caused certain accounts to be drawn out and if your honor had reduced a portion in the same and caused fresh accounts to be written as stated in this Hookoom, those two accounts would at the very same time have been delivered into

into the Huzzoor, Moreover you would have argued with me and ascertained on what grounds the account said to have been caused to be first written was drawn out, without shewing the individuals in detail - the accounts particular with reference to which the reduction was made by you would have been delivered into the Huzzoor If the circumstance of an account having been caused to be first drawn out irregularly shewing a large amount and of your having discovered it & reduced the same had taken place, there would be no occasion why those accounts should not have been received at the very same time, and to issue the Hookoom in question to the Auneen in Fusly 50 directing him to submit the said accounts. Consequently it is to be inferred that the Circumstance of my having first caused accounts to be drawn out on account of Postponement in that Fusly

14

is false, and that the Deputy Sirstadar, in order to support the Charge brought forward against me, had Caused his sentiments to be written in the abovementioned Hoo=kroom for the purpose of an account being prepared and submitted by the Aumeen, as if it had been caused by me to be drawn out at the Jemaun=bundey. In the Arzee No. 78. dated 16th October addressed by the Aumeen in reply to this Hookroom letter, it is stated that, in June 1839. the Cummums &c had requested me to postpone a large portion of their sist, that I had prepared in person a Draft statement for Rupees 12818= with some intent or other, that he had repaired to the place where the Jemaunbundey was going on, from the Western Villages, that I had shewn to him the account in question, and said to him that we should Jointly recom=mend to the Gentleman to postpone so much a= Amount, that I had yielded to the instigation of the Cummums &c and had acted thus, that

that he being a very regular person, had= Considered this a bold step and irregular, and particularly informed the Cummums &c= of the same, that after your arrival he had made a representation to you, and the Deputy Sirstadar and reduced Rupees 5,234 in the Statement said to have been caused by me to be drawn out, and that a Statement= was prepared in your presence, shewing the amount of Rupees 7,584 to be postponed, and in accordance with this, he sub=mitted a statement which shewed only the Villagemar total, and not the indivi=duals in detail. If I had held such a Conversation with this Aumeen, I would have conversed with the Aumeen of= Datchapully Thannah also, in the same manner. but he did not mention in his arzee that such a Conversation took place. This aumeen (viz.) the aumeen of Pinnur cottah, alone having written in this manner, it is to be inferred that a hint has= been given privately by the Deputy

Sirstadar

Sirstadaur, and the above Hookoom having
contained leading expressions, he /the Aumeen
of Tinnnur cottah Sanah./ being his—
/Deputy Sirstadar's/ close friend, had, for
the pleasure of the Deputy Sirstadaur, invent=
=ed and Mentioned such words in his arzee
in support of the Complaint brought forward
against me by him, and that in accordance
with the same he also sent a Statement.
but Neither are those expressions nor the
statement genuine. Without the details of
the individuals, and without seeing the sist'
resources, &c^a of each individual, on what
ground could I cause this Statement to be
prepared? If I had caused such a groundless
Statement to be prepared, and recommended
your Honor for postponement in that manner,
how would you admit it—what reasons
had I to assign for the objections you—
would make to My Causing this State=
=ment to be drawn out? I have dictated
above, that I had remained there but a
few

few days, during the Semaubundy of that
Fusly before your arrival. At that time,
Neither the aumeens Nor Carnums &c^a—
Mentioned to me the circumstance of—
postponement. If the expressions made by
this aumeen in this arzee are true, I am
guilty of postponing Rupees 5,234 out of
the revenue recoverable by the Circaur.
If you had been given to understand
by the Aumeen at that time that this
Crime was Committed by me as stated
by him, would you have remained quite
without duly examining me at that time,
would you suffer such an act? you
Must therefore infer that the expressions
made by this aumeen are not true at all,
and that they were invented & Mentioned
at the hint of the Deputy Sirstadar - In the
statement which was sent by him /Aumeen/
it is stated that a statement was first Caused
to be drawn out for Rupees 12,818. and that af=
=terwards that amount was reduced to Rupees
7,584. I beg to represent that, after the Semaubundy
was

was over, he / Auneen / and the auneen of the Dautchapully, shewed ab one and the same time, a paper to me, and the Deputy Sirstadaur before our departure from thence, after we both had expressed our displeasure as stated above, he / the Auneen / himself reduced the amount to Rupees 7,584 - also in the Memorandaum then obtained by me, the same amount of Rupees 7,584 was inserted on account of this Shaunah - This is all, I did not see previous thereto, either the statement exhibiting a large amount, or other account of postponement - Nothing was mentioned to me on the subject -

Q. 80. You have stated above that, the appointments and dismissals having taken place thro' the means of the Deputy Shirstadaur, his authority has been in force, and that all the servants are afraid of him - In these Cases, I have fully Considered and acted as I thought proper, and

and did not leave them to others. further in all these Cases, Enoyetnaumaks have been issued to you - did you find irregularity in any one Case?

A: You have Mentioned that you had fully Considered and acted as was proper, - relative to the appointments and dismissals, but these things have been performed thro' his means - In Case where New persons are to be appointed, you are appointing those persons only whom he would recommend, but not otherwise, at any time, I only understand that he makes recommendation

Questions 80, 81.

It will be seen that, the Deponent would not meet the Question till it was repeated, when he answered that he did not "recollect" that any improper appointment had been made -

The Style of the Deponents answer, and the expression of his opinion that he does not know whether in cases of

of appointments "the propriety" or "impropriety" of the recommendations was duly Considered by me, will not fail to attract the attention of the Board.— Deponent was required to point out an improper appointment, he acknowledges— that he is unable to do, but falls in to this improper style of expressing himself. His defence Consists of denial of everything, refusal to meet the questions put, accusation of others, and an improper tone of address towards the Collector—

recommendation to you, and your honor makes appointments, but I know nothing of your having examined into the propriety and impropriety of the persons recommended by him, you have stated that Enquetnamahs have been issued to me. These Enquetnamahs simply state that such persons are desirous and such persons are appointed, and to mention the same in the Baramds and nothing moreowhenever you Made appointments you have never asked Me whether such a person is fit for such a situation"

you

you have asked in your question, if irregularity has taken place in such appointments, It has been going on for 3 or 4 years past— if you ask me now what irregularity has taken place in each case what can I reply? If you ask me when the proper time comes, I may ascertain the necessary circumstances and state the same what shall I state now? Altho' I have received Enquetnamahs and objections occurred to me in Cases of appointments and Dismissals, yet, on considering the favor which you have towards the Deputy shirstadar, I have inferred that my directly objecting to the business done by him would become the cause of my being injured, and that you would not admit that objection Nobody will think that you will admit if I make objection/ If I should some times make such objection, the other servants also will support his word as all the affairs are managed by him but

but the objection will not stand I
therefore have never spoken against him—
2. 81. The above question will again
be put to you— Has any irregularity taken
place in Cases of appointments and dis-
-missals or not?—

A. I do not recollect Now—

2. 82. How many Mootasuddies are there in
the Departments of Sirstah, Sayer &c
under your command at the Huzzoor?

A— In the Land Revenue Department
there are Somayauzoola Soobbiah
Cauze Lingiah, Caleanum Hanoomuntarow,
Mungoo Kristna Row, Ganagam
Jauneky Ramoodoo and D: Ven
-catarow. The servants attached
to the Mulrauze Estate are Yatoory
Coliah, and Poottagoonta Soobiah
under the situation of the Head assist-
-ant Sirstadar the Head Muddutgar
Pauja Raumaunah, & Potarauze Rama
-swamy. In the Sayer Department, the
Pay of the Pushcaur, is paid to the
Deputy Sirstadaur, besides him, there

are

are Seventeenurty Lastrooloo, Copultey
Autiah, Cadavacondoor Bhagavuntarow
and Numboory Raumiah. Govaravapoo
Lutchmeursoo Ingoova Venieta Kristna
-mah. Chitta Sambiah, and Akkama
-pragada Lutchmiah, are attached to the
Estates made over to the Zemindars—
In the Salt Department, there
are Edoopoodoory Chinea Raumaunah
Puntooloo the Head Mootasuddy.
and Goondemada Vencatasem, in
the Moturpha Department, there
are Ghanagam Ramachendrooloo
and Gandecherla Casavarow, Soma
-yauzoola Soobiah has hitherto been
looking after the Road business
Now he has been removed to Condaveed,
Cauza Lingiah has been looking after
the business of the Kristna Canals.
Sambiah looks to the business
of the Tonga Bhadra Channels, Yatoory
Coliah has been doing business
with the Aumeen of the Rau
-choor, Jaunah, and with the

Deputy

Deputy Sirstadars, whenever required. —
Poottagoontee Soobiah is not a pen-
man, he consequently is used to go
on other affairs according to your orde
the Head Muddutgars take busines —
from the others according to the pleasure
of the deputy Shirstadaur. Relative
to the point of their acting according
to my pleasure, I have already stated —
in my above answer. Consequently, it is
unnecessary to mention it here.

2. 83. The Deputy Shirstadar was on
Circuit in last fusly from December to
July, during that time what particular
persons of the said Mootasaddies were
with him?

(Questions 82. 83. 84. —

A. I do not recollect now
the details, what particu-
lar Persons went —
/with him/ and at
what particular times
altho' the Deputy Sir-
stadaur is in Circuit
and some of the other
Mootasuddies

It will
be apparent
from what has
been stated else-
where, and from
the Deponents own
admission

admission in the —
answer to a previous
Question that all
the Moottasaddies
are obedient to him
The principal Go
-mastahs are at
the Kuzzoor, —
and attended to
the orders of the
Nail in regard
to the prepara-
-tion of Accounts
&c. purely because
of the inability of
the Head Shersta-
-daur to transact
these duties. all the
business of the
Shirstah Depart-
-ment has fallen
upon the Nail —
the Head Shir
-tadaur failed

Mootasuddies remain —
with me, yet the —
Head Muddutgars —
take business from
each of the Goomas
-tahs according to
the pleasure of the
Deputy Sirstadaur —
They transact the
usual Current bu-
-siness in accordance
to my Command al-
-so, but as it is im-
-portant to them —
that they should
act according to the
pleasure of the —
Deputy Sirstadaur,
they do not see the
business which I —
may direct them —
to do in contradiction
to his opinion.

Q. 84. Now have stated
above.

in the Current
business, and I
was obliged to
make the Nail
take it up, the
same as regards
the preparation
of Accounts, and
other branches
of duty in that
Department. It
has been too
=much for one
person to per
=form, and so
much inconve
=nience has
been experienced
in consequence.

above, that you have
never had concern
at all in the Cases of
appointments and
dismissals. In these
cases some of the
Minorandums drawn
out in your hand
writing bearing your
signature will be
shewn to you, you should
see them, whereas it
appears from theses
that you had con
=cern, how did you say
as above?

A. When you appoint
=ed me Head Sirs
=daur, you ordered me
to conduct every busi
=ness in conjunction
with the Deputy
Shirstadaur - a few days
passed in that
Manner,

manner, afterwards, this practice discon
tinued, this circumstance, I have
stated in a reply above, I yadost which
bears my signature and which was
closed by him, dated 8th December
1838, Draft drawn out in my hand
writing, and another Draft Drawn
out both in my and his hand writ
ing during the short time, that is
the time during which every business
was conducted jointly both by my=
self and him, are shewn to me. These
are the Papers drawn out in the
curse of one or two Months after
I was appointed during this short
period, I was Concerned, subsequently
it has not passed so

(Signed) N. Sashagery Row.
Head Sirstadaur.

Before me this 26th August 1841.
(Signed) J. Goldingham
Collector

Investigation held on this 27th
August 1841.

2.

2.85. You have in many places mentioned that the Aumens in the Palnaud District submitted, last year, the statements and Arzees respecting the postponement for fuslees 1248 and 49 in accordance to the hint given privately by the Deputy Shirstadar. Do you say yourself that such a hint was given by him or are there any other proofs.

Remarks of the Collector

Question 85. Answer In fusly 1250. This has been already stating that the accounts referred to exhibit what actually occurred and as the evidences shewn, there has been no fabrication the "private hint" alluded to by the Deponent has no grounds to rest upon. orders were issued disposed of elsewhere Head Sirstadaur caused certain accounts of postponement to be prepared for a large sum of Money that the Collector, when he arrived there, deducted a certain portion of the above amount and caused fresh accounts

Accounts to be prepared, and that the said accounts of two descriptions should be sent. But, this is not the case which actually passed, certain circumstances, which in fact did not take place were mentioned in the orders as if they had really occurred. Whereupon, the Aumeens of Dautchapully Sannah addressed an Arzee reporting that there were no accounts prepared in two different ways, and that the only accounts which were prepared by them before the arrival of the Collector were presented after his arrival. Notwithstanding which, an order was given issued with reference to the same circumstances, alluded to in the first order. The Aumeen then submitted an abstract statement which does not exhibit the aforementioned details, stating at the same time, that it was found among rough paper. The Ameen of Simmer Cottah Sannah, had on the

the receipt of the first orden above mentioned untrue circumstances in his arzee that the Head Sirstadaur caused Certain accounts to be prepared for the postponement of Rupees 26,000 and odd and that the Records will not afford any detailed information on that Head, and thus he forwarded an abstract Statement for twenty six thousand Rupees and odd. On bringing the whole of the foregoing Circumstances into Consideration it appears that, unless there had been a private hint there would be no occasion at all either to mention in the arzee the Circumstances which did not really take place, or to submit abstract Statements under pretence of their having been found among rough papers elsewhere. I am therefore of opinion that the abstract Statements were fabricated and sent as above mentioned. Merely at the hint given privately by the Deputy Shirstadaur, who caused orders

orders to be issued, mentioning circumstances, which had not occurred as if they had really taken place.

2. 86 You have stated above, that, you would peruse the accounts which accompanied the Demarcundy Report for Fusly 1249. and then say whether or not there are any irregular items. Have you perused the above Accounts and are there any irregular items or not?

A. What is the meaning for the word "Irregular items?"

2. 87 "Items contrary to that which is regular are irregular."

A. My meaning is that there is dry Calculation under Question 86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93- The difficulty Demarcundy. of getting Depos- -ition besides Mettas. -ent to meet the Mustakeens Question will be entered in the Cowles apparent. regularly - There is Demarcundy & Depiment. Mettas, besides that entered

Deponent signed the Semaubundy Accounts for Fusly 1249. as Head Sirs-tadar, as he has stated that he was not consulted in the preparation of the Semaubun-dy Report &c for Fusly 1249. he was asked if any irregular items were in the Accounts which had &c passed his sig-nature. Two items which are men-tioned by him as irregular de-serve Notice 1st. Revenue from lands not included in

entered regularly in the Cowles &c Shere are certain Items of rice Lands having been Cultivated with Dry Crops when rice Lands were not cultivated to the full extent. There is an item of Go-vernment Share on Crops Cultivat-ed in the beds of Tanks. Does your meaning apply to such as these items, or what others. There are accounts of lands bearing a favorable Sist There is a Head "Deduct on account of

in the afsets of the permanent Settle-ment, and 2nd &c the noncollection of the full amount of Quit rent on Ag-grahanums &c the former it is stated by Deponent, has not hitherto been carried to the cre-dit of Government, and in regard &c to the latter, the accompanying &c Statement will shew that the &c amount of Quit rent outstanding has been larger in former Fusties than in Fusly 1249 It is not &c quite clear what inference

of lands in which Crops failed entirely but there has been no custom here to grant remission on that account. If your honor &c please to say what meaning your Ques-tion involves I will represent the &c same.

2. 88. If it appears to you that any item was irregular-ly entered in the Accounts, that ac-companied the &c above report state the same. &

A. I will peruse them accordingly and represent &c

2. 89. Have you not perused

inference Deponent wishes to be drawn from his not being consulted in the preparation of the Jemabundy Report. It will be quite clear from his answers that he does not know what are in the Accounts, nor how to deal with the respective items when known.

perused them up to this time?

A. I have perused the Accounts belonging to the Zemindary Estates there are items of fruit Trees, of Topes, Fazul vaysool. Yes In my opinion that Topes belong to those lands which were deducted at the time of forming the permanent settlement, and that that item is irregular.

Q. 90. You must answer my Question. there is no need for you to question me, therefore you must give answer to the above question?

A.

A. The Tanks and Tamarind Topes which were at the time of forming the permanent Settlement having been deducted at that time the Zemindar has no concern in the Collections made on account of such Tamarind Topes and lands in the beds of Tanks. It may therefore be said that those items are irregular.

Q. 91. Are there any other irregular items or not?

A. Discharging the sists against Monoorthees, Aggraharums yes with punctuality in each year is regular. In the Accounts regarding the Malrauze zemindary, there are items of arrears for many years against such lands as abovementioned.

Q. 92. Is this all or are there any other irregular items.

A. These are the items which occur.

occur to me. The other items are in conformity with the custom observed here.

The signature of
N. Shashagherry Row
Head Sirstadaur.

Before me this 27th August 1844.

[Signed] J. Goldingham
Collector.

Investigation held on the 3d September 1844.

Q. 93. You have stated in your answer abovementioned that it is irregular to carry to the Zemindary Estate the Collections made on account of Crops sown in the bed of Tanks, and of Tamarind Topes which were deducted from the Permanent assessment. Did you ascertain in what Villages there were Crops in the beds of Tanks, and in what Villages there are Tamarind Topes, and what Tanks and Tamarind

Topes

Topes out of these were deducted during the formation of the permanent Settlement, and what were subsequently constructed or planted?

A. As the Tanks &c. which stood previously were deducted at the time of forming the permanent Settlement, it is true that the Zemindars have no concern with the produce yielded in those lands: on the contrary, however the produce yielded in the beds of Tanks and in the Tamarind Topes in many places has been always appropriated by the Zemindars, but none of the Collectors had taken notice of it, since your honor's arrival, you were pleased to issue orders that the said Branches of Revenue belonged to Government, some of the ameens attached certain branches (Tanks &c.), but in many places they are appropriated by the

Zemindars

Zemindars according to the prevailing usage - you have questioned me whether I have ascertained the number of those that stood up to the time of forming the permanent Settlement as well as the Number of those subsequently originated, To find out the said information, I do not perceive that there were any Records in this office, shewing that such and such Sanks and Sopes respectively were in existence at the date of the permanent Settlement - I cannot say whether, the above details would come out in the event of making a long enquiry, but such enquiry was not ever ordered by any of the Collectors up to this time. With respect to your remark that I have stated such items as above described to be irregular, I beg to represent that, you have

have first questioned me whether there are any irregular items in the Accounts which were sent up to the Board: there would be no occasion to insert irregular items in them: your honor repeated the said inquestion - as I have therefore thought that your honor Questioned me, supposing the items of the above description to be irregular, and as the items which were excluded from the permanent settlement, have no Concern to the Zemindary, I mentioned the above items These items have been always carried to the accounts of the Zemindaur according to custom, but they were not irregularly entered in the above accounts Contrary to the prevailing Custom.

2. 94. On referring to you the Arzees presented by Palvoy Kristnarow since his dismissal from his situation of Choukey Goomastah at Peddacorrpaud, which took place in

in consideration of the proofs alluded to in the Arzee of the Aumeen of that Tannah respecting the irregularities committed by him in discharging the said Duty as well as of certain irregularities Committed by him formerly while he was employed in different other situations. you brought them into your consideration, and thus addressed an Yadost to the Head Moonshey under date the 9th October 1839, stating that he may be re employed, and that the same should be reported to me again on my returing to you the said Yadost mentioning at the bottom of the same that you should peruse the whole of the Record in the case, and that the actual circumstances will be known if attention is paid. accordingly you addressed another yadost dated 30th October 1839, stating that you had also perused the Records respecting

G.B.

respecting the irregularities committed by him while he was employed in Ellepara chowkey, and that he may be reemployed you did not make any allusion in the said two Yadosts to the Arzee No. 89. addressed by the Aumeen of Peddacoorapaud Tannah, in which it is mentioned that while he (P. Kristnarow) was employed in the Peddacoorapaud Chowkey he inserted a certain item in the Chittah in one way and in the Rowanahs in other way, embezzling at the same time a certain sum of Money without bringing the same to account, and certain proofs with the Rawanahs, were also alluded to in the said Arzee. While I had plainly mentioned that you should go through the whole Record what made you to conceal from the said Arzee which contains the principal point of speculation. I shall shew you now the said two yadosts and the Arzee, Peruse them and say.

A. If I am allowed to peruse the order issued regarding his

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

his dismissal I will give my answer
to the above question.-
2.95. Here is the Diary which
contains the copy of the required order
Peruse it and say.
Questions-94-95-96-97-
98-99-100-101-102-

This subject A. It appears
as regard the Deponent, that an order co
may be briefly disposed No. 38 was issued
of Paulvoy Christnaw to the Aumeen co
=rcw's application for dismissing this
re-employment was individual / 8
referred to the De= Christnarow / from
=ponent, in order Service on the
that he might go over 23d May 1839. when
the whole of the case his Petition was re=
and see whether this= ferred to me, I sent
Person had been guilty for the order of his
or not of misappro= dismissal and
=priating the Sayer having perceived
Collections. Depo= from it that
=nent reported his dismissal was
by yadost under grounded on
date 9th October 1839, the arzees. as
that
No.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

that P. Christnarow No. 65. 66. & 80 addressed
might be re-employed, by the aumeen of
this yadost was sent Coorapaud Tannah,
back to Deponent as well as on their
and he was directed enclosures, I perused
by my note at the the whole of the Records
foot of the yadost alluded to in the
to peruse the whole said order, and
Record and to report addressed the co
again. He had made yadost dated 9th
no allusion to arzee October 1839 to the
No. 89. 5th June on Head Moonshy-
1839. and the case With respect to the
was, therefore, refer= allusion made in
=red again to him, the order of dismis=
but in doing so, =sal that he recei=
this arzee No. =lated certain co=
89 was not speci=number of Dabs
=fically pointed out, out of the amount
Deponent reported collected on ac=
again under date =count of duty,
30th October stating there is no other
that he had a evidence in its
gone favor

gone over the Collepara favor except that
case, and that the in- of the Peon named
dividual might be Soryoodoo, who co
re-employed. In this brought forward
he again pafsed the complaint co
over the sub- nected
sequent Case, Arzee against him before
No. 89, and admitted the Auneen, conse-
to the former or quently I mention-
Collepara case, it ed my opinion in
was manifest at the Yadast that
the time that he there was no prof
wished to make in that case, that
a report in favor his remaining with
of K. P. Kistnarow out service 4 co
is now stated by Months up to that
Deponent that he time is a sufficient
did not see arzee punishment for
No. 89 at the time. his other co
This is impofsible irregularities
for, in the Memo- and that he being
randum of Docu- a Servant of 18
ments which he years up to that
perused to report on time, he may be
this case, this arzee re
is also entered, co
the Memorandum
is

is in the hand re-employed in any
writing of a other situation.-
Mootasuddy who Having perused
went to Nellore the Arzee No. 89.
8 Months ago and addreffed by the
is no longer in Auneen of Coo-
this Cutcherry.- rapaud Tannah-
Further, the which your honor
case was sent shewed to me, say-
back to the De- ing in your ques-
ponent that he tion that I had
might take concealed the same
into consideration from my ya-
No. 89, and it is dost, it appears
not to be inferred to me that
that both he and it is one ad-
the Mootasuddy dreffed subse-
were ignorant quently to his
of the Existence dismifsal and
of this Arzee received at the
particularly as Huzzoor on the
the Moonshy 5th June 1839.
Department It is stated in
made over the this Arzee that
whole Record on making a reference
to them.- to the 3 Rowanahs
joined.

issued by the said
Goomastah, he found
that the Goomastah collected
Rupees 3-9-0 on account
of duty, that he carried to
account Rupees 2-6-0 out of
the above amount on different
dates, and that he had not credited
the remainder Rupees 1-3. an Endor-
sement was made on this arzee
that it requires no answer as the
Goomastah had been already dis-
missed, and the signature of
the Deputy Shirstadar was
affixed thereto. At the time
of addressing the said Yadast re-
garding this Goomastah, I have only
perused the record, Viz.t arzee &c.a
alluded to in the order of dismissal, but
I do not recollect having perused this arzee No
89 which it appears was received since his dis-
missal. Had I seen this arzee at that time,
I would have brought into my consideration the
contents

contents thereof, and mentioned the same
in the Yadast in the same manner
as I did in other points. I was not
aware of this arzee which was
received since the dismissal, your
honor mentioned in the remark
made out on my Yadast that the
true circumstances would come
out if a reference was made to
the whole record, therefore I again
perused the order of dismissal &c.a
It is mentioned in the order of dis-
missal that in consequence of the
said Goomastah having committed
certain irregularities at Collepara
Chowkey, before his removal to Coo-
rapaud Pannah, he was removed
to the Goomastah situation of the
said Coorapaud Pannah, the pay
of which is less by 2 Rupees. As
he was thus punished by the re-
moval to a situation of less salary
after bringing into consideration the
said irregularities, I considered it unne-
cessary to mention in my Yadast regarding
the Record of Collepara, which was disposed

of

of as abovementioned. On Considering the meaning of the remark which was made by your honor on my Yadost, Having perceived that it is necessary for me to go through the record of Collepara, I accordingly perused it and sent a further cu Yadost underdate the 30th October 1839. Even at the time of addressing this second Yadost I was not aware of the arzee No. 89 which was re=ceived since the date of his dis=missal. as I was not informed concerning that arzee even subse=quently, I did not make any search for the same. It is, 2 Months less 2 years since I wrote the said se Yadost. I addressed them to the present Deputy Sheristadar who was then Head Moonshy. Even the Deputy Sheristadar who caused an endorsement that there is no answer and affixed his signature on the arzee said to

to have been received subsequently to the dismissal, had not inform=ed me the Circumstance of that arzee tho' he received my second yadost. Had your honor upon the receipt of my second yadost, thought that I Knowingly concealed the circumstance of that arzee, you should have asked me on that head. On the contrary your honor never asked me up to this time, as I was not aware of the said arzee having been received, I had not mentioned the same in my yadost, but I have not Knowingly Concealed the same. I am not aman of such a nature as to conceal it from you, while I Know of it I have not up to this time been considered by any one to be a person making such co concealments.-

Q. 96. You say that the remark made by me on your first yadost that you should peruse the entire Record, gave you a meaning that you

you should peruse the Records of the Collepara chowkey. I only mention-ed that you should peruse the Record of the Collepara Chowkey. I only men-tioned that you should peruse the whole Record, but not as you have supposed you say that you had not searched after the arzee No. 89 abovementioned, and that the pre-sent Deputy Sheristadar who was then Head Moonshy had not informed you the circumstance of that arzee. This arzee is in the same Book which contains the arzees you acknowledge to have perused. More-over, as it was posted immediately after the arzee No. 80 which you acknowledge to have perused, there is no need to search purposely after the same, and it is not a circum-stance to be informed to you by others. It is to be seen by yourself easily

Again

Again it is necessary for you to search purposely after the same in consequence of my having direct-ed you to peruse the whole Record. When you have seen the Books con-taining the arzees as well as the Register, as above pointed out this arzee could not have escap-ed your Notice at all. While this is the case How do you say that you had not seen it.

A. When I received the arzee of the said Goomastah regard-ing his dismissal I first perused the order of dismissal inorder to Know what were the records therein alluded to and upon what ground his dismissal took place, and then went thro through the arzees and their Enclosures therein quoted. In respect to your objection that

the

the said arzee No. 89. was also posted immediately after the one No. 80 on which I had read. and that I might therefore find out myself the same without the necessity of being informed by others, I beg to represent that the arzee No. 80. having been alluded to in the order of dismissal I have perused it without the necessity of making a search after the same. The arzee No. 89 cannot be seen unless I peruse 8 or 9 Arzees which were posted immediately after the said arzee (No. 80) to find this out, it ought to be known before hand that a certain arzee was received subsequently to the dismissal, if it is the case, it induces one to make a search after the same. In the absence of such previous information, there would be no reason to suppose that an arzee was received even after the dismissal,

Consequently

Consequently, I had not found any occasion to go through the arzees that were received subsequent to No. 80. With respect to your remark on my first Yadast that I should peruse the whole of the Record, I have to state that as the case of Collepara was also alluded to in the order of dismissal and as there appeared no reason to suppose that the Aumeen of Coraput Jannah had addressed an arzee even after the dismissal took place, I imagined that your honor might have made out the above remark under an impression that his irregularities would be known fully in the event of a reference being also made to the Collepara Record, and thus, I perused also the said Record and reported the result in my second Yadast, your honor have not mentioned either on my second Yadast, or with myself

the

15893. Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

the circumstance of an arzee having been addressed by the aumeen of Coorapaud Tannah even after the dismissal took effect. Even the Deputy Sheris=tadar who endorsed the arzee under his signature stating that there is no answer, did not mention it to me. Had your honor imagined that I so knowingly concealed the circumstance of the said arzee, your honor would not have been silent without questi=oning me even after the receipt of my second yadost. From the circum=stance of the Deputy Shirstadaur who endorsed the arzee that there is no answer and affixed his signa=ture thereto, not informing me at any time within the last two years about the said arzee, which was ad=dressed by the aumeen of Coora=paud Tannah since the dismissal took place, as well as from the Circum=stance of his not mentioning to me the said

15894. Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

said arzee, where as I had addressed my yadosts to himself, it is to be consi=dered that he had himself know=ingly concealed from me the cir=cumstance of the arzee above adverted to.

The signature of N. Sa=shagerry Row Head Sirstadar.

Before me this 3d September 1841.

(Signed) J. Goldingham.
Collector.

Examination held on the 4th September 1841.

D.97. After Paulvoy Christna Row had presented arzee soliciting to reinstate him in employment, who read the Record in that case, who drew out the Memo=randums, In whose hand writing were the yadosts, which were dictated by you, written?

A. The yadosts were shewn to me yesterday, they are in the hand writing of Ramarow, I do not recol=lect who read the Record. Some one or other

other of the Goomastahs who were pre=
=sent probably read it, as it is a circum=
=stance which passed 2 years ago, I
do not recollect who read the re=
=cord in each Case. I do not recol=
=lect who wrote the Memorandums.
I do not recollect the details to
such an extent whether Memo=
=randums were written or whether
a Yadast was drawn out with re=
=ference to the Record.

298. Yesterday the set itself Con=
=sisting of the Record in that Case
was given to you. Did you not see
in whose hand writing the Memo=
=randums in the same were written?

A. If you direct me to see again, I will
see and represent. If it is shewn, I will see and
represent. Yesterday I saw particularly the
Yadast, and the arzee and not the other
papers in it.

299. The set is given, you should state

in

in whose hand writing the Memoran=
=dum in it were written?

A I have seen the set, there are
2 Memorandums in it which were
drawn out in the hand writ=
=ing of Rainarao. one of them is
relative to the Record formed when
Paulvoy Krishtnarow was Choukey
Goomastah at Collepara, and the
other is relative to the Record mention=
=ed in the Hookroom of his dismis=
=sal from the Choukey Goomastahs
situation at Coorapaud. These two Me=
=morandums are in it, the points which
were considered by me after hearing
the Record when I was going to
write a Yadast to the Head Moon=
=shey are written in the first Page
of the Memorandum of the coora=
=paud Record. in the second Page,
it is stated that Pt. 1-3 Pice is
found less on Comparing the amount
inserted in the 3 Rowanahs with
that brought to the Chitta account.

The

The case of the said one anna and 3 Pice inserted on the back side of the Memorandum, is the Content of the Arzee which was addressed by the Annuees subsequent to the dismissal and which was shewn to me Yesterday. The hand writing in which this was written is that of Ramarow himself: when I was going to write a Yadost to the Head Moonshee if I had made reference to this Memorandum, it must be inferred that the Circumstance of Rupees 1 3 inserted on the backside was not then mentioned in it, and that it was subsequently at some time or other interpolated. If the Circumstance also which is mentioned on the back side had been written at that time, there would have been no occasion to Ramarow, who wrote this Memorandum, not to mention it in

in the Yadost while he mentioned that Circumstance in the Memorandum, as he wrote the Yadost also, which I dictated to the Head Moonshey. Moreover, if this Circumstance was mentioned in the Arzees, Depositions &c. which were read to me, and if this point was not mentioned in the Yadost written to the Head Moonshey, I would at the very same time have argued or objected to it. I would have dictated in the Yadost also, as that Circumstance was not mentioned in the Yadost, it must be concluded that the Circumstance of the one anna and 3 Pice was inserted in the back side of this Memorandum, subsequently to the time of my having written the Yadost to the Head Moonshey.

2.100. Are these two Memorandums

the

the same which were caused by you to be prepared or not?

A I have already stated the circum=stance of my having written a Yadost to the Head Moonshey after causing each record to be read to me at that time in this Case, but I do not recollect whether that Ya=dost was written after the record was read to me or whether a Me=morandum was drawn out previous to that Yadost having been written. That Yadost also was written in the hand writing of Ramarow. This Memorandum was likewise written in the hand writing of Ramarow. I would have directed him to draw out a Memorandum shewing the points of the Record which was read to me previous to the Yadost being written to the Head Moon=shey. Ramarow would have written it. but the Circumstance of the Rupees 1-3 which is mentioned on the back side of this Memoran=dum was not entered in the same

prior

prior to my having written a Ya=dost to the Head Moonshey. Nor was the arzee relative to that Case caused to be read to me. I do not recollect when and on what account that point also was mentioned on the back side of this Memorandum. I did not Conceal in those Yadosts the point relative to the case of the Rupees 1-3 Knowing the same before I wrote them to the Head Moon=shey. Such concealment could not be made. The HooRoom No. 89. rela=tive to the point abovementioned bears date 2d. June. The Deputy Shirstadaur caused an Endorse=ment to be made on the arzee that no answer was required and made his signature Four Months afterwards. In October 1839. I wrote to the abovementioned Yadosts to the Head Moonshey. If I had Con=cealed that point in the Yadosts written to him Knowing the same,

would

would the Head Moonshey who was
acquainted with the contents of that
arzee and who endorsed with his
signature that there was "no answer"
not have objected to it, as it is a thing
which I think he would object
to, how could I have made any Con=
=cealment in my Yadast if I had
been aware of the Content of that arzee
previous thereto - I did not omit
writing, that Circumstance in
the Yadast Knowing the same -
2-101- You have mentioned in seve=
=ral places that the Circumm=
=stance of the said Rupees
"-1-3 was written on the back
side of the Yadast, was this written
on the back side, while there
is space on the first side
of the Yadast to write the same,
or was it written on the back
side because there was no space
on that side, that is the first
side/?

An

A On the first side the
different points of the Record
mentioned in the Hoolroom
of dismissal were written in
Paragraphs - on the back side,
the Circumstance of the Rupees
"-1-3 was written in a separate
Paragraph, there being no space
on the first side -
2102. Is the Circumstance of
the Collections having been precalat=
=ed, which was mentioned by
you in your first Yadast, as not
having been proved, proved
against the said Paulroy
Kristna Row or not by the
said Arzee No. 89?-
A My yadast was written
with reference to the same re=
=cord consisting of the arzees and
their Enclosures, with reference
to which the Hoolroom of dis=
=missal was written - as there
was no proof from any others except
from

from Colah Sooreadoo who complain=
=ed of him to the Aumeen, I =
mentioned in my yadast that
there was no proof in the Re=
=cord to the point of the Col=
=lections having been embezzled.
I have already stated that =
neither the arzee No. 89. nor it's
Enclosures, which are now shewn
to me, were seen by me when
I wrote the Yadast - The Aumeen
mentioned in his arzee that the
said Sooreadoo had produce cer=
=tain Rawanahs before him, that
the other Rayyanahs had Corres=
=ponded with the Chittahs, but
that, on Comparing the items
in the 3 Rowanahs with those
in the Chittahs of the different
dates it appeared that 2 annas
and 6 Pice were credited, leav=
=ing one anna and 3 pice out
of the 3 annas and 9 pice =
which was Collected on account
of the said 3 Rawanahs, and
that

that by which there was room to
believe that the one anna and 3
Pice was appropriated by the Goo=
=mastah for himself - From the
expressions made by the Aumeen,
it appears that the Goomastah
had embezzled the 1 anna and =
3 pice - However if the Enclo=
=sures mentioned in that arzee are
also seen, it can be stated positively -
2103. From the solemn declaration
which was entered into by your
Son in law Tumbarkana Pooroshot=
=tum the Shirista Nuddutgaur in
the Muzzar, his Brother Tiroomul=
=row the Magistrat Jawabneiss, and
Cansoobala Ragoopatty row Jawabneiss
in the Muzzoor attached to the Mut=
=ranze Estate &c. in order to injure =
the Deputy Shiristadaur, and which
was seized from Raghoopatty Row,
and from the Proceedings held in
that

that Case, it appears that you have forward=ed and advised the Conspiracy connected with the Solemn de=claration. what is the reason of your hav=ing done so?=

Question 103.

The relations of A Deponent were chiefly concerned in this Conspira=cy, the Deponent says 1st he knows nothing about that "Conspiracy" and 2d he gives a Story which he heard as to the origin of it — It is an important ad=mission of Deponent that the Paper or Solemn de=claration referred to was drawn up. having the first step granted, it remains to consider the Circum=stances of the Case and then to decide which is the most probable, the case as it was developed before me

I have not seen what kind of Solemn decla=ration and what kind of Proceedings they are, which are mention=ed in your Question — The examination which was made by you in that case was not held in my presence. I do not know what kind of Conspi=racy that is which was made by the Person mentioned in your question in order to injure the Deputy Shirstadaur as stated by you in the said Question. I do not know how it appears to you that I was the

Remarks of the Collector

=me in the Examina=tion of the Practices of the Conspiracy in the version of it which question. I have served the Deponent heard the circum=stances of the Case as it was developed before me

The relations of A Deponent were chiefly concerned in this Conspira=cy, the Deponent says 1st he knows nothing about that "Conspiracy" and 2d he gives a Story which he heard as to the origin of it — It is an important ad=mission of Deponent that the Paper or Solemn de=claration referred to was drawn up. having the first step granted, it remains to consider the Circum=stances of the Case and then to decide which is the most probable, the case as it was developed before me

I have not seen what kind of Solemn decla=ration and what kind of Proceedings they are, which are mention=ed in your Question — The examination which was made by you in that case was not held in my presence. I do not know what kind of Conspi=racy that is which was made by the Person mentioned in your question in order to injure the Deputy Shirstadaur as stated by you in the said Question. I do not know how it appears to you that I was the

15 years past, I was deputed in this Collect=orry and in this capacity I had to be a person of good disposi=tion, preventing the intrigues of per=sons and not other=wise you have men=tioned in your Quest=ion that it appeared you that I and such persons became author to the Cons=piracy tending to injure a person this causes me much sorrow & astonishment I know nothing of that Conspiracy. The circum=stances which I heard are as follows — One a day, a few days previous to

joined the party of Sashagyry Row and his relations, and end=eavoured to draw Nundoory Kistniah into the views of that party a Solemn "Declaration" was drawn up by Rughoo=putty Row & shewn to all including Nundoory Kristniah the latter person gave intimation of what was going on to the Nair. — The

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector.

The "Solemn Declaration" was taken to the relations of the Deponent by Raghowputty Row this the relations in their Deposition admit as well as the Deponent but the Deponent and his relations break off at this point the Deponent states that his relations said to Raghowputty Row "the words which you uttered are not proper, we do not design any "thing paper go away" The relations in the Examination state nothing of the kind, they admit the case in its manifestations as stated by Raghowputty Row in his Deposition.

Again, as the name of this relation the Deponent was brought forward in the Solemn "declaration" how was it that to your removing me from the Situation of Head Serastadar Kumbooary Kristniah who is in the confidence of Venkata Krishna row Puntulou the Deputy Sirstadar, and who writes my present Deposition, had according to the pleasure of the Deputy Shirastadar encouraged a Servant Raghowputty Row who was not a servant in the Cutchery before your arrival in this Skilled and in who we are employed in the service after your arrival & caused certain things to be written on

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector.

that the affairs was not exposed by the relations nor one of them lifted up his voice against it.

Again, if the case originated with the Deponent himself as is urged in the story heard by Deponent it stamps his name with infamy as well as partly with infamy not only because of the spirit of intrigue which the case manifests but also because of the very iniquitous purport of the Document. With fully for an intrigue in his right mind would be hardy send to his enemies a paper of the Description referred to and by a person who had become inimical to him. Not only is the story heard by the Deponent rendered altogether unworthy of belief by this

on a paper by him the said Kristniah sent on a certain night the Paper in question by Raghowputty Row to Venkatrow & certain other servants letting him know that he should by any means whatever get them to sign on that Paper & send him there and at the very same time informed the Deputy Shirastadar of the same Raghowputty Row having been a resident in the streets of the Deputy Shirastadar the Deputy Shirastadar & at his desire some others waited in the Road

15909 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

this consideration but the well known character of the Naikoyies that he told a lie

Again the Deponent was here the same cautious regard to all truth which Tregret is manifest throughout. He only "heard" this story he says, and again he says with respect to the interviews at Veroonil Rauze house between Raghoopulty Row and others "the circumstances which I heard regarding them I do not fully recollect" Nature with standing this in the same answer he says that his relation Lala Raghoopulty Row that what he "has uttered was not proper" we do not sign "an this paper go away."

Again

Road at the time of Raghoopulty Row returning to his aboad in the night. Raghoopulty Row went to the House of Ambatoor or cunning as this Veroonbrow where Veroonbrow & others / the circumstances which I heard regarding them I do not fully recollect) were present to whom he shewed that paper and said "that Nunboory Krishna Row and others "the "which have caused I heard regarding "drawn out that them I do not fully "Krishniah was his friend "that Crostniah said "that if they should "sign on that paper, "he would also sign it, "afterwards that said "a few days the Deputy "Sheristadar for same "reason" was other having "been at variance with "him

15910 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

Again, it is inexplicable why, when the Deponent "heard" that his Name had been so freely used as the adviser in this affair he did not bring the case to notice in some way.

Again, the Deponent admits that he has enmity towards the Naik also it is well known that he made offerings in certain Pagodas calling upon the evil spirits to catch the Naik With this fact and the above admission and the evidence in the case it is not

"him / Raghoopulty Row) "was making anger "with him, and that "Krishniah having "been his friend "combined with him" upon this Veroonbrow having heard these words replied "the words which "you uttered are not "proper, we do not "sign on this Paper. "go away." whereupon, as he was returning home with that Paper, the Deputy Sheristadar and some others seized that paper. afterwards (I do not know) whether that Paper was sent for by your order.

15911 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

— — not difficult to day break or whether
fix upon the Deponent the case was brought to
bat the concurrence and ad- your notice, you came
-vice in the affair connect- to the Cutcherry at
-ed with the drawing up day breake & Peons were
of the Paper called the sent to Unbark himself
"Solemn declaration" Fara Viroonmalrau & Co. who as
-turedely, the Nails strung soon as they awake from
sense tells him that "evil their sleep, were separate,
spirits" are not easily called - by brought to prove their
-ing their way and should Homes respectively to
they be imprudent enough the Cutcherry and
to appear in the garb of kept in different
Flesh they are likely places and you ob-
to experience rough hands - tained Kyfeyets
-ling.—
from each of them

Deponent urges These circumstances
that he is "a person of came to my notice at
good disposition prevents noon of the day and
-ing the intrigues of per- which those Kyfeyets
"sons" & Co. It is to be were taken - that is
regretted that the circumstance of the
Deponent

15912 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

Deponent has departed the Peons having come
from this course on the and taken them Vero-
present occasion. — -nalrau & Co. / came to
my notice early in the
morning of the other
circumstances I heard
some at noon after
you had taken Kyfeyets
& Co. and same in the Cutcherry
I heard also from the Persons
who gave the Kyfeyets but I do not
recollect the circumstances which they
told me as they had related in each of their
Kyfeyets respectively - I did not see those Kyfeyets
nor did I see the Paper said to have been
caused to be drawn out by Ragoo putty Row -
I heard that in the Paper said to have
been caused to be drawn out by Ragoo putty
row, / I do not know particularly whether
there were mentioned the names of Ragoo -
-putty Row and Veroonmalrau & Co. or how
it was drawn out / it was stated "that we
"must all have revenge of the Deputy
"Serishtadar and act according to the
"advice

advice of Napputtey Sashagerreraw "There was
no reason whatever for Ambarkane Teroomul
-rauw &c. for contesting with the Deputy Sheris-
-daur but the Deputy Sheristadar having been
using his endeavours to invent the neces-
sary reasons for removing me from the situation
of Head Serstadaur and to promote himself
to that situation, shewed displeasure towards
the said Paroushatturw &c. in consequence
of his variance with me, as Ambarkha-
-nah Teroomulraw his younger Brother
Paroashatturw and some others are of my own
sect, and my relation and as the authority
of the Deputy Shirstadaur has been in
force as respects all the servants He having
thus shewn displeasure, Raghooputty raw
would have inferred that there was
enmity between them and the Deputy
Sheristadaur For that reason only
Raghoopputty raw without comprehend-
-ing that Nunkaary Coastniah had with
the

the view of his deceiving him caused
the Paper to be drawn out by him
considered Coostniah to have been his
friend, deceived himself saying to him-
-self that the Deputy Sheristadar had
been angry with Teroomulraw &c. conse-
"quently they also would sign on that
"Paper" and went to them but they
having perceived this to be an irregular
proceeding, did not sign that Paper. On
considering the cause of the Deputy Sheris-
-tadar having caused Raghoopputty Row
through the means of Coostniah to draw out
this paper and took it to Teroomul Row-
&c. it is to be inferred that the Deputy
Sheristadaur had considered that
"if Teroomulraw &c. like Raghoopputty
"Row were deceived and had signed on
"that Paper they would not only
"become criminals, but it would also
"be considered that I am a dishonest person
"in

"in consequence of my name having been
"mentioned in it that it would also be-
"come a cause like those which have
"been fabricated as the post ponement &c.
"in July 1848 in the District of Palwaud
"for removing me from the situation of
"Head Serristadaur and that if you
"approve of those reasons and write to the
"Board, it would be the means for my being
"removed from the situation of Head Serista-
"daur." and through the means of Kristnaiah
caused Raghooputty row to draw out the
paper in question and having sent it by
him, seized him on that night together with
the said Paper and brought him before
your honour but, it is not to be concluded
that Ambarkhanah Viraunchow &c.
had conspired to injure the Deputy
Seristadaur - nor should it be inferred
that I was the author of and advised
for those plots - The persons who
are

are honest, will never make such in-
trigues - If any dishonest persons intend
to be parties to such intrigues, they would
consult one another, and then act; but they
would not draw out a paper called a solemn
Declaration and sign every one of them on
the same - If they had drawn out (a paper)
in that manner, and signed on it and if
any of them had separated himself
from them without keeping their com-
pany as agreed upon in that Paper it would
not be convenient for the others to complain
against him with reference to the Document
called Solemn Declaration - It would be not
be proper even to make known such an
irregular paper - which this is the case, what
is the use of their drawing out that paper
and signing on it - who would consent either
to draw out - such as useless paper or to sign
on it; therefore, the Paper in question is the
one which was caused by the Deputy Sheris-
dar to be written by Raghooputty row, having
been encouraged thro' the means of —
Crostinaih

Croostinah

2.— 10th— After that Solemn Declaration was seized on the person of Raghoo-putty Row, he in his Kyfeyet given before me, stated that he having been deceived by the instigations of your son-in-law Ambarkhana Poorooshottem his elder Brother Tiroomulrow, and your relation Surbada Sannekerammoodas &ca had participated in that intrigue and drawn out the Solemn Declaration— but he did not state at all that the Deputy Shirstadaur had through the means of Numbaary Croostinah encouraged and caused him to draw it out— Moreover the said Poorooshettem, Tiroomulrow and Sannekeyrammoodas gave in Kyfeyets admitting that they had seen that solemn declaration, they are the Circar's servants by that paper, injury was intended— that paper came into their hand— when such Documents with intent to commit injury was found, it ought to have been seized as it is mentioned in that paper that you are the principal author and adviser

adviser of this attempt, it was very important for them to seize that paper even for your good— who are a near relation, if they had not thought that you were the creator of the same— if they had not been all induced by you— if you were not the author of that conspiracy and if they did not know, that by you were the author of it, why should they have given up again the paper which came into their hand— while the case is this, on what grounds do you say that the Deputy Shirstadar had through the means of Croostinah, induced and caused Raghoopputty Row to draw out that paper— How do you throw aside the proofs appearing from the Record that you and your relations are the authors of the conspiracy—

A.— As it is necessary in the Question Proofs appearing from the Record I beg to state that I did not see at the time and to what kind of Record have brought it to be— that is, and what for me and yet the kinds of proofs they are

Remarks of the Collector.—

Question 10th.—

The Deponent admits that his relations ought to have seized the Paper

has consequently

15919 Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Remarks of the Collector

has never brought the case to notice subsequently. He says very boldly that he would have caused Rayhavpatty Row to be seized with the Paper & brought before me and yet in the same answer he says that nobody will speak a word against the Raja.

Deponent says that the affair of the intrigue originated with the Raja "with the same "design as the false "complaint relative to the pastforements as the alleged Intrigue is

consequently, I have not to state on length on the subject. You have stated that Rayhavpatty Row in his declaration given before you stated "that he had at the instigation of Tirovanuel Row &c. entered into that conspiracy" and that "he did not mention that Ramboory Kistniah had encouraged and caused that paper to be drawn out by him" I beg to represent that the Deputy Shirastadar in who thro' the means of Ramboory Kistniah could cause Rayhavpatty Row to draw

15920 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remarks of the Collector

is made by Deponent to rest on the same grounds of supposition and inference as the case of the Postponements the Board will find no difficulty in judging on which the truth lies.

draw out that Paper would not have failed to take care that he should state in his declaration as required by him. Deputy Shirastadar after he had seized him on the night together with that paper. As you have stated in your Question that Tirovanuel Row Pooroo Shottum &c. had given Kyfeyats admitting that they had seen the paper which was brought to them by Rayhavpatty Row, I beg to state in answer to this that the circumstance of their having seen that paper when it was brought and shewn to them being true they stated that they had seen and that they did not consent to sign it. From their refusal to make their signatures

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

signatures you must infer that they did not attempt to make that conspiracy. If they had attempted to make conspiracy as mentioned in your Question they would have affixed their signatures what reason was their for their not having signed, as they are not the persons who would acquiesce for such a thing, they refused to sign it contrary to the request of Raghoo putty Row, and said "go away" When Raghoo putty Row brought back that paper to them, they should at the very same time have snatched it from him brought and delivered it to you whether from their omitting to do such a thing, or whether from fear that if they should take and produce it to the Gentleman it would become a cause for the increase of the grudge of the Deputy Shirstadar towards them and that they would lose their services as the paper appeared to them to be of an intriguing nature at the desire of the Deputy

Com. Dist. R.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Deputy Shirstadar thro' the intrigue of Numbory Kristniah, they could not venture to snatch from Raghoo putty Row and produce that paper before you in that manner After this circumstance came to my notice, I called and frequently reprimanded them saying "the not snatching and bringing "this paper either before myself or the "Gentleman is a very injudicious thing" All what I said was useless as the thing had already passed. If it had come to my notice at that time, that Raghoo putty Row had come to them on that night with that Paper, I undoubtedly would have caused him to be seized together with that Paper by the Peons who were with me, and have sent him before you at the very same time. As I did not understand so, I am very sorry you have asked me in your question "on what "ground do you say that the Deputy Shirstadar had encouraged Raghoo putty Row, thro' "Kristniah and caused him to draw out "this Paper in this case" In answer to it I beg to represent that, every one knows that the

Fort St. George 11th November 1861

the Deputy Sheristadar had made such an intrigue thro the means of Kroostiniah but they are afraid to speak before you a word which is unfavorable to the Deputy Sheristadar Consequently they do not speak the truth at present before you but the truth will come out at the time the God has appointed as you have asked me, "on what grounds do you now say that "the Deputy Sheristadaur made the intrigue "inquestion." I beg to state that I have no doubt at all of the Deputy Sheristadaur having committed this intrigue with the same design with which he had invented false complaints relative to the postponement Vea" in Fusly 1268.—

105 After the solemn Declaration question was seized on the Person of Casoocala Raghooputty Raw, and the Examination was held in the case, it was proved before me that one day the said Raghooputty Raw having written an argee to my address in that Case, sent it to Cullapully Ramarow in the Cutcherry desiring him to inform you of

Fort St. George 11th November 1861

of the same and put it in the Tuppaul, & and that Ramarow had written a note to you stating "the argee has been caused "to be prepared according to your order, may "I get it entered in the List"— If you were not the author of that conspiracy, why did Raghooputty Row send word that he Ramarow should inform you of it, and put the argee in the Tuppaul and why should Ramarow write a note to you that the argee was prepared.—

Remarks of the Collector

Question 105. 106. 107. 108.

The fact of Raghooputty Row sending an argee which he had written to my address for the approval of the Deponent shows that Deponent had taken a part in the affair of the solemn Declaration."—

It will be seen how the Deponent avoided

A. The circumstance of Raghooputty row having written to your address and sent an argee to Ramarow, as well as the circumstance of Ramarow having written a note to my address in that Case asking whether that argee might be entered in the list subsequent to the Examination held

Remarks of the Collector

avoided giving an answer to the Question at last in the answer to Question 109. the Deponent meets the point He admits that the argee was sent to him through Ramarow and says "I do not "recollect whether "it was an application "for leave or for resigna- "tion on behalf of "Raghooputty Row. I "do not recollect whether "he Ramarow wrote on "a Scrap of Paper asking "shall I deliver in the "argee and shewed it "to me, or whether he "sent it to me by any "Person in the Cutchery.

The

held by you in the case of Conspiracy. are the intrigues made by the encouragement of the Deputy Sheristadar in the same manner as he did in encourag: :ing and causing Ragho: :putty Row thro' Nuna :boory Kristnial to draw out the said Paper called "Solemn Declaration." Shewing that Viroomulraw Ven had made intrigue and as intending to procure the signatures of Viroomulraw Ven in the same and not otherwise as you have mentioned on your Question that "they are proved before

you

The fact of a Commu: :nication being made by Raghooputty Row through Ramarow to the Deponent relative to an application for leave or resignation of his situation in Consequence of the discovery of the affairs of the "Solemn Declaration" shews the participation of the Deponent in the case. —

Deponent says that had he known that the Communica: tion from Raghooputty Row was in connection with the affairs of the "Solemn Declaration" he would have brought

Ramarow

you. I beg to represent that at the present time the servants will give evidence as required by the Deputy Sheristadar from fear that they would lose their Service, Consequently I have not to represent more on the Subject. —

106. Is the Circum- :stance of Ramarow having written a note to your address in the above manner true or not. —

A You say "having written a Note in the above manner," what is mentioned in it? —

2.107. The above Question will be read

Ramarow before me— It is difficult to reconcile this Statement with the Deponents statement that he "argued with Ramarow Saying why do "you ask me regarding "the argee which you "have to represent: It is clear that he knew the purport of Ramarow's communication—

read to you you would should hear it?—

A. When it was proved before you that Ramarow had written a note to my address. why did you not send for and ask me at the very same time.—

2.108. You must answer give answer to the Question put to you as putting a counter question is irregular, you must give answer to the above Question?—

A. In your Question you have mentioned "it is proved that "Ramarow had written a note to your "address stating that the argee had been "written according to your order and asking "whether it might be delivered in to the Post.

Post" I have already represented that that evidence was given by the encouragement of the Deputy Shirstadaur. Ramarow did not write a note to my address in the manner as mentioned in your Question. I do not recollect whether it was an application for leave or for resignation on behalf of Raghoopatty Row. I do not recollect whether he Ramarow wrote on a scrap of paper asking "shall I deliver "in the argee" and shewed it to me or whether he sent it to me by any person in the Cutcherry at the very same time. I argued with Ramarow Saying "why do you ask me regarding the "argee which you have to present" he went away without giving reply. I do not know what kind of argee it was. From your Question it is intimated that that argee was written relative to the examination made in the case of the paper which was seized on his Person. Had I been aware at that time that Ramarow had come to me to ask something relative to such an argee I would have brought Ramarow before you with the note in question and presented

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

presented them to you at the very same time because his coming to ask me so, was at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadaur, I did not comprehend it. I thought it would have been an argee either for resignation or leave. I therefore replied "what is the cause of your asking me."—

/Signed/ N. Sashagherry Row
Headshirstadaur

Before me this 6th September 1841.—

/Signed/ J. Goldingham
Collector

Investigation held on the 6th September 1841

2-109. The Enclosures of the argee No. 89 addressed by the Auneen of Pedacoorapad Tannah respecting the speculation made by Paulvoy Kristna Row which you wanted to peruse, are here say, whether there is proof or not from them in relation to the said speculation?—

A. I have perused them

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Remarks of the Collector

2-109 The Question relative to the Goomastah Paulvoy Kristna Row has been received above much time would have been saved had the Deponent admitted at once what he has stated in the answer to this question. The Deponent having admitted the speculation of Paulvoy Kristnahrao it is not necessary to advert to the subject further.—

them. In the 3 Rawanahs Nos. 43121, 41626 and 41717. it is stated that the value of the article is Rs. 1-8-0 and that the Duty is Rs. 0-1-3. respectively on referring to the Chittahs of those dates, it appears that Rupees 0-0-2- was credited in the name of the individual who was furnished with the first mentioned Rawanah, and at B 1-2- in the name of the other two individuals. From the Deposition given by the Goomastah before the ammeen, it appears that he declared that when Dubs are received from individuals, it is common for an increase to happen in

Fort St. George 11th November 1861

in some cases, and decrease in others in the amount of Pice, that the alone difference occurred for the above reason, that he had by oversight inserted an additional figure in the Rawanah No. 43121 instead of putting the same according to the Chittah, and that he had not peculated the same, the regular duty due on an article valued one and half a Rupee is Rupees a. 1-2½. but, there has been no Custom to insert half Pice, therefore in some cases a sum of Rupees a. 1-3 would be inserted, while in others Rs. 1-2. With respect to the Rawanahs Nos. 41626 and 41717 above referred to, it is inserted in the Chitta that a duty of three dubs and three dummedees was levied for each Rawanah respectively. The rate of Conversion for three Dubs and 3 dummedees will be less than Rupees a. 1-2, but not more under this reason, as it is right to Credit Rupees a. 1-2 in the Chitta, it may be imagined that the insertion of Rupees a. 1-3 in the Rawanah instead of Rupees a. 1-2 occurred by mistake

For

Fort St. George 11th November 1861

For, as it is also customary to insert Rs. 1-3- for the article valued at Rs. 1-8 a. to it may be supposed that he had by oversight followed the same practice instead of inserting at Rs. 1-2 in these Rawanahs according to the Chittah Consequently we may coincide with the reasons assigned by the Goomastah in respect to these two Rawanahs. But the answer given by the Goomastah in regard to the Rawanah No. 43121 is not satisfactory For he alleged that an additional figure was by oversight inserted in the Rawanah above that entered in the Chittah, but, on making a reference to the Chittah, as it appears that a sum of Rupees a. 1-3 to was first inserted under the Head of Duty and afterwards rectified to two pice, and as the Name of the article was also blotted out, it ought to be inferred that the Goomastah had peculated one anna and one Pice in this Rawanah alone. In the information submitted by the Auneen to shew the difference between the articles entered in the Rawanah and the Chittah

he

he stated in regard to the said Rawanah No. 43121. that an entry was made in the Chittah thus, "a pair of Angavastrums of 6th sort valued 1/2 Rupee" which is inserted in the Rawanah thus "one Racoo Measuring 16 cubits of 2d sort" Having made a reference to the entry in the Chittah, it is not clear whether it is a pair of Angavastrums or Racoo because the same was blotted out. This point would have been clearly understood, had the individual, who was furnished with the Rowanah been examined. It does not seem that the Ameen made such investigation.—

2. 110 It is reported to me that you have also combined with Cotum Roilnaidoo, when the latter submitted to Government a Petition stating therein certain false and frivolous complaints, and that he had made out the said Petition with your advice. What is the cause of your combining in

in such a Matter.—

Remarks of the Collector

Question 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.—

Deponent has acted in concurrence with and at the instigation of Cotum Royal Naidoo or he has not—that he has acted at his instigation and with him rests on the following grounds. 1st it is a subject of notoriety and is in every persons mouth at Goontoor. 2d a presumption grows out of the Deponents own statement defending the course adopted by Cotum Roil Naidoo. 3 dly the Deposition of the Magistrates Manager and 4th the Deposition of Nimmagudda Rama

A. I have not combined in such a false case as above said If Cotum Royelnaidoo submitted an argee. it is to be considered that he had made out the same with his own sense but there is no occasion for me to give him advice. I heard that Royelnaidoo addressed a certain argee, but as I had not seen it, I cannot say whether he had mentioned in it false charges or true circumstances-as to the argee said to have been addressed by

Rama Kristniah. a perusal of the Deposition will place the fact of the case before the Board. The Deponents disregard of a true and straight forward course is here apparent. He designates Rama Kristniah a liar and expectant for Office and charges the Magistrates Manager with perjury, with the same very little consideration as has been shewn in regard to the Head Moonshey and others. The reason of the interview between Rail Naidoo and Nimmagueddah Rama Kristumnah was because of the Friendship between the

by Railnaidoo. I am hearing since these seven or eight Months past, that he had sent an argee to Madras against the Deputy Shirstadaur - As Railnaidoo is living in this Zillah since a long time, and as he is himself able enough to gain the information required it is to be inferred that the argee sent by him against the Deputy Shirstadaur was made out by himself, so far as his Knowledge permitted. What occasion have Its to give him advice. Neither did I give him advice, nor did he address it with any

the Deponent and Rama Kristniah Railnaidoo to insure his own success urged the friendship between himself (Railnaidoo) and the Deponent. If no friendship subsisted between Rama Kristniah and the Deponent, why should Railnaidoo send for the former for the purpose of getting evidence in the charges he was bringing forward, and why should he make his suit to rest on the friendship that existed between himself (Railnaidoo) and the Deponent. It is very well known that Rama Kristniah is a friend of the Deponent in answer to Question 120. He says he has

my advice. In consequence of there being at enmity between the Deputy Shirstadaur and myself, the former might have informed your honor that the argee submitted by Railnaidoo against him was made out with my advice, but I did not give him advice. your honor mentioned in the Question that Railnaidoo submitted a false and frivolous Petition. He who has been a district Moonsiff would I think, not write such a false Petition against a servant as he is aware that he would be visited with

has known him for the last 10. or 15 years It has never been understood that Rama Kristiniah was an expectant for office; he has never served and lives by Cultivation and lending money The Deponent has adopted the course from the first of denying every thing He makes out that every body is a liar; the Petition to the Board of Revenue against the Deputy Shirstadaur are stated to have per- jured themselves as well but it is not proper as the whole Cutcherry for an Officer as myself and now he says that to cause some one to submit such a Petition as I am the Head shirstadaur, it is my duty to lay for enquiry before your Honor the irregularities done with punishment in the event of the charge brought forward by him being upon investigation proved false but as I had not seen what was written in his argee it is unnecessary for me to enlarge any more on that Subject It is proper for me to submit myself a Petition to the Board of Revenue against the Deputy Shirstadaur

Deponent urges that Rama Kristiniah was not examined

in any particular case - He was Examined in regard to the intrigues of the Deponent and Columun Radnaidoo, which were matters of Notoriety -

It will be seen that Deponent at every step brings forward the instigation of the Jail. the Manager, he says, gave his evidence on Solemn affirmation at the instigation of the Jail - Perhaps it will have been determined before this that this string Viz. the instigation of the Jail, has been over strained Deponent has called it to his aid oftener than a prudent Person should have done whose purpose is done by the Deputy Shirstadaur - but as his irregularities would not be proved in the event of their being investigated before your honor for reasons already stated by me in many places, I deemed it proper to address an argee to the Revenue Board, and so submitted one about a month ago, since the dispatch of the above argee your honor began to take from me this deposition - I have also submitted another Petition after your honor began to take this deposition from me -

2. III - You say that

is to gain a specific end, but the animus could not conceal itself and is manifest throughout.-

In regard to the two argees which Deponent states that he has written to the Board (answer to Question 110), it is for the Board to pass their opinion on the course adopted by the Deponent, particularly with reference to his admission that he transmitted them through the Nellore Post Office - Why this crooked way of proceding in a case where truth alone was concerned - It is also for the Board to

that Rainiandos is able enough to gain information in different matters - While his authority is within the bounds of Chaybrole, how could he be able to obtain any information in different matters without privately combining with others with a bad intent?-

A.- To obtain information in respect to real circumstances, there is no need to be a party to fill disposed endeavours As he (who receives a monthly salary of 40 Rupees and who lives in Chaybrole which is three Cos distance from Guntoor, and who has had

to determine the degree of credit to be attached to their contents - It is simply necessary for me to observe that, the Course adopted by the Deponent and his refusal to disclose their contents before me appear to involve matter of serious consideration - It is obvious that the affairs of a district are likely to be affected when the Head servant under the Collector adopts this course, be it from a mistaken sense of duty, a wilful and malicious feeling or from having been easily misled by others - The bold and unblushing assertion that nothing can be proved before me which has reference

had an opportunity of speaking with the inhabitants of different Villages, Zemendary Vakeels &c- who may attend on him in cases pending in the Moonsiffs Court, was in the habit of resorting to Guntoor which is situated very close to his station, during the adjournment of the Court, and of conversing with the Court- servants and certain other Gentlemen, he could have commonly understood the real Circumstances but there would be no necessity why he should make ill disposed Endeavours.-

2-112 Do you consider this

reference to the Nair. Have for disposal of by the Board — M. has been my object that deponent should have an opportunity of stating all that he wished — I have some times waited an hour for his answer, some times the Question has been repeated several times, more than once — I have been obliged to put a stop to most improper conduct on the part of Deponent towards the writer, who took down the Deposition and throughout the whole a more than ordinary exercise of patience has been called for which a perusal of the Deposition

him right in addressing a false arzee, and do you not think that the Circar business would thereby be disturbed? — A — Had he mentioned in his arzee false circumstances it will of course be considered a false arzee, and he would be punished accordingly or had he collected information regarding the irregularities that were actually perpetrated, and brought them to the notice of the higher authorities it will induce the higher authorities first to order an enquiry in order to bring out the true circumstance and then to punish those who committed those

Deposition will readily Shew. —

those irregularities, and thus prevent such irregularities being committed hereafter — therefore writing accurate circumstances in the arzee will put the affairs in an efficient state, but they cannot be disturbed — Had Railnaidoo mentioned in his arzee accurate Circumstances, I consider it to be a good arzee and it will be the cause of putting the Circar's affairs in an efficient State, & had he stated a false statement in his arzee I consider it as a false arzee and thus, would interfere with the Circar affairs; But formerly Railnaidoo having submitted a compliant to Madras stating that one Ramiah the Shirestadar of the Zillah Court deceived the then Judge and committed many irregularities, an investigation was held through the then Collector and it was proved that the said Shiristadar had committed the irregularities above-mentioned and thus Justice was made; consequently I think not that Railnaidoo who had done

done such a thing, would mention false circumstances.-

2.-113. You speak as having been informed since 7-8- months past that Railnaidoo had written an arzee, why have you not informed me of it.?

A Sheard, and your honor also heard.- It has been reported throughout this Zillah.- It came to your notice before Sheard it.-

2-114- How do you know that I heard before it came to your notice.?

A I cannot recollect the person who first informed me of it, but I was told at the same time, when I heard that Railnaidoo was publicly saying that he wrote an arzee, the circumstance of your honor being also informed of the same.-

2-115.- Why do you defend Railnaidu, and how do you say that he must have written a true account- From this it seems that you have had concern with him.- If not why do you give answer in his favor.-

A Shave

A Shave no occasion at all to defend in favour of Railnaidoo, I would not do so. Shave already stated that I am ignorant whether the Railnaidoo mentioned true circumstances, or otherwise in the arzee said to have been despatched to Madras.- As he commonly knows the true circumstances for reasons Shave before mentioned, and as he formerly brought forward a true complaint, it induced me to think that he might have stated a true account in the arzee said to have been addressed by him- As he formerly preferred a true complaint, which was proved from the investigation held in my presence by the Collector, Shave now only stated what I actually thought that he might have mentioned a true account in his arzee, and not otherwise; but the answers which Shave given above are not intended to support him - From his connexion with me, I could not derive profit of even a blade of straw.-

2-116 You state that you had written two arzees to the Board.- If you had any thing to complain of against the Deputy Shristadaur or any other servants attached

attached to the Cutcherry it is the proper course and your duty that you should prefer them before the Collector in the first instance, and then to appeal to the Board in the event of your finding the former has neglected the interests of the Circar. Why have you deviated in this case from the regular course, on what dates and through which Post Offices did you dispatch the said arzees? are you disposed to disclose their contents and cause an enquiry to be made into them, and are you ready to declare on oath regarding the truth of the Statement which your Petitions contain?

A I have stated in one of my former answers that it is my duty as mentioned in your Question to prefer to your Honor any complaints against the Deputy Shirastadaur in the first instance, and to cause them to be investigated. I stated in my different answers in this deposition that in consequence of your Honors favor towards the Deputy Shirastadaur and

and of consequent enforcement of his authority, no one would venture to declare before your Honor, the truth which may tend to his injury, that the proofs would thereby be retarded and that the actual case cannot be substantiated. I had for these very reasons found it inconvenient to lay first before your Honor the complaints I preferred to the Board against the Deputy Shirastadaur, and thus addressed to the Board. With respect to your Question through which Post Office did I dispatch my Petitions they were not sent in to the Post Office at Gudiatam they were dispatched thro the Post Office in the Nellore District; but I cannot recollect that such arzee was dispatched in such a Post Office. With respect to your Question whether I wish to disclose the contents of the said arzees before your Honor, and to cause enquiry to be made into them, I have in my former answer stated that, in the event of complaints against the Deputy

Deputy Shiristadaur being investigated before Your Honor, no one would say the truth which might tend to his dis-grace, and that therefore the truth cannot come out. also Stated that, I do not wish for an inquiry before your Honor regarding the complaints against him. As to your Question "would "you make oath regarding the truth of "the statements of your Petitions." I have to state that, I always write such circumstances as are to be set-forth, on oath, and not otherwise.

(The signature of A. Shashagherayen Head Shiristadaur)

Before me this 6th September 1841.

(Signed) J. Goldingham

Collr.

Investigation held on the 7th September 1841.

2-117. I shall shew you the Deposition given on oath, by one Nimmagudde Ramma Kristunnah on the 1st December 1840 and

and by Doctala Kistanna chetty the Magistrate manager on the 8th March 1841. Peruse them. Does it appear or not from them that you had combined with Bailnaidoo and made an intrigue?

A. What is your Honor's meaning for the word intrigue?

2-118. You must give your answer with reference to the meaning that occurs to yourself, but you are not to ask me again?

A. What is the meaning of Intrigue. What kind of intrigue is that?

The above Deposition will shew particulars; I told you to peruse them, and you did so: you must say what you have to relate on them?

A. As your Honor are my Master, I am ready to obey as your please. therefore I perused the two Depositions

Depositions you have shewn me — On perusing the Deposition given by Nimma-gadda Rama Kristunmah I does not seem from it in what case, and on whose behalf, this individual came as Witness, and gave this Deposition before your honor; but, it appears from the contents thereof that he (who always attends for service, and who is a liar) had given the Deposition before your honor at the instigation of the Deputy Sheristadaur a few days after Ralnaidoo submitted his argee to the Board against the Deputy Sheristadaur in order that your honor may think that Ralnaidoo mentioned inaccurate circumstances in the said argee, and that it is a false argee — It is very astonishing that your honor gave credit to the Deposition of such a person, and thus questioned me that I had combined with Ralnaidoo and made an intrigue. The contents of this Deposition themselves shew that the said

said individual gave a false deposition, in the hopes that the Deputy Sheristadaur will be pleased with it, and get him service — Consequently I have no necessity to enlarge upon the subject — Even in this Deposition, he has alleged, in places where my name is alluded to, that Ralnaidoo told him that there is a friendship between him and myself but this ought not to be received merely on his assertion — I have such common friendship with Persons in Guntoor have with him, but not otherwise — I have also perused the Deposition given by Kristumma chetty alluded to in your Question — I heard lately that Depositions were taken from some of the servants &c. stating that Venkata Kristnarow Pantolo the Deputy Sheristadaur is a very good Gentleman, and that he is not a man to receive Bribes &c; The Deposition of Kristumma chetty above referred to seems to be the one that had been taken during the above period — These

Depositions

Depositions were given with fear lest they should lose their services in the event of their setting forth against the intention of Kristnarow Puntoloo, but they were not given willingly - consequently, they are not true - Even Kristnum chetty, has mentioned in his Deposition that Railnaidoo had addressed an arzee complaining against the Deputy Shirstadaur and that he advised him not to do so in future &c. He further mentioned that he was informed by some others that Railnaidoo was in the habit of speaking to me when he resorted to Guntoor; and that he was therefore obliged to suppose that I also combined with Railnaidoo. Even this last allegation was set forth at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadaur, but is not true - It is astonishing that your Honor have in consideration of the above words, questioned me that I and Railnaidoo combined together, and made an intrigue. I have not at all made an

an intrigue as above said - I have already stated that in the event of Railnaidoo mentioning true circumstances in his arzee they will not be considered as intriguing ones - From your Honor Questioning me with reference to a mere assertion set forth by certain Persons at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadaur that Railnaidoo had combined with me and followed up an intrigue, it appears that your Honor began to put such Questions to me in this Deposition, with the view to invalidate my arzee before the Board, in consequence of my having mentioned in the same regarding the irregularities perpetrated by the Deputy Shirstadaur - I have been serving in this Office since 30 years and bore a character that I am not a person to speak falsehood, and of good behaviour but not otherwise - While I, who bore such a character had not addressed an arzee of this kind to the Board, it ought not to be inferred that I

I would mention falsehood in any degree in the arzee I have now addressed — you will therefore not retain a suspicion that I had written falsehood in any degree — your Honor must depend that I have not written a false statement in my arzee, as I am not ignorant of that disgrace which my respectability is about to be visited with, in the event of my having ventured to address a falsehood in the arzee, and if the Board directed an investigation in to it as requested.

(The signature of No Shokaghevvy Row Head Shirastadaur.)
Before me this 7th September 1841.-

(Signed) J. Goldingham
Collector

Investigation held on the 8th September 1841.

Question 122.-
The subject of the Record Department now comes under notice. It will be proper to state the real facts of

2.120.- You have stated above that Nimmagadda Ranna Kristniah is a liar that his statement should not be depended upon, and that he gave

of the case, and then to contrast the Statements of Deponent with these. The facts of the case are as follows: not very long after my arrival in the District, it became evident that many of the Records had been altered, new Maunims inserted, the extent of old Maunims altered &ca. It appeared also that, when Copies of Documents were required by individuals, these were not given under proper check, the copies were prepared on stampt Paper in the Record Room, and then sent for the signature of the Collector. the original might

gave the Deposition at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadaur. What evidence is there to prove him a liar? How do you say, that he gave this Deposition at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadaur?

A. I have known this Ramakristanmah Since 10 or 15 years past. He was in the habit of resorting to those Servants whose influence in the management of affairs was in succep, and of complaining to them false circumstances against their Enemies to gain their favour, after which, they to whom

might be a fraudulent document, this the Collector could not ascertain from the copy, it could only be brought to his notice by the Record Keeper. Further Omeeduars were employed in the Record Room and persons generally had access to it, or held Communication with the Record Keeper at the Door or through the Windows, all this was not as it should be, accordingly on the 20th July 1838 rules were made by me that when copies of the Records were required the practice of giving Copies in the Record Room should be discontinued, it was required that the originals

whom this individual had resorted. / being displeased with his conduct, were obliged to turn him out of their company. I can give proof in favour of my said statement, but whatever proofs I may give before your honor will be in vain. With respect to your Question, "How do you say that he gave this deposition at the instigation of the Deputy Shirstadar," I beg to represent that all those, who gave depositions before your honor in favor of Khistnarow Puntoolo, were obliged to give such deposition at his instigation

originals should be sent to the Collector in the first instance, who would direct the Shirstadar Department to examine the Documents, and after examination to send them to the Moonshey Department, where the Copy was to be made under the Signature of the Head Moonshey. It was further required that, no person besides the Record Keepers should enter the Record Room unless specially permitted by the Collector. The statements of Deponent have to be contrasted with these facts. Again, about a year and a half ago, the Record Keepers made

instigation, and for fear lest he would injure them in the event of their setting forth the actual circumstances against him, I cannot give proofs before your honor to evince the truth of the said statement. This truth would come out at the time the almighty thinks best. On perusing the Deposition given by the said Ramakristnamah, it does not appear that he was chosen by any one as witness, He declared in it that Railraidoo had chosen him as Witness and that he (Ramah Khistnamah) promised him that he would fulfil

made certain statements in regard to the frauds in that Department, and it was considered proper that the Duftery should not be allowed to go to the Record Room in future, and in order that the nature and extent of the frauds might be known, information elicited in regard to the persons by whom the frauds had been committed, the Deponent, the Deputy accountant, and the Sayer Peishcar, were formed into a committee to investigate the subject. The appointment of this committee with the rules already noticed in regard to giving

fulfil his wishes. From his giving a promise that he would give evidence in a case unknown, by him, it is evident that he is a man of bad character. As there is no doubt that the Deposition given by such a bad character is false, it is to be imagined that the Statement set forth by him is false, and that the circumstance of Railnaidoo having desired him to become his Witness is also false.—

D. 121. Has any public Officer recorded in any case that the said Nimmuguddda Ramakrishnamah is

giving Copies of Documents it was cosidered was sufficient at the time, as the report of the committee would determine what further steps should be adopted in regard to the Frauds in that Department. no report, verbal or written, has been made by Deponent. The first statement he has made on this subject is contained in the present Deposition. It is now proper to consider the statements of Deponent.

Deponent endeavours first (132) to induce an impression that the frauds have taken place recently. "I did not at any time here formerly that alterations &c. ca" and, again "I have been hearing, that alterations were found to have

is a liar

A It is known by respectable persons that he is a liar.

With respect to your Question whether any Public Officer recorded him to be liar" it would have been so recorded had there been any public trial, otherwise there would be no necessity to enter his name in any record. I have not ascertained whether or not there was any record in any place regarding this Person.—

D 122. What is the present state of the different Records in the Record Rooms attached to the Hoozzoor Cutcherry.

When

"have taken place in
"the Records within the
"last two or three years"
Deponents' disregard of
the real facts of the
case is here apparent.
"I have been hearing"
he says, and yet
he never brings what
he hears to my
notice "within the
last 2 or three years"
he says, and this
statement is made
in the face of the
facts that the rules
drawn up by me in
July 1838. were made
in consequence of the
frauds which had
been committed previous-
-ly and in the face
of the fact that for
the last 18 Months
the

When were the
alterations &c. which
appear in different ac-
counts made?
A. I did not at
any time hear formerly
that alterations &c.
were made in the
Records, which have
been in the Record
Room attached to this
Cutcherry. I have been
hearing that alterations
were found to have
taken place in the
Records within the
last two or three years.
It ought to be known
from a strict enquiry,
when and by what
person such alterations
as above referred to
were committed. I do
recollect that the
Record

the Records have been
under deponents special
charge. But, he has a
motive in insinuating
that the Records have
been tampered with
during the last 3 years.
This motive will shew
itself as we proceed.
"If the Records
"together with the writers
"were placed under my
"Superintendence, alone
"I would have given my
"answer to the above
"points." Deponent is here
unintelligible. unless
he means that owing
to the shirstah Depart-
ment generally being
held answerable for the
Examination of the Records
before copies are given, he
is unable to give a reply to
the

Record Keepers addressed
urzees to your honor in
certain cases, and that
your honor made
an investigation regard-
ing the Record Keepers
&c. to some extent.
I do not known what
might have been the
result of the above
investigation. If the
Records, together with
the writers were placed
under my superintend-
ence alone, I would
have given my answer
to the above points, but
they were not pla-
-ced under my Surveil
-lance. It was custom-
-ary during the
management of the
former collectors that
when applications for
Copies

the question. If this is Deponents' meaning the point may be left for the consideration of the Board without further remark.—

"The busines of furnishing Copies on Stamp Papers." Deponent says [122.] "has been going on with the Deputy Shirstadars."

Here is the motive for attempting to fix the frauds on the introduction of the new rules declares itself. Depnent again touches the chord which has been already rendered incapable of responding. He wishes to fix the frauds on the

Naib

copies of the Documents such as accounts &c. were received from any individual, the Record Keepers should prepare them and send them for the Collectors' Signature according to the Collectors orders, and that the Collector should then affix his Signature to them after having made the necessary examination. The above Custom is not inforce at present. The Copies above said have not been sent for my signature. I heard that when occasion calls for giving Copies

now"

naib as he has insinuated this, he has been further questioned on this point as will be seen. On the further questioning he abandons this ground, and says that the Frauds must have originated with some person in the Record Room, and although it is clear, that Deponent Knows who that or those persons are, he will not speak out.

It is astonishing that the Deponent should have made an attempt to induce a suspicion that the Frauds might have originated within the last 2 or 3 years with the naib. The naib discovered these Frauds, and brought them to my notice nearly 4 years ago, during the year that he was

now, orders have been issued to the Record Keepers, and that when the required accounts &c. are received from the Record Keepers the busines of furnishing copies on Stampt Papers has been going on with the Deputy Shirstadaurs. Formerly, all persons were not generally permitted to go into the Record Room. No Paper was brought out from the Records after sun set. There was no occasion to light lamps in the Record Room. Such rules as these were in force. It is now understood that Duftars or accounts &c. have been

was Head Shirstadaur, and the responsibility of the office rested in him — But Deponent cannot conceal the animus which impells him. —

Deponent says that Records are sent for after "Night fall" this is not the case. The Records required by the Sirsta Department are sent for under a written requisition signed by the Deponent himself, Those required in the Moonshey and Magis. terial Departments are sent for under an order signed by myself. —

Deponent says 122. that if the Records were under his charge he should have known been sent for from the Records Room after night fall — Had the Records and the Record Keeper been placed under my own surveillance, why should it not be known to me before you showed me the Diaries at the time of taking this Deposi. tion, how the copies of the orders disappear. ed in the Diaries, which were prepared and sent by me from Innacondah in relation to the post ponement for Fusly 1248. to the Deputy Shirstadaur for the purpose of getting your signature on them. As the Records are not under my

known how the orders for the post pone. ment of the Balances of Fusly 1248 dis-appeared from the Diaries. The Board will bear in mind that the Records have been specially under Deponent's charge for the last 18 months, and they will also remem. ber that in a former part of this Deposition relative to the orders in question, Deponent as. serted that he had seen these orders. It is quite clear from this, that Deponent had acces to the Records, if he says that frauds have been committed in this interval when the Records were under his charge, a heavy charge my superintendence alone, the point alluded to in your Dustion ought to be known upon strict investigation, on the contrary, it is not a matter to be answered by me. I have before stated that the copies on stamps furnish. ed to dif. ferent indi. viduals are not sent for my signature since I have been appointed as Head Shirstadaur

charge lies at his door. But it will be in the recollection of the Board, that the assertion of Deponent that he saw the orders in the Diaries has been shewn to be untrue, in as much as such orders were never issued. —

The Minor points in regard to what the former rules were &c. as asserted by Deponent, need not be adverted to, the Board will judge whether Deponent's statements are given with or without due reflection. vide Questions 123. 124.

The Board will judge of the state of the Records from

Shirastadaur, they were sent for my signature in two or three cases, but never afterwards. —

Q. 123. While the Records have been in such a state, and while the Registers have not been prepared since Fus[illegible] 1244 why was the Report stating that the Records in this Office are in good order, sent in November 1836.

A. Please to send for and shew me the report sent in November

from Deponent's own statement below /126./ and then of the propriety of his defending the report of the Shirastah Department regarding these, which was made to the Board in November 1836.

Deponent, it will be seen, admits /124./ that the Department is in arrears, and says that the references made to it for records &c. have increased which has prevented the Registers being prepared, the Registers are for Fusles antecedent to this alleged increase of business —

November 1836. —

Q. 124. Here it is, peruse it and say?

A. I have stated above that I have been hearing that alterations &c. were committed in the Records as abovementioned since these two or three years past, and there was nothing similar previous to that time, therefore, it is right that a report stating that the records are in a good state should be sent in November 1836. With respect to your Question that the Registers have not been prepared since Fus[illegible] 1244.

I have to state that, the Record Keepers being employed in arranging the Duftors

Duftors received from different departments and putting number to them after making the necessary examination with the lists, and in furnishing certain parties with Copies of accounts &c. according to the orders issued, as well as in giving references of the old accounts to the different Departments when called for &c., it is probable, that the Register of any year may fall in arrear, as it would be inconvenient to prepare the same in due time, owing to the pressure of business, and that the same should be brought up afterwards. Altho' the preparation of the Registers for Fuslies 44 and 45 was for the abovementioned reasons, delayed up to the date of the said Report sent to the Board, yet the same was not alluded to in the above report, under an idea that they would be prepared afterwards. The above report which was sent to the Board, was not prepared through my means. It appears that it was prepared through the means of the then Head Shirstadar. It was Stated in the above report that a memorandum

is

is sent to shew the state of the Record, as well as the mode observed, to preserve the same; and that the Teloogoo and English Records are in good order. It is true that the Teloogoo and English records were in good order up to that time, with the exception of the said two Registers not prepared by that period. It is also true that the mode observed for the security of the Records, and rules as alluded to in the said memorandum were in force. It is therefore to be considered that sending a report in the above manner in November 1836 is right; also subsequently, the Records have been sent up to the Record Keepers with lists from different Departments after the close of the years. since I have been appointed as Head Shirstadar, I enquired into the cause of arrears in this Department; and was informed by them (Record Keepers) that the number of orders as well as of Endorsements sent to them by your honor in relation to the Complaints preferred by Enamdars and Aggraharumdars, calling upon them to refer to the old accounts and report, had been

increased,

increased, and that they have been especially employed in taking out accounts of several years and preparing Memorandums shewing the required information, as well as in sending accounts &c of former years to different departments, when required, and arranging the same when they were returned to the Records. To which as well as to other increased state of business, they attribute the arrears. Formerly when the business fell in arrears during Mr. Whish's management the same was brought up by the aid of a certain number of additional Goomastahs - I told two or three times to the Deputy Shirstadaur that the present arrears of business should be brought up in the above manner. I had once informed you on the subject. I cannot recollect whether the account shewing the Number of Goomastahs entertained during Mr. Whish's management or the purport of the same was lately sent to the Deputy Shirstadaur, while he was on Circuit, but no Goomastahs were employed accordingly.

accordingly.

The Signature of N Shaskagerry Row
Head Sheristadar

Before me this 8th September 1841.
(Signed) J. Goldingham.
Collector.

Investigation held on the 9th September 1841.

2125. You stated above that, when the report was sent to the Board of Revenue in November 1836, there were no alterations &c in the Records and that you heard that they have been made within two or three years. Is it your opinion that the alteration discovered in the Records took place within these two or three years.

Question 125.

The Answer to this Question is not to be passed over, Deponent says, he did not hear of Frauds till within the last 2 or 3 years, but that he is not

A. Within two or three years I heard that alterations &c were discovered in the Records, but, I never heard it previously to that time, nor did any such circumstance

not able to give an = opinion on the subject whence, is this in = = ability to give an = opinion.—

circumstance come to my hearing prior to = that time, you Questioned me thus "Is it your = opinion that those altera = = tions took place within two or three years," to which I cannot answer myself, but it should be known by an investigation— How and what = Kind of enquiry do you mean to be instituted relative to those = alterations, and who appears to be the person that made the alterations.—

In the = answer to this Queste: = on Deponent ad: = mits that "great" frauds have taken place, that the = Records must = have been taken into

A I stated in the preceding answer the information which = was formerly given to you by the Record = Keepers by Arzies, and the enquiry instituted thereon

into the Town and whole Books Copied a fresh, and that = this must have been done by one "of the Servants of the Re: = cord Department."—

thereon by you, but I stated that I had not any Knowledge of the result thereof. On the 9th. April 1840, You were pleased to issue a = Hookom informing me that you selected = me, Aucoolamunnauty = Ramasawmy, the Deputy Accountant, and Davursoo Lutchemenarayanah, the Sayer Peishcar, as a committee to examine the whole Record in profession of the Record Keepers, and keep a Memorandum of all alterations &c." in the same, and directing us to note down the same accordingly. It was already stated by me in the Deposition that Lutche = menawrayanapah one of the three = Persons was after 10 or 15 days removed from the Kuzzoor

Huzzoor to be sall Thanadaur at Cheinagajeim. and that my request was not complied with to send another trust worthy person in his stead. About 60 Dufters were examined during the stay of Lutchemenaurayanappah, no more examination took place owing to a third person not being appointed again. In the month of September of last year, I employed by the Parega Ramannah the Head Sherishta Muddulgar and Aucoola Munnauty Ramasawmy, the Deputy Accountant, on that business, informing the circumstance to you and the Deputy Sheristadar. Rawmunnah looked to that business for about 20 days and afterwards was engaged under the orders of the Deputy Sherishtadar to prepare accounts &c. Consequently the examination of the Record even that time was not properly carried on. From the Memorandum &c. kept by Ramannah and Aucoolamunnauty Ramasawmy for the discrepancies discovered in the Record, during their examination and

shewed

shewed to me every day, it will be manifest that descrepancies are to be found in the Gentoo Register Book of Enams. The above Gentoo Register Books were copied in Mr. Wiskis time by Suzzapoorapoo Streneyasarow, who was the Moolasuddy employed to enquire into Enams. The oreginal Book No. 2 being compared with the Book No. 2 copied, the names of many Enamdars which were not entered in the latter were discovered in the former. In the original Book aforesaid, the names of some Enamdars were interpolated without number affixed. the numbers to some persons in the Book copied, differ from those in the original Book. Extracts from the said Gentoo Register Book were given to some Enamdars during the time of Mr. Oakes. The copies of those Extracts kept in the Record room were found, which appeared on being compared both with the Copy and Original register Books No. 2, to correspond with the former and not with the latter under the

above

above reasons, the Book No. 2. Copied seems genuine and the originab Book No. 2. has been subsequently Changed. — I do not know as regards the Gentoo register aforesaid whether it was brought or not into investigation held by you on the arzees of the Record Keepers. you have questioned me thus. "by whome do you think the alterations in the Record were made" — I beg to state that besides common alterations the Gentoo Register Book No. 2 appears to have been Copied anew, this shews that — great things as writing fresh Copies of Books &c. have taken place in the Record besides the alterations. As regards the preparation of a fresh Copy of a Book or account I presume the respective papers have been taken out of the Record Room into the Town or — to some other place, and the fresh Copies — prepared there were brought and put again in the record room. Such great Circumstances could not possibly have taken place in the

Record

Record Room. I think one of the Servants of the Record Department took out the Papers in the above manner and put the fresh Copies — in the Record Room after committing this fraud. It is necessary to find out what servants of the Record Department Committed the — offence of taking out the Papers and who — committed offence of making out fresh — Copies, also the place where and to whom the papers were given. To consider that the — said fraud was committed by the Record Keepers, there are no grounds, because they — themselves gave information, that fraud appeared to have taken place in the Gentoo Register Books, and that it would be manifest when compared with the Books — Copied. Consequently it would not be right to Consider them to be the particular Source of the fraud. The Record Keepers and the other servants of the Record Department should be examied on the subject, and by that enquiry what other grounds exist

exist; the respective persons that may be discovered should be sent for and a strict enquiry made. You Questioned me thus "How and what kind of enquiry do you mean ought to be instituted on the occasion." The manner in which the fraud was committed was mentioned by me above, and therefore a strict enquiry should be instituted to find out things of such great importance.

Q. 127. When Lutchemenaurayanapah, one of the three persons selected for the Committee to examine the Record in the manner aforesaid was removed to the District, why did not the other two Persons look to that business. you mentioned that only Panga Ramannah, the Head Muddutgar, when appointed for that Examination and Aucoolamauty Ramasawmy the Deputy Accountant looked to that business, why did not you, who were one

one of the three Persons of the Committee look to that business at that time, you have said that the Deputy Sheristadar sent Ramunnah for the preparation of accounts, why did you not tell me at the time either to send him or any other person in his stead. You have stated that substitution of papers besides alterations in the Records were discovered from the examination of Deputy Accountant and Panga Ramunnah the Sherishtah Head Muddutgaur, why did you not bring those particulars to my notice. It is mentioned by you in one place that you think someone of the Servants of the Record Department took out papers, and after the fraud was committed, fresh Papers were substituted in the Records, and in another place that the Record Keepers do not seem to be the particular source of the fraud, inconsequence of their having informed themselves that the

the fraud appeared to have taken place in the Gentoo Register Books, and that they should be compared with the Books Copied If the Record Keepers are not the Particular Persons concerned in that offence, whom do you mean to say is so concerned, where and to whom did the Record Keepers give information that fraud appeared to have taken place in the above manner in the Register Books, and that they should be compared with the Copies. If they informed you why did not you bring the particulars thereof to my notice at any time. You said that strict inquiry should be instituted. what do you Mean by strict enquiry, and in what manner is it to be made?

Question 127, 128, 129, 130, 131,

Deponent Excuses himself for not looking into the details Connected with the Records as he was engaged in the "Current business" it will be seen elsewhere that Deponent declared that he was disengaged from the Current business, and it will be remembered that the Arrears in his hands remained untouched. The Demand upon Deponents time from this Cause could not then have been great— Deponents reason for not looking into the details because he was merely superintending the business does not need comment— Deponents plea that the Nail would not

A With respect to the Question you put to me "why did not the other two Persons Namely I

and Aucoolamanauty Ramasawmy Examine the Records after Lutchmenaurayanappah was removed from the Huzzoor. "I beg to state that, when we three Persons were at first appointed, two were directed to look at every paper and bring the discrepancy that may be found before me, together with the references thereof, and I to satisfy myself after the necessary references had been made. three Persons were appointed with

an

not allow a suitable Goomastah to supply the place of the person engaged on other business, does not appear deserving of Notice. the Motive assigned for not allowing the Goomastahs is in keeping with the rest of the Deposition. These answers do not appear to call for remark, further than to point out the impossibility of getting a distinct and specific reply to the matter contained in the Question.

an idea that it would be inconvenient for me to look at every paper, as well as the other two persons in consequence of my being engaged on current business, besides the one aforesaid. It was therefore desired that a person should be substituted for Lutchemenaraymah, when he went away from this place. As regards your question "why did you not look "to the business when Pauja "Raumanah engaged to do it"

I beg

I beg to state that, I was the supervisor and the other two persons looked at every paper. The business being superintended by me, it became inconvenient to look at every paper as well as themselves when the Deputy Sherishtadaur employed Raumunnah on the preparation of Accounts. I came and represented to you that certain things were discovered, in consequence of both Raumunnah and Ramasawmy being engaged in the enquiry, that that business should be conducted by such persons as Raumannah or Cotiah, Creditable Persons, and that the other Goomastahs cannot be employed on this Task indiscreminately, when the Deputy Sherishtadaur also was before you and said we should look after the accounts are prepared. I intended to carry on the business through Raumunnah and Ramasawmy as before after the annual accounts and the Jemaubandy report of fusly 1249. were prepared, but,

You

you were pleased to remove me from the situation of Head Sheristadaur as soon as that Report was dispatched. From the time I was restored to my situation as you have been displeased with me it became inconvenient to represent to you any thing. After some time, a Hookoom was issued directing me to proceed to Innacondah, the Deputy Sheristadaur wrote Yadast from the District in the name of Pauga Ramunnah, who without my knowledge and signatures prepared Hookooms &c. and sent them himself. I only looked to the business which directly came to me, it thus passed and I had no authority. As this was the case, I did not bring to your notice in regard to a person for Examining the records. When Lutchmenarayanuppah was removed, I proposed the substitution of a Person instead of him, but it was in

in vain. when Ramannah was employed by me on the business, he was taken for the preparation of accounts, whereby the business was precluded from being carried on, even that time, and my request to put Colah in his stead proved useless. Thus being circumstanced, I ascertained after my return from Innacondah that the Deputy Sheristadaur would not allow my request to be granted, if made for a trustworthy Person for the examination of the Record, when you were displeased with me. My request at two or three different times not being complied with in the manner aforesaid, the Deputy Sheristadaur considering that a Hookoom had been issued to me on the subject and that the business cannot be carried on if he do not cause a Competent Person to be allowed and that he may there impose it as an offence on me, did not permit a suitable Person

Person to undertake the business. My word is not inforce and I am inevitably obliged to be silent with respect to my declaring that some one of the Servants of the Record Department seems to me to have taken out the papers; that there are no grounds to consider the record Keepers as the particular source of the fraud, in consequence of the information having been given by themselves relative to the discrepancies discovered between the original register Books, and those Copied. You Questioned me thus "whom do you "mean to be the particular source of "the offence." I beg to state that I cannot pointout the offenders at present, who can only be discovered by an investigation that may be held in the manner alluded to above by me. As regards your Question, "when did the Record Keepers give information that discrepancies will be found when reference is made." I have to state that I do not know the contents of

ORIGINAL DESCRIPTIVE ROLL

of their arzees to you, but when Pauga Rowmannah and Arcoola Nunnauty Ramasawmy were employed on that business, the Record Keepers themselves informed that the discrepancies will be discovered on reference being made to certain Books. As for your Question "why did I not bring to your notice the information given by the Record "Keepers" I beg to answer that I reported certain differences even discovered from the enquiry both of Ramanah and Ramasawmy, and that those Register Books were examined on the information given by the Record Keepers. Relative to your Question, "what kind of strict enquiry do you mean to be made," I beg to represent that, the manner, in which the investigation is to be held was mentioned by me above.

2128. You have stated that it appears that, some one or other of the servants attached to the Records had taken out Papers and committed frauds, who are the Servants attached to the Record

what

what are their names?

A. The Record keepers are Caturmranje Vencataraido, Noosheerwan and Abdulkhauder employed by you as additional for time past, paying them out of their salaries. Besides, there were Duffer bunds Shaik Audum and his son Shaik Makestoon, who was a Peon for some time. when examination was made Shaik Audum was directed not to look to the Record business consequently he has not been looking to that business since that time. His son was at the very same time dismissed. since Shaik Audum was directed not to look to that business, the Parash Shaik Komed and Balkeeshum are looking after that business.

2129. Whether after Shaik Audum was directed not to look to that business, and Shaik Makestoom was dismissed, or whether previous thereto, does it appear that fraud took place?

A. If the Record keepers and the other Servants had been only under my authority

authority, it would have been convenient for me to supervise thus far, but they have not been under my authority in that manner, consequently I cannot reply to particularly, I cannot say that frauds are not being committed after Shaik Audum was directed not to look after that business. It should be discovered upon examination.

2130. In what Month was Shaik Audum forbidden to look to that business, and was Shaik Makestoom dismissed? and in what Month were you appointed on the Committee for the examination of the Record.

A. I was not appointed for the examination of the Record. A Hookum was issued in the Month of April, Fusly 1249, to sift the Papers in the Record. I have already mentioned above the result of the Examination and the reasons by which the business of Examination was not regularly carried on, the circumstance of Shaik Audum having

having been forbidden to go upon that
business, and of his son having been dis-
missed took place about that time: that
is about the time when you held ex-
amination on the arzees of the Record
Keepers. I have represented the circumstances
of the examination of the papers being
discontinued instead of going on according
to the Hookoom issued to me. I have
likewise represented the circumstances of
the Record Keepers and the Record
not being under my exclusive authority.
The sending for and returning to the
Record keepers the required Duftars and
Diaries does not take place thro' my
means alone.

2131.

In the above reply you
have stated that Shaik Aadum was
forbidden to look to the record business,
and Shaik Mastoom was dismissed about
the time you were appointed on the Committee
for discovering the frauds in the Record, and in
the reply preceding thereto, you have stated
that

that you could not say that frauds are
not being committed after it was so done; From
this, it appears that you were aware of certain
frauds having been committed in the Record
during the time also you were appointed on
the Committee for discovering the frauds com-
-mitted. Did you hear or know that any
frauds took place subsequently. What kind
of frauds did you hear or know to have
been committed, by whom, in what papers,
and in what manner?

A. I have already stated that
on a Hookoom being issued to me for
the examination of the Record papers, the
examination was made for 10 or 15 days,
and afterwards for about 20 days that
it did not go on any longer than
that time, I have likewise mentioned
the reason by which the examination
was discontinued. The Record keepers
and the Record are not under my authority,
and the sending for the Duftars, Diaries
&c. from the Record did not take place
thro'

thro' my means alone - also subsequently those things have passed in the same manner as previous to the issue of the above-mentioned Hookoom to me. but subsequently the things connected with the Records have not passed under my authority only, consequently, I have represented that "I cannot say that frauds are not being committed subsequently that is, after Shirk "Ardum was forbidden to go on the "Record business and his son was dismissed" As you have said that it appears that "I was aware of frauds having been committed also subsequently" and asked me whether I had heard the same, I beg to represent that, if the Record Vcs had been under my exclusive authority it would have been convenient for me to pay strict attention and observe immediately if any irregularity was committed - as it is not so, the things passed do not reach my ear nor did I hear them.

2132. You have stated above that, formerly

formerly when any person applied for Extracts from the Documents in the Record, the Record keepers themselves used to prepare and send copies, Extracts Vcs according to the order of the Collector, that at present in such cases, the papers are sent for from the Record keepers and Extracts Vcs are caused to be given on Stamp Papers in the Kuzzoor and that the business is conducted thro' the means of the Dfts by Sheristadaur. You had no occasion to mention that circumstance at that place - nevertheless, do you know why the system of sending for accounts and giving copies has been established contrary to the system formerly observed and what rules have been established.

Question 132.

Deponent says A. As you have that he heard that mentioned that "you a Hookoom was issued had no occasion to enforcing new rules state the circumstance for the observance of at that place" I beg

the to

the Departments concerned in granting copies of Documents from the Records, and that the Copies are prepared with the Deputy Sheristadaur against this hear-say set forth by the Deponent are his admission that the said Documents were prepared and signed by him under these rules, and the probability whether as Head of the Department, he could have known of these rules from hear-say only; and still more the circumstance to represent that the rules observed during the time of former Collectors, as well as those now in force, having been mentioned then, that point also was specified. I heard that a Hookaoor was ijured directing that Documents should be sent by the Record keepers to the Huzzoor, and that Copies should be given from the Huzzoor itself contrary to the system formerly observed, when the Record keepers themselves prepared and sent copies together with the corresponding

circumstance of his having special charge for the Collectors of the record for 18 Months. corresponding papers, signature but I do not know under what grounds you have ijured that Hookoom. I do not recollect that I was present when that Hookoom was caused to be written. as you have asked me whether I know what rule is observed in giving copies I beg to state that, I heard that they are prepared with the Deputy Sheristadaur, and come for your signature, but I heard nothing more.

2133. Do you consider the rule of my sending for the Documents to the Huzzoor and causing copies to be ijured from the Huzzoor to

to be calculated to prevent frauds being committed as before. or do you consider that by this rule frauds will be committed, or are being committed?

Question 133, 134.

The Deponent A. Formerly it was it will be seen, customary for the avoided the question Record Keepers to prepare as long as he Copies and bring them could. Deponent to the Collector together says / 133 / that with their originals, formerly, when and for the Collector copies of the Record- to examine the were granted the originals and sign originals were brought the Copies. Consequently by the Record Keepers it does not appear to the Collector that frauds were with the copies. committed in giving Referring to the Copies. "As you have former arzees of asked me: do you consider the Record keepers, it does not present system, that appear.

appear that the ori- is the rule of the ginal was sent in "Documents coming any one instance. to the Huzzoor and of the copies being prepared in the Huzzoor frauds are being committed"

I beg to represent that the preparing of the Copies does not take place before me. Consequently I cannot give any reply to that point.

2134. Do you say that the above rule established by me contrary to the former one, is calculated to suppress irregularities, or tends to give birth to irregularities?

A. The system of sending for them / Documents / to the Huzzoor and issuing Copies after examining the originals is good, but, as the things done according to that Rule are not done before me, I said that

I

I cannot give answer to the Question put to me saying do you consider irregularities "are being committed thereby."

2135. In a reply lately given by you, you have stated that on account of postponement in Fasly 1248 Hookoons were issued in that Fasly to Auneen of the Pulnaud District, and that at different time you had seen the Copies of those Hookoons in the Diaries. In one of the replies given yesterday, you have stated that you were not aware of those Hookoons not being in the Diaries before the time they were shewn to you at the examination, while there is no hindrance whatever to your sending for and seeing the Diaries, and other Papers when required, what is the reason of your stating that you were not aware of the Copies of those Hookoons not being in the Diaries before the time they were shewn to you?

A I have already mentioned why

why the circumstance of those Hookoons not being in the Diaries had not come to my notice before the time those Book were shewn to me, what I mean is that, formerly I saw those Hookoons in the Diaries. those Hookoons which were seen formerly are not to be found in the Diaries, when looked for at the time of your taking this deposition and that if the Record and the Record Keepers had been under my independant authority, the circumstance of the Hookoon which had formerly existed not being forthcoming in the Diaries would not have escaped my knowledge. As there is no hindrance to my sending for, and referring to the Di. aries when required, I sent for and referred to the Diary on some account or other, then I saw those Hookoons. I do not know when and how the non-existence of those Hookoons has occurred. I do not recollect that I had subsequently sent for and referred to those Diaries. If I had

sent

sent for /the Diary/ on my account, I would have seen the same Hookoom on account of which it was sent for but it did not happen to me to see the part where the Hookoums were, which are said to be absent. In your taking this declaration as it was necessary I looked for them but they/ are not to be found.

2136. While I was at Madras at the commencement of 1840, did the Record Keepers inform you of any thing relative to the Records. That conversation took place between you and them at that time?

A. Relative to this point, you sent for and asked me at the time of your making investigation on the arzees of the Record Keepers. and I gave my reply to the effect that, a few days before your arrival from Madras the Record Keepers told me - whenever they occasionally refer to the record, they find differences, that it was

not

not possible for them to determine through when they occurred, and that they had suspicion against the other Servants attached to the Record. I replied that "you must fully keep your eye on the "other Servants and observe their acts as "the arrival of the Gentleman is near, "you must prepare and send an arzee on "the subject. He will investigate it, in "the mean time you must take much care "that further differences may not occur" Before the arrival of the Gentleman, you may present an Arzee to the Head Assistant Collector in charge, but he is a new Gentleman. the arrangement and scrutiny, the Collector would make cannot be done by a new Gentleman. you will therefore send an arzee to the big Gentleman. In a few days afterwards, your honor also arrived

and

and the Record keepers reported to you on the subject.

/Signed/ N. Sashagherry Row
Head Sheristadar

Before me this 9th. September 1841.

/Signed/ J. Goldingham
Collector.

True translate/

/Signed/ J. Goldingham
Collector.

14 - 15

Proceedings thereon disapproving the Proceedings of the Collector of Guntoor in the investigation of certain charges against the Head Sheristadar N. Sashagherry Row: directing for stated reasons the removal of the Head Sheristadar S. Venkatachistna Row from his appointment at the Huzzoor and directing the

Read letter from Collector of Guntoor under date 19th October submitting a Deposition taken from N. Sashagherry Row Head Sheristadar of that District in explanation and defence of his conduct in the exercise of his Public duties.

1. Before noticing the documents now recorded a short recapitulation of the circumstances which led to the examination under review appears to be required.

2 On the 25th November 1840

the Collector to find employment for him in the Talooks if he wishes it- also stating that the Bd. will not object to the removal of N. Sashagherry Row from his situation of Head Sheristadar as soon as any arrangement can be made for giving that individual suitable employment elsewhere

Mr. Goldingham reported that under circumstances briefly adverted to in his letter he had found it necessary to remove his Head Serishtadar N. Sashagherry Row partly from incompetence and partly from his having been privy to a fraud in the Settlement of Palmaud for Fusly 1248 by which a great diminution from the authorized Settlement was sought to have been obtained thro' the collusive agency of the Tahsildars. at the same time he intimated the nominations of S. Venkatakistna Row then and still Naib Serishtadar to succeed to the appointment from which Sashagherry Row had been extruded.-

7th Sept. 1840

3. The Board informed Mr. Goldingham in reply that his proceedings were entirely disapproved of N. Sashagherry Row was ordered to be reinstated and it was directed before Mr. Goldingham again made application for

for his removal that specific charges of impropriety or unfitness should be furnished with their proofs as also any explanation the Head Serishtadar might wish to offer in vindication of his acts impugned by the Collector Mr. Goldingham was likewise informed that the Head Serishtadar was not a person whom, if the Head appointment was vacant, they could permit to succeed to such vacancy.-

4.

In Cons. 11th Jany. 1841.-

Mr. Goldingham reported his compliance with the Board's orders in his letter of the 16th December 1840, and acquiescing in the exclusion of S. Venkatakistna Row, he still solicited permission to select another Native Officer to be Head Serishtadar. But as it appeared that no Statement or exculpation of Mr. Sashagherry Row was forwarded and that in point of fact the charges against him had not been made known to him, the Board felt themselves precluded from adopting

11th Jany. 1841. adopting the Collector's suggestion. They accordingly repeated this injunction to Mr. Goldingham to follow the course previously indicated, and more particularly to take the Serishtadar's reply to the accusation of the irregular or fraudulent postponement of Balances in Pulnaud.-

5. Notwithstanding these injunctions and the apparent urgency of the occasion Mr. Goldingham took no immediate step whatever in reference to this investigation. It now is seen that the Serishtadar was at last called in and subjected to a long intricate and searching examination on a vast variety of subjects on the 13th August last. continued at intervals till the 9th September. Translate of this examination fills 56 Sheets of paper closely written, the questions put, some of them of great length, being in number 136.-

The

6. The case seemed to the Board to be in a very small compass. The Principal charge was that R. Shashagherry Row had engaged in a fraudulent attempt in Fusslies 1248 and 1249 but chiefly in the former Fusly; to postpone the collection of a large portion of the current Revenue of those years in Palnaud. The Serishtadar's written recommendation the personal enquiries of the Collector to shew that the proposed remission was improper and uncalled for. The written orders to the Tahsildars desiring the Collection of the Balances and finally the record of the enquiry into the alleged misconduct & fabricated accounts, and fraudulent attempt were it was supposed forthcoming. The subjects seemed capable of being confined within very narrow limits instead of which from the extraordinary method of examination pursued, matter has been

been accumulated which the Board think it would be a useless waste of public time to examine or expose in detail.

7. It will suffice to state that after a very full and careful consideration of all the documents submitted, the Board are constrained to express their entire disapprobation of the whole course of the Collector's proceedings, both as regards the nature of the examination pursued and the harrassing course of cross questions that followed, no direct charge is made, and answer required but all is left to inference and insinuation while many of the interrogatories put appear to the Board to be as devoid of fairness to the Serishtadar, as the discussion they involved was derogatory to the position and dignity of the Collector's Office in reference to his Head

Native

Native Servant.-

8. To the direct accusation of Criminal connivance in a fraud the Head Serishtadar's replies appear to the Board to afford a full clear and satisfactory refutation. While to R. Shashagherry Row's complaint that the charge was kept back for months may years, that his acts, if culpable were not reprobated when they occurred, and that the Subordinates were neither removed nor suspended, no satisfactory answer is attempted to be given. The imputation that the fraudulent attempt was known and opposed no punishment or grave censure was passed upon the guilty persons at the time of the alleged offence is not met in any way by Mr. Goldingham.-

9. One fact however is notoriously evident from a perusal of the Papers before the Board, and the correspondence on which it originates

Viz.t

Viz.t that S. Venkatakistna Row has tho' nominally in a subordinate position, actually exercised for the two last years the real powers of the Head Serishtadar of Guntoor Now as his appointment to be Head Serishtadar was disallowed on good and sufficient grounds, it is evident that to permit his exercise of the substantial powers of the Office through serving in a subordinate situation is a mere evasion of the Board's orders and that it consequently behoves them to prevent its continuance.-

10. The frequent instances of complaint made to the Board of intrigue in his Serishta Depart=ment in reference to other Native Servants in Guntoor have satisfied the Board that the continuance of S. Venkatakistna Row in his present situation is injurious to the proper administration of the District. This

man

man had no previous Revenue experience nor past public services to refer to when first brought forward in the Serishta Department - and tho' the Board were led to acquiesce in his appointment to the situation of Hait Serishtadar, they are now satisfied that it is for the good of the public service that he should no longer retains it. It is besides incidentally known to the Board that the Judges of the Foujdaree Adalut in reference to the Criminal charge brought against a Native Public Servant in Guntoor have recorded an opinion not only that the charge was false but that there were strong grounds for believing the accusation originated with S. Venkatakistna Row.

11.

The Board have no hesitation therefore in desiring that S. Venkatakistna Row be once removed from his Office of appointment at the Kotzoor. If he desires to seek public employment

employment under Government Mr. Goldingham will make an arrangement for his entertainment in the Talookes.

12.

This done the Board will not object to the removal of V. Shashagherry Row from his situation of Head Serishtadar of Guntoor, so soon as any arrangement can be made for giving that individual suitable employment elsewhere because altho' nothing has been proved to his prejudice and the answers to the intricate questions and harrassing cross examination to which he has been exposed apparently taken down as delivered sufficiently attests his abilities and fitness, it can hardly be supposed with Mr. Goldingham's recorded opinion of him, that these could be beneficially exercised in his present situation. If therefore Mr. Goldingham will

will select two parties duly qualified & to be Head Serishtadar and Naib and submit their names with a record of their previous services for approval the Board will be prepared to sanction their appointment upon & Sashagherry Row being otherwise provided for.-

Read the following letter.

To,

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Extract from the Board's Proceedings of the 28th June last, requiring further information regarding the service Jeemiah of Rupees 4-11 per Mensem of Syed Meer a deceased Jemmiahdar.

2. The Supreme Government is desirous of being informed before passing any orders in this case how far and in what manner the

16

From the Pl. Collr. of Nellore

Submitting the information required by the Supreme Govt. relative to the service Jemiah of Rs. 4-11 per Mensem of Syed Meer a deceased Jemiahdar.

Para 1.

Government stands pledged to the continuance of Jeemiahs of this & Description.-

3. The records of my Office afford but scanty means of obtaining satisfactory information on the point on which the Supreme Government requires it. The only paper which throws any light upon the subject is an Extract of a letter from the & Honorable the Court of Directors under date the 12th April 1815 copy of which was transmitted to this Office by the Board of Revenue in March 1816.-

4. Viewing the general tenor of the Honorable Courts Despatch it seems to me that the Government is pledged to the continuance of Jeemiahs granted for services at Mosques and & other services connected with their religious institutions which were paid by the Nabob when the Country was assumed so long as the service is performed with a fair

right

right to reduce the amount where it may appear unnecessarily large. I am not aware that it has ever been matter of question whether the British Govern-=ment in succeeding to the sovereignty of this Country was bound to maintain the Civil rights of the Native or the natural religion; In practice it is so as regards the Hindoos, as the large land endowments continued to them by our Government abund-=antly testify. It has been the same hitherto as regards the Mussulmans, for I think it would be difficult to find an instance where a Jeomiah for service in a Mosque has been discontinued so long as the service was performed. To discontinue there-=fore an allowance for service at a Mosque enjoyed long before our possession of the Country is in my opinion to contravene this principle.

So

So Zealously did the Honorable Court of Directors view the discontinuance of Jeomiahs granted by the Mussel-=man Government that they objected to the rule that the possession of other sufficient maintenance should invariably be considered sufficient ground for resuming a Jeomiah, a proceeding which they looked upon as "involving a violation of the "public faith solemnly pledged in "the Sunnuds issued by the British "Government in 1806 to the Jeomiah-=dars." There is no reason to doubt therefore that the faith of Govern-=ment was at least pledged to continue to the then existing Jeomi-=ahdars the Jeomiahs they had been in the receipt of from the Mus-=selman Government, at the same time on the ground of a belief that it was not the policy of the Native Governments to confer hereditary

money

Money grants, but that where those allowances had descended from generation to generation, it had more probably originated in abuse rather than the intention of the donor the Honorable Court approved of an investigation into the matter, and observed that as the Rabob's Sunnuds were mere life grants and those of the British Government were couched in the same terms the notion of hereditary Jeomiahs ought to be exploded and directed that on the demise of the actual holders, it would be for Government to determine what share of the grants, if any, should be continued to the heirs of the deceased.

5. The Honorable Court however in their remarks do not discriminate between mere subsistence Jeomiahs and those granted for services in Mosques, and other places of religious worship, and from the general tenor of the letter, I am led to believe that

that in penning those remarks the Honorable Court had chiefly if not wholly in view eleemosynary grants for the support of indigent families which it must be confessed it would be absurd to consider in the light of hereditary allowances, but allowances for religious services are of altogether a distinct character. There can be no doubt that Mosque allowances were always continued under the Mussulman Government so long as the Mosque was in existence and the service in it performed, and as a general principle I conceive the British Government is under an obligation to afford the same means of religious worship to the Natives as they enjoyed under the Government which it supplanted.-

6. In the particular case under consideration, I have only further to observe that it was a grant by the Rabob himself so far back

as

as A. D. 1762. The grant was originally Rupees 9-6 per Mensem, and was in the names of two persons, the descendant of one of whom is Syed Hoosain the present claimant, the descendant of the other grantee had her portion renewed in the year 1830 in addition to a large sum paid in arrear. From 1762 the allowance has been continued up to the death of Syed Meer in 1837 now a period of nearly 80 years.-

Nellore.
Pt. Collr.s Cutcherry
26th October 1841.-

/Signed/ T. V. Stonhouse
Principal Collector

Resolution thereon.

(16-17)

Resolved that a copy of the foregoing letter be submitted for the information and orders of Government, with reference to the communication from the Supreme Government dated the 19th March 1841 copy of which was furnished to the Board under date the 19th June last.

Under

Under the circumstances set forth by Mr. Stonhouse in the letter now submitted, the Board resolve to repeal the recommendation contained in their letter of the 8th April last, for the continuance of the service Jeomiah of Rupees 4-11 per Mensem claimed by the family of the late Syed Meer.-

(18)

From the Pt. Collr. of Nellore. Read letter requesting leave of absence for three Months from the date of his quitting the District to proceed to the Presidency on private affairs under Section XI of the Absentee Rules.-

(18-19)

Order thereon. Ordered to be sent to the Civil Auditor with the following remark.-

Submitted for the favorable consideration of Government through the Civil Auditor with reference to the resolution of Government dated 30th November published in the Fort St. George Gazette under date 1st December last.-

Read

Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

Read the following letter

20

From the Coll.r of Bellary...

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit the undermentioned Statements of Extra Tent allowance drawn by myself and my Subordinates during the past Fusly 1250 prepared agreeably to the prescribed form and amounting in the aggregate to Company's Rupees 2,386. 2. for which sum I request you will obtain the sanction of the Board.

No. 1. Statement showing the number of Tents proposed by the Collector and the amount of Extra Tent allowance to which he is entitled for Fusly 1250 being at Rs. 5-4-" per diem for 136 days..... CRs. 714-"-"

No. 2. Ds. Ds. the Sub Collector at Rs. 5-4-" per diem for 253 days.. CRs. 1328-4-"

No. 3. Ds. Ds. the Acting Head Ass.t Coll.r at Rs. 2-10 a. per diem for 105 days..... CRs. 275-10-"

No. 4. Ds. Ds. the Ass.t Coll.r at Rs. 2-10 a. per diem for 26 days..... CRs. 68-4-"

Total CRupees.. 2386-2-"

Bellary Coll.rs Office,
on Circuit at Hospett.
11th. October 1841....

/Signed/ A. Mellor
Collector

20. 21 Resolution thereon.

	No. of days
Mr. A. Mellor Coll.r	136
Mr. C. Rilly, Sub Coll.r	253
Mr. W. Fisher Actg. Head Ass.t Coll.r	105
Mr. J. Ratliff Ass.t	26

The Board sanctions the amount of Extra Tent allowance drawn in Fusly 1250 by the Collector of Bellary and his Subordinates respectively for the number of days noted in the Margin as shewn in detail in the Statements which accompanied the foregoing letter.-

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing resolution be transmitted for the information of the Civil Auditor.-

Read

Fort St. George 11th. November 1841.

Read the following letter

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

22

From the Ass.t Coll.r of Cuddapah

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for submission to the Board the enclosed Copies of letters received from the Zillah Judge with a Plan of part of the great road passing through Cuddapah and leading to the Military Cantonment.

Mr. Walker has been making very great improvements in this road which have not only had the effect of shortening the distance and otherwise rendering the communication easier, but by opening a wide street through the town of Cuddapah have done much to remove the unhealthiness always more or less complained of by the inhabitants. That Gentlemen's personal exertions and conciliating treatment have been highly successful in obtaining the consent of the inhabitants to the removal of houses &c.a and in the case now laid before the

Recommended that a portion of a Putta land may be sanctioned to be given up as Enam in Exchange for that portion which the Enamdars agreed to give for the use of the high road now under improvement.-

Board

Board I shall be unable through the Tahsildar to effect an exchange of the land required.

It will be seen by the enclosures that the land required of certain inhabitants is partly Enam and partly Puttah land and the holders of the Puttah land have for a sum of 15 Rupees paid by Mr. Walker himself consented to relinquish their puttahs, so that some of this Circar Puttah land is available partly for the road itself, partly to be given as Enam in exchange for that portion to be given up by the Enamdars.

The extent to be so given in exchange is larger but of a lower amount of Teerwah than the portion of Enam surrendered, and the Enamdars only stipulate that they shall not be liable at any future period for Teerwah jasty or other charge in the event of their changing the Cultivation from Kooshky to any other, whether Bagayet or Turry. This appears to be but reasonable,

and

and I trust the Board will at once sanction the exchange.

The following is the exact statement of the portion of Enam land and of the Circar land to be given in exchange for it.

Musjeed Surwah Enam 28½ Goontahs of Bagayet land of Turrum Teerwah Cant. Pagodas 2 – 1 – 6 for which the Enamdars have accepted 1 acre 13 Gunt. 2 Ass. of Circar Kooshky bearing Turrum Teerwah of 6 Pag. 5 – 5 Fs. as. capable of improvement by irrigation to Bagayet for which no additional charge is to be made.

Cuddapah Pr. Coll. Office 25th October 1841.

(Signed) W. Ashton
Print. Coll.

A

To the Principal Collector of
Cuddapah

Sir

Previous to your departure for Muddenpully I had the honor of communicating with you demi officially on the subject of the improvement of the road between the Fort of Cuddapah and the cantonment which I am endeavouring

to

to effect and it was proposed by you that as I had been successful in prevailing on various householders living on either side of the Principal street between the Fort and the old Bridge over the Cuddapah tank Channel to consent to my removing their houses to other places I should also endeavour to effect an amicable arrangement with the owners of certain Enam land on the Cantonment side of the Channel.-

2 I have now the honor to acquaint you that such an arrangement has been effected. I enclose herewith a Razeenamah executed by Murad Khan and Rokka Bibi agreeing to relinquish so much of their land as is wanted for the road on certain terms. I subjoin to this letter a translation of their Razeenamah, and I send with it a plan of the ground which the Superintending Engineer has made at my request.

3. I should mention that the portion of

of new road marked out in the plan will be equally important as an improvement on the present wretched Communication between the Fort and the Cantonement, whether the Government are pleased to sanction or to object to the Bridge recommended by the Superintending Engineer to be built over the Pullavanka, the broad stream near the Cantonment.-

4. As the state of the above communication has been brought by others to the notice of Government, it is not necessary for me to expatiate upon it. I would however beg that it may be especially remembered that your Treasury, your Bazar Kutcherry and the Zillah Jail are all within the walls of the Fort at a distance of at least two miles from the Cantonment.-

5. Canalakuri yellamma, Mchamma, and Durgadu have for a fair consideration renounced their title to the Putta land in favor of the Original holders Murad Khan and Rokka Bibi in their Original Razeenamah is also forwarded

forwarded herewith.-

6. The readiness with which these individuals have all assisted our endeavours to improve the principal thoroughfare through Cuddapah instead of holding out against us for opposition's sake, according to the com= =mon fashion will not escape your notice. It is to be hoped that the arrange= =ment suggested by them will turn out hereafter to their advantage.-

7. I trust that you will readily obtain the sanction of Government to the measure proposed.-

Cuddapah -------
Zillah Criminal Court
21st October 1841. ---

Signed/ John Walker
Criminal Judge

To The Honorable Company

11th October 1841

Razeenamah or Deed of resig= =nation of Inam land executed by Murad= =khan, Jamman, and Rokka Bibi Mosque Inam holders at Cuddapah town, to the following effect.-

"As we are this day asked by the Cirkar to give up such portion of our Inam

Enam land as is necessary for the construc= =tion of a road leading thro it to the can= =tonment &c. we have relinquished from our Enam for the said road a portion of land of 231 yards in length and 15 yards in breadth being 28½ Coontas assessed at 2 Pagodas 1 3/8 fanams out of our No. 78.-

The said piece of land assessed at 2 Pags. and one and three eighths fanams being relinquished by us for the construc= =tion of the road required by the Cirkar in lieu thereof there is to be given to us as follows.-

The Cirkar khushki (or dry= =Gramanathum) land included in No. 78 which is entered in the Pottah granted in the names of Camalakooryyellumma / Mohemmd and Durgadu / 3 persons / is 1½ acre assessed at 6 fanams. From this is to be deducted a portion required for the road, being ---

Coontas 6 7/8 assessed at 11/16 fanams
acre Coolies - 4 per fan. 7 fs.
The remainder is 1 - 13 1/8 - 5 - 7 fs. -

This portion of land bearing an assessment

a pesesment of five fanams and five sixteenths and consisting of one Acre and thirteen Coontahs and one eighth being granted to us in lieu of the land we have relinquished, we beg that an order may be issued to enter it under Enam and to exempt it from any demand of Extra Revenue if we irrigate it from a Channel of a tank or from a well, and to allow us to irrigate it from the Channel &c. If such order should be given for the exemption of any demand of Extra Revenue on the said land, we give with our free consent to from our Enam No. 78 a portion of land bearing an assessment of 2 Pagodas and one and three eighths fanams for the construction of the road. And neither we nor our representatives shall hereafter make any dispute whatever about this resignation of our Enam land. This Razeenamah is written with our free consent

Consent.-

(Signed) Muradkhan

Mark of Rokka Bibi

Witnesses.

(Signed) Broddenkhan of Cuddapah.

Mark of Moneenkhan

Mark of Goodoor Munchala Goorevereddy

Mark of Akbarkhan

Written by Goodoor Eurnum

Rungapah

Presented 18th October 1841 through J. Rajapah.-

(Signed) John Walker

Criminal Judge

To

The Principal Collector of

Cuddapah

It has occurred to me that in my letter of the 21st instant respecting the arrangements with the Enamdars Muradkhan and Roka Bebe, I may not have been sufficiently explicit, I have therefore the honor to acquaint you that the Government are not to be put to any expence in consideration of the relinquishment by Canalakuri Yellamma Achchumma and Durgadoo of

of the portion of land included in No 78 for which they had obtained a Putta. The sum of fifteen (15) Rupees, in consideration of which they executed their Razeenamah was paid by myself out of my private purse.—

2 Lest this should appear mysterious, I beg leave further to state my reason for making such payment when, after a former communication with you I requested these persons to give up some land for the information of the proposed Road, the utmost readiness was expressed and manifested by them to accede to my wishes. In the course of making out the boundaries of the Road, I was given to understand that the Cumdars Murad Khan and Rokka Bibi had been obliged through poverty to surrender a portion of their Putta land in payment of a debt, and that the individuals who had so obtained that portion were perfectly willing to restore it if their debt were

were paid. I was so pleased with the readiness of these people to fall in with my plans for the accommodation of the public, that as a mark of my appreciation thereof, I at once sent them the trifling sum requisite for restoration of the land to its former holders.—

Court house
Cuddapah,
5th October 1841.

(Signed) John Walker
Criminal Judge

Resolution thereon,

Resolved that the foregoing Communication be submitted for the consideration and orders of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council with the Board's recommendation that sanction may be granted for carrying out the arrangements therein suggested, for improving the line of road leading from the Fort of Cuddapah in the Cantonment.—

To

16031 Fort St. George 11th November 1841

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

24

From the Pt. Coll.r of Cuddapah

Sir,

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board dated the 18th Instant and the orders of Govern=ment therein communicated I have the honor to state my opinion that there is no impropriety ac=cording to Butcha Rauk's request that the name of his second son may be entered as his next heir in the Sunnud to be issued for his Shrotrium Village

Cuddapah District Print.g Coll.rs Office
Vuvidalloor
27th October 1841.

(Signed) W. Askton.
Pt. Coll.r

Order thereon (Read again in Cons.n 2d Dec.r) in Circulation.

Ordered to be sent again

Read

24. 25

16032 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Read again letter from the Collector of Chingleput dated 19th ultimo and entered in Consultation 4th Instant

Ordered that the follow=ing address be submitted in con=sequence.

To The Acting Chief Secretary to Government

26

To the Actg Chief Secy to Government

Sir,

Submitting a letter from the Collector of Chingleput re=porting the demise of Cavelly Venkata Soobiah and requesting au=thority to register the Shrotrium Village of Tinnamoor in the name of Cavelly Venkata Boriah the next surviving son of the Original Grantee Cavelly Venkata Lutch=miah with the Board's opinion whether under the Cowle=granted the Shrotrium is to revert to Government or

19 Oct.r Cons.s 4 Nov.r 1841

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request you will lay before the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the ac=companying letter from the Collector of Chingleput reporting the demise of Cavelly Venkata Soobiah, and requesting authority to register the Shrotrium Village of Tinna=moor in the name of Cavelly Venkata Boriah the next surviving son of the late Cavelly Venkata Lutchmiah.

This Village it is known

2

to

on the demise of the present incumbent being the third life in succession as maintained by the Collector or to continue in the family for three Generations as contended for by the surviving sons of the original Grantee.-

to Government was conferred on the late Cavelly Vencata Lutchmiah on Shrotreium tenure and his two next heirs in succession This person died in May 1839. and on the report of the Collector the Board of Revenue authorized Mr Freese to register the Village in the name of the surviving sons they being Members of an undivided Family, leaving at the same time a Sowcar Sevarunker Pondich in possession, in virtue of a Mortgage Bond he held from the Father and eldest son Cavelly Vencata Sobiah. The orders of the Board were reported in the letter from this Department of the 23d December 1839 and were fully approved of and sanctioned by Government in the Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of

Sel. Cons. 23 Jany. 1840 of the 8th January 1840.-

3 The death of Venceta Soobiah is now announced without children and Mr Freese proposes that the Sagheer be registered in the name of Cavelly Venceta Boriah the eldest surviving son of the original Grantee with the distinct understanding that on his demise the Village will then revert to Government this being the third life in succession.

4 This interpretation of the wording of the Cowle granted by Government; is objected to by the two surviving sons of the late Cavelly Venceta Lutchmiah, who have personally before the Collector, and by Petition to the Board herewith submitted, contended that the intention of Government was to confer the Shrotreium on the family for three generations, and

No. 1839 of 1841.-

and not on the two immediate heirs who in this instance are the eldest and second sons of the first incumbent. They have cited in Corroboration of their views the fact that the Village on their father's death was registered in the names of all the Sons and not in that of the eldest son only.

5 The Board however are of opinion that Mr Freeze's interpretation of the Cowle is correct. It seems to them that the registry in the name of the three sons was wrong and made through inadvertence, altho' sanctioned by Government. For if the eldest son whose death is now reported had left a Heir the Jaghire would clearly have devolved on him for life, subject to any claims for subsistence his uncles, as members of an undivided Hindoo family, might legally have upon their representative

representative and head. Strictly speaking Cavelly Venkata Boriah is the succeeding second Heir in succession to his Father, and as such the Jaghire they think will revert to Government at his death.

But as possibly it may be considered that it was intended that this Village should be enjoyed for two Generations by the family, that is until the demise of the descendant of one of the sons of Cavelly Venkata Lutchmiah, and as the Registry of the Village was made with the sanction of Government in the name of all the sons, the Board will not cancel the arrangement and direct the registry to be amended by the insertion of the second son's name only unless the Right Honorable the Governor in Council should approve of this suggestion under the explanation now afforded.

Revenue Board Office
Fort St George 11th November 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett
Secretary.

Read

Read the following letter

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

27

From the Coll.r of Chingleput

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for sanction the accompanying Statement of Extra Tent allowances drawn by the Collector and his assistants during Fasly 1250.

Chingleput District
Collector's Cutcherry
Pullecarney
13th September 1841.

/Signed/ A. Freese
Collector

Resolution thereon.

27-28

The Board sanction the amount of Extra tent allowance drawn in Fasly 1250 by the Collector of Chingleput and his assistants respectively for the number of days noted in the margin as shewn in detail in the statement which accompanied the foregoing letter.

	No. of days
Mr. A. Freese Coll.r	105
Mr. Gell Swinton Asst.	17
Mr. H. A. Brett Do.	25
Mr. C. Peters Do.	57
Mr. R. J. Clarke Asst.	36

Ordered

Ordered that a Copy of the foregoing Resolution be transmitted for the information of the Civil auditor

Read again letter dated 30th Septr. 1841. from the Principal Collector Northern Division of Arcot reporting upon the extra sources of Revenue in that District for Fasly 1250.

29

Proceedings thereon

Relative to the management of the Extra sources of Revenue in the Northern Division of Arcot for Fasly 1250.

Salt 1.

Owing to the favorable nature of the season, the manufacture of Salt was carried on to a much greater extent in Fasly 1250, than in the preceding year. The accounts shew an increase of G M 129 - 113 in the quantity manufactured and in the quantity sold, an excess of G M 143 - 394 - the increase of revenue derived therefrom being Rupees 15,718-

Para 3.

6 9 The Collections in Fasly 1249 were Rupees 21,373 - " - 3 and in the year following Rupees 36,491-7-"

The charges in the Fasly under review

review exceeded those of the preceding year by Rupees 915-6-1 the disburse=ments of manufacturers share having been larger in consequence of the increased quantity produced.-

2. The Net revenue after deducting charges* amounted to Rupees 33,034-6-7- and exceeded the Net Revenue of Fasly 1249 by Rupees 1,425-8-0.-

Rs P
*3,457-5-

3. In the sall Revenue of Fasly 1249 the Board noticed a decrease of Rupees 10,709- regarding which it appeared to them that some explanation should have been afford=ed by the Principal Collector in his report for that year — This falling off would seem to be sufficiently accounted for, in the concluding para of the report now before the Board, wherein it is stated to have occured in consequence of the want of forage and water experienced by the traders

Proceedings 23d November 1840 Para 1.

traders at the Poongalium Pass during the early months of Fasly 1249 owing to which their Cattle perished in great numbers, and they were prevented from remaining to complete their usual purchases- The state of things was much better as regards the season of Fasly 1250 and the Sales were accordingly increased to the extent above noticed.-

Sayer. 4 The "demand" under this head amounted to Rupees 15,940-12-7 of which Rupees 12,550-12-7 comprized the current collections on the various articles liable to Sayer Duty- and Rupees 20,400 was the amount of Betel and Tobacco rents- In the former there was a net increase of Rupees 3,671-13-11 resulting from an increase of Rupees 9,858-6-2 in the Collections on Betel nuts, Tamarinds, Cloths, &c and a decrease of Rupees 6,186-8-3- in the Collections on Jagery, Ginjelly oil

Stat. in P6

oil seeds, and other small articles. In the Betel and Tobacco rents there was an increase of Rupees 900. The total demand was thus Rupees 4,571 - 13 - 11 in excess of the demand for Fusly 1249.

5. The current demand was realized in full within the Fusly. and the Net revenue after deducting

† 21,601 - 7 - 4 Charges (which were less by Rupees 597 - 9 - 4 than in Fusly 1249) amounted to Rupees 1,30,339 - 5 - 3 shewing a gain of Rupees 4,169 - 7 - 3 upon the Net Revenue of the previous year.

Abkarry. Rs as p

Fusly 1250 - 104775 - - - 6. The Abkarry settlement

" 1249 - 87730 - 14 - 4 for Fusly 1250 shews an increase of

14,044 - 2 - 4 Rupees 14,044 - 2 - 4 over that of the preceding year. The Total Collections amounted to Rupees 97446 - 3 - 10 being in excess of the collections of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 10534 - 12 - 4. There were no charges under this head.

7. There was a balance of

of Rupees 4,328 - 12 - 2 uncollected at the close of the year which the Principal Collector states, is the amount of remission due on account of the

Page 15. removal of Regiments from Ramnad and Arnee during the Fusly under review - Under this explanation the Board recommend that the above sum may be at once written off.

Tripetty Offerings Rs as p

Fusly 1250 - 110509 - 3 - 10 8. In consequence of an increased resort of Pilgrims to Tripetty

" 1249 - 82520 - 3 - 10 in Fusly 1250 the gross amount realized

28189 - - under the head of Tripetty offerings, exceeded that collected in Fusly 1249 by Rupees 28189.

9. The Net Revenue after

† 27881 - 4 - 9 deducting Charges† amounted to Rupees 82927 - 15 - 1 and exceeded the Net Revenue derived from this source in Fusly 1249 by Rupees 2900 - 9 - 8.

Sundry Small Farms & Licences } 10. In the demand under this head there was a net increase of Rupees

Rupees 1301-7-4 arising from an increase of Rupees 2,457-12-8 principally occa-
Para 12 -sioned by the sale of certain offerings at the Purwaid and Ellatoor Pagodas and a decrease of Rupees 1,150-5-8 of which all but 15-10 occurred in the rent of Tank fisheries the season having been unfavorable to speculation in that branch of Revenue.-

11. The total Revenue derived from Sundry small farms and licenses in Fusly 1250 was Rupees 9,744-6-1 being Rupees 1,255-7-4 in excess of the revenue of the preceding year.-

Stamps. 12. In the Stamps Collections there was a decrease of Rupees 213-6-3 and in the charges, an increase of Rupees 239-13-1 The result being a decrease of Rupees 453-3-4 in the net revenue from this branch - the amount realized being in Fusly 1249 Rupees 29,069-6-7 and in Fusly 1250 Rupees 28,616-3-3.

Motwipha. 13. In the Motwipha demand there was a net increase of Rupees 665-13-6 The particulars of

of which are exhibited in the Statement annexed to Para 14 of the report before the Board, and which do not appear to re-quire any particular notice. The Gross Collec-tions, which, as there were no charges, con-stitutes the net revenue under this head, amounted to Rupees 34,844-14-3 being Rupees 661-7-4 in excess of the revenue of Fusly 1249.-

14. There was a balance of Rupees 189-4-3 due at the close of the year, which has since been brought to account.-

Total. 15. The total demand on account of all the branches of extra revenue in North Arcot for Fusly 1250 exceeded that of the preceding year by Rupees 63,077-4-11 and the Collections within the year shew an increase of Rupees 60,135-9-1 The total collections amounted to Rupees 4,71,745-10-4 and the charges to Rupees 54,793-2-3 leaving a net Revenue of 4,16,952-8-1 being Rupees 59,974-8-3 in excess of the net revenue of Fusly 1249 a result which the Board consider extremely satisfactory.-

Ordered that a Copy of the fo-regoing Extract from the Board's Proceed-ings with the annexed comparative State-ments of the Collections, Charges, and Net Revenue be submitted to Government and a transcript of the same be forward-ed to the Collector in the Northern Division of Arcot for his information and guidance.-

Northern

16045

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Northern Division of Arcot July 1250.

		July 1249	July 1250	Increase	Decrease
		Rupees a P	Rupees a P	Rupees a P	Rupees a P
Salt	Demand	21,373 " 3	36,491 7 "	15,118 6 9	" " "
	Balance on the 12th July	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Current Collection	21,373 " 3	36,491 7 "	15,118 6 9	" " "
	Extra Dr	3 " "	" " "	" " "	3 " "
	Arrears	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Total	21,376 " 3	36,491 7 "	15,115 6 9	" " "
	Charges	25,411 10 4	31,457 " 5	915 6 1	" " "
	Net Revenue	18,824 5 11	33,034 6 7	14,200 " 8	" " "
Sayer	Demand	147,368 14 8	151,940 12 7	4,571 13 11	" " "
	Balance on the 12th July	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Current Collection	147,368 14 8	151,940 12 7	4,571 13 11	" " "
	Extra Dr	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Arrears	1,550 " "	" " "	" " "	1000 " "
	Total	148,368 14 8	151,940 12 7	3571 13 11	" " "
	Charges	22,199 . 8	21,601 7 4	" " "	597 9 4
	Net Revenue	126,169 14 "	130,339 5 3	4,169 7 3	" " "
Akavy	Demand	87,730 14 "	101,775 " "	14,044 2 "	" " "
	Balance on the 12th July	887 15 8	4,328 12 2	3,440 12 6	" " "
	Current Collection	80,842 14 4	97,446 3 10	16,603 5 6	" " "
	Extra Dr	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Arrears	68 9 6	" " "	" " "	68 9 6
	Total	80,911 7 10	97,446 3 10	16534 12 "	" " "
	Charges	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Net Revenue	80,911 7 10	97,446 3 10	16534 12 "	" " "
Sundry Small farms and Renewals	Demand	8,488 15 1	9,790 6 1	1,301 7 "	" " "
	Balance on the 12th July	" " "	46 " "	46 " "	" " "
	Current Collection	8,488 15 1	9,744 6 1	1255 7 "	" " "
	Extra Dr	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Arrears	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Total	8,488 15 1	9,744 6 1	1255 7 "	" " "
	Charges	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
	Net Revenue	8,488 15 1	9,744 6 1	1255 7 "	" " "

Pittsburgh 11th December 1851.

| | | |

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Read again Letter from the Principal Collector of North Arcot dated 19th ultimo and entered in Consultation 4th Instant,

Ordered that the following address be submitted in consequence.

30

To

The Actg. Chief Secretary to Government

To the Actg. Chief Secy. to Government Submitting a correspondence with the Pr. Coll.r of N. Arcot having reference to the disposal of the Village of Carrapaurum alienated in 1791 by the Predecessor of the present Zemindar of Calastry as an Endowment for a charitable institution in favor of one Venkataramiah with the Board's sentiments on the subject

Sir

I The Board of Revenue direct me to request you will bring under the consideration of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the correspondence noted in the Margin having reference to the disposal of the Village of Carapaurum Rum in North Arcot formerly appertaining to the Calastry Zemindary.

From the Bd. to Coll.r 26th Augt. in Cons.y 6th Sept.r
Proceedings of the Board 6th September 1841
From the Pr. Coll.r 19th Octr. in Cons.y 4th November 1841

2 The Village in question is represented to have been alienated by a predecessor of the present Zemindar in 1791 as an Endowment for a Charitable institution in favor of one Venkataramiah a second Village called Canamanambaid

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

was also presented by the Zemindar to the same individual as a free Enam.

3. Venkataramiah having fallen into difficulties was subsequently prosecuted in the Supreme Court by one Condaliah and Judgment for Forty thousand Pagodas was eventually decided against his representative and adopted on Nursimmiah This Amount was ordered to be paid to Sashachelliah & Venkatachellah sons of the Creditor P. Condaliah

4. Meanwhile the Zemindar it is stated had reassumed possession of the Carrapaurum Village but restoration was ordered to be made in consequence of legal proceedings instituted in the Centre Provincial Court by the adopted Son of the Original Proprietor. In the end in 1839 both Villages Carrapaurum & Canamanambaid were ordered by the Judges of the Sudr. Adalut to be sold in Satisfaction of

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue 1st January 1842

of this Judgment referred to in the preceding Para passed in the Recorder's Court in Madras.

5 — The latter Village was sold, accordingly but Cauvapatnum being granted as a Charitable endowment was under the orders of the Sudr adalut Court held under attachment of the Collector who at the same time directed — that the Revenues should be appropriated to the purposes for which they were destined by the original grant and if any surplus remained after such appropriation that it may be annually transmitted to the Tillah Court for payment to — Sasachelliah and Vencatachelliah, the Village has so continued under attachment for the last thirteen years and under the Superintendance of the Officers of Government the — surplus funds have accumulated to Rupees 5383-5-9 but the security has ceased to be maintained and Nursimiah son to the original grantee has died without an Heir. No part of the accumulated surplus has been paid into Court on account of the Judgment.

From Collector 19 Octr 1841 Para 4

Judgment, Creditors Sasachelliah and Vencatachelliah who appear also to be both dead.

6 Under these circumstances — the Zemindar of Calastry now proposes to take the Village under his own Management offering if the surplus Funds be paid to him to construct and furnish suitably a Commodious Choultry engaging to keep it in repair. Mr Ogilvie inclines to this arrangement, and the Board direct me to support this suggestion if the Right Honorable the Governor in — Council should see no objection to its being carried out. —

The.

The Endowment in question seems properly to fall under the Provisions of Regulation VIII of 1817 and if the offer of the Zemindar of Calastry be accepted it will be the Principal Collector's duty to see that the revenues of the Village are properly appropriated to the purposes for which they were originaly granted.—

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
11th November 1841

(Signed) B. B. Smollett
Secy.

From the Principal Collector of North Arcot

31

Read letter,
Submitting Statements of contingent charges sanctioned by the Board for Fusslies, 1249 & 1250.—

31-32

Order thereon

Ordered to be recorded.

From the Pl. Coll.r of N. Arcot.

33

Read letter requesting that the lease of a house granted to Mr. Bourdillon —

Sub

Collector may be cancelled.—

33.34

Order thereon.

Ordered to be submitted for the information of Government.

Read the undermentioned Statements

35

From the Principal Collector of North Arcot

Statements shewing the comparison of the collections between Fusslies 1249 and 1250.—

36

From the Principal Collector of North Arcot

Statements shewing the comparison of the charges between Fusslies 1249 and 1250.—

35-37

Order on the 2 abovementioned Statements

Ordered to be lodged.—

Read again letter from the Principal Collector of Salem dated 28th September and entered in Consultation 1st Instant.

Ordered.

16053 Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence

To

The Principal Collector of

Salem,

38

To the Collr of Salem

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th September last furnishing a list of letters addressed by you to this Office from January to August 1841 inclusive. On examination of this list it is found that the Documents mentioned in the accompanying Memorandum, have not been received here the Board therefore request that duplicate copies of such as still seem to require notice be furnished at your earliest convenience.

Sm Cas 1st Nov 1841

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George
11th November 1841.

Signed D. B. Smellie
Secy.

Memorandum

16054 Fort St. George 11th November 1841

A Memorandum of letters reported to have been sent by the Principal Collector of Salem to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue from January to August 1841 but not received by the latter.

No.	Date of the Letter	Purport
	1841	
	18th February	Forwarding an Estimate of Extra charges proposed to be incurred in Fasly 1250 —
		Informing that no persons were charged with Offences under Regulation IX of 1822 in January 1841 —
	5th April	Forwarding Returns of Persons charged under Regulation IX of 1822 in February 1841 —
	1st May	Stating that there are no presentations in the shape of offerings on the part of Government at Native festivals in this District —
	4th Do.	Requesting to know if the other sample of Cotton besides what have been already sent is still required to be forwarded

Enclosing

No.	Date of the letter	Purport
	28th May	Enclosing Copy of a letter from the Acting Sub Collector regarding the Sayer Ameen of Yadapandy.—
	29th Do.	Transmitting Return of Tahsildars Requesting to be informed under what head the Aggraharam Villages are to be entered in Aumanie Accounts &c.—
	1st June	Forwarding Copies of letters &c with the Principal Coll.r of Chittoor &c relative to the Outstanding Balance of Sayer rent of Fusly 1242 and Requesting sanction to write it off.—
	1st Do.	Regarding the dismissal of Certain Individuals by the Sub Coll.r and the appointment of the same to his Cutcherry.—
	30th Do	Requesting the Board to apply to Govt. for Copy of an agreement between the Rajah of Mysoor and General Harris &c relative to the possession of Forts to reply to a Complaint filed in the Court by Mr. Fischer of the Department of Public Works.—
To the Secretary to Govt. 1841 20th Feby.		Reporting that the building of the Salem Treasury is perfectly secured &c against any common risk.—
9th April		Forwarding 2 Bills amounting to Rupees 1644 8 4
3rd June		Stating that no replies have been &c received to several letters.—

Read

Read the following letters.

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

39

From the Coll.r of Salem

Sir,

Para 1 I have the honor to forward copy of a letter received from Messrs. Binny & Co. claiming a refund of payment of Quit rent due on land occupied by a House lately belonging to Colonel Lennon and now in the possession of Government.—

2 The ground of their claim would appear to rest on the Circular orders of the Board dated 6th June 1840 stating that the Right Honorable the Governor in Council had been pleased to direct that the demands for arrears of Quit rent due on Government Grants should be limitted to a period of five years.—

3 In the present case however the lands are not held on Government Grant they are held of the Salem Poottahdar who claims the full arrear and to whom

whom the amount has been paid by Government as the proprietor of the property I do not therefore consider that the late proprietor has any claim in reference to the order abovementioned, and I know of no other which makes a demand for arrears above five years standing illegal. However request the Board's instructions previous to forwarding a reply to Messrs. Binny & Co.—

Salem Collah
Salem
Prin.l Coll.r Cutcherry
25th October 1841

(Signed) J. D. Sleig
Prin.l Coll.r

A

To The Principal Collector of
Salem

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 8th October 1839 to the address of our Mr. Key preferring a claim of 31 years arrears of Pul rent on the Ground occupied by a House at Salem lately the property of the

late Colonel Lennon and which arrears were duly paid to you, We have the honor to represent to you that it has lately come to our knowledge that not more than 5 years arrears can be legally claimed and as the Government have recognized this and refunded to us a similar over payment made to them on account of certain Houses at Trichinopoly also belonging to the late Colonel Lennon which we had sold to them we have the honor to request you will send us an order for the excess paid to you as above.—

Madras 15th October 1841

(Signed) Binny & Co.
(True Copy)
(Signed) J. D. Sleig
Prin.l Collector

39-40

Proceedings thereon — Mr. Sleig should intimate to Messrs. Binny & Co. the facts stated in their letter and explain to these Gentlemen that the indulgence shewn to the owners of Houses at some Stations

Stations by Government in reference to the levy of arrears of Quit Rent is in no way binding upon private Landed Proprietors and that in reality the precedent cited by them has no analogy to the present case —

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

(41)

From the Asst. Coll.r of Salem

Sir,

With reference to the accompanying Copy of Correspondence relative to deputation allowance claimed by Mr. Brett, I have the honor to inform you that on Mr. Bretts appointment as Acting Register to the Zillah Court of Salem being announced to him, application was immediately made by him requesting to be permitted to continue in the Office of Acting Head assistant Collector and in the anticipation of his request being complied with

DESTROYED ORIGINAL

with the Establishment under his charge was not called up to the Khuzzoor Station as I consider the circumstances under which Mr. Brett solicits deputation allowance for the whole period to be a peculiar one — I beg to submit his application for the favorable consideration and orders of Government —

Salem Zillah
Salem
Print.d Coll.r Cutcherry
30th October 1841

(Signed) J. D. Sleig
Asst. Collector

To The Acting Civil Auditor
Fort St. George

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit for the purpose of being passed and returned Mr. Bretts Bill for Deputation allowance for the past Month, together with a copy of a letter which accompanied it

Salem Zillah
Salem
Print.d Coll.r Cutcherry
4th September 1841

(Signed) J. D. Sleig
Asst. Collector

To

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

To
The Principal Collector of
Salem

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 1st Instant requesting me to report the date on which I left off doing duty as Acting Head Assistant in this District, and returning my bill for deputation allowance to be corrected.

Believing myself entitled to the deputation allowance for the whole month on the ground that my appointment to act as Register having been cancelled, I am restored thereby to my appointment of Head Assistant from the date on which the appointment to the Court was made, and became entitled to the full emoluments in consequence, I again return the bill and request if there is still any doubt on the point,

that

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

that it may be referred to the Civil Auditor. - Tho' there was a temporary suspension of my duties as Acting Head Assistant yet as it was caused by no act of my own, but by an order which has since been cancelled I cannot think this circumstance would be allowed to operate to my injury. -

The date on which I ceased to do duty as Acting Head Assistant, in consequence of the appointment dated 10th Ultimo was the 13th of the same month. -

Salem 3rd September 1841

(Signed) H. A. Brett
Ag Head Asst Coll

To The Principal Collector
of Salem

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd Ultimo, and in reference to the copy of a letter to your address from Mr. Brett which accompanied

accompanied it to state, that according to the usage of the service, deputation allowance is never granted except for the precise period in which an Officer may be officiating in a situation as therefore Mr. Brett ceased to do the duty of Acting Head Assistant on the 13th of August, I am of opinion that he is not entitled to deputation allowance from that date until he resumed charge of the Office - I beg in consequence to return the bill submitted by him to be corrected accordingly -

Fort St. George
Civil Audr. Office
18th October 1841

(Signed) J.C. Morris
Civil Auditor

To The Principal Collector
of Salem

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of date 25th Instant, forwarding copy of letter from the Civil Auditor dated the 18th Instant conveying

conveying his opinion that I am not entitled to deputation allowance after the 13th of August (the date on which I reported I had ceased to do the duty of Acting Head Assistant in this District till I resumed charge of the Office on the ground that "according to the usage of the service, deputation allowance is never granted except for the precise period in which an Officer may be officiating in a situation" - Having resumed the duties of my office on the 29th on receipt of a letter from the Private Secretary informing me that my appointment to the Zeillah Court had been cancelled - I herewith transmit a bill for deputation allowance for 16 days viz. from the 1st to 13th and from the 29th to 31st August - The question in respect to the remaining days of the Month - I request may be submitted

Submitted to Government as the case is a peculiar one.-

In addition to what I have already urged I beg to state, that I reported the 13th as the date on which I ceased to do duty because it was on that date that I received intimation of my appointment to the Zillah Court, but the current business of my Office not having been assumed by the Principal Collector, pending the reference to Government, I do not consider my claim can be rejected on the ground of my having done no equivalent duty for the interval.-

Combooor 41
October 29th 1841

(Signed) H. A. Brett
A. J. & J. Coll.r
Salem

(True Copy)
(Signed) J. D. Sleig
Asst. Coll.r

Proceeding thereon.- The Board of Revenue do not see occasion to recommend to Government that an exception be made from the rule and.-

41 - 42

GB

usage of the Service as declared by the civil auditor in reference to Mr. Brett's claim for deputation allowance as Acting Head Assistant Collector of Salem, during the interval in the Month of August last when he ceased to do the duty on being gazetted to act as Register to the Zillah Court.-

Read the following letters.

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

43

From the Asst. Coll.r in the 1st Div.n of Arcot. 21st Instant.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of 1st Instant, I have the honor to enclose a Statement of all the claims preferred before me, from the Trinomaly talook, for remission on account of crops and lands damaged by Elephants.-

2. In the instances where no remission was given, it was because although the Money due to the circar had been previously paid, and it was not thought necessary to apply for sanction to refund, except in the case

No.

Fort St George 11th November 1841.

No 5. where the damage claimed for was said to be over 6 cawnies, and which period on a careful inspection to have been only to the extent of 5. annas — of a cawny — The attempt at fraud and the trifling per centage of loss on the whole puttah, did not justify any remission.—

The Board will observe that there is very little ground for complaint under this head — The Petitioner is a man who amuses himself by looking out for grievances, and encouraging the people to make complaints a character productive of much mischief.—

Cuddalore,
Coll.r Cutcherry,
27th October 1841.

/Signed/ C. H. Hallett.
Acting Coll.r

P. S. The Petition No. 1689 of 1841. is herewith returned.—

Statement

nts and the —
remission gran Fusly 1250.—

Number.	Villages.			
		w		
		to		
		9.		
		5		
1	Paroombacum	"		
		"		
		5.		
2	Pundarapollu	"		
3	Punchoor	"		
4	Keela annac	"		
		1.		

Orderd

1668 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Statement Shewing the Extent of Cultivation destroyed by the Wild Elephants and the remission granted on that account in Trenomallie Taloob in the Southern Division of Arcot for Fuly 1250.-

Number.	Villages.	Number of Ryots.	Names.	Amount of Settlement.	actual Collection.	Balance.	Damage of cultivation occurred.	Remission granted to the Ryots.
				C. Rs. A P	C. Rs. A P	C. Rs. A P.	C. Rs. A P	C. Rs. A P.
1	Paroombacum	1	Mootiah Pillay.	33 15 7.	24 8 .	9 7 7.	6 13 5.	6 13 5
		2	Arnachella Pillay.	13 9 .	13 . .	. 9 .	2 10 . .	9 .
		3	Shapaya Caunden	36 4 3.	36 4 3.	. . .	2 12 7. . .	.
				83. 12 10.	73 12 3.	10 . 7.	12 4 .	7 6 5.
2	Pundarapollium	4	Seetha reddy	56 3 8	47 12 .	8 7 8.	8 7 8	8 7 8.
3	Pinchoor	5	Arenoo too Gaunden	37. 14 5.	37. 14 5.	. . .	1 . 1 . .	.
4	Keela anacara	6	Soobroya Chitty.	54 8 7.	54 8 7.	. . .	9 12 6. . .	.
			Total for four Villages	232 7 6.	213. 15 3.	18 8 3.	31. 8 3.	15 14 1.

27th October 1841. (Signed) C. H. Hallett. Collector.

Ordered

Order thereon.—

(43-44)

Ordered that the following endorsement be passed on Petition No. 1,689. of 1841. alluded to in the foregoing letter.—

From the information which they have received on the subject of this petition the Board have no reason to believe that the petitioner has sustained losses by the inroads of Elephant to an esctent which entitles him to the remission claimed by him.—

The other points adverted to in the petition have been under consideration, and such instructions issued to the authorities in South Arcot as appeared to be requisite.—

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

(45)

From the Asst. Coll.r in the S.th Div.n of Arcot. } Sir,

With reference to your Acting Predecessor's letter of the 29th December 1841 and its enclosures, I have the honor to state that—

another

another Establishment with machinery for making thread has been started at Pondicherry by a Mr. Burett, and I shall be obliged by your informing me, if it is the wish of Government that the principles contained in the enclosures referred to should have general effect with respect to all thread made at Pondicherry.—

2. The favor was specially granted in the first instance to Mr. Mackenzie. That Establishment is now in the hands of share holders.—

3.— From the best account I can obtain, I find that the import of the thread from Pondicherry has been very trifling, and in no degree equal to the expectation entertained, as will be seen by this table.—

Fasly	1242	1243.	1244	1245.	1246.	1247.	1248.	1249	1250
Cand.s Indn.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.	cwt.	Mds.
"	15.—	1—	7.	2—	16.	2—	3.	3—	19.	4—	19.	7—	8.	20—	11.	5—

and

and this also, when by some inadvertence, the indulgence of Government has not by any means been within the bounds fixed, for it is clear that the remission of duty was intended on thread, made from cotton, exported from British territory - were as, it has been customary to admit into this district free of duty - all thread sent out of Pondicherry by the owners of the Establishment without any reference whatever to previous duty having been collected on the Cotton. This certainly was never contemplated, because under such a practice, not only - is all taxe on the making of the thread remitted - but payment of the actual duty on the raw material is evaded -

The

4.- The establishment has now been found to be very profitable, and quite able to take care of itself without any special favor being continued by the English Government, I am of opinion, therefore, that after a stated period, it would be advisable to impose the same terms of duty on this as on all other descriptions of thread.-

Cuddalore,
Coll.r's Cutcherry
27th October 1841.

(Signed) C. H. Hallett.
Acting Coll.r

The

Proceedings thereon.

(45.46)

The indulgence authorized by Government in reference to thread imported from Pondicherry, under date Inform 29th Decr. 1834. the 27th December 1834. would seem to have been for the encouragement of the manufacture, and not to favor an Establishment. There appears therefore no reason for making any exception to the Thread manufactured by Messrs Burnett

To

Read the following letter

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

(47)

From the Collr of Tanjore
Submitting information as to the practice in regard to the disposal of Seycal lands left uncultivated in Tanjore.

Sir,

Para 1 In reply to your letter of the 9th Ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that the practice in regard to the disposal of Seycal lands left uncultivated in Tanjore has been in strict conformity with the rule laid down in the 7th Cos para of the Cultivation Rookoonamah Viz. to grant them to any one who chooses to undertake their cultivation guaranteeing to him the enjoyment of the land and of the Poondooma: rum thereof so long as he shall continue to pay the Circar dues. The mention of Poodooarum in that Rookoonamah was made expressly to extinguish a notion which seemed to be entertained that Meerasdars were

were entitled to a landlords rent from lands the cultivation of which was provided for by Government as well as from lands occupied by tenants of their own procuring; a rule which if admitted would enable any Meerasdar to relinquish all charge of his Estate beyond appearing at harvest time to receive his landlords rent from his steward. The arrears The motion seems to have originated in the arrangement made in regard to lands attached under precept from the Civil Courts; and to those lands which, to so considerable an extent were temporarily resumed by order of Government as having been purchased by public servants in sales for arrears of Revenue, under which the Poondooarums or landlords rent, was very properly reserved for the party to whom, after due investigation it might be determined to make them over. But there is a vast difference

difference between the claims of a landlords temporarily suspended from his functions by official authority, and one who voluntarily neglects their performance; and I am not aware that in any instance the consent of the Meerasdars / beyond ascertaining whether they purposed doing so themselves / has ever been considered a necessary preliminary to either Waste or Seycal lands being made over to others to cultivate, or any stipulation made in regard to the Poondooarum

2 The practice of the District in reference to the three points upon which the instructions of the Board are solicited has been First: simply to give to the Meerasdars of the Village the refusal of Cultivating waste lands before granting them to others.—

Secondly: Not to accept of more favorable terms from Strangers when the Meerasdars undertake to cultivate waste according to the Customary terms.

This

This practice it will be observed is at variance with the 5th rule of the Cawle Wookoomnamah appended to the letter noted in the margin which giving the refusal to the Meerasdars only on the same terms as may be offered by a stranger exposed them, when willing to cultivate according to the authorized scale, to be deprived of all its advantages by the rivalry, or by the mere enmity of any one who chose to bid against them & appeared too harsh and has not been acted upon.—

† To Board 17th June 1823

Thirdly. The Board have already been informed that the sale of waste by Meerasdars to Strangers was formerly of rare occurrence in this District. This Statement however had reference to sales of waste alone. For in sales of entire Villages or of the shares of individual Meerasdars whether by private contract or by precept of the Courts, as or

To Board 26th August 1841 para 6.

on account of arrears of Revenue, that entire waste of the Village or the share of the individual Meerasdars in it (as the case may be) is always included as a matter of course, and in the documents granted by Collectors to purchasers in public sales is always distinctly specified, nor in the sale of waste alone without precedent. Two notable instances of it in the Shrally and Codavasel Talooks, to an extent of about 50 Valies in each,

† Vide From Board of Revenue 17th March 1823
To D° 10th April "
From D° 25th March 1824
To D° 2d April "
From D° 28th July 1825
To D° 13th April 1826
From D° 7th January 1828
To D° 21st April "
From D° 16th June "
To D° 16th January 1832
From D° 20th February "

are on record in the case of the Grant made to the late Heriditadar of the Zillah Court of Combaconum, and recent enquiries have made me acquainted with several instances of smaller purchases of waste alone from ex Meerasdars.—

3 The particulars of the case which has suggested my reference

reference to the Board are as follows

The excavation of the South Rajah Voykal of the Lower anneicut provides for the irrigation of 300 and odd Valies of anadic Lans in the Village of Podooputnum in the Sheally Talook. The Meerasdars of the Village whose Sheycal Lands are about 31 Valies being unable to undertake the expence of clearing and cultivating this extensive tract, one Sambasiva Sastry a Meerasdar of considerable property in that part of the Province made a proposal to the Sub Collector in whose Division the lands in question are situated, to cultivate them at the rate of 15 Valies Pr. annum on the following terms Vizt.—

1st & 2nd years rent free
3rd " year ——— 1/4 Teerwah
4th " ——— 1/2
5th " ——— 3/4
6th " ——— full teerwah

and stipulating for the completion of the

the irrigation Channels the usual extent of backyards Vizt. whilst this proposal was under consideration another neighbouring Meerasdar named Chokalingapillay proposed to undertake about 80 Valies of these same lands, and certain lands similarly circumstanced in other adjacent Villages amounting in the aggregate to about 300 Valies on the same terms, but agreeing to pay half teerwah in the 1st year and to undertake the whole at once. Sambasiva Sastry then asserted his claim to the rights of a Meerasdar in support of which he produced documents executed to him by the original Meerassdars and acknowledged by them selling to him for 1,100 Rupees 55 Valies of their waste, and 2/3 Pr. share in other 232; another document was produced purporting to be executed to the Sastry by one

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

one Venkatachellapillay, transferring to him 30 Valies in the same Village ex previously purchased by Venkatachellapillay from the original Meerasdars for 852 Rupees. This document and the previous transaction are acknowledged respectively by Venkatachellapillay and the original Meerasdars.—

Tanjore, - - -
Vellum, - - -
30th October 1841

(Signed) N. W. Kindersley
Principal Collector

Proceedings thereon.— The practice stated in the foregoing letter to be in force in Tanjore in regard to the disposal of arable lands left uncultivated by which these are granted to any one who chooses to undertake their cultivation under a guarantee of the enjoyment of the land and of the Poondoowa: run so long as he shall desire it and continue to pay the Circar dues

47. 48

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

dues seems all that is requisite, in practice to protect the interest of Government, when ex these are threatened with injury from the apathey or indifference of the Meerasdars in neglecting to provide for their Cultivation.—

2 Under this view of the case it is not considered expedient to raise abstract questions of the extent of the Meerasdars rights in regard to the Village waste. An opinion on these points would be binding upon any Court of Law in which the question might be mooted by Parties dissatisfied with the diction of the Revenue authorities, and it seems quite unnecessary to raise the question with a view to its solution by the highest legal authorities, unless it could be shewn that, under existing practice, the interests of Government are compromised

or

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

or injured.—

3 Mr. Kindersley's first question is whether in default of exertion or means or desire of Meerasdars to exercise their right of cultivating waste, their consent is necessary before the Government can grant the land for cultivation to a Stranger.

2 To this the Board can only reply that it is the custom generally to give the option of occupation to the Meerasdars and to the Kadeem Ryot where no Meerasi exists in preference to a Stranger. It matters not what the law may be on this point, much of Revenue practice is founded on custom, and the practice is both the Board believe favorable to Government and in accordance with the feelings and sentiments of the People.—

4 The second question is to the

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

the taken effect whether the offer of Strangers can be accepted by Government if more favorable than that of the Meerasdars? To this the Board would answer most unquestionably it cannot. The admission of such a practice would virtually set aside the prescribed remission of assessment on the redumption of Waste existing in every Province.—

5 The Board cannot conceive a Case in which the interests of Government can suffer materially by the continuance of the system that now prevails. If the Meerasdars can by themselves or through others undertake the cultivation of all the reclaimable lands of their Village and pay the Established dues of Government, no loss is sustained by the state. If they cannot do this or if they neglect

neglect to do it, then the rule is
to give the land as well as the
Toondoowarum thereon, to any
stranger who chooses to undertake
Thus the right of Government
which is simply the right to
claim the authorized assessment
is abundantly protected.—

6 The only possible profit
or advantage that Government
could derive in assuming the
right to dispose of waste land
for cultivation without reference
to the Meerasidars or ancient
Cultivators would consist in the
sums they might derive over and
above the legitimate annual land
tax, by selling to the best advan-
tage the right of occupancy, as
the Ryots now do in some instances
— The assertion of such a right
even if it was upheld by judicial
decision would lead, it is believed
to

to much discontent and dissatisfaction
and be powerless, in the main, as
a means of raising Revenue.—
7— The views here
propounded are in no way oppo-
-sed to the instance brought
forward as regards the Village
of Poodoopulnum-Cumbaisiva
Sastry, by private arrangement and
purchase from the Meerasidars,
has acquired a tittle to the
Meerasi right in the
land he proposes to bring under
cultivation.- If his offer to cultivate
be in accordance with the Esta-
-blished rules of the district, in
reference to the redemption of Waste,
then it is unexceptionable. It would
be contrary to practice and fair dealing
to bring in the rivalry of an
opponent to deprive him of the
advantages he has obtained; such a
System

System would virtually amount to the Plan of putting up the right to the occupation of Wastes to competition by public Sale.—

8.— Of the esctent of waste claimed by Sambasiva Sastry he must be permitted to cultivate to the esctent of his means for such portion as he cannot find cultivators, the Circar will be at liberty to do so on the terms usual throughout the District.—

49

From the Coll.r of Trichinopoly.

Read Statement of Esctra Tent Allowance for Fusly 1250.—

ORIGINAL DESTROYED

Ordered

Ordered that the following letter be sent in consequence.—

To The Collector of Trichinopoly.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd Ultimo submitting a Statement of Esctra tent allowance for Fusly 1250 and to convey sanction for the amount drawn by you for the 116 days therein referred to.—

49-50

To the Coll.r of Trichinopoly.

Inft. 11th Nov.r 1841

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George,
11th November 1841.

Signed/ P. B. Arnollett.
Secretary.

Order thereon.—

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing letter be transmitted for the information of the Civil Auditor.

Read the following letter

To The Secretary to the Board of Revenue

Sir,

51

From the Do. Coll.r of Madura.

In answer to your letter of

of the 14th received on the 25th instant with — Petition No. 1139 of 1841 (herewith returned) I have the honor to state that the Chuttrum alluded to, was not a personal property of the ancestors of — Petitioner's deceased husband, but was a charity of the Carnatic Government, and her husband received an allowance of 10 Cully chukrums a month, as fixed by Mr. Hurdis, as manager of its affairs. On his death in last year, leaving no issue, the Petitioner, his widow, being incapable from her sex of its management, it was put under the superintendance of a Maniagar under the Sapsildar, and a reduced monthly pay of 5 Chukrums or Rupees 10 — 10 — 8, was fixed for Petitioner's maintenance during life. And notwithstanding the sufficiency of the sum allotted for her

her, a single woman's support, she refuses to receive it, claiming the whole allowance. I see no reason to make an extravagant expenditure of the charity funds.

The arrangements regarding the deceased Servants and Superintendents of the Chuttrum and Cowils have been made by the Collectors themselves without reference to the Board of Revenue since the assumption of the Country to the present time.

Madura 27th October 1841. } (Signed) J. Blackburne Pro Collector.

Proceedings thereon,

Ordered that the following Endorsement be passed upon original Petition No. 1139 of 1841.

51. 52

End. — "The Board of Revenue having ascertained on a reference to the Principal Collector of Madura, that a monthly sum of five Chukrums

Chuttrums was assigned for the Petitioner's maintenance out of the income belonging to the Chuttrum superintended by her deceased Husband, See no occasion to interfere further in the matter to which this address relates.

53

To From the Pro Coll.r of Madura.— Read Statement of Extra tent allowance for fusly 1250.

Ordered that the following letter be sent in reply

53-54

To the Pro Coll.r of Madura.

Sir,

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of the Statement of Extra tent allowance submitted by you for fusly 1250 and to convey sanction for the amount drawn by yourself and subordinates for the number of days noted in the margin.

		No. of days
12th Judgin fours 11th Novr. 1841	Mr. J. Blackburne Pro Coll.r	170.
	Mr. R Davidson Sub Coll.r	170.
	Mr. A. M. Owen Head Asst.	22.
	Mr. C. J. Arbuthnot 1st Do.	90.

Revenue Board Office. Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

} (Signed) P. B. Smollett Secretary

Order thereon.

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing letter be transmitted to the Civil auditor for his information.—

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly reporting the result of the management of the Extra Sources of revenue in that District for Fusly 1250 under the Superintendance of the late Acting Collector.—

In Cons.n October 1841.

(Received 20th September 1841)

55

Proceedings Relative to the Management of the Extra Sources of Revenue in the District of Tinnevelly for Fusly 1250.

Para 1. The Salt collections in Fusly 1249 exhibited a decrease owing to short Sales, and increased charges, the causes of which were noticed in the Board's Proceedings of the 4th February 1841 to the extent of Rupees 15,161. but it was expected that the deficiency would be made up in the succeeding year in consequence of the entertainment of a more efficient establishment for the conduct of this branch of Revenue. It appears from the report now under

Consideration

consideration that these anticipations have been fully realized, the Collections in Fusly 1250 having exceeded those

Fusly 1250	25,3464-5-3	of 1249 by Rupees 16,283-5-3. The chief part of
" 1249	237181-"-"	
	16,283-5-3	

this increase occurred at the Tyfpaum pans, and may be attributed, the Collector observes, in a great measure to Para 3. the circumstance of Tyfpaum having been a favorite place of esport for Cotton, affording a favourable opportunity for employing the returning carriage in the conveyance of Salt to the interior.—

2. The stock of Salt in hand at the commencement of Fusly 1250 having been some what large, the disbursement for the supply required in the course of the year was considerably less than in Fusly 1249.— The annexed

annexed Marginal Statement shews the quantity received, sold, and remaining in store at the close of the year.— The charges fell below those of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 10,891-12- and the result was an increase

	G.	M.
In hand at the commencement of Fusly 1250	3,019	7 4
Supplyed in Fusly 1250	1270	6 8
	4,289	14 2
Surplus by measurement and smuggled Salt	8	31 1/4
Total	4,298	53 1/4
Sold in Fusly 1250	2413	37 3/4
	1884	7 5
Wastage	85	8 5
In hand at the close of Fusly 1250	1798	39 0

in the Net revenue brought to account, to the extent of Rupees 27,123-1-5- The Net revenue of Fusly 1249 being Rupees 2,05,341-2-10 and that of the year under review Rupees 2,32,464-4-3- This sum is greater, by nearly 12,000 Rupees than the Net revenue of Fusly 1248 in which year the Sales were reported to have exceeded by a considerable amount those of any previous year since the Establishment of the monopoly— The Board consider that

	Net Revenue	
Fusly 1250	2,32,464-4-3	
1248	220503-"-8	
	11961-3-"	

Pro: 4th Feby 1842 Para 2.

that the outturn of this branch of the revenue in the Fusly under review reflects great credit upon the manage=ment of Mr. Pringle, the Head Assistant under whose immediate control the Department is conduck=ed.—

Sayer 3. The demand under the head of Sayer, which compriges the items noted in the Aumanie Sayer 1,15,118-6-4
Betel and Tobacco Rents 77270-0-0
Chay root 2500-0-0
Total 1,94,888-6-4
Morgan, amounted to Rupees 1,94,888—6—4 shewing a decrease of Rupees 13,154-13-6 below the settlement of Fusly 1249. The deficiency in the aumanie Sayer Collections amount=ed to Rupees 13,444—13—6 and is stated to have occurred from

Para 4. "diminished exportation of piece "goods to Bombay, Mecca "and Malabar, and of Jaggery "to the Presidency - and from reduced

"reduced produce of Gingerly oil Seeds "&c. for home consumption" In the Chayroot duty there was a decrease of Rupees 2,150- and an increase of Rupees 2440 in the rents of the Betel and Tobacco duties.—

Para 8. 4. The current Sayer collections amounted to Rupees 1,91,238-6-4- and the gross collections within the Fusly including extra collections Rupees 137-9 and the ar=rears of the preceding year, which amounted to Rupees 4,929-12-10- were Rupees 1,96,305-3-11 being Rupees 7,353-5-8 below the gross collections of Fusly 1249- In the Charges there was a decrease of Rupees 17681-13-0 Rupees 5,338-5-1 consequent on less payment

Para 11. of drawback on exportation of piece goods. The result was that the decrease in the net revenue realized from the Sayer in Fusly 1250 was reduced to Rupees 2,015-7- the amount being for Fusly 1249 Rupees 1,80,638-7-6- and Rupees 1,78,623-6-11 in Fusly 1250.

The

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Sea Customs. 5. The Sea Custom Collections fell short of those in Fusly 1249 by Rupees 5,320-11-10. This may be accounted for in a great measure, by the Collections of the preceding year having been accidentally raised by the transhipment, and exportations to Madras and Malabar of a quantity of white-lead the cargo of the "Lady Wallace" which was

Paras 13. wrecked on the Tinnevelly coast in 1839, and by the duty on Tobacco the Cargoes of certain Vessels bound for Travancore, which were obliged by stress of weather to be discharged at the ports of the Tinnevelly District.—

Charges 6,069-4-11. 6. In the charges there was an increase of Rupees 3,650-2-1 caused in a great degree by refunds of duty levied upon Cottons consequent upon an alteration in the rates under authority referred to by the Collector in Para 14 of his report. The net revenue after deducting charges amounted to

Rupees

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Rupees 12,368-13-2 being less by Rupees 8993-2-9 than the net Sea Customs revenue of Fusly 1249

Abkarry 7 The abkarry rents shew an increase of Rupees 5,910. The net collections within the year Amounted to Rupees 21,479-8- and exceeded the net Collections of the preceding year by Rupees 4,654-15-10. There was a balance of Rupees 1,472-4- outstanding at the close of the year under review which has been brought to account subsequently.—

Sundry Small Farms & Licenses 8 The settlement of this branch for Fusly 1250 fell below that of the preceding year by Rupees 7,679-"-4 owing to a decrease in the biddings for Chayroot and Fish rent, the latter having been caused by the failure of the usual rains.

Fusly 1249	25,797-7-11
1250	18,118-7-7
	7,679-"-4

The

Para 7 | The collections within the Fusly amounted to Rupees 13,905 7-1 leaving a balance of 4,213 4-6 due at the close of the year, which has been reduced by subsequent collections to Rupees 1049-1-7.

9 | The total collections within the year, which include a sum of Rupees 9135-15-11 arrears of the previous fusly amounted to Rupees 23,061-9-8 shewing an excess of Rupees 4,060-4-9 above the revenue brought to account under this head in Fusly 1249.—

Fusly 1250-23,061-9-8
1249-19,001-4-11
4,060-4-9

Stamps | 10 | The total Stamp collections in Fusly 1250 amounted to Rupees 23141-2-6 and the net revenue after deducting charges to Rupees 21,565-13-3 being less than the net revenue of Fusly 1249 by Rupees 1860-3-6.

Moturpha | 11 | In the Moturpha settlement there was an increase of 688-4-2 the amount being 6,960-13- of which Rupees 9,745-15-5 were realized within the year and Rupees

Rupees 10,621-4-8 subsequently to its close leaving a balance of Rupees 3590-12-11 due at the date of the report under consideration which is expected to be realized hereafter—

12 | The gross collections include extra collections Rupees 160-15-7 and arrears Rupees 12,193-15-11 and amounted in the aggregate to Rupees 105,403-14-11 from which being deducted incidental charges amounting to Rupees 75-15-1 there remains a net revenue of Rupees 105,327-15-10 being Rupees 193-6-4 below the net revenue of Fusly 1249.—

13 | The Board trust that the

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

the report upon the Moturpha alluded to in Para 25 will be furnished with as little delay as practicable.

Total 14 From the Statement annexed to Para 26 it appears that the Total Collections on account of all the sources of Extra revenue in Fusly 1250 amounted to Rupees 6,41,5.86-12-5 being Rupees 8,169-1-5 in excess of the total Collections in the preceding year. In the charges, which amounted to Rupees 45,495-12-8 there was a decrease of

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

of Rupees 14,607-7-5 the result being an increase in the Net Revenue of the year under review, amounting to Rupees 22,776-8-10.

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 Government and a transcript of the same be forwarded to the Collector of Tinnevelly for his information and guidance.-

Fusly.

Court of King George II. in November 1841

Journeymen Tailors.

| | | |

16104

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

		Fasly 1249			Fasly 1250			Increase			Decrease		
		Rs	as	fo	Rs	as	fo	Rs	as	fo	Rs	as	fo
Sundry Small Farms and Licenses	Demand	25,797	7	11	18,118	7	7	"	"	"	7,679	"	4
	Balance on the 11th July	9,850	2	6	4,213	"	6	"	"	"	5,637	2	"
	Current Collection	15,947	5	5	13,905	7	1	"	"	"	2,041	14	4
	Extra Do	138	8	2	20	2	8	"	"	"	118	5	6
	Arrears	3,108	8	"	9,135	15	11	6,027	7	11	"	"	"
	Total	19,194	5	7	23,061	9	8	3,867	4	1	"	"	"
	Charges	193	"	8	"	"	"	"	"	"	193	"	8
	Net Revenue	19,001	4	11	23,061	9	8	4,060	4	9	"	"	"
Stamps	Demand	25,749	"	"	23,141	2	6	"	"	"	2,607	13	6
	Balance on the 11th July	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
	Current Collection	25,749	"	"	23,141	2	6	"	"	"	2,607	13	6
	Extra Do	91	13	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	91	13	2
	Arrears	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
	Total	25,840	13	2	23,141	2	6	"	"	"	2,699	10	8
	Charges	1,414	12	5	575	5	3	"	"	"	839	7	2
	Net Revenue	24,426	"	9	22,565	13	3	"	"	"	1,860	3	6
Maturpha	Demand	1,06,472	12	10	1,06,966	13	"	498	"	2	"	"	"
	Balance on the 11th July	12,864	6	5	14,211	13	7	1,347	7	2	"	"	"
	Current Collection	93,608	6	5	92,748	15	5	"	"	"	859	7	"
	Extra Do	152	15	4	160	15	7	8	"	3	"	"	"
	Arrears	12,098	15	6	12,493	15	11	"	"	"	204	15	7
	Total	1,06,460	5	3	1,05,403	14	8	"	"	"	1,050	6	4
	Charges	938	15	1	75	15	1	"	"	"	863	"	"
	Net Revenue	1,05,521	6	2	1,05,327	15	10	"	"	"	193	6	4
Total	Demand	6,44,201	6	6	6,38,120	4	9	"	"	"	6,081	1	9
	Balance on the 11th July	24,699	5	9	23,547	2	1	"	"	"	1,152	3	8
	Current Collection	6,10,602	"	9	6,14,573	2	8	"	"	"	1,928	4	1
	Extra Do	1,108	2	9	398	13	1	"	"	"	709	5	8
	Arrears	16,807	7	6	26,614	12	8	10,807	5	2	"	"	"
	Total	6,33,417	11	"	6,41,586	12	5	8,169	15	"	"	"	"
	Charges	69,103	4	1	45,495	12	8	"	"	"	14,607	7	5
	Net Revenue	5,73,314	6	11	5,96,090	15	9	22,776	10	"	"	"	"

Read

1605 Fort St. George 11th November 1841

Read the following letter

To the Secretary to the

Board of Revenue

Fort St. George

56

Sir,

From the Coll.r of Tinnevelly } Referring to the remarks in the Extracts from the Statement of Contingent Charges which accompanied your letter of the 4th Instant, I have the honor to state that to the seal for which Rupees 7-3- were charged is a new one prepared for the use of the Assistant Collector. On reference to records it appears that a Revenue Seal was in use of the above Officer in July 1232, but it is not to be found in the Office nor can it be ascertained by whom it was destroyed. Under these circumstances it was necessary to incur the charge for a new Seal.-

Tinnevelly 28th October 1841 } Signed / H. C. Montgomery Collector

Under

1605 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

Resolution thereon.- Under the explanation

56-57 -tion furnished in the foregoing letter the Board sanction the charge of Rs.

-pees 7-3- incurred for making a Silver

Seal for the use of the Assistant Collector

Read again Letter from

the Principal Collector of Coimbatore

dated 30th September and entered in

Consultation 14th Ultimo.-

Read also Petitions noted

Nos 88 1503 in the Margin from Parvoveutumma-

1737 1738 1739 -nadu Grandmother of the Minor

of 1841.- Paligar complaining of the acts of the

Principal Collector in securing the

Property belonging to her Estates.-

The circumstances of this

Proceedings thereon Para 1 case are as follows the Paligar Rama-

58 -swamee Vanavaraiyan died

in 1838.- The facts was reported by

Mr.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Mr. Babington the Acting Principal Collector of Coimbatore in February 1839. with an intimation that the deceased had left a legitimate son a Minor about two years old. In addition the family was stated to consist of his wife about 18 years old an uterine Brother and two half Brothers and a grand Mother Purvut Vunnal the Petitioner whose addresses are now recorded.

1st in Cons 18th Feb. 1839.

2. The whole of the family at that time lived together, and the Grand Mother was recommended by Mr. Babington to be entrusted with the management of the Paliam an arrangement which was acceded to by the Board of Revenue. The Grand Mother was stated to be then forty two years of age and qualified for the charge having had an entire management of the Estates for four years while her son now deceased was himself

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

himself a minor.

3 Matters remained in this state till February 1841 when Mr. Drury who had returned and assumed charge of the Coimbatore District reported that dissentions had taken place in the family of the Poligar which rendered it inexpedient to continue the management of the Lands under Parvut Vunnal. The Mother of the child it was said appears had already removed herself from the Poligar's family and the Protection of Poligar's family and gone to reside with her own family. She had insisted also in the removal of the child to which its Grand Mother objected but ultimately the Mother with the Board's sanction was entrusted with the custody of her child.

20th Feb. 41 in Cons 11th March 1841.

4 The Board concurring with the Principal Collector acquiesced in the Propriety of relieving Parvut Vunnal from the responsibility of the management of the landed Estate in consequence of

of the family dissentions. The ad-
=ministrations of the Pallevoy was accord-
=ingly assumed by the Court of Wards
and the Lands were placed under
the superintendence of the Tahsildar
of Pullochey, separate allowances having
been made for the maintenance of
each member of the Family.—

From the Pr. Coll. 11th in Cons. 24th May 1841.

5.— Up to that time no complaint
had reached the Board of any abstrac-
=tion of Property, but from Mr. Wroughton's
letter now recorded it is seen that on
the 18th May two days only after the
date of the Principal Collector's report
of his assumption of the Pallevoy Ayut.
=toor Unnuall the mother of the Minor
complained that Parvati Unnuall (the
Grandmother had, after she (the Mother)
had left her late husband's residence
and had gone to that of her own
family removed from its usual place
of custody and otherwise misappro-
=priated certain Property belonging

to the deceased Pallegar, an infringement
of the contents of an alleged Will said
to have been executed before his death.
The charge is vaguely stated, but the
Principal Collector seems to have treated
it as a Robbery. He speaks of it as an
"attack on the complainant's property
that "Locks of Boxes were broken open
"and specie stolen therefrom by Parvati
"Unnuall" the Grand Mother of the Minor.

6.— Acting under this impression
and in his capacity as a Magistrate
Mr. Wroughton appears to have taken
possession of a large quantity of Property
in Bullion and other effects exhibited
in a list which accompanies his letter.
He adds that there is a further quantity
of Treasure said to be contained in
certain Boxes deposited in the Treasury
but the keys of which Parvati Unnuall
contumaciously refuses to produce.

Parvatta Unnuall complains
at
at great length in the Petitions she has
forwarded both of the acts of the Collector
himself

himself, and of his proceeding in search-
ing for and securing the property, but
it is needless to recapitulate her
statements here.—

8 Upon an attentive consideration
of all the Proceedings and the docu-
ments which are forwarded with
the Principal Collector's letter, the
Board cannot but regret that Mr
Wraughton should have thought
it necessary to take the steps for
securing the property in question
which he has reported. The colour
sought to be given to the transaction
of a theft, and improper abstraction
of property seems quite unsupported—
nor are the Board at all satisfied
that the entire Funds secured, are
the undantted property of the Minor
That property however has for
several years been under the
care of Parvati Ummal Banko it the

the natural head of the family, and
should not the Board think have
been removed from her custody, except
upon better founded grounds than
what have been produced for inter-
fering in its disposal.—

9 It is accordingly desired
that it be restored to Parvati Ummall
and the parties from whom it was
was taken. The Mother of the
Minor may take legal steps if
she sees fit to secure the Pro-
perty of her son and if necessary
security for its production
may be taken by the
Collector.—

Fort St. George 11 November 1841.

Collector.

10 The Estate meanwhile will continue to be managed by the Officers of Government and it only remains to add that the Board see no reason for the dismissal of the Tahsildar of Pullachey who will accordingly be reinstated in Office on the receipt of these orders if he has been already removed.

Ordered that a copy of the foregoing Extract from the Board's Proceedings be submitted to Government and a transcript of the same be forwarded to the Principal Collector of Coimbatore for his information and guidance.

Read the following Letter to

Comp. S.R.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

To

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

59

From the Pt. Coll. of Coimbatore.

Sir,

With reference to the standing orders of the Board of Revenue under date the 13th July 1826, I have the honor to submit the accounts of the settlement of the Davistanum and other Enams lands in the District of Coimbatore for Fusly 1250.

Coimbatore,
Print. Coll. Office,
1st November 1841.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
(Signed) J. C. Troughton.
Print. Collector.

Statement.

16113 Fort St. George 11 November 1841.

Collector.-

10 The Estate mean-
-while will continue to be
managed by the Officers
of Government and its only
remains to order that the
Board see no reason for the
dismissal of the Tahsildar
of Pollachey who will accordingly
be reinstated in Office on the
receipt of these orders if he has
been already removed.-

Ordered that a copy of the
foregoing Extract from the Board's
Proceedings be submitted to Government
and a transcript of the same be for-
warded to the Principal Collector of
Coimbatore for his information and
guidance.-

Read the following Letter to

Comp. J.R.

16114 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

To

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

59
From the Pl. Coll. of Coimbatore. } Sir,

With reference to the
Standing orders of the Board of
Revenue under date the 13th July
1826, I have the honor to submit the
accounts of the settlement of
Davastanum and other Enams
lands in the District of Coimbatore
for Fasly 1250.-

Coimbatore,
Prin. Coll. Office,
1st November 1841.

} Signed J. C. Troughton.
Prin. Collector.

Statement.

16115 | | Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Statement of Southern Division Coimbatore as per Settlement of Fusly 1250.-

No.	Names of the Talooks.	Survey Assessment	Total Survey Assessment	Punjah. Bullahs.	Punjah. Survey Assessment.	Garden. Bullahs.	Garden. Survey Assessment.	Deduct waste. Total. Bullahs.	Deduct waste. Total. Survey Assessment
		11	12	13	14	15	15	17	18
1	Coimbatore	340. 15 4	4,363 2 6.	320.	11 3/4	760. 7 4.	" " "	320	11 3/4 760. 7 4
2	Palachey	" " "	550. 4 11.	"	"	" " "	" " "	"	" " "
3	Errode	" " "	86. 13. 0	5	6 1/2	19. 1 1.	" " "	5	6 1/2 19. 1 1.
4	Dharapooram	14. 5 1	2540. 8 6.	220.	1/2	64. 8 2	2 13 1/2	40. 4 6.	222. 14 684. 12 8.
5	Flonguiesw	" " "	10,432 1 2	545.	13.	1,426. 13 8.	54 5 1/4	869. 12 "	6,00. 2 1/4 2,296. 9 8.
6	Larour	023. 12 "	11,462. 13 "	1,027.	10 3/4	2,797. 9 6	22 5 1/2	318. 4 2.	1,050 1/4 3,115. 13 9.
7	Pulladum	410. 5 7.	3,543. 15 7	106.	12 3/4	289. 8 5.	10 13 1/4	185. 4 "	117 10. 474. 12 5.
8	Chuckragherry	337. 8 3.	3,135. 9 "	341.	5 1/2	866. 1 "	15 15 1/4	165 12 2.	357. 4 3/4 1,031. 13 2
	Total	226. 15 3	36,094 8 8.	2,567.	12 3/4	6,804. 1 2	106. 4 3/4	1,579 4 11.	2,674 1 1/2 8,383 6 1.

Fort St. Geo.

Statement shewing the Enam Lands granted to the Tuteek Dariastanums in the Southern Divis.

No.	Names of the Talooks	No. of Villages	Number of Pagodas situated to each Village.	Punjah. Bullahs	Punjah. Survey Assessment	Garden. Bullahs	Garden. Survey Assessment	Total. Bullahs	Total. Survey Assessment	Ayacut or Government Lands. Punjah. Bullahs	Ayacut or Government Lands. Punjah. Survey Assessment	Ayacut or Government Lands. Garden. Bullahs	Ayacut or Government Lands. Garden. Survey Assessment	Ayacut or Government Lands. Total. Bullahs	Ayacut or Government Lands. Total. Survey Assessment	Total Bullahs	Total Survey Assessment
1	2		3	4	5	6				7	8	9	10				
1	Coimbatore	0	1.	420	2. 1,906 " 7.	1	6.	16	27. 421. 8.	1022	3 2. 356. "	3340. 15 4		4,362	2		
2	Pulachery	4	5.	159	15½ 536. 65.	"	13½	13	146. 160. 13.	550.	4 11. " "	" "		550.	61		
3	Erode	2	2.	18	1. 70. 10 6	"	13½	16	26. 18 14½	86.	13. " "	" "		86.	13		
4	Dharapooram	11	9.	587	7¼ 1,624 1 1.	"	13 15/4	111	2 4 601. 6½	1,835.	3 5. 40. 13½	714. 5 11.		2,549.	16		
5	Elongiem	30	44.	2,265.	3¾ 5,901. 10 2	275.	¼	4,530.	7. 2,540 4	10,432	1 2 " "	" "		10,432	12		
6	Laroor	20	23.	2,621.	1¾ 7,222 14 5.	87	5.	1,216.	17. 2768 6¾	8,439.	" " 389. 11¾	3,023. 12.		11,462.	13		
7	Pulladum	12	20.	512.	15. 1,399. 14 2	180	12½	1,703.	11 12. 613 9½	3,103.	10. " 31. 9¾	410. 37		3,513.	15		
8	Chuckragherry	1	2	724.	8. 1,807. 2 6.	57.	8.	590.	14 3. 782 "	2,398.	" 9. 129. 14½	737. 8 3.		3,135.	9		
	Total	86	116	7,309	4¼ 19,568. 11 10.	537.	10.	8,298.	87. 7,846. 14¼	27,867.	4 5. 948. 1½	8,224. 15 3		37,092.	18		

16116.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

land.							Cultivation of Fusly 1250.					
Nunjah				Remainder Punjah			Garden.			Total		
Cawnies.	Survey assessment.	Total Survey assessment.	Bullahs.	Survey assessment.	Settlement.		Bullahs.	Survey assessment.	Settlement.	Bullahs.	Survey assessment	Settlement
19	20	21	22	23	24		25	26	27	28	29	30.
181 8.	1,142. 5 3.	2,202. 12 7.	99 6¼	245. 9 3.	149. 14 2		1 6.	16. 2 7.	16 2 7.	100 12¼	261. 11 10.	166 4 9.
" " " " "	" "	159. 15½	536 6 5.	517. 15 4			" 13½	13 14 6.	10 3 9.	160 13.	550. 4 11.	528. 3 1.
" " " " "	19. 1 1.	12. 10½	51. 9 5.	51. 9 5.			" 13½	16. 2 6.	11 4 10.	13 8.	67. 11 11.	62 14 3.
" " " " "	684. 12 8.	364 6¾	979. 8 11.	610. 7			11 13½	170. 13 10.	133. 2 10.	378. 8½	1,150. 6 9.	743. 3 5.
" " " " "	2,290. 9 8.	1719. 0¾	4,474. 12 6.	3,088. 10 2			220. 11.	3,660. 11 -	2,983. 15 2	1940. 1¾	8,135. 7 6.	6,072 9 4
53. 8¼	311. 15 -	3,427 12 9.	1,593. 7.	4,425. 4 11.	2,987 5 9.		64. 15½	897. 13 4	591. 4 8.	1,058. 6½	5,323. 2 3.	3,578. 10 5.
4. 9¼	45. 9 8.	520. 6 1.	406. ½	1,110. 5 9.	885. 12 3.		89. 15¼	1,518. 7 10.	1,230. 11 8.	495 15½	2,628. 13 7.	2,116. 7 11.
40 14½	200. 7 1.	1,232. 4 3.	383. 2½	941. 1 6.	359. 8 6.		41. 8¾	425. 2 1.	337. 12 4	424. 11¼	1,366 3 7.	997. 4 10.
280. 8.	2,000 5 -	10,383. 11 1.	4,741. 7½	12,764. 10 8.	8,650. 12 2.		431. 5¼	6,719. 3 8.	5,314. 9 10.	5,172. 12¾	19,483. 14 4.	13,965. 6 -

10117. Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Remainder cultivation of Fusly 1250 /Contd/

Cawnies.	Nunjah. Survey assessment.	Settlement.	Punjah. Survey assessment.	Settlement.	Fixed Tournadayem.	Total including Tournadayem.	Settlement of Fusly 1249.	Comparison of Fusly 1249 & 1250. Increase.	Decrease.
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
174 8.	1,898 10 1.	1,830. 3 5.	2,160. 5 11.	1996. 4 2					
" "	" " "	" " "	550 4 11.	528. 3 1.	29. 14 11.	2,026. 3 1.	1,782 5 "	243. 14 1.	" " "
" "	" " "	" " "	67. 11 11.	62. 14 3.	" "	528. 3 1.	513. 4 "	14. 15 1.	" " "
40 13½	714. 5 1.	670. 1 7.	1,864. 11 10.	1,413. 5 "	" "	62. 14 3.	62. 14 3.	" " "	" " "
" "	" " "	" " "	8,135. 7 6.	6,972. 9 4	14 13. 5 "	1,318. 14 2	94. 6 10.	" " "	" " "
336. 3½	2,711. 14 "	2,206. " 5.	8035. " 3	5,784. 10 10.	20 13 4	6,993. 6 8.	5,866. 4 1.	227. 2 7.	" " "
27. ½	364. 11 11.	228. 3 1.	2,993. 9 6.	2,344. 11 "	24 13 4	5,784. 10 10.	5446. " 5.	338. 10 5.	" " "
89. "	537. 1 2.	558. 12 6.	4903. 4 9.	1,256. 14	" "	2,344. 11 "	2,217. 9 7.	127. 1 5.	" " "
					" "	1256. 14	1,247. 14 6.	8. 2 10.	" " "
667. 9½	6,226. 10 3.	5,493. 5 "	25,270. 8 7.	19,458. 11 "	50. 12 3.	19,509. 7 3	18,455. 2 "	1,054. 5 3.	" " "

Coimbatore, 11th July 1841. E. C.

H. T. /Signed/ J. C. Troughton.
Principal Collector

Statement

16118. St. George 11th November 1841.

Statement of the Coimbatore District as per settlement of Fasly 1250.

No.	Names	Land. Nunjah. Number	Survey assessment	Total Survey assessment.	Bullock.	Deduct waste Land Punjah. Survey assessment.	Bullock.	Garden. Survey assessment
		9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Coimbatore	8 7¼	356.12 9.	699 10 10.	44 8¾	145. 10 10.	1 "	17 10 1.
2	Suttimoo	5 8¾	1,763 13 11.	1,806. 2 10.	2 7¾	11 11 "	" "	" " "
3	Danaickenpollam	2	70. " "	745. 2 4	127 8¾	520 5 8.	" "	" " "
4	Collegal	"	" " "			113. 12 11.	" "	" " "
5	Pulacherry		86. 1 8.		28. ¼	38. 5 4.	" "	" " "
6	Parindoor	1 7¼	21. 4 9.	987 3 11.	8 1.		6.	5 4 10.
7	Andioor	" "	" " "	541 11 3	53 ¾	252. 9 3.	" 7¼	5 10 "
8	Chrodee	7. 14½	336. 7 "	1,554. 1 4	350. 4½	1,153. 7 7.	" "	" " "
9	Dharapoor	" "	" " "	389. 5 8	" "	" "	" "	" " "
10	Kongiem	" "	" " "	1,350. 15 5.	249 12¾	787. 1 3.	1 13.	27. 7 4
11	Caroor	" "	" " "	500. 1 11.	82 2½	205. 11 4	" "	" " "
12	Cheyoor	" "	" " "	746. 9 6.	124 ¼	368. " 7.	" "	" " "
13	Pullaod	6¾	54. 1 10.	" " "	" "	" " "	" "	" " "
14	Chuckra	9¼	218. 2 9	536. 13 3.	65. 7¼	206. 14 6.	" "	" " "
		7¾	2,906. 12 7.	542. 6 10.	58. 4¼	212. 3 7.	" "	" " "
				10,641. 6 7.	1193 10¾	4,015. 13 10.	3 10¼	56. " 3.

16118.

Fort St. Geo.

Statement shewing the settlement of lands to Chetturums to be erected hereafter in the Coi

				Ayacut or Government Land.									
			Punjah			Garden		Total.			Punjah.		
No.	Names of the Talooks.	Number of Chetturums	Bullahs		Survey assessment	Bullahs	Survey assessment	Bullahs		Survey assessment	Cawnies		Survey assessment
	1	2	3		4	5	6	7		8	9		10
1	Coimbatore	3	83	15¼	320. 14 3.	1	4¾	21. 15 10.	85.	4	342	14 1.	28 7¼ 356 5
2	Suttimungalum	3	5	¾	25. 12 8.	1	2	16. 8 4	6.	2¾	42	5 "	115 8¾ 176 3 8
3	Danaickancottah	9	162	13¾	675. 2 4	"	"	" " "	162	13¾	675.	2 4.	7 2 70 "
4	Collegal	1	42	3¼	175. 1 6.	"	"	" " "	42.	3¼	175.	1 6.	" " "
5	Pulachey	4	206	11.	860. 14 3.	2	5½	40. 4 "	209.	½	901.	2 3.	10 " 86 1 8
6	Variodoray	3.	108	1.	480. 11 9.	3	3½	39. 10 9.	111	4½	520.	6 6.	1 7¼ 21 4
7	Andiore	9.	460.	5½	1,531. 4 4	1	9¼	22 13 "	461.	14¾	1,554	1 4	" " "
8	Errode	2	"	"	" " "	2	12.	52. 14 8	2.	12	52.	14 8.	27 14½ 336 7
9	Dharapooram	8	410.	13½	1,240. 6 9.	7	6½	116. 8 8.	418.	4.	1,356.	15 5	" " "
10	Kongieu	2	227	7¼	554. 9 11.	"	6.	5 8 "	227	13¼	560.	1 11	" " "
11	Caroor	3	262.	4¼	746. 9 6.	"	"	" " "	262.	4¼	746.	9 6.	" " "
12	Cheyoor	"	"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	"	"	"	" "	" " "
13	Pulladuve	2	154.	12.	481. 6 14.	"	13¼	1 4 6.	154.	13¾	482.	11 5.	5 6½ 24 10
14	Chuchragherry	3	87.	1.	324. 4 1.	"	"	" " "	87.	1.	324.	4 1.	22 9¼ 218 2
	Total	52	2211.	8½	7,417. 2 3.	20.	3¼	317. 7 9.	2,231.	11¾	7,734.	10 "	219 7¾ 2,480 2

Fort St. George

11th November 1841.

Deduct waste Land. /Cont.ᵈ/

Total.

Punjah.

Bullahs	Survey Assessment	Cawnies.	Survey Assessment	Total Survey Assessment.	Bullahs
15	17	18	19	20	21
45 8¾	163 4 11.	22 5½	283 " 6.	446.5 5.	39 6½
2 7¾	11. 11 "	2 5½	33 10 2	45. 5 2	2 9.
127 8¾	520. 5 8.	7 2	70. " "	590. 5 8.	35 5.
28 ¼	113. 12 11	" "	" " "	113. 12 11	14. 3.
8 1	38. 5 4	" "	" " "	38. 5 4	198. 10.
53 6¾	257. 14 1.	1 7¼	21. 4 9.	279. 2 10.	55 ¼
350. 11¾	1159. 1 7.	" "	" " "	1159. 1 7.	110. 1.
" "	" "	3 6.	33. 2 11.	33. 2 11.	" "
251. 9¾	814. 8 7.	" "	" " "	814. 8 7.	169. ¾
82. 2½	205. 11 4	" "	" " "	205. 11 4	145. 4¾
124. ¼	368. " 7.	" "	" " "	368. " 7.	138. 4
" "	" "	" "	" " "	" "	" "
65 7¼	206. 14 6.	1 7.	19. " "	225. 14 6.	89 4¾
58 4¼	212. 3 7.	5 8.	37. 7 5.	249. 11 "	28. 12¾
1197 5	4,071. 14 1.	43 9¼	497. 9 9.	4,569. 7 10.	1017. 13¾

Remainder Cultivation of Fusly 1240.

Garden

Survey Assessment.	Settlement.	Bullahs.	Survey Assessment.	Settlement.
22	23	24	25	26.
175 3 5.	157. 5 6.	" 4¾	4 5 9.	4 5 9.
14 1 8.	14. 1 8.	1 2.	10 8 4.	10 8 4.
154 12 8.	147. " 2	" "	" " "	" " "
61. 4 7.	61. 4 7.	" "	" " "	" " "
822. 8 11	682. 10 6.	2 5½	40. 4 "	40. 4 "
228. 2 6	201. 11 8.	2 13½	34. 5 11.	33. 1 10.
377. 12 9.	321. 1 7.	1 2	17. 3 "	17. 3 "
" " "	" "	2 12	52. 14 8.	33. 11 9.
453. 5 6.	280. 14 4.	5 9½	89. 1 4	85. 5 11.
348. 14 7.	210. 14 6.	" 6.	5. 8 "	1. 6 1.
378. 8 11.	222. 12 10.	" "	" " "	" " "
" " "	" "	" "	" " "	" " "
274 8 5.	248. 10 7.	" 1¾	1. 4 6	1 4 6.
112. " 6.	87. 2 6.	" "	" " "	" " "
3,461. 4 5.	2,641. 10 5	15 9.	261. 7 6.	233. 3 2

16120 Fort St. George 18th November 1841.

Remainder Cultivation of Fusly 1240. /Cont.d/

Total.

Survey

Bullahs.	Assessment.	Settlement.	Coorumbs.	Survey Assessment	Settlement
27.	28	29	30	31	32
39 1¼	179. 9 2	161. 11 3.	6 1¾	78 12 3.	40 9 3.
3 11.	30. 10 -	30. 10 -	113. 3¾	1730 3 8.	1418. 15 6.
35 5.	154. 12 8.	147. " 2	" "	" "	" "
14 3.	61. 4 7.	61 4 7	" "	" "	" "
200 15½	862. 12 11.	722. 14 6.	10. "	86. 1 8.	9. "
57 13¾	262. 8 5.	234. 13 6.	" "	" "	" "
111 3	394. 15 9.	238. 4 7.	" "	" "	" "
2 12	52. 14 8	33. 4 9.	24. 8½	303. 4 1.	303. 4 1.
166. 10¼	542. 6 10.	366. 4 3.	" "	" "	" "
145 10¾	354. 6 7.	218. 4 7.	" "	" "	" "
138. 4.	378. 8 11.	222. 12 10.	" "	" "	" "
" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "
89 6½	275. 12 11.	249. 15 7.	3 15¾	35. 1 10.	22. 4 7.
28 12¾	112. - 6.	87. 2 6.	18 1¼	180. 11 4.	180. 11 4.
1934 6¾	3,662. 11 11.	2874 13 7.	175 14½	2409. 2 10.	1975. 2 9.

Comparison of Fusly 1249 & 1250

Total Survey Assessment	Total Settlement	Settlement of Fusly 1249	Increase	Decrease
33	34	35	36	37
		181 12 11	20 7 7	" " "
253 5 5	202 4 6			
1760 13 8	1449 9 6	1394 1 8	55 7 10	" " "
154 12 8	147 " 2	166 8 5	" " "	8 8 3
61 4 7	61 4 7	61 4 7	" " "	" " "
948 14 9	731 14 6	681 13 9	50 - 9	" " "
282 8 5	234 13 6	213 8 5	21 5 1	" " "
394 15 9	338 4 7	279 1 2	59 3 5	" " "
356 2 9	336 15 10	333 13 2	3 2 8	" " "
542 6 10	366 4 3	350 9 4	15 10 11	" " "
354 6 7	218 4 7	231 9 1	" " "	13 4 6
378 8 11	222 12 10	188 3 10	34 9 "	" " "
" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
" " "	" " "	312 14 5	" " "	40 3 9
310 14 9	272 10 8	271 8 7	" " "	3 10 9
292 11 10	267 13 10			
6071 14 9	4850 1 14	4655 13 4	259 15 3	65 11 3

Net Increase 194 4 "

Coimbatore, 11th July 1842. C.E. 70½

/Signed/ S. C. Wroughton

Prin.l Coll.r

Statements

16121

Fort George

11th November 1841.

Statement shewing the Coimbatore District as per Settlement of Fusly 1250.-

Coimbatore Government Land.

Deduct waste Land

No.	Names	Survey Assessment Cawnies			Total Survey Assessment			Punjah. Bullahs	Punjah. Survey Assessment			Garden Bullahs	Garden Survey Assessment		
		8		9	10			11	12	13		14	15		
1	Coimbatore	44	13	1	20	11	4	65	8	5	" 10	2	6	2	" " " " " "
2	Suttimunga	8	2	10	"	"	"	8	2	10	" "	"	"	"	" " " " " "
3	Danaicken	27	15	2	"	"	"	27	15	2	6 1/4	27	15	2	" " " " " "
4	Collegal	12	3	1	"	"	"	12	3	1	" "	"	"	"	" " " " " "
5	Parindoray	16	8	4	"	"	"	16	8	4	" "	"	"	"	" " " " " "
6	Indioor	14	10	10	"	"	"	14	10	10	" "	"	"	"	4 1/4 2 15 6
7	Erode	3	1	4	3	1	4	33	3	"	36	4	4	"	" " " " " "
8	Cheyoor	39	10	7	"	"	"	39	10	7	" "	"	"	"	4 3 8 5
		167	1	3	5	"		63	14	4	220	15	7	6 1/4	30 5 4 " 8 1/4 6 7 11

16121

Fort-St. George.

Statement shewing the Settlement of Lands granted to Moosapherkanahs in the Coimbatore

Ayacut or Government

No.	Names of the Talooks.	Number of Moosapherkanahs.	Punjah				Garden				Total			
			Bullahs		Survey assessment		Bullahs		Survey assessment		Bullahs		Survey assessment		Cawnies
	1	2	3		4		5		6		7		8		9
1	Coimbatore														
2	Suttimungalum	3	11	"	44	13	1	"	"	"	11	2	44	13	1 1 3/4
3	Danaickencottah	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	10 3/4	8	2	10	"	10 3/4	8 2 10 " "
4	Collegal	1	6	1 1/4	27	15	2	"	"	"	"	"	6	1 1/4	27 15 2 " "
5	Parindoray	2	2	8 3/4	12	3	1	"	"	"	"	"	2	8 3/4	12 3 1 " "
6	Indoor	1	1	8 1/2	7	7	"	"	11 1/2	9	1	4	2	2	16 8 4 " "
7	Erode	1	"	12 3/4	3	8	2	1	"	11	2	8	1	12 3/4	14 10 10 " "
8	Cheyoor	1	"	8	3	1	4	"	"	"	"	"	"	8	3 1 4 3 1/4
		1	"	"	"	"	"	2	13	39	10	7	2	13	39 10 7 " "
	Total	11	22	7 1/4	98	15	10	5	3 1/4	68	1	5	27	10 1/2	167 1 3 5 "

J. C. Houghton
Asst. Collr.

10122

Fort St. George 11th November 1811

Total			Nunjah		Total		Remainder Cultivation of Fusly 1250					
							Punjah			Garden		
Bullahs	Survey Assessment	Cawnies	Survey Assessment		Survey Assessment	Bullahs	Survey Assessment	Settlement	Bullahs	Survey Assessment	Settlement	
16	17	18	19		20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
11	10	2 6 2	1	15 3/4	20 11 4	23 1 6	10 8	42 6 11	29 6 1	" "	" "	
"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	" " "	" "	" "	" 10 3/4	8 2 10	8 2 10	
"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	" " "	" "	" "	" "	" "	" "	
6	1/4	27 15 2	"	"	" " "	27 15 2	" "	12 3 1	12 3 1	" "	" "	
"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	" " "	2 8 3/4	7 7 "	7 7 "	" 11/2	9 1 4	9 1 4
"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	" " "	1 6 1/2	3 8 2	3 8 2	" 11 3/4	8 3 2	8 3 2
"	4 4/4	2 15 6	"	"	" " "	2 15 6	" 12 3/4	3 1 4	3 1 4	" "	" "	" "
"	"	" " "	"	"	" " "	" " "	8	" "	" "	29	36 2 2	36 2 2
"	4	3 8 5	"	"	" " "	3 8 5	" "					
7	3 1/2	38 13 3	1	15 3/4	20 11 4	57 8 7	15 12	68 10 6	55 9 8	4 11	61 9 6	61 9 6

16123

Fort St. George

Abstract Comparative Statement of the Settlement

Total Bullaks	Total Survey Assessment	Total Settlement	Remainder Cultivation Nunjah Bullaks	Nunjah Survey Assessment	Nunjah Settlement
27	28	29	30	31	32
10 8 42 6 11	29 6 1	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
" 10 3/4 8 2 10	8 2 10	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
2 8/4 12 3 1	12 3 1	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
2 2 16 8 4	16 8 4	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
1 8/2 11 11 4	11 11 4	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
" 8 3 1 4	3 1 4	3 1/4	33 3 "	33 3 "	
2 9 36 2 2	36 2 2	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "	" " " " " "
20 7 130 4 "	117 32	3 1/4	33 3 "	33 3 "	

Coimbatore 11th July 1841. C. C.

11th November 1841.

of Fasly 1250 /Continued/

Total Survey Assessment	Total Settlement	Settlement of Fasly 1249	Comparison of Fasles 1249 & 1250. Increase	Decrease
33	34	35	36	37
42 6 11	29 6 1	22 5 3	7 " 10	" " "
8 2 10	8 2 10	" " "	" " "	" " "
" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
12 3 1	12 3 1	12 3 1	" " "	" " "
16 8 4	16 8 4	14 13 11	1 10 5	" " 1
11 11 4	11 11 4	11 11 5	" " "	" " "
36 4 4	36 4 4	36 4 4	" " "	" " "
36 2 2	36 2 2	30 6 6	5 11 8	" " "
163 7 "	150 6 2	135 15 4	14 6 14	" " 1

Sd/ Signed/ A. C. Naughton
Dpt. Collr.

Abstract

10124 || Fort St. George

Abstract Comparative Statement of the Settlement of Coimbatore District for Fusles 1249 and 1250.-

	Settlement of		Comparison between Fusles 1249 & 1250.-		Collections of Fusly 1250.-			Balance		
	Fusly 1249.-	Fusly 1250	Increase	Decrease	Collections of Fusly 1249	Within the Fusly-	Since collected up to September 1841	Total	Fusly 1249	Fusly 1250.-	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Lands granted to Tuntek Davastanums in the Southern Division	18455 2 "	19570 4 53	1114 2 53	" " "	17713	1964 6 3	" " "	19677 6 3	18212 4 11	19055 9 1	133 10 11	19189 4 "
Lands granted to Chuttrums	4,856 13 4	4,850 1 4		194 4 "	" " "	4539 2 9	4,597 8 6	4,597 8 6	212 14 5	4,810 6 11	116 10 7	39 10 15
Lands granted to Publick Choultries	135 15 4	150 6 2	14 6 10	" " "	135 15 4	137 8 7	5 11 9	143 4 4	" " "	7 1 10	7 1 10	156 5 "
Ditto Ditto to Sundry Davastanums	893 11 7	998 7 6	104 11 11	" " "	863 13 9	871 5 5	24 10 1	895 15 6	29 13 10	102 8 "	132 5 10	
Total	24,140 10 3	25,308 6 3	1,367 12 "	" " "	23,751 7 9	24,661 15 7	376 15 2	25,038 14 9	389 2 6	469 7 6	858 10 "	

Coimbatore 11th July 1841 - C. C. J. / Signed / S. C. Wroughton
Print. Cotta
ordered -

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Order thereon. (59. 60.) Ordered to be recorded.-

From the Pr. Coll. of Coimbatore. - Read Statement Extra Peri allowance for fusly 1250.-

(61) Ordered that the following letter be sent in reply.-

To the Acting Principal Collector of Coimbatore

To the Pr. Coll. of Coimbatore } Sir

(61-62) I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th August last submitting a Statement of Extra Cist allowance for fusly 1250, and to convey sanction for the Amount drawn by Mr. Drury late Principal Collector and Subordinates for the number of days noted in the Margin.-

Mr. G. D. Drury Pr. Coll.	42
Mr. I. Bird Sub Coll.	48
Mr. W. P. Daniell Asst.	13
Mr. F. Capletton Actg. Do.	50

Revenue Board Office. Fort St. George, 11th November 1841.

/ Signed C. B. Smollett Secretary

Order thereon.- Ordered that a Copy of the foregoing letter be transmitted for the information of the Civil Auditor.-

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

From the Pr. Coll. of Canara } Sir

(63) I have the honor to request that you will have the goodness to furnish me with a copy of a letter from Mr. Read late Collector of this District, addressed to the Board under date 1st January 1814 containing detailed information regarding several items of Revenue as owing to the absence of records lost in the insurrection in 1837 this letter with Statements accompanying it, may be useful for occasional reference.-

Prin. Coll. Cutcherry Mangalore, 25th October 1841.- } / Signed / H. M. Blair Collector

Order thereon. Vide letter to the Pr. Coll. 17th March 1842.- Ordered to be brought forward at a future Meeting.-

(63-64) Read

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.-

Read the following letters.-

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

(65) From the Actg. Coll. of Madras.- Submitting a Statement shewing the particulars of the demand against the Arrack Shop Keepers within the limits of the Supreme Court between the 18th and 26th September last, and stating that the closing of the 2nd Door of their respective Shops had been productive of a loss of revenue amounting to an average of Rupees 1111 9 9-4 per annum.-

Sir,

Para 1.- I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter under date the 18th Instant, and to submit herewith the Statement called for by the Board of Revenue exhibiting the particulars of the demand against the Arrack Shop Keepers within the limits of the Supreme Court, between the 18th and 26th Ultimo.-

Whilst the entries in Col 2. 3 are corroborative of the fact stated in Para 2 of my letter of the 9th Instant, that in numerous instances the Security deposited by the Venders of arrack, falls short

Short of the balance outstanding against them, the results as required by the heading of Cols. 9/10/11 and 12 in the case of parties who were fined by the Police shew that the Gross Revenue uncollected for the period under review, is Rupees 1,082-5-6. that the Net revenue uncollected for the Same period, Supposing the full Sowle had been taken, is Rupees 934-9-2, and that the Gross revenue uncollected until the day on which the whole Amount of deposit became forfeited is Rupees 316-7-0, and the Net revenue Rupees 272-15-3-

3. Adverting to the Shop Keepers representation, as made in the petition Submitted on the 9th Instant, that, in order to guards against loss, it was requisite they

they should have two Doors to their respective Shops, I beg leave to submit, for the information of the Board, a marginal Statement shewing the actual Collections from arrack and Toddy for 3 years Subsequent to the closing of the 2nd Door on

Fasly	1240/41/42. Rs.	A.	P.	Fasly 1243/44&45 Rs.	A.	P.
Arrack	10,14,334	-	11	7,58,904	10	4
Toddy	6,21,702	13	11	5,41,404	7	4
	16,36,036	13	11	13,00,309	1	8
Deduct	13,00,309	1	8			
Decrease	3,35,727	12	3			
average	1,11,909	4	1			

Compared with those for the 3 previous years, from which it will be seen that the average loss to Government amounted to no less than Rupees 1,11,909-4-1. per annum-

Madras, 27th October 1841.

/Signed/ J. A. Hudleston
Acting Collector.

Statement.

16129 Fort St. George

11th November 1841.

A Statement of Shop Keepers within the limits of the Supreme Court at Madras between the

No.	Shops No. & Shop Keepers Name	Prime cost of arrack on the 18th September still the 26th September	Prime Cost of the arrack shops according to the Doles entered in Col 4	Amount of Gross revenue collected from the 18th to the 26th September on the whole of the Shops	Amount of Net revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th September supposing the full Dowle had been taken, excluding the prime cost of liquor from the whole of the Shops	Amount of Gross revenue uncollected until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, including the prime cost of liquor	Amount of Net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of Deposit became forfeited excluding the prime Cost of Liquor
		Prime Cost of arrack on the Full Dowle of each arrack Shop from the 18th September still the 26th September	Shops liable to forfeiture according to Dowle	Amount of Gross revenue collected from the 18th to the 26th September on the whole of the Shops	Amount of Net revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th September supposing the full dowle had been taken excluding the prime cost of liquor from the whole of the Shops	Amount of Gross revenue uncollected until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, including the prime cost of liquor	Amount of Net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of Deposit became forfeited excluding the prime Cost of Liquor
		8	9	10	11	12	
		Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	
	Batavia						
1	Mootoosawmy	8 2 3.	1 2 9	9 4 10	65 4 8.	55 11 10	56 14 7.	48 12 4
2	Mootegia	3 2 11.	9 8 9	9 4 10.	88 15. 4	76 3 8.	22 3 10.	19 4 11
3	Venatachel	" " "	" " "	7 13 4	54 12 "	46 14 8.	" " "	" " "
4	Nangiah	" " "	" " "	11 4 2	78 11 4.	67 7 2	" " "	" " "
5	Jungama	" " "	" " "	9 4 10.	65 " 8.	55 11 10.	" " "	" " "
6	Maureyapy	2 5 1	6 15 8	9 4 10.	65 " 8.	55 11 10.	16 4 2	13 15 1.
7	Sawmy N.	5 14 "	9 12 8	15 10 8.	109 8 "	93 13 4	41. 1 "	35. 3 "
8	Auroonach	3 10 9.	6 1 11	9 12 8.	68 6 8.	58 10 "	25. 10 6.	21. 15 9.
9 E	Cundappa	15 10 8.	1 15 4	17 10 "	123 3 "	105. 9 "	109. 8 "	93. 13 4
10 E	Ramasaw	1 11 5.	13 11 4	15 6 9	107 13 "	92 6 3.	11. 15 8.	10. 4 3.
11 E	Ramasaw	5 8 2.	4 6 6	9 14 8	69. 4 6.	59. 5 10	38 7 10.	32 15 8.
12	Narraina	2 15 "	4 14 4	7 13 4	54 12 "	46. 14 8	20 8 6	17 9 6

16129

Fort St. George

A. Statement exhibiting the particulars of the demand against the arrack Shop Keepers with between the 18th and 26th September 1841.—

No.	Shops No. and Names of the Shop Keepers.	Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841. Days	Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841. Amount	Day on which according to the Mofussil Dowle to the Shop became distinguishing not chargable in consequence of the Deposit having became Subject to forfeiture	Day on which according to the Mofussil Dowle to the Shop became distinguishing not chargable in consequence of the Deposit having became Subject to forfeiture	Amount of Dowle to the 26th September	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September.	Prime cost of arrack from the 18th September until the day on which the deposit became Subject to forfeiture according to Dowle	Prime cost of the arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4
		1	2			3	4	5	6	7
			Rs. A P			Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P
	Batavia arrack.									
1	Mootoosawmy Moodely	7	56 2 9.	Sept. 18th 1841	26th	8 2 1.	8 2 1	" " "	8 2 3.	1 2 9
2	Mootega Naick	2	16 3 5.		21st	11 1 11	66 11 6.	" " "	3 2 11.	9 8 9
3	Venkatachella Naick	10	66 9 2			6 13 6	" " "	13 11.	" " "	" " "
4	Naujah Naick	10	100. 10 "			9 13 5	" " "	19 10 10.	" " "	" " "
5	Jungama Naick	10	83 2 "			8 2 1	" " "	16 4 2	" " "	" " "
6	Maureyappa Moodely	2	19 6 3.	"	21st	8 2 1	4 8 12 6.	" " "	2 5 1	6 15 8
7	Sawmy Naick	3	44 2 10.	"	22nd	13 11 "	6 8 9 "	" " "	5 14 "	9 12 8
8	Auroonachella Moodely	3	27 9 9.	"	22nd	8 8 10	42 12 2	" " "	3 10 9.	6 1 11
9 F	Cundappa Moodelly	8	100 10 4	"	26th	13 11 "	13 11 "	" " "	15 10 8.	1 15 4
10 F	Ramasawmy Moodelly	1	6 2 4	"	19th	11 15 8	95 13 4	" " "	1 11 5	13 11 4
11 F	Ramasawmy Moodely	5	39 6 4.	"	23rd	7 11 2	30 12 8	" " "	5 8 2	4 6 6
12	Narraina Moodely	3	22 1 5	"	22nd	6 13 6	34 3 6	" " "	2 15 "	4 14 6

16130

Fort St. Geo.

Shops Nos and Names of the Shop Keepers

Deposit remai... on the 18th Septem... 1841.

No.	Names	Days Absent	
	1st	2	
13	Gangana Naick	1	10 5
14	Veerasawmy Naick	3	25 12
15	Veerasawmy Pillay	10	39 6
16	Soobroyloo Naick & Kundapa Moodely	1	7 13
17	Moorooga Sa Moodely	3	19 3
18	Chinnatumbey Moodely	9	126 5
19	Casava Moodely & Pastambaram	1	5 1
20	Siddooloo Naick	10	43 12
21	Veeradawmy Pillay	5	35 6
22	Vencata Kistnama Naick	7	10 [illegible]
23	Moonesawmy Moodely	5	56 11
24 F	Kistnaspem	1	4 [illegible]

11th November 1841.-

Day.	Amount.	Day in which according to the Abkarry Shop became forfeited, & stood forfeited the day and amount of Dowle.	Amount of Dowle to the 26th September not chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture.	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September.	Prime Cost of arrack from the 18th September until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowle	Prime Cost of the arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4.	Prime Cost of arrack on the full Dowle of each arrack Shop from the 18th Sept. till the 26th September.	Amount of Gross revenue collected from the 18th to the 26th September on the whole of the Shops.	Amount of Net revenue collected from the 18th to the 26th September. Supposing the full Dowle had been taken exclusive of the prime cost of liquor on the whole of the Shops.	Amount of Gross revenue collected until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited including the prime cost of liquor.	Amount of net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the prime cost of liquor.
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Sept. 20th	9 13 5.	6 8 13 11.	" " "	1 6 6.	9 13 8.	11 4 2	78 11 4	67 7 2	9 13 5	8 6 11.
" 22d	9 13 5.	49 3 1.	" " "	4 3 6.	7 " 7.	11 4 2	78 11 4	67 7 2.	29 8 3.	25 4 9.
"	3 13 7	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "	4 6 6.	30 12 8.	26 6 2	" " "	" " "
" 20th	11 15 8.	83 13 8.	" " "	1 11 5.	11 15 11.	13 11 4	95 13 4	82 2 "	11 15 8.	10 4 3.
" 22d	7 4 4	36 5 8.	" " "	3 1 11.	5 3 3.	8 5 2	58 2 8.	49 13 6.	21 13 "	18 11 1-
	13 11 "	13 11. "	" " "	" " "	" " "	15 10 8.	109 8 "	93 13 4	" " "	" " "
" 20th	11 1 11.	77 13 5.	" " "	1 9 6.	11 2 2.	12 11 8.	88 15 4	76 3 8.	11 1 11.	9 8 5
	4 4 5.	8 8 10.	" " "	" " "	" " "	4 14 4	34 3 4	29 5. "	" " "	" " "
" 24th	6 6 8.	19 4 "	" " "	4 9 5.	2 12 1.	7 5 6	51 5 4	43 15 10	32 1 4	27 7 11.
" 26th	14 5 9.	14 15 7.	" " "	14 15 11.	2 2 4.	17 2 2	119 12 8.	102 10 6.	104 13 1.	89 13 2
" 24th	12 6 6.	37 3 6.	" " "	8 14 "	5 5 2	14 3 2	99 4 "	85 " 10	62 " 6.	53 2 6.
	10 11 1	85 8 8	" " "	1 8 6	12 3 10	13 12 4	96 3 9	82 7 5	10 11 1	9 2 7
" 19th										

16121

Fort St. George

No. Fined	Shops Nos. and Names of the Shop Keepers:-	Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841		Day on which according to the Mochilka any Shop became forfeited, distinguishing the day and amount of Dowle.-		Amount of Dowle to the 26th September not Chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become Subject to forfeiture	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September.	Prime cost of arrack from the 18th September up to the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowle	Prime cost of the arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4
		Days.	Amount.	Days.	Amount.				
		1	2		3	4	5	6	7
			Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
25	Sabapaty Naik	8	47. 3 8.		6 6 8	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
26. Fr	Mootoosawmy	1	9 2 10.	Sept. 19th	10 4 3.	82. 2 "	" " "	1 7 6	11 12.
27.	Kistnapa Naik & Jagannada G.f.	2	23. 1 "	" 21st	11 1 11.	66. 11 6.	" " "	3 2 11	9 8
28	Vurdarawzoolo Naik	9	118. 2 11.		13 11 -	" " "	13. 11 "	" " "	" " "
29	Veerasawmy Pilly	5	56. 4 8.	" 24th	12 6 6.	37. 3 6.	" " "	8 14 -	5 52
30	Veerasawmy Naik	10	78. 12 "		7 11 2	" " "	15. 6 4	" " "	" " "
31	Rackeyappa Moodaly	10	83. 2 "		8 2 1	" " "	16. 4 2	" " "	" " "
32	Pareytamby	6	40. 4 1.	" 25th	7 11 2	15. 6 4	" " "	6 9 9	2 33
33	Yagappa Modaly	10	52. 9 7.		5 9 "	" " "	11. 2 "	" " "	" " "
34	Soobroya Modaly	10	39. 6 "		3 13 7	" " "	7. 11 2	" " "	" " "
35	Narraina Modaly	1	4. 11 "	" 20th	5 9 "	38. 15 "	" " "	12 9	59
36	Veerasawmy Naik	1	10. 8 "	" 20th	8 8 11	59. 14 5.	" " "	1 3 7	8 9

Fort St. George

11th November 1841.

		Which according to Rule any one forfeited, during the day and Dowle.	Amount of Dowle to the 26th September not chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become Subject to forfeiture.	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September.	Prime cost of arrack from the 18th September till the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowle	Prime cost of the arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4	Prime Cost of arrack on the full Dowle of each arrack from the 18th September till the 26th September.	Amount of Gross revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th September on the whole of the Shops.	Amount of net revenue uncollected from the 18th until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the prime cost of liquor on the Shops of the Shops.	Amount of Gross revenue uncollected until the day on which the whole Amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the prime Cost of liquor.	Amount of Net revenue until the day on which the whole Amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the prime Cost of liquor.
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P	Rs A P
13		6 6 8	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "					
14		10 4 3.	82. 2 "	" " "	1 7 6	11 12 "	7 5 6.	51 5 4	43. 15 10.	" " "	" " "
15		11 1 11.	66. 11 6.	" " "	3 2 11	9 8 9	13 3 6.	92 6 3.	79. 2 9.	10 4 3.	8 12 9.
16		13 11 "	" " "	13. 11 "	" " "	" " "	12 11 8.	88 15 4	76. 3 8.	22 3 10.	19. " 11.
17		12 6 6.	37. 3 6.	" " "	8 14 "	5 5 2	15 10 8.	109. 8 "	99. 13 4	" " "	" " "
18		7 11 2	" " "	15. 6 4	" " "	" " "	14 3 2.	99. 4 "	85. " 10.	62. " 6	53. 2 6
19		8 2 1	" " "	16. 4 2	" " "	" " "	8 13 "	61. 9 4	52 12 4	" " "	" " "
20		7 11 2	15. 6 4	" " "	6 9 9	2 3 3	9 4 10.	65. " 8.	55. 11 10.	" " "	" " "
21		5 9 "	" " "	11. 2 "	" " "	" " "	8 13 "	61. 9 4	52 12 4	46. 3 "	39. 9 3.
22		3 13 7	" " "	7. 11 2	" " "	" " "	6 5 10.	44. 8 "	38. 2 2.	" " "	" " "
23		5 9 "	38. 15 "	" " "	12 9	5 9 1	4 6 6.	30. 12 9.	26. 6 3.	" " "	" " "
24		8 8 11	59. 14 5	" " "	1 3 7	8 9 1	6 5 10.	44. 8 "	38. 2 2.	5. 9 "	4 12 3
							9 12 8	68. 9 4	58. 10 8.	8 8 11	7 5 4

16132 16133

Fort St. George

Shops Nos and Names of the Shopkeepers.

Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841.—

Nos of Shops	Names.	Days.	Amount
	1		2
			Rs. A P
37	Sooreyamoorty Moodely	10	45 2 1
38	Mootoosawmy Moodely	10	57 13 3
39	Veerasawmy Moodely	3	19 " "
40	Rackiyappa Moodely	1	7 6 6
41	Nullavandoo Naick	10	59 10 2
42	Cundappa Moodely	"	" " "
43	Narraina Moodely	3	38 15 10
44	Rawmasawmy Moodely	10	52 8 "
45	Audeymoola Moodely	10	61 4 "
46	Appasasawmy Moodely	5	30 1 11
47 F	Vyapoorey Naick	10	65 10 "
	Total Rs.		2,065 2 6

11th November

Day on which according to the Mochelika the Shop became forfeited, distinguishing the days and amount of Do.	Amount of net revenue collected till the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, including the prime Cost of liquor.	Amount of net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, excluding the prime Cost of liquor.	Day.	Amount
	11	12	2	
	3	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P
	Rs. A P			
	" "	" "	" "	3 14 6
	4 11			
	" "	" "	" "	3 1
	5 1			
	19 4 "	16 7 11		0 4 5
Sept. 22	6 6			
		8 2 1		
20th	8 3			
		" "	" "	8 "
	6 4			
	" "	" "	" "	8 "
		29 11 2		
19th	11			
	34 10 6			2 9 "
22nd	11			
	" "	" "	" "	8 8 "
	5			
	" "	" "	" "	" "
	5 1			
	32 1 4	27 7 11		7 6 "
24th	6			
	" "	" "	" "	12 2 "
	6			
		885 7 9	758 12 11	
	410			

Day on which according to the Mochelika the Shop became forfeited, distinguishing the days and amount of Do.

Amount of net revenue collected till the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, including the prime Cost of liquor.

Amount of net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, excluding the prime Cost of liquor.

Day. Amount

Day. Amount

Day on which according to the Mochelika the Shop became forfeited, distinguishing the days and amount of Do.

Amount of net revenue collected till the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, including the prime Cost of liquor.

Amount of net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited, excluding the prime Cost of liquor.

Day. Amount

Day. Amount

11th November 1841.-

Day on which according to the Mookhtika any Shop became forfeited distinguishing the day and amount of Dowla		Amount of Dowla to the 26th September not Chargeable in Consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture.	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime cost of arrack from the 18th September until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowla.	Prime cost of the arrack according to the Dowla entered in Col. 4 -	Prime Cost of arrack on the full Dowla of each arrack Shop from the 18th September till the 26th September	Amount of Gross revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th September on the whole of the Shops.	Amount of Net revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th September supposing the full Dowle had been taken, excluding the prime cost of liquor on the whole of the Shops.	Amount of Gross revenue collected until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited including the prime Cost of liquor.	Amount of Net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the prime Cost of liquor.
Day.	Amount.									
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
						5 6 2.	37 10 8.	32 4 6.	" " "	" " "
	4 11 4.	" " "	9 6 8.	" " "	" " "	6 13 8.	47 14 8.	41 1 "	" " "	" " "
	5 15 10.	" " "	11 15 8.	" " "	4 9 5.	7 5 6.	51 5 4.	43 15 10.	19 4 "	16 7 11.
Sept. 22	6 6 8.		32 1 4	" " "						
					1 2 7.	8 2 3.	9 4 10.	65 " 8.	55 11 10.	8 2 1.	6 15 6.
" 20th	8 2 1.		56 14 7.	" " "						
			12 13 4.	" " "		7 5 6.	51 5 4.	43 15 10.	" " "	" " "
	6 6 8.	" " "								
						13 3 6.	92 6 8.	79 3 2	" " "	" " "
					13 3 6.					
" 19th	11 8 10.		92 6 8.	" " "						
					4 15 4.	8 4 2.	13 3 6.	92 6 8.	79 3 2	34. 10 6.	29 11 2
" 22nd	11 8 10.		57 12 2.	" " "						
			10 4 4.	" " "			5 14 "	41 1 4	35 3 4	" " "	" " "
	5 2 2.	" " "								
			11 15 8.	" " "			6 13 8.	47 14 8.	41. 1 "	" " "	" " "
	5 15 10.	" " "			4 9 5.	2 12 1.	7 5 6.	51 5 4.	43. 15 10.	32. 1 4	27. 7 11.
			19 4 "	" " "							
" 24th	6 6 8.		6 6 8.	" " "			6 4 1.	57 12 "	49. 7 11.	" " "	" " "
	6 6 8.	" " "									
	6 6 8.	" " "									
	4 10 10	8.	1441. 2 9		206 10 "	126 10 10	206 2 10	478 11 "	3,346. 1 3.	2,867. 6 3.	885. 7 9.	758 12 11

Nos. Serial	Shops Nos. and Names of the Shop Keepers.	Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841		Day on which according to the Mochilka any shop became forfeited, distinguishing by the day and amount of Doubles.		Amount of Doubles to the 26th September not chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th September until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Double.	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Doubles entered in Col 4.
	Names.	Days	Amount	Day.	Amount				
	1		2			3	4	5	6	7
			Rs. A P			Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P.
	Putta Arrack.									
1	Soobroya Moodely	8.	58 4 6.			7 7 10.	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
2	Coreykistna Moodely	1	4 3 1.	Sept.	20th	4 1 11.	28 13 5.	" " "	8 7.	3 11 11.
3	Chella. Pillay	8	50 4 5			6 5 10	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "
4	Govindoo Chetty	"	" " "			4 7 11.	33 13 4.	" " "	" " "	4 10 6.
5	Rackeyappa Moodely	10	75 " "			7 7 10.	" " "	14. 15 8.	" " "	" " "
6	Iya Moodely	10	52 8 "			5 3 10	" " "	10. 7 8.	" " "	" " "
7.	Mootoosawmy Moodely	10	52 8 "			5 3 10.	" " "	10. 7 8.	" " "	" " "
8	Narrainasawmy Naik	4	16 2 9 "	23d		4 1 11.	16. 7 8.	" " "	2 2 3.	2 2 3
9	F Paroosarama Moodely	7	43 8 8 "	25th		6 11 10.	13 7 8.	" " "	6 2 "	1 12 "
10	Seetarama Moodely	10	45 " "			4 7 11.	" " "	8. 15 10.	" " "	" " "
11	Runga Pillay	3	18 7 6 "	22d		6 11 10.	33. 11 2.	" " "	2 10. "	4 6 "
12	Paroosarama Pillay	9	105 12 2			11 2 8.	" " "	11. 2 8.	" " "	" " "
13	Mootoosawmy Moodely	2	13 3 9 "	21st		7 1 11.	42 11 6.	" " "	1 13 9.	5 8 9

Fort St. George

November 1841

No.	on which ting to the il ha any shop e forfeited, les- sluding the day unt of Dowle. Amount.	Amount of Dowle to the 26th September not Chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture.	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September.	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th September until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture ac- cording to Dowle.	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4.	Prime Cost of Arrack on the full Dowle of Arrack from the shop from 18th to the 18th Sept. 26th Sept. on the 26th the whole September of the Shops.	Amount of Gross revenue collected from the 18th to the 26th Sept. on the supposing whole amount of the Dowle had been collected for the whole shops.	Amount of net revenue collected from the 18th until the day on which the whole amount of the Dowle became forfeited including the cost of the prime cost of Liquor in the prime cost of Liquor.	Amount of net revenue collected & Collected until the day on which the whole amount of the Dowle became forfeited excluding the cost of Liquor.
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 12
	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P	Rs. A P.	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as
37	7 7 10.	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "				
	4 1 11.	28 13 5.	" " "	8 7.	3 11 11.	7 12 5.	59 14 8.	52 2 3.	3 9 4.
38	6 5 10.	" " "	" " "	" " "	" " "			4 1 11.	
						4 4 5.	32 15 4	28 10 11.	
39	4 7 11.	35 15 4.	" " "	" " "	4 10 8.			44 4 11	
						6 9 9.	50 14 8.		
40	7 7 10.	" " "	14. 15 8.	" " "	" "			31 4 8	
						4 10 8	35 15 8		
41	5 3 10.	" " "	10. 7 8.	" " "	" "			52 2 3	
						7 12 5.	59 14 8		
42	5 3 10.	" " "	10. 7 8.	" " "	" "			36 7 7	
						5 7 1.	41 14 8		
43	4 1 11.	16. 7 8.	" " "	2 2 3.	2 2 3			36 7 6	
						5 7 2	41 14 8		
44	6 11 10.	13 7 8.	" " "	6 2 "	1 12 "			28 10 11.	16 7 8 14 5 5.
						4 4 5.	32 15 4		
45	4 7 11.	" " "	8. 15 10.	" " "	" "			52 12 6	47 2 10 41 " 10.
						7 14 "	60 10 6.		
46	6 11 10.	33. 11 2.	" " "	2 10. "	4 6 "			31 4 8	
						4 10 8	35 15 4		
47	11 2 8.	" " "	11. 2 8.	" " "	" "			46 14 8	20 3 6 17 9 6.
						7 " "	53 14 8		
	7 1 11.	42 11 6.	" " "	1 13 9.	5 8 9			77 10 8	
						11 10 8	89 5 4		14 3 10 12 6 3
						7 6 3.	56 15 4	49 9 4.	

16134-

Fort St. George

11th November

Nos. Fined	Names of the Shopkeepers	Days	Amount of Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841	Day on which it is record=ed according to the succeeding Accounts until the Shop became forfeited & distinguished by the day and date of Drawing	Amount of Net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of Deposit became forfeited exclusive of the Opium & Cost of Liquor	Amount
	1.	2	3.		11 12	6
			Rs as		Rs as	
					20 a 10	
			4 7 10		3 14 6.	
14	Servovengada Naick	2	4 14 6.	September 21st		7 6 6. Sept. 5.
				" " "	" " "	
15	Appasawmy Moodely	10	45 a a			12 a 9. 2
		4	8 15 8		7 13 "	
16.	Auroomooga Moodely	4	8 10 5.	" 23rd		5 5 6. "
		2				
			15 11 6.		11 5 6.	18 12 "
17	Corey Kistna Moodely	3	13 9 2	" 22nd		3 7 3. 7.
		3		" " "	" " "	
			4 7 11.		3 14 7.	
18	Sooreyamoorty & Caroomal Razah	10	52 8 "			11 5 10. 7.
		4		" 20th		
			57 10 6.		44 15 2	
19	Govindoo Chetty	1	3 7 3.			37 2 8 4.
		3		" 25th		
			44 15 "		39 1 8	
20	Runga Pilly	6	49 9 1.			9 13 1. 2
		1		" 25th		
			15 11 6.		13 10 10.	
21	Shunmooga Moodely	6	48 a 10	" 20th		7 3 6. 2
		1		" " "	" " "	
						28 9 9. 7.
22 F	Soobroya Moodely	2	13 13 11.			
					33 3 8	
23	Audeyappa Moodely	10	37 8 "		38 3 "	1 4 6 "
		1		" 25th		
					" " "	
24	Soobroya Moodely	6	35 4 10.			75 " 5. "
		1		" 18th		
					" " "	
25 F	Cundappa Moodely	"	3 13 9.			7 10 8 07.
				" 19th		
26.	Veerasawmy Moodely	"	" "			

11th November 1841-

Day	Amount	Day on which according to the Act of sale the shop became forfeited distinguishing the day and sum part of Dowle -	Amount of Dowle to the 26th Sept. not chargeable for consignment to the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture -	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th Sept. until the day on which the deposit became subjects to forfeiture according to Dowle -	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4.	Prime Cost of Arrack on the full Dowle of each Arrack shop from the 18. Sept. till the 26th Sept.	Amount of Gross Advance uncollected from the 18. to the 26th Sept. on the whole of the Shops -	Amount of net revenue uncollected from the 18. to the 26th Sept.	Amount of Gross revenue collected from the 18. until the day to the 26th Sept. on which the whole amount of the deposit having become forfeited exclusive of the prime cost of liquor -	Amount of net revenue until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited exclusive of the prime cost of liquor -
							8	9	10	11	12
							No nb	No nb	No nb	No nb	No nb
										4 7 10	3 14 6.
September 21st	2 3 11.	13 7 6.	" " "		- 9 4	1 12 "	2 5 4	17 15 4	15 10 "		
"	4 7 11.	" " "	8 15 10		" " "	" " "	4 10 8	35 15 4	31. 4 8		
23rd	2 3 11.	8 15 8	" " "		1 2 8	1 2 8.	2 5 4	17 15 4	15 10 "	8 15 8	7 13 "
22nd	5 3 10	26 3 2	" " "		4 6 "		5 7 1.	41 14 8	36 7 7.		
"	5 3 10	" "	10 7 8		" " "		5 7 2	41 14 8	36 7 6.	15 11. 6.	11 5 6.
20th	4 7 11	31 7 5.	" " "		- 9 4	4. 1. 4	4 10 8	35 15 4	31 4 8	" " "	" " "
25th	8 9 9	17 3 6	" "		6 11 4	2 3 9.	8 15 1.	68 14 "	59 14 11.	5 " "	" " "
25th	7 7 10	14 15 8	" " "		5 13 4	1 15 1.	7 12 5	59 14 8	52 2 3.	4 7 11.	3 14 7.
20th	7 13 9	55. 3.	" " "		2. 8:	1 2 4	9 3 "	70 11 9	61 8 9.	57 10 6.	44 15 2
"	3 11 11.	" " "	7 7 10		" " "	" " "	3 14 3	29 15 4	26 1 1.	44 15 "	39 1 8
25th	6 5 10	12 11 8	" " "		4 15 4	1 10 5.	6 9 9	50 14 9	44 5 "	15 11 6.	13 10 10.
19th	6 5 10	57 4 6.	" " "		7 7 "	7 7 "	5 7 6.	49 13 6		" " "	" " "
19th	10 13 9	86 13 4	" " "		11 4 6.	11 4 5	86 13 4	75 8 11		38 3 "	33 3 8
										" " "	" " "

No.	Fined	Shops No. and Names of the Shopkeepers	Deposit remaining on the 18th September 1841. Days	Amount	Day on which according to the Invoice any Shop forfeited became liable to Double the amount of Double	Amount of Double to the 26th Sept. not chargeable consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th Sept. until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Double	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Double entered in Col 4.
		1.	2.		3	4	5	6	7.
			No.	a/o	No. a/o	No. a/o	No. a/o	No. a/o	No. a/o
27		Venkatachella Pilly	3	57 6 6.	September 7 7 10.				
28		Veerasawmy Naik	3	12 9.	22d 3 11 11.	18 11 7.		1 14	2 6 11.
29		Kistnuppa Naik	1	5 5 6.	20th 5 9 10.	39 4 10		11 8	5 1 8
30		Ramasawmy Naik	10	18 12	1 13 11.		3 11 10.		
32		Ramasawmy Naik	1	3 7 3.	20th 4 7 11.	31 7 5.		9 4	4 1 4.
33	F	Venkatachella Pilly	2	11 5 10.	20th 7 7 10.	52 6 10.		1 15 1.	6 12 11.
34		Soobroylos Naik	6	37 2 8	25th 5 15 10.	11 15 8		4 10 8	1 8 10.
35		Maureyappa Moodely	2	9 13 1.	21st 4 7 11.	26 15 6.		1 2 8	3 3
36	F	Curumagerry Moodely	1	7 3 6.	19th 5 9 10.	44 14 8		11 8	5 13 4
37	F	Ramasawmy Moodely	3	28 9 9.	21st 8 9 9.	57 10 6.		3 5 8	6 11 4
38		Baulamootoo Moodely		1 4 6	19th 8 9 9.	68 14			8 15 1.
39		Moovoguppa Moodely	8	7 5 5.	8 15 9				
40	F	Govindoo Naick	1	7 10 8	19th 9 11 9.	77 14		1 4 2	10 1 9

Madras 27th October 1841.

1836

Fort St George

Day.	Amount.	on which ge= ing to the Mo= dras any Shop =ps forfeited ting also the day =ount of Double	Amount of Double to the 26th Sept. not charge= able con= =sequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture.	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th Sept. until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowle=	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4.
		3	4	5	6	7
		no ap	no ap	no ap	no ap	no ap
1	Number	7 7 10.	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —
13	22d	3 11 11.	18 11 7.	— — —	1 7 4	2 6 11.
16	20th	5 9 10.	39 4 10	— — —	— — —	5 1 8
1		1 13 11	— — —	3 11 10.	— — —	— — —
1	20th	4 7 11.	31 7 5.	— — —	— 9 4	4 1 4.
1	20th	7 7 10.	52 6 10.	— — —	1 15 1.	6 12 11.
2	25th	5 15 10.	11 15 8	— — —	4 10 8	1 8 10.
2	21st	4 7 11.	26 15 6.	— — —	1 2 8	3 8 —
2	19th	5 9 10.	44 14 8	— — —	1 1 8	5 13 4
2	21st	8 9 9.	57 10 6.	— — —	3 5 8	6 11 4
2	19th	8 9 9.	68 14 —	— — —	— — —	8 15 1.
2		8 15 9	— — —	— — —	— — —	10 1 9
2	19th	9 11 9.	77 14 —	— — —	1 4 2	— — —

11th November 1841

Prime cost of Arrack in the full Dowle of each Arrack Shop from the 18th to the 26th Sept. till the 26th September	Amount of Gross Re= venue collected from the 18th to the 26th Sept. supposing the whole of the Shops	Amount of Gross Re= venue un= collected from the 18th to the 26th Sept. whole of the full Dowle amount of deposit had been taken ex= =cluding the forfeited prime cost of liquor on the whole of the shops.	Amount of net revenue collected from the 18th until the day on which the whole amount of deposit be= =came for= =feited ex= =cluding the prime Cost of liquor	
8	9	10	11	12
no ap	no ap	no ap	no ap	no ap
— — —	— — —	5 2 2	— — —	— — —
7 12 6	59 14 8	26 1 1.	11 3 9.	9 12 5
3 14 3	29 15 4	39 1 4	5 9 10	4 14 2
5 13 4	44 14 8	13 3.	— — —	— — —
1 15 1.	14 15 4	31 4 8.	4 7 11	3 14 7.
4 10 8.	35 15 4	58 10 6.	14 15 8	13 3 7.
8 12 —	67 6 6.	41 11 2.	35 15 —	31 4 4.
6 3 7.	47 14 9.	31 4 8.	8 15 10	7 13 2
4 10 8	35 15 4	43 15 6.	5 9 10.	4 14 2
6 9 —	50 8 6.	67 6 9.	25 13 3.	22 7 7.
10 2 —	77 7 9.	39 14 11.	— — —	— — —
8 15 1.	68 14 —	62 8 8	— — —	— — —
9 5 4	71 14 —	76 3 9	9 11 9	8 7 7.
11 6 —	87 9 9.			

16136.

Fort St. George

11th November

Shops Nos and Names of the Shop Keepers	Deposit remaining on the 1st September 1841	Day on which according to the Gurchilka any Shop became forfeited distinguishing the day, and part of Day	Amount	Amount of Net revenue uncollected until the day on which the whole Deposit became forfeited including the principal of the liquor	Amount of Net revenue collected until the day on which the whole amount of deposit became forfeited excluding the principal cost of the liquor
				11	12
No Fined Names	Days Amount			Rs as p	Rs as p
	1 2	3.	Rs as p	22 7 6.	19 8 10.
41. Auronagerry Moodely	3. 21 7 7	Sept 22d	7 7 10	" " "	" " "
42 Vencatachella Moodely	9 67 8 2.		7 7 10	" " "	" " "
43 Mottay Naick	" " "		10 13 8	12 5 9.	10 12 1.
44 Comarappa Moodely	3 12 " 10	22d	4 1 11	" " "	" " "
45. Parosarama Naick	8 45 " 5.		5 15 4	11 3 6.	9 12 2
46 E Narrainasawmy Naick	6 10 2 3.	24th	1 13 11	" " "	" " "
47. Auroonachella Ancharey	10 52 8 "		5 3 10	5 3 10	4 8 11.
49 E Parthasarady	1 8 11 4	19th	5 3 1	33 11 "	29 5 "
50 Munnaparooma Moodely	6 31 2 9.	25th	5 9 1	" " "	" " "
2. Annasawmy Moodely & Goorooppa Naick	10 11 4 "		1 1 1	" " "	" " "
3. Appasawmy Moodely	10 22 8 "		2 3 1	" " "	" " "
4. Carey Kistna Moodely	" " " 11.	19th	2 15 1	" " "	" " "
5. Veerasawmy	" 1 14 9.	19th	2 9 1	493 13 1	427 5 10
Total	141. 6 "		301 11	1379 4 10	1186 2 9
Grand Total	3476 8 6.		712 5		

Madras 27th October 1841

11th November 1841.

Day on which according to the Provisions for any Shop became forfeited distinguishing the day and amount of Dowle	Day	Amount	Amount of Dowle to the 26th September not chargeable in consequence of the Deposit having become subject to forfeiture	Balance of Deposit remaining on the 26th September	Prime Cost of Arrack from the 18th Sept. until the day on which the deposit became subject to forfeiture according to Dowle	Prime Cost of the Arrack according to the Dowle entered in Col 4	Prime Cost of arrack on the full Dowle of each Arrack Shop from the 18th September till the 26th September	Amount of Gross Revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th Sept. on the whole of the Shops	Amount of Net Revenue uncollected from the 18th to the 26th Sept. supposing the full Dowle had been taken excluding the prime cost of Liquor on the whole of the Shops	Amount of Gross Revenue collected until the day on which the whole Amount of Deposit became forfeited including the prime cost of Liquor	Amount of Net Revenue until the day on which the whole Amount of Deposit became forfeited excluding the prime cost of the Liquor
	3.		4	5.	6	7.	8	9	10	11	12
		Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as	Rs as
					2 14 8	4 13 9	7 12 5.	59 14 9.	52 2 4	22 7 6.	19 8 10.
Sept.	22d	7 7 10.	37 7 2	" " "			7 12 6.	59 14 8	52 2 2	" " "	" " "
"		7 7 10.	" " "	7 7 10.	" " "	"	11. 4 5.	86 13 4	75 8 11.	" " "	" " "
"	19th	10 13 8	86 13 4	" " "	" " "	11	4 4 6.	32 15 4	28 10 11.	12 5 9.	10 12 1.
"	22d	4 1 11.	20 9 7.	" " "	1 9 8	2	6 3 7.	47 14 8.	41 11 1.	" " "	" " "
"		5 15 10	" " "	" " "	" " "	"	11 8 2 3 "	16 13 3.	14 10 3.	11 3 6.	9 12 2
"	24th	1 13 11.	5 9 9.	" " "	1 7 4	"	" " 5 7 2	41 14 8	36 7 6.	" " "	" " "
"		5 3 10.	" " "	10 7 8	" " "	"	" " 6 2 "	47 2 6.	41 " 6.	5 3 10	4 8 11.
"	19th	5 3 10.	41 14 8	" " "	" 10 11.	5	7 2 5 13 4	44 14 8	39 1 4	33 11 "	29 5 "
"	25th	5 9 10.	11 3 8	" " "	4 6 "	1	7 4. 1 2 8.	8 15 4	7 12 8	" " "	" " "
"		2 1 11.	" " "	2 3 10.	" " "	"	" " 2 5 4	17 15 4	15 10 "	" " "	" " "
"		2 3 11.	" " "	4 7 10	" " "	"	" " 3 1 9.	23 15 4	20 13 7	" " "	" " "
"	19th	2 15 11.	23 15 4	" " "	" " "	3	11 7. 2 11 7.	20 15 4	18 3 9.	" " "	" " "
"	19th	2 9 11.	20 15 4	" " "	" " "	2					
		301 11 "	1168 1 3.	111 7 10	66 7 3.	151	108. 321. 2 9	2473 " 7.	2151 13 10	493 13 1	427 5 10
		712 5 8	2609 4 "	318 1 10	193 2 1.	357	136. 799 13 9	5819 1 10.	5019 4 1.	1379 4 10	1186 2 9

E. E. J. (Signed) J. H. Maddeston
Actg Collr

20

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

(66)

From the Collector of Madras — Reporting with reference to the recent correspondence on the subject that for 5 or 6 successive years under Annual Management lists were annually sent to the Police Office shewing that parties were entitled as Contractors for Arrack Shops to receive licenses — and that none were fined that when fined they were allowed to hold more shops than one and that this and other facts shew that they closed their shops only after their endeavours to obtain redress by petition had failed —

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

Sir,

Para 1. With reference to the correspondence relating to the late proceedings of the Police Office in the case of the Arrack and Toddy Shopkeepers, I have the honor to observe that it occurs to me that it is desirable to bring to the notice of the Board of Revenue certain points not particularly adverted to before which would be likely to add weight to the representations already made and to report accordingly that it appears from the records of this office that for five or six successive years after the Abkarry farms lists were annually transmitted to the Superintendent of Police shewing what parties were entitled as Contractors for Arrack Shops to receive licenses from his Department under Police Regulation No 4, and that the receipts of the Letters forwarding those lists was not noticed and no letters were issued upon them to the Shopkeepers in consequence of which no further lists were sent to him. Those he was furnished with shewed that several of the Contractors had more shops than one, and that on one occasion one person had six shops to which no objection was made —

2. Amongst the parties fined for not giving personal attendance at their Shops were persons who, within the last eighteen months, as well as other parties before, had received the sanction of the

Fort St. George 15th November 1841

the Police, on references from the Cutcherry to open a second Shop, they already having another previously opened, but they were not called upon to give the names of the parties who were to attend in either — To prove this, there are, besides, the records of accounts documents in the Cutcherry bearing the signature of the Acting Chief Magistrate and Superintendent of Police and other Magistrates — Enclosure B will shew the particulars of some of them —

3. I have ascertained that on some of the Shopkeepers being fined at the Police Office on the 15th and 17th September, several of them made a complaint personally to the Collector on the latter date, stating that fines were imposed upon them, for allowing sheds to be constructed at the entrance of their respective Shops as well as for keeping arrac

this

two Windows open and entrusting the sale to hired servants and others on which orders were given to the Superintendents and Amildar of the Abkarry Department to go personally and enquire, in the first instance, whether the sheds &c.ca on account of which the fines were said to be levied were of recent construction or of old standing. This would seem to prove that the parties who complained despaised themselves to have been fined for having Pandals erected and Windows open.

4. Previously to the 18th September only the Shops of the parties actually fined were closed; but on finding that by petitions, they could not get the proceedings against them arrested, the others closed their shops on the 19th 20th and 21st twenty of the shopkeepers having been fined at the Police Office on

† Note Fifteen Arrack Shops were closed on the 18th September before 12th O'Clock A.M.

on the very day, on which the petitions presented by the Shopkeepers seeking redress were forwarded for the consideration of the Acting Chief Magistrate and Superintendent of Police; and even after all the shops were closed, one Shopkeeper was fined by the Police on the 21st.—

Vide Note a/a pended to Para 8th of letter to Board 21st September 1841 N 84.

5. The facts stated above shew that the Contractors resorted to closing their Shops only after their endeavours to obtain redress by petition had failed.—

Madras, 3d November 1841.

(Signed) J. A. Huddleston
Actg Collector

Litt.

1641

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

A

List of some of the parties who have been allowed to have more Toddy Shops than one on applications duly passed by the Police Office.

Names of the Shopkeepers	Class of Heads of the Shops	Villages or situation of the Shops	Dates on which the Magistrates passed the applications	Names of the Magistrates
			1840	
Puttiniva Canneapoen	3	Tennettoor Road	Febr 6th	V. Rayavah Chary.
Do	3	Cuttewauk Road	" 6th	Do
			1839	
Calatoor Soubramanien	1st	Peddoo Naick Pettah	July 17th	Mr C. F. Elliot
Do	3	Tondiarpett	April 5th	V. Rayavah Chary
			1837	
Coliatan Salayaba Granny	2	Porsawauk	Augt 12th	Mr F. Kelly
Do	1st	Chintadrepett	1838 May 2d	Mr C. F. Elliot
			1837	
Vadamana Nyneapah Granny	1st	Moottalpettah	Febr 11th	Do
Do	1st	Peddoo Naick Pettah	May 21st	Mr F. Kelly
Vayloor Sawmy Granny	3	Singevarayen Pettah	July 1st	V. Rayavah Chary
Do	1st	Peddoo Naicks Pettah	" 3	Do
			1840	
Goodul Veerasawmy Granny	3	Chetpett	June 5	Mr J. H. Bell
			1841	
Do	3	Perambaur	Sept 11th	Mr J. A Oakes
			1839	
T. Nyneapah Granny	2	Royapooram	June 19th	Mr F. Kelly
Do	3	Tondiarpett	" 17th	V. Rayavah Chary
			1837	
Pully coodatan Granny	3	Monbray Road	Augt 24th	Mr C. F. Elliot
Do	3	Royapett	1840 July 11th	Mr F. Kelly
Aurumbauk Vengoo Granny	1st	Chintadrapett		Old Shop
Do	2	Do	1840 Febr	Both on Mr Cockerell's Pinder's application

the 20th & 16th September, the former as he states, for allowing his saw to sell, and the latter for keeping a passage open leading from the Shop to his dwelling house.

Madras 3 November 1841.

Signed / J. A Huddleston.
Actg Coll.

Ordered

Edward Hammond Jr. — 3 — Clothier — 1840 June 6 — Mrs. J. H. Bell

Jacob Hammond — 3 — Baltimore — 1841 Feb 24 — Mrs. J. A. Coates

Benjamin Hammond — 2 — Boatman — 1839 June 19 — Mrs. H. Mills

Benjamin Hammond — 3 — Merchant — 1834 Dec 4 — Mrs. C. H. Campbell Hammond

Wm. Hammond — 3 — Merchant — 1838 June 14 — Mrs. C. H. Collins

Wm. Hammond — 3 — Farmer — 1839 May 9 — Mrs. H. Mitchell

Hammond — 3 — Carpenter — June 17 — Mrs. V. Hammond

N.B. In case this deed should not be recorded in the proper office in due time, the Mortgagee is hereby authorized to sell the premises mortgaged after giving 30 days notice of the time and place of sale by advertisement in some newspaper published in the City of Baltimore.

Witness. Matthew and Edward Hammond

Dated 20th & 21st February 1840 and acknowledged before me the subscriber a Justice of the Peace for Baltimore County on the same day & year aforesaid.

Geo. Hammond

Matthew & Edward Hammond

Clothiers

1842 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Ordered that the following letters be sent in consequence —

To the Acting Collector of Madras —

(67)

To the Actg Coll.r of Madras

Sir,

In order that the Board of Revenue may have before them the fullest information on certain points noticed in your communications respecting the late closing of the Arrack and Toddy Shops within the limits of the Supreme Court, I am directed to request that you will as soon as possible transmit any original records in your office which relate to the arrangements respecting the transmission of a list of Toddy Shops to the Superintendent of Police with the view of guarding against any irregularities in that department, and to shew that in 1832 & 1833 the Police were applied to for Licenses in the names of the Arrack Shopkeepers entitled to them, any rebate to arise from agreement between the Collector & Superintendent of Police

From 3rd Cons 11th Nov.r 1841.

Cons P.R.

1843 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Police in 1832. that from that time the Collector alone instead of as before, the Superintendent of Police and the Collector conjointly should sign and issue Licenses to the Arrack and Toddy Shopkeepers, the application last sent to the Police Authorities for Licenses in the names of the Arrack Shopkeepers. Any record shewing that the Collector came to an understanding with Mr. Elliot, the Superintendent of Police, that thenceforward at the period of issuing the Licenses annually it should be stipulated that no shop could be permitted to have more than one entrance only, and that permission has been given by the Police Authorities for the Establishment of two or more Toddy Shops at one time.

Revenue Board Office, Fort St. George, 11th November, 1841.

Signed P.B. Smollett. Secretary.

To the Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

(65-68)

To the Actg Chief Secy to Government.

Sir,

I am directed by Board of

of Revenue to request that the officiating Chief Magistrate and Superintendent of Police may be directed to furnish them with the original or a copy of all proceedings against the Parties punished in the Police office, on account of alleged breach of the Police Regulations in the sale of Arrack and Toddy within the limits of the Supreme Court during the month of September last.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George, }
11th November, 1841. }

Signed P.R.
Secretary.

Read the undermentioned Registers.—

69
From the Collr. of Guntoor.— Register of Petitions bearing the Board's endorsements presented to him in the Month of September last.

70
From the Principal Collector of Nellore.— Register of Petitions bearing the Board's endorsements presented to him for the Month of August last.

71
From the Pnl. Collector of Nellore— Register of Petitions bearing the Board's endorsements presented to him for the Month of September last.

72
From the Pnl. Collector of North Arcot— Register of Petitions bearing the Board's endorsements presented to him for the Month of July last.

73
From the Pnl. Collector of North Arcot— Register of Petitions bearing the Board's endorsements presented to him for the Month of August last.

Order on the Five abovementioned Registers— Ordered to be lodged in the Office.

69-74

Resolved that the following letters be dispatched

75
To the Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

To the Actg. Chief Secy. to Government— Sir, Para 1. In an Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 9th March last, Para 14, the attention of the Board of Revenue was directed

Submitting the Board's sentiments on a suggestion from the Justices of the Tondiary Adawlut to fix a higher rate of taxation on Arrack

Letter to Actg. Chief Secy. to Govt. dated 11th Novr. 1841

Arrack & Toddy with a view to the diminution of crimes in the interior.-

directed to a suggestion emanating from the Judges of the Sarejdary Adalut, to fix a higher rate of taxation on Arrack and Toddy with a view to the diminution of crime in the interior, and their sentiments on this proposal were ordered to be submitted. With a view to conform to the instructions of Government, a reference was made, by the Board, to the several Collectors noted in the Margin, and the replies of these Officers are now forwarded for the consideration of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council.

From Sanjore 20th Augt. inclos: 6th September 1841.
From Chingleput 31st Augt. inclos: 6th Septr. 1841.
From Nellore 1st inclos: 9th September 1841
From N. Arcot 17th inclos: 30th Augt. 1841.
From S. Arcot 1st inclos: 4th November 1841.
From Bellary 6th inclos: 27th Septr. 1841.
From Tinnevelly 20th inclos: 26th Augt. 1841.

2. With the single exception of Mr. Kindersley, Princl. Collector of Tanjore, none of the Authorities in the interior seem disposed to entertain the suggestion favorably. Mr. Ogilvie Princl. Collector of North Arcot indeed considers the Selling Price already too high for the poor laborious classes engaged in occupation which make the Estates of their drain of Arrack as necessary to them after Cessation from their labour, as their daily food. Mr. Stonhouse Princl.

Principal Collector of Nellore, and Mr. Hallett, recently in charge of Cuddapah, seem to concur generally in opinion, that Natives are not much addicted to drunkenness, and that those classes who habitually use intoxicating Spirits are not generally the Parties by whom serious crimes are committed in their districts.-

Mr. Dowlow in Tinnevelly is not unfriendly to a trial of the measure of doubling the present minimum price of both Arrack and Toddy, and suggests that drunkenness should be made a crime liable to severe Punishment.

3. To both of these suggestions the Board are averse, and the first they believe would in practice be found inoperative, unless the renting system was abandoned, and the sale of Spirits conducted by the hired Servants of Government. In the opinion of the most experienced Officers, even the present established rates of sale are not adhered to by the Abkarree Renters, tho' it is next to impossible to detect and punish the

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

the Shopkeepers. To raise the price of liquor still higher therefore would only tend to reduce the public Revenues, and to hold out greater inducements than at present exist to the renters to sell liquor clandestinely at reduced prices.

4. Mr. Hinderley in his report treats the question as one not of Police, but of Religion and Morality, apparently advocating the principle of total abstinence, he seems to consider the acquisition of revenue from the Consumption of Spirits or any intoxicating beverage as a disgrace to Christianity. Influenced by this sentiment he goes the full length of advocating the entire suppression of the manufacture and sale of Indian Arrack, and the imposition of prohibitory duties on the imported Article. The loss of Revenue, Mr. Hinderley thinks would be more than counterbalanced to Government by the improved health and Morality of

Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

of the community, and the great moral effects that such a proof of the Christian conscientiousness of their rulers would have on the unenlightened of the heathen.

5. The Board trust that it will not be considered necessary for them to discuss these extreme opinions. An attentive consideration of the reports of the authorities whose sentiments are now submitted, has satisfied the Board that the opinions they have before repeatedly expressed are correct, that greater evils would flow from the attempt to confine the Consumption of liquors to the wealthier classes by the increase of smuggling and illicit distillation and of the manufacture of Toddy are universally admitted, and it is satisfactory to observe that those most competent by their Position to judge, testify both that the native Population

16150 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Population are not generally addicted to drunkenness, and that the Classes to whom from their employment the consumption of liquors is habitual and necessary, are not the Parties engaged in the commission of the most serious offences against property or life.-

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
11th November, 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett.
Secretary.

76

To the Acting Chief Secretary to Government.

Sir,

In conformity to the orders of Government conveyed in the Extract from the Minutes of Consultation of the 18th October 1836, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to submit for transmission to the Honorable Court of Directors the Broken set of their Proceedings for the Month of May 1841.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
11th November, 1841.

(Signed) P. B. Smollett.
Secretary.

Received

16151 Fort St. George 11th November 1841.

Received the undermentioned miscellaneous Letters and Statements.

77

From the Pnl. Collector in the Northern Division of Arcot. Return of Revenue Defaulters confined in the Jail for the Quarter ending 30th September last.

78

From the Collector of Bellary. Transmitting Statement of goods recommended for confiscation and of goods released on payment of Extra duty during the Month of September last.-

79

From the Sub Collector in charge of Cuddapah. Statement showing the levy of additional duty on certain articles for the Month of October last.-

78-80

Order on the 2 Abovementioned Statements. Ordered that the confiscation and sale of the smuggled goods and the levy of Extra duty enumerated in the Statements be authorized.- Acknowledging

From the Collector of Ganjam. Acknowledging the receipt of 3,000 Salt Rowanahs.
(81)

From the Prin.l Collector of Madura. } Indent of Stationery
(82) and sundries required for the use of his office for the year 1842.

From the Sub Collr. and Joint Magistrate of Madura. } Indent of Stationery
(83) required for the use of the Sub Collector and Joint Magistrate for the year 1842.

Order on the 2 abovementioned Indents. } Ordered that the
(82-84) original Indents be passed and transmitted to the Superintendent of Stationery, with a request that the supply be furnished.

From the Collector of Malabar. Abstract of Demand, Collection and Balance for the Month
(85) of September last.

From the Collector of Malabar. Statement shewing the average Bazar wholesale prices

prices of Grain and Salt for the Month of September last.
(87)

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Reporting that the Return of persons suspended and dismissed under Regulation VII. of 1831 for September 1841. has not been sent there being no entry to be made.
(88)

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Return of fines imposed and stoppages made from the pay of the public Servants from 1st July to 30th September last.
(89)

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Return of alterations that have occurred in the list of fines and stoppages from 1st July to 30th September last.
(90)

From the Collr. of Rajahmundry. Reporting of there not being an item to transmit the Return of the Revenue Defaulters confined in Jail and that of public Servants suspended or dismissed for the Quarter ending 30th Septr. last.

Return.

Fort St. George 11th November 1841

(91) From the Print. Collector of Salem. Return of persons holding Village offices suspended or dismissed under Section VIII. Regulation VII. of 1831. during the Month of September last.

(92) From the Collector of Sivaganga. Salt account Current for the Quarter ending 30th September last.

" Hunt.

" J. D. Dury

" D. Robertson

A. MacLean

Comptr.