

has now been raised to Rs. 1,24,800. But large though these enhancements appear they are not proportionate to the rate at which these zamindaris are developing. In all the open country estates except Pandaria the Government demand has been doubled and over the Satgarh generally it has been more than trebled. Yet the Zamindars are actually gainers by the re-settlement, their takolis being raised in the aggregate by Rs. 62,284, while their income, as a result merely of re-settlement, has risen by Rs. 91,057. Needless to say they have paid their enhanced assessment without a murmur and I have recently heard that immediately after announcement the Zamindar of Korba, whose takoli had been more severely enhanced than any other, *i. e.*, from Rs. 6,703 to Rs. 23,000, gave a contract for a house for his own occupation in Korba which will cost him about Rs. 50,000.

101. It is of course a fortunate circumstance that the new settlement has opened with a succession of such excellent harvests as those of 1909-10, 1910-11 and 1911-12.\* The result has been an expansion of income already well beyond the figures assumed at assessment. This again is giving the Zamindars time to consider the enhancements they will impose on their thekedars and on those tenants whose rents have not been fixed by Government, and will also make it easier for them to abandon the collection of those miscellaneous dues and cesses which have hitherto disfigured the administration of these zamindaris. In estates which have come under Court of Wards management such irregularities are of course discouraged, but in the others they seem to multiply with extraordinary rapidity until one is almost bewildered by their variety. Thus, to take an example, the following collections outside the rent are noted in paragraph 16 of the Preliminary Report on the Matin zamindari (page 351 of Volume of Annexures) as being levied from the ryots by the late Zamindarin:—(a) *Sharah Majid*, or a tax of Re. 0-3-0 per rupee of rental, (b) *Salahi*, a tax on agricultural implements, (c) *Kharchari*, a grazing tax levied on cattle including plough cattle, (d) *Pachkathiya*, a fee for nistar, (e) *Lakhai*, a tax on lac cultivation, (f) *Likhai*, a fee for writing up the Kotwar's books, (g) *Hathi Ratab*, collections to meet the cost of feeding the Zamindarin's elephant. And besides these there were fees paid by each village to the Kotwar at Matin, and to the Zamindarin's relatives resident in Matin. When the Zamindarin bought an elephant the whole estate had to contribute to the purchase money, and when she subscribed to public Relief and Memorial Funds she exacted the amount she gave *pro rata* from her headmen. The advent of a Government Officer to tour in this estate was invariably an excuse for the collection of supplies of which probably nine-tenths were absorbed by the Zamindarin herself and her followers. This estate has since fortunately come under Court of Wards, but much the same story was told in other estates, such as Uprora and Korba. In Pendra, Chhuri, Kenda and Lapha irregularities were less in evidence, in the last two estates because of the personal character of those in charge of the zamindari and in the first two because Court of Wards management had only recently been withdrawn. The latter reason also explains the comparative absence of such collections in the open country, Pandaria, Kanteli, Bilaigarh Katgi and Bhatgaon having all at one time or another come under Government control.

102. The main difficulty in dealing with irregularities of this kind arises from the readiness of the people to acquiesce in them without complaint. As an instance of this I may mention that in Korba immediately after announcement the Zamindar proceeded to collect thousands of rupees of *nazarana* from the tenants of his estate on account of their occupation of what he was pleased to call "without-rent land," his demand being speciously supported by some decision in a Munsiff's Court. Though it was quite beyond the people's capacity to meet this improper demand except by borrowing, yet scarcely any complaint was made. The matter however came to notice and the sums collected were refunded by the Zamindar. In the course of re-settlement everything that was possible was done to repress these irregular collections. The matter has been expressly referred to in the new *Wajib-ul-arz* and every tenant has been given a

*Parcha* or rent certificate showing him exactly what he has to pay. The Zamindars have been leniently assessed, and should be content to impose intermediate rent enhancements in the regular way without having recourse to the collection of illegal dues. The matter however will require the constant attention of the District Staff, for if their vigilance is relaxed the old order of things will quickly be restored.

103. The takolis then have been revised with reference to the assets, kamil-jamas and income of the separate estates—considerations of the effect of re-settlement upon each Zamindar's income taking first place. From this point of view the new takolis and cesses are lighter than those of last settlement, absorbing now only 36 per cent of the gross income all-round as compared with 44 per cent then. This comparison is to some extent vitiated by the fact that the last settlement was based on unrevised assets and income. Yet our revised estimates of income at the new settlement have also been sufficiently lenient to leave a considerable surplus with the Zamindars, over and above that which has been formally recorded. And besides this there has been undoubtedly a large amount of concealment of miscellaneous income on the part of the Zamindars. This was perhaps inevitable in dealing with men themselves ignorant and unable to appreciate any other aspect of business than that in which one party over-reaches the other. In every zamindari one was met by the most barefaced and wilful mis-statements. In no case were any accounts produced. Their existence was denied, and the Zamindar would present instead a fanciful account of his receipts and expenditure which disclosed a bare margin in his own favour. The result was that, receiving little or no assistance from the Zamindars, we were thrown upon our own resources, and it was only by the most wearisome enquiries that it was possible to substantiate even the figures now recorded for each estate. It is far too much to hope that these represent anything like the whole of any of the Zamindar's income, and, in view of the rapidity with which these estates are advancing each year in their material resources, I should be inclined to regard this re-settlement, in spite of the takolis in the Satgarh being trebled and miscellaneous collections discouraged, as no less lenient to the Zamindars than that which preceded it 20 years before.

#### (VII).—GOVERNMENT CESSSES.

104. There have been considerable changes in the demand for cesses during the currency of the expiring settlement. In 1890 the land revenue takoli was distinct from the forest takoli. Cesses were even then based on a kamil-jama, but this kamil-jama was only calculated for the *villages* of each estate on the same assets as those which formed the basis of the land revenue takoli. The whole forest assets of these large proprietors were disregarded in assessing them to cesses. The contributions then levied were :—

- (1) Road cess at 3 per cent of the kamil-jama.
- (2) School cess at 2 per cent of the kamil-jama.
- (3) Post cess at  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of the kamil-jama.
- (4) Additional rate at 2 per cent of the kamil-jama.
- (5) Patwari cess at  $\frac{1}{2}$  anna per rupee from the ryots *plus* a lump assessment from the Zamindar not exceeding 6 per cent of his kamil-jama.

Cesses (1) to (4) were levied only from the Zamindar and his sub-proprietors. The additional rate was abolished in 1905 and the Patwari cess in 1906, changes which effected a noticeable reduction in the demand from the Zamindars. At the new settlement therefore only the Road, School and Post cesses, collectively known as the Settlement cesses, have been imposed. But here, as in the Rajpur zamindaris, the whole of the Zamindar's assets as a landed proprietor, whether derived from his villages or from his forests, have been taken as the basis of the kamil-jama on which his liability to cesses has been based. The

actual effect in cash of these changes on the Zamindar's assessment can be most conveniently exhibited in tabular form :—

Name of Zamindari.	Cesses and contribution.		
	Prior to 1905.	Prior to re-settlement.	As announced.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Pendra	1,750	442	1,420
Kenda	677	179	642
Matin	227	66	492
Lapha	601	173	657
Uprora	323	99	313
Chhuri	1,142	404	1,039
Korba	2,578	783	2,312
Total for Satgarh	7,298	2,146	6,894
Pandaria	8,281	3,080	3,674
Kanteli	1,009	1,009	415
Champa	1,262	400	885
Bhatgaon	567	199	315
Bilaigarh-Katgi	1,523	559	769
Total for open country estates	12,742	5,238	6,058
GRAND TOTAL	20,040	7,384	12,952

It may be noted here that in practice the Zamindars have not been used to contributing any portion of these cesses from their own pockets. Here, as in the case of the revenue, they have shifted the burden to their village headmen, who until recent years took care to make good what they had to pay from the ryots. But for the future this will not be so. The full cesses are assessed by Government on sub-proprietors, and the Zamindars may take them also from their *muafidars*, and in the case of *theke-dari* villages may meet the demand by including something extra on this account in the theka-jama. But in the case of *kham* villages and forest mahals the Zamindars will have to contribute from their own pockets the share of the cesses debitable to such areas. In no circumstances will the ryots be liable to any contribution on account of cesses.

#### VIII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

105. The new settlement was announced in every zamindari for a period of 20 years as laid down in the orders contained in Government of India's letter No. 991—352-2, dated the 15th September 1910. The date of the commencement of the new settlement varied slightly in different estates. That of the Kanteli zamindari began on the 1st July 1908, that of the Kenda zamindari began on the 1st July 1909, and that of the Bilaigarh-Katgi, Bhatgaon, Pendra, Matin, Lapha, Uprora, Chhuri, Korba, Pandaria and Champa zamindaris began on the 1st of July 1910.

106. Besides the ordinary rent certificates, lists of rents prescribed by the Settlement Code, and the statement in Form XIII-A, given to the sub-lambardars in the case of sub-proprietary villages, certain special forms (see translations in Appendix D) were prepared for use at announcement, *viz.*, special *qabuliyats* or Forms of Acceptance both for Zamindars and sub-proprietors and special abstracts showing the basis on which the new takoli has been calculated for the information of each Zamindar. All the *qabuliyats* were signed without demur. Presumably, too, the Zamindars were satisfied with the justification for the new takolis shown in the abstracts as though more than a year has elapsed since announcement, not a single appeal of any sort has been filed in regard to the new assessment. Without any desire to make capital on behalf of the new settlement out of the jungly character of many of the persons affected thereby I think one can in fairness infer a certain unanimity among the assessee—tenants, sub-proprietors and zamindars—in regard to the equitable basis of the new assessment from the fact that, excluding one appeal by a sub-proprietor against my estimate of his siwai, no protest of any kind whatever has

been put forward regarding it, in spite of the fact that tenants' rents were frequently raised by 50 per cent, the Zamindars' total takoli doubled, and the sub-proprietary assessment trebled. On reference to the Settlement Commissioner's office, I find that in all only 36 appeals were filed with reference to matters connected with this zamindari settlement, of which 29 had to do with the grant of protected status, 5 with questions of possession, one with the Wajib-ul-arz and one, as I have said, with the assessment of siwai.

107. The preparation of the Wajib-ul-arz was a matter in which it was necessary to break fresh ground. At the two previous settlements of these estates nothing more than a general Wajib-ul-arz, applied without modification to each estate, was drafted and filed. As no one but the Zamindar and the Government officers concerned were aware of its existence it was naturally not of much practical value in the administration of village affairs. Its main importance was that it purported to define the relations not only of the Zamindar and village headmen with the ryots but also of the Zamindar with Government. The new Wajib-ul-arz has been prepared on very different lines. It makes no claim to define the zamindari status. That matter was still *sub judice* at the time the Wajib-ul-arz was being prepared, and the only reference to it was, at the end of the qabuliyat, to the effect that no change in the zamindari status would be made till the decision of the Privy Council\* was announced and that thereafter the position would be defined either by legislation or by the issue of a new Sanad or Patent. The whole of the new Wajib-ul-arz was therefore concerned with defining the relations between the Zamindars, the village headmen, and the ryots. It has been prepared separately for each mahal. An entirely distinct skeleton draft was prepared for sub-proprietary villages. For the rest the skeleton was prepared so as to apply both to villages under the Zamindar's direct management (kham) and also to those managed by a thekedar or muafidar. The skeleton form varied but little from zamindari to zamindari as there is a very remarkable similarity in village custom through all the estates, but a separate form was prepared for each, and, after careful verification by a panchayat of local headmen at which the Zamindar himself attended, each was submitted separately for sanction with a statement of any objections which the Zamindar might wish to put forward. The skeleton form so approved was then filled in for the separate villages from notes recorded at the time of attestation, and after completion has been bound with the village Settlement Record. The detailed orders in regard to the Wajib-ul-arz are included in the Volume of Annexures at page 1825.

108. In connection with the new Wajib-ul-arz we were required to record the name and remuneration of every village Kotwar. This was not a very easy matter. The Kotwari organization in several zamindaris was peculiar. The indigenous system provided for a village watchman known as the *Tahalu* or *Tarar* or *Gorait* who kept watch and ward and acted as the village servant in matters affecting its internal management only. But when under British administration the additional duty of taking weekly or fortnightly reports regarding vital statistics and crime were imposed on the village, the *Tahalu* or *Tarar* in several estates refused to undertake this extra work and accordingly a separate office of *Rapat* or reporting kotwal was created. The necessity however of retaining this dual system was not apparent at the recent re-settlement. In many cases the reporting kotwar worked for a number of villages, and therefore was really in touch with no part of his charge except the particular village in which he resided. The Gaontias themselves disliked the system because the *Tahalu* was insufficiently remunerated, while the *Rapat* was not under their control. It was therefore decided to institute the ordinary system by which a separate village watchman is appointed for each village, except in cases where it is necessary to combine more than one in a single charge in order to secure an adequate total remuneration for the particular kotwar. This has now been done.

\* See paragraph 139 below.

109. As regards remuneration orders were issued that the minimum sum to be fixed at settlement for each kotwar should be Rs. 4 per month or Rs. 48 per annum. Considering however the existing custom of payment in kind and the very high rate upon the rental which it would have been necessary to fix in order to provide this remuneration in cash, it was decided not to alter the basis on which the ryots were required to contribute, but to raise their subscription on the existing basis of assessment in cases where the kotwars' present remuneration was clearly inadequate. Enquiry showed that throughout the Pandaria and Kanteli zamindaris the kotwar was being paid at a fixed rate of 1 *katha* (or 3 seers) of paddy or half a *katha* of wheat per rupee of rental. In these zamindaris, therefore, the rates where necessary were raised to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or 2 *kathas* per rupee. In the other estates a fixed rate of 5 *kathas* of paddy per *nagar*\* (plough) was in vogue. This rate was raised to 6, 7, or 8 *kathas* per *nagar* as circumstances required. By these means a remuneration equivalent in most cases to the minimum of Rs. 48 per annum was obtained. Where this figure has not been worked up to the explanation lies in the fact that it was considered undesirable to raise the rate very much beyond that which the tenants were already paying. In making these calculations due allowances under the rules was made for the *Gaontias* or in *kham* villages for the Zamindars' contributions to the kotwars. At the same time it is necessary to remember that in so doing we run absolutely counter to indigenous custom. As I have already pointed out more than once, the Gaontia himself was originally a village officer and, being himself remunerated for his services† by the village community, was under no obligation to subscribe towards the support of other village officials similarly remunerated. This customary exemption of the village headmen has persisted with the greatest tenacity to the present day. Even in the Khalsa, where the kotwars' claims upon the *malguzars* have been asserted by Government now for many years, it is the exception rather than the rule for the latter to subscribe; while in the zamindaris where matters have been largely left to themselves no headman in any village has hitherto been in the habit of contributing to the kotwar's remuneration beyond giving him a rupee or two with which to buy himself a *dhoti* (cloth) or a blanket in the cold weather. There will therefore now be the same difficulty in the zamindaris as in the khalsa in getting headmen to subscribe to the kotwar. This point was remembered in fixing the latter's remuneration, care being taken that the *ryots*' share constituted in each case at least a living wage for the kotwar.

110. Another important matter was the revision of the Patwaris *halka-bandi*. We had had sufficient experience of arrears of map correction to realize that the existing staff was too weak to cope with the difficulties of annual *girdawari* in the Satgarh. And, apart from the fact that the mere work of survey and its yearly correction is far more difficult in broken and jungle country than in the level plains of Mungeli and Janjgir, we had to allow for the extraordinarily rapid extension of cultivation. Eventually, proposals, which were sanctioned, were submitted for an addition of 22 men to the Zamindari Patwari staff, of whom 19 have been posted to the Satgarh. Incidentally the general scale of pay was also raised. Hitherto the rates had varied from Rs. 9 to Rs. 11. A minimum of Rs. 10 was introduced, and a special rate of Rs. 12, fixed for all jungly circles in view of the difficulty of the work and as some sort of compensation to the Patwari for the absence of conveniences which would be obtainable elsewhere. In certain cases special personal allowances varying from Re. 1 to Rs. 3 per month were also given. But it was not enough merely to increase the number and pay of the Patwari staff. What was chiefly required in the Satgarh was better supervision. Two new Revenue Inspector's circles were therefore formed and, if it be possible now gradually to improve the personnel of the staff, there should be no difficulty in maintaining the accuracy of the Land Records for some years. It must, however, be remembered that the northern zamindaris are developing at a very rapid pace. Map correction should therefore receive specially close

\* The use of the *nagar* for calculating the *ryots*' subscriptions to the reporting kotwar in the northern zamindaris is itself proof that the post was of foreign introduction. The *nagar* as a basis of assessment is otherwise unknown in these estates.

† He received for example in the open country one plough of land rent free out of every eight paying revenue to Government—vide Jenkins' Report on the Nagpur Territories.

attention from the district staff now that Settlement operations have been concluded, and if necessary proposals should be submitted for a further increase in the Patwari staff before the new settlement has expired. An attempt should also be made to force an acquaintance with these hill estates upon the senior Indian officials of the district. Hitherto no Extra-Assistant Commissioner, Tahsildar or Superintendent of Land Records has considered it incumbent on him to tour in these estates, and when I began the settlement in 1906 the Satgarh were still very largely a *terra incognita*. The formation of a new Tahsil with its headquarters at Kathghora will do much to remedy this state of affairs, but more will be effected by the Deputy Commissioner insisting on the district staff paying as much attention to the zamindaris as they do to the more accessible and, to the Indian mind, agreeable country comprised within the Khalsa.

---

# **PART IV.—THE GRANT OF PROTECTED STATUS AND THE SETTLEMENT OF BOUNDARIES.**

## **A.—PROTECTED STATUS.**

111. There are 432 villages in these 12 zamindaris wherein Protected Status has been at different times conferred. I have pointed out (in paragraph 51 above) that this peculiar tenure was created in 1889 and was conferred on 414 village headmen at the second settlement of the district. Of these, 75 lost their villages between 1891 and 1906—many being ousted by the Court of Wards, while some were compelled to surrender in the famines. To the surviving 341 were added another 91 during the course of this re-settlement on my recommendation. Careful lists of all the thekedars were prepared for every zamindari showing exactly in regard to each the basis of any claim he might have for Protected Status, with the opinions of the various officers by whom my recommendations were considered. These lists have been printed and have, for convenience of reference, been incorporated in the Volume of Annexures to this report. The 432 villages held by protected thekedars are distributed as follows:—

Name of zamindari.	Number of Protected Status villages.	Remarks.
Pendra ... ..	62	For detail of Protected Status villages in each estate, <i>vide</i> Appendix B to this Report.
Kenda ... ..	9	
Matia ... ..	17	
Lapha ... ..	9	
Uprora ... ..	9	
Chhuri ... ..	57	
Korba ... ..	102	
Pandaria ... ..	109	
Kanteli ... ..	15	
Bilaigarh-Katgi ... ..	32	
Bhatgaon ... ..	11	
Total ... ..	432	

112. The privilege was first defined—in the new Section 65A of Act XVI of 1889—as the protection against arbitrary enhancement or ejection of thekedars, *gaontias*, or farmers who had either held their villages continuously since the last preceding settlement or had established them or substantially improved them at their own cost. It was further laid down in the local Zamindari Wajib-ul-arz (Part II, clauses I and II) that co-sharers in Protected Status villages could not claim partition, that the tenure was heritable but not transferable, and that “a protected thekedar gaontia was entitled to a renewal of his lease on its expiry “on his agreeing to farm his village at a fair equitable rent” (see also Article 273 of the Settlement Code quoted in paragraph 45 above). The special points to be noticed about this new creation are (1) that co-sharers were formally recognized in Protected Status villages even though their right to partition was withheld; (2) that the tenure was declared heritable without restriction and would therefore pass to an ever-widening circle of descendants; (3) that the protected headman was spoken of (in the Wajib-ul-arz but not in the Act itself) as a “*thekedar gaontia*” holding under a *lease*, who had agreed to *farm* his village. All these points prevent some difficulty.

The formal re-cognition of co-sharers, it must be said at once, was contrary to indigenous custom, to the traditions of native rule, and also *now* to the accepted policy of our own Administration. Under native rule the headman was a village *officer*. An office,

as such, can only be held by one man; and it was therefore the consistent and universal practice in the Khalsa up to 1869 and, with certain exceptions in the zamindaris to the present day, to accept but one man as the head of the village for purposes of administration. Thus, Mr. Chisholm wrote (Report of 1868, paragraph 317) that "under the Maratha Government the *Gaontia* was the only individual whom the Revenue officials at all recognized."

But though never recognized from outside as sharers in the headman's office the headman's immediate relatives had a very definite status in the village. As Mr. Baden-Powell says: "He (the headman) was quite content with his hereditary position and above all with the holding of land—probably the best in the place—that was allotted to him as headman. This *ex-officio* holding was hereditary in his family and was shared among all his descendants even though only one of them was performing the official duty of headman" (Land Revenue in British India, page 70). So, too, Mr. Chisholm wrote (Sheonarayan Assessment Report, paragraph 25) in special reference to the Bilaspur District: "The ordinary feature has been for the head of the family to manage the entire estate (*i. e.* village), while the rest of the brotherhood, avoiding interference with the general management, remained content with their quota of the *sir* land rent free." These quotations put the customary position of the co-sharers in *gaontiahi* villages beyond all question, and confirmed as they are by scores of local enquiries which it has fallen to me to make in this connection will, I hope, finally discredit the view which has sometimes been advanced that the headman's relatives have no customary status in the village.

113. Now in the Zamindari Settlement of 1890 these relatives were not recognized, as they should have been, merely as sharers in the village *home-farm*. They were expressly stated to be co-sharers in the village.\* This mistake arose partly from ignorance of local custom and partly from a misconception as to the position of the *Gaontia*. Had it been realized that he was merely a village officer the absurdity of recognizing co-sharers would have been apparent. But the *Gaontia* was treated as the lessee of a joint property in which his immediate kinsmen of the same ancestry as himself might reasonably claim to hold an equal interest and hence, when Protected Status was conferred in 1890 in *gaontiahi* and *thekedari* villages, the mistake was made, which has since given rise to so much difficulty of conferring formal recognition on the headman's co-sharers as if they were participating in the *gaontiahi* or *thekedari* interest.

114. It was soon seen however that the existence of a multiplicity of *Gaontias* or *thekedars* in Protected Status villages constituted a most unworkable position of affairs; and the opportunity was taken in 1898 of revising Section 65-A of the Land Revenue Act so as to provide that, "except so far as arrangements to the contrary were in force at the time of the grant," the Protected Status should devolve upon one member only of the *thekedar* or *Gaontia's* family.

This was an excellent provision and fully in accord with custom; but it was introduced after the evil had been done. Under the influence of British trained officials and also no doubt as a direct consequence of the assumption in 1890 that every village headman was a *lessee* of the village property, the idea that the headman was a *thekedar* prevailed more and more among the people, while the *gaontiahi* conception of his position as a village officer fell more and more into abeyance. By the time then that the position of 'co-sharers' in Protected Status villages came first under consideration in 1906 they were already well established. They held in many cases certificates of 1890 recognizing their position; their shares were entered in the village papers (*Khewat*, *Khasra* and *Jamabandi*), and their lands were recorded as *sir* and *khudkasht* exactly as if they were, and strictly on the analogy of, co-sharers of a *malguzari* village in the Khalsa. Even co-sharers in ordinary *thekedari* villages had also come to be recorded in the same way.

115. We had then a set of facts pointing in one direction, and tradition, the requirements of good village administration and the provisions of 1898 pointing in the other. We were on the horns of this dilemma that, if we gave formal recognition only to the real headman, his "co-sharers" would be bereft of all

\* "In villages held by *thekedars* having Protected Status co-sharers cannot claim partition" (Zamindari-Wajib-ul-arz of 1892, Part II, clause I).

status in the village, and would after long years of continuous enjoyment of their shares of the home-farm be liable to summary ejectment by the headman. On the other hand, if we recognized the co-sharers as having a status independent of the real headman, the Zamindars would in ordinary thekedari villages on the conclusion of the thekedar's lease and his ejectment be unable to oust his kith and kin cultivating their shares in the home-farm, since the latter might be empowered by virtue of their independent title to claim to continue in possession.

A compromise was necessary and on my recommendation the following course was adopted. It was decided that in future no Protected Status would be conferred until some decision had been reached as to co-sharers and proper provision made for them. This was a clear and easy line to follow, and in all the 91 cases in which, on my report, further protection was conferred it will be found that a single Gaontia is recorded as the recipient of the status—his relatives being in each case entirely excluded from all lot or part in the thekedari interest; those who were separate from the headman have received occupancy rights in their share of the home-farm, while those who were joint have agreed in each case to trust themselves to the good-will of the headmen if at any subsequent time they may be compelled to separate from him.

116. This was an easy and suitable settlement of the case so far as it concerned new grants. But for the old grants of 1890 in which allowance had to be made for 20 years of misconception it was decided to permit the record of co-sharers in Protected Status so far and only so far as they were found to have been in existence in 1890, thus conforming strictly to the words of the Act of 1898 which provide that "save in so far as any arrangements to the contrary are in force at the time of the declaration the Protected Status shall not be partitioned and shall devolve on one member only of the thekedar or Gaontia's family." A separate enquiry was accordingly instituted in regard to every Protected Status village. The names and the number of the 'co-sharers' in existence in 1890 was elicited and put on record. So far and no further could the ordinary rule as to single devolution be relaxed under the Act and accordingly any further recognition of co-sharers was refused. Thus if A the headman protected in 1891 had then two brother co-sharers B and C and each of these three had since had two sons D, E, F, G, H and I, all six of whom are now in possession, their fathers having meanwhile died, then only D the eldest son of A, F the eldest son of B, and H the eldest son of C were to be recorded as co-sharers in the village since three co-sharers constituted the arrangement in force at the time of the declaration of protection. Any claim by the younger sons, E, G and I to share in the thekedari interest was denied, and no notice of them whatever was taken in the village papers except to the extent of recording their separate possession of any portion of the home-farm by entering them as ordinary tenants of *sir* in column 7 of the khasra and as "*rishtedari men muaf*" in column 13 in the case of khudkasht. The basis for the decision in each case has been recorded on a separate form for each village, the forms being collected in separate case files for each zamindari, and the whole sent for record to the district office. A new certificate has also been issued to each Protected headman. This also records the detail of "co-sharers" so far as these have been recognized. It will now be necessary, if these arrangements are to be enforced, that a reference be made in every mutation case from a Protected Status village either to the files in office or to the revised Protected Status certificates. Unrecognized co-sharers must be firmly discountenanced until the present custom of maintaining them falls into abeyance, when they will of necessity push their own fortunes in the world and cease to be as at present a mere encumbrance on their headman's home-farm. The Deputy Commissioners of Bilaspur and Raipur have been separately addressed in this connection and a copy of the note forwarded to them is appended for facility of reference to this Report (see Appendix C).

117. We have seen now that in certain villages the existence of co-sharers recognized in 1890 has had to be permitted. This was the only possible settlement of the first of the three difficulties (see paragraph 112 above) arising out of the form in which the Protected Status was originally conferred. The second difficulty consisted in the absence of any limitation to the number of heirs entitled

to succeed to the new tenure. This was removed, as we have seen, by legislation in 1898 when it was laid down that the status of a Protected Thekedar or Gaontia should devolve on one member only of his family. This has been rigidly enforced at the recent settlement, except that, of course, where a separate co-sharing interest dating from 1890 has had to be recognized this separate interest devolves upon one member only of the *co-sharer's* family. This second difficulty is intimately connected with the first and needs, I think, no further detailed explanation. There remains the third difficulty—that the existence of a *gaontiahi* as distinct from a *thekedari* tenure was not perceived by the Settlement Officer of 1890. The *wajib-ul-arz* spoke of a 'thekekar-gaontia'

Confusion as to the exact status of the headman. a hybrid term with no clear meaning, while the explicit reference to a 'lease' or 'farm' in the same document

would naturally lead one to suppose that the thekedar-gaontia was in every case a lessee. But this was very far from being the case. As I have already more than once explained the terms *thekekar* and *gaontia* properly speaking mean two very different things. The thekedar holds merely under a contract whereby he accepts as the essence of his contract a responsibility for the annual 'jama' assessed upon the village. The gaontia is simply an administrative village officer under no essential responsibility for the village jama.\* He may actually collect the rents in his official capacity and the Zamindar may insist on his producing the full assessment placed upon his village. But until he accepts the responsibility for that assessment he cannot properly be called a thekedar. How the gaontia may gradually change and in the majority of cases has already changed into a thekedar, I have explained at some length earlier in this Report. But it must not be supposed that this change occurred uniformly over the whole district or even over all the zamindaris. There are some zamindaris in which the change was almost complete by 1869. In others it has yet to be fully effected. Exactly how far matters had advanced by 1890 it is impossible to say. But although in his *Wajib-ul-arz* the Settlement Officer emphasized the contractual status of the gaontia—referring explicitly to his *lease* of the village, in making his actual recommendations he made no attempt to distinguish (except in regard to Champa) the gaontia proper from the thekedar. All alike received Protected Status provided the period of their tenure whether as lessee or as village officer was sufficient to establish a claim for consideration. This was a further encouragement to the thekedari idea. The grant of Protected Status, owing to the terms in which the *Wajib-ul-arz* of 1890 and later the Act of 1898 were drawn up, made acceptance of responsibility for the village jama practically compulsory for the village headman. And when the present re-settlement was undertaken it was found that the gaontia proper was to all intents and purposes extinct except in certain eastern portions of the district where it was no doubt kept alive by the proximity of the peculiar ryotwari tenure sanctioned for the Sambalpur district.

118. This result was largely due to a misconception as to the exact status of the gaontia. It was not realized as the terms of the *Wajib-ul-arz* of 1892 show that gaontias were primarily village officers. The Settlement Officer (who had no time to make a close first hand acquaintance with the zamindaris of the district) insisted on their position as lessees, and thus hastened the oblivion into which the gaontiahi status is now rapidly declining.†

The proper gaontiahi tenure being now practically extinct in Bilaspur it may be urged that its examination can be of no more than academic interest. But on the contrary it is only in the light of its historical development that the present thekedari tenure can be fully understood. The forest thekedar's refusal to enhance the tenants' rents, the modest home-farm with which he is content, the position of his co-sharers and so on, are all matters which can only be

\* See paragraphs 29 to 32 above.

† It may be mentioned here that in the adjoining administration of Chhota Nagpur the official status of the village headman has been recognized. Section 127 of the Chhota Nagpur Tenancy Act of 1908, by which protection was afforded to this class of land-holder expressly refers thereto. It runs as follows: "The Local Government may make an order directing that a record be prepared by a Revenue officer of the rights and obligations in any specified local area of headmen of villages or groups of villages whether known as *mankis* or *pradhans* or *manhis* or otherwise. The word 'rights' as used in this sub-section includes the right of a village headman to hold his office as well as his right to hold his land." As my description of the gaontiahi status has sometimes been considered fanciful—and I confess that the silence of the earlier Settlement Officers in this regard naturally gave rise to such suspicions—it is satisfactory to find such outside confirmation of the official character of the headman's position.

explained by reference to the lessee's original position as a mere village-officer. Then again, as already stated, there are some villages in the Korba Zamindari where the headman has not yet accepted the responsibility of a lessee. And a local official might well be at a loss to understand the strong prejudice which exists in this tract against the acceptance of a written lease. At first sight a written lease seems to confer a certain stability of tenure. But to the hereditary village officer it is otherwise. To him the written lease is no more than a formal acknowledgment on his part that on a certain date his claim to retain his office will have ceased, and he naturally refuses to make such an admission if he can. Lastly the Zamindars themselves have not been unwilling to take advantage of official ignorance of what the gaontiahi status is to prevent the accrual of rights in favour of their headmen. They commonly plead that a headman whom it is proposed to protect is merely their servant or, as they often call him, their agent or kamdar, and that he is not a thekedar or gaontia whom it is possible to protect under Section 65-A of the Land Revenue Act. And there is, owing to the history of the tenure, a certain plausibility in this to any one ignorant of the real position of affairs.

119. Such arguments were frequently advanced, especially in Korba, Bhatgaon and Champa, during my enquiries with a view to conferring the Protected Status. In the first two estates they could be disregarded because the point had not been raised at the previous Settlement and there were precedents in both zamindaris for the grant of Protected Status. But in Champa the Zamindar as far back as 1869 had urged that his headmen were not thekedars at all but merely kamdars. It is true that they were not thekedars. But they were gaontias in the proper sense of that term. The Champa zamindari was the first which the Settlement Officer visited, and misled by the Zamindar's representation that his headmen were not lessees but mere agents, he conferred no sub-proprietary rights on village headmen in that estate as was done in all the other estates of Bilaspur. It must not be supposed that the position of the Champa headmen was in 1869 really in any way different from that of headmen in other zamindaris. The contrary can be demonstrated, for in paragraph 333 of his final report Mr. Chisholm himself records that the headmen in these zamindaris were "often by their own confession mere agents collecting the full rents for the Zamindar." But the Zamindar of Champa opposed the grant of sub-proprietary right, and the Settlement Officer was himself in favour of putting as little restriction as possible on the zamindari privilege. The result was that the gaontias in this estate received less favourable treatment than, under the subsequent orders of the Settlement Commissioner, was accorded to the headmen of other estates. The Champa gaontias were equally unfortunate in 1890. The Zamindar finding that his insistence on the true gaontiahi (or as he called it kamdari) status of his headmen had precluded the accrual in their favour of rights over the villages they managed, was careful to see that they made no advance towards the position of thekedars, and insisted on their entire dissociation from the work of rent collection. The Settlement Officer of 1890 therefore found no thekedars in Champa and, not realizing that the Champa headmen were really gaontias whose protection equally with that of thekedars was permitted under the Act of 1889, made no recommendation in their favour. He wrote: "There are no thekedars in the Champa Zamindari..... The Zamindar's policy has been to convert the thekedars into managers and in this he has been completely successful" (Final Report, paragraph 115). And again "There are no old or new thekedars in this estate. By his skilful management the father of the present Zamindar succeeded in ejecting all the old thekedars and making them his kamdars and mukaddums who look after his villages and cultivate some land without payment of rent. The rents are realized directly by the Zamindar..... There are no thekedars entitled to protected status." It will be sufficiently apparent from what has been already written that the Settlement Officer of 1890, was in error *firstly* in supposing that there ever had been thekedars in Champa and *secondly*, in holding that he was precluded from protecting the headmen of that estate because they were not thekedars. The Champa headmen were still in 1890, as they always had been, gaontias, *i. e.*,

officers responsible not for the village jama but only for the village management and the Act of 1889 expressly mentioned gaontias as well as thekedars as suitable recipients of the Protected Status.

120. Taking this view of the case I was anxious at the recent re-settlement to redress the inequality of treatment accorded by Government to the Champa headmen as compared with that meted out to gaontias in other zamindaris. It was no longer possible to offer them full Protected Status as the position of a protected gaontia not responsible for the village assessment would now be an anomaly. I proposed therefore to secure their permanent retention of a substantial portion of their home-farm in return for their services to the villages. But my proposals were not approved. I pressed the case as strongly as I could but the view prevailed that no protection could be offered to the headmen of this estate.

121. I have adverted to these orders here because it is important that the position in Champa should be understood by local officials. In 12 villages I was able, by reviving orders of 1868, to afford protection to headmen in Champa over a portion of their home-farm. But in 11 other cases\* where the headmen have held their villages for over 40 years (and have in some cases substantially improved them at their own cost), they have no permanent tenure whatever either in the village or in their home-farm, and remain liable at any moment to summary ejectment at the will of the Zamindar. It is inevitable but that the Zamindar will sooner or later propose to oust some one or other of these headmen, and it will then fall to the local officers to use their influence to prevent any arbitrary treatment of these deserving headmen.

122. Before leaving the subject of Protected Status it will not be out of place to offer an opinion on the future working of the tenure in these zamindaris. The present position is far from satisfactory. The rule by which 20 years' continuous possession is ordinarily a condition precedent to the grant of protection only operates as an inducement to the Zamindars to oust lessees before their claims can mature. We are in fact confronted by the same difficulty as that which arose 25 years' ago in the Central Provinces in regard to tenants. At first a measure of protection was given only to those tenants known as occupancy who had 12 years' continuous possession. This was found to work badly because of the inducement to the Malguzar to eject them before 12 years were up. The contingent character of the protection was accordingly abandoned in favour of an absolute rule specifying that tenants holding from a certain date should *ipso facto* have rights of occupancy. And later on statutory rights were extended to all tenants regardless of the period of their possession. A similar policy should now be adopted in regard to village headmen in all zamindari estates. The period test should be abolished as being now no more than an inducement to the Zamindar to eject his headmen, at short intervals in order to defeat the intention of the law. Similarly, substantial improvement of the village being also a ground on which protection can be claimed a Zamindar is compelled in his own interests to oppose strongly any attempt on a thekedar's part to effect improvements. This is an altogether undesirable position. During my investigations into claims for Protected Status I was frequently informed that the headmen, though willing and eager to make improvements, feared to do so as such action would displease the Zamindar. It was also a common condition entered in his written lease that the thekedar should not make any improvement in the village. Short term leases and the frequent levy of nazaranas exactly suit the interest of the Zamindars. It gives them ready cash and at the same time secures them completely against the danger of Protected Status. On the other hand it begets a purely ephemeral and commercial interest in the mind of the lessee which is the worst possible atmosphere in which to attempt to produce a stable and contented tenantry.

123. To remedy the present undesirable position which will be fraught with serious consequences to the welfare of these large estates if it is not grappled with

\* See Volume of Annexures to this Report, page 1771.

at once there are two possible alternative courses. The first is to go back upon our present policy and the second to advance upon it. By the first alternative I mean that we should abandon the policy of protection altogether, and leave the unprotected headmen to the mercy of the Zamindar. This would at least withdraw the active inducement offered to the Zamindar by the present law to eject deserving headmen for fear they may gain an independent status. His action would no doubt be in many cases short-sighted and arbitrary, but in others equally without doubt he would be sufficiently influenced by self-interest and the weight of public opinion to permit a good headman to continue in possession. This first alternative would at least be preferable to our present policy.

But there is a better line of argument than this. The grant of sub-proprietary rights in 1868, of universal tenant's rights in 1889 and of Protected Status in 1890 are simply so many indications that the Zamindars cannot be trusted with the revenue administration of their estates. Now, if they cannot be trusted to deal fairly by their more deserving thekedars and gaontias of standing it seems reasonable to suppose that their treatment of short-term headmen will leave still more to be desired. But from the point of view of the welfare and development of the village it is obvious that what is wanted is not to protect a lessee because he has held the village for a long time or will be greatly distressed if he is ejected, but because he is a *good* lessee, well-disposed towards the ryots and capable of developing the estate entrusted to his charge. A good lessee can declare his character in 2 years as well as in 20, and this being so, there seems no reason why in the interests of the village and of the Zamindari any lessee or gaontia of any standing, however short, should not at the discretion of the Government be entitled to protection if he is a desirable headman. We thus arrive at the second alternative proposal which, as I have said, constitutes a further advance along our present line of policy. My own belief is that the Zamindars will never be fit to administer their own estates. I say this after considerable acquaintance with them, being convinced that the less Government lends an ear to their sentimental claims to continue to administer their estates as they did in the pre-British days the better it will be for the general welfare. It is not that I deny a certain capacity for development in the character of the Zamindars. But the art of administration is also a developing one. The Zamindars stand on a low level of intelligence, and in these days of rapid change it is too dangerous a policy to let them play fast and loose with their estates in the hope that at some, manifestly far distant, date they will acquire a capacity for administration on advanced modern lines. In the last 25 years their police, their pounds, and their excise monopoly have had to be withdrawn from them in the interests of good administration. It is a well-known fact that they are rapidly bringing to ruin the valuable forests entrusted to their charge. And it would indeed be surprising if, when incompetent to deal with these comparatively simple branches of administration, they proved to be fit for the far more intricate work of revenue control.

124. Let us then adopt a definite and consistent policy. Instead of saying that we cannot trust the Zamindars to deal wisely by

A consistent policy needed.

some only of their village headmen let us openly assert that their proper treatment of all of them needs to be safeguarded. Every village headman whom a Zamindar proposes to eject should have the right of appeal to the Deputy Commissioner, and unless the Zamindar can show that his management has been defective or that his presence in the village is for any reason undesirable he should be supported in possession. But if this measure of protection is thus readily to be obtained it must also for sufficient cause shown be as quickly liable to be withdrawn. Something in this direction will be effected by the revised provisions regarding Protected Status proposed in the new Land Revenue Bill. But more than this will I now consider be required. The fear of the withdrawal of protection and of his ejection from the village should be ever present in the mind of a protected headman, and should be a constant incentive to him to show his fitness for his post by the improvement of his village. At present the very security of the status is the main objection to it. The headman once he is protected can, as has been found in some of the open country estates, successfully

defy both the Zamindar and the Deputy Commissioner. He is under no apprehension of evil consequences if he neglect his village and is certainly under no stimulus to improve it. I believe then that the zamindaris would be most successfully administered under a system by which the selection of the village headmen would rest with the Zamindar entirely, but that in regard to their ejection and assessment a right of appeal should lie in all cases to the Deputy Commissioner (or Settlement Officer).<sup>1</sup> Then and then only should we get security of tenure for the desirable lessee coupled with a constant stimulus to improve his village and develop it. The tenants would benefit from his good management, while the Zamindar and the Government would gain the advantage of securing a higher assessment and a more fully developed estate. The present position as between the Government and the Zamindars is this, that the former stands aside while the latter mismanages his property, conceals his income and defrauds the State. Under the system proposed the State would secure its fair proportion of the assets, while by its interposition those assets would be so far developed that the Zamindar's actual share in them would undoubtedly exceed anything he would ever gain by his own primitive and short-sighted methods.

#### B.—THE SETTLEMENT OF BOUNDARIES.

125. The demarcation and survey of village and zamindari boundaries has caused so many difficulties in the past that the subject deserves separate notice, if only to explain the questions which have arisen in this connection and how they have been settled. Village boundaries will be dealt with first, and thereafter the more difficult question of zamindari boundaries.

126. The view has been expressed that in early times the limits of the tribal settlement were always, and those between village and village but "rarely, if ever," defined\*. But this theory does not apply very well to the Bilaspur estates. When the first Settlement began in 1866, though the zamindari tract was wholly unsurveyed, the traditional village limits were accurately known to the people and especially to the village *Brigas* or priests, who were the recognized repositories of knowledge of this kind. They could not, of course, mark an exact line for survey. But they could describe it clearly enough for all practical purposes—over the ridge of such and such a hill, past such and such a rock or haunted tree, along such and such *ajnala* etc.,—and what could be done for individual villages could also be done for the zamindari as a whole. Looking at our maps to-day the first things which strike us are (1) the enormous disparity in the size of villages, and (2) the fact that generally the more remote the villages the larger the area which they cover. These circumstances are to be explained partly by the nature of the country and partly by differences in agricultural development. It is certain that the introduction of settled rice cultivation in the more remote and hilly parts of these estates is of fairly recent date. Prior to that introduction the system of cultivation was that generally known as "benwara" or "beora" cultivation, to which a reference has been already made. This consists in felling the forest growth over a patch of jungle, firing it, raising a crop of millets in the ashes and then abandoning it till the forest grows again. And as the period of forest reproduction might be anything from 10 to 20 years it was necessary that every village settlement should jealously preserve exclusive rights to 'beora' cultivation over a very large area, at least some square miles in extent. Later, when rice cultivation with the plough was introduced, it by no means ousted the "beora" altogether. The two systems continued, as we find them in the remotest villages still continuing, side by side. And long after rice cultivation had been accepted as the staple industry of the village, the tenants continued to regard their "beora" cultivation over an extensive tract of adjoining forest as a valuable asset and took good care to be well informed as to the village boundaries. In level country where population was dense and the jungle more accessible, the absence of forest protection had already by the time of the first Settlement laid the country bare. "Beoras" had been forgotten,

\* Baden Powell's Indian Village Community, page 11.

regular cultivation had become the exclusive occupation of the tenantry, and the waste land had been occupied and broken up into a number of hamlets which soon developed into small independent villages.

127. Thus villages in all the stages of transition from those with scattered "beoras" to those with compact rice cultivation, and therefore of all sizes, confronted the Settlement Officer in 1866. Under his orders the existing village boundaries, comprising in some cases huge areas of forest and in others the barest minimum of waste needed for the village *nistar*, received a certain Government sanction. As to the exact procedure he followed in defining village boundaries one cannot be positive. It was decided for reasons of economy not to embark on an elaborate survey (see Mr. Chisholm's Final Report, paragraph 242) but it was intended that at least the bulk of the villages should be demarcated. The orders in this connection are contained in paragraph 3 of Secretariat letter No. 2712-241, dated the 16th August 1866, to the Settlement Commissioner, which runs:—"The interior boundaries of villages in Feudatoryships will not be demarcated. But in non-Feudatory Zamindaris village boundaries must be marked off with the due proportion of waste just as in ordinary Khalsa tracts. In some of the wilder tracts such as Pendra, Ambagarh Chauki and the like, internal demarcation may for special reasons be foregone under your sanction." On receipt of these orders Mr. Chisholm wrote (his No. 336, dated the 10th October 1866): "I have the honour to report that in all the Zamindaris village boundaries have, as a rule, already been demarcated" and that is all we know about the matter. Nothing is said defining what particular villages whether in Pendra or any other of the Zamindaris did or did not have their boundaries demarcated, nothing is said on the difficult subject of marking off for each village only its "due proportion of waste just as in ordinary Khalsa tracts," and there are no traces left of any demarcation then effected.

128. The matter was one not of great practical importance except in villages where a sub-proprietary title was conferred. Here a tenure independent of the superior Zamindar was created, and here at least a physical definition of the area over which the new rights extended was of the very first importance, and should have formed an essential feature of the Settlement. Unfortunately it is a matter of considerable doubt how far the demarcation reported as more or less complete by Mr. Chisholm was really carried out. But it is certain that difficulties soon came to the notice of the District officials. Captain Bloomfield, as Deputy Commissioner, referred the whole matter for the decision of the Local Administration in 1874. In the course of that correspondence it was expressly stated that no village boundaries had been demarcated at Mr. Chisholm's Settlement (see page 1797 of Volume of Annexures). No reference was made to the previous decision of 1866 according to which village boundaries were to include only a "due proportion of waste just as in ordinary khalsa tracts"; and in the end, Secretariat letter No. 3784-175, dated the 14th November 1874, affirmed the title of every sub-proprietor not over a "due proportion" of the village waste but over the whole area, whether cultivated, waste, or jungle, comprised within the traditional boundaries of the village; and over this area the sub-proprietor was declared to possess the same rights as the Zamindar himself enjoyed over the rest of his estate. This decision was of course infinitely more favourable to the sub-proprietors than that of 1866. A few of them held in open country where, as I have said, there was no excess waste liable to excision even under the Khalsa rules. But very many of them held villages amid hills and forests where regular cultivation covered but a tiny fraction of the traditional area of the village; and these were at once made owners of large properties which are still continuously rising in value as the country is opened up and timber and other forest produce become available for export. Thus, in the Lapha Zamindari sub-proprietary rights were conferred in 1868 in 12 villages. Their cultivated area then was only 3,327 acres. But with the waste and jungle attached to them they now cover 58,022 acres, or one-fourth of the whole area of the Zamindari.

129. The decision of 1874 was of course most unpopular with the Zamindars. It was challenged by the Lapha Zamindar in the Civil Courts but was reaffirmed in Appeal No. 147 of 1881 in the Judicial Commissioner's Court and

again in Second Appeals Nos. 205 and 186 of 1885.\* The first survey of Zamindari village boundaries effected between 1891 and 1898 was also based on the traditional limits of sub-proprietors as of other villages, a procedure in full accord with both judicial and administrative decisions. All this should, one would have thought, have put the territorial extent of the sub-proprietary title beyond dispute. But in 1898, in the course of a Civil Suit between the Zamindar of Korba and the sub-proprietor of *mausa* Labed in that estate, some ingenious mind drew attention to Mr. Chisholm's Assessment Registers of 1867. In these documents three area columns only are shown for each village, the first the cultivated area, the second the culturable area, and the third the total of the other two. These areas alone were abstracted because they alone formed the basis on which Mr. Chisholm estimated the land revenue capacity of the village. But it was argued that the total area shown in this Register must necessarily represent the total area of the whole village - an instance of the danger of allowing the uninitiated too free access to technical Settlement statistics. The result was that by an order of the Civil Courts, running counter to all precedent rulings, the village of Labed formerly some thousands of acres in extent, was arbitrarily reduced to 947 acres, this having been Mr. Chisholm's rough estimate 30 years before of the extent of its culturable and cultivated lands. Nor was this the only case of the kind. A similar decision based on the same misunderstanding was given in 1908 in regard to *mausa* Amlibahara of the Matin Zamindari. As this emanated from the court of an Additional Judicial Commissioner the consequences threatened to be very serious. Some dozens of applications were at once put in by the Zamindars claiming a re-adjustment of all sub-proprietary boundaries where the waste land was extensive. The sub-proprietors themselves became thoroughly alarmed at finding their valuable forest rights threatened, and the widest confusion in our new Settlement if these decisions were taken as authoritative precedents was also imminent. The matter was therefore referred to the Local Administration and the misunderstanding of the Civil Courts removed. (See page 1798 of Volume of Annexures); and it is now to be hoped that the uncertainty which has from time to time enveloped the sub-proprietor's rights in his forest land during the past 40 years or so has been finally dissipated. It is high time that this was done for, probably, in one sub-proprietary village out of three where waste land is extensive the sub-proprietor has not yet ventured to assert his rights for fear of an unsuccessful collision with the Zamindar. This has caused a very serious difficulty in assessment, it being impossible to impose an accurate assessment on a forest village whose sub-proprietor has never ventured to enjoy the income to be derived from it. What will now bring home the position to these sub-proprietors is the fact that they have all been assessed to an enhanced revenue on the basis both of their cultivation and also of their forest assets. Having to pay an assessment on their forest lands they will soon pluck up courage to absorb whatever income is to be got from them.

130. Though the urgency of a final Settlement of village boundaries was naturally greater in the case of sub-proprietors, yet it soon became a pressing necessity in the case also of some of the less privileged village holders. I have already explained that, no trace being found of Mr. Chisholm's village demarcation—an operation which, according to the statements both of 1874 and 1890, was never really carried out—Mr. Lancaster, the Assistant Settlement Officer in charge of the first survey of 1891—98, in defining the village boundaries simply followed the traditional limits as disclosed by local enquiry. This was well enough in the case of sub-proprietary villages, being in accordance with the orders of 1874 which have been recently reaffirmed. It was also perfectly adequate in the case of other villages in open country whose development had reached the stage at which the ambiguous waste land was reduced to a reasonable proportion of the cultivated area. But a large number remained in the hill country in which—with the disappearance of 'beora' cultivation, discouraged by the Zamindars and prohibited by the Court of Wards owing to the resulting loss of valuable timber—the village waste included within the traditional boundaries was altogether disproportionate to the existing or prospective needs of the villagers. We have seen that the original orders of 1866 contemplated an excision of excess

\* See Central Provinces Law Reports, II 25.

wastes, and it was obvious that, whatever concessions might be given sub-proprietors, the merely cultivating interest of a village lessee could not be intended to include extensive rights over forest produce. But the difficulties which confronted us, when considering the possibility of excising excess wastes in villages other than sub-proprietary in the course of re-Settlement were twofold, *viz.* *firstly*, the natural configuration of the country, which favours scattered cultivation and offers but few solid blocks of unculturable land suitable for excision even in villages where the actual area of waste is manifestly disproportionate to the needs of the people, and *secondly* the fact that the whole existing traverse and survey was based on the traditional village boundary lines. From an administrative point of view it would doubtless be some convenience to have the villagers compelled to limit their *nistar* to reasonable areas of forest. It was however still more important to define the area over which the village lessee exercised his cultivating rights, and this definition was particularly desirable in the case of Protected Status lessees because they hold a title which is in a measure independent of the Zamindar. In reply, therefore, to a special reference in this connection (see letter No. 605, dated the 18th October 1908, at page 1809 of Volume of Annexures) orders were issued by the Local Administration (see page 1814 of Volume of Annexures) to the effect that, whereas excision of excess waste must certainly be effected wherever possible in the case of Protected Status villages, it would not, owing to the practical objections to throwing the whole existing boundary survey once more into the melting pot, be necessary to apply this procedure to ordinary thekedari villages unless the Zamindars pressed for it and were willing to undertake it at their own expense.

131. Work then was confined to excising the excess waste of Protected thekedari villages, and what was done was quite sufficient to indicate the difficulty attaching to this kind of undertaking. In the first place any rigid principles such as the '*dochand*' standard of earlier Settlements (which would ordinarily allow a waste area for each village no larger than twice the area occupied for cultivation) was found unsuitable in undeveloped forest villages, as within a few years such limitation would be a serious restriction on their natural growth. Again, as already stated, the cultivation in such villages extremely scattered. There was no authority for including in the excised waste fields already occupied for cultivation, and however closely the boundaries were drawn round the cultivated area this area would in many cases be so scattered that the intermingled waste would even so exceed the strict requirements of the village. There were also objections to excising what would constitute merely small and isolated blocks of waste not exceeding more than a few hundred acres, and also to the introduction of wholly artificial boundaries. In the end it was found necessary to dispose of each village wholly on its individual merits. A genuine effort was made to reduce the excess waste where this was practicable, and in several cases additional lines were traversed so as to enable us to give an improved alignment to the boundary. But where such reduction, either in whole or in part, was not conveniently practicable, or where, as in some cases, the Zamindars themselves objected because the villages adjoined their estate boundary and they desired to avoid an extra boundary line as liable to give an opening for future encroachments, a free hand was taken either in reducing the excess waste only in part or else in waiving the reduction altogether. In all, excess waste has been excised from 32 Protected thekedari villages, some 39,000 acres being thus added to the area of Zamindari forests outside village boundaries.

132. In regard to villages either under the Zamindars' direct management, or held by unprotected thekedars or other unprivileged holders, the Zamindars themselves expressed no desire for excision of excess wastes and no such innovation was attempted, as its practical advantages would have been altogether negligible and wholly disproportionate to the trouble and expense of substituting new artificial boundaries for the traditional limits already traversed and surveyed. It must be remembered that throughout the hill estates it is customary for the villagers to acknowledge no limits either to the area over which they may take their *nistar*

or to that over which any may graze their cattle, provided in the latter case that the cattle return each night to the village. This position is accepted by the Zamindars who are content to levy at most a commutation fee for *nistar* and grazing assessed in the former case per plough and in the latter per head of cattle. Naturally so long as this system continues the practical importance of the village boundary is greatly minimized as it really does no more than define the limits within which the villagers can extend their cultivation. Then again the inclusion in these villages, where the Zamindar's authority remains unquestioned, of large areas of excess waste cannot in any way under the present *regime* obstruct his forest management. The *nistar* and grazing rights enjoyed by the village, over the estate generally, carries with it no title to any timber or other forest produce which the Zamindar may declare to be reserved (*mamnua*). So effective is the Zamindar's control of such produce that I have often heard complaints from tenants that they dare not cut down timber trees standing on their holdings. The position would be different if a serious attempt were made to manage the forest on up-to-date lines, to introduce fire-protection, separate off the valuable forest areas of each estate, and subject them to proper forest management. If this is ever done it will no doubt be necessary to excise waste land of value as forest land from the village areas over which the general tenantry exercise their rights of *nistar* and grazing. But this has never been attempted yet, and I think what has been said will show that under the present system it would be to the advantage neither of the villagers nor of the Zamindar that we should attempt to repudiate the traditional village boundaries which have been brought already on the village maps and are the only ones the people know. I confess that if the cultivation and waste land in these estates were in each village entirely separate and compact it would be even now an advantage to have a general excision of excess wastes on Khalsa lines such as was contemplated in the orders of 1866. But in view of the difficulties already encountered in Protected Status villages to which I have referred above, it will, I am sure, be the wisest and most economical course to defer excision until it can be effected gradually as occasion may hereafter require in particular villages where the circumstances demand it.

133. To summarize the position as regards village boundaries it may be said that in sub-proprietary villages the traditional limits have been, and in view of the Local Administration's orders must hereafter be, retained. In Protected Status villages these traditional limits have been abandoned wherever it was possible, after due consideration of the existing natural features and probable future requirements of the village, and an improved alignment introduced which will more accurately define the area covered by the thekedar's lease. In other villages the traditional boundaries have been retained, because they have been surveyed already and, the villages being all under the Zamindar's unrestricted control, the practical significance of the boundaries in any case is extremely small, while to abandon the old existing limits in favour of new and artificial ones would be to incur both trouble and expense in return for which, under the present system of Zamindari management, no administrative advantage whatsoever would accrue.

134. We have next to consider what measures were taken during the recent re-settlement and before it to define the inter-zamindari boundaries. It is obvious that in the ordinary course of village boundary settlement. It is obvious that in the course of the Khalsa village survey of 1885 to 1889 and the Zamindari village survey between 1891 and 1898 the bulk also of the external boundaries of the zamindaris themselves were incidentally defined. Then again the survey by the Forest Department wherever zamindaris adjoin the Government Reserves extended the formal and accurate record of zamindari limits. But even so considerable lines of frontier remained, of which no really adequate delimitation and record had been made. The whole question was therefore reconsidered and a final effort made to secure such a detailed and continuous demarcation and survey of all zamindari boundaries as would render serious dispute impossible in future.

135. Frequent but spasmodic efforts had previously been made to secure settlement of zamindari boundaries. When the Provinces were first formed it was found that the zamindaris of Pendra, Matin, Uprora and Korba impinged on foreign territory. Two Imperial Commissions were, therefore, deputed in 1869 to define the exact limits of British territory along this line, one working from Amarkantak to the trijunction of Pendra with Rewa and Kauria, and the second from this trijunction point along the borders of Kauria, Sarguja and Udaipur. All other boundaries, whether between zamindari and zamindari, or between zamindaris and the Khalsa or Government forest or Central Provinces Feudatory States, were decided by the Provincial Settlement Department (see Secretariat letters Nos. 2111 and 2112, dated the 16th August 1866) and were formally demarcated by Mr. Chisholm. It must be confessed that these decisions were not very accurate in detail. It was hardly possible that they should be so in the absence of an accurate survey to work upon, and in one important instance along the Pendra and Rewa boundary the whole work of the Imperial Commission of 1869 had to be re-done by Mr. Blakesley on behalf of the Central Provinces and Colonel Robertson on behalf of the Rewa Durbar in 1893. But, though the detail was inaccurate, the proceedings of the 'sixties were of course of prime importance in settling numerous disputes and in indicating the general features of each boundary line. They were moreover given still greater definition by means of the Imperial topographical survey (1864-1868 and 1871-75) in which all these decisions were as far as possible incorporated. Add to this the fact already noticed that the surveys by the Forest Department and the provincial cadastral village surveys after 1890 had already defined the major portion of all the zamindari boundaries, and that an Assistant Commissioner (Mr. Tabor) was specially deputed in 1895 to settle zamindari boundary disputes, and it may at first be matter for surprise that so much remained to be done during the present re-settlement.

136. But it was deemed essential to systematize the record of all boundaries, in order to check the recrudescence of disputes which had in some cases (e.g. between Lapha and Chhuri) begun to be cherished almost as an heirloom, and also in order to facilitate their settlement if they did re-appear. For this purpose an accurate traverse and large-scale survey, supported by a series of well-defined survey marks each accurately represented on the map was obviously demanded. Mr. Chisholm had demarcated without surveying and the marks when lost or moved could not be replaced. The topographical maps prepared by the Imperial Survey Department had surveyed without demarcating, and the scale being a small one the exact alignment on the ground could not be found. The forest maps and the village cadastral surveys had been carried through without, in every case, allowing sufficient opportunity for possible objections from interested parties, and in the case of many of the village maps the original traverse which should have been taken only as the basis for a subsequent boundary survey was itself taken as the survey line. The boundary marks also were not sufficiently imposing. This work therefore of completing and systematizing the zamindari boundary survey was one of difficulty for it involved local inspection of the ground and considerable traverse and survey work as well as an examination of all previous records and decisions. The work was first attempted by the ordinary Settlement staff but was found to be too severe an addition to their other duties, and in November 1909 Mr. Graham, I. C. S., was deputed as Assistant Settlement Officer on special duty to carry these operations through. He remained in the district till September of the following year and then made over charge to Mr. Chhotelal, Assistant Settlement Officer, on our ordinary staff. The protraction of the work was due to various causes. In the first place, the Political Agent, Chhattisgarh Feudatory States, questioned Mr. Graham's jurisdiction in regard to matters affecting foreign territory. I urged that all disputes had already been decided by competent authority and that our work consisted merely in giving adequate expression and effect to orders already passed. Correspondence on this question continued for more than a year, and pending a decision we were compelled to confine our attention to the inter-zamindari boundaries and to such others of these estates as abut on Government

forest or Khalsa jurisdiction. Eventually the view I had urged was accepted by the Local Administration, but meanwhile time had been lost. Another cause of delay was of course the remoteness and difficult nature of much of the country through which the boundaries ran. The Zamindaris of Pandaria, Kanteli, Champa, Belai-garh-Katgi and Bhatgaon gave but little trouble. They lie mainly in the open country and map comparison between villages of the zamindaris and the Khalsa was all that was required, any part of their borders not adjoining the Khalsa being either faced by Government forest (*e. g.*, Sonakhan, Lormi, or the Mandla district) or marked off by an unmistakable natural boundary (*e. g.*, the river Hanph between the jungles of Pandaria and those of the Kawardha State). But in the Northern Zamindaris—the “Satgarh” of Pendra, Kenda, Lapha, Matin, Uprora, Chhuri and Korba—conditions were very different and the mere definition of the correct alignment of the boundaries in these estates, quite apart from their

Necessity for transferring the work half-finished to the District Staff.

permanent demarcation and survey, occupied Mr. Graham for the whole time he was permitted to remain in the district. The third and most serious obstacle to the completion of the work was the difficulty of erecting permanent masonry pillars in the remoter hills and forests. The Settlement Officer was primarily charged with the duty of demarcation, but owing to the number of estates under the Court of Wards and the failure of the Zamindars to co-operate in the work our staff was compelled to look to the District Office for the executive assistance which alone would enable it to be carried through. This led to further delay until it has at last become necessary to close the Settlement Office finally before the work of demarcation and survey is finished. The whole responsibility for the work has now been laid on the District Staff and it is to be hoped that this will result in its speedy completion.

137. As matters are thus being left but half complete it is important to place on record the exact procedure followed by the Settlement Staff so long as it was in charge of these boundary settlement operations. The work was divided into 24 cases—a separate case being prepared for each portion of the boundary over which any two jurisdictions coincided, *e. g.* (1) Pendra and Lormi Forest, (2) Pendra and Kenda, (3) Pendra and Lapha, (4) Pendra and Matin, (5) Matin and Lapha, and so on. Each of these positions was then examined separately. The line was first determined by the Boundary Officer and then at once temporarily demarcated, where necessary, by means of numbered posts heaped round at the base with loose stones. The line was then, where this had not been done already, traversed by an imperial traverser. The complete traverse sheets have been received and the Boundary Officer has selected a number of points along the line at which masonry pillars ought in his opinion to be erected in order to give practical permanence to his decision. When these masonry pillars, each with its own serial number, have been erected it will remain to have the actual boundary line cadastrally surveyed to the scale of 16 inches=1 mile on the traverse sheets, each permanent pillar being carefully recorded thereupon. The work is now on a fair road to completion and when finished should, since the demarcation and survey will mutually support one another, successfully defeat any attempt either to revive old quarrels or to discover new ones.

An exact account of the balance of work remaining to be done by the District Staff has been given in this office letter No. 181, dated the 20th July 1912, to the address of the Settlement Commissioner, and the close of the next field season should see it very near completion.

## PART V.—CONCLUSION.

138. I have now dealt with the main operations undertaken in connection with the new Settlement, *vis.*, the correction of the maps and records, and the enhancement of rents, kamil-jamas and takolis. But, important though some of these measures have doubtless been, the feature of the recent re-settlement which will, I believe, constitute its chief value is the effort which has been made to obtain for the Zamindaris of Bilaspur a clear definition of the varying tenures and titles which have from time to time been conferred on the land-holding population. When this Settlement began the status of the Zamindars themselves, of their sub-proprietors, muafidars, thekedars, protected and unprotected, malik-mak-buzas, and even of the muafi khidmati and muafi khairati tenants, all had certain features in regard to which considerable uncertainty prevailed. So far as possible these were all examined, and definite orders obtained indicating what was the exact status of every grade in the land-holding community. This is, I take it, the real function of a "Settlement"—not merely to revise the rents and revenue but so to settle the terms on which the land is held by the various agricultural classes as to minimize misunderstanding in the future and enable every one to realize exactly the position that he fills. Absolute finality in a matter of this kind it is impossible to obtain. Fresh circumstances are certain to create fresh difficulties in regard to the mutual relations of such a complex body as the land-holders of a zamindari estate. But still a great deal has been achieved in the last five years, and it will be convenient here to refer to the various orders and decisions passed in this connection and to summarize the results obtained.

139. First as regards the Zamindars themselves. We have already seen (paragraph 40 above) how several of the Zamindars were ousted under the Maratha rule, and it is probably not too much to say that it was the intervention of the British power which alone saved these estates from being gradually absorbed into the area under centralized control. This however is a historical fact to which the present Zamindars are hardly likely to allow much weight. Rather, their attention has been directed in recent years to murmuring against the necessity which has arisen of introducing into their estates Government control of certain administrative branches. As a result the Zamindars of the neighbouring district of Raipur were sufficiently ill-advised to file a suit against the Government for a restitution of their full powers over the local police, excise, ferries, pounds, etc., of their estates, which they had enjoyed prior to the lapse of the Nagpur Kingdom to the British but which it had, in the interest of good government, been necessary gradually to withdraw from them. The suit was instituted in 1906 and after being fought to the Privy Council was eventually settled in favour of the Government (see Privy Council's Judgment in *Bir Bikram Deo v. the Secretary of State for India in Council*, dated the 16th January 1912, forwarded with the Government of India's endorsement No. 573-218-1, dated the 13th May 1912, to the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner and published at page 362, *Calcutta Weekly Notes*, Volume XVI, No. 14). Meanwhile the status of all the Zamindars throughout Chhattisgarh remained a matter for speculation. The Zamindars of Bilaspur soon imitated their fellows in Raipur, made the same extravagant pretensions to all sorts of sovereign rights in their estates, and eventually, through the Zamindar of Pandaria, filed a similar suit against the Government. It was of course no more successful than the Raipur suit, and has just recently been decided on the basis of the Privy Council's decision (see Judgment of Civil suit No. 2 of 1909 in the Court of the District Judge, Bilaspur, dated the 11th May 1912). The one good result of this protracted litigation has been that it has cleared the air. Recourse will probably be had to legislation to decide finally the exact incidents of the Zamindari status but, as it is, the position can be sufficiently defined. The Zamindars possess no sovereign or semi-sovereign rights whatever. They are ordinary British subjects in exactly the same position legally as any other person on whom proprietary right has been conferred by Government, except that restrictions on the partibility, transferability and heritability of their estates have been imposed with a view to preserving its

integrity, while on the other hand some concession in the matter of assessment is as a matter of grace, allowed them in recognition of the peculiar position which they at one time held. It is a great matter that a final and satisfactory decision as to their position has at last been reached, and it is to be hoped that in future they will lend a less ready ear to interested persons who see their way to profit by bringing these ignorant but wealthy clients into Court.

140. After the Zamindars, the next most important class of land-holders are the sub-proprietors. I have dealt separately in Part IV with the difficulty that has from time to time been felt in defining the area over which their rights extend, and this matter was the subject of protracted correspondence. In the end it was finally and indisputably decided that the rights of a sub-proprietor—which are defined to be as wide in regard to his Mahal as those of the Zamindar himself in regard to the rest of his estate—extend throughout the traditional boundaries of his village as now defined by our Settlement maps and papers. The method of sub-proprietary assessment was also examined and defined, and the liability of the sub-proprietors to be assessed to malikana in addition to kamil-jama was affirmed (see paragraph 87 above). The Zamindars now receive the whole kamil-jama, malikana and cesses direct from their sub-proprietors. The cesses they remit intact to Government, their profit on the village consisting of the difference between the kamil-jama *plus* malikana they receive and the portion of the Government takoli debitable to the particular Mahal.

141. Another but less important body of village holders are the muafidars or assignees holding from the Zamindars. In most cases the whole village is assigned, but in some the assignment covers only the jama, or part of the jama, paid by a thekedar whom the Zamindar appoints. The class is numerically unimportant, but the individual beneficiaries, being for the most part Brahmins, have often hitherto made extravagant pretensions to a permanent title. In this connection therefore a ruling by the Local Administration in Secretariat (Survey and Settlement Department) letter No. 337—XI-14-5, dated the 23rd October 1908, is important. "The first general principle" it lays down "is that no Zamindar is bound to recognize the grants made by his predecessors, inasmuch as the special Zamindari tenure gives each incumbent only a life interest in his estate and he cannot encumber it with any grants which shall be valid beyond his own lifetime." This is an important ruling which should be welcomed and acted upon by some of the smaller Zamindars who find important villages in their estates held rent-free under assignments of long standing for which no return in service is contributed.

142. The bulk of the villages in these estates are held by what in official language are called thekedars but whom the villagers among themselves invariably speak of as Gaontias (or in the east of the district as Sirdars). Of the protected thekedar I have said sufficient in a separate chapter (see Part IV). Of the ordinary thekedar it is unnecessary to say very much. There is no doubt now but that in the vast majority of zamindari villages the ordinary thekedar is a lessee of the proprietary rights of the village, and will hold a written *patta* roughly defining his status and usually fixing his assessment and the term of his possession for a period of three to five years. The letter of the contract between Zamindar and thekedar, strictly speaking, defines the position of the latter in each case. Practically, however, all the Zamindar is commonly concerned with is to limit the thekedar's rights over the forest of the village, to prevent him making improvements which may lead to the conferral of Protected Status, and to secure his peaceful eviction in case his period of possession is approaching 20 years which is, under the present Act, a condition precedent to the grant of this coveted status. The ordinary lease directs its whole attention to these three points, merely adding a few pious instructions to the thekedar to pay his jama regularly, obey the Zamindar's orders, and treat his tenants with consideration. In a certain number of villages to the east of the district the gaontias will be found to hold no 'pattas,' to have never held them, and

to be unwilling to receive them. If enquiry also discloses a surprising coincidence between the theka-jama so called and the total rental collections it will be apparent that in such villages the full thekedari conception has not been accepted by the headman. The Zamindar may be forcing responsibility for the village assessment on to the headman and may be calling him a thekadar (or when it suits his argument a Kamdar). But the headman pushes this responsibility on to his ryots and calls himself the gaontia. These are the sole relics of the true gaontiahi system at one time prevalent throughout the district. They are only interesting however as survivals, and will doubtless be entirely extinct before the next Settlement commences.

143. Below the village headmen the chief of the ryot class are the malik-makbuzas. Orders defining their status were obtained in connection with the Chhuri Zamindari Assessment Report. It was there laid down that what the sub-proprietor is to a village the malik-makbuza is to his plot. If the tenure of either determines, the Zamindar comes in—not Government. The malik-makbuzas are in fact *adna* malik-makbuzas—the Zamindar being over-lord in respect of all proprietors of land in his estate including such plot proprietors. Their revenue goes to the Zamindar and, if there be no sub-proprietor or other middleman in the village where a malik-makbuza plot is situated, the whole of the malik-makbuza assets go to the Zamindar without drawback and he is assessed on them to takoli.

144. The rest of the ryot class consist of occupancy, ordinary and village service tenants. (There are no absolute occupancy tenants, see paragraph 70 above). The status of these is defined in the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, and requires no comment. But a reference may here be made to Settlement Circular No. 19, dated the 12th May 1910, which lays down that all persons holding land rent free with the consent of the malguzar are *tenants* under the Land Revenue and Tenancy Acts, and must be entered as such (*i. e.*, as ordinary or occupancy) in the village papers with the addition of the words 'muafi khairati.' These orders being issued late in the Settlement could only be given partial effect to in preparing the record-of-rights. Presumably persons holding land in return for service (other than village service tenants for whom there is statutory provision) are also tenants under the Act. But they, in accordance with the ruling in III, Nagpur Law Reports, page 190, are liable to be ejected on the termination of their service.

145. While writing on the subject of the tenant status I may mention one difficulty which came prominently to notice in the course of the recent Bilaspur Settlement, both Khalsa and Zamindaris. The Civil Courts maintain that an agricultural tenancy can only come into existence either by the operation of law or by agreement between the parties, *i. e.*, the landlord and the tenant to be. There is therefore a residue of land cultivated in the villages by persons who are not legally speaking tenants at all. But so far our Land Record system recognizes no such class of land-holders and records them all either as "ordinary without rent" or as "ordinary muafi khairati." The Civil Courts are now, I understand, taking the further step of regarding such entries in the Land Records or jama-bandi as proof of the existence of a tenancy, so that in practice every cultivator becomes a tenant, regardless of any agreement with his landlord. The position I think, requires further examination. Our record-of-rights and annual Land Record papers should provide a separate classification for cases in which the land lord expressly challenges the existence of a tenancy. On the other hand, the landlord's consent should be interpreted in many cases by construction—that is unchallenged possession over a series of years (say three) even if unaccompanied by the payment of rent, should be taken as constituting an acknowledgment of tenancy by the land-lord.

146. The new Settlement then has started free of many uncertainties which have hitherto beset the status of landholders in zamindari estates. The new assessment is a very reasonable one and was bound to be so seeing how intimately the people have themselves been associated in the work of re-settlement. No figure in the revised assets, whether of rental or of siwai, was adopted for the purpose of assessment without being previously endorsed and admitted to be correct by the person assessed. The first field to field survey has been completed. A detailed record-of-rights has been prepared for every village in the zamindaris.

Tenants have for the first time received a written acknowledgment of their legal status from Government, and village customs have for the first time been recorded in a village wajib-ul-arz.

But in emphasizing the administrative importance of the results achieved I must not be thought to be seeking in any way to reflect upon or institute comparisons with the work done in these zamindaris by the earlier Settlement Officers. For more than four years I was able to devote exclusive attention to a tract which they had to deal with in as many months as a mere episode of their general Settlement of the district. It was a sheer impossibility for them to study the idiosyncrasies of these distant zamindaris, and if I have anywhere in this Report criticized their methods or dissented from their views, I have done so with full recognition of the value of the work they did remembering the short time in which they had to do it.

147. Prior to revision the kamil-jama of these 12 estates was Rs. 1,41,209, the takoli Rs. 62,516 and the cesses Rs. 7,384. Now the kamil-jama is Rs. 2,34,730, the takoli Rs. 1,24,800 and cesses Rs. 12,952. The Government therefore in the matter of takoli and cesses gains directly the sum of Rs. 67,852 by re-settlement. Had the Settlement been a malguzari one the gain would have been the difference between the new and old kamil-jama and cesses, *viz.*, Rs. 99,089.

The total cost of re-settlement operations from the date on which the office opened in January 1906 to the date on which it closed in July 1912, including the large extra outlay involved in the deputation of an officer of the Indian Civil Service for 12 months on boundary work, was Rs. 2,37,074, of which the main heads were *Establishment* (*i. e.*, salary of Settlement Officer, Assistant Settlement Officers, Superintendents, Inspectors, Clerks and servants) Rs. 1,60,005; *Travelling allowances* Rs. 15,001; and *Miscellaneous* (*i. e.*, pay of mada'gars and chairman, section writing, etc.) Rs. 62,068. It will thus take  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years for the addition to the former takoli and cesses (taking no account of deferred enhancements) to pay off the whole cost of re-settlement. Had the Settlement been on malguzari lines the difference between the new and old assessment of kamil-jama and cesses would have wiped off the cost of resettlement in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years.

Considering the very heavy delay caused by difficulties in map correction and the extra expense (probably not less than Rs. 15,000 to Rs. 20,000) involved in appointing a special officer for zamindari boundary work this result may be regarded as sufficiently satisfactory for the first regular Settlement of the tract. The cost-rate of re-settlement per square mile was necessarily very low (Rs. 53) owing to the large extent of forest.

148. Under Article 300-A of the Settlement Code and Revenue Book Circular I-14, paragraph 13, I am required to include in this Final Report a proposed scale for relief by suspension or remission of Land Revenue to be applied in case of widespread famine, drought or failure of crops. All the zamindaris are most suitably classed as B—Normal and in all but Kanteli and Pandaria a simple scale of full remission if the crop is 40 by American Notation or under, and of full collection if it is over 40 would be sufficient. In Pandaria and Kanteli where rents are about a rupee an acre a half suspension might be allowed when the crop is between 40 and 50 by American Notation.

149. The bulk of the burden of re-settlement was borne by the following officials: Mr. Chunnilal, Senior Assistant Settlement Officer, Mr. Chhotelal, Assistant Settlement Officer, Tukaram, Statistical Superintendent, and Amrit Rao, Settlement Clerk. The Assistant Settlement Officers worked very steadily and well. Their work was often very trying and I am greatly indebted to them both for the willing way in which they discharged their duties. Tukaram was indefatigable in the statistical branch and maintained a high standard of accuracy in the details of assessment. Amrit Rao, as Settlement Clerk, was careful and hard-working and punctual in the discharge of the numerous duties entrusted to him.

Among other officials I would mention for their good work Nerbada Prasad, Assistant Settlement Superintendent, and Lachman Prasad, Additional Revenue Inspector, who fell a victim to cholera.

NAGPUR:

The 16th September 1912. }

C. U. WILLS,

Zamindari Settlement Officer.

## APPENDICES.

---

- A.—Prescribed Statements I to XII.
  - B.—List of protected thekedari villages. (See Report, paragraph 111.)
  - C.—Instructions regarding the record of co-sharers in protected thekedari villages. (See Report, paragraph 116.)
  - D.—Special forms of Zamindar's acceptance of assessment, sub-proprietor's acceptance of assessment and of information concerning the new Settlement given to Zamindars. (See Report, paragraph 106.)
  - E.—Orders defining areas which were summarily settled. (See Report, paragraph 89.)
-

## APPENDIX A.

## STATEMENT I.—Details of Revenue Demand prior to re-Settlement and as revised for each group or Zamindari.

No.	Assessment group.	As fixed at former Settlement.		At time of re-Settlement.		As sanctioned by the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner.	
		Land Revenue.	Takoli.	Land Revenue.	Takoli.	Land Revenue.	Takoli.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Pendra ...	9,800	5,021	9,800	5,861	25,949	13,000
2	Kenda ...	5,183	2,500	5,183	2,751	11,673	5,750
3	Matin ...	1,800	1,344	1,800	1,104	8,935	5,000
4	Lapha ...	4,411	2,000	4,411	2,204	12,090	6,750
5	Uprora ...	1,961	929	1,961	1,183	5,700	3,500
6	Chhuri ...	8,643	4,340	8,643	3,920	18,850	10,500
7	Korba ...	17,093	7,208	17,077	6,703	41,980	23,000
	Total for Satgath ...	48,891	23,342	48,875	23,726	1,25,177	67,500
8	Pandaria ...	63,890	27,500	63,890	27,500	66,725	34,000
9	Kanteli ...	6,463	2,200	6,463	2,200	7,540	3,500
10	Champa ...	7,274	3,300	7,248	3,283	16,028	10,000
11	Blaigarh-Katgi ...	11,037	4,610	11,037	4,210	13,979	7,000
12	Bhatgaon ...	5,703	1,800	5,696	1,597	5,737	2,800
	Total for open country Zamindaris ...	92,367	39,410	92,334	38,790	1,10,009	57,300
	GRAND TOTAL ...	1,41,258	62,752	1,41,209	62,516	2,35,186	1,24,800

*STATEMENT II.—Number of soil-units per acre for each group or Zamindari.*

(For regularly settled villages only.)

No.	Assessment group.		No. of soil-units per acre.	Area classed as—			
				Wheat land.	Rice land.	Garden land.	Minor crop land.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
			Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	
1	Pendra ...	9	5,500	57,831	4,413	47,020	
2	Kenda ...	11	485	15,276	1,453	8,529	
3	Matin ...			Not classified.			
4	Lapha ...	12	5	13,306	1,002	7,506	
5	Uprora ...			Not classified.			
6	Chhuri ...	13	...	22,864	1,336	8,371	
7	Korba ...	11	477	67,521	2,472	24,781	
	Total for Satgarh ...	11	6,467	1,76,798	10,676	96,207	
8	Pandaria ...	15	49,278	36,247	956	25,411	
9	Kanteli ..	18	6,934	5,836	120	1,111	
10	Champa ...	16	2,523	31,041	661	4,463	
11	Bilaigarh-Katgi ...	14	2,155	38,638	1,470	8,629	
12	Bhatgaon ...	10	920	11,810	345	5,823	
	Total of open country Zamindaris ...	15	61,810	1,23,572	3,552	45,437	
	GRAND TOTAL ..	13	68,277	3,00,370	14,228	141,644	

NOTE.—Calculated by dividing the total number of soil-units in regularly-settled villages by the area in cultivation (i. e., excluding old fallow).

## STATEMENT III.—Cropped area classified according to Crops

(For surveyed villages both

No.	Assessment group.	At present Settlement (1906-07 to 1909-10).										
		Wheat.	Rice.	Gram.	Linseed.	Kodan.	Tilli.	Urad.	Others.	Total.	Double croped.	Net area under crop.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
		Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
1	Pendra (204 surveyed villages)	737	50,053	3,130	842	11,804	4,937	8,136	13,082	92,721	2,521	90,200
2	Kenda (74 surveyed villages)	330	13,282	566	609	2,805	689	1,367	3,231	22,879	1,454	21,415
3	Matin (53 surveyed villages)	10	10,442	157	1	1,316	1,165	1,103	3,711	17,905	1,121	16,784
4	Lapha (78 surveyed villages)	23	13,082	74	24	780	831	1,109	2,478	18,401	423	17,978
5	Uprora (38 surveyed villages)	8	4,852	63	2	124	140	340	1,105	6,634	219	6,415
6	Chhuri (128 surveyed villages)	12	22,181	94	28	526	484	1,355	3,431	28,111	393	27,718
7	Korba (302 surveyed villages)	80	81,426	39	239	3,817	6,074	5,708	10,915	108,298	527	107,771
	Total for Satgarh (877 surveyed villages).	1,200	195,318	4,123	1,745	21,172	14,320	19,118	37,953	294,949	6,668	288,281
8	Pandaria (298 surveyed villages)	19,176	30,468	823	4,143	43,261	1,102	158	26,880	126,011	15,639	110,372
9	Kanteli (44 surveyed villages)	3,238	5,380	292	946	3,821	...	...	2,581	16,258	2,824	13,434
10	Champa (63 surveyed villages)	537	29,696	18	4,689	304	...	2,713	3,404	41,361	7,405	33,956
11	Bilaigarh-Katgi (111 surveyed villages)	431	36,093	168	1,514	747	1,965	6,110	3,169	51,097	6,818	44,279
12	Bhatgaon (55 surveyed villages)	42	11,358	98	133	592	1,501	680	1,421	15,825	417	15,408
	Total of open country Zamindaris (571 surveyed villages).	23,424	113,895	1,399	11,425	48,725	4,568	9,661	37,455	250,552	33,103	217,449
	GRAND TOTAL (1,448 surveyed villages).	24,624	309,213	5,522	13,170	69,897	18,888	28,779	75,408	545,501	39,771	505,730

for each group or Zamindari.

regularly and summarily settled.)

Compare as at Survey (1891-92 to 1898-99).

Wheat.	Rice.	Gram.	Linseed.	Kodon.	Tilli.	Urad.	Others.	Total.	Double-cropped.	Net area under crop.
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
959	53,765	1,666	943	5,473	2,063	4,425	12,772	82,664	1,854	80,810
141	13,582	188	959	1,224	877	656	2,697	20,324	1,034	19,290
33	6,739	43	20	450	329	702	3,296	11,612	649	10,963
17	9,609	41	114	178	500	838	2,641	13,938	496	13,442
1	3,789	23	1	66	157	338	1,134	5,509	225	5,284
33	20,181	126	26	224	632	1,713	4,001	26,936	286	26,650
346	66,359	352	2,607	1,226	2,424	4,366	10,971	88,651	1,594	87,057
1,530	174,024	2,439	4,669	8,840	7,582	13,038	37,512	249,634	6,338	243,296
20,860	50,052	1,014	13,145	26,909	...	...	42,200	154,480	32,580	121,900
2,278	6,711	79	3,056	2,472	...	...	4,942	19,538	5,882	13,656
1,194	27,595	586	4,385	173	...	1,217	4,343	39,493	4,156	35,337
616	38,744	342	5,553	397	944	4,598	6,703	57,897	8,622	49,275
543	12,121	213	1,793	412	1,206	846	2,070	19,144	1,162	17,982
24,891	136,123	2,234	27,932	30,363	2,150	6,661	60,198	290,552	52,382	238,170
26,421	310,147	4,673	32,601	39,203	9,732	19,699	97,710	540,186	58,720	481,466

## STATEMENT IV.—Details of village area

(For surveyed villages both

No.	Assessment group.	Occupied area.					Unoccupied area.				
		Area in cultivation.			Old fallow.	Total area occupied.	Groves.	Tree forest.	Scrub jungle.	Under water, hill, &c.	Total unoccupied area.
		Under crop.	Fallow of three years or under.	Total.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
1	Pendra (204 surveyed villages) ...	90,200	24,685	114,885	12,143	127,028	66	205,431	50,808	24,248	280,553
2	Kenda (74 surveyed villages) ...	21,415	4,328	25,743	1,833	27,576	4	78,735	8,658	5,973	93,370
3	Matin (53 surveyed villages) ...	16,784	3,855	20,639	1,581	22,220	2	104,090	15,020	12,962	132,374
4	Lapha (78 surveyed villages) ...	17,978	5,096	23,074	2,171	25,245	9	98,131	6,804	34,369	139,513
5	Uprora (38 surveyed villages) ...	6,415	1,498	7,913	518	8,431	...	49,121	4,746	11,765	55,633
6	Chhuri (128 surveyed villages) ...	27,718	7,318	35,036	3,018	38,054	10	75,906	13,787	12,514	102,257
7	Korba (302 surveyed villages) ...	107,771	20,496	128,267	11,698	139,965	37	187,955	59,816	35,582	283,390
	Total for Satgarh (877 surveyed villages).	288,281	67,276	355,557	32,062	388,519	128	799,669	159,639	137,653	1,097,089
8	Pandaria (298 surveyed villages) ...	110,372	9,729	120,101	13,894	133,995	251	45,425	34,040	19,047	98,763
9	Kanteli (44 surveyed villages) ; ...	13,434	567	14,001	321	14,322	7	25	2,054	496	2,582
10	Champa (63 surveyed villages) ...	33,956	4,732	38,688	1,757	40,445	17	4,329	13,076	6,978	24,400
11	Bilalgarh-Katgi (111 surveyed villages).	44,279	7,005	51,284	1,935	53,219	2	17,284	13,774	15,208	46,268
12	Bhatgaon (55 surveyed villages) ...	15,408	3,625	19,033	2,138	21,171	5	7,583	5,928	2,980	16,406
	Total of open country Zamindaris. (571 surveyed villages).	217,449	25,658	243,107	20,045	263,152	282	74,646	68,872	44,709	188,509
	GRAND TOTAL (1,448 SURVEYED VILLAGES).	505,730	92,934	598,664	53,007	651,671	410	874,315	2,28,511	182,363	1,285,598

for each group or Zamindari.

regularly and summarily settled.)

Total of village areas.	Area irrigated.			No. of irrigation wells.	No. of artificial irrigation tanks.	No. of ploughs.	No. of plough-cattle.	Compare at survey.						
	From tanks.	From other sources.	Total.					Area cropped.	Area occupied.	Area irrigated.	No. of irrigation wells.	No. of artificial irrigation tanks.	No. of ploughs.	No. of plough-cattle.
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.					Acres.	Acres.	Acres.				
407,531	26	4	30	50	545	8,063	23,507	80,810	93,914	209	6	34	6,931	15,126
130,946	181	...	181	75	79	2,194	6,070	19,290	24,100	64	...	10	2,119	4,974
154,594	...	...	...	...	...	2,870	3,850	10,763	11,630	...	...	...	1,230	2,447
164,758	496	167	663	51	142	2,384	6,429	13,442	16,289	62	8	11	1,785	4,093
74,063	87	12	99	1	23	1,005	2,137	5,224	5,803	17	...	4	659	1,368
140,311	410	415	825	49	137	3,807	8,621	26,650	29,897	73	25	9	3,014	6,227
423,355	3,711	424	4,135	295	405	11,127	30,160	87,057	103,514	393	89	100	7,864	19,031
1,485,608	4,911	1,022	5933	521	13,311	30,449	80,774	243,220	285,247	818	128	168	21,602	53,266
232,758	36	16	52	6	149	7,968	22,035	121,900	139,479	8	3	5	7,924	19,151
16,904	2	1	3	1	26	925	2,492	13,656	14,348	...	...	...	982	2,181
64,845	1,487	189	1,676	356	206	3,454	9,500	56,337	38,591	598	212	91	2,787	8,147
99,187	3,965	418	4,383	353	181	4,209	12,661	49,295	52,329	153	149	19	3,928	12,791
37,667	1,156	46	1,202	29	66	1,352	4,570	17,982	21,442	38	19	41	1,309	3,869
451,661	6,640	670	7,310	745	628	17,908	51,258	238,170	266,119	827	383	156	16,930	46,079
1,937,269	11,551	1,692	13,243	1,266	1,959	48,357	132,932	481,466	551,366	1,645	511	324	49,532	99,345

## STATEMENT V.—Details of holdings for each Group

(For surveyed villages both

No.	Assessment Group.	Held by village headmen.				Held by malik-makbuzas.		Held by occupancy tenants.	
		As sir.	Other than sir.	Total.	Area of total leased.	Number of holdings.	Area.	Number of holdings.	Area.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.		Acres.		Acres.
1	Pendra (204 surveyed villages)	9,892	4,301	14,193	1,853	2	75	1,647	21,792
2	Kenda (74 surveyed villages)	3,327	1,598	4,925	433	...	...	426	5,064
3	Matin (55 surveyed villages)	1,852	1,422	3,274	345	...	...	100	797
4	Lapha (78 surveyed villages)	2,565	1,308	3,873	246	...	...	284	1,685
5	Uprora (38 surveyed villages)	1,180	519	1,699	178	...	...	61	582
6	Chhuri (128 surveyed villages)	5,197	1,650	6,847	1,234	3	136	686	6,072
7	Korba (302 surveyed villages)	15,252	6,196	21,448	4,609	1	15	1,416	17,810
	Total for Satgarh (877 surveyed villages)...	37,265	1,6994	54,259	8,898	6	226	4,620	53,802
8	Pandaria (298 surveyed villages)	32,179	1,1479	43,658	7,240	...	...	1,613	20,100
9	Kanteli (44 surveyed villages)	3,231	1,163	4,394	1,138	...	...	329	3,603
10	Champa (65 surveyed villages)	1,058	640	1,698	255	49	574	1,925	15,881
11	Bilaighat-Katgi (111 surveyed villages)	6,056	2,543	8,599	1,679	...	...	1,972	19,131
12	Bhatgaon (55 surveyed villages)	3,202	1,184	4,386	602	...	...	437	5,598
	Total for open country Zamindaris (571 surveyed villages.)	45,726	1,7009	62,735	10,914	49	574	6,276	64,313
	GRAND TOTAL (1,448 SURVEYED VILLAGES)...	82,991	3,4003	1,16,994	19,812	55	800	10,896	128,125

NOTE.—There are no revenue free grantees or absolute

or Zamindari

regularly and summarily settled.)

Held by tenants of superior class in ordinary tenant right.	Held by ordinary tenants.		Held by rent-free or privileged tenants.		Total occupied area.	Compare as at survey.			
	Number of holdings.	Area.	As grant from malguzars.	In lieu of service.		Held as sir.	Held by malik-mak-buzas.	Held by occupancy tenants.	Held by ordinary tenants.
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
11,105	9,576	77,378	1,824	660	1,27,028	9,545	...	25,234	54,221
2,080	2,162	15,081	190	236	27,576	3,505	...	6,437	13,174
967	2,264	16,706	216	260	22,220	1,550	...	560	8,671
1,191	2,542	18,108	154	234	2,5245	2,404	...	2,229	10,656
355	1,007	5,481	148	166	8,431	1,079	...	755	3,419
2,691	3,587	21,229	580	499	38,054	5,622	...	6,989	15,343
10,630	11,066	89,288	1,154	1,630	1,39,965	13,563	...	21,570	62,686
29,010	32,204	2,43,271	4,266	3,685	3,88,519	37,268	...	63,774	1,68,170
5,919	7,192	60,780	2,116	1,422	1,33,995	33,930	...	27,191	58,490
780	725	5,405	57	82	14,322	3,232	...	5,619	4,887
4,975	2,689	13,433	3,651	1,133	40,445	3,239	30	17,562	12,592
3,287	2,893	20,912	421	869	53,219	5,616	...	22,315	21,581
930	1,082	9,154	536	517	21,171	3,441	...	8,189	7,530
15,041	14,581	1,09,685	6,781	4,023	2,63,152	49,458	30	90,876	1,05,980
44,051	46,785	3,52,956	11,047	7,708	6,51,671	86,726	30	1,54,650	2,73,250

occupancy tenants in these Zamindaris.

## STATEMENT VI.—Details of Malik-makbuzas and tenants' payments

(For all occupied villages both surveyed)

Serial No.	Assessment group.	At last Settlement.	Number of villages.	Regularly settled							
				As paid prior to Settlement.				As enhanced i. e. sanctioned at the re-settlement.			
				Malik-makbuza.	Tenants.			Malik-makbuza.	Tenants.		
					Occupancy.	Ordinary.	Total.		Occupancy.	Ordinary.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. a.	Rs. p. a.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
1	Penda ...	8,952	200	...	5,122 0 0	12,487 0 0	17,609 0 0	15 0 0	7,326 0 0	21,348 0 0	28,674 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 3 9	0 2 3	0 2 7	0 4 6	0 5 5	0 3 10	0 4 2
2	Kenda ...	3,881	74	...	2,007 0 0	5,683 0 0	7,690 0 0	...	2,600 0 0	7,548 0 0	10,148 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 6 4	0 5 4	0 5 6	...	0 8 0	0 7 0	0 7 4
3	Matin ...	1,005	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
4	Lapha ...	2,469	67	...	720 0 0	5,685 0 0	6,405 0 0	...	955 0 0	8,104 0 0	9,059 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 6 11	0 5 0	0 5 2	...	0 9 2	0 7 2	0 7 4
5	Uproza ...	2,805	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
6	Chhuri ...	7,005	116	94 0 0	2,945 0 0	7,620 0 0	10,565 0 0	118 0 0	3,788 0 0	11,190 0 0	14,978 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	0 11 1	0 8 1	0 5 6	0 6 0	0 13 11	0 10 5	0 8 1	0 8 6
7	Korba ...	16,141	236	...	5,369 0 0	19,332 0 0	24,701 0 0	4 0 0	7,015 0 0	27,927 0 0	34,942 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 6 0	0 4 5	0 4 8	0 4 3	0 7 10	0 7 4	0 6 7
	Total for Satgarh	41,538	693	94 0 0	16,163 0 0	50,807 0 0	66,970 0 0	137 0 0	21,684 0 0	76,117 0 0	97,801 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	0 7 3	0 5 4	0 3 9	0 4 1	0 10 6	0 7 1	0 5 8	0 5 11
8	Pandaria ...	68,776	239	...	14,201 0 0	46,387 0 0	60,678 0 0	...	17,957 0 0	54,125 0 0	72,082 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 11 7	0 12 6	0 12 3	...	0 14 7	0 14 7	0 14 7
9	Kanteli ...	7,627	44	...	2,698 0 0	5,471 0 0	8,169 0 0	...	3,466 0 0	6,506 0 0	9,972 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 12 0	0 14 2	0 13 4	...	0 15 5	1 0 10	1 0 4
10	Champa ...	8,956	63	20 0 0	8,821 0 0	8,514 0 0	17,335 0 0	369 0 0	11,508 0 0	11,968 0 0	23,476 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	0 0 7	0 8 11	0 7 9	0 8 4	0 10 3	0 11 7	0 10 11	0 11 3
11	Bilaigarh Katgi	13,200	103	...	6,186 0 0	8,241 0 0	14,427 0 0	...	9,097 0 0	11,103 0 0	20,200 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 5 2	0 5 6	0 5 4	...	0 7 7	0 7 5	0 7 6
12	Bhatgaon ...	3,189	51	...	2,060 0 0	3,646 0 0	5,706 0 0	...	2,627 0 0	4,639 0 0	7,266 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	...	0 5 11	0 5 10	0 5 10	...	0 7 7	0 7 5	0 7 6
	Total for open country Zamindaris	1,01,748	500	20 0 0	34,056 0 0	72,259 0 0	1,06,315 0 0	369 0 0	44,655 0 0	88,341 0 0	1,32,996 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	0 0 7	0 8 6	0 9 11	0 9 5	0 10 3	0 11 0	0 12 1	0 11 9
	Grand total	1,43,286	1,193	114 0 0	50,219 0 0	1,23,065 0 0	1,73,285 0 0	506 0 0	66,339 0 0	1,64,458 0 0	2,30,797 0 0
	Incidence per acre.	...	...	0 2 4	0 7 2	0 5 11	0 6 3	0 10 4	0 9 5	0 7 11	0 8 3

for each group for Zamindari.

and unsurveyed.

villages.				Summarily settled villages.							Unsurveyed.		
Compare as deduced from rates.				Number of villages.	As paid prior to Settlement.		As sanctioned at Settlement.		Ordinary rents.	Number of occupied villages.	Malik- mak- buza.	Ordinary rent.	
Malik- makbuza-	Tenants.				Malik mak- buza.	Occupancy.	Malik mak- buza.	Occupancy.					
	Occupancy.	Ordinary.	Total.										
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
16 0 0	7,378 0 0	20,721 0 0	28,099 0 0	4	...	...	5 0 0	...	15 0 0	14	...	108 0 0	
0 4 6	0 5 5	0 3 9	0 4 1	...	...	...	0 4 5	...	0 2 5	...	...	0 1 11	
...	2,732 0 0	6,911 0 0	9,643 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	80 0 0	
...	0 8 8	0 6 5	0 6 11	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0 2 8	
...	...	...	...	53	...	206 0 0	...	256 0 0	4,604 0 0	49	...	578 0 0	
...	...	...	...	...	...	0 4 2	...	0 5 2	0 4 2	...	...	0 2 7	
...	997 0 0	8,079 0 0	9,076 0 0	11	...	8 0 0	...	8 0 0	333 0 0	6	...	207 0 0	
...	0 9 7	0 7 2	0 7 4	...	...	0 8 0	...	0 8 0	0 4 6	...	...	0 5 0	
...	...	...	...	38	...	360 0 0	...	389 0 0	2,201 0 0	43	...	695 0 0	
...	...	...	...	...	...	0 9 11	...	0 10 8	0 6 0	...	...	0 3 11	
118 0 0	3,976 0 0	11,020 0 0	14,996 0 0	12	...	88 0 0	...	109 0 0	471 0 0	14	5 0 0	148 0 0	
0 13 11	0 10 11	0 7 11	0 8 7	...	...	0 6 1	...	0 7 6	0 4 5	...	0 3 10	0 3 3	
4 0 0	7,093 0 0	26,988 0 0	34,081 0 0	66	...	814 0 0	...	1,114 0 0	3,984 0 0	39	...	635 0 0	
0 4 3	0 7 11	0 6 2	0 6 5	...	...	0 3 9	...	0 5 2	0 2 2	...	...	0 1 11	
138 0 0	22,176 0 0	73,719 0 0	95,895 0 0	184	...	1,476 0 0	5 0 0	1,876 0 0	11,608 0 0	173	5 0 0	2,451 0 0	
0 10 7	0 7 3	0 5 5	0 5 9	...	...	0 4 8	0 4 5	0 5 11	0 3 4	...	0 3 10	0 2 8	
...	18,294 0 0	50,770 0 0	69,064 0 0	59	...	115 0 0	...	129 0 0	2,603 0 0	30	...	508 0 0	
...	0 14 10	0 13 8	0 14 0	...	...	0 4 8	...	0 5 3	0 5 9	...	...	0 6 8	
...	3,627 0 0	6,168 0 0	9,795 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
...	1 0 2	0 15 11	1 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
368 0 0	11,658 0 0	11,575 0 0	23,233 0 0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
0 10 3	0 11 9	0 10 7	0 11 2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	
...	9,392 0 0	10,649 0 0	20,041 0 0	8	...	1 0 0	...	1 0 0	68 0 0	1	...	...	
...	0 7 10	0 7 2	0 7 5	...	...	0 2 1	...	0 2 1	...	...	...	...	
...	2,622 0 0	4,362 0 0	6,984 0 0	4	...	3 0 0	...	3 0 0	14 0 0	...	...	...	
...	0 7 6	0 7 0	0 7 2	...	...	0 1 8	...	0 1 8	0 1 7	...	...	...	
368 0 0	45,593 0 0	83,524 0 0	1,29,117 0 0	71	...	119 0 0	...	133 0 0	2,685 0 0	31	...	508 0 0	
0 10 3	0 11 5	0 11 5	0 11 5	...	...	0 4 6	...	0 5 1	0 5 7	...	...	0 6 8	
506 0 0	67,769 0 0	1,57,243 0 0	2,25,012 0 0	255	...	1,595 0 0	5 0 0	2,009 0 0	14,293 0 0	204	5 0 0	2,959 0 0	
0 10 4	0 9 8	0 7 7	0 8 1	...	...	0 4 8	0 4 5	0 5 10	0 3 7	...	0 3 10	0 3 0	

**STATEMENT VII.—Incidence per soil-unit of rents before and after revision (expressed in decimals of an anna.)**

(For regularly settled villages.)

No.	Name of group.		Malik-makbuza.	Occupancy.	Ordinary.	All-round.	Standard rate.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Pendra (200 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'38	0'29	0'31	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'41	0'55	0'50	0'50
		Enhancement per cent	...	+43%	+71%	+63%	...
2	Kenda (74 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'53	0'55	0'54	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'69	0'72	0'71	0'65
		Enhancement per cent	...	+30%	+31%	+32%	...
4	Lapha (67 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'53	0'49	0'50	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'70	0'71	0'70	0'65
		Enhancement per cent	...	+33%	+43%	+41%	...
6	Chhuri (116 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'78	0'58	0'53	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'97	0'75	0'75	0'70
		Enhancement per cent	...	+26%	+29%	+42%	...
7	Korba (236 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'48	0'44	0'45	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'46	0'63	0'64	0'65
		Enhancement per cent	...	+31%	+44%	+41%	...
	Total for Satgarh (693 villages).	Incidence before revision	...	0'65	0'46	0'41	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'81	0'62	0'61	...
		Enhancement per cent	...	+46%	+34%	+50%	...
8	Pandaria (239 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'78	0'92	0'88	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'95	1'08	1'04	1'00
		Enhancement per cent	...	+26%	+17%	+19%	...
9	Kanteli (44 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'67	0'87	0'79	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'86	1'03	0'90	0'95
		Enhancement per cent	...	+28%	+19%	+22%	...
10	Champa (63 villages).	Incidence before revision	...	0'04	0'56	0'54	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'69	0'73	0'76	0'75
		Enhancement per cent	...	+1,745%	+30%	+41%	+35%
11	Bilalgarh-Katgi (103 villages).	Incidence before revision	...	0'36	0'46	0'41	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'54	0'62	0'58	0'60
		Enhancement per cent	...	+47%	+35%	+40%	...
12	Bhatgaon (51 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'59	0'64	0'62	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'76	0'82	0'79	0'75
		Enhancement per cent	...	+28%	+27%	+27%	...
	Total for open country Zamin-daris (500 villages)	Incidence before revision	...	0'04	0'58	0'75	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'69	0'76	0'92	...
		Enhancement per cent	...	+1,745%	+31%	+25%	+25%
	Grand Total (1,193 villages).	Incidence before revision	...	0'17	0'54	0'56	...
		Do. after do.	...	0'72	0'71	0'75	...
		Enhancement per cent	...	+344%	+32%	+43%	+35%

# STATEMENT VIII.—Siwai income for each Group or Zamindari.

(For surveyed villages and for waste land mahals.)

Recorded at former Settlement.										Recorded in the year of re-settlement.															
No.	Assessment group.	Village siwai.		Waste land mahal siwai.		Total.		Sivai of surveyed villages.										Waste land mahal siwai.*						Assumed as average.	
		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Mahua, man-gos, guavas, &c.	Kosa.	Lac.	Grazing.	Nistar.	Timber.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	Lac.	Grazing.	Timber.	Nistar.	Miscellaneous.	Total.	Sivai of surveyed villages.	Waste land mahal siwai.	Total.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23			
1	Pendra	...	4,663	4,663	36	...	374	6,127	3,771	2,562	376	11,216	...	278	3,489	277	3,682	7,746	11,400	4,810	16,210	...	...		
2	Kenda	...	4,234	4,466	48	...	1,197	5	20	377	66	1,713	1,240	631	10,415	...	288	12,674	1,713	9,502	11,215	...	...		
3	Matin	...	1,698	1,698	84	16	1,189	2,118	727	457	777	5,363	...	968	4,867	289	2,082	8,206	4,225	6,435	11,560	...	...		
4	Lappa	...	2,856	3,993	115	61	1,025	89	...	3,110	89	5,389	1,654	116	4,416	...	986	7,472	4,945	7,148	12,093	...	...		
5	Uprota	...	866	866	48	36	1,109	67	448	531	89	2,325	780	987	3,607	...	1,453	6,287	1,549	5,387	6,926	...	...		
6	Chhuri	...	2,927	3,786	171	374	1,526	1,037	2,455	1,312	349	7,224	3,621	...	7,837	247	554	12,259	6,427	9,615	16,082	...	...		
7	Korba	...	6,822	7,715	754	236	2,982	...	3,513	2,607	639	16,731	3,250	307	20,820	...	2,286	26,063	9,998	22,485	38,483	...	...		
Total for Satgarh		3,081	24,106	27,187	1,256	723	10,202	9,445	10,934	10,956	2,385	45,999	10,945	3,287	54,911	813	11,231	81,287	40,957	65,402	1,06,359	...	...		
8	Pandaria	...	15,109	16,109	677	...	936	2,014	1,135	...	59	4,821	5,568	495	5,156	426	3,261	15,106	4,402	11,468	15,870	...	...		
9	Kanteli	...	...	...	4	...	25	...	...	...	...	29	...	...	...	...	...	...	29	...	...	...	...		
10	Champa	...	...	577	25	122	879	...	...	434	970	2,430	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,202	...	3,202	...	...		
11	Bhagarth Katgi	...	1,998	2,221	67	...	...	126	313	20	46	572	...	...	1,520	...	789	2,319	504	1,433	7,937	...	...		
12	Bhatgaon	...	631	631	...	...	...	...	978	...	...	978	...	...	476	39	265	780	882	434	1,316	...	...		
Total for open country Zamindari		780	18,738	19,518	773	122	1,840	2,140	2,125	454	1,075	8,810	5,568	495	7,252	465	4,415	18,205	8,019	13,335	21,354	...	...		
GRAND TOTAL		3,861	42,844	46,705	2,029	845	12,122	11,583	13,360	11,410	3,460	54,809	16,513	3,782	63,173	1,278	15,746	99,493	48,976	78,737	1,27,712	...	...		

\* The area of the waste land mahal in each Zamindari can be found by subtracting the total of surveyed villages areas (column 13 of Statement IV) from the total area of the estate (column 3 of Statement I) of Report.

**STATEMENT IX.—Rental value assumed for land held by headmen and privileged tenants for each Group or Zamindari.**

(For all occupied villages both surveyed and unsurveyed.)

Serial No.	Assessment group.	Surveyed villages.									Unsurveyed villages.	
		Sir and Khudkasht.			Area held by privileged tenants.		Total rental value (columns 3, 5 and 6).	Rental valuation adopted.		Rate per area of valuation adopted for sir and khudkasht.	Home-farm valuation.	Maufi land valuation.
		Area leased out.		Area cultivated by village headmen.				Rental valuation adopted.				
		Rental value at sanctioned rates.	Compare rent actually recorded.		Rental value at sanctioned rates.	Rental value at sanctioned rates.		Compare rent actually recorded.	For sir and khudkasht.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs. a. p.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Pendra ...	762	246	3,593	803	...	5,157	4,356	823	0 4 11	10	...
2	Kenda ...	218	107	2,344	236	...	2,798	2,565	240	0 8 4	11	...
3	Matin ...	131	33	834	134	...	1,089	957	137	0 4 8	125	13
4	Lapha ...	145	48	2,133	232	...	2,509	2,277	242	0 9 5	50	5
5	Uprora ...	102	47	753	149	...	1,004	857	150	0 8 1	242	32
6	Chhuri ...	858	326	3,577	751	...	5,186	4,437	758	0 10 4	39	7
7	Korba ...	2,248	481	6,464	1,207	...	10,009	8,710	1,332	0 7 2	55	23
	Total for Satgarh ...	4,454	1,288	19,696	3,602	...	27,752	24,159	3,682	0 7 1	532	82
8	Pandaria ...	7,147	3,837	32,080	2,787	...	42,014	39,489	2,825	0 14 6	39	10
9	Kanteli ...	1,259	1,108	3,451	124	...	4,834	4,722	126	1 1 2	...	...
10	Champa ...	184	78	1,263	3,381	...	4,828	1,449	3,403	0 13 8	...	...
11	Bilaigarh-Katgi ...	866	69	3,554	569	...	4,989	4,417	585	0 8 5	...	...
12	Bhatgaon ...	279	105	1,590	495	...	2,365	1,901	501	0 6 11	...	...
	Total for open country Zamindari.	9,735	5,197	41,938	7,357	...	59,030	51,978	7,440	0 13 3	39	10
	GRAND TOTAL ...	14,189	6,485	61,634	10,959	...	86,782	76,137	11,122	0 10 5	571	92

No.	Assessment group.	Regularly settled villages.										Summary				
		Pay-ments of malik-mak-buzas.	Pay-ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khud-kasht and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai re-ceipts.	Total.	Compare as at former Settlement.					Pay-ments of malik-mak-buzas.	Pay-ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khudkast and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai receipts.	Total.
							Pay-ments of malik-mak-buzas.	Pay-ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khud-kasht and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai re-ceipts.	Total.					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Pendra ...	15	28,674	5,174	11,270	45,133	...	8,915	2,809	...	11,724	5	15	5	130	155
	As announced.	15	29,551	4,979	11,270	45,815	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
2	Kenda ...	...	10,148	2,805	1,713	14,666	...	3,798	946	232	4,976	...	...	...	...	...
	As announced.	...	10,783	2,612	1,713	15,108	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
3	Matin ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4,860	1,094	4,925	10,879
	As announced.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
4	Lapha ...	...	9,059	2,437	4,810	16,306	...	2,373	1,175	1,108	4,656	...	341	82	135	558
	As announced.	...	9,267	2,474	4,810	16,551	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
5	Uprora ...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,590	1,007	1,549	5,146
	As announced.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
6	Chhuri ...	118	14,978	4,826	6,016	25,938	...	6,572	3,173	777	10,522	...	580	369	411	1,360
	As announced.	118	15,066	4,860	6,016	26,060	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
7	Korba ...	4	34,942	8,367	8,341	51,654	...	13,433	4,713	691	18,837	...	5,098	1,675	1,657	8,430
	As announced.	4	35,597	8,235	8,341	52,177	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total for Satgarh.	137	97,801	23,609	32,150	153,697	...	35,091	12,816	2,808	50,715	5	13,484	4,232	8,807	26,528
	As announced.	137	1,00,264	23,160	32,150	1,55,711	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
8	Pandaria ...	...	72,082	41,516	1,779	1,15,377	...	65,725	31,676	...	97,401	...	2,732	798	2,623	6,153
	As announced.	...	73,010	41,983	1,779	1,16,772	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
9	Kanteli ...	...	9,972	4,848	29	14,849	...	7,627	2,701	...	10,328	...	...	...	...	...
	As announced.	...	10,192	4,805	29	15,026	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
10	Champa ...	369	23,476	4,852	2,202	30,899	...	8,956	2,709	557	12,222	...	...	...	...	...
	As announced.	369	23,829	4,836	2,202	31,236	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
11	Bilalgarh-Katgi ...	...	20,200	4,951	476	25,627	...	13,124	2,887	220	16,231	...	69	51	28	148
	As announced.	...	20,701	4,614	476	25,791	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
12	Bhatgaon ...	...	7,266	2,399	863	10,598	...	3,181	1,995	...	5,176	...	17	3	19	59
	As announced.	...	7,496	2,427	863	10,786	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	Total for open country Zamindari.	369	1,32,996	58,566	5,349	1,97,280	...	98,613	41,968	777	1,41,358	...	2,818	852	2,670	6,340
	As announced.	369	1,35,228	58,665	5,349	1,99,611	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
	GRAND TOTAL..	506	2,30,797	82,175	37,499	3,50,977	...	1,33,704	54,784	3,585	1,92,073	5	16,003	5,084	11,277	32,865
	As announced.	506	2,35,493	81,825	37,499	3,55,322	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

and as announced for each Group or Zamindari.  
or waste-land mahals)

settled villages.					Waste-land mahal.											Grand Total.
Compare as at former Settlement.					Compare as at former Settlement.											
Payments of malik- makbu- zas.	Pay- ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khud- kasht and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai receipts.	Total.	Payments of malik- makbu- zas.	Pay- ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khud- kasht and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai receipts.	Total.	Payments of malik- makbu- zas.	Pay- ments of tenants.	Annual value of sir and khud- kasht and land held by privileged tenants.	Siwai receipts.	Total.		
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
...	15	9	...	24	...	108	10	4,810	4,928	...	22	14	4,663	4,699	50,216	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	50,898	
...	...	...	...	...	...	80	12	9,502	9,594	...	83	21	4,234	4,338	24,260	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	24,702	
...	883	426	...	1,309	...	578	138	6,435	7,151	...	122	95	1,698	1,915	1,8030	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	18,030	
...	82	73	29	184	...	207	55	7,148	7,410	...	14	36	2,856	2,906	24,274	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	24,519	
...	1,756	285	...	2,041	...	695	275	5,387	6,357	...	329	86	866	1,281	11,503	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	11,503	
...	345	171	42	558	5	148	46	9,635	9,834	...	88	72	2,067	3,127	37,132	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	37,254	
...	2,466	746	202	3,414	...	635	78	22,485	23,198	...	242	72	6,822	7,136	83,282	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	83,805	
...	5,547	1,710	273	7,530	5	2,451	614	65,402	68,472	...	900	396	24,106	25,402	2,48,697	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,50,711	
...	2,697	934	...	3,631	...	508	49	11,468	12,025	...	354	25	16,109	16,488	1,33,555	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,34,950	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	14,849	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,5026	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	30,899	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	31,236	
...	65	44	3	112	...	...	...	1,433	1,433	...	11	1	1,998	2,010	27,208	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	27,372	
...	1	3	...	32	...	...	...	434	434	...	7	4	631	642	11,001	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	11,259	
...	2,763	1,003	3	3,775	...	508	49	13,335	13,892	...	372	30	18,738	19,140	2,17,512	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,19,843	
...	8,310	2,719	276	11,305	5	2,959	663	78,737	82,564	...	1,272	426	42,844	44,542	4,06,209	
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4,70,854	

## STATEMENT XI.—Calculation of revised assessment as announced.

(For surveyed villages and for waste land mahal.)

No.	Assessment group.	Malik makbuzas' payments.	Total mal-guzari assets.	Malguzari revenue (kamil-jama).	Percentage of mal-guzari revenue on mal-guzari assets.	Total assets.	Total gross income.	Total net income (i. e. deducting cost of management).	Amount of takoli payable to Government.	Amount of cesses.	Percentage of takoli and cesses on total assets.	Percentage of takoli and cesses on total gross income.	Percentage of takoli and cesses on net income.	Increase of total income as prior to and as after re-settlement.	Increase of takoli as announced and as prior to re-settlement.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.				Rs.	Rs.
1	Pendra	20	50,878	25,932	51	50,898	39,942	33,334	13,000	1,429	28	36	43	+16,191	+7,139
2	Kenda	...	24,702	11,673	47	24,702	19,849	18,724	5,750	642	26	32	34	+5,456	+2,999
3	Matin	...	18,030	8,935	50	18,030	16,526	12,281	5,000	492	30	33	45	+1,971	+3,896
4	Lapha	...	24,519	12,090	49	24,519	19,689	18,909	6,750	667	30	38	39	+5,604	+4,546
5	Uprora	...	11,503	5,700	50	11,503	10,690	7,743	3,500	313	33	36	49	+926	+2,317
6	Chhuri	123	37,131	18,472	50	37,254	31,415	29,327	10,500	1,039	31	37	39	+6,678	+6,580
7	Korba	4	83,801	41,977	50	83,805	69,269	65,981	23,000	2,312	30	37	38	+15,705	+16,397
	Total for Sat-gath.	147	2,50,564	1,25,049	50	2,50,711	2,07,380	1,86,299	67,500	6,894	30	35	40	+52,531	+43,774
8	Pandaria	...	1,34,950	66,725	49	1,34,950	98,036	92,672	34,000	3,674	28	38	41	+20,647	+6,500
9	Kanteli	...	15,026	7,540	50	15,026	11,849	11,035	3,500	415	26	33	35	+2,389	+1,300
10	Champa	369	30,867	15,700	51	31,236	30,471	29,087	10,000	885	35	36	37	+8,176	+6,717
11	Bilaigarh-Kat-gi.	...	27,372	13,979	51	27,372	21,898	20,830	7,000	769	28	35	37	+5,076	+2,790
12	Bhatgaon	...	11,259	5,737	51	11,259	9,660	8,640	2,800	315	28	32	36	+1,538	+1,353
	Total for open country Zamindaris.	369	2,19,474	1,09,681	50	2,19,843	1,71,914	1,62,264	57,300	6,058	29	37	39	+38,526	+18,510
	GRAND TOTAL	516	4,70,038	2,34,730	50	4,70,554	3,79,294	3,48,563	1,24,800	12,952	29	36	40	+91,057	+62,284

## STATEMENT XII.—Net revenue increment for each Group or Zamindari.

No.	Assessment group.	Prior to revision.			As revised.			Actual increase of revised net realized jama over previous jama.
		Kamil-jama.	Amount conceded to Zamindar in virtue of his position.	Takoli realized.	Kamil-jama as sanctioned by the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner.	Amount conceded to Zamindar in virtue of his position.	Takoli realized.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Pendra	9,800	3,939	5,861	25,949	12,949	13,000	+ 7,139
2	Kenda	5,183	2,432	2,751	11,673	5,923	5,750	+ 2999
3	Matin	1,800	696	1,104	8,935	3,935	5,000	+ 3,896
4	Lapha	4,411	2,207	2,204	12,090	5,340	6,750	+ 4,546
5	Uprora	1,961	778	1,183	5,700	2,200	3,500	+ 2,317
6	Chhuri	8,643	4,723	3,920	18,850	8,350	10,500	+ 6,580
7	Korba	17,077	10,374	6,703	41,980	18,980	23,000	+ 16,297
	Total for Satgarh	48,875	25,149	23,726	1,25,177	57,677	67,500	+ 43,774
8	Pandaria	63,890	36,390	27,500	66,725	32,725	34,000	+ 6,500
9	Kanteli	6,463	4,263	2,200	7,540	4,040	3,500	+ 1,300
10	Champa	7,248	3,965	3,283	16,028	6,028	10,000	+ 6,717
11	Bilaigarh-Katgi	11,037	6,827	4,210	13,979	6,979	7,000	+ 2,790
12	Bhatgaon	3,696	2,099	1,597	5,737	2,937	2,800	+ 1,203
	Total for open country Zamin-daris.	92,334	53,544	38,790	1,10,009	52,709	57,300	+ 18,510
	GRAND TOTAL	1,41,209	78,693	62,516	2,35,186	1,10,385	1,24,800	+ 62,284

## APPENDIX B.

*List of Protected thekedari villages in the ten Bilaspur and two Raipur Zamindaris affected by the re-settlement of 1906—10.*

Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.
I.—PENDRA ZAMINDARI.			PENDRA ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)		
1	9	Changeri.*	43	134	Pandrikhar.
2	10	Parasi.	44	136	Bhanri.
3	11	Dhanora.	45	139	Girari
4	20	Chanadongri.	46	143	Jatadeori.
5	21	Gania.	47	148	Deori Khwurd.
6	23	Bagrar.	48	152	Sakola.
7	24	Tendumura Kalan. †	49	153	Deori Kalan.
8	30	Kachhar. †	50	154	Sikhwa.
9	33	Marakot.	51	155	Kotmi Kalan.
10	37	Naka.	52	159	Tilora.
11	40	Patharra.	53	163	Korgar.
12	41	Kolbira.	54	164	Kanhaibahara.
13	46	Bharidanr.	55	170	Rama kachhar.
14	50	Gullidanr.	56	173	Tidi.
15	51	Litia Sarai.	57	177	Lamna.
16	56	Silpahri.	58	178	Kotmi Khwurd.
17	57	Latkoni Khwurd.	59	181	Jogisar.
18	61	Karsiwa.	60	195	Keonchi.
19	71	Naror.	61	196	Parwania.
20	72	Nimdha.	62	201	Kesla.
21	78	Kotkharra,	II.—KENDA ZAMINDARI.		
22	80	Meruka.	1	10	Nagpura.
23	86	Andhiarkhor.	2	11	Lamridabri.
24	87	Dahibahara.	3	27	Dholmohuwa.
25	92	Korja.	4	44	Amamura.
26	94	Lakhanwahi.	5	45	Banabel.
27	97	Harratola.	6	52	Umariadadar.
28	98	Girwar.	7	65	Nawagaon.
29	99	Dumariha.	8	67	Amali.
30	103	Kanhari.	9	72	Bankighat.
31	104	Jhagrakhanr.	III.—MATIN ZAMINDARI.		
32	105	Neosa.	1	1	Dhelwa.
33	110	Semra.	2	3	Lainga.
34	114	Amarpur.	3	6	Tulbul.
35	116	Bachharwar.	4	7	Karri.
36	117	Bandhi.	5	10	Kotmarra.
37	121	Seora.	6	12	Kumhari.
38	122	Majhgawan.	7	20	Babupara.
39	125	Dongaria.	8	23	Kodgar.
40	129	Dumarkherwa.	9	25	Pali.
41	131	Pipramar.			
42	133	Kudri.			

\* Both lessee and sub-lessee are protected.

† These have since been made Kham.

*List of Protected thekedari villages in the ten Bilaspur and two Raipur Zamindaris affected by the re-settlement of 1906—10.—(Contd.)*

Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.
III.—MATIN ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)			VI.—CHHURI ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)		
10	26	Kulharia.	13	35	Chakabura.
11	32	Atari.	14	36	Jawali.
12	39	Lad.	15	37	Kolhamura.
13	41	Korbi.	16	38	Murhali
14	42	Sarma .	17	45	Bijaipur.
15	43	Tanera.	18	50	Mahora,
16	45	Phulsar.	19	52	Rampur,
17	53	Khodri.	20	53	Dangania.
IV.—LAPHA ZAMINDARI.			21	54	Kolbari.
1	24	Jarmahua.	22	55	Maheshpur.
2	27	Kotapani.	23	56	Gharipakhna.
3	28	Madan.	24	57	Gudrumura.
4	45	Kartala.	25	59	Ghunchapur (Hukra).
5	47	Dhaurabhatha.	26	60	Kenadaur.
6	48	Dumar kachhar.	27	61	Darrabhatha
7	50	Sendripali.	28	64	Durga
8	63	Khodri.	29	65	Dhawaipur.
9	72	Bari Umrao.	30	71	Singhali
V.—UPROA ZAMINDARI.			31	73	Kasaipali.
1	5	Karra.	32	75	Korai.
2	12	Dongartarai.	33	76	Banki.
3	13	Bartarai.	34	77	Mongra.
4	17	Bango.	35	79	Arda.
5	26	Khirti.	36	80	Jamnimura (Dau).
6	27	Uchlenga.	37	81	Ghana kachhar.
7	28	Jilda.	38	83	Chhirhut.
8	37	Lemru.	39	86	Dindolbhata.
9	U. S.	Bimalta.	40	88	Jatangpur.
VI.—CHHURI ZAMINDARI.			41	90	Salora.
1	3	Nawagaon alias Bijrabhatha.	42	93	Jhora.
2	4	Iraph.	43	99	Ghorapat
3	10	Gopalpur.	44	106	Songurha
4	14	Rainpur (Charpara).	45	108	Jel.
5	16	Kanjipani.	46	109	Sahimuri.
6	21	Kera kachhar.	47	111	Lata.
7	22	Rangole.	48	113	Balgikhar.
8	24	Bandhakhar.	49	115	Sura kachhar.
9	27	Rainpur (Basibar).	50	116	Danganiakhar.
10	30	Sirki (Tiwarta).	51	117	Bhejrinara
11	31	Litiakhar.	52	118	Suklakhar.
12	34	Deogaon.	53	119	Patha.
			54	121	Garkatra.
			55	123	Dhangaon.

Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.
<b>VI.—CHHURI ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)</b>			<b>VII.—KORBA ZAMINDARI.—(Contd.)</b>		
56	124	Ajgarbahar.	37	87	Semipali (Urgaj).
57	127	Chhuia.	38	89	Deormal.
			39	93	Kanki.
			40	94	Jogipali (Kanki).
			41	96	Kathrimal.
			42	97	Chainpur (Sarai singar).
			43	98	Sarai singar (Chainpur).
			44	110	Kesli (Ardi).
			45	113	Bhathi Kunda.
			46	115	Rangbel.
			47	118	Khairbhaona..
			48	119	Rampuri.
			49	121	Parania.
			50	124	Ghanadabri.
			51	125	Bata.
			52	132	Barpali (Durpa).
			53	135	Barkuta.
			54	137	Koharia.
			55	140	Jambahar.
			56	141	Rumgara.
			57	142	Darri (Nogain khar).
			58	144	Gerwan.
			59	145	Nogain khar.
			60	148	Chhirhut.
			61	152	Dumarmura.
			62	155	Gajra.
			63	156	Ghordewa.
			64	157	Charpara.
			65	174	Junadih.
			66	179	Beltikri.
			67	180	Jhingatpur.
			68	183	Hardi (Chhote).
			69	185	Bareli,
			70	187	Amgaon (Bareli).
			71	188	Ralaya.
			72	189	Hathibari.
			73	190	Bhulsipahri.
			74	191	Katgidabri.
			75	192	Nawapara (Ralaya).
			76	194	Bamhnika.
			77	196	Korbi.
			78	204	Fathbarri.
			79	210	Utarda.

*List of Protected thekedari villages in the ten Bilaspur and two Raipur Zamindaris affected by the re-settlement of 1906---10.—(Contd.)*

Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.
VII.—KOREA ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)			VIII.—PANDARIA ZAMINDARI.—(Cont'd.)		
80	229	Kachhar.	20	49	Dharampura.
81	238	Madanpur.	21	50	Patharra.
82	239	Kolga.	22	51	Raitara Khwurd.
83	243	Labed (Phulsari).	23	52	Bortara Kalan.
84	249	Amaldiha (Syainghola).	24	54	Khektara.
85	252	Gidhkuari.	25	55	Khairwar Khwurd.
86	254	Barpali Bangawan.	26	59	Chilphi.
87	255	Katkona.	27	67	Siltara.
88	258	Kartala.	28	68	Jotpur.
89	259	Champa.	29	72	Gatapar.
90	260	Chorbhatthi.	30	74	Illachpur.
91	262	Barmer.	31	75	Baijalpur.
92	269	Tenganmar.	32	76	Dumarha.
93	270	Bothli.	33	77	Sahaspur.
94	272	Baharchua.	34	80	Baghmar.
95	274	Khuntakunda.	35	81	Amlidi.
96	277	Suwarlot.	36	82	Nawagaon Thelka.
97	281	Aunrai.	37	83	Kukurhatta.
98	287	Periya.	38	84	Singhanpuri.
99	288	Kotmer.	39	85	Belsari.
100	291	Kera kachhar (Rajgamar).	40	86	Semarkona Khwurd.
101	292	Kesla (Rajgamar).	41	87	Bhurka.
102	296	Gorhi.	42	88	Bhantha.
VIII.—PANDARIA ZAMINDARI.			43	89	Pandotara.
1	5	Chhirpani.	44	90	Sarangpur.
2	7	Madanpur Kalan.	45	91	Khaira Setganga
3	8	Khairdongri.	46	92	Maradabri.
4	9	Amarpur.	47	94	Singarpur Khwurd.
5	14	Lalpur Khwurd.	48	96	Bijatarai.
6	16	Bhadrali.	49	97	Khunta.
7	20	Bodhipara.	50	98	Kesli Kalan.
8	21	Baghamura.	51	99	Andodabri.
9	24	Damapur.	52	100	Senabhatha.
10	25	Ghutor kundi.	53	101	Bhawalpur.
11	26	Amaldiha.	54	103	Mahaka.
12	30	Bhaskarra.	55	104	Bijabhatha.
13	31	Ramepur Kalan.	56	107	Raitara Kalan.
14	32	Nihalpur.	57	109	Narauli.
15	36	Naurangpur.	58	114	Nanapuri.
16	40	Kutelatola.	59	118	Newargaon.
17	42	Charnitola.	60	119	Kisangarh.
18	44	Ghatapani.	61	120	Torla.
19	48	Sengurha.	62	121	Tilaibhatha.
			63	122	Maheli.

*List of Protected thekedari villages in the ten Bilaspur and two Raipur Zamindaris affected by the re-settlement of 1906-10.—(Contd.)*

Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settlement No.	Name of village.
VIII.—PANDARIA ZAMINDARI.—(Contd.)			VIII.—PANDARIA ZAMINDARI.—(Contd.)		
64	124	Bandha.	107	239	Keolari Kalan.
65	125	Pusera.	108	250	Buchipara.
66	126	Pendri Khwurd.	109	286	Panripathra *.
67	127	Sirmadabri.			
68	128	Mohtara Khwurd.			IX.—KANTELI ZAMINDARI.
69	132	Samnapur Khwurd.	1	2	Bodhapara.
70	136	Sarupara.	2	4	Bijrakapa.
71	141	Sonpuri.	3	12	Gurwaindabri.
72	149	Roha.	4	13	Hariapur.
73	154	Larwa.	5	18	Kestarpur.
74	155	Paraswara.	6	21	Lalpur.
75	157	Charbhatta Khwurd.	7	23	Madanpur.
76	163	Dongaria Kalan.	8	24	Mahrukapa.
77	166	Palansari.	9	30	Parsakapa.
78	167	Putki Kalan.	10	34	Sarangpur.
79	168	Keolari Khwurd.	11	35	Sanwatpur.
80	173	Baniya kuwa.	12	36	Singarpur.
81	180	Panrki Kalan.	13	40	Sipahi.
82	181	Kumbhi.	14	43	Tarwarpur.
83	186	Khairwar Kalan.	15	44	Udka.
84	187	Nawagaon Gajri.			X.—BHATGAON ZAMINDARI.
85	188	Bortara Khwurd.			
86	190	Kesli Khwurd.	1	3	Thakurdaya.
87	197	Girdhari kapa.	2	7	Churela.
88	199	Dullipar.	3	8	Beltikri.
89	200	Dhola kapa.	4	9	Durumgarh.
90	201	Dongaria Khwurd.	5	17	Ghana.
91	205	Kheltukri.	6	18	Gadhabhatha.
92	209	Ghorpendri.	7	22	Nawapara.
93	210	Basni.	8	25	Junwani. *
94	211	Kolegaon.	9	40	Madhuban Khwurd.
95	215	Ruse.	10	47	Khurdurha.
96	216	Mohgaon.	11	50	Gandapali
97	219	Mohtara Kalan.			XI.—BILAIGARH-KATGI ZAMINDARI.
98	220	Kanjheta.			
99	222	Kuamalg.	1	1	Soniadih Khwurd.
100	223	Amlimalgi.	2	2	Muriadih.
101	225	Mahwa Marwa.	3	4	Deori.
102	227	Ningapur.	4	6	Sel.
103	228	Gobarra.	5	7	Sabar.
104	230	Samnapur Kalan.	6	8	Bhadra.
105	233	Bhatruse.	7	10	Sarwa.
106	238	Amadah.	8	11	Sarwani.

\* Has been made Kham since.

*List of Protected thekedari villages in the ten Bilaspur and two Raipur Zamindaris affected by the re-settlement of 1906-10.—(Concl'd.)*

Serial No.	Settle-ment No.	Name of village.	Serial No.	Settle-ment No.	Name of village.
XI—BILAIGARH-KATGI ZAMINDARI.—(Contd.)			XI—BILAIGARH-KATGI ZAMINDARI.—(Concl'd.)		
9	14	Jhabri	21	42	Mahuadih.
10	17	Murpar	22	47	Deorbor.
11	18	Pikri	23	50	Khajuri.
12	20	Markara	24	60	Kurkuti.
13	22	Dhawalpur	25	63	Barbhatha.
14	24	Amodi	26	70	Parsadih.
15	25	Deradih	27	73	Murpar.
16	29	Bhonsra	28	84	Pachri.
17	31	Bhaurid	29	85	Patharia.
18	35	Marwa	30	91	Chhapora.
19	39	Sukli	31	96	Sutiurkuli.
20	40	Bareli	32	111	Surguli.

## APPENDIX C.

**Note of the arrangements made for co-sharers in Protected thekedari villages in the Bilaspur Zamindaris (including Bilaigarh-Katgi and Bhatgaon) at the Settlement of 1906—10.**

1. The recognition of co-sharers in thekedari villages is now admittedly undesirable. In all cases therefore in which Protection has been given *during the recent Settlement* (i. e., *subsequent to 1905*) care has been taken to confer this status only on the head of the family in possession. Other members of the family when separate from their head have been provided for by the grant of occupancy rights in the portion of home-farm already in their separate possession. Such members of the family as were found joint with their head at the time of the grant of Protection and had therefore no separate possession of any part of the home-farm could not be provided for. They were required to express formally their surrender of all claim to share in the thekedari interest. Presumably hereafter the thekedar will provide for them on separation in accordance with custom by the grant of some land in tenant right.

2. But the Protected Status came into existence in 1889. We have now, therefore, to consider the action taken as regards co-sharers in those villages *where protection was conferred between 1889 and 1906* when the new Settlement began. Here we are confronted by the difficulty that at the Bilaspur Settlement of 1890 the existence of co-sharers in Protected thekedari villages was formally recognized. In many of the Protected Status certificates then issued it was expressly stated that the status was conferred on so and so "may hissedaran," i. e., along with his co-sharers. Their position was also recognized by implication in clause 1 of Part II of the Zamindari Wajib-ul-arz (sanctioned in 1892, and printed at page 161 of Rai Bahadur Purshottam Dass' Settlement Report) which runs "In villages held by muafidars or thekedars having protected status co-sharers cannot claim partition," and is still further confirmed by a judgment, dated the 19th January 1907, by the Judicial Commissioner, in second appeal No. 89 of 1906, in which in the Protected thekedari village of Girari in the Pendra Zamindari a junior member of the headman's family was held to be a co-sharer—the Judicial Commissioner finding that "the tenure has all along been held by the joint family, not by one member only—, an arrangement which is expressly saved by clause (a), Section 65-A (4) of the Land Revenue Act of 1898."

3. This clause (a) runs as follows:—"The tenure (of a thekedar who has been declared to be Protected) shall be heritable but not transferable by sale, gift, mortgage or dower; it shall not be saleable in execution of any decree nor shall any decree be passed for the sale thereof; and, *save in so far as any arrangements to the contrary are in force at the time of the declaration (of Protection) it shall not be partitioned and shall devolve on one member only of the thekedar's family*" After careful consideration it was held, *vide* correspondence ending with Commissioner of Settlements' No. 259, dated the 24th January 1908, that in view of the terms of the Wajib-ul-arz of 1890 (above-quoted) no Protected thekedari village could be *partitioned*; but that co-sharers in such villages should be recognized—in contravention of the provision of law that the status devolved on one person only—so far and only so far as plural devolution existed at the time of the declaration of Protection. Single devolution is ordinarily prescribed no doubt, but where several co-sharers are in existence when the claim to Protected Status is considered this clearly constitutes "an arrangement to the contrary in force at the time of the declaration," entitling them, in the absence of any such special provision as we have made at the recent Settlement in new cases of Protection, to be regarded as co-sharers.

4. The procedure then followed at the recent Settlement was to enquire into and record the detail of the co-sharers (if any) existing at the time of the original grant. This gave us a fixed starting point—the arrangement in force at the time of the declaration. It also set a limit to the number of co-sharers whom under the law of 1898 it was legitimate to recognize. If, for instance, 4 brothers held the lease at the time of the grant we could not recognize the 8 sons of these 4 brothers when the latter deceased. Only the eldest son of each brother could be so recognized. There could never be more co-sharers than originally existed in the village (though of course if a co-sharer died without issue there might be less) for the rule of single devolution could only be departed from so far as, and no further than, arrangements to the contrary were in force at the time of the declaration of Protection.

5. Thus, of the whole body of so-called co-sharers found in existing Protected thekedari villages at the time of the recent re-settlement some could and others could not be recognized. The *recognised co-sharers* for whose recognition there is precedent in the arrangements in force at the time of the grant have been entered in the khewat of the Settlement misl and on the certificate of Protection given to the head of the family, a copy of which has been filed for reference in the District Office. Their possession of *sir* and

*khudkasht*, if separate from that of the head of the family, has also been separately recorded in the khasra and jamabandi. The *other surplus members* of the family whose claim to be called co-sharers cannot be recognised because their branch of the family has multiplied since Protection was conferred and the rule of single devolution precludes their recognition, have, as far as possible, been ignored. They are mentioned neither in the khewat nor in the Certificate of Protection. If they have separate possession of *sir* land they are recorded merely as ordinary tenants thereof in column 7. If they have separate possession of *khudkasht* they are entered only in the column of remarks (13) as holding rent-free on account of relationship (*rishtedari men muaf*). Doubtless before long if this interpretation of the law is properly enforced these surplus members will gradually sink into the tenant class and abandon all claim to share in the thekedari interest.

6. The practical importance of all this for the District Staff is in connection with the record of mutation. It is imperative that Tahsildars and others in considering mutation cases from Protected thekedari villages should continue only to acknowledge at most the same number of co-sharers as existed at the time of the declaration of Protection. It is to facilitate this work that I have written this explanatory note. I also append a list\* of the  $\frac{148}{10}$  protected thekedari villages in the  $\frac{10}{2}$  Bilaspur Zamindaris Raipur Zamindaris affected by the recent re-settlement in which recognized co-sharers exist, giving the names of these recognized co-sharers. If any so-called "co-sharers" other than those entered in this list claim to be entered in regard to any Protected thekedari village, their claim must be rejected. And if in any village on the list members of the thekedar's family other than those shown therein as recognized (or the one successor in interest of each) make such a claim it must be similarly rejected.

7. Complicated though the position may seem when it has to be explained it should in practical application be simple enough if every mutation case is decided strictly in accordance with the appended list\*—none but the persons entered thereon or the one successor in interest of each being admitted to the ranks of Protected thekedar's co-sharers.

---

\* The list is not reproduced here. It has been made over to the Deputy Commissioners, Bilaspur and Raipur.

## APPENDIX D.

## Form of Zamindari acceptance of Assessment in regard to Takoli, Cesses and Kamil-Jama. (Translation.)

Whereas the Settlement of the \_\_\_\_\_ Zamindaris situated in the \_\_\_\_\_  
Tahsil of the \_\_\_\_\_ District has been completed, I \_\_\_\_\_, Zamindar  
of the aforesaid Zamindari, do hereby accept under Section 54 of the Land Revenue Act,  
the newly assessed Kamil-Jama as sanctioned by the Chief Commissioner for the mahals  
shown in the statement below from the 1st July 19 \_\_\_\_\_ till a fresh Settlement is made :—

Serial No.	Name of Mahal.	Sanctioned Kamil-Jama.	Cesses.
1	2	3	4

In consideration of my status of Zamindar the Government does not require me to pay the whole of the above Kamil-Jama and the Chief Commissioner has fixed a takoli of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ on my estate. This I agree to pay subject to the deductions on account of deferred enhancement shown in the statement below\* together with the undermentioned cesses or such cesses as may from time to time be fixed by law :—

Details of kist.	Sanctioned takoli.			Cesses.	Total.		
	From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____	From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____	From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____ or till fresh Settlement is made.		From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____	From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____	From 1st July 19 _____ to 30th June 19 _____ or till fresh Settlement is made.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
First ...							
Second ...							
Total ...							

\* To be struck out if unnecessary.

I hereby bind myself to abide by all the conditions entered in the Wajib-ul-arz sanctioned for the current Settlement, and will to the utmost of my ability secure their observance at the hands of my gaontias and ryots. I will also manage my forests strictly in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down by the Chief Commissioner under Section 124-A of the Land Revenue Act.

Signature of Zamindar,

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ th 19 \_\_\_\_\_.

Signature of Settlement Officer.

**Form of Zamindari Sub-proprietor's acceptance of Assessment in regard to  
Kamil-Jama, Cesses and Malikana. (Translation.)**

Whereas the Settlement of Mahal No. \_\_\_\_\_ situated in the \_\_\_\_\_ Zamindari,  
Tahsil \_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ District, has been completed, I  
Sub-Lambardar Sub-proprietor of the aforesaid mahal do hereby accept, under Section 54 of  
the Land Revenue Act, the newly assessed Kamil-Jama and Malikana for 20 years (from 1st  
July 19 \_\_\_\_\_ till a fresh Settlement is made), subject\* to the deductions on account of  
deferred enhancements, as entered in the appended table and sanctioned by the Chief Com-  
missioner. In addition I will pay the undermentioned cesses or such cesses as may from  
time to time be fixed by law :—

Sanctioned. kamil-jama.	Details of kist.	Sanctioned assessment.			Malik- ana.	Cesses.	Total assessment.		
		From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19	From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19	From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19 or till a new Settle- ment is made.			From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19	From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19	From 1st July 19 to 30th June 19 or till a new Set- tlement is made.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rs.	First ...								
	Second ...								
	Total ...								

I hereby bind myself to abide by all the conditions entered in the village Wajib-ul-arz  
as now sanctioned for the current Settlement. I admit that a breach of the conditions  
relating to forest management laid down by the Chief Commissioner under Section 124-A  
of the Land Revenue Act, and the illicit enclosure of waste will warrant the Government  
in annulling the Settlement of the mahal.

*Signature of Sub-Lambardar*

*Sub-Proprietor.*

*Dated the*    *th*

19    ,

*Signature of Settlement Officer.*

\* To be struck out if unnecessary.

Assets.				Kamil-jama.
Rents of tenants.	Value of home-farm and muafi lands.	Siwai income.	Total.	
1	2	3	4	
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Villages under direct management	...			
Villages held by assignees	...			
Villages held by sub-proprietors	...			
Villages held by lessees	...			
Waste land mahal (deducting Rs. for fluctuations).				
Total	...			

				Rs.
From villages under direct management (full assets)	...	...		
From villages held by assignees	...	...		
From villages held by sub-proprietors (kamil-jama, malikana and cesses)			...	
From villages held by lessees (estimated theka-jama at	per cent of assets)	...		
From waste land mahal	...	...	...	
			Total	...
Net income of Zamindari (deducting Rs.			, being cost of Forest and Revenue	
management).				

[illegible]



No. 365—XI-14-3, dated Nagpur, the 6th July 1907.

From—J. HULLAH, Esq., I. C. S., Under Secretary to the Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces, Survey and Settlement Department,

To—The Commissioner of Settlements, Central Provinces.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 2668, dated the 15th June 1907, and of its enclosure.

2. In reply, I am to say that under Section 63 (i) of the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, 1898, the Hon'ble the Chief Commissioner directs that in the portion of the Pandaria zamindari of the Bilaspur district specified below, the rents payable by ordinary tenants shall not be fixed by the Settlement Officer at the time of land revenue assessment in the course of the Settlement now being made:—

Patwari Circle No.	1	The whole.
"	"	" 2 Mauza Madanpur.
"	"	" 17 " Saraipatera.
"	"	" 18 Mauzas Birkona, Kesli, Pandri-Pathra, Hazarikapa.
"	"	" 21 Mauza Nawagaon Tikait.
"	"	" 29 The whole except mauza Jhiria Kalan.
"	"	" 30 The whole.
"	"	" 31 " "

Nagpur, the 30th November 1908.

No. 393.—Under Section 63, Sub-section (1), of the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, 1898, the Chief Commissioner directs that in the portion of the Bhatgaon and Bilaigarh-Katgi Zamindaris of the Raipur district specified below, the rents payable by ordinary tenants shall not be fixed by the Settlement Officer at the time of land revenue assessment in the course of the Settlement now being made:—

Bhatgaon Zamindari	...	In mauzas Rankot, Pirda, Charpali, Dhutikona, Boradih, Jamunardih, Murkhatta, and Chandlidhi of Patwari Circle No. 4.
Bilaigarh-Katgi Zamindari	...	In mauzas Amakachhar, Jharnidih, Bora, Surguli, Jogidipa, Saluha, Parsapali, Dhaurabhatha, Goradih, Maluha, and Bagmala of Patwari Circle No. 5.

B. P. STANDEN,

Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner,

Central Provinces.

Nagpur, the 28th October 1909.

No. 555.—Under Section 63, Sub-section (1), of the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, 1898, the Chief Commissioner directs that in the portion of the Korba Zamindari of the Bilaspur district specified below, the rents payable by ordinary tenants shall not be fixed by the Settlement Officer at the time of land revenue assessment in the course of the Settlement now being made:—

Korba Zamindari, Patwari Circle No. 1—Mauza Puta, Chhindpani, Musaria and Choraha.		
Do.	do.	No. 2—Nawagaon Khurd.
Do.	do.	No. 3—Jatraj and Barampur.
Do.	do.	No. 10—The whole, except mauzas Urga-Kukri-Choli, Semi-Pali, Korba Khas, Koharia, Ramgarha, Jambahar, Rogbahari and Risda.
Do.	do.	No. 11—The whole, except mauzas Junwani, Bhaisma, Karmandi, Chhitapali, Dhongdaraha ( <i>alias</i> Salaihabhatha), Sakdukla, Rajgamar and Batati.
Do.	do.	No. 12—The whole, except mauza Chirra.
Do.	do.	No. 13—The whole, except mauzas Jhilga, Taolipali and Kudmura.

Korba Zamindari,	Patwari Circle	No. 14—The whole, except mauzas Taraimar, Kalgamar, Charmar and Kachhar.
Do.	do.	No. 15—The whole, except mauza Binjkot.
Do.	do.	No. 16—The whole.
Do.	do.	No. 17—The whole, except mauzas Tilkija, Gidhori, Dadar, Saraidih, Limdih, and Kapupahari.
Do.	do.	No. 20—Aurai, Supatarai, Rewabahar, Jampani and Kasipani.
Do.	do.	No. 21—Sidhapat.

B. P. STANDEN,

*Chief Secretary to the Chief Commissioner,**Central Provinces.*

## APPENDIX E.

## Orders defining areas to be summarily settled.

*Nagpur, the 5th April 1911.*

No. 272.—Under Section 63, Sub section (1), of the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, 1898, the Chief Commissioner directs that in the Uprora Zamindari and in the portions of the other Zamindaris of the Bilaspur district specified below, the rents payable by ordinary tenants shall not be fixed by the Settlement Officer at the time of Land Revenue assessment in the course of the Settlement now being made:—

Zamindari.	Tahsil.	Patwari Circle.	Name of village.
1	2	3	4
Chhuri	Janjgir	No. 3	Bhejrinara, Suklakhar, Birkona, Jhalkachbar, Ghuchapur (Ral), Amarpur ( <i>alias</i> Bagdewa).
		" 4	Sutarra.
		" 7	Jhaber.
		" 8	The whole, except mauzas Kachhar, Kouriaghat, Songurhat and Sonpuri.
Lapha	Bilaspur	No. 1	Jemra, Bagdara, Pahar-Jamri, Uran, Raha, Sapalwa-Hirwadoli, Barumiao, Telsara, Baisemar, Kermura, and Pahargaon.
		" 2	Barbhatha, Sirki, Rawa, and Banwar.
		" 4	Bagdaridand.
Matin	Do.	All the unsurveyed villages.	
Pendra	Do.	No. 10	Kesla.
		" 12	Khairjithi and Taoli.
		" 20	Baidkhodra, Karangra and Khamli.
		" 21	Marna, Kotariadanr, Gourkhera, Piperkhuti, Thengdana, Barjherka, Umarkhohi, Choktipani, Tawaruaaba, Amanala, Pandripani and Khodri.
Kenda	Do.	No. 1	Amagohan.
		" 2	Katra, Sonra, Nawapara, and Newaribahara.
		" 3	Kekradih, Sargor.
		" 4	Darsagar ( <i>alias</i> Kerpabandha).

R. C. H. MOSS KING,

*Third Secretary to the Chief Commissioner,**Central Provinces.*

# INDEX.

A		PAGES.
Abatement of rents and revenue	...	... 37
Aboriginal	...	... 5, 9, 11, 12, 13
Absolute-occupancy	...	... 44, 54, 81
Acre-rates	...	... 22
Acts, Tenancy and Land Revenue	...	... 13, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 54, 66, 69, 81
Additional rate	...	... 29, 60
After-crop	...	... 4, 6, 40
<i>Agaria</i>	...	... 10
Agriculture	...	... 14, 19, 44, 46, 47, 81
Akaltara	...	... 3
Assignees	...	... 50, 80
Amarkantak	...	... 24, 77
Ambagarh Chauki	...	... 73
Amlibahra	...	... 74
<i>Andeota</i>	...	... 14
Animism	...	... 14
<i>Ankuari</i>	...	... 14
Announcement	...	... 59, 61
Apparel	...	... 7
Area, cropped	...	... 4
„ surveyed villages	...	... 15
„ total	...	... 1, 74
„ tree forest	...	... 15
„ wheat	...	... 4
„ waste land mahal	...	... 15
„ Zamindari jungle	...	... 15
„ cultivated	...	... 22, 23, 74, 75
Attestation	...	... 4, 26, 38, 39, 44, 62
B		
<i>Bahra</i>	...	... 3, 40, 41
Baloda Assessment Report	...	... 20, 21
Baiga	...	... 72
<i>Barainkapat</i>	...	... 19
<i>Barapali</i>	...	... 18
<i>Barhon</i>	...	... 18, 19, 25
<i>Bare Banko</i>	...	... 40
<i>Bari</i>	...	... 5, 6, 40
Barren-waste	...	... 22
<i>Batar</i>	...	... 6
<i>Batra</i>	...	... 40
Bihar	...	... 10
Bengal	...	... 10, 33

Bengal-Nagpur Railway...	...	...	2, 3, 7, 11, 31, 33
Bengal Settlement	...	...	32
<i>Beora</i>	...	...	5, 15, 56, 72, 73, 74
Berar	...	...	2, 9
Bhatgaon	...	...	1, 2, 8, 9, 22, 30, 31, 33 to 38, 43, 52, 59, 61, 65, 69, 78
Bhimsen	...	...	15
Bhuihar	...	...	10
Bhumia	...	...	5, 58
<i>Bhut</i>	...	...	14
Bilaigarh-Katgi	...	...	1, 2, 8, 9, 22, 30, 31, 33 to 38 44, 52, 59, 61, 65, 78
Bimbaji	...	...	18
Binjhia	...	...	1
Binjhvars	...	...	5, 10, 11
<i>Bijra</i>	...	...	15
Bir Bikram Deo	...	...	79
Boundary	...	...	72 and following.
Brahmin	...	...	7, 8, 11, 15, 44, 45, 57, 80
<i>Byasi</i> (cross ploughing)...	...	...	36

## C

Caste	...	...	5, 8, 10, 44, 45
Census	...	...	7, 9, 36
Cesses	...	...	30, 49, 55 to 61, 80, 82
Chaitma	...	...	25
Champa	...	...	1 to 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 25, 26, 30 to 38, 44, 46, 50, 52, 53, 57, 61, 68, 69, 70, 78
Chamars	...	...	8, 10, 13, 44, 45
<i>Chaurasi</i>	...	...	18, 19
Chhuri	...	...	1, 3, 7, 9, 25, 30 to 32, 34, 36, 39, 42, 44, 52, 57 to 59, 61, 65, 66, 77, 78, 81
Chisholm's Report	...	...	2, 21, 22, 24 to 26, 58, 66, 69, 73, 74, 77
Chhota Nagpur	...	...	10, 13, 68
<i>Churail</i>	...	...	14
Communications	...	...	2, 3, 12, 15, 42
Commutation fees	...	...	58, 76
Concealment of rents	...	...	46, 60
Contractors	...	...	7, 11, 15, 16, 45
Co-operative Society	...	...	46
Court of Wards	...	...	3, 16, 25, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 43, 44, 54, 59, 65, 74, 78
Cowries	...	...	24
Crops	...	...	3, 6, 36, 38
Currency	...	...	11

# INDEX.

iii

## PAGES.

### D

<i>Dahiya</i> cultivation	...	...	...	5
<i>Dao</i>	...	...	...	18 to 21, 25, 31
<i>Darha</i>	...	...	...	40
Deities	...	...	...	11, 14
Demarcation	...	...	...	29, 72, 73, 74, 76, 78
Demonology	...	...	...	14
Denudation	...	...	...	16
Dewan	...	...	...	18, 19
Dhanpur	...	...	...	14
Dhanuhar	...	...	...	10, 11
Dharm	...	...	...	11
<i>Dhup</i>	...	...	...	16
Dhur-Gond	...	...	...	1
Dialect	...	...	...	1
Dispensaries	...	...	...	28, 56
<i>Dochandi</i>	...	...	...	75
Double-cropping	...	...	...	4, 6, 40, 41
Dues, irregular	...	...	...	30
<i>Dulhadeo</i>	...	...	...	14

### E

Embankment	...	...	...	5, 6
Encroachment	...	...	...	75
Enhancement	...	...	...	4, 28 to 31, 37, 39, 41 to 45, 48, 49, 53, 55, 58 to 60, 65, 79
Excise	...	...	...	11, 18, 24, 28, 29, 35, 45, 71, 79
Excision of excess waste	...	...	...	74 to 76
Export	...	...	...	3, 7, 47

### F

Factor	...	...	...	8, 38 to 41, 56
Factory	...	...	...	7, 12
Fallow	...	...	...	4 to 6, 22, 39, 45
Famine	...	...	...	2, 8, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, 65, 82
Ferries	...	...	...	18, 79
Feudatory States	...	...	...	73, 77,
Forest mahal	...	...	...	15, 28, 39, 50, 51, 55, 56, 58, 61
Forest produce	...	...	...	31, 50, 53, 73, 75, 79
Foreigners	...	...	...	10, 13
Forsyth	...	...	...	14, 16
Frost	...	...	...	6

### G

<i>Gabhar</i>	...	...	...	40
Ganiari	...	...	...	3

		PAGES.
Ganra	...	... 10, 44, 45
Gaontia	...	... 12, 19 to 21, 25 to 27, 31, 32, 43, 48, 62, 63, 65 to 71, 80, 81
Gaurasa	...	... 40, 41
Gazetteer	...	... 14
Geology	...	... 2
Ghamsan Dao	...	... 14, 19
Ghosts	...	... 14
Gohari	...	... 40
Gond	...	... 5, 7, 9 to 11, 13, 14, 32, 44, 45
Gram	...	... 4
Grazing dues	...	... 52, 58, 76
Groups	...	... 2, 39, 41, 68
Gurmatia	...	... 40
<b>H</b>		
Haihaibansi Kings	...	... 1, 10, 18
Halkabandi	...	... 63
Halwai	...	... 7
Hamlets	...	... 31, 73
Hareli	...	... 14
Harra	...	... 47
Head-loads	...	... 3
Headman	...	... 5, 9, 12, 13, 19, 20 to 22, 26, 27, 30, 32, 52, 57, 61 to 63, 65 to 72, 81
Home-farm	...	... 22, 26, 49, 51, 54, 56, 57, 66 to 68, 70
<b>I</b>		
Immigrants	...	... 5, 7, 10, 12, 34
Imports	...	... 7
Improvements	...	... 3, 5, 6, 11, 31, 80
Income-tax	...	... 35
Inter-marriage	...	... 10, 11
Intoxicants	...	... 11
Irrigation	...	... 6, 40, 41
<b>J</b>		
Janjgir	...	... 1, 2, 36, 63
<b>K</b>		
Kabir Panti	...	... 11
Kachhi	...	... 7
Kalar	...	... 7
Kamdar	...	... 69, 81
Katha	...	... 63
Katti Paidawar	...	... 47
Kamil-jama	...	... 23, 28, 30, 31, 49, 50 to 58, 60, 79, 80, 82

# INDEX.

v

			PAGES.
Kanteli	...	...	... 1, 2, 8, 9, 30 to 39, 43, 52, 53, 59, 63, 65, 78, 82
Kanwar	...	...	... 1, 5, 7, 9 to 11, 13, 21, 32, 44, 45
Kargi Road Station	...	...	... 2, 14
Kathghora	...	...	... 3, 64
Katni	...	...	... 2, 3, 7, 31, 33
Kauria	...	...	... 77
Kawardha	...	...	... 15, 58, 78
Kenda	...	...	... 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 16, 30 to 32, 34, 36 to 40, 44, 52, 54, 59, 61, 65, 78
Kewat	...	...	... 44, 45
Kharchari (grazing tax)...	...	...	... 59
<i>Kham</i>	...	...	... 57, 61, 62, 63
<i>Khandi</i>	...	...	... 3, 21, 22
Kol	...	...	... 14
Komoghat	...	...	... 3
Korba	...	...	... 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 39, 44, 46, 52, 54, 58, 59, 61, 65, 69, 74, 77, 78
<i>Korika Dao</i>	...	...	... 14, 19
Korwa	...	...	... 5, 10
Kosam	...	...	... 47
Kosgain	...	...	... 14
Kota	...	...	... 12
Kshatris	...	...	... 8
Kudurmāl	...	...	... 11
Kurmis	...	...	... 8, 44, 45
L			
Lac	...	...	... 7, 11, 12, 47, 50
<i>Lakabhata</i>	...	...	... 6
<i>Lakkai</i> (a tax on lac cultivation)	...	...	... 59
Lapha	...	...	... 1, 3, 7, 16, 25, 30 to 32, 34 to 36, 39, 44, 52, 54, 59, 61, 65, 73, 77, 78
<i>Lehi</i>	...	...	... 6
License fee	...	...	... 50
<i>Likhat</i> (fee for writing Kotwar's book)	...	...	... 59
Linseed	...	...	... 4, 6, 40
Lormi	...	...	... 78
M			
Madanpur	...	...	... 35
<i>Mahabir</i>	...	...	... 11, 15
Mahanadi	...	...	... 1, 2, 37, 43, 47
Mahato	...	...	... 5, 10
Mahua	...	...	... 47

		PAGE.
Maikal Mountains	...	1
Maize ( <i>Jondhri</i> )	...	5
<i>Malikana</i>	...	53, 57, 80
Malik-makbuza	...	26, 29, 54, 79, 80
Manjhi	...	10, 11, 68
Manjhwar	...	10, 11
Manure	...	5, 6, 40
Map-correction	...	39, 54, 79, 82
Marar	...	44
Marathas	...	21, 24, 25, 66, 79,
<i>Masahati Khasra</i>	...	54
Matin	...	1, 3, 7, 16, 25, 30 to 32, 34, 36, 39, 52, 54, 59, 61, 65, 74, 77, 78
Millets	...	5, 72
Mirzapur	...	3
Muhammadans	...	7, 10
Money-lenders	...	11, 12
Monsoon	...	2
Muafi grants	...	57
Mungeli	...	1, 2, 4, 8, 18, 24, 36, 63
Murwara	...	14
Mukaddam	...	21, 69
<b>N</b>		
<i>Nagar</i>	...	63
<i>Naka</i> (outpost)	...	50
<i>Nar</i>	...	3
Nawagarh	...	8, 18, 24
<i>Nasarana</i>	...	12, 28, 29, 46, 59, 70
<b>O</b>		
Opium	...	45
Orissa	...	10
<b>P</b>		
<i>Pach-kathiya</i> (fee for nistar)	...	59
Paddy	...	4, 22, 63
Pandaria	...	1, 2, 5, 8 to 10, 20, 21, 24, 25, 30, to 39, 43, 52, 53, 55, 59, 61, 63, 65, 78, 79, 82
Paikra	...	10, 21
Palas	...	47
Pali	...	14
Pandhri (tax)	...	28, 29, 35
Panika	...	10, 11, 44, 45
<i>Parcka</i> (rent certificate)...	...	60
Pardhan	...	18, 68
Patel	...	18 to 20, 26

# INDEX.

vii

		PAGES.
<i>Pattas</i> (deeds of grants)...	...	26, 80
Patwari cess	...	29, 60
Pendra	...	1 to 5, 7, 9, 16, 18, 22, 24, 25, 30 to 32, 34, 36 to 40, 42, 44, 48, 52, 55, 57 to 59, 61, 65, 73, 77,
Phuljhar	...	8
Pig	...	5
Pillars, boundary	...	78
Plough jama	...	22, 23
Population	...	1, 6 to 9, 13, 16, 32, 36, 72, 79
Police	...	11, 18, 28, 35, 71, 79
Post-office	...	56
Pounds	...	11, 18, 35, 71, 79
Prices	...	42
Privy Council	...	36, 62, 79
Protected Status	...	25, 26, 29, 32, 33, 38, 62, 66, 67 to 71, 75, 76, 79, 80

## Q

<i>Qabuliyats</i> (forms of acceptance)	...	39, 61, 62
---	-----	------------

## R

Railway	...	8, 16, 42
Rainfall	...	2, 16, 37
Raj-Gond	...	1
Rajputana	...	25
Raout	...	44
<i>Rapat</i> (reporting Kotwar)	...	62
Regularly settled areas	...	54
Religion	...	11, 13, 14
Rewa	...	3, 22, 36, 77
Rice	...	2, 3, 4, 5, 36
Ringling (of trees)	...	15, 16
Roads	...	28, 56
Ryotwari tenure	...	26, 27, 30, 32, 68

## S

Sub-lambardar	...	61
Saja	...	15
<i>Saktaha</i>	...	11, 15
Sakti	...	58
Sal (Sarai)	...	15, 16, 31
<i>Salahi</i> (tax)	...	59
Sanad	...	62
Sarais	...	56
<i>Sarah Majid</i> (tax)	...	59
Sarguja State	...	3, 77

		PAGES.
<i>Sarson</i>	...	... 5
<i>Saunta</i>	...	... 10
<i>Schools</i>	...	... 28, 56
<i>Sheorinarayan</i>	...	... 2, 66
<i>Siras</i>	...	... 15
<i>Siwai-income</i>	...	... 28, 31, 39, 47, 51 to 54, 57, 58, 62
<i>Sleepers</i>	...	... 7, 15, 47
<i>Sobhrai Dao</i>	...	... 14, 19
<i>Sonakhan</i>	...	... 78
<i>Subah</i>	...	... 19
<i>Subahdars</i>	...	... 20, 32
<i>Summary Settlement</i>	...	... 28, 29, 38, 53, 54
<i>Sub-proprietor</i>	...	... 15, 21, 25, 28, 30 to 33, 50 to 53, 55, 57, 60 to 62, 69, 71, 73, 74 to 76, 79 to 81
<i>Survey, Cadastral</i>	...	... 28, 33, 77
„ <i>Topographical</i>	...	... 39, 77
„ <i>Imperial Traverse</i>	...	... 33, 78
„ <i>Local Traverse</i>	...	... 33
„ <i>Stones</i>	...	... 33, 78

## T

<i>Tahlu or Tarar (Watchman)</i>	...	... 62
<i>Takoli</i>	...	... 18, 22, 24, 28 to 31, 35, 39, 48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 58 to 62, 79 to 82
<i>Taluq</i>	...	... 18, 19, 25
<i>Taluqdar</i>	...	... 18, 19, 25
<i>Tangar</i>	...	... 40
<i>Tanwar</i>	...	... 1, 10, 44, 45
<i>Teora</i>	...	... 40
<i>Teli</i>	...	... 8, 13, 44, 45, 46
<i>Thakur</i>	...	... 18, 19, 25, 26
<i>Theka-jama</i>	...	... 48, 51, 54 to 58, 61
<i>Tilsa</i>	...	... 15
<i>Tobacco</i>	...	... 5
<i>Transplanting</i>	...	... 6
<i>Trijunction</i>	...	... 33
<i>Tuman</i>	...	... 14

## U

<i>Udaipur</i>	...	... 77
<i>Uprora</i>	...	... 1, 3, 7, 16, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 52, 54, 59, 61, 65, 77, 78
<i>Urad</i>	...	... 3, 4, 6, 7, 40

# INDEX.

ix

	W	PAGES.
<i>Wajib-ul-ars</i>	...	26, 27, 29, 35, 39, 44, 47, 51, 54, 59, 62, 65, 68, 82
Wheel-tax	...	31
Wheat	...	4, 5, 36, 63

