

**REPORT**  
ON THE  
**ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES**  
UNDER THE  
**COURT OF WARDS**  
IN THE  
**PUNJAB**

*For the year ending 30th September 1930.*

12804



**Lahore :**

Printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, Punjab.

1931.

**Price : Rs. 2-4-0 or 3s. 5d.**

REPORT

ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES

COURT OF WARDS

FINANCIAL

TABLE

# REPORT

ON THE

## ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES

UNDER THE

### COURT OF WARDS

IN THE

### PUNJAB

*For the year ending 30th September 1930.*

**Lahore :**

Printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, Punjab.

1931.

## Revised List of Agents for the Sale of Punjab Government Publications.

### ON THE CONTINENT AND UNITED KINGDOM.

Publications obtainable either direct from the High Commissioner for India, at India House, Aldwych, London, W. C. 2, or through any bookseller.

### IN INDIA.

The GENERAL MANAGER, "The Qaumi Daler" and the Union Press, Amritsar.

MESSRS. D. B. TARAPOREWALA, SONS & Co., Bombay.

MESSRS. W. NEWMAN & Co., Limited, Calcutta.

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & Co., Calcutta.

MESSRS. RAMA KRISHNA & SONS, Lahore.

The SECRETARY, Punjab Religious Book Society, Lahore.

The MANAGER, University Book Agency, Lahore.

L. RAM LAL SURI, Proprietor, "The Students' Own Agency," Lahore.

L. DEWAN CHAND, Proprietor, The Mercantile Press, Lahore.

The MANAGER, Mufid-i-'Am Press, Lahore.

The PROPRIETOR, Punjab Law Book Mart, Lahore.

MR. D. PESTONJI, Stockists' Representative, Lahore.

The MANAGING PROPRIETOR, The Commercial Book Company, Lahore.

R. S. JAURA, Esq., B.A., B.T., The Students' Popular Depôt, Anarkali, Lahore.

MESSRS. THACKER, SPINK & Co., Simla.

The MANAGER, The English Book Depôt, Taj Road, Agra.

\*The MANAGING PARTNER, The Bombay Book Depôt, Booksellers and Publishers, Girgaon, Bombay.

\*The PROPRIETOR, The Book Company, Calcutta.

\*MESSRS. CHATTERJI & Co., Booksellers, 204, Cornwallis Street, Calcutta.

\*The MANAGER, Standard Book Depôt, Lahore.

\*The PROPRIETOR, Aftab Punjab General Law Book Agency, Lahore.

\*The MANAGER, Oxford Book and Stationery Co., The Mall, Lahore.

\*The PROPRIETOR, City Book Co., Post Box No. 283, Madras.

\*The MANAGER, The New Book Depôt, No. 79, The Mall, Simla.

**Review of the Annual Report on the Administration of estates under the Court of Wards in the Punjab for the year ending 30th September 1930.**

THE number of estates under the Court of Wards increased from 49 to 55. Nine new estates came under management and the affairs of the majority of these were in an involved state at the time of assuming control. It is this reason which generally compels most landlords to appeal to Government for assistance in this form, but there is a point at which Government must refuse to make itself responsible for the management of a hopelessly encumbered estate and the reference in the report to the impossibility of saving several of those now under management from total insolvency is a warning that Government have been unduly lenient in the past in taking over responsibility for the management of some which were beyond hope of recovery. With the great fall in the value of agricultural produce and consequently in rents, the Governor in Council fears that it will be a difficult task to save many estates which, though encumbered, when taken under superintendence, appeared to be solvent at that time. It is all the more necessary now, therefore, to study with great care the financial position of estates whose owners may seek the assistance of the Court of Wards in their troubles before taking them under superintendence.

2. It is somewhat surprising to find that the ordinary income of the estates which remained under superintendence from the previous year only showed a falling off from 19·8 to 19·2 lakhs. The full effect of the fall in prices will, however, doubtless be shown in succeeding years. The total rents from all the estates under superintendence, whether in cash or grain, amounted to 12·1 lakhs, and this works out at an average of almost exactly six rupees per cultivated acre. It is most improbable that this figure will be maintained, and indeed on the Mamdot estate, which alone account



for nearly one-third of the total area under cultivation, a substantial reduction has since had to be made.

3. The total assets of the estates are estimated at Rs. 6,34 lakhs. The Governor in Council would be glad if these estimates were made with more care in future and the figures were not automatically reproduced each year, as they are in the case of some estates. With the recent fall in the value of land and other property it is all the more desirable that the figures which are given should represent the existing market value of the properties to which they relate.

4. A big rise in the arrears of rents was noticed in last year's review. If it was disquieting then when the figure had risen to 4.33 lakhs, it must now be regarded as alarming when the figure stands, as it does, at 7.27 lakhs. This is no less than 60 per cent. of the total annual rent roll and is slightly more than the whole of the annual cash rents to which alone these arrears of course relate. Moreover, the balance is struck on a day, the 30th September, which is long after the normal time for recovery of the rabi rents. The explanation as given in the report for this serious state of affairs attributes it partly to bad management, but mainly to the economic depression of the cultivators. The Governor in Council would be disposed to interchange the relative importance which is to be ascribed to these two causes. The average rent per cultivated acre has been noted above as being six rupees, and it is difficult to accept the view that up to and including rabi 1930 prices had fallen to such an extent that this amount could not have been paid, though doubtless in a few cases where this average was exceeded difficulties would be experienced in collection. The Governor in Council, therefore, fears that considerable slackness has been shown in the collection of these dues—a collection which, moreover, becomes all the more difficult the longer it is delayed, and he desires that the Financial Commissioner should take steps to remedy this very unsatisfactory state of affairs at an early date.

5. Attention has been drawn in the report to the cost of management. It is misleading perhaps to take one year's returns, and deduce from them that the cost

of management of a particular estate is high as the income of that year may for some reason show a temporary falling off, but nevertheless the Governor in Council considers that the question of management requires very careful consideration particularly at a time when there must be an all-round falling off in revenue. Expenses, therefore, must be cut down, and in the case of many of the smaller estates especially it is the cost of management which eats up a very large share of the assets. The Governor in Council, therefore, desires that the Financial Commissioner should consider the possibility of amalgamating the management of several estates—especially the smaller ones—and placing them under one person. No hesitation should be felt moreover in dispensing with the services of managers who show by results that they are not efficient in every respect and great care should be exercised in the selection of persons for appointment.

6. *The Governor in Council is glad to notice that the Financial Commissioner is issuing instructions regarding a suitable minimum and maximum balance for each year, and he trusts that any sums in excess of that maximum will at once be invested to the best possible advantage.*

7. Estates under the Court of Wards, like those under private management, must be prepared to pass through trying times so long as the present economic depression continues, and everyone responsible for the efficient working of the Court of Wards must, therefore, do his utmost to guard against incurring expenditure, which the financial position of the particular estate does not fully warrant. It is only by drastic economy that many estates, which even in happier times were on the verge of bankruptcy, can possibly be saved.

By order of the Governor in Council,

J. W. HEARN,

*Secretary to Government, Punjab,*

*Revenue Department.*





**REPORT**  
ON THE  
**ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES**  
UNDER THE  
**COURT OF WARDS**  
IN THE  
**PUNJAB**

*For the year ending 30th September 1930.*

1. *Estates under management and those released and taken over.*—The previous year closed with 49 estates under the superintendence of the Court of Wards. During the year under report the following estates were taken under superintendence either (a) by reason of minority; or (b) at the request of the owners. No estate was taken under superintendence by Government of its own motion.

(a) Under Section 6, estates of—

- (1) S. Jaswant Singh of Ludbiana.
- (2) Sons of the late S. Jiwan Singh (Lahore).
- (3) Sons of the late Nawab Saif-ullah Khan (Muzaffargarh).

(b) Under Sections 5 (1) and 5 (2) (b), estates of —

- (1) S. B. S. Gurdit Singh of Shamgarh (Karnal).
- (2) Raja Dhian Singh of Sheikhpura.
- (3) Syed Ghulam Mohammad Shah, etc., of Jabanian Shah (Shahpur).
- (4) Ch. Hot Khan (Muzaffargarh).
- (5) M. Khuda Bakhsh (Muzaffargarh).
- (6) Sons of the late Jam Chiragh, Muzaffargarh.

The estates of Rampura (Gurgaon), Raipur (Ambala) and Rupi (Kangra) were released. Consequently 55 estates remained under superintendence at the end of the year. The statements appended to this report do not contain statistics for the estate of Killa Jiwan Singh and the four Muzaffargarh estates, as these were taken over towards the close of the year and enquiries into their affairs are not yet complete.

*S. Jaswant Singh of Ludhiana.*—The late S. B. Sardar Gajjan Singh had, before his death, expressed strong desire that his estate should be taken under the superintendence of the Court of Wards after his death. In view of the meritorious public services of the Sardar, this request was acceded to. At the time of his death, his son, S. Jaswant Singh, a minor, was studying at College.

*Estates of the sons of late S. Jiwan Singh (Lahore) and Nawab Saif-ullah Khan (Muzaffargarh)* were taken over to safeguard the interests of the minors.

*Shamgarh.*—The Shamgarh family is one of the Chauntis Ghar (thirty-four families) referred to in "Massy's Chiefs and Families of Note in the Punjab." The estate was taken under superintendence at the request of the owner who pleaded increasing infirmity. The old Sardar died after a brief illness, and the property of the son was continued under management.

*Sheikhupura Estate.*—The finances of the Sheikhpura estate were in a bad way and the estate was taken over on the application of its owner, Raja Dhian Singh, who found much difficulty in its management; it was formerly under the management of the late Sir Moti Sagar.

*Jahanianshah Estate.*—The Jahanianshah estate was also taken over by request on account of indebtedness and professed inability to manage.

*Estates of Ch. Hot Khan and M. Khuda Bakhsh of Muzaffargarh district* were taken under superintendence at the request of the wards.

*Estate of the late Jam Chiragh of Muzaffargarh* was taken over at the request of the adult sons, Jam Hashim Ali, Sultan Mahmud and Ali Mohammad. The shares of the minor sons (Mohammad Hussain, Wahid Bakhsh, Ghulam Kasim and Ghulam Sarwar) were also taken under the superintendence of the Court of Wards by the Financial Commissioner under Section 6 of the Act.

*Rampura Estate.*—Five rectangles being part of the property of R. B. Lt. Balbir Singh were taken over in 1925 as security for a loan of Rs. 35,000 at 6½ per cent. per annum. The loan was repaid from the sale-proceeds of these rectangles owned by the ward in Montgomery and the property released.

*Raipur Estate.*—This estate was placed under the Court of Wards in 1906 by order of Government under Section 5 (2) of the Court of Wards Act, and was released on 1st December 1929. During this period debts amounting to Rs. 1,41,000 were paid off, leaving 31,000 due to the Arnauli estate secured on the jagir. A considerable sum was spent on the education of Rao Baldeo Singh's two elder sons, who passed the Diploma Examination of the Aitchison College, Lahore. On release there was an increase of 124 acres of land held in proprietary right and the assets of the estate increased by nearly half-a-lakh of rupees from the date of assumption of charge.

*Rupi Estate.*—The Rupi estate was involved in debt to the extent of Rs. 1,00,840 at the time of assumption of charge in 1921. The entire debt has been redeemed and the income of the estate has increased from Rs. 21,900 to Rs. 24,800 per annum. The eldest ward is an intelligent young man, and will take up judicial work in his *waziri*.

2. *Income and expenditure.*—The total gross income was Rs. 25·4 lakhs as against Rs. 23·3 lakhs last year. The income of the new estates comes to Rs. 2·8 lakhs while last year's income of the 3 estates, which were released, was about Rs. 5 lakhs. So in the estates neither added nor released income was steady.

Extraordinary income includes sale of land '53, loan taken '76 and loans repaid 1'2. The total ordinary income of the estates under superintendence amounted to Rs. 21'9 lakhs as against Rs. 20'2 lakhs last year. But in the estates neither added nor released there is a decrease from 19'8 to 19'2 lakhs. The ordinary income of all the estates under management for the whole or part of the year is made up as follows :—

				Rs.
Jagir	...	...	...	6'6 lakhs.
Cash rents	...	...	...	7'1 "
Sale of grain	...	...	...	5'0 "
Other income	..	...	...	3'2 "
				Total
			...	21'9 "

The total assets of the estates are estimated at Rs. 6,34 lakhs. The ordinary income is, therefore, about 3 per cent of the estimated assets. But 430 lakhs of the assets represent estimates of the value of land and houses made at different periods which cannot be relied on as representing their present value.

The percentage of land revenue on the income from agricultural land still shows remarkable variations ranging from 3'0 per cent. in Chak Haidarabad to 542'7 per cent. in the Attari estate. In 10 estates it is below 10 per cent. in 20 it is between 10 per cent. and 25 per cent. In 11 it is between 25 per cent. and 50 per cent. This leaves the following :—

Farrukhnagar	...	...	...	50'7
Sohana	...	...	...	199'4
Ber Khurd	...	...	...	65'1
Buttar	...	...	...	160'8
Attari	...	...	...	542'7
Sheikhupura	...	...	...	123'9
Jahanian Shah	...	...	...	74'0
Dharek	...	...	...	134'7

In Farrukhnagar the high percentage is due to arrears of land revenue and cesses having been paid.

In Sohana there are no serious arrears and the normal rents appear to be Rs. 700 as against Rs. 1,400 land revenue. This will be enquired into.

In Ber Khurd, Attari, Sheikhpura and Jahanian Shah the percentage appears due to arrears of rent.

In Buttar and Dharek it is due to agricultural produce having been held up in the mistaken hope of better prices.

These cases show that it is not possible to draw any profitable conclusion from a comparison between the figures of land revenue paid and rents received in any one year. Gross expenditure rose from 22·0 to 26·7 lakhs. 8·8 lakhs were spent on investment loans and debt transactions, including 3 lakhs repayment of debts, 2·2 lakhs purchases of securities, 1·5 lakh purchases of land, and 1·3 lakh loans. Of this last figure, 1 lakh were lent by the Mamdot Estate to Manauli.

1·4 lakhs were spent on permanent improvements.

The total ordinary expenditure also increased from Rs. 16 lakhs last year to Rs. 17·9 lakhs, but ignoring estates added or released there is an increase from 15·8 to 15·9 only. Taking all estates included in the returns, the cost of management was this year 15·7 per cent. of the ordinary expenditure and 12·8 per cent. of the ordinary income as compared with 16 and 12·3 last year. These figures indicate no material variation on the whole in the cost of management.

Taking individual estates the Financial Commissioner finds that out of the 52 estates submitting returns in 17 the cost of management was less than 10 per cent. of ordinary income. In 13 it was between 10 and 15 per cent, in 9 it was between 15 and 25. This leaves 13 where cost of management calls for special notice. Out of these, Raipur has been released, and Jahanian Shah, which

has only just been taken over does not yet afford a basis for judgment. The others are :—

			Percentage.	Ordinary income. Rs.
Behk	...	...	33·6	18,000
Buttar	...	...	85·8	3,000
Malout	...	...	33·1	10,000
Mitha Tiwana	...	...	34·7	18,000
Heirs of R. B. S. Boota Singh			42·1	17,000
Dharek	...	..	154·7	2,000
Bahtar	...	...	26·3	10,000
Dab Kalan	...	...	28·4	41,000
Jalalpur Pirwala	...	...	29·9	24,000
Shujabad	...	...	25·2	15,000

In none of these estates was the cost of management last year as much as 26 per cent., and these high percentages simply mean that either the sale of produce has been held up in the hope of better prices or it has not been possible to collect cash rents.

3. *Assets and Liabilities.*—5·7 lakhs were added to assets in various forms. Investments in purchase of land were smaller than last year and amounted to only 5 lakh. Land worth Rs. 10,000 was purchased by the estate of S. Jaswant Singh, son of the late S. B. S. Gajjan Singh of Ludhiana. The Kalabagh estate sold 28 acres for Rs. 16,200 and purchased 47 acres for Rs. 23,500. Securities worth Rs. 2·2 lakhs were purchased as against those worth Rs. 10,000 only purchased last year. The Mamdot estate alone invested 1·6 lakhs, Amb and S. Jaswant Singh come next in order with Rs. 42,500 and Rs. 15,000, respectively. Loans secured on immovable property were made by the Mamdot and Kalabagh estates to the extent of Rs. one lakh and Rs. 18,000, respectively.

In paragraph 3 of Government review on the report of the last year particular mention was made of the surplus funds of the estates lying idle in treasuries and banks. Cash in treasuries and banks remains as high



as last year ; in fact, it is even higher in the estates of Sidhowal, Buria, Rani Chhaunian, S. Kesri Singh, Nowshera Nangli and Kalabagh. The Financial Commissioner, however, feels that it is impossible to estimate the effect of this without some attempt to arrive at a reasonable working balance. On October 1, the estates can expect no more income until the *kharif* cash rents have been collected and the *kharif* produce sold – a process not likely to be complete until the end of January. Moreover, the estate should not be in the position of being forced to sell for want of ready cash. It is, therefore, impossible to say without a detailed examination of the estate that a manager is not acting prudently who keeps in hand on October 1st, 40 per cent. of his ordinary income. On this standard cash balances on October 1st should have been 8,76,000 whereas only 7,86,000 were in the treasury. At the same time there is no doubt that while some estates kept much less than this, others exceeded this generous limit—for example—

			40% income.	Actual balance.
				Rs.
Sidhowal	...	...	38,000	62,000
Buria	...	...	33,000	61,000
Amb	...	...	16,000	34,000
Iftikhar-ud-Din	...	...	13,000	46,000
Rani Chhaunian	...	...	22,000	39,000
Kesri Singh	...	...	12,000	20,000
Nowshera Nangli	...	...	9,000	24,000
Dharek	...	...	1,000	13,000
Kalabagh	...	...	47,000	1,15,000

In the case of Sidhowal investment has been held up on account of the impending partition of the estate.

The Financial Commissioner proposes to lay down a minimum and maximum balance for each estate, and then

to explore the possibility of pooling the liquid resources of the estates. It is not reasonable to expect of the ordinary manager of an estate that he should know how to invest to the best advantage. Assets include 2·5 lakhs loaned to other estates under the Court of Wards. The *per contra* item is 1·98 of liabilities—the discrepancy may be due to a loan to an estate under another Government. Assets also include 7·8 lakhs loaned to private persons on the security of landed property. It is a defect in the form of the statements that interest on these loans is lumped under “other income”, and that there is no means of ascertaining if there are arrears of interest or default in repayments. For example, the Dharek estate has lent  $\frac{1}{2}$  lakh, but the whole of the “other income” is only Rs. 400. The recovery of principal and interest on these loans will be an increasing cause of anxiety, while the agricultural depression continues.

4. *Reduction of Debt.*—Total liabilities increased from 34 to 36·6 lakhs, but their comparison like others are of little value when the estates under management in the two years are not the same. The new estates of Shamgarh, Sheikhpura and Jahanian Shah with liabilities of 4·8 more than account for the difference. The liabilities of the estates at management were 63 lakhs. The real debt position is shown as follows :—

	Rs.
Income from sale of land and houses	73,000
“    “    loans	1,20,000
	<hr/>
	1,93,000
Expenditure on payment of debts	3,09,000
“    “    purchase of land and houses	49,000
“    “    purchase of securities	2,21,000
“    “    secured loans	1,27,000
	<hr/>
	7,06,000

The liabilities are made up as follows :—

Loans from Government 1·29 lakhs, of which 1·18 are due from Attari.

Other sums due to Government 1·1 lakhs chiefly on account of unpaid *nazrana*.

Loans from other Court of Wards, 1·98 lakhs.

Loans from other persons, 32 lakhs.

The following statement shows the estates (excluding those recently taken over) where liabilities exceed two years' ordinary income, with the amount they have been able to devote during the year to the extinction of debt :—

...	Liabilities	Repaid.	Ordinary income.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Farrukhnagar ... ..	36,000	300	13,000
Ramgarh ... ..	39,000	4,000	9,000
Buttar ... ..	1,23,000	7,000	3,000
Malout ... ..	1,29,000	8,000	10,000
Najm-ud-Din ... ..	3,22,000	5,000	16,000
Attari ... ..	1,18,000	15,000	13,000
Mitha Tiwana ... ..	62,000	4,000	18,000
Rai Bahadur Boola Singh ...	16,17,000	200	17,000
Shujabad ... ..	1,23,000	5,000	16,000
Khan Bahador Sardar Din Mohammad Khan.	91,000	2,600	14,000
Sardar Manzur Ahmad Khan	31,500	...	9,000

The Farrukhnagar estate has been unable to pay its instalments of principal or interest either to Government

or to Sidhowal. Ramgarh could pay off its debt in 20 annual instalments of 3,600 and appears to be working as well as can be expected on a small margin. Buttar and Malout are probably hopelessly insolvent, and the question of their release on that account is under consideration. There is a prospect of the creditors of the estate of Khan Sahib Najam-ud-Din accepting a sum in composition which can be reasonably met by the sale of land. Attari is reported to be in default with 5 instalments on account of the loan it owes to Government, and only succeeded in making a payment of 15,000 by the sale of land. The estate is managed practically without cost by the Deputy Commissioner, but all its assets are the jagir of Rs. 13,000 and land valued at  $\frac{3}{4}$  lakh leased for Rs. 6,000, which rent it has not been possible to recover. Mitha Tiwana is making reasonable progress with the reduction of liabilities, which were  $2\frac{3}{4}$  lakhs in 1919.

The estate of the late Rai Bahadur Boota Singh is still in some confusion on account of its entanglement with the company of Rai Bahadur Boota Singh and Sons, as to which legal opinion is being taken. So far no scheme of management has been prepared, and it has not been found possible to deal with any assets other than the immoveable property.

Shujabad's debts are worse off than when charge was assumed in 1926—liabilities Rs. 1,23,000 against Rs. 1,10,000, but it has lent Rs. 9,000 on security. The instalment of Rs. 5,000 was paid by the sale of a house. It was intended to pay off debts by the sale of land, but no purchasers are now to be found. The estate appears to be in a somewhat precarious position.

The estate of K. B. Sardar Din Mahammad Khan is in a very serious position, and the alternatives of redeeming the debt by the sale of land or of releasing it are before Government.

5. *Arrears of rent.*—Recoverable arrears have almost doubled this year, having increased from Rs. 4·3 lakhs last year to Rs. 7·3 lakhs and are now more than 100 per cent. of rents collected. Of this amount, the new estate of Sheikhupura accounts for Rs. 1·4 lakhs.

The table below shows the more important accumulations of arrears :—

Estate.	LAST YEAR.		YEAR UNDER REPORT.	
	Collections.	Arrears.	Collections.	Arrears.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Sidbawal ... ..	66,000	24,000	42,000	23,000
Buria ... ..	5,000	17,000	17,000	15,000
Manauli ... ..	19,000	25,000	20,000	21,000
Anandpur ... ..	13,000	24,000	14,000	22,000
Kariarpur ... ..	31,000	15,000	33,000	23,000
Mamdot ... ..	2,28,000	82,000	3,13,000	1,52,000
Behk ... ..	5,000	27,000	2,000	35,000
M. Iftikhar-ud-Din ... ..	35,000	9,000	23,000	20,000
Rani Chhaunian ... ..	54,000	22,000	46,000	29,000
S. Kesri Singh ... ..	20,000	43,000	20,000	46,000
Attari ... ..	500	24,000	200	36,000
Jamal Khan ... ..	2,000	19,000	...	25,000

Rupees 12,000 out of Rs. 20,000 have since been recovered in the estate of M. Iftikhar-ud-Din. Suits for recovery of rents have been instituted by Rani Chhaunian, Nowshera Nangli, Attari, Chak Haiderabad and Mitha Tiwana estates, while S. Kesri Singh estate has obtained decrees amounting to about Rs. 30,000, but executions have proved fruitless.

In regard to paragraph 4 of the Government review of the last year's report, a circular was issued to all Commissioners requesting them to insist upon suitable measures being adopted to secure prompt realization of arrears of rent. In the opinion of the Financial Commissioner the existence of heavy arrears could not be altogether dissociated from the choice of the managers. An example of this is Rs. 8,000 produce rent misappropriated by the tenants of the Behk Estate through the

neglect of the late manager. No doubt some of the present arrears could have been avoided—in Buria, for example, there seem to have been a year's delay in instituting a suit. Instructions were, therefore, issued that there need be no hesitation in discharging managers who had proved themselves unable to collect rents. The tendency to select managers from the district ministerial staff and from pensioned officials long past hard work was also deprecated, as in some cases the interest of the estates had been sacrificed to the desire to do a good turn to candidates for office. At the same time it is the present Financial Commissioner's opinion that the chief cause of these arrears is to be found in the fall of prices, and real inability of tenants to pay. It is of importance to note that wherever leases have fallen in tenants have either secured much lower rents or succeeded in changing to cash rents, and it is to be observed that the large and well managed estate of Mamdot has not been able to steer the tide of arrears. The fact has to be faced that many arrears are at present irrecoverable, and it has also to be put to the credit of the administration that although arrears have increased, actual realizations have also increased from 6·4 to 7·1 lakhs. A considerable part of the arrears consists of money for which decrees have been awarded, e.g., Rs. 30,000 in the estate of S. Kesri Singh. The execution of decrees present great difficulty.

6. *Cash and Batai rents.*—The general practice of the Court of Wards to encourage cash as against *batai* rents has suffered a set-back in the year under report owing to the fall in prices and the refusal in many cases of tenants to tender for cash rents. At the same time the Financial Commissioner adheres to the view that where possible cash rents are to be preferred to *batai*, and that it is easier to accept a reasonable cash rent even if it is lower than the expectation from *batai*. In this connection the Financial Commissioner observes that several estates were misguided enough to hold up produce for a rise. He does not think that either Deputy Commissioners or Managers possess the skill (if indeed anyone possesses it) to gamble on the market in this way; and he thinks that over a period of years nothing will be found more profitable than to sell the harvest at



current rates provided always that surplus cash is promptly invested.

7. *Expenditure on Improvements.*—A sum of Rs. 1·38 lakhs was spent on permanent improvements as compared with Rs. 86,000 last year. The expenditure of Rs. 72,000 was incurred by the Mamdot estate mainly on additions and alterations to existing property. Rs. 7,000 were spent on the construction of buildings for the Health Centre at Jalalabad and Rs. 8,000 on repairs to roads. The new wells were sunk at a cost of Rs. 6,000. The Kalabagh estate spent Rs. 22,000 on permanent improvements, of which Rs. 17,000 represent part payment on account of the construction of shops at Burewala and Arifwala mandis in the Nili Bar Colony. Rs. 2,000 were spent on repairs and alterations to the Nawab's bungalow at Kalabagh. In Kartarpur a new house was constructed for the ward and his mother at a cost of Rs. 9,000. New wells were sunk at a total cost of Rs. 3,500. A residential bungalow was constructed for the ward of Chak Haiderabad in the Sheikhpura district at a cost of Rs. 5,000. Of the total of 1·37 lakhs, Rs. 72,000 were in Mamdot; Rs. 22,000 in Kalabagh; Rs. 13,000 in Kartarpur; Rs. 6,000 in Chak Hyderabad and Rs. 5,000 each in the estates of Sidhowal and Khan Bahadur Muhammad Jamal Khan—total 1·23 lakhs in 6 estates, leaving Rs. 15,000 for the remaining 52, of which Rs. 10,000 was spent in sums of Rs. 1,000 or over in 5 estates. In the remaining 47 the amount spent was nothing or negligible. From these figures it would appear that a good deal more could be done in the way of permanent improvements, more especially improvements affecting the productivity of the estate. But the figures in the statement do not always give the whole of the sum that could properly be booked to this head—these 29 wells were reconditioned in the Shah Jiwana estate, which only shows Rs. 159 spent on permanent improvements.

8. *Agricultural Developments.*—A plot of land called "Moti Bagh" (Pearl Garden) in Kartarpur was used as a demonstration farm. Improved varieties of sugarcane and Molisoni cotton were planted with good results. It is hoped that this will prove a model farm in the neighbourhood and will provide the tenants of the estate with improved seeds. The Jalalabad (Mamdot) Farm is doing

appreciable work in popularising the use of modern implements and improved varieties of seed among the tenants of the estate. The sheep farm is making satisfactory progress and so is the cattle farm at Chak Hirak. The latter was started with ten cows and one bull in 1926 and now possesses 42 animals at present. The Co-operative Union Bank at Jalalabad continued to help the tenants by making advances for purchase of seed and bullocks. Both these institutions have proved useful to the estate tenants. *Killabandi* has been introduced in all the estate villages in Ferozepore district and has facilitated the distribution of canal water. Consolidation of holdings still remains to be done in some villages and will be taken in hand shortly.

In the Mitha Tiwana estate the experiment of introducing modern implements again coincided with a year of insufficient rainfall, and in the riverain tracts the flood in the Jhelum destroyed all the standing crops. *Corbynwah*, an inundation canal, remained closed, except for a few days, for want of proper repairs to the water-courses damaged by the flood. In the months of June and July it had to be closed for repairs to the railway line. This caused considerable loss to the estate as the *kharif* crop could not be irrigated, nor could the land be prepared for the following *rabi* sowings. This had a bad effect on grazing also, and the tenants of the estate could not conveniently get drinking water for their cattle. The Executive Engineer of the Canal Department has been approached in the matter.

The use of modern implements and improved wheat and cotton seed in the Tarkhanwala estate has given satisfactory results. The produce of the estate is preferred by grain dealers and purchasers. Wheat of the estate was sold at Rs. 4-1-0 per maund, while the wheat of the neighbouring *ilaga* did not fetch more than Rs. 3-12-0 per maund. The quality of cotton was also improved. This year also the canal remained closed owing to the damage caused by floods in the Jhelum, but the wells, which were brought into working order, last year, proved very beneficial and profitable. Pumps sunk in the houses of all the three widows for supplying drinking water have proved so successful that tenants

of the estate living at Tarkhanwala have begun to sink similar pumps in their houses.

Modern implements and improved seed of good quality were used in the Shah Jiwana estate in the Jhang district. Twenty-nine old wells were reconditioned to meet the scarcity of canal water.

9. *Miscellaneous.*—The Sidhowal estate spent Rs. 5,500 on the betrothal ceremony of Kanwar Sher Jang Singh, the younger ward. Two polo ponies were purchased for the elder ward, Bhai Fateh Jhang Singh, at a cost of Rs. 3,400.

Rupees 700 were spent on the marriage of the Lambagraon (Kangra) ward's daughter, who was married to the Raja of Rampur Bashahr in the Simla district.

Rupees 1,500 were given to Tikka Lachhman Singh of Amb in Hoshiarpur district for the performance of ceremonies on the fourth anniversary of his wife's death (*charsali*).

The Kartarpur estate had to spend Rs. 4,800 in defending suits filed by the Shiromani Gurdawara Prabandhak Committee before the Gurdwara Tribunal for possession of the Baoli Sahib Gurdwara situated in the heart of Lahore City. The Tribunal has decreed possession of one block in favour of the Committee and has awarded the remaining portion to the Kartarpur estate.

The consolidation of holdings in the Ber Khurd estate (Ludhiana) has been completed successfully in five villages. The figures are striking: 591 fields being consolidated into 13 blocks. A good example of consolidation work was the exchange of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  acres of *barani* land situated at a distance of 3 miles for a plot of *chahi* land in the headquarters of the estate.

The delay in the decision of succession to the Mamdot estate is acting unfavourably on agricultural developments and on tenants who now hold under annual leases instead of for long terms.

A Health Centre was started at Jalalabad (Mamdot) in August 1929 for the purpose of training *dais*. It is reported to be very popular now.

Schemes of rural uplift and village sanitation taken in hand last year in Behk (Ferozepore) estate have had to be postponed owing to financial stringency.

The death of a widow of Sodhi Balwant Singh may add about 3,000 ghumaons of land to the Buttar estate.

A new car was purchased for Rs. 6,000 by Rani Chhaunian (Lahore). Repairs to a temple at Batti, District Meerut (United Provinces), were carried out at a cost of Rs. 1,440. A sum of Rs. 1,000 was paid on the occasion of the birth of a child to the niece of the ward.

Rupees 3,000 were spent on the betrothal of Amir Abdullah Khan, ward of the Tarkhanwala estate (Shahpur) to the daughter of Nawab Muzaffar Khan, Director of Information Bureau, Punjab.

Annual repairs to the Sarfaraz Khan Canal (Mianwali) were carried out at a cost of Rs. 8,000. Owing to damage done by hailstorms Rs. 7,200 were advanced to the tenants of the Kalabagh estate for purchase of seed.

The marriage of the ward of Dab Kalan estate was celebrated with the daughter of Sir Fazl-i-Husain in April 1930. The expenditure amounted to over Rs. 20,000.

A sum of Rs. 1,000 was spent on the funeral expenses of Mian Lutf Hussain Khan of Hajipur (Dera Ghazi Khan).

10. *Education and training.*—Sodhi Harbhajan Singh of Anandpur (Hoshiarpur) having failed twice in the Diploma Examination left the Aitchison College and is now working as Assistant Manager of the estate. The younger ward, Sodhi Harautar Singh, is now studying in the Prince of Wales' College, Debra Dun, in preparation for entrance to the Royal Military College at Sandhurst.

K. Harcharan Singh, son of the ward Sardar Kesri Singh, has been successfully carrying out the duties of honorary manager.

M. Iftikhar-ud-Din of Baghbanpura will shortly complete his studies at Balliol College, Oxford, and is expected to return in the coming year.

Raja Dbian Singh of Sheikhupura is being associated with the management of his estate in order to qualify him for supervision of his property when it is released.

Malak Sher Muhammad Khan, son of the ward of Mitha Tiwana, has been awarded a commission in the Territorial Force, but has not been confirmed yet. He was appointed an Assistant Manager of the estate, but is reported to be somewhat indifferent to his duties.

The only grandson of Khan Muhammad Nawaz Khan, Isa Khel Chief, is being educated at the Chiefs' College, and is reported to be progressing well.

Malik Amir Muhammad Khan of Kalabagh returned from England. His educational expenses, including guardian's allowances as well as the cost of a motor car purchased in England, amounted to Rs. 30,600.

S. Mubarik Ali Shah, a ward of the Shah Jiwana estate in Jhang, was elected as Member of the Punjab Legislative Council. S. Abid Ali Shah, the younger ward, again stood second in form VI at the Aitchison College, Lahore.

S. Muhammad Nawaz Khan of Dab Kalan Estate left the Aitchison College after his marriage. He received training at the Agricultural College, Lyallpur, for three months.

The eldest son of Khan Bahadur Nawab Muhammad Jamal Khan of Dera Ghazi Khan is studying for his degree examination in the Government College, Lahore. His second son, Sardar Ata Muhammad Khan, a youth of much promise, passed his Senior Cambridge Examination at St. Paul's School, Darjeeling, and has been sent to a coaching establishment in England, with a view to entering Oxford University. He is under the guardianship of the High Commissioner for India.

In addition to the above, wards of the following estates are at the Aitchison College :—

Sidhowal, Arnauli, Buria, Ber, Behk, Nowshera Nangli, Shamsheer Ali Khan, Chak Haiderabad, Mitha Tiwana, Bahtar, Isa Khel, Shah Jiwana.



M. Zain-ud-Din of the Farrukhnagar estate was recalled from the Aitchison College and admitted into the Rewari High School.

Tika Bhopindar Singh of Jharauli is in the Government High School, Karnal.

The children of the ward at Sohana are receiving instructions at a local school.

S. Jasbir Singh of the estate of Rai Bahadur Sardar Boota Singh is reading at the D. A.-V. College, Rawalpindi.

Thakur Prithi Chand, the youngest ward of the Lahaul estate, is studying in the Intermediate College, Dharmsala.

The ward of the Dharek estate is at Queen Mary's College, Lahore.

The only estate where the education of the ward is reported as unsatisfactory is that of Ghugh.

Young ladies of the following estates are being educated at Queen Mary's College :—

Arnauli, Buria, Ber, Behk, Sheikhupura.

11. *Notice of officers.*—Nawabzada Ahsan Ullah Khan of Kunjpura, General Manager of the Court of Wards estates in Karnal District, is reported to have done another year's good work.

S. Pritam Singh has done well in the difficult charge of the Manauli estate.

M. Jagnandan Singh has been successful with consolidation of holdings in the Ber Khurd estate in Ludhiana District.

Lala Jai Narain retired from the managership of the Kartarpur estate on account of age leaving a good record of service.

Khan Sahib Sh. Nazir Ahmad Khan has managed the Mamdot estate with intelligence and energy throughout the year, and has shown much ability in handling the small tenants who have been hit by the fall in prices.



Khan Sahib Mirza Mehdi Hussain, Manager of the Sheikhpura estate, takes keen interest in his work, and by his energy and whole-hearted devotion has secured the confidence of the Raja.

Lala Parma Nand, retired Extra Assistant Commissioner, has done another year of good work as General Manager in the Multan district.

The Financial Commissioner, Development, wishes to place on record his appreciation of the efforts made by the district officers to carry on the administration of the estates under their charge at a time when the heavy burden of political work has prevented some Deputy Commissioners from devoting as much attention as they would have liked to give to this interesting work. Initiative and constructive ideas ought to be supplied by the managers of the estates, but it is too often the case that they fail to rise above the performance of the daily routine, and when they do it becomes necessary for Deputy Commissioners to supply the want. There is much to be said for the suggestion of the Commissioner, Jullundur, that each estate should be made the special charge of one of the District Gazetted Staff.

12. *Guardian and Wards Act.*—In one estate (that of Padri Kalan in Amritsar) the Deputy Commissioner is guardian under the Guardians and Wards Act.

Division.	District.	Serial No.	Name of Estate.	Name of Ward.	Date of birth of Ward, if a minor.	Date of assumption of charge.	Section or Sub-section of Act applicable.	Annual value of jagir.	LAND HELD IN PROPRIETARY RIGHTS.					Serial No.	
									Total area.	Cultivated area.	Land revenue assessment.	Total liabilities on assumption of charge.	Total assets on assumption of charge.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
								Rs.	Acres.	Acres.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		
AMBALA	Gurgaon	1	Farrukhnagar	Khan Muhammad Siraj-ud-Din Haidar Khan	..	3-7-1923	Section 5 (1) of Court of Wards Act	4,640	6,323	3,655	6,164	49,003	6,78,787	1	
		2	Rampura	Captain R. B. Balbir Singh, O.B.E.	..	26-1-1925	ditto ditto	..	125	125	..	38,000	50,000	2	
		3	Sidhowal	B. Fateh Jang Singh	..	29-3-1909	4-6-1918	Section 6 of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	44,936	1,459	1,454	8,260	1,22,794	13,54,092	3
	Karnal	4	Arnauli	B. Subhsher Singh	..	4-1-1914	3-11-1918	ditto ditto	58,393	1,048	540	1,108	67,889	16,67,178	4
		5	Jharsauli	S. Bhupinder Singh	..	5-1-1917	4-10-1925	ditto ditto	1,006	661	226	430	1,16,119	1,82,206	5
		6	Shamgarh	S. Harindar Singh	..	9-3-1926	23-6-1926	Section 5 (1) and (2), (6) of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	4,268	2,265	1,452	2,064	1,18,776	3,21,100	6
			S. Bahadur S. Gurdit Singh	..	1-1-1930	1-3-1930									
	Ambala	7	Raipur	S. Gurbaksh Singh	..	..	1-3-1930	Section 5 (2) (d) of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	4,915	4,947	2,569	1,347	1,13,002	2,61,740	7
		8	Burki	Rao Baldeo Singh	..	13-8-1876	19-6-1906	Section 6 of Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	53,240	4,371	3,026	5,666	4,900	26,76,223	8
		9	Sohana	S. Lal Amol Singh	..	31-10-1920	3-9-1921	Section 5 (2) (d) of Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	9,154	251	88	620	62,875	2,28,349	9
	Jullundur	10	Manauli	S. Dev Indar Singh	..	19-2-1900	16-6-1928	Section 5 (2) (d) of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	49,905	4,474	2,843	8,536	1,51,221	22,56,211	10
		11	Ramgarh	S. Umrao Singh	..	15-6-1896	25-6-1928	ditto ditto	5,877	2,205	649	984	66,496	1,87,143	11
12		Lambagraon	Mian Ajmer Singh	..	9-8-1897	27-9-1928	ditto ditto	2,000	5,216	1,210	12	21,323	61,713	12	
Kangra	13	Lahaul	M. Daljit Chand	..	..	4-4-1888	Section 35 (g), Act IV of 1872, as amended by Act XII of 1878.	..	533	664	337	718	23,683	1,21,952	13
	14	Rupi	Thakar Abhai Chand	..	14-4-1909	14-10-1923	Section 5 (1) and 6 of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	19,125	2,290	2,290	1,523	1,00,837	6,72,801	14	
			Thakar Partab Chand	..	1-1-1911	1-1-1911									
Hoshiarpur	15	Amb	Mt. Rigzan Angmo	..	8-8-1914	..	Section 6 (3) (b) (c) of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	22,135	1,922	772	1,284	..	10,19,183	15	
			Rai Bhagwant Singh	..	20-10-1907	1915									
	16	Bhabaur	Kanwar Dhanwant Singh	..	1913	1913	Section 5 (2) (d) of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	847	1,949	390	836	47,645	71,190	16	
Jullundur	17	Anandpur	Thakur Durga Singh	..	5-10-1902	20-12-1928	Section 45 of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	4,400	2,209	900	4,861	12,300	17,36,348	17	
			M. Sandev Singh	..	19-8-1904	30-10-1909									
	18	Kartarpur	M. Hardev Singh	..	30-10-1909	29-4-1919	Section 6 of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	13,500	12,023	9,538	7,825	27,000	14,21,216	18	
Ludhiana	19	Ber Khurd	M. Shivdev Singh	..	3-3-1910	..	Section 6 of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	19,170	912	504	1,612	78,940	7,97,297	19	
			Rai Savitra Chand	..	15-1-1906	7-1-1919									
	20	S. Jawant Singh	S. Harbhajan Singh	..	4-9-1911	6-2-1923	Section 6 of Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	600	1,322	1,322	8,000	10,031	11,58,372	20	
Ferozepore	21	Mamdot	S. Har Antar Singh	..	14-1-1918	..	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	76,783	68,619	61,264	60,480	3,67,647	66,05,638	21	
			Guru Amarjit Singh	..	20-12-1927	9-2-1929									
	22	Bohk	S. Harwant Raj Singh	..	15-1-1921	24-1-1922	Section 6 of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	235	9,330	8,351	3,524	16,849	23,18,000	22	
Lahore	23	Shamsher Ali Khan	S. Jawant Singh	..	17-7-1912	1-11-1929	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	..	75	75	..	..	40,998	23	
			M. Ghulam Qutb-ud-din Khan	..	13-10-1889	20-1-1891									
	24	Buttar	M. Muhammad Sarwar	..	12-2-1916	2-11-1922	Section 5 (2) (a) and (d) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	1,069	1,821	1,700	897	1,23,772	9,84,066	24	
Lahore	25	Malout	Sahibzada Shamsher Ali Khan	..	7-2-1917	22-9-1925	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	..	2,306	2,161	839	1,39,188	14,23,769	25	
			M. Iftikhar-ud-din	..	8-4-1907	21-3-1918									
	26	M. Iftikhar-ud-din	F. S. Najam-ud-Din	..	..	17-12-1927	Section 6 of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	676	2,168	1,380	4,466	4,255	4,12,014	26	
Lahore	27	F. S. Najam-ud-din	Rani Chhannian	..	..	25-5-1915	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	405	801	720	1,006	3,34,508	66,651	27	
			S. Keeri Singh	..	6-7-1921	2-12-1916									
	28	Rani Chhannian	S. Keeri Singh Jagjit Singh	..	..	..	Section 5 (2) (a) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	7,222	4,390	2,818	6,055	..	6,96,800	28	
Lahore	29	S. Keeri Singh	Killa Jivan Singh	..	..	1-9-1930	Section 5 (2) (a) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	6,266	1,635	1,193	5,950	61,920	7,00,229	29	
			Nowshera Naugli	..	16-9-1915	21-6-1927									
	30	Killa Jivan Singh	Balbindar Singh	..	20-1-1927	1-9-1930	Section 6	..	..	..	..	..	..	30	
Amritsar	31	Nowshera Naugli	Sunder Singh	..	16-9-1915	21-6-1927	Section 6 of Act II of 1903	..	1,100	939	1,322	44,530	9,83,535	31	
			Buta Singh	..	..	..									
	32	Attari	S. Baiwant Singh	..	..	25-5-1914	Section 5 (1) Act II of 1903	12,111	598	448	970	5,17,000	4,61,074	32	
Sheikhopura	33	Chak Haidarabad and Sayedwala	Muhammad Sharif Khan	..	1904	..	Section 6, Act II of 1903	..	833	897	1,560	30,000	2,79,481	33	
			Muhammad Hassan Khan	..	16-7-1913	..									
	34	Sheikhopura	Raja Dhyani Singh	..	..	1-8-1930	Section 5 (1), Act II of 1903	1,35,321	3,884	3,072	12,746	1,70,000	69,79,678	34	
Shahpur	35	Mitha Tiwana	Manik Dost Mohammad Khan	..	..	23-9-1919	Section 5 (2) (d), Act II of 1903	10,104	11,565	4,510	2,895	2,78,006	7,66,061	35	
			Amir Abdulla Khan	..	21-1-1911	2-4-1914									
	36	Tarkhanwala	(1) Ghulam Mohd. Shah	..	..	..	Section 6 of Act II of 1903	..	2,855	2,341	3,539	4,900	2,50,702	36	
Jhelum	37	Jahanian Shah	(2) Riaz Hussain Shah	..	..	..	Section 5 (2) of Act II of 1903	..	6,423	3,652	4,540	2,11,070	25,01,080	37	
			(3) S. Qal-ndar Hussain Shah	..	..	..									
	38	Ghugh	(4) Nasir-ud-Din Shah	..	..	..	..	Inam 808	3,400	1,389	1,620	10,472	3,34,900	38	
Rawalpindi	39	Estate of the heirs of the late R. B. S. Boota Singh.	Yaquub Khan	..	14-1-1907	..	Section 6 of Punjab Act II of 1903	..	1,302	1,302	755	16,17,419	10,27,325	39	
			Muhammad Behram Khan	..	1910	..									
	40	Dharek	Ayub Khan	..	12-4-1911	..	..	..	6,030	3,886	2,152	..	4,57,754	40	
Attock	41	Bahtar	Sher Khan	..	1912	..	Section 6 of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	446	3,326	1,675	2,075	21,039	6,21,394	41	
			Ghulam Shah	..	14-1-1903	..									
	42	Khan Muhammad Abdul Rahman Khan and Khan Muhammad Nawaz Khan	Ghulam Mehdi	..	8-2-1909	..	..	..	16,582	6,023	9,606	1,32,436	4,47,580	42	
Mianwali	43	Kalabagh	S. Jasbir Singh	..	..	22-3-1929	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Act, II of 1903.	..	9,424	76,188	9,950	15,310	..	43	
			S. Jaidev Singh	..	..	..									
	44	Shah Jiwans	S. Atana Singh	..	..	..	..	..	9,838	5,725	10,884	1,15,492	7,04,992	44	
Jhang	45	Khan Wali Dad Khan	S. Hardy Singh	..	..	..	Section 5 (1), Act II of 1903.	400	606	425	214	40,000	1,48,922	45	
			S. Rab Nawaz Khan	..	6-11-1919	8-5-1920									
	46	Dab Kalan	Muhammad Hayat Khan	..	13-10-1917	..	..	..	7,005	3,610	11,447	3,222	11,67,588	46	
Multan	47	Jalalpur Pirwala	Iitikhar Ahmad Khan	..	2-1-1927	6-4-1929	Section 6 of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	..	..	..	..	..	..	47	
			Afzal Ahmad Khan	..	16-2-1926	14-1-1909									
	48	Sher Shah	Khan Muhammad Nawaz Khan	..	..	..	..	..	16,582	6,023	9,606	1,32,436	4,47,580	48	
Muzaffargarh	49	Shujabad	Malik Amir Muhammad Khan	..	10-7-1910	1-11-1924	Ditto ditto	..	9,424	76,188	9,950	15,310	..	43	
			S. Abid Hussain Shah	..	1-8-1915	26-11-1915									
	50	Sheikh Umar	S. Khizar Hayat Shah	..	..	..	26-6-1928	Section 5 (2) (d) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	..	9,838	5,725	10,884	1,15,492	7,04,992	44
		S. Mubarak Ali Shah	..	..	..										
Muzaffargarh	51	Chabutra Adha	Khan Wali Dad Khan	..	..	9-2-1921	Section 5 (1), Act II of 1903.	..	400	606	425	214	40,000	1,48,922	45
			Muhammad Nawaz Khan	..	22-8-1919	23-6-1924									
	52	Paunta Malana	Sayad Muhammad Ghaus	..	..	..	..	..	7,005	3,610	11,447	3,222	11,67,588	46	
Muzaffargarh	53	Khangach	Sayad Ghulam Abbas	..	17-3-1917	1-5-1919	Section 5 (1) of the Punjab Court of Wards Act, II of 1903.	..	34,196	9,625	6,887	19,841	13,93,541	47	
			Sayad Ghulam Akbar Shah	..	15-2-1901	9-1-1919									
	54	Hajipur	Sayad Amir Haidar Shah	..	..	11-10-1900	..	..	15,763	6,480	10,270	3,17,039	11,45,900	48	
Dera Ghazi Khan	55	K.B. Sr. Lin Mahd. Khan, Leghari, C.I.E., of Choti-zerin	Chaudhri Sham Singh	..	..	15-11-1926	Section 35 (A), Punjab Act IV of 1872 as amended by Act XII of 1878.	..	..	3,573	1,033	5,129	1,10,000	7,01,000	49
			M. Khuda Bakhsh	..	..	..									
	56	Paunta Malana	Ch. Hot Khan	..	..	1-4-1930	Section 5 (1) Ditto	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	50
Dera Ghazi Khan	57	Batli	Jam Hasham Ali	..	..	..	Section 5 (1) Ditto	..	..	..	..	..	..	51	
			Sultan Mahmud	..	..	..									
	58	Khangach	Ali Mohammad	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52
Dera Ghazi Khan	59	Hajipur	Mohd. Naerullah Khan	..	13-11-1918	1-9-1930	Section 6 Ditto	..	..						







## STATEMENT No. III.

INCOME OF THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 1930.

DISTRICT.	Serial No.	Name of estate.	INVESTMENTS AND DEBT TRANSACTIONS.									ORDINARY INCOME.					Total income.	Serial No.	
			Income from sale of			Income from loans received from			Income from repayment of loans due to the estate.	Recovery of advances made to tenants.	Total.	Jagir or taluqdari income.	Cash rents.	Sale of grain and other produce and of stock.	Other income.	Total ordinary income.			
			Land.	House property.	Securities	Government.	Other estates under the Court of Wards.	Other persons.											Rs.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
GURGAON	1	Farrukhnagar											11,136	6	2,353	13,495	13,495	1	
	2	Rampura																2	
KARNAL	3	Sidhowal							4,000		4,000	42,837	41,543		9,924	94,304	98,304	3	
	4	Arnauli										46,075	8,220		4,356	58,651	58,651	4	
	5	Jharauli										803	2,741	13	3,889	7,446	7,446	5	
	6	Shamgarh										3,993	162	2,294	155	6,604	6,604	6	
AMBALA	7	Raipur											310		28	338	338	7	
	8	Buria							5,000		5,000	54,626	17,362	1,917	7,914	81,819	86,819	8	
	9	Sohana										8,805	624	84	6	9,519	9,519	9	
	10	Manauli							50,000		50,000	51,117	20,067	3,058	1,258	75,500	1,25,500	10	
	11	Ramgarh										5,607	3,061	384	29	9,081	9,081	11	
KANGRA	12	Lambagraon										1,943				1,943	1,943	12	
	13	Lahaul										529	3,774	520	1,525	6,348	6,348	13	
	14	Rupi										10,603	3,522		1,011	15,136	15,136	14	
HOSHIARPUR	15	Amb							7,566		7,566	23,489	5,958	2,205	9,038	40,690	48,256	15	
	16	Bhabaur										3,516	5,637		1,484	10,637	10,637	16	
	17	Anandpur										6,445	14,269	9,071	3,002	32,797	32,797	17	
JULLUNDUR	18	Kartarpur						10,000			10,000	13,500	33,237	1,474	55,635	1,03,846	1,13,846	18	
LUDHIANA	19	Ber Khurd										17,286	5,868		1,991	25,145	25,145	19	
	20	Sardar Jaswant Singh			1,000	25			2,500		3,525	1,000	6,580	34,516	17,277	59,373	62,898	20	
FEROZEPUR	21	Mamdot	19,649						69,506		89,215	92,398	3,13,123	2,350	99,767	5,07,638	5,96,853	21	
	22	Behak	4,432						427	287	5,146	276	1,096	13,188	3,284	18,444	23,590	22	
	23	Shamsher Ali Khan											276	1,096	11,185	11,507	11,507	23	
	24	Buttar											322		278	881	3,336	3,336	24
	25	Malout							500	28	528		1,507	670	834	9,627	10,155	25	
LAHORE	26	M. Ittikhar-ud-Din		10,050						508	10,558	803	23,196	4,186	3,429	31,614	42,172	26	
	27	S. Najam-ud-Din										475	15,000	300	43	15,748	15,748	27	
	28	Rani Chhaurian			4,000				5,498		9,498	7,230	45,969	1,646	1,610	56,455	65,953	28	
	29	S. Kesri Singh							1,748		1,748	6,306	19,537	1,098	1,587	28,528	30,276	29	
	30	Kila Jiwani Singh																30	
AMRITSAR	31	Naushera Nangli							192		192		17,938	3,872	458	22,268	22,460	31	
	32	Atteri	12,964								12,964	12,648	203	10	4	12,865	25,829	32	
SHEIKHUPURA	33	Chak Haiderabad and Sayadwala											9,953	376	645	10,974	10,974	33	
	34	Sheikhupura							110		110	1,56,349	18,472	28	23,623	1,98,472	1,98,582	34	
SHAHPUR	35	Mitha Tiwana								356	356		359	3,801	4,333	18,272	18,628	35	
	36	Tarkhanwala							1,894	126	2,020	9,779	7,315	12,663	6,330	26,308	28,328	36	
	37	Jahaniyan Shah						5,000			5,000	100	4,274	967	1,318	6,659	11,659	37	
JHELUM	38	Ghugh							1,000	1,396	2,396	811	40	5,656	1,003	7,510	9,906	38	
RAWALPINDI	39	Estate of the heirs of R. B. S. Boota Singh.											13,226	2,831	946	17,003	17,003	39	
ATTOCK	40	Dharek							1,500	2,238	3,738		765	1,112	408	2,285	6,023	40	
	41	Bahar							730		730	446	559	8,211	307	9,523	10,233	41	
MIANWALI	42	Khan Mohammad Abdul Rahman Khan and Mohammad Nawaz Khan.										1,745	227	71,507	1,585	73,319	75,064	42	
	43	Kalabagh	16,223		63,000				11,247	2,293	92,763	9,424	7,390	85,625	15,905	1,18,344	2,11,107	43	
JHANG	44	Shah Jiwana							790	481	1,181		5,069	62,070	1,341	68,480	69,661	44	
	45	Khan Wali Dad Khan										550	1,087	2,476	362	4,475	4,475	45	
MUZZAFAR	46	Dab Kalan								682	11,526		250	35,041	5,609	40,900	52,426	46	
	47	Jalalpur Pirwala		4,458					1,845	247	6,550		1,178	18,780	3,768	23,726	30,276	47	
	48	Sher Shah								82	82	2,918	622	21,578	1,563	26,681	26,763	48	
	49	Shujabad		4,725					209	196	5,130			12,670	2,019	14,689	19,819	49	
MUZAFFARGARH	50	Sheikh Umar																50	
	51	Rangpur																51	
	52	Paunta Malana																52	
	53	Khangarh																53	
DEEPA KHAN. GHAZI	54	Hajipur							1,049		1,049	8,506	2,707			11,213	12,262	54	
	55	K. B. Sardar Din Mohammad Khan C. I. E., Leghari							320	288	608		4,490	9,266	103	13,859	14,467	55	
	56	S. Manzur Ahmad Khan Qasrani											1,060	7,497	737	9,294	9,294	56	
	57	Betil												3,420	10	3,430	3,430	57	
	58	K. B. Nawab Muhammad Jamal Khan, M.L.C.							2,842	2,755	5,597	60,536	1,463	55,584	4,385	1,11,968	1,17,565	58	
		Total	53,268	19,233	68,000	25	15,844	60,000	1,20,443	13,708	3,50,521	6,54,236	7,12,203	5,01,390	3,20,257	21,88,086	25,38,607		



**STATEMENT No. IV.**  
**EXPENDITURE OF THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 1930.**

DISTRICT.	Serial No.	Name of Estate.	INVESTMENTS, LOANS AND DEBT TRANSACTIONS.									ORDINARY EXPENDITURE.											
			Repayment of debts.	Purchase of			Loans.		Advances made to tenants.	Cost of permanent improvements.	Total.	Land revenue cesses, commutation fees and Haq-ul-tahsil.	Ward's rate.	Cost of manager and staff.	Total cost of management sums of (columns 14 and 15).	Cost of ordinary improvements and repairs.	Personal expenses of wards, including cost of education.	Allowances to ward's family.	Expenditure on law, domestic ceremonies, servants, stables, etc.	Total ordinary expenditure.	Total expenditure.	Percentage of cost of management (column 16) on total ordinary income (column 17) of statement No. III.	Serial No.
				Land.	House property.	Government securities or securities of local bodies.	Made to other estates under the Court of Wards.	Secured on other immovable property.															
1	3	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
GURGAON	1	Farrukhnagar	203								293	5,654	72	1,926	1,998	59	2,600	4,168	599	15,078	15,371	14.8	1
	2	Rampura																					2
KANAL	3	Sidhowal		1,000						5,351	6,351	12,565	1,240	8,038	9,278	2,261	21,118	7,653	21,464	74,339	80,690	9.8	3
	4	Arnauli								23	23	6,592	837	8,864	6,701	1,818	7,801	15,449	16,233	54,594	54,617	11.4	4
	5	Jharauli		636	80						716	389	1,205	330	1,535		653	1,040	776	4,393	5,109	20.6	5
AMBALA	6	Shamgarh		535							535	3,038	282	828	1,110	64			1,225	5,437	5,972	16.8	6
	7	Raipur											498	463	961		1,768		2,611	5,340	5,340	284.3	7
	8	Buria								166	166	13,729	758	3,859	4,647	2,627	7,998	15,432	17,757	62,188	62,354	5.7	8
	9	Sohana	6,416								6,416	1,412	349	934	1,283	97	1,755	1,678	605	6,830	13,246	13.5	9
KANGRA	10	Manauli	1,02,294								1,02,294	13,722	977	7,477	8,454	3,036	11,500	23,958	11,527	72,197	1,74,491	11.2	10
	11	Ramgarh	3,564								3,564	1,336	333	63	1,096	200	1,324	1,200	955	6,111	9,675	12.1	11
HOSHIAHPUR	12	Lambsgraon	300								300	12	108	120	228		64	274	775	1,029	2,229	11.7	12
	13	Lahan										132	327		327		2,743		12	3,214	3,214	5.1	13
	14	Rupi										397	400	450	850		2,750	6,010	4,078	14,085	14,085	5.6	14
JULLUNDUR	15	Amb				42,500				300	42,800	2,851	652	4,567	5,219	352	8,531	5,270	7,539	29,762	72,562	12.8	15
	16	Bhabaur	4,320								4,320	1,025	356	678	1,034		3,553	900	447	6,959	11,279	9.8	16
	17	Anandpur								100	100	4,099	570	5,028	5,998	1,993	7,967	7,240	4,800	31,697	31,797	17.1	17
LUDHIANA	18	Kartarpur	23,094							12,702	35,796	6,892	1,376	6,526	7,899	2,021	13,441	12,000	35,174	77,427	1,13,223	7.6	18
	19	Ber Khurd	1,209							828	2,037	3,820	478	2,985	3,463	765	6,833	3,580	3,220	21,681	23,718	13.7	19
FEROZPORE	20	Sardar Jaswant Singh		10,031		15,000					25,031	7,971	878	4,107	4,985	328	5,063	744	2,832	21,913	46,944	8.4	20
	21	Mamdor		4,326		1,60,000		1,00,000	2,000	71,821	3,56,147	44,846	4,504	37,001	41,505	54,290	66,050	27,784	1,01,927	3,36,402	6,92,549	8.1	21
	22	Behk							143	1,985	2,128	3,524	572	5,635	6,207	3,435	5,091	5,007	8,809	32,073	34,201	33.6	22
	23	Shamsher Ali Khan											362	227	589		9,600		185	10,344	10,344	5.1	23
	24	Butter	6,553								6,553	1,525	417	2,448	2,865	42	1,208	750	763	7,147	13,700	85.8	24
LAHORE	25	Malout	8,080							8,080	745	409	2,774	3,183	314		4,376	1,652	10,270	18,350	33.1	25	
	26	M. Iftikhar-ud-Din							546	2,841	3,387	4,930	857	3,673	4,530	4,243	14,414	6,300	13,369	47,786	51,173	14.0	26
	27	F. S. Najam-ud-Din	4,749								4,749	1,306	717	266	983		2,270	1,500	98	6,157	10,906	6.2	27
	28	Rani Chhaunian								2,007	11,407	1,583	3,998	5,581	1,755	26,071	1,637	12,969	59,420	61,427	9.2	28	
	29	S. Kesari Singh								1,942	1,942	3,950	554	1,816	2,370	416	4,445	5,768	9,298	26,247	28,189	8.3	29
	30	Killa Jiwan Singh																					
AMRITSAR	31	Nowshera Nangli	5,566							5,566	1,663	473	2,213	2,686	1,217	3,125	650	2,117	11,458	17,024	12.1	31	
	32	Attari	14,772	1,600							16,372	1,156	385	282	667		2,525	4,433	3,110	11,891	28,263	5.2	32
SHEIKHPURA	33	Chak Haiderabad and Sayadwala.						4,060		5,868	9,928	305	469	1,430	1,899		6,674	1,090	317	10,285	20,213	17.3	33
	34	Sheikhupura	31,905								31,905	23,922		13,674	13,674	5,067	21,952	9,745	53,349	1,28,609	1,60,514	6.0	34
SHAHPUR	35	Mitha Tiwana	3,765						1,050	520	5,335	1,570	819	5,529	6,348	405	1,392	1,500	4,653	15,868	21,203	34.7	35
	36	Tarkhanwala						5,000	361	630	5,991	1,521	453	2,839	3,292	390	4,485	2,610	5,884	18,182	24,173	12.5	36
	37	Jahanian Shah	1,542								1,542	2,895		1,999	1,999	400	900	2,341	1,267	9,862	11,344	31.5	37
JHELUM	38	Ghugh							1,500		1,500	1,654	290	1,110	1,400	42	2,340	672	1,211	7,319	8,819	18.6	38
RAWALPINDI	39	Estate of the heirs of R. B. S. Buta Singh.	185							185	755			7,165	7,165	379	1,275	6,040	2,212	17,826	18,011	42.1	39
AFKOCK	40	Dharel							710	300	1,010	2,528	578	2,958	3,536	944	2,388	797	642	10,825	11,845	154.7	40
	41	Baktar	934							400	1,334	3,252		2,506	2,606	22	2,269	670	644	9,263	10,697	26.3	41
MIANWALI	42	Khan Muhammad Abdul Rahman Khan and Muhammad Nawaz Khan.	6,379						1,515	240	8,134	9,656	898	10,601	11,499	8,074	5,500	6,592	27,774	68,545	76,679	15.6	42
	43	Kalabagh		23,481				18,000	7,681	21,816	70,978	15,310	1,624	23,383	25,007	3,659	30,621	14,536	18,867	1,08,000	1,78,978	21.1	43
JHANG	44	Shah Jiwana	21,165							156	21,321	19,381	1,205	5,926	7,131	452	15,483	1,920	3,658	48,025	69,346	10.4	44
	45	Khan Waji Dad Khan										491		407	407			3,276	168	4,342	4,342	9.1	45
MULTAN	46	Dab Kalan						500	1,488	1,988	11,447	781	10,833	11,614	2,989	11,208	7,219	21,384	65,861	67,849	28.4	46	
	47	Jalalpur Pirwala	5,000	1,056						168	6,224	6,887	610	6,500	7,110	1,794	5,900	2,665	5,083	29,439	35,663	29.9	47
	48	Sher Shah	8,844							734	9,628	10,709	611	5,533	6,144	320	2,009	1,820	7,442	27,566	37,324	23.0	48
	49	Shujabad	5,464						156	6	5,626	5,129	460	3,239	3,699	1,168	1,802		1,459	14,057	19,683	25.2	49
MUZAFFARGARH	50	Sheikh Umar																					50
	51	Rangpur																					51
	52	Paunta Malaha																					52
	53	Khangarh																					53
DEBA GHAZI KHAN	54	Hajipur	5,000						2,515		7,515	239	456	365	822		3,300		2,684	7,045	14,560	7.3	54
	55	K. B. Sardar Din Muhammad Khan, C.I.E., Leghari.	2,200								2,200	624	506	2,592	3,098	347	3,600	3,302	1,077	12,048	14,248	22.4	55
	56	S. Manzur Ahmad Khan, Qasrani.												176	176		2,677	6,720		10,175	10,175	1.9	56
	57	Batil										790		749	749	243	800	1,200	41	3,823	3,823	21.8	57
	58	K. B. Nawab Muhammad Jamal Khan, M. L. C.	35,258	4,665	2,000	3,075																	



## STATEMENT No. V.

IMPORTANT TRANSACTIONS (IF ANY) OF THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 1930.

DISTRICT.	Serial No.	Name of estate.	LAND PURCHASED.		LAND SOLD.		VALUE OF HOUSE PROPERTY.		VALUE OF SECURITIES OF GOVERNMENT OR LOCAL BODIES.		VALUE OF LOANS MADE		VALUE OF LOANS RECEIVED FROM			Debts of estates paid off.	No.
			Area.	Value.	Area.	Value.	Purchased.	Sold.	Purchased.	Sold.	To other estates under the Court of Wards.	To other persons on security of immoveable property.	Government.	Other estates under the Court.	Other persons.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
			Acres.	Rs.	Acres.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
GURGAON	1	Farrukhnagar	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
	2	Rampura	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	293	2
KARNAL	3	Sidhowal	8	1,000	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
	4	Arnauli	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
	5	Jharauli	4	636	..	..	80	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
	6	Shamgarh	..	535	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
AMBALA	7	Raipur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
	8	Buria	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
	9	Sohana	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6,416	9
	10	Manauli	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	80,000	1,02,294	10
KANGRA	11	Ramgarh	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3,564	11
	12	Lambagraon	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	300	12
HOSHIARPUR	13	Lahaul	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	13
	14	Rupi	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14
	15	Amb	..	..	..	..	..	..	42,500	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	15
JULLUNDUR	16	Bhabaur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
	17	Anandpur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,320	17
LUDHIANA	18	Kartarpur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10,000	23,094	18
	19	Ber Khurd	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,200	19
FEROZEPUR	20	S. Jaswant Singh	..	10,031	..	..	..	..	15,000	1,000	..	..	25	..	..	..	20
	21	Mamdot	12	4,326	..	..	..	..	1,60,000	..	..	1,00,000	..	..	..	..	21
	22	Behk	..	..	14	4,432	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	22
	23	Shamsher Ali Khan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	23
	24	Buttar	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8,553	24
	25	Malout	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8,080	25
LAHORE	26	M. Iftikhar-ud-Din	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10,050	..	..	..	..	..	..	26
	27	F. S. Najam-ud Din	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,749	27
	28	Rani Chhaunian	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,000	..	..	..	..	..	28
	29	S. Kesri Singh	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	29
AMRITSAR	30	Killa Jiwan Singh	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	30
	31	Nowshera Nangli	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5,560	31
SHARKEHPURA	32	Attari	15	1,600	13	12,961	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14,772	32
	33	Chak Haiderabad and Sayadwala	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,000	..	..	..	..	33
SHAHPUR	34	Skeikhupura	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	31,905	34
	35	Mitha Tiwana	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3,765	35
	36	Tarkhanwala	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5,000	..	..	..	..	36
JHELUM	37	Jahanian Shah	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5,000	..	1,542	37
	38	Ghugh	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	38
RAWALPINDI	39	Estate of the heirs of R. B. S. Boota Singh.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	185	39
ATTOCK	40	Dharek	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	40
	41	Bahtar	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	934	41
MIANWALI	42	Khan Mohammad Abdul Rahman Khan and Khan Mohammad Nawaz Khan.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6,379	42
	43	Kalabagh	47	23,481	28	16,223	..	..	..	..	63,000	..	18,000	..	..	..	43
JHANG	44	Shah Jiwana	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	21,165	44
	45	Khan Wali Dad Khan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	45
MULTAN	46	Dab Kalan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	46
	47	Jalalpur Pirwala	52	1,056	..	..	..	..	..	4,458	..	..	..	10,844	..	5,000	47
	48	Sher Shah	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8,844	48
	49	Shujabad	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4,725	..	..	..	..	..	5,464	49
MUZAFFARGARH	50	Sheikh Umar	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	50
	51	Rangpur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	51
	52	Paunta Malana	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52
	53	Khangarh	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	53
DERA GHAZI KHAN	54	Hajipur	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5,000	54
	55	K. B. S. Din Mohammad Khan, Leghari C.I.E.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,200	55
	56	S. Manzur Ahmad Khan, Kasrani]	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	56
	57	Batil	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	57
	58	K. B. Nawab Muhammad Jamal Khan, M. L. C.	270	4,665	..	..	2,000	..	3,075	..	..	..	..	..	..	35,258	58
Total			408	47,330	55	53,268	2,080	19,233	2,20,505	68,000	5,000	1,22,060	25	15,744	60,000	3,08,851	



## STATEMENT No. VI.

ESTATES RELEASED DURING THE YEAR ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 1930.

District.	Name of estate.	Name of ward.	Date of assumption of charge.	Date of release.	Debts on assumption of charge.	Debts on date of release.	AREA OF LAND HELD IN PROPRIETARY RIGHT.						Expenditure on permanent improvements during period of charge.	ASSETS, OTHER THAN VALUE OF JAGIR ON ASSUMPTION OF CHARGE.				ASSETS OTHER THAN VALUE OF JAGIR ON RELEASE.				
							On assumption of charge.			On release.				Value of land.	Value of house property.	Other assets.	Total assets.	Value of land.	Value of house property.	Value of securities.	Other assets.	Total assets.
							Total area.	Cultivated area.	Land revenue assessment.	Total area.	Cultivated area.	Land revenue assessment.										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
					Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Gurgaon ..	Rampura ..	R. B. Captain Balbir Singh.	26th January 1925.	1st March 1930.	35,000	..	125	125	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ambala ..	Raipur ..	Rao Baldeo Singh.	19th June 1906.	1st December 1929.	1,13,002	31,897	3,023	2,445	1,349	4,047	2,569	1,347	..	1,09,360	25,000	..	1,34,360	1,27,535	25,000	..	31,254	1,83,798
Kangra ..	Rupi ..	Rai Bhagwant Singh. Kr. Dhanwant Singh. Kr. Durga Singh.	26th July 1921.	1st July 1930.	1,00,837	..	2,274	2,274	1,496	2,290	2,290	1,523	..	1,19,680	70,000	19,080	2,08,760	1,21,840	70,000	..	40,920	2,32,760

## STATEMENT No. VII.

STATEMENT SHOWING COMPARISON OF THE PROPORTION BORNE BY LAND REVENUE AND CESSSES PAID TO RENTS RECEIVED AND PROCEEDS OF GRAIN SALES, AND THE OTHER VALUE OF TOTAL CROPS IN DIFFERENT ESTATES FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 1930.

District.	Name of Estate.	Rents and sales of grain (columns 14 and 15 of statement No. III).	Land revenue and cesses (column 13 of statement No. IV).	Percentage of land revenue to rents, &c.	Rate of total.	Value of total crops.	Explanation in brief.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Rs.	Rs.			Rs.	
GURGAON	* Farrukhnagar ..	11,142	5,654	50.7		..	* Last two years' arrears of land revenue and cesses were paid during the year under report.
	Rampara ..	..	..	..		..	
	Sidhowal ..	40,778	7,391	18.12		..	
KARNAL	Arnauli ..	7,886	765	9.7		..	
	Jharauli ..	2,754	219	7.9		..	
	† Shamgarh ..	2,466	2,505	102.0		..	
AMBALA	Raipar ..	310	..	..		..	
	Uria ..	19,379	13,729	42.7		..	
	Sobana ..	708	1,412	199.4		..	
KANGRA	Mansuli ..	23,125	13,722	32.4		..	
	Ramgarh ..	3,445	1,356	23.7		..	
	Lambagraon ..	..	12	..		..	† Income for Kharif 1929 was received by the Jagirdar while land revenue (Rs. 1,189) was paid by Court of Wards.
HOSHIARPUR	Lahaul ..	4,294	132	3.1		..	
	Ropi ..	3,522	397	11.3		..	
	Amb ..	8,163	2,851	34.9		16,328	
JULLUNDUR	Bhabpur ..	5,637	1,925	18.2		11,274	
	Anandpur ..	23,340	4,099	17.6		23,174	
	Kartarpur ..	34,711	6,892	19.8		1,474	
LUDHIANA	Ber Khurd ..	5,888	3,820	65.1		..	
	Sardar Jaswant Singh ..	41,095	7,971	16.8		34,516	
	Mamdot ..	3,15,473	44,946	14.2		..	
FEROZEPUR	Bekh ..	14,884	3,524	23.7		41,448	
	Shamsher Ali Khan ..	322	..	..		..	
	Buttar ..	948	1,525	160.8		10,968	
LAHORE	Malout ..	8,793	745	8.4		22,656	
	M. Ittikhar-ud-Din ..	27,382	4,930	18		..	2. Grain valuing Rs. 2,246 was not sold.
	F. S. Najam-ud-Din ..	15,300	1,306	8.5		..	
AMRITSAR	Rani Chhaunian ..	51,615	11,407	22.1		..	
	Sr. Kesri Singh ..	20,635	3,950	19.1		..	
	Killa Jiwan Singh ..	..	..	..		..	
SHEIKHUPURA	Naushera Nangli ..	10,122	1,663	16.4		10,575	
	Attari ..	213	1,156	542.7		12,000	
	Chak Haiderabad and Sayadwala ..	10,329	305	3.0		376	
SHAHPUR	Sheikhupura ..	18,500	23,922	123.9		..	
	Mitha Tiwana ..	4,160	1,570	37.7		8,750	
	Tarkhauwala ..	19,978	1,021	7.6		39,956	
JHELUM	Jahanian Shah ..	3,916	2,895	74		11,849	
	Ghugh ..	5,696	1,654	29.1		5,640	
	Estates of the heirs of R. B. S. Buta Singh ..	16,055	755	4.7		8,933	
ATTOCK	Dharek ..	1,877	2,528	134.7		..	
	Bahar ..	8,770	3,252	37.1		..	
	Khan Muhammad Abdul Rahman Khan and Khan Muhammad Nawaz Khan ..	71,734	9,606	13.3		87,229	
MIANWALI	Kalabagh ..	63,015	15,310	16.5		1,14,571	
	Shah Jiwana ..	67,139	19,381	28.9		50,725	
	Khan Wali Dad Khan ..	3,563	491	13.78		4,779	
MULTAN	Dab Kalan ..	40,289	11,447	28.4		35,912	
	Jaisalpur Pirwala ..	17,301	6,887	39.8		24,840	
	Sher Shah ..	20,814	10,270	48.3		26,489	
MURRAYPARGANAH	Shujabad ..	13,298	5,129	38.5		14,350	
	Sheikh Umar ..	..	..	..		..	
	Rangpur ..	..	..	..		..	
DEHA GHAKI KHAN.	Paunta Malana ..	..	..	..		..	
	Khangarh ..	..	..	..		..	
	Hajipur ..	2,707	239	8.8		..	
DEHA GHAKI KHAN.	K. B. Sardar Din Muhammad Khan, C.I.E., Leghari ..	13,728	624	4.8		13,360	
	S. Mansur Ahmad Khan, Quarnai ..	7,497	..	..		..	
	Batli ..	3,420	790	23.1		4,625	
DEHA GHAKI KHAN.	K. B. Nawab Muhammad Jamal Khan, M.L.C. ..	57,047	8,655	15.2		62,363	
		..	..	..		..	
		..	..	..		..	
Total ..		12,05,035	2,76,215	22.9		..	

