CHAPTER VII: ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE
OF FORTS
Information on this aspect is available only in contemporary inscriptions and literature. This can be done by a study of the political and military administration of various kingdoms. Before proceeding to deal with them in detail, let us first examine what literature on polity has to say on the subject.

Kautilya, in his Arthasastra, as we have already noticed in chapter IV, assigns 4th place to the institution of forts among the 7 Limbs of the state in the body politic. He prescribes the appointment of 'antapālas' for protecting the frontiers or border forts and mentions a source of revenue and lists a series of duties as coming under the head of forts. Among them he includes, all varieties of duties, as tolls, measures, weights, sugar, liquor, slaughter of animals, threads, oils, ghee, and all taxes collected at the gates, and from the people known as 'Baharikas'. He does not prescribe any separate office to command a fort. Probably, the Nagarika or city Superintendent, was entrusted with watch and ward duties of a fort or city.

The next class of literature that draws our attention is Puranic lore, in which the Matsya, Vishnu-Dharmottara and Agni deserve notice. Of them, the latter i.e. Agni Purāṇa prescribes the appointment of an officer called Durgādhyaksha, on the lines of other high functionaries like Śeṇāpati.
(commander in chief) dhanādyaksha (treasurer) Gajādyaksha (commander of elephants) and asvādyaksha (Commander of cavalry). 5 The Matsya even goes still farther, and prescribes a series of qualifications required of a superintendent or commandant of forts. He, according to it, should be a Man, who cannot be easily led away by intrigue, brave, of high family, persevering and energetic in all actions. 6

With this brief study of the system of maintenance of forts embodied in literature, we shall now proceed to examine the system of maintenance and administration of forts chronologically in Andhra Pradesh.

To take up first, early or Ancient Andhra, it has already been pointed in chapter V, that forts during this period, did not enjoy any place of importance. Hence the complete or near absence of any information in the inscriptions of the period. Further, it is not until the period of Eastern Chālukyas of Vēṇgi, that we find a separate office to look after forts, called Durgapāla, which was included among the 18 tirthas of the state. 7 Then proceeding to the Medieval period, we find forts occupying a place of importance and began playing role of significance in the field of warfare. Hence, it is necessary to study the system and maintenance of forts under each dynasty separately.

Western Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa:

The kingdom of this dynasty was divided into several rāshtras, vishayas and nāḍus, such as Kandūri nāḍu, Śīndavādi-1000 and Kollipake 7000 which were governed generally by a
feudatory or governor, who enjoyed both political and military powers styled as Mahāmandalēśvara and Mahā-Saṃantādhīpāti. The known forts of this period in Andhra are, Chilukūru, Bhuvanagiri, Kollipake-7000, Vēhgi, Guttī, Tuğbălam etc.

**Chilukuru:**

Identical with modern Chilukuru in Hyderabad district, Andhra Pradesh, it was the headquarters of Lombalike-70. It is referred to in several inscriptions of the period ranging from the time of Jayasiṃha Vallaḥa II to Vikramāditya VI. An inscription dated 5.934 A.D. refers to a gift to Parsavanatha Jinalaya of Chilukuru by dandanayaka Ailarasa, governing Lombalike-70.8

**Bhuvanagiri:** is another important fort of the period. It was originally known as Tribhuvanagiri. The Kolanupāka inscription of Vikramāditya VI dated C.V.31 A.D.1106 mentions a grant of village by Pārāma Jaggadēva lord of Kollipake-7000, to God Brahmesvara, installed by Brahmadevanayaka, son of Dhakkana-nayaka at Bhuvanagiri, which was a fort belonging to the king.9 Another inscription of the ruler dated C.V.32 A.D.1108, from Bairanapalli mentions a certain dandanayaka Biramareddi of the capital Bhuvanagiri.10 Another inscription of the same ruler dated C.V. 36 A.D.1118 situated in one of the gateways of Bhuvanagiri itself refers to a certain Lakshmaṇa dandanayaka, who was stated to be incharge of that fort.
Kollipake-7000: Identical with modern Kolanupaka or Kulpak in Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh, it was an important fortified capital of the western Chalukyas of Kalyana. It was the headquarters of a vishaya comprising 7000 villages. There are inscriptions ranging from the period of Somesvara I, to Vikramaditya VI, providing us the names of various governors ruling over it. During the reign of Somesvara I according to an inscription on the rock of Tirumala hill, of Parakasavarma alias Udayar Rajendrachola, in his 12th year conquered with his great and war like army Iduiturainc, vanavasi. Kollipakkai, whose walls are surrounded by such trees. This Chola attack against Kollipaka took place in the year 1044 A.D., i.e. during the reign of Somesvara I as his feudatory Singanadevarasa bears the title Kollipakkeya Kavari protector of Kollipaka in A.D. 1045. The names of the various chiefs or governors under different rulers of the dynasty are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial Ruler</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subordinate chiefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Somesvara I</td>
<td>S.966</td>
<td>Singanaddevarasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D.1045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somesvara I Trailokyamalla</td>
<td>S.969</td>
<td>Mahamandalesvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D.1047</td>
<td>Komareyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. -do-</td>
<td>S.996</td>
<td>Mahamandalesvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D.1064</td>
<td>Buddharaasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. -do-</td>
<td>S.992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D.1067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Somesvara II Bhuvanaika-malla</td>
<td>S.990</td>
<td>Mahamandalasvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D.1068</td>
<td>Asagamarasa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above study of various governors of Kolenupāka, we find it enjoyed a place of paramount political and military importance in Telingana. Other officers of the period that find are, Anantapāla dāṇḍāṇāyaka who was enjoying the charge of Vēṅgi-1200 and Enamala 6000 and Govinda dāṇḍāṇāyaka his nephew ruling over Kondapalli-300. To the same period also belong the forts of Tumbalam and Gutti.
in Rayalasima region. Of them Tumbalam, identical with modern Pedda Tumbalam near Adoni, in Adoni taluk of Kurnool district Andhra Pradesh, was the headquarters of Sīdeśa-1000 vishaya. It was governed by several Mahāmandalēśvara as and Mahā Sāmanitas. Under it was Gutti, which was governed by a danda-nayaka and a rājādhyaksha, whose names are found in several inscriptions carved on the rock boulders within the fort area itself. These danda-nayaka's or commanders of Gutti are styled as Guttiyakāṭeya danda-nayakas. The inscriptions here belong to reigns of Vikramaditya VI, Somesvara III, Bhulōkamalla and Jagadēkamalla II. The names of the commanders mentioned in inscriptions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial ruler</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Danda-nayaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vikramaditya VI</td>
<td>C.V.9 A.D.1086</td>
<td>Bāchana danda-nayaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.V.23 A.D.1100</td>
<td>Mārτanḍa danda-nayaka styled as Guttiya danda-nayaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.V.46 A.D.1123</td>
<td>Bhōgadeva, the danda-nayaka of Gutti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.V.49 A.D.1126</td>
<td>Kēśavāja, Gutti danda-nayaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somesvara III</td>
<td>A.D.1135</td>
<td>Sambhudeva Herggade, Guttiyadanda-nayaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhulokamalla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadekamalla II</td>
<td>5th regnal year A.D.1142</td>
<td>Brāmmarasar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides the above, there are also other officers called Rajadhyakshas, probably king’s agent or Residents, stationed at Gutti owing to its special importance. The names of the various Rajadhyakshas that we come across in inscriptions are Birmmanayaka under Vikramāditya VI in C.V. 23, A.D. 1100, Bācharasa under Somesvera III in A.D. 1135 and Biddanarasa under Jagadēkamalla II in A.D. 1142. Further there is another office of military nature called Kūtaya jantravaha, probably an officer be incharge of a cannon like machine. Details about the garrison kept in different forts, or their pay etc. are however not available.

Kakatiyas: The administration of the Kakatiya kingdom was based on feudal or nayamkara system, introduced by Rudrādevi and well organized by her successor Prataparudra. According to Nītisāra, cited by Sakalānīti Sāmatamu, king was to assign a number of villages to several Nāyakas, in lieu of their salary and maintenance of army. It is not known how many forts were maintained by the Kakatiyas in their kingdom. But according to one account they are 72 and another 77 known by the term ‘bāhatteri durgāmbulu’. Inscriptions of the period do not help us much in gleaning information about the various forts that flourished or their maintenance. The only information that we get from the inscriptions is the Raichur fort inscription of Gona Viṭhala which informs that he built the fort of Rachuru, after capturing the forts of Tumbulam, Ādavāni, Hāhuva, Mānuva etc. Hence we have to rely on the
information supplied by literary works of later date, like Pratapacharitra and Siddheshvara charitra, which furnish information about the administration of the capital Orugallu or Warangal. According to the former i.e. Prataparudra, the defence of the capital was entrusted by Prataparudra to the care of 77 nayakas or commanders of Padmanayaka lineage or Velama community, by appointing the 77 bastions of the fort among them. The Siddheshwaracharitra, even goes farther, and gives details of the system of defence of the capital. According to it, each Komma was defended at the role of two soldiers, whereas each bastion or Kottala was defended by 50 each "Gawani" (gateway) by 500 and each diddi by 100. Thus to calculate the total strength of the forces on the basis of the existing bastions and gateways would be 6,350. The above works also mention the names of several Nayakas such as Sri Rangamadeva, Raya Rudradeva, Penakuchi Rudradeva, Nijadavolu Chandradeva and Induluri Anmayadeva. Above them were several Lenkas called Visingathanthumi Ramu Lenka, Jitittinathumi Ramu Lenka, Gogulavari Mahu Lenka, and Koduri Ramu Lenka. Each of these Lenkas was provided with a force of more than 3 lakhs infantry, who were governing the cities, towns, and other cantonments called Guatemal. The city of Warangal was protected by Pedda Talari Missanka Vallabha, whose annual pay was 33,20,000 varahas. The gateways were strongly guarded by 9 lakhs archers and their pay was 3,30,0000 varahas.
Reddis of Kondavidu: Like their predecessors the Kakatiyas, the Reddis also followed the practice of defending their kingdom by means of well organized forts. The important forts of the kingdom were Kondavidu, Kondapalli, Bellamkonda, Vinukonda, Dharanikota, Rājamahēndravaram etc. The different rulers of the family by evinced great interest in building new forts and reducing many belonging to their enemies. This becomes evident from the various titles born by several kings and generals. For instance Errapreggada in his Harivamsamu, praised his patron Prōlayavēma with the title, "Chaturvidha durgadhārana vihāvarōdārāṇu".44 His son Anapotareddi, is credited to have built the new capital Kondavidu, known as Kundinapuri and shifted his headquarters from the earlier capital Addanki. According to the Manyommā inscription this Prōlayavēma is said to have built 'Chauti-durgas' and controlled by appointing governors, who belonged to his family.45 From the Manyomapuram record, we learn his son Anapota built a new city Kondavidu, called Kundinapuri, and shifted his capital from Addanki.46 The Drākshārāma inscription of the same ruler describes him as the conqueror of 'Dvipi' as 'Dvipijēta' Čāndā.47 One of his durgādhyakshas was Kētaya Mallinādhuni Vēmāna, who was ruling over Dharanikōta.48 During this period, we also find a jaladurga, Motupalli, the governor of which was Sōmayā.49 The Śrīsālam record of his successor Anavēma, credits him with the titles "Rājamahēndra Niravadya nagarādi bahuvīda Sthaladurga varga vidalana balārāma (A Balarama
in tearing asunder many kinds of sthala durgas) and "Sagara Gautami Salila Sangrama Sakala Jaladurga Sadhana Raghura" (Raghurama in subduing and the jaladurgas situated at the confluence of Sea and Gautami). During the reign of Komaragiri, we find his brother-in-law and general Katana Vema, reducing a number of forts such as Molletidurgamu, Kimmuru, Bendapudi, Vajrakottam, Ramagiri, and Virakuttam. From the Balayapalli grant of Mācha, belonging to the reigns of Pedakomativema Dated S.1386 A.D. / 1404 we find, that Mācha fortified Kondapalli and made it his capital. But, according to a recently discovered, inscription on one of the lintels of the gateways, Kondapalli is stated to have been built at the behest Komaragiri by one Dinakarareddī in the year Bhāva, corresponding to A.D.1394. There were in all 84 forts termed asthanas. It also mentions that a certain Donti Allāda Reddi was the Durgādhyaśkha of Dharanikotā in A.D.1225. There were also appointed several officers to defend different forts, who belonged mostly to the Velama and Balija communities. There also appear to be Muslim officers in the service of the Reddis, which fact is supported by the names of the officers furnished by the Durgādhyaśkha; The names of the various officers are as follows:

Velamas: 11 Balija; 21 (names not given) Muslims: 8
Baliias: names not furnished
Muslims: 1 Bhajat Nayak, 2. Karim, 3. Abdul, 4. Dawalji

A perusal of the above list raises a curious doubt whether it would be a fact that officers of Velama community could have been in the service of the Reddis, in view of the fact that there was a long drawn out and protracted family struggle between the Velamas of Recherla chiefs of Rachakonda and the Reddis of Kondavidu. The varacity of the list furnished by the Dandekavile is open for question, obviously because of its late date and hence precludes some interpolation.

Another interesting information furnished by the record is regarding the system of defence adopted by the Reddis of their capital Kondavidu. According to it, the various officers mentioned above were known as Hamsam Nayakas (Amsam) whose duty was to defend forts. It explains that each Hamsam comprised 2 Kottalas, and each Kottala 12000 kommas. It is not known who the Komma is and how many kommas were there in Kondavidu. However, on the basis of the information supplied there were in all 40 Hamsam Nayakas. Calculating on the above basis that 12000 kommas make one Kothala, we find a total of 24000 kommas for each Hamsam. Thus the total force appears to be 24000 x 4 = 96000 kommas. The record does not furnish details about the actual garrison kept in the fort. The same information is also supplied by another record "Gajapativari Vrittantamu" which gives the
method of maintenance of Kondavidu by the Reddis. According to it, Kondavidu had several bastions (buruzus) Kommas (uprights or arched wood stones) Mettadas and Hamsam Nayakas. There were a total of 12000 Memmas and 2 such memmas make on Kottada.  

We also find a certain tax called 'Durgarakshanapannu' meant for Kavali or protection of the forts. This tax appears to have been collected from the people providing protection.

**Vijayanagar:** The institution of forts under Vijayanagar attained its heyday and pinnacle of glory, and was accorded its due place. During this period, forts attained the status of a district, the capture of which resulted in the conquest of the entire territory belonging to it. Dr. Venkataramanayya in his origin of the city and empire of Vijayanagar remarks "It is evident that the highest district was Durga and Sima and Nadu came after it". Several important forts like Udayagiri, Gutti, Chandragiri, and Penugonda were raised to the level of Rajyas or provinces, which in turn had several smaller forts as the headquarters of Simas functioning under them like Ghandikota. Inscriptions and literature vie with each other in providing information about forts of the period and the system of administration and maintenance. The Gutti inscription of Bukka I extols the strength of Gutti, as the naval to the wheel of sovereignty." The Srisailam and Chinnahobilam records of Krishnadévaróya, furnish details about the various forts captured by him, and methods which he adopted. Rayavachakamu furnishes interesting details about the number of forts
maintained by the Vijayanagar empire, which belonged to all the 4 varieties, as Sthala, Jala, Giri and Vana and equipped with strong garrisons and men material, money and all sorts of weapons, arsenal etc. called 'Rāstu sāmagri'. The different forts mentioned by it are as follows:

**Hill forts:** Ādavāni, Cheyyētīdurgam, Guttī, Ghandikōta, Chandragiri, Gurramkonda, Maddur, Somagiri, Tripurantakam, Kummattur, Penukonda. 62

**Venadurgas:** Nandyala, Śrī Raṅgapetnam, Ummattur, Dālanayakulakota Madura, Playankota, Dandikal, Setyavedu, Kottikal, Dinkinikota, Narayanavanam. 63

Apart from the above, there are also forts like Udayagiri, Kandukur, Vinukonda, Bellamkonda, Nāgarjunakonda, Tengeda, Ketchavaram, Kondapalli, Bezavada, Kondavidu, Rajahmundryaram, Potnur etc., which figure among the forts captured by Krishnadevaraya in his Kaḷinga expedition. 64 Adoni, Raichur, and Mudgal were important strongholds in Krishna Tunbhabdra doab which played a key role in the warfare between the Vijayanagar and the Sultanates of Deccan as Bijapur and Gūtub Shabīs of Golconda.

Coming to the administration and maintenance, the kingdom of Vijayanagar was divided into several rajyas or provinces and entrusted to amaranāyakas (feudal lords) who wielded both political and military authority. 65 These amaranāyakas often enjoyed hereditary right and some times governors were appointed who did not belong to the royal family usually they stayed in the headquarters of the empire and appointed deputies or
Karyakartas to discharge duties on their behalf. For instance, Krishnadevaraya, entrusted Kondavidu to Saluva Timma his Chief minister after its capture in 1515 A.D. who in turn appointed his nephew Nandendra Gopa to act as his deputy, who held the office till A.D. 1525. Ramabhatlayya, who was the governor of Udayagiri in A.D. 1540, appointed Yendaluri Venkatadri Aayya as his deputy. Another inscription of the same king is the appointment of Siddhavaṭam Ellamarasa, the Karyakarta, by Rayasam Ayyapparasa the Nayaṅkara holder of Gandikota-Sīma. During the reign of Sadāśivaraya, we find the Naḍyāla chieftain holding the amaram of Gandikota who appointed the Pemmasani chief to act as their Karyakartas.

Another interesting office that we find is the Durga Daṇḍayak or commandant of forts. This appears to have been combined in the office of the provincial governor of Sīma holder, as we do not find persons holding this office separately. According to Krishnadevaraya, forts should be entrusted to the members of the Brahmana community, as they do not suffer from evils like malice, greed, and lust. Rayavachakamu furnishes the names of the commanders appointed to different forts by Krishnadevaraya, after their capture in his eastern campaign. According to it they are, Udayagiri, Kampayya, Kampavidu, Kondayya, Vinukonda, Bhaskarayya, Bellamkonda, Virabhadrayya, Nagarjunakonda, Aayyalayya.

But the above information runs contrary to the actual names available in inscriptions. Udayagiri after its capture,
was entrusted to Rāyasām Kondamarusayya. Where as Kondāvidu

Lastly, we learn of a source of income yielded from
corts which was levied by the rulers of Vijayanagara empire. It
was known as "Durgadānnāya nivartanamu." Two inscriptions from
Ghandikota, belong to the reigns of Achyutaraya and Sadāsīva refer
to it. The former dated 5.1455 A.D.1533 registers the grant of
income derived from taxes such as Durgadānnaya by Bācharasu, the
Kāryakarta of the king. The later, dated 5.1466 A.D.1544,
registers the remission of taxes as "Durgadānnāya nivartanam"
by Nandyāla Timmayadeva mahārāju, who held Gandikota sima as
amaram. From the above inscription we learn that this tax
came to be levied from the time of Achyutadēvāraya only and
continued, in the reign of his successor Sadāsīva also. We
do not know whether it was confined to Gandikota alone, or
whether it was extended to other forts also. But it may noted
that there is no mention of any such levy in respect of other
forts either by the same rulers or their governors.

In the end we may note the care with which gateways were
strictly guarded, Rāyaśvāchakamu informs that the Pārupatyam or
Superintendence of entrances was given to Brahmins alone. It
also says that strict vigilance was imposed while admitting
strangers to and from the fort. There was also the system of
pass port or visa, in the form of official letters of authority
duly stamped by royal seal. Persons not carrying such official
letters of permission were put to severe interrogation about their
identity and bonafides. All strangers were to show their letters of authority to the Pedda Talārī and make their movements.82

Bahmani: Like their contemporary Hindu kingdoms as Vijayanagar the political and military organization of the Bahmani kingdom, was largely feudalism in character. Several feudal lords were appointed and granted jagirs and were to render military service to the king. The defence of their kingdom depended heavily on a wide net work of forts and their efficient maintenance. The kingdom of Bahmanis was divided into several provinces called Tarafs' each headed by a Tarafdar corresponding to a governor.83 The Bahmani kingdom, towards the end of Allauddin Hasan Bahman Shah I seize had 4 such Tarafs. They were84

1. Ahsanabad :- Gulbarga comprising the territory right upto Dabul including the Krishna-Tungabhadra.
2. Daulatabad including Junair and Paithan
3. Basar including Mahur
4. Bidar including Qandahar, Indur, Kowlas, and occupied parts of Telingana. The Tarafdar of these provinces had several forts under him and he commanded the whole of his Taraf, as Sar-e-Lashkar, combining both civil and military authority. Each Tarafdar in turn had several thandars under him who was the commander of each fort.85 This system continued for a long time. But, when the empire grew large in extent and became unwieldy, it became necessary to introduce new measures for administration. Hence Mahmud Gawan, the great prime minister of Hamayun Shah, introduced new measures by dividing the kingdom into smaller provinces.
According to this, every Taraf (province) comprised several Sarkar's (districts) and each Sarkar, had several paraganas (Tafsils). Every Pargana had a group of villages under it. As regards the selection and appointment of Tarafdars, great care was exercised. Usually members of royal family were given preference, although people of exceptional merit and unquestionable faith were appointed.

Coming to the various forts of the Bahmanis in Andhra Pradesh, we find Telingana presenting a firm foothold. Several forts in Telingana region have gone under their control. Although they changed hands frequently depending upon the political vicissitudes. In its initial phases, its hold extended up to Bhongir, the western part of Telingana. The fort of Kaulas was wrested from Musunuri Kapayanayaka. Telingana was oramised as a separate Tarf or province called Banamani Telingana comprising Indav and Kaulas, and kept under Azam-i-Humayun, son of Seif-ud-din Ghori. Another important fort in the region that came under Bahmanis was Gölcoğa, when it was ceded to them by Kapayanayaka. Adoni is another fort that figures prominently in the Vijayanagar Bahmani wars, and was the target of attack by the later, as it provided entry into the doab region.

During the region of Ahmad Shah I, we find a certain Abdul Latif, appointed as Khan-i-Azam and Sarlashkar of Telingana. After this capture of Warangal, in A.D.1425, the Sultan appointed Khan-i-Azam as governor of Warangal. In 1433 he left Telingana leaving Ibrahim Sanjar Khan as Sarlashkar of Telingana.
him the fort of Bhongir. Towards the end of his reign he divided the kingdom among his sons, appointing the prince Mahamud Governor of Mahur, Kalluru and Ramagiri with a part of Besar, and Davad as governor of Telingana.

In the next reign that of Alauddin Ahmad Shah II in 1436 A.D. the Sultan gave Muhammad Sha, the Jagir of Raiachal i.e. Rachakonda. During the same period also occurs the revolt of Jalal Khan, the brother-in-law of the Sultan. Jalal Khan, in 1455 A.D. proclaimed independence and occupied Nalgonda; while his son Sikander Khan proceeded to Mahur to seek help from Mahmud Khalji of Malwa. The Sultan, in the meanwhile, determined to suppress the insurrection of Jalal Khan, ordered Mahmud Gewan, the Mansabdar of 8000 to proceed against Nalgunda and invest it. On learning this, Sikander Khan hastened back to Nalgonda secured the promise of pardon, and persuaded his father to hand over the citadel.

During the reign of Hamayun Shah Khwaja-i-Jahan was acting as Tarafdar of Telingana and Sikander Khan as Sipahsalar of Telingana. Not satisfied with this, Sikander Khan rose in rebellion against the Sultan; which was however quelled by the sultan himself by killing Sikander Khan, in a battle near the fort of Balkonda. This period also marked the loss of several forts like Bevarakonda, Rachakonda and Warangal, to Gajapati, which were captured by Kumara Hanvira son of Kapilcsvara Gajapati.
The next reign that of Muhammad Shah III, witnessed the reconquest of lost territories as a result of the heavy price paid by Hamvira, by ceding the entire Telengana, in return for the help rendered to him to make himself king of Oriya. This task was entrusted by the Sultan to Malik Hasan Ba who led an expedition and conquered the whole of coastal tract including Rajahmundry, and the great fort of Kondavidu. On his return, the Sultan honoured him with the title Nizam ul Mulk and appointed him as Sarbashkary Telengana. During this period, the Bahmani kingdom was divided into 8 Sarbashkarships of moderate size. Under this, Telengana was divided into two charges with Rajahmundry including Nalgonda, Majulipatam, and other Oriya territory, and Warangal, Mahamud Gawan, revolutionised the whole of military administration by keeping only one fort under the Tarafdar, while the diladars or commandants of all other forts were directly appointed by the central government and responsible to it.

The last governor of Telingana was Quli Hamdani, bestowed with the title, Qutb ul Mulk Dakhani by Shihabuddin Mahmud in 1498, and granted the fief of Telengana, with Golconda. Qutb ul Mulk, after his appointment established his control over Telengana soon after, by regaining a large number of forts as Warangal, Rājkonda, Devarakonda, and Koilkonda.
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