Iswar Chandra Roy was asked to sign the Decennial Settlement on the basis of the gross jumma of 1195 B.S. i.e. Rs. 10,56,652. Deductions were allowed, under the following heads:

- for sairs abolished = Rs. 43,359
- for the Parganah Boorun = Rs. 30,000 (to be recovered with a russud in 3 years)
- for talookdaries separated = Rs. 18,648
- for Parganah Cobajeepur sold at the Chalsa = Rs. 12,236
- allowance for poolbundy = Rs. 8,000
- charges for collection at the rate of 10 per cent on the rest of the revenue.

Profits on batta at the rate of 1 anna 6 gundas per rupee formed part of the estimated resources of the Zamindary. Fouzdar tax was allowed to be collected at the rate of 8 gundas per rupee.

The Collector pointed out that the net jumma payable to the Government at the end of third year would be 8 lakhs and between 70 and 80 thousand rupees which was "near a lakh of rupees more than was ever realized from the district for a period of 21 years, commencing in 1172 B.S. when the Company acquired the Dewany and ending in 1192 B.S."

Iswar Chandra declined to sign the Settlement on the above terms. In 1196 B.S. and 1197 B.S. he was allowed to make collections and was required to deposit the revenue at the rate of 1195 B.S. In a petition to the Board of Revenue Iswar Chandra stated his case:

".....Mr. Vansittart in 1190 B.S. let my hereditary Zamindary in farms for 5 years. In 1196 I received possession of the district at the same jumma and was obliged to borrow money in order to make good the revenues of that year. But in 1197 B.S. I was necessitated
to borrow much larger sums to pay up my balances to the Government. The farmers were likewise obliged to dispose of their property, and to borrow money in order to pay their kists to me. The district is unable to pay so heavy a jumma and you, gentlemen, are well acquainted with the state of it....

"The particulars of the proposed Settlement for the 10 years have been communicated to me but it will be impossible for me to enter into engagements agreeable there to .... Be pleased to consider the state of my ancient hereditary Zamindary and allow me a deduction of one lakh of rupees on the proposed Settlement half of which I will pay as rassud on the ensuing year's jumma ......"

Haggling continued till August 1792 when Iswar Chandra had to yield. The Settlement was concluded on the terms of the Government.

Iswar Chandra frequently represented his difficulties in realizing the revenue from his farmers. He paid his revenue to the end of Sawan, 1200 B.S., but by the month of Magh fell in balance of Rs.1,16,931.5 He was imprisoned on 5th February, 17946 and was kept in confinement till 22nd March, 17947. His lands were advertised for sale. Iswar Chandra stated in a petition8 to the Collector that he had Rs.1,20,000 due from his farmers but had no power to enforce payment from them. Muktaram Bose and Cally Prasad Dutta of Calcutta owed to him as balance Rs.14,000 and Rs.14,500 respectively. He had decrees of the Court against them for the above sums. But the process in the Dewany Adalat caused much delay. He appealed, - "you will be pleased to allow me a month to borrow money from the mahajans and I shall
discharge the amount within that time. Papers should not be required for the present, as it will lessen me in the opinion of the people who may be inclined to advance me the money."\(^9\)

At the end of the year 1200 B.S. (i.e. April 1794) Iswar Chandra's outstanding balance to the Government amounted to Rs.1,30,092.\(^10\) He took a loan of Rs.40,000 from Rosha Ali, a minor with the sanction of the Board, Rs.11,000 was suspended by the Government on account of his claims on the 24 Parganahs - Zamindary and the rest of the sum was raised as loans in Calcutta. At the end of 1201 B.S. (April 1795) his balance amounted to Rs.55,753. Iswar Chandra requested the Collector to excuse the interest of Rs.10,341 included in the outstanding demand. He still owed from his rentiers rupees 60 to 70 thousand on account of the year 1200 B.S. and Rs.50,000 on account of 1201 B.S. He had obtained a decree of Rs.40,000 but the money remained unrealized. He was now obliged to borrow money to pay the outstanding balance.\(^11\) The interest was not excused in spite of the recommendation of the Collector. At the end of Magh, 1202 B.S. the Raja had a balance of Rs.1,91,737\(^12\). To meet the balance the Raja mortgaged Parganahs Chowrassee and Myhatty to Raja Naba Krishna Roy for Rs.50,000 and incurred a further debt of Rs.42,000 in Calcutta.\(^13\)

In September 1796, an extra-ordinary inundation led to a petition\(^14\) "signed by a considerable number of ryots" belonging to the following Parganahs - Ookhra, Anwarpur, Balindah, Chowrassee, Havelyshire, Namjawan, Boorun, Baugmarah, Allumpur, Bhalkah, Belliah, Myhatty, Muttairi, Pajnour, Aoolghaur, Bagwan, Plassey, Krishnagar, Mohutpur, Monshibpur, Sonalipore, Nadia, Khurdah and Sreenagur.
The petitioners stated their distress due to failure of crops. The officers of the Raja pressed for the revenue which they were unable to pay. They prayed that the Raja should grant them some indulgence respecting their balance so that they might remain in their habitation. Otherwise, they would be obliged to quit the country altogether. The Raja replied to the query of the Collector: "If I cannot collect from the ryots how shall I be able to pay the Company's revenue." The Collector personally investigated the complaints of the ryots, visited the different parganahs mentioned in the petition and confirmed the sufferings of the ryots. But neither the Raja nor the ryots got any remission. In March, 1797 parts of the Zamindary were advertized for sale for a balance of Rs. 3,070 till the close of the Magh Touji of 1203 D.S.

Sales of parts of a large estate presented the problem of over-rating the parts sold. By such a transaction, the portion of the original estate left with the Zamindar, would be benefited in exact proportion in which the assessment had been unequally distributed and over-rated, on the parts sold. Regulation I of 1793 states the assessment upon each lot shall be fixed at an amount, which shall bear the same proportion to its actual produce, as the fixed assessment upon the whole of the lands of such proprietor, including those sold, may bear to the whole of their actual produce. But the actual produce of the whole or of the part of an estate was known only to the Zamindars and his own servants. The means which the former Governments possessed, and might have exercised for this purpose were relinquished, on the conclusion of the Permanent Settlement. The Court of Directors
had prohibited the practice of minute local scrutinies; the Canongoe's office had been abolished, and the putwary or village accountant was declared to be no longer a public officer but the servant of the Zamindar.

The Collector tried to ascertain the actual assessment of the lands proposed to be sold and the amount of 'muzcoory' jummas included therein. The Zamindar informed that in the month of Chait 1202 B.S. his cutchery caught fire which burnt almost the whole of his 'dafter'. The Collector told the Zamindar to send the 'Hat Chitta novices' ("at sutta noveeze" of records) of each Parganah but the Zamindar again evaded compliance. The sale of lands had to be postponed again and again for want of necessary details. The amins sent to attach the parganah on 23rd February, 1797 failed to supply the required information.

The Collector allowed the Zamindar a period of seven days to submit the necessary papers, after which a daily fine would be imposed for the delay. The period of seven days expired on 22nd April, but even a month after that date no information was furnished.

The Collector wrote on 29th May, 1797: "I beg leave to inform the Board that the Zamindar this day attended me at my desire, and I imagine, he thought I had detained him perhaps longer than necessary, but I was induced to attempt this mode of treating him in order if possible to receive from him all his mofussil 'dafters' for the year 1203 B.S. He as usual requested time to do this, mentioned the delay that must arise on furnishing papers of the description, and in fact endeavoured all in his power to evade giving what I demanded. On finding, however, the day
rather far advanced and that I was determined to same no trouble or perhaps even risk, to gain my point, he gave me his word that he will positively deliver over this 'dafter' by 10'0 clock tomorrow morning and has also given an Ekrar to that purport."

The papers furnished at last by the Raja were scrutinised and sent to Calcutta on 24th June.

Meanwhile the Raja was taken seriously ill and at his request to Collector Dr. Mitchel, Surgeon of Hooghly, examined the Raja on 17th June and informed the Collector that, "from the nature of the disease with which he is afflicted the life of the Zamindar is in a very precarious state." The Zamindar, however, survived the crisis this time. Iswar Chandra sent to Calcutta "Brahmins of Consequence" to use their influence upon the Calcutta people to prevent them bidding for his lands when they would be put up for sale. On 24th June, the Collector reported: "The Zamindar's conduct throughout the whole of the present transaction is most unaccountable. He appears to be buoyed up with an idea that his lands can not be sold and that no one will purchase when they are put up for sale. These assurances in which he apparently places the most implicit faith, I understand he receives from some of the moneyed men and others at Calcutta who are his friends but I trust he will find himself disappointed."

The sale of the Raja's lands finally took place in August 1797 to realize a total balance of Rs.3,33,464 for the year 1203 B.S. The Zamindary was released from attachment in early September, 1797. Upto the month of July the Government amins collected from the ryots
Rs.4315 on account of 1203 B.S. and Rs.2401 on account of 1204 B.S.  

The collection could not be considerable for "not one pattah has been delivered out (by the Zamindar) as required by the Regulations (Regulation 8 of 1793 and Regulation 4 of 1794)." The Zamindar's officers did not co-operate with the Government Amins. The Collector had reported: "The ryots in many parts of this district are of so turbulent a disposition that the instant they hear of its being in their power to evade payment of their revenues, they will immediately avail themselves of it."  

In 1204 B.S. the Raja duly paid his kists upto Augrahain. But in Pous he fell in balance to the amount of Rs.56,875. The balance increased to Rs.80,036 at the end of Magh.  

He stated the cause of balance to the Collector: "Parganah Anwarpore which forms part of Zamindary is farmed to Radha Kissen Baboo who gave Ramlochan Baboo as his security and the balance due from him amounts to 3 Rs.18,603, which he unjustly keeps from me. These responsible people withholding my revenue allow my lands to be sold and occasion my ruin. For my balance of Pous the Parganahs Belliah and Plassey were advertized to be disposed of and in order to discharge that arrear I was under the necessity of selling two other parganahs by private sale. For the balance of Magh an 'istiari' is now published to take place on the 15th Bysakh and should I in the meantime not be able to pay it, my property will undoubtedly be disposed of - my just demand these affluent people detain from me.... The farmer and security both reside in Calcutta. Favour me and
call upon them for this balance of revenue. At the end of 1204 B.S. lands worth about Rs.36,000 were sold to recover arrears of revenue.

No sale of lands took place in 1205 for the Raja paid the accruing balances by utilizing his usual resources, viz. loans. But in 1206 B.S. he was in great difficulty. A serious inundation affected collection. The balance for the month of Kartick amounted to Rs.72,575. Portions of Zamindary sufficient to recover balance were attached. At the end of the year the balance increased to Rs.1,45,160. The whole of the Zamindary was attached and particulars were being prepared for the sale of lands at the Presidency. Putwaries were summoned by the collector from the villages. To receive them "a chappur on bamboos" was erected. The putwaries came in large number but "no less than two hundred of them ran away. The Collector explained the cause: "As more than half of the putwaries who have yet attended are Brahmin and know that they are to be called upon to swear to the truth of the account they deliver in, I can only attribute this going off and secreting themselves to the aversion they have to take up the gungajal."

The putwaries were suspected to have "entered into collusion with the proprietors to delay the preparation of the statements of their lands." By the middle of July, while the particulars of lands were still being prepared, the Raja paid a considerable part of his arrears, and sought remission of Rs.35,000 for the loss of collection due to inundation. He stated his case in a petition:
"... There is not any profit arising from my Zamindary. My country suffered severe loss by the inundation and draught which occurred in 1204 B.S....... several of my parganahs were unfortunately sold. The country was likewise overflowed the following year, and from the drought and inundation in 1206 B.S. it sustained the greatest injury for many of the ryots being unable to pay their rents have run away, and those who have remained are in arrears of ₹35,000 which is the cause of the sudder balance being considerable..... Radha Kissen Baboo of Calcutta who is farmer of Parganahs Ookhra and Anwarpur is in balance of ₹24,200 which he withholds; ..... there are izaradars and others by which means there is a suddar balance of ₹1,44,000. The favour I now request is that you will receive ₹48,000 of the amount which I will immediately pay by a sale of property, that you will be pleased to suspend the demand of ₹35,000 due from the ryots who have not absconded and suffered from draught and inundation and for the remaining balance I present a decree for ₹24,200 which will be recovered. Besides this the sum of ₹36,000 is due from the ryots who have run away and also from several of the farmers. This I hope you will have the goodness to allow me to pay in four years by kistbundee and then I shall be able to keep possession of the estate of my ancestors. From the former izaradars Collyprasad Dutta and others there is a balance due to me of sixty-four thousand rupees for which I hold five decrees. This will account for my distress......"31 The Government suspended ₹24,200 - the amount of the decree against Ram Kissen Baboo. The rest of
the amount was secured by the Raja mostly by raising loans and selling family jewels. No sale of land took place this time.

At the end of the year 1206 B.S. the Sudder jumma of the Zamindary of Raja Iswar Chandra amounted to Rs.324912. Next year i.e. 1207 B.S. he had a balance of Rs.1,32,200. Mahals amounting to Rs.1,40,000 had been advertised for sale.

In a petition the Raja stated: "I have used every endeavour to procure money to pay this arrear, but without success, in consequence of which I have sold to Fren Kishore Biswas the Parganah Anwarpur and also my 'maddrasse' mahals situated in the 24 parganahs by which I shall receive a lakh of rupees...... and by disposing of Plassey and Bagwan I shall discharge the whole of my balance previous to the day of sale."

A disastrous flood recurred again in 1801. Governor General Marquis Wellesley himself witnessed the flood on his way back from Mirshidabad. He ordered the Collector to extend relief to the distressed. Grains were distributed amongst the most afflicted people in Parganahs Krishnagar, Agradwip, Plassey and Rajipur, and to others money was distributed amounting to Rs.3165. Several land-holders and talookdars asked for suspension of their kists. But the Raja of Nadia was suspected to have collected his kists from the ryots for the month of Bhadra (when most of the harvests in the district was over). The Collector reported: "The Raja is so prodigal and idly dissipate that if the attachment for
the Bhadra kist do not take place immediately as authorised by the Regulations he will not hesitate to lavish the whole he has already collected and can realize between this period and the Dusserah in celebrating that festival in October next.³⁷ Lands were again sold in December 1801 by the Government to realize its balances.

At the close of the year 1209 B.S. Iswar Chandra had a balance due to Government with interest amounting to Rs.77,178 including the balance of Rs.24,200 for the year 1206 for which he received repeated suspension.³⁸ Iswar Chandra died in December 1802 leaving the balance due to Government unpaid and the Zamindary in attachment.

Iswar Chandra's only son Girish Chandra was a minor (16 years of age) at the time of his father's death. Girish Chandra paid up the arrears of his father and current balances till August, 1803, with the hope that the Zamindary might be released from attachment and given back to him. But as required by the Regulations, the Zamindary was taken over by the Court of Wards and the management remained in its hand till 5th June, 1805,³⁹ when Girish Chandra completed the age of 18 years. The Court of Wards had let the whole of the Zamindary in farm and appointed Ramlochan Banerjee - who had been in the service of the family for some years - as guardian and manager of the minor Zamindar on a monthly salary of Rs.1000.⁴⁰

The process of dismemberment of the Zamindary went on under Girish Chandra as before. But the value of land had been
increased by the time and Girish Chandra always preferred private sales which fetched him high prices to public sale by the Government. Often he would let parts of his Zamindary in farm to the highest bidders. To meet the arrears of the year 1212 B.S. Girish Chandra sold part of parganah Ookhra to Sumboo Chandra Pal Chowdhury for Rs.26,000. Similarly parganah Dooleapur was sold to meet the arrear of 1213 B.S. In 1214 B.S. Girish Chandra was in arrear of Rs.61,070. The main excuse was the unsettled state of the district due to the depredations of the dacoits which had considerably depopulated the district and diminished cultivation. The Collector reported: "The reason of the Raja's balance proceeds from his extreme profusion and he seems to be of opinion that the performance of his religious duties at however great an expense ought to be his first consideration." On 2nd November, 1809 the Collector wrote: "During the past year his private sale of lands to prevent them being sold publicly were so great that his jumma has been reduced to Rs.1,33,988." At the close of the year 1216 B.S. the Raja had an arrear of Rs.86,271 for the liquidation of which the whole of his Zamindary was advertised for sale on 26th May. But the Raja paid his balance in full on 23rd April, 1810.

Girish Chandra was still left with the niz parganah Ookhra, Chuckla Krishnagar and Teref Nadia, Sukh Sagar gunge, Chuckla Natteary and some other mehals. Most of the land of "neez" parganah Ookhra had already been sold. Chuckla Krishnagar
and Teref Nadia being places noted for their sanctity and held in the greatest veneration by the Hindoos, no price would be adequate to their purchase and certainly would never be disposed of by public or private sale so long as a vestige of the Raja's family remained. Sukhsagur had been leased to Mr. Groffes and now owned by Mr. Barretto. "Gopimohan Thakoor and many other opulent natives would be happy to give a lakh of rupees for the estate of Sukhsagur", and Mr. Barretto would make no objection to give sixty thousand rupees himself for it. About Chuckla Matteary, the Collector reported: "Chuckla Matteary from the Ichhamutty river running through it, is annually renovated and the soil being chiefly compounded of clay and black earth does not require manure.... yields a revenue of three or four rupees per bigha. The necessities of the Raja, however, have been and still continue such that with a view of getting the most he can from this mahal he has adopted the destructive system of farming it out on a short lease to the highest bidder by whom it is again relet in the small parcels which are afterwards transferred to Kutkinadars and by then again to Durkutkinadars by which means an oppressive rack-rent has been established so ruinous to the ryots that they have turned dacoits in their own defence or emigrated to the neighbouring Zamindaries. The Chuckla has consequently been nearly depopulated and its produce instead of seventy thousand rupees which it used to pay annually has been reduced in the small period of ten years to a sum of less than thirty thousand. It is however, considered so improvable an 'estate' that were the Raja inclined or obliged
to sell, I am informed it would without difficulty produce
four lakh rupees, I think two is more probable."^48

Collector's estimation of the value of parganah
Matteary might have been exaggerated for greater part of
Chuckla Matteary was sold for Rs. 40,000 to pay the arrear of
1218 B.S. 49

In 1812 A.D. before the sale of the parganah Matteary,
total jumma of the Zamindary amounted to Rs. 75,107. 50. Towards
the end of that year (September 1812) Birish Chandra had a
balance of Rs. 62,936 due to Government besides numerous
private debts. On 28th December, 1812, the whole of the
Ookhra Zamindary was sold for Rs. 6,20,000 in satisfaction of a
decree of the Court. 52 Obhoy Charan Banerjee, Kashinath
Banerjee and three others of Calcutta were the joint purchasers
of the estate. Several months passed before the purchasers got
actual possession of the Zamindary. 53

The withering of the Nadia Zamindary was complete within
two decades of the Permanent Settlement. A survey of the
history of these twenty years shows that the dismemberment
of the Zamindary was not so much due to the incapacity and
extravagance of the Nadia Rajas as to their initial difficulties
and defects in the system of administration. Iswar Chandra was
called upon to sign the Decennial Settlement at a jumma much
above the average actual collection. Moreover, he was utterly
impoverished and encumbered with heavy family debts at that
time. His insolvency helplessly drove him to the arms of the
Calcutta mahajans in a year of natural calamity. The rigours
of the rules of payment, kist by kist, and of other regulations passed in 1793 were not foreseen by him. As Iswar Chandra pointed out in a petition: "If at the time of the Decennial Settlement such Regulations for the collection of revenue existed, as are now in force, I should not have ventured to have signed the engagement." At the beginning of the Settlement he continued the traditional practice of remitting rents of his ryots in a year of failure of crops. He states in a petition forwarded by the Collector on 2nd February, 1793, "on account of the draught in 1198 B.S. and the crops having failed the sum of ₹67,954 was suspended to afford relief to the ryots." The same year the Calcutta tycoon Baranasi Ghosh, farmer of parganah Noolgur kept in confinement in his Calcutta House, his under-renter Shyam Bose for failure to pay the sum stipulated in the Kabuliyat. Soon, the Hadia Rajas, too became more business-like. In 1800, the year of a devastating flood, the Collector reported: "the average quantity of grain saved is not more than 8 annas which after deduction on account of seed advanced by the Mahajans of the village and payment of revenue, a very small pittance if any will be left for the support of the ryots and their families." In that year Iswar Chandra collected all his dues from the ryots except ₹35,000. The Collector commented: "in doing this the ryots must have been distressed to the utmost."
The combination entered into by the Calcutta farmers to withhold payments they owed to the Zamindar was extremely ruinous. The case of Radhakissen Baboo and Ramlochan Baboo showed the helplessness of the Zamindar before the inadequacies of the laws. Iswar Chandra appealed to the Government to enforce the decree against the above persons. Warrants were issued by the district Court. But the Baboos repeatedly escaped the receipt of warrants by eluding the peons. Calcutta Police were not legally bound to enforce warrants of district Courts and did not extend any help. Ultimately the warrants were withdrawn and the responsibility of realising money was left to the Zamindar.

Attachments and sale of lands at the end of the year created a vicious circle. To the Zamindars attachment was preferable to immediate sale. They would wait till the lands were about to be sold, then raise loans "even at the exorbitant rate of thirty or forty per cent", pay the balance before the last day of sale and get the attachments withdrawn. In the early part of the next year they would collect rents, pay the debts first and then allow the balance to be accumulated, and the lands attached again. Collection of revenue by Government Amins led to fall in collection and increasing balance of Government demands. Thus attachment ultimately did greater harm to the Zamindars.

Recurring scourge of inundation was the effect of neglect of the long-standing bunds during the period preceding the Decennial Settlement when frequent changes were made in the
ownership of the Zamindaries. The amount of Rs. 8000 allowed as poolbundy money in the Decennial Settlement was "the businessman's way of measuring out a matter of very serious social responsibility in terms of his balance-sheet." Progressive dismemberment of the Zamindaries and apportioning the poolbundy deduction amongst the new purchasers led to division of responsibilities and further neglect of the bunds. After the disastrous floods of 1801, steps were taken by the Government to keep vigilance over the embankments in the district. The proceedings of the 'Government in the Judicial Department' dated 11th February, 1802 vested the Collectors with a general superintendence and control over all embankments and other works constructed for the supply of water for the purpose of agriculture - whether such works be maintainable at Government cost or at the cost of the individuals. The Collectors were required during the rainy season to pay every practicable attention to the repairs of the above works. The Magistrates were to inspect personally the state of embankments and the Judges of the Court of Circuit were asked to collect information and report the same to the Nizamat Adalat. Commercial Residents, Salt Agents and other Europeans in the mofussil whose residences were in the vicinity of such embankments were to superintend the repair works and afford other necessary assistances. Costs of repairs were borne by the landholders in whose area the embankments were situated. A Committee for Embankments was formed at Murshidabad to supervise the bunds in Nadia and Murshidabad. Annual inundations posed a great threat to the
investments of the indigo planters. They took special interest and initiative in looking after the embankments. After 1801, the district was free from serious inundation for many years, until 1823-60.

The wide powers given to the landholders over their tenants by the Regulations of 1812 were of no use to the Rajas of Nadia. They had lost their Zamindary almost entirely by 1813. Unlike the Burdwan Rajas', the Nadia Rajas' "benamee" lands were negligible. They made some purchases during the bulk sale in 1797-61. But most of their lands being privately sold, the question of 'benamee' purchase did not arise.

The lands of the Nadia Zamindary were purchased "either by Calcutta banians or by responsible inhabitants of the district and a few by persons who have since turned out adventurers, who, not finding their purchases equal to the expectation they had formed, collected what they were able and absconded." Amongst the Calcutta banians who had either purchased or farmed lands in Nadia were Nabakrishna Roy, Codly Prasad Dutta, Joynarayan Ghosal, Baranasi Ghosh, Muktaram Bose, Radhakissen Babu, Gopimohan Thakoor, Obhoycharan Banerjee, Kashinath Banerjee and others.

The Palchowdhuries of Ranaghat were the purchasers of largest part of the Nadia Zamindary. They had their origin in the district, but carried on trade and business in Calcutta. Sahasraram Panty, (the title Palchowdhury was bestowed to them by the Raja of Nadia) father of Krishna Chandra and Sambhuchandra was a man of very "indigent circumstances." Krishnachandra was
originally a petty trader at Ranaghat, and there lived at that
time a certain mohunt (a Brahmin priest) who had a considerable
trade or cultivation at Aranghatta, a little north of Ranaghat.
This mohunt had some very large stores of the grain called
"chola" but the insect got at it and spoiled it all - at least
so it seemed. The mohunt determined to cast it all away, when
Krishna Pal offered him some small price for it, and subsequently
by selling it realised enormous profit, for it turned out that
the insects had destroyed only a little of the surface grain.
Krishna Chandra then monopolised trade in salt. Their trade
flourished so that in 1793-1794 the Palchowdhuries were the owners
of movable and immovable properties amounting to more than
seven lakhs of rupee. In 1797 during the public sale of the
Nadia Zamindary Krishna Chandra and his brother Sambhu Chandra
purchased parganahs, Allumpur, Parganahs Baugmara, Parganah
Serampur and 11 dhees forming part of Chuckla Sreenagur, Shibpur
and three dhees forming part of parganah Pajnaur, paying altogether
a jumma of Rs.87,212. In the year 1206 B.S. they purchased
tereef Ranaghat, the jumma of which was Rs.1,294 and in 1209
purchased tereef Chourasy the jumma of which was Rs.2,355 and
another kismat belonging to Ramohun, the jumma of which was
Rs.156 and a third kismat belonging to Shambhu Nath Banerjee,
the jumma of which was Rs.1229. The total jumma of all lands
purchased by them amounted to Rs.1,30,804 in 1805. In 1213
B.S. (1806) Shambhu Chandra purchased a part of the parganah
Cokhra jumma of which was Rs.9,650. In this way the Zamindary
of the Pal Chowdhuries continued to swell along with the fortune
of the family. In years of natural calamity, they too were in arrear of collections, but they could pay off the balance because of their solvency. In 1812, total assets of the family amounted to forty-five lakhs of rupees. 

There was another kind of purchasers amongst the newly rich men of Calcutta who would jump at the bid without knowing the resources of the lands. Bindaban Mitra of Calcutta states in a petition: "On the 5th day of Aswin 1208 B.S. I purchased at the cutchery of the Board of Revenue the 10 annas share of Bettai, the jumma of which in the tahood was Rs. 1819. On taking possession and examining into the papers of the mofussil I found that there was a deficiency in the assets amounting to Rs. 600 and that there were no means cultivating the land so as to recover the deficiency.... I took much trouble and expended a large sum of money but I could not make up the deficiency.... in order to recover the balance the mahal has been advertised at four different periods for sale, but in consequence of the deficiency no one has bid for it - when an advertisement was published that the mahal would be let in farm but no proposals have taken place - every one is sensible of the deficiency." Bindaban Mitra's appeal for reducing the jumma or preparing a fresh hustabood by the Government anins was turned down.

A history of the two decades of the Permanent Settlement shows that the furious tensions occasioned by the rigours of the Settlement had their harmful effects upon the indigent ryots. Circumstances were ill-suited for improvements in cultivation. The miseries of the ryots, begun with the Famine of
1770, were perpetuated. Half a century of Dewany was the period of extreme exploitation and distress for the ryots of Bengal.

But things had just begun to change. After the Charter Act of 1813, there were bright prospects of producing commercial crops in the district. The production of cash crops indeed increased several times between 1813 and 1835. But these new circumstances instead of bringing any relief to the peasants brought fresh miseries upon them. All the benefits were shared by the land-lords, factory-owners and their handful of Indian agents, and the peasants remained discontented as before.
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