CHAPTER-V

British Administration: Early Phase
(1833-49)
Narayan Sing was elevated on the 11th of October 1833 to the Gaddi of Sambalpur without any pledge on the part of the British Government to support him in the possession of it. Capt. Wilkinson gave him a Khillat consisting of the following articles and value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value (Sicca Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Elephant</td>
<td>800-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jhoolpor Elephant</td>
<td>75-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Puggrie</td>
<td>18-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dupatta</td>
<td>14-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dupatta</td>
<td>21-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Shawl Roomal</td>
<td>45-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Piece of Khukhol</td>
<td>35-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sari for Narayan Sing’s</td>
<td>25-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1033-0-0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capt. Wilkinson left Sambalpur on the 25th of October 1833. All the troops except one Havildar and twelve Sepoys for the Treasury and the Post office were withdrawn. He requested the Government for sanction of 1500/- Sicca rupees to the Rajas of Patna and Sonepur for their loyal services to the Government in apprehending and delivering the rebels. These sums could not be paid by the Rani as the treasury was empty. Accordingly, Rs.1000/- and Rs.500/- were sanctioned to both the Rajas as reward to them.

---

1 Letter No. 141 dated 13.10.1833, from Capt. Wilkinson to the Secretary to Government, Political Department, (NAI).

2 Letter No. 103 dated 6.2.1834, from C.E. Travelyan, Deputy Secretary to Government to Capt. Wilkinson (NAI).
The Company did not assume the charge of administration of the state of Sambalpur till the year 1849, although it had been occupied by the British. In the year 1805, it was gratuitously restored to Raghuji Bhonsle and remained with them upto 1817, when it came under the British for the second time. The rule through a puppet administrator practically continued till 1849 and this was naturally a long period during which the people had a bitter taste of the weak administration. Lt. Kitto, who visited Sambalpur in 1838, observed that "Sambalpur lapsed to the British Government in 1827 by the death of the late Raja but for some reason they sought for an heir in law and conferred it on an obscure and aged Zamindar and a perfect imbecile who is now entirely in the hands of his crafty ministers". The intentions of the East India Company’s Government would be quite clear from the statement of Kitto that “it was to be hoped that on the demise of the Raja, who had no children, the Government would avail itself of the opportunity to resume it”.

The rule of Narayan Sing was marked by gross favouritism. His was a period of completely weak administration consistent with his incapability and feebleness. From the description of Lt. Kitto, it is known that the fort of Sambalpur occupied about more than a kilometre and was fast falling to ruins. The Raja no more resided in the old palace, which was in the occupation of some top-rank officers. There was a miserable garrison of a few regamuffins dressed as Sepoys and some 20 or 30 sowars whose steeds were like Pharaoh’s lean kine. The walls were in a very dilapidated state having suffered much from the effects of the extraordinary floods in 1836.

2 Letter No. 103, dated 6.2.1834 from Capt. Wilkinson to Secretary to Government, (NAI).
Narayan Sing being aged was not able to cope with the situation and it can be judged from the fact that, he never handled a gun although he had 8 guns including the two presented by the British Government. The fact came to the notice of Cadenhead when he prepared an inventory of personal assets of the estate of Raja Narayan Sing after his death. Out of these guns, two brass guns were subsequently melted and the sale proceeds of the brass had to be credited into the treasury. It was reported by Kitto that, the Raja was realising a revenue of 7,00,000/- per annum although according to accurate assessment it might be Rs.4,00,000/- including valuable diamonds. He was paying a tribute of Rs.8,000/- to the British Government.

As regards insecurity of law and order Lt. Kitto said, "I was somewhat surprised. One morning while taking my ride to see three human heads struck on a pole at the junction of two roads near the town, they were placed there on January, 1838, their owners having forfeited them for treason, though not without a protracted and severe struggle". The heads were there for four months while Kitto visited Sambalpur. These were surely the heads of those insurgents who raised their voices, supporting the cause of a genuine native rule, against Narayan Sing.

Narayan Sing was quite aged when he was made the Raja of Sambalpur. He, with a religious bent of mind, was not able to discharge his duty as the king of Sambalpur. He was described as having been

---

1 Letter No. 57, dated 22.7.1850, from J. Cadenhead, Principal Assistant Agent, Governor General to the Agent to Governor General South West Frontier, (NAI).
2 Letter No. 109, dated 10.3.1852, from Agent to the Governor to Principal Assistant at Sambalpur.
3 N. Senapati (ed), op.cit., p.72.
perfectly astounded when it was proposed to make him the Raja, so much so that he prayed the Agent not to exalt him to so dangerous a position\textsuperscript{1}. The Raja, in order to perpetuate his position made feverish attempts to win over the Brahmins and other influential people to his side. His ministers and the Brahmins possessed the best lands and obtained his sanction to all kinds of extortion, the former, in their turn, grind their royats\textsuperscript{2}. The elevation of Raja Narayan Sing to the Gaddi of Sambalpur and his weak and corrupt administration added fuel to the agitation, this time by Balaram Sing, assisted by Surendra Sai, his nephew.

Anirudha Sai, the fourth son of Madhukar Dev\textsuperscript{3} was assigned the villages of Baragaon, Dhama in Dhama P.S., Talab and Tabla within Sasan P.S., Mauja Khinda with two hamlets Talmira and Dantomara in Katarbaga P.S and Rajpur. Some of these grants were ratified by the last Raja Narayan Sing, the opponent of Surendra Sai and shown in the Government records as such. Excepting the Mauja Khinda with two hamlets, all the four villages named Talab, Tabla, Baragaon and Dhama, were resumed and given as rewards to those who had helped the British Government in getting Surendra Sai arrested and punished. As regards Rajpur, Aniruddha Sing gave it to another son Raj Sing with whom the branch of Chauhan of Rajput started.

Till the time of Drup Sing, the third successor in Aniruddha's line, the descendants lived in the palace in joint families with the Maharajas. It was Tej Sing, the successor of Drup Sing, who for the first time settled in Khinda. Balaram Sing, uncle of Surendra Sai, was for some time, the Dewan of Rani Mohan Kumari. He, later on became

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p.71.
\textsuperscript{2} Lt. Kitto, op.cit, p.90.
\textsuperscript{3} R.C. Mullick, op.cit, p.168.
the key figure to guide Surendra Sai in a rising against Narayan Sing, the aim being the restoration of native rule in the country.

Surendra Sai was the son of Dharam Sing and the nephew of Balaram Sing. He had six brothers, Udant Sai, Dhrub Sai, Ujjal Sai, Chhabila Sai, Jajjal Sai and Medini Sai and one sister, named Anjana, the youngest of all.

Dharam Sing, father of Surendra Sai, was a sober man with a religious bent of mind. Surendra Sai was born at his native village Khinda, which is at a distance of 21 kilometres north of Sambalpur town, on the 23rd of January 1809. Surendra Sai and his brother had no aptitude for education but their’s was a practical and real education, in the sense that they had military training by all methods which were necessary for developing a sense of unity of action. He with his brothers was spending most of the time in physical culture with a purpose to undergo all hardship and vicissitudes of life for restoring native rule in Sambalpur. Obstinacy and tenacity of purpose were two great characteristics of Surendra Sai.

Apart from legal claim, the family feud between the Khinda Chauhan family and that of Sambalpur was the factor responsible for putting Balaram Sing against Narayan Sing. Manohar Sai, brother of Balaram Sing being very handsome was suspected of having secret love with the queen of the King Jayanta Sing. The king could smell the affair between Manohar and his queen and made a conspiracy to murder the former. He, accordingly, instructed Dewan Mana Mishra to murder Manohar Sai. But the Dewan could not agree to it. Subsequently the king sent for Govinda Dewan of Sonepur who acted according to the

---

king and Manohar Sai was murdered. He was duly rewarded and made the Dewan of Sambalpur. Balaram Sing, brother of Manohar was determined to avenge the death of his brother and the relation between the Khinda Chauhan family with that of Sambalpur was estranged. The withdrawal of the British after the elevation of Narayan Sing as the Raja of Sambalpur gave Balaram Sing the long-awaited opportunity in organising the people against the Sambalpur Raj, now headed by Narayan Sing with British support. By this venture Surendra Sai with his brothers became the motive force in mobilising the affected people and tried all possible manners to organise the tribals. Their involvement was so effective and convincing that the tribals as well as the non-tribals in spite of their fear of loss of tenures supported the cause of the Sai family. It may be stated that Raja Narayan Sing created thirty-seven muaffi tenure during his reign. The Brahmin and other higher classes also were no less apprehensive of loss of status and rights as Raja Narayan Sing was under the protection of the British authority. In the fitness of things, Balaram Sing with all courage and endurance, could shoulder the responsibility of putting a dogged defense against the Narayan Sing Government.

The accession of Narayan Sing caused a wave of protest throughout the state. The people were not prepared to accept him without a queen from the royal family. The Raja, at the age of sixty, married to Mukhyapen Devi of Sareikela Raj family. He, in order to meet the marriage expenses, put the village Samasingha as mortgage with the Zamindar of Amagaon in Bonai State. There was a skirmish, while the king was returning, between the Raja's sepoys and the rebels.

1 Letter, dated 13.9.1833, from Capt. Wilkinson to Secretary to Government of India, Political Department, (NAI).
2 A. Das, op.cit., p.47.
3 Sapneswar Das, op.cit, p.55.
organised by Surendra Sai at a distance of 15 kilometres from Sambalpur. The Raja's troops, because of their number, were able to disperse the insurgents. Raja Narayan Sing sent for Surendra Sai but in vain. Subsequently, in the later period, when the country was facing the ravage of famine in 1834, Surendra Sai desisted the authority from collecting revenue and put all the efforts to break open granaries which resulted in an encounter between him and the royal troops. Narayan Sing further called upon Surendra Sai for accepting his suzerainty but he did not yield and accordingly went with his family to Gangpur. The Barpali Zamindar Bhawani Sing and Bhuban Gauntia of Putiapali tried for a reconciliation between Surendra Sai and Raja Narayan Sing but the effort yielded nothing. The Raja felt offended and sent troops to capture Surendra Sai who had already escaped to Gangpur. The Rampur Zamindar, at the instruction of Raja Narayan Sing, looted the village of Surendra Sai and in retaliation the village of Rampur was looted. Raja Narayan Sing lodged a complaint to the Agent of the Governor General against Surendra Sai.

Balabhadra Sing Dao, the Gond Zamindar of Lakhanpur was a great supporter of Surendra Sai and he had a number of trained archers under him. He had much cause of complaint and was very active in resisting the authorities and many of the Zamindars of both the Khalsa and Garajats used to encourage him. Rebellion broke out at once and the insurgents met in the Barapahar range of Hills, their stronghold and

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 F. Dewar, op.cit., p.47.
6 S.P. Padhi, op.cit., p.2.
7 A village situated 40 kilometres to North East of Baragarh.
safe place of shelter. The highest peak Debrigarh used to be the stronghold and shelter of these insurgents. The hill-cave “Barabakhara” was capable of accommodating 400 men. Both Surendra Sai and Balabhadra Sing Dao used to adopt guerilla warfare against the troops of the Raja. The British authority, in spite of all efforts, could not get the whereabouts of the two rebels who caused much panic in the mind of the Raja. At last one Pahdu Ganda, who had been a follower of Surendra Sai, betrayed the rebels and supplied all clues about their whereabouts to the authorities. Surendra Sai and Balabhadra Sing Dao were taken by surprise when resting at Debrigarh unprepared for any action. The Raja’s troops supported by the British force were helped by the Rampur and Barpali Zamindars and there followed a heavy encounter between the insurgents and the troops. The rebels, though unprepared, put up a good show but could not withstand for long as the troops were sufficiently reinforced by Phuljhar Zamindar. In the action, Balabhadra Sing Dao was killed and Surendra Sai escaped with severe injuries.

The Raja expected that with the death of Balabhadra Sing Dao, the rebellion would cease, and his policy of winning over the followers of Surendra Sai to his side would succeed. Attempts were made with the people and the Zamindars to alienate their sympathy from Surendra Sai in support of the Raja. The rebels were given rewards, granted Jagirs, and their confiscated lands were restored. But the rebellion was renewed with doubled vigour. The death of Balabhadra created stir in the minds of the Gond and Binjhal Zamindars who took up arms against Narayan Sing. Consequently, the people resented very much to the attitude of Raja Narayan Sing and when things became intolerable, they

1 A. Das, op.cit, p.39.
2 S.P. Padhi, op.cit., p.3.
3 L.S.S.O’Malley, op.cit, p.27.
again had to make a show of their utter resentment at the state of affairs by an uprising, the only means open to them.

Consequent upon the failure in capturing Surendra Sai, dead or alive, the Raja sent purwanah to his Zamindars and Jagirs very secretly for plundering his villages\(^1\). The Rampur Zamindar Narahari Gartia played the leading part. Accordingly, the armed followers of Narahari Gartia took away the cattle from Mauja Dantomara of Surendra Sai and also took with them as captives the persons who were in charge of the cattle\(^2\). The matter was reported to Harekrishna Bohidar, the Tahasildar who forwarded it to Col. Osley. Further, the armed followers of Rampur Zamindar forcibly collected the revenue of Villeimal, which was in possession of Balaram Sing and carried three of royats who opposed them\(^3\). A full investigation was demanded but the Raja, being instructed by Col. Osley secretly, deliberately remained inactive.

The Zamindar of Rampur assisted the Raja and the British forces against the leaders of the country and gave information of their whereabouts. The Britishers also were disappointed that in spite of their well-planned attempts, loss of money and man-power, they could capture neither Balaram Sing nor Surendra Sai. Of all the Zamindars who actively supported the capture of Surendra Sai and his followers with men and money and gave secret information of their whereabouts, the Zamindar of Rampur was most prominent. Surendra Sai sent a messenger to caution him but he was insulted.

In September 1837, at the instance of Balaram Sing, their uncle, the two brothers Surendra Sai and Udant Sai went with an armed force

---

\(^1\) S.P. Padhi, op.cit., p.4.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Sapneswar Das, op.cit, p.63.
and attacked Rampur. There was stiff opposition by the Zamindar Duriya Sing. In a fit of anger the rebels raged the fort to the ground and burnt down the village. The son and father of Duriya Sing were killed in action and Duriya Sing fled to Himgiri. The news reached the headquarters immediately and a large force was on the march to capture Surendra Sai. He rightly apprehended that the Britishers would take drastic action against him and accordingly was proceeding to Patna state to request the Raja for help. On the way, he was taken by surprise. A bloody battle was fought at Deheripalli near the Budharaja Hills. It did not take much time for the British and the Raja's sepoys to disperse the rebels after killing and injuring many. Surendra Sai, his brother Udant Sai and their uncle Balaram Sing were captured.

The case was investigated in 1840 and in 1841. The Agent Col. Osley submitted the proceeding of the case with the recommendation that the rebels be sentenced to death. As there was delay, the Agent solicited the orders of the Government in the case of Surendra Sai and Udant Sai. The Agent was informed that his judgement has been referred to the Nizamat Adalat for opinion, on the receipt of which he would be furnished with the orders of the Government.

The imprisonment of the Sai brothers and their uncle at Hazaribagh was not justified and the sentence was not legal. The record of the case, in which they were sentenced, unfortunately, could not be found. It is doubtful whether it was ever laid down before the

1 L.S.S.O'Malley, op.cit, p.27.
2 N. Senapati (ed), op.cit, p.71.
3 Sapneswar Das, op.cit, p.53.
4 Letter dated 30.7.1842, from the Agent, Sambalpur to Secretary to Government, Political Department, (OSA).
5 Letter, dated 31.8.1842, from Secretary, Political Department to Agent S.W.F., (OSA).
Government which was bound by every possible consideration of justice. It was, particularly with regard to Balaram Sing, very harsh and severe. He, being very old, was not expected to take as active part as did Surendra Sai and his brother in the Rampur affairs. Rai Rup Sing Bahadur, Dewan of Raja Narayan Sing in 1847-48 made a clear and definite statement that Balaram Sing did not take part in the atrocity on the family members of the Zamindars of Rampur and that he did not go to Rampur. He was, however, implicated and served with the life sentence. He was punished because he was the brain behind the operation conducted by his nephews.

The sentence on Surendra Sai and Udant Sai were against the feelings of the country. All classes of people had extraordinary sympathy for them.

The incident, which was responsible for making the Sai brothers prisoners for life, had been narrated by Surendra Sai himself in the official records. His statement was recorded by R. Leigh, Senior Assistant Commissioner, Sambalpur on the 23rd of October 1857 after the forced release of Surendra Sai and his short stay at Sambalpur. The Government of Bengal enquired from the Assistant Commissioner as to when and for what offence, Surendra Sai and Udant Sai had been imprisoned. While forwarding the statements of Surendra Sai, Rai Rup Sing Bahadur, the Munsif and native Assistant and Sheik-Panchkaudi, Subedar of the Light Infantry Battalion, the Assistant Commissioner

1 Letter No. 3119 dated 15.10.1857, from A.R. Young, Secretary to Government of Bengal to Capt. R. Leigh, Assistant Commissioner, Sambalpur, (OSA).
replied that the Sambalpur office was established only in 1850 and there were no records having reference to the cases of the two persons.1

Raja Narayan Sing according to Surendra Sai called upon him to show his allegiance. It was refused because Surendra Sai considered himself to be the better claimant to the Gaddi. After this occurrence Surendra Sai went with his family to Gangpur. After some time, the Barpali Zamindar and others brought about reconciliation between him and Narayan Sing who wished to dine with him. Surendra Sai refused to do this as he considered the Raja to be of a lower caste than himself. After sometime the Rampur Zamindar looted his village and in retaliation Surendra Sai looted the village of the Rampur Zamindar. Subsequently Col. Osley, Agent to the Governor General of the South West Frontier came to Sambalpur and Raja Narayan Sing complained to him that Surendra Sai committed various acts of violence for which the Agent sentenced him to imprisonment for five years, his brother Udant for seven years and his uncle for life. When the terms of imprisonment expired, they petitioned that they should be released and their properties restored to them. Upon this Narayan Sing represented that if they were allowed to return to Sambalpur, there would be fresh disturbances. They were then told that they had to remain in prison for life.

According to Subedar Sheik Panchkaudi of the Light Infantry Battalion in the year 1840 he had come to Sambalpur in command of an escort accompanying the late Col. Osley, Agent to the Governor General, South West Frontier. After leaving the state when they had proceeded three or four marches, Surendra Sai, Udant Sai and their uncle Balaram Sing were handed over to him as prisoners by the order

---

1 Letter No.87, dated 23.10.1857, from Capt. R. Leigh, Assistant Commissioner to A.R.Young, (OSA).
of Col. Osley. On their arrival at Ranchi, the three men were imprisoned. Balaram Sing died in the prison when he heard that Suredra Sai and Udant Sai were imprisoned, the former for five years and the latter for seven years, but he spoke only from what he had heard that their terms of imprisonment had been increased to seven and nine years respectively and subsequently they were informed that they were imprisoned for life. He, being frequently on guard at the jail, heard the two men Suredra Sai and Udant Sai saying that Narayan Sing, the Raja of Sambalpur had caused them to be imprisoned for life for fear of his own safety. He heard that they had been imprisoned for having retaliation for some injury and oppression inflicted on them by Raja Narayan Sing, robbed some villages and killed some persons in the years previous to 1840.

According to Rai Rup Sing Bahadur, the Dewan of Narayan Sing, in 1847-48 the Governor General’s Agent, South West Frontier, sent a purwanah to the Raja informing him that Suredra Sai and Udant Sai had been imprisoned for life and directed him to apprehend Dhruba Sai, brother of Suredra Sai and some others, who were involved in the offences for which Suredra Sai and Udant Sai had been convicted. Dhruba Sai was apprehended but afterwards, on representation made to Government, was released to remain at Sambalpur. About the year 1832-34 when Raja Narayan Sing was returning from Singbhum, Suredra Sai, Udant Sai and Balaram Sing opposed the Raja’s progress at a place about .5 kos\(^1\) from Sambalpur. The Raja, having a strong force with him, drove them off. Afterwards Raja Narayan Sing sent Barkandazee to either apprehend or kill them, but they effected their escape and the Barkandazee looted their villages. The Raja then issued orders to different Zamindars to apprehend or kill them. One day Suredra Sai and Balaram Sing and others attacked the Rampur

\(^1\) A kos is roughly about 3 kilo metres.
Zamindar’s house at Rampur and killed several of his family members. For these offences Col. Osley ordered for their imprisonment. The above circumstances as also other acts of violence said to have been committed by them were heard by Rai Rup Sing Bahadur from Raja Narayan Sing. He, however, corrected his statement by saying that he believed that Balaram Sing was not a party to the murder of the Rampur Zamindar’s family as he did not go there.

The statement of Surendra Sai, Subedar Sheik Panchkaudi and Rai Rup Sing Bahadur clearly established the fact that Raja Narayan Sing being guided by the British was responsible for the confinement of the two Sai brothers and their uncle. The sentences were indefinite in the beginning. The atrocities were committed during the Raja’s rule characterised by wild feudal time and it was not unprovoked. The Rampur Zamindar had been the first aggressor. Further, it is to be noted that during Col. Osley’s visit to Sambalpur, Surendra Sai had been permitted to attend with other Chiefs to pay him his respect and was not apprehended until he rejoined Osley’s Camp.

Moreover, it is clear from the statement of Rai Rup Sing Bahadur, the Dewan, that he had no personal knowledge of the various atrocities committed by Surendra Sai and that he had only heard from his master, the Raja. This also indicates that the Raja was doing it to weed the thorn out of his way. The vengeance of Raja Narayan Sing did not end there. He was also after Dhruba Sai, another brother of Surendra Sai and others towards the close of his life. Even after 10 years of this incident a purwanah was obtained for their arrest.

The Rampur incident offered Narayan Sing the much sought-after opportunity of wrecking his vengeance on Surendra Sai and his brothers. The Sai brothers, being his rivals with better claims to the Gaddi and with much more popularity and personality than himself,
were like thorns in his path. Consequently they were confined and Surendra Sai passed into complete oblivion after 1840.

In spite of the confinement of Surendra Sai in the Hazaribagh jail, the spirit of dissatisfaction continued to prevail upon the country with a new dimension. The people resisted to their utmost and the authority had no rest, no peace in life. The rebellion of Surendra Sai left its traces in the Gond Rebellion. Agitations were organised supporting the cause of a native rule. Resentment and opposition to the authority found expression in robberies, dacoity, arson and hooliganism. The socio-economic life of the people was completely paralysed; life and property were quite unsafe. The weak administration of Raja Narayan Sing looked unmatchable to this situation. Janardan Sing, the Gond Zamindar of Paharsirgida headed the rebellion against the authority of Narayan Sing.1

Balunkeswar Das, better known as Balki Das, being a favourite of the Raja, was entrusted with the charge of quelling the Gond disturbance. He was the son of Sambhu Das, who came from Puri and settled at Kalapani village2. Balki Das while a young boy, was kidnapped by the Marathas during the period when Raja Jayanta Sing and his son Maharaja Sai were royal prisoners of the Marathas. This boy who was in charge of a herd of buffaloes, could make his escape from Chanda with the herd, and presented them to Maharaja Sai, thereby becoming his favourite3. In due course, he was made the Talukdar of 96 villages. Subsequently, he also gained favour of Raja Narayan Sing who entrusted him with the work of quelling down the rebellion.

1 A. Das, op. cit., p. 44.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 45.
Balki Das, in order to suppress the rebellion, raised a platform in his village Katapali, from where he used to give warning to other villages, by beating of drums, indicating the movement of the Gonds. In 1843, the Gonds looted his properties, burnt the village and the two leaders named Bandya Rai and Mohapatra Rai killed him and concealed themselves in the Debrigarh peak of Barapahar range. Bandya Rai, after the death of Balabhadra Sing Dao became the Zamindar of Lakhanpur. Raja Narayan Sing granted the village Baragarh in favour of Narayan Das and Krushna Das in recognition of royal services of Balki Das. On the 28th of November 1843 the gift was conveyed in a copper plate and the pattah was termed “Mundakata” (Head cut off). Bamdev Padhi, father of the former Tahsildar, Satyabadi Padhi, was likewise murdered by the Gonds.

Bamdev Mishra, Syamasundar Tripathy, Ram Chandra Baxi etc. were suspected of having a role in the disturbances and were confined by Narayan Sing. Later on, they were called to Ranchi by Col. Osley, who being convinced of their innocence, freed them from the confinement. Col. Osley himself came to Sambalpur for a spot verification and stayed for four months. Subsequently, he left for Ranchi giving the charge to Bux Maulavi. The Tahasildar Harekrishna Pattnaik was replaced by Kalia Babu and on the 13th of May 1846, Rup Sing was appointed the Dewan of Raja Narayan Sing.

In the year 1849, Col. Osley marched against the Angul Raja Somnath Sing, who rebelled against the British Government. Accordingly, the Rajas of Sambalpur and Bamra sent garrison and
assisted Col. Osley. Ultimately, the Raja of Angul was defeated but effected his escape, but he was apprehended by the Bamra Raja and the Dewan Rup Sing. Subsequently, they handed him over to the British authority and he was sent to the Hazaribagh jail. The title "Raibahadur" was conferred on Raja Narayan Sing for his loyal service to the British.

On the 10th of September 1849 Raja Narayan Sing died and the period of consolidation of the British administration commenced. The widow Rani Mukhyapan Devi assumed the charge of the administration for a very short time but she had to quit as no adoption was recognised and, therefore, the State lapsed to the Government.

The first action of the British Government was to set in order the administration of Sambalpur. The general nature of the rule of the native Chiefs of Sambalpur was illustrated in the Settlement Report by Mr. Dewar. The royal household received supplies of necessaries from its rich domain land in such villages as Talab lying near the palace, but while the Raja remained in his residence at the headquarters, the henchmen of the villages both far and near, sent in requisitions of produce in addition to their customary money-payments. When he toured though his state, further supplies were exacted and all the officers of the Government lived free of charge and took toll not only from the fields and gardens but also from the looms and nets. At times villages were liable to render unpaid labour on the roads and public buildings. These, the usual incident of feudal rule, represented an amount of taxation, large out of proportion, with the fixed annual payments of cash. They were further added to an all exceptional or recurring occasions of expense by the levy of Nazrana on the headmen.

---

1 R.C. Mullick, op.cit., p.212.
2 Political Department No.24, dated 4.9.1850.
of the villages. Their amounts were determinable only by the state, and they were liable to take the form of heavy ‘benevolences’. The Zamindars besides their normal tributes and the cost of presents paid and the produce consumed during a royal progress in time of peace, were in war time liable to be called out with men, arms and supplies. On the whole “the total revenue probably not less than five times the fixed annual collections can never under this system have been a light one even in prosperous peaceful years\(^1\).

The first act of the new Government was to create fear in the minds of the influential land-holders in general. The revenue was at once raised by one-fourth indiscriminately without reference to the capability of the villages. Further, the whole of free-hold grants, religious and other forms, were resumed. Those who held villages entirely rent-free were assessed at half rate without any reference to the period for which the grant had been held in terms of tenures. Assignments in money or grain from the revenue of villages were resumed. Also was resumed assignment of land in villages. Great dissatisfaction was consequently created at the out-set, and so seriously did the Brahmins, a numerous and powerful community, looked upon it that they went in a body to Ranchi to appeal but for no redress. In 1854, a second settlement was made on an equally indiscriminate principle. The assessment of all villages being again raised by one-fourth, the result was an enormous rise in the revenue obtained by the Government i.e. from Rs.8,800/- to Rs.74,000/-.

Under such circumstances, it was not altogether surprising, that when Surendra Sai headed a revolt during the mutiny of 1857, he was joined by a number of Chiefs, who feared further losses under the British Settlement. The Chief of Kolabira was one of the most powerful

\(^1\) F. Dewar, op.cit, p.47.
of these Zamindars and on his taking up the rebel cause, many others followed from the force of the example and many were compelled to join by the more influentials.

The other act of the display of supremacy was that proceedings were initiated against the neighbouring Rajas.

Sangram Sing, the Raja of Sarangarh resented the British Government for taking charge of direct administration. He sent three “Urzies” to Cadenhead and those were forwarded directly to the Agent by Kalia Babu, the Treasurer. Cadenhead was asked to warn Kalia Babu not to send such papers directly. One of the petitions was on the claim of a kinsman. On this, the observation of Crawford was as follows:

“In the 1st ‘Urzie’, Sangram Sing has obtruded on this office his opinion that one of the nearest of those who have been the Rajas of Sambalpur ought to be raised to the Gaddi in stead the country being brought under the direct administration”. Cadenhead was asked to warn the Raja that such anti-Government conduct of him thereafter should be ‘brought to the notice of the Government which would result in serious punishment to him’. The Raja had to appear before Cadenhead under a purwanah to explain his conduct and beg apology and he did so. It may be stated that of all the Rajas under the Raja of Sambalpur, the Rajas of Sarangarh and Raigarh were made most powerful in the days of Baliar Sing as they had assisted Raja Baliar Sing in conquering 18 Garjats.

---

1 Letter No.19, dated 6.3.1850, from Crawford to J. Cadenhead, (NAI).
2 Letter No.33, from Crawford to J. Cadenhead.
3 N. Senapati (ed), op.cit, p.64.
The Raja of Rairakhol, it was alleged, oppressed his tenants. The Raja was called to Sambalpur but he left Sambalpur without intimation to the Principal Assistant Agent as no interview was given by him. A purwanah was issued to him directing to appear again.

Along with the Rajas, the native officers of whom Rai Rup Sing Bahadur was the most trusted, were also kept under strict discipline. Rai Rup Sing was appointed as Munsif for one year on a pay of Rs.200/- per month, as he was acquainted with the country. Proceedings were drawn up against him for certain allegations and they were enquired to. But these allegations were found false. The Agent and Commissioner observed that Government had full confidence in him. He was invested with civil and criminal powers which were exercisable by the Principal Assistant Agent.

The East India Company's Government also asserted itself in the internal administration of Sambalpur. Accordingly, the Principal Assistant Agent to the Governor General, South West Frontier at Sambalpur, received detailed instructions regarding taking over of charge of the administration of Sambalpur from the Agent to the Governor General and Commissioner at Chhota Nagpur. He himself came over to Sambalpur with a Regiment of the Ramgarh Battalion, and from his Sambalpur Camp, issued further instructions. He issued a

---

1 Letter No.10 dated 13.2.1850, from Agent to Principal Assistant Agent, (NAI).
2 Letter No.4 dated 12.1.1852, from Crawford to Lt. Haughton.
3 Letter No.33, dated 22.5.1852, from Crawford to Lt. J. Emerson, Principal Assistant Agent, (NAI).
4 Letter No. 1, dated 12.12.1849, from Crawford, Agent and Commissioner, South Western Frontier, to J. Cadenhead, Principal Assistant Agent Sambalpur, (NAI).
proclamation in the Sambalpur town regarding taking over of the
administration. He, being directed, took over the charge of treasury
from Rai Rup Sing Bahadur, Ameen and Munshi Prasanna Lal after due
observance of the rules.

The eldest Rani of the late Raja Narayan Sing made over certain
jewelleries to the Agent and it was kept in a sealed box in the treasury.
Cadenhead was instructed to prepare an inventory of the properties of
the estate of the late Raja in the presence of the confidential Agent of
the Rani and sent it to the Agent. The Principal Assistant Agent was
directed to disband the Raja's force and to pay their salary from the
10th of September 1849, the date of the death of the Raja till the date of
disbandment. He was also directed to select out of them persons fit for
the posts of chaparasis, jail guards and police servants. Subsequently,
the armed forces were stationed at four places Chandrapur, Padampur,
Sarsora and Lakhanpur. These were the Khalsa of the Raja. The salary
so sanctioned was Rs.5,000/-.

The members of the Raja's family requested that the elephants
and the horses were left for the dowry of the infant daughter of the late
Raja and the other cattle were distributed among the three Ranis of the
Raja. Mukhyapan Devi, the widow of the late Raja was sent off to
Cuttack with a pension of Rs.100/- per month.

Further, the East India Company's Government, in order to assert
its hold thoroughly, burnt the clothes, staff and the old standard of the

---

1 A. Das, op.cit, p.49.
2 Letter No.1, dated 3.1.1850 from Crawford to J. Cadenhead.
3 Letter No.3, dated 9.1.1850 from Crawford to J. Cadenhead.
4 Letter No.10, dated 13.2.1850 from Crawford to J. Cadenhead.
5 Latter No.8, dated 16.10.1850 from Crowford to Cadenhead.
Raja of Sambalpur. The State sword and small fire arms were destroyed completely.

The measures for consolidation of the British administration were completed with the destruction of the Royal insignia. The country was annexed to the British domain. This decision was taken in pursuance of Lord Delhousie's well-known Doctrine of Lapse; but the case of Sambalpur was different from that of other native States. No adoption in case of Sambalpur had ever been proposed and the last Raja had during his life time expressly intimated his wish that the British Government should take the possession of his principality, and provide for the Ranis. Accordingly, the State had lapsed to the British Government and there was perfect consolidation of administration and enforcement of Law and Order whether the people liked it or not. The years of consolidation of the British administration had created a suitable field for a wide and sustained rebellion in which most of the dissatisfied people participated under the banner of Surendra Sai.

With the despatch of the several valuables of the late Raja Narayan Sing, found at the time of preparing the Inventory to Chhota Nagpur and the burning of the clothes and staff and the old standard of the Raja of Sambalpur and the breaking of the State Sword and the small fire arms in an unceremonious way, ended the last vestige of the powerful Chauhan family.

1 Letter No.8, dated 6.3.1851 from J. Cadenhead to Crawford, (NAI).