Date of Submission: 19/6/2026
Date of Review: 19/7/2026
Date of Publication: August 2026

Controlling Crime and Castes in the Pre-Colonial Jaipur State

Dr. Niti Singh

In the last many decades scholars have paid increasing attention to the problems of land ownership, imperial revenue administration, and the design of village societies in medieval India.[1] Surprisingly, in these studies the focus has been limited to the study of relations which subsisted between the dominant and the subaltern groups in the countryside. Somehow, significant aspects of caste in the medieval society have remained unaddressed in these studies. According to Irfan Habib the Mughal state preferred not to disturb the caste system as it helped them "to generate larger revenues from the village and lower the wage costs on the cities."[2] Apart from this apt observation no detailed study has been carried out on the role and structure of caste in medieval India. At micro level some fascinating studies have been carried out on the structure of agrarian economy and rural society of medieval Eastern Rajasthan.[3] But somehow several questions related to caste have been left unanswered.

In this paper an attempt has been made to study the institution of caste in pre-colonial Jaipur kingdom. For these certain questions need to be answered. Was the society organized on the caste basis? If yes, how strong was the caste system in the region of our study? Did the Jaipur state use caste as an instrument of exploitation to keep its subject population divided which in turn assured to perpetuate its rule? How important was the caste of any subject for the state while dealing with him? In order to find an answer to these questions we have analysed the

patterns in which the Jaipur state had imposed penalties on the crimes and offences committed by members of different castes. Rusche and Kirchheimer in their work Punishment and Social Structure have related different systems of punishment with systems of production within which they operate: thus in a slave economy, punitive mechanism served to provide an additional labour force- and to constitute a body of civil slave in addition to those provided by war or trading. Under feudalism, at a time when money and production were still at an early stage of development, we find a sudden increase in the use of corporal punishment – the body being in most cases the only property accessible. Forced labour and prison factory appear with the development of the mercantile economy. But in the industrial system, the role of forced labour in the mechanism of punishment has diminished and corrective detention has taken its place. And by the nineteenth century the punishment had no doubt ceased to be centred on torture as a technique of pain; it assumed as its principal object the loss of wealth or rights.[4]

The present paper is based on the information collected from a systematically arranged series of annual revenue records prepared *pargana* wise known as *arsatthas*, which were compiled for a variety of notations. The *arsatthas* contain interesting information under the revenue head *hasil firohi*, as these accounts indicate various types of crimes, offences, violations of established social norms, the social groups involved and how these were seen by the state and contemporary society. For this chapter we have analysed five *parganas* namely Sawai Jaipur, Ghazi-ka-Thana, Dausa, Fagi and Naraina. These *pargana*s were under the jagir or *ijara o*f the Amber/Jaipur rulers at various intervals during the Mughal rule. The *arsatthas* pertaining to the areas under study cover the period from V.S. 1780/1723 A.D. to V.S.

1840/1783 A.D. This paper is divided into two sections where we have studied crimes related to economy and society and how caste played a crucial role in defining the fines imposed by the state against the offenders.

In medieval India extraction of revenue from the peasantry was the principal form of exploitation. The magnitude of revenue demand was the real bone of contention between the Mughal ruling class and the peasantry.[5] The state tried to establish control over all the phases of the production process through its revenue officials. The peasant was not completely free at any stage such as ploughing, sowing, gathering, binding, stalking, and threshing of the agricultural production.[6] As a result, peasants adopted various forms of resistance against the rising fiscal demands of the state. In those instances where the peasants adopted nonviolent devices to sabotage state's drive to collect the full quantity of revenue from them has been termed as everyday forms of peasant resistance.[7] These modes of resistance are theft of grain: concealment of taxable land and assets: clandestine eating of unripe corn: poaching of grass and tress: cultivation of revenue free lands: insulting state functionaries and refusal to pay revenue. It may be noted that here the administrators considered such acts as unlawful and labelled these acts as crimes.

From a close look at the documents, it appears that caste formed a very important part of a person's identity. So much so that the caste of the person is mentioned right next to his name. Therefore, a close study of the *hasil firohi* documents has helped us to retrieve caste wise- everyday forms of peasant resistance in the Jaipur state. The present study is based on an analysis of 900 cases in which peasants were involved in grain related matters (*anaj ka mudda*). For instance, Phoola Ahir of of *qasba* Fagi was found guilty by the *shehna* for *anaj ka*

mudda and fined Rs. 33 by the state.[8] Bakhta Jat, Veera Jat, Khema Ahir, Peva Patel and Savlo Kumhar of village Modha *khurd* in *pargana* Naraina were found guilty of *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and they were fined Rs. 40, 6, 16, 3 and 15 respectively. A total of Rs. 80 by the state.[9] Sedho Gujar, Pema Gujar, Lakho Balai, Lala Balahi of village Sirohi *khurd* in *pargana* Naraina were found guilty of *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and they were fined Rs. 17, 7, 3 and 2 respectively. A total of Rs. 29 was collected by the state.[10] Mansa Musalman, Salu Kumhar, Ram Mali, Devli Malini (a woman) Kusla Kumhar and Daula Regar of *qasba* Fagi were found guilty of *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and they were fined Rs. 3, 6, 2, 1, 6 and 6 respectively. A total of Rs. 24 was imposed on them by the state.[11]

There are very few cases recorded for the crime *anaj ka mudda* against the higher castes such as the Rajputs and Brahmans. Even in instances which show that they were caught for the same crime, the penalties imposed on them indicate that the state considered their caste and showed leniency towards them while imposing fines. For instance, Jodh Singh Naruka of village Salarsu in *pargana* Fagi was found guilty of *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and a fine of Rs. 9 was imposed by the state.[12] Deva Singh Ranawat of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty for *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and was fined Rs. 8[13]and Rupa Brahman of village Gohandi in *pargana* Fagi was found guilty of *anaj ka mudda* by the *shehna* and was fined Rs. 15 by the state.[14]

There are numerous instances of theft of grain from the state's granaries (*khata*). Such instances show that the burden of taxes was so high that it left the peasants with bare minimum as a result of which they had to resort to such measures. For instance, Sundar Jat of village Choru in *pargana* Fagi was fined Rs. 100 by the state as he was caught stealing *jowar* from the (*khata*) state's granary.[15] Ramji Gujar of *qasba* Sawai

Jaipur was found guilty of stealing *jowar* from the *khata* and was fined Rs. 51 by the state.[16] Deep Bihari Mali of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty by *faujdar* Ratan Singh for stealing pulses from the *khata* and was fined Rs. 22 by the state.[17] Sada Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty by *faujdar* Dalel Singh for stealing one *ser* of wheat from the *khata* and was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[18] Kisna Teli of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of stealing grain from the *khata* for which he was fined Rs. 6 by the state.[19] Adu Kalal of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of stealing wheat from the *khata* and was fined Rs. 4 by the state.[20] Ghaso Chamar and Nanig Regar of *qasba* Fagi were found guilty of stealing a *syalu* crop from the *khata* for which both were fined Rs. 4 each by the state.[21]

The common assumption about the Mahajans is that they belonged to the richer strata of society, but our documents show that even they were caught stealing grains from the state's granary (*khata*). For instance, Rupala Mahajan of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of stealing *bajra* from the *khata* and was fined Rs. 51 by the state.[22] Bhagwan Mahajan of *qasba* Fagi was caught guilty of stealing grains from the *khata* for which he was fined Rs. 40 by the state.[23] But the amount of penalty imposed on them shows that they were relatively prosperous. It also indicates their ability to pay the amount of penalty.

The second most important category of crimes recorded in the documents are those related to peasants hiding their movable and non-movable assets at the time of counting by the state officials. Apart from revenue from land, taxes on all the assets of the peasants such as the house, goat, oxen, buffaloes, axes etc. created an extra burden on the peasantry. As a result, peasants seldom revealed the exact number of belonging in order to save them from being taxed. Such acts meant loss of revenue to the state. Hence these were described as unlawful acts in

official discourse. A few instances are given here Ganga Ram Mahajan of *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of hiding five buffaloes. He was fined Rs. 40 by the state.[24] Rama Gujar and Mota Gujar both of *qasba* Fagi were found guilty of hiding 16 and 4 goats and were fined Rs. 8 and Rs. 2 respectively by the state.[25] Doda Gujar of village Choru in *pargana* Fagi was fined Rs. 11 for hiding a hut and goats from the state.[26] Nathu Nai of village Sirsya was fined Rs. 6 by the state for hiding 6 goats.[27] Jiva Brahman of *qasba* Dausa was fined guilty of hiding one buffalo and was fined Rs. 8 by the state.[28] Chatra Koli of *qasba* Fagi was found guilty of hiding goats for which he was fined Rs. 10 by the state.[29] Chatra Bhuj Mahajan of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of hiding 24 camels and was fined Rs. 78 by the state.[30] Lala Jat of village Soda in *pargana* Fagi was fined Rs. 4 by the state for hiding a sickle.[31] Hevala Balai of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of stealing the bull of Radho Mina of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 10 by the state.[32] Shymala Balahi of *qasba* Naraina was fined Rs. 11 by the state for stealing the bull of Kushla Patel and lying about it.[33] Netya Kumhar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was fined Rs10 by the state for stealing the bull of Deva Mina of the same *qasba*.[34]

In the Jaipur state there was no free access to pastures and forests. There are numerous instances where the state had imposed heavy penalties for using the products of forests. For instance, Kheva Jat of village Palisoli in *pargana* Naraina was fined Rs. 35 for cutting the *babul* tree without the permission of the state.[35] Deva Jat of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of cutting Daya Ram Patel's *pipal* tree for which he was fined Rs. 201 by the state.[36] Lala Mina, Dharma Mina, and Govardhan Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur were found guilty of cutting the branches of *atragar* tree without the permission of the state for which they were fined Rs.9, Rs 22, and Rs 33 respectively.[37] Govardhan Gujar

of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of cutting the branches of *babul* tree without the permission of the state, for which he was fined Rs. 5.[38] Babul Khan Muslim of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of cutting *babul* tree for which he was fines Rs. 22 by the state.[39] Chela Balahi and Rupa Khatik of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur were found guilty of cutting the branches of *pipal* tree for which they were fined Rs. 9 and Rs. 19 respectively by the state.[40] Narayan Balahi of *qasba* Jhak in *pargana* Fagi was found guilty of cutting *neem* tree for which he was fined Rs. 125 by the state.[41] Harla Koli of *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of cutting *babul* tree for which he was fined Rs. 26 by the state.[42] Bhuri Kolin in of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was fined Rs. 10 by the state for cutting the branches of *neem* tree.[43] Rupa Kalal of *qasba* Naraina was fined Rs. 5 for stealing grass.[44]

As revenue was fixed on the crops and not on the land therefore, raising crops was mandatory for each peasant. The revenue assessors usually fixed the revenue demand for each crop after its sowing. At the end of the process peasant had to pay the fixed revenue, even on the unhealthy crop unless it was declared as a case of crop failure (*nabud)* by the state authorities. In such a situation the peasants uprooted the crop if there was scanty sprouting (*mamur*) and they reploughed the same field for a second sowing. This agricultural practice was called *uthelna* (uprooting) in the local dialect. This was a clear act of defiance of the revenue norms by the peasants. For instance, Cheta Mina of *qasba* Dausa was subjected to a fine of Rs. 13 when he refused to cultivate his field.[45] Jag Ram Brahman of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was subjected to a fine of Rs. 5 when he uprooted scanty sprouts of *jowar* from his field.[46] Nanig Jat of village Jhorda in *pargana* Fagi was subjected to a fine of Rs. 18 when he uprooted scanty sprouts of maize from his field.[47] Kesu Jat of village

Mohanpura in *pargana* Fagi was subjected to a fine of Rs. 20 when he uprooted the scanty sprouts of wheat from his field.[48] Sada Ram Mali, Jagga Mali and Teja Mali of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur were to a fine of Rs. 15, Rs. 29, Rs. 20 respectively when they uprooted scanty sprouts of sugarcane from their fields.[49]

It is clear from the cited examples so far that for the same crime the state had imposed different penalties on members of different castes. From a perusal of the above stated cases, it appears that the state followed a discriminating approach while imposing penalties. It appears that members of lower caste were not shown any leniency in this regard albeit they were mostly involved in what may be termed as 'petty' crimes. The incidences of crimes and degree of penalties imposed shows the working of a *jati* order at all levels.

Since revenue from the land was the main source of income, the state decided the time of sowing and reaping of the crops. Owing to slow system of communication many a times the orders of the state reached very late to *pargana* officials, who in turn got late to send the message to the village. This sometimes resulted in late sowing and late reaping. There are several instances where the peasants were fined for sowing and reaping the crops without the permission of the state. For example, Kanha Mina of village Govindpura in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was subjected to a fine of Rs. 14 for sowing *bajra* in his fields before the permission of the state.[50] Nathu Gujar of village Sangla in *pargana* Naraina was fined Rs. 19 for reaping *jowar* without the order of the state.[51] Rama Gujar of *qasba* Jhak in *pargana* Fagi was fined Rs. 22 for reaping sugarcane (*var*) without the order of the state.[52] Nathu Ahir and Bahra Ahir of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur were fined Rs. 15 and Rs. 14 each for reaping *jowar* without the permission of the state.[53] Savla Brahman of village Panchal in *pargana* Fagi was fined Rs.13 for

harvesting the crop without the order of the state.[54] Hira Patel of *qasba* Dausa was fined Rs. 3 for harvesting the crop without the permission of the state.[55] Nathu Khati of *qasba* Dausa was fined Rs. 20 for reaping sugarcane (*van*) without the permission of the state.[56] Mansa Muslim of *qasba* Fagi was fined Rs. 44 for reaping *channa* without the order of the state.[57]

Peasants often ridiculed and insulted the watchmen (*shehnas*) who were the custodians of the state's interest in the village. They were subjected to all forms of teasing (*shonkhi*), disrespect (*be adabi*), abuse (*be jubani*) and retorts (*aputha bol*) by the peasants. Through such acts the peasants sought to demoralise the *shehnas* so that the former could carry out their activities unhindered. For instance, Dhana Jat of village Dhanoli in *pargana* Naraina was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi)* the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 17 by the state.[58] Keso Jat of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of disrespecting (*be adabi*) the *tappdar* while the latter was preparing the *khsara* documents and was fined Rs. 21 by the state.[59] Narayan Mina of village Padaka in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[60] Shera Muslim of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 10 by the state.[61] Shyama Darjee of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 10 by the state.[62] Ganga Kumhar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty for the same crime and was fined Rs. 5 by the state.[63] Bhola Balahi of village Darli and Kala Balai of village Sarli in the *pargana* Fagi were found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* and was fined Rs. 4 each by the state.[64] Gidha Chamar of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 15 by the state.[65]

If Sukha Brahman of village Panchalo in *pargana* Fagi was

found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* and was fined Rs. 5 by the state,[66] Heera Chamar of village Mahedwas in *pargana* Fagi was found guilty of teasing (*shonkhi*) the *shehna* for which he was fined Rs. 4 by the state.[67]

It is often assumed that the pre-colonial state stood at a distance from society and did not intervene too directly in the matters of caste, community, and family life. Its primary concerns were the appropriation and redistribution of surplus and maintenance of law and order. It is further believed that it was the colonial state that sought to regulate the social life of community and the domestic lives of the individuals in a determined fashion. In this paper further an attempt has been made to suggest that the pre-colonial state too intervened in many ways in domestic, caste and community life to regulate interpersonal relationships in conformity with the existing norms and practices. Intervention by the state in social issues gives us a comprehensive picture of what the state sought to uphold, what the moral and ideological norms were which the state sought to preserve or change and the nature of its jurisdiction and intervention in the life of people belonging to different castes. Since at that time there was no uniform legal code which could be applied to different castes which in turn could be the basis of judging behaviour perceived as divergent from expected social norms, Empirical evidence throws considerable light on how the state reacted when different castes engaged various types of crimes and offences.

A large number of documents dealing with numerous cases pertaining to domestic affairs show the nature of the state's intervention in family life. Through its intervention the state sought to define the normative and when these criteria violated it intervened to punish the offenders. An analysis of about 800 instances related to social crimes

and offences helped us to create the *jati* order in the Jaipur state. Two variables, namely, the frequency of crimes committed by various castes and the amount of penalty imposed on those crimes by the state have been chosen by us.

The foremost important aspect of family strife that were perceived as crimes against women by the state: sexual abuse, homicide, unauthorised marriage and ill- treatment of wives. Instances of sexual abuse of vulnerable women of the household are numerous. Nearly 500 instances out of total 800 social instances are recorded under the head of *chamchori*. The *hasil firohi* documents makes it difficult to draw a line between adultery and rape as all forms of sexual misconduct were termed as *chamchori* literally meaning 'theft of body'. According to Dilbagh Singh, the term '*joravari*' is prefixed to *chamchori* which implies rape.[68] Interestingly in the cases studied by us there is not a single document which mentions the term '*joravari*'. Moreover, in all the cases it is the men who are the held guilty by the state and women are described the victims.

Our sources show that certain castes committed the crime of *chamchori* with higher frequency than the other castes. Of all the caste Brahmans, Mahajans, Meensa, Sunars, Nais, Malis, Chhippas and Balahis are penalised frequently for indulging in *chamchori.*

Looking at the pattern of penalties imposed by the Jaipur state, it appears that the state did consider caste while imposing a fine. On the basis of some of these penalties a caste order can be established wherein for the same crime certain caste are penalised heavily than the others. For instance, Jai Ram Brahman of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of committing *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Sukha Brahman of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[69] One Khetya Brahman of village Dausa Khurd in *pargana* Dausa

was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Sukhla Brahman of the same village and he was fined Rs. 8 by the state.[70] Sita Ram Brahman of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Lakshmi Das Brahman and was fined Rs. 28 by the state.[71] Similarly, Nathu Mahajan of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of committing *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Pemu Jat of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 51 by the state.[72] Daula Ram Mahajan of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of committing *chamchori* with Nathi Meeni of the same *qasba* for which he was fined heavily by *faujdar* Ratan Singh.[73]

Somehow the Rajputs who were at the peak of the caste order were penalised the leniently when they committed any social crimes such as the *chamchori.* For instance, one Raj Singh Rathor of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of committing *chamchori* with Rupa Jatni for which he was fined Rs. 8 by the *faujdar* Dalel Singh.[74] Khet Singh Naruka of *qasba* Fagi was found guilty of committing *chamchori* with a *bhagatni* for which he was fined Rs. 4 by the state.[75] The Jats, Minas, Gujars Ahirs, and Malis formed the bulk of the peasant population. They were either *paltis*, *pahis,* distressed peasants, petty producers etc. As mentioned above the crimes committed by them were predominantly related to agriculture but a glimpse at the penalties imposed on them by the state in social offences would clear their position in the caste order. For example Dalal Jat of village Sahimalpura in *pargana* Naraina was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter of Khema Jat of the same village and he was fined Rs. 22 by the state.[76] Ramu Jat of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Kushla Jat of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 51 by the state.[77] Kisna Jat and Bana Singh Naruka (Rajput) of *qasba* Naraina were found guilty of gang

rape/*chamchori* with the daughter in law of Tiku Jat of the same *qasba* for which both were fined Rs. 77 by the state. The document records that out of the two Kisna Jat was fined Rs. 44 and Bana Naruka was fined Rs. 33. These examples show that the state took into consideration the caste of the offender before fixing a fine on them.[78] Mohan Mina of *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with the wife of Sukha Jat of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 42 by the state.[79] Uda Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Akkha Mina of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 33 by the state.[80] Nathu Gujar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of chamchori with the daughter in law of Kalu Gujar of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 31 by the state.[81] One Khushpal Chand Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the Kesi Virani for which he was fined Rs. 91 by the state.[82]

Similarly, Teja Gujar of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi –ka-Thana was found guilty *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Sambha Gujar of the same *qasba* for which he was fines Rs. 16 by the state.[83] Jugga Mali of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Lala Mali of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 28 by the state.[84] Khushla Mali of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with Bhagli Malini for which he was fined Rs. 17 by the state.[85] Nathu Ahir of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with Gulabo Ahirni of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 18 by the state.[86]

Such instances clearly show that the state deliberately imposed heavy taxes on castes such as Jats, Minas, Gujar, Ahirs, and Malis in comparison to the Brahmans and Rajputs. Clearly members of higher castes were let off easily while members of cultivating castes were subjected to heavy penalties.

The lowest rung of society needs special attention. This group needs to be studied in two parts. The first group consisted of the service providers such as *Luhars* (iron smiths), *Kumhars* (potters), *Khatis* (carpenters), *Darjis* (tailors), *Julahas* (weavers), *Nilgars* (dyers), *Thatheras* (utensil makers), *Chippas* (block printers) etc. The second group consisted of the menials such as *Chamars, Mochis, Balahis, Lodhas, Dhedhs*, etc. The second group formed the vast body of landless rural poor who fulfilled the labour requirement of the land-owning peasantry. Apart from being temporarily employed in agricultural activities these low castes had their ancestral occupations such as tending, skinning, scavenging etc.[87] Dugga Luhar of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-llaw ofRamu Luhar for which he was fined Rs. 13 by the state.[88] Bakhat Ram Luhar of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chmchori* for which he was fined Rs. 28 by the state.[89] Khushla Kumhar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Andha (blind) Kumhar of the same *qasba* for which he was fines Rs. 11 by the state.[90] Ram Lal Kumhar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with Rano Kumhari of the same *qasba* for which he was fined Rs. 14 by the state.[91] Bal Krishna Khati of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Lala Khati for which he was fines Rs. 31 by the state.[92] Jai Ram Khati of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter of Ramu Khati of the same *qasba* for which he was fines Rs. 27 by the state.[93] Mansa Darjee of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter of Natha Darjee for which he was fines Rs. 8 by the state.[94] Kisna Darji of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Dano Darji and he was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[95] Punya Chhippa of *qasba*

Naraina was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Madho Chhippa and was fines Rs. 17 by the state.[96] Aasa Chhippa of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Kisna Chhippa and was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[97] Dhana Balahi of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Sopa Balahi and was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[98] Gidha Chamar of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of *chamchori* for which he was fines Rs. 8 by the state.[99] Hardo Chamar of *qasba* Bgangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* and was fined Rs. 3 by the state.[100] Nathu Mochi of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of *chamchori* and was fined Rs. 9 by the state.[101] Har Ram Dhedh of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* for which he was fined Rs. 8 by the state.[102] Pura Mev of *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty *chamchori* for which he was fined Rs. 2 by the state.[103]

Untill now we have established the caste order wherein both the offender and the victim were of the same castes. Now we will analyse some documents to show how important was the caste for the state when the caste of the offender and the victim were different. For instance, Mota Brahman of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Mana Jat and was fined Rs. 18 by the state.[104] Kanha Brahman of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with Bhuri Gujarni of the same *qasba* and was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[105] Hera Brahman of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with Bhagli Malini and was fined Rs. 5 by the state.[106] Khadak Singh Rajput of *qasba* Sawai Jaiur was found guilty of *chamchori* with with Bholi Rajputni and was fined Rs.11 by the state.[107] Nathu Chauhan of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with Brahmani was fined Rs. 9 by the state.[108] There are very few cases recoded against the Rajputs in these documents,

which shows that many offences committed by them were left deliberately unrecorded for, by the state. As most of the *faujdars* were Rajputs, they connived at the crimes committed by their fellow caste members.

Kanha Mahajan of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Daya Ram Mahajan and was fined Rs. 33 by the state.[109] Kanha Mahajan of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori with* the daughter-in-law of Ram Chandra Brahman and was fined Rs. 91 by the state.[110] Nerta Mahajan of *qasba* Bhangarh in Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with Bhagli Malini and was fined Rs. 41 by the state.[111] Hathi Ram Mahajan *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with Rajputni for which he was fined Rs. 61 by the state.[112] Udda Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with a Brahmani and was fined Rs. 33 by the state.[113] Teja Meena of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law of Akkha Kumhar and he was fined Rs. 22 by the state.[114] A Meena of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was caught guilty of *chamchori* with Rupa Dhedhni and was fined Rs. 8 by the state.[115] Chander Balahi of *qasba* Fagi was found guilty of *chamchori* with Dhari Chamarni and was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[116] Ram Chandra Koli of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of *chanchori* with Bhuri Chhippi and was fined Rs. 10 by the state.[117] Bakhat Singh Khati of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter in law of Kisna Brahman and was fined Rs. 33 by the state.[118] Daya Ram Khati of *qasba* Ajabgarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *chamchori* with the daughter of Ramu Chamar and was fined Rs. 3 by the state.[119] Mohan Khati of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty for *chamchori* with Dhedhni and was fined Rs. 8 by the state.[120]

A further analysis of the documents it appears that the state before imposing a fine considered the whereabouts of the victim with whom the offence was committed. Women in the documents are rarely mentioned by their names. Women are always mentioned in a relation to men, for instance a daughter, daughter-in-law, mother and sister. The state considered the relation of the woman while imposing the fine. It appears that the crime of *chamchori* with the daughter-in-law was fined more than that with the daughter. In reality it should have been the other way round. It is not clear why the Jaipur state followed two separate parameters while imposing penalties on the victims of *chamchori*, namely, daughter and daughter-in-law.

The state took serious view of violence against women and ill treatment of wives within the family circles. Despite it, several cases are recorded as intra family violence against women. Husbands were often found guilty of indulging in murderous assaults and homicidal acts against their wives. Here again, caste played an important role in determining the fines imposed by the state. For instance Kapala Brahman of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of murdering his daughter in law for which he was fined Rs. 4 by the state.[121] Sukha Pansari of *qasba* Naraina attempted to murder his daughter in law by poisoning her. Interestingly, due to overdose of the poison she vomited and did not die. As a result Sukha Pansari was fined heavily Rs. 231 by the state for attempt to murder.[122] Keju Jat of *qasba* Naraina was found guilty of killing his wife Nathi Jatni for which he was fined Rs. 17 by the state.[123] Suja Nai of village Vibhori in *pargana* Naraina was found guilty of killing the daughter of Sera Nai for which he was fined Rs.13 by the state.[124] Ghazi Julaha of *qasba* Dausa was found guilty of murdering his wife with a cooking pot (*handi)* for which he was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[125]

A large number of documents show the nature of state's intervention in affairs relating to the institution of marriage. Non – adherence to prescribed customs and rituals were considered to be within the jurisdiction of the caste panchayats as well as that of the state. For instance Cheta Kumhar of *qasba* Dausa married Radha Kumhari of the same *qasba* but he did not bring her to his home after the marriage. As a result, the caste *panchayat* had to intervene and Cheta Kumhar was fined Rs. 8.[126] Keju Jat of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur married Bhuri Jatni from Chatsu but he did not bring her home after the marriage. As a result, the caste *panchayat* intervened and issued the order of bringing the wife back to her new home and Keju Jat was fined Rs. 18.[127] Veera Brahman of *qasba* Bhangarh in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was fined Rs.5 by the state for not sending his daughter to the house of her in laws when her husband had come to take her.[128]

Marriage contracts could not be done or dissolved without the permission of the caste *panchayat* or the state. The state sought to enforce these contracts in the absence of any valid reason for dissolution. The prior permission of the state was required even when a promise was broken with mutual consent. Nanha Gujar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur arranged the engagement of his daughter with a Gujar of the same *qasba* but instead married her off to Khushpal Gujar. He was fined Rs.22 by the state.[129] Madho Khati of *qasba* Dausa arranged the engagement of his daughter with Bhoja Khati of Village Kishanpura but instead married her to Hera Khati of village Jagdishpura in the same *pargana*. He was fined Rs. 11 by the state.[130] Bhima Kadara of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur arranged the engagement of his daughter to Hariya Kadara of the same *qasba* but instead married her to Rama Kadara of village Ramgarh. He was fined Rs. 20 by the state.[131] Rama Chhippa of *qasba* Sanganer in *pargana* Sawai Jaipur was fined Rs.11 for marrying

without taking permission from the *panchayat*.[132] The state reacted against non reportage of marriages conducted in their kingdom. For instance Hariya Madari of *qasba* Sanganer in *pargana* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of marrying without informing the *darbar* and fined Rs. 11 by the state.[133]

The artisans and menials' castes followed the practice of *nata, gharvas* and *gharecha* thereby giving social sanction to remarriage and widow marriage within the framework of caste regulations as prescribed by the *panchyat* or the entire caste body or *jati.* Formal recognition was granted by the state to such marriage contracts through a *parvana* or official order. The state intervened in numerous cases where a remarriage was performed without prior permission of the caste body and the state. Here again caste played an important role. For instance, Ram Das Mina of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of marrying the daughter-in-law of Kishna Mina without informing the state. He was fined Rs. 25.[134] Ballu Luhar of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of marrying the wife of his brother who had gone to find work some other place and had not returned since. Ballu Luhar was fined Rs. 71 by the state, for not informing upon this act.[135] Nathu Khati of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of marrying the wife of Hira Khati without informing the state. He was fined Rs. 60.[136] Bandha Thathera of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of marrying his brother's wife without the permission of the state. He was fined Rs. 40.[137] Bhiva Teli of *qasna* Naraina was found guilty of marrying the daughter-in-law of Sukho Teli without informing the state. He was fined Rs. 22.[138] Kisna Balahi of *qasba* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of marrying the wife of Uda Balahi without informing the state. He was fined Rs. 5.[139]

The state also punished those who did not adhere to the rules

and regulations of their castes during the births, and deaths. For instance Wife of Pancha Darji of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of not feeding Brahmans at the death of her father-in-law. She was fined Rs. 67 by the state.[140] Hema Gujari of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of not feeding the Brahmans at the death of her father-in-law. She was fined Rs. 18 by the state.[141] Ramu Chhippa of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur was found guilty of not feeding the Brahmans at the death of his father. He was fined Rs. 22 by the state.[142]

From the documents it appears that the state took cognisance of the issue of caste contamination and fined the violators of customs. For instance Teja Chamar of village Dhavar Khurd in *pargana* Ghazi-ka-Thana was found guilty of *jowar roti* of Rama Brahman and was fined Rs. 3 by the state.[143] Nathu and Bullah Bhitara of *qasba* Sawai Jaipur were found guilty of feeding Amjad Khoja (*eunuch*) and were fined Rs. 11 each by the state.[144]

All the documents discussed above provide us a glimpse of the nature of the Jaipur state authority in action. Therefore, the view that the pre-colonial state in India did not intervene too directly in affairs of caste, community and family life is a skewed understanding. The Jaipur state appears to be exercising an overarching authority and did not hesitate to put its administrative apparatus to full use in regulating the affairs of the society down to the level of villages, various caste groups, family and even its individual members. The above instances clearly establish the state's primary concern to preserve caste system. Surprisingly, none of the persons involved in a variety of crime/offences were either imprisoned or subjected to corporal punishment. The offenders were let off after they had paid the fiscal penalties imposed on them. Perhaps the state's primary concern was to uphold the caste norms and reinforce the *jati* order.

References

1. Habib, Irfan, *The Agrarian Systems of the Mughal India, 1556-1707*, Asia Publishing House, 1963; N.A. Siddiqi, *Land Revenue Administration under the Mughals (1707- 1750)*, Bombay, 1970; S. Nurul Hasan, *Thoughts on Mughal Relations in Mughal India,* People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1973; Shireen Moosvi, 1978 *The Economy of the Mughal Empire, c.1595: A Statistical Study*, Delhi, and John F. Richards, *The Mughal Empire, Cambridge University Press,* Cambridge, New York, 1993.
2. Habib, Irfan, 'Caste in Indian History' in his *Essays in Indian History : Toward a Marxist Perception*, Tulika publication, New Delhi, 1995, pp.172-173
3. Chandra, Satish, *Medieval India, Society, the Jagirdari Crisis and the Village,* Delhi, 1982; Gupta, S.P.*, The Agrarian Systems of Eastern Rajasthan (c.1650-1750)* Manohar publication, Delhi, 1986; and Dilbagh Singh, *The State, Landlords and Peasants, Rajasthan in Eighteenth Century*, Manohar Publication, Delhi, 1990.
4. Foucault, C.f Michel, *Disciple and Punish, The Birth of a Prison,* Penguin Publication, New Delhi, 1991, pp. 14-24
5. Habib, Irfan, 'Forms of class Struggle in Mughal India.' In his *Essays in Indian History: Toward a Marxist Perception*, Anthem Press, London, New Delhi, 2002, p. 237
6. Rana, R.P., 'Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance in Eastern Rajasthan' (c.1660- 1750), *Social Science Probings*, Winter edition, People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 2003, pp. 52-53
7. Scott, James C., *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of*

Peasant Resistance, Oxford University Press, Delhi, pp. 1-15

8. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
9. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
10. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
11. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
12. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1784/1727 A.D.
13. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
14. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
15. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1788/1731 A.D.
16. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
17. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
18. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
19. *Arsattha,* Pargana Narains, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
20. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1828/1771 A.D.
21. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
22. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
23. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1787/ 1730 A.D.
24. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1814/1757 A.D.
25. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1787/1730 A.D.
26. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1787/1730 A.D.
27. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1789 /1732 A.D.
28. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1833/1776 A.D.
29. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1834/ 1777 A.D.
30. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina V.S. 1803/1746 A.D.
31. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
32. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1827/ 1770 A.D.
33. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
34. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/ 1741 A.D.
35. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.

36. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/ 1745 A.D.
37. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/ 1741 A.D.
38. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/1744 A.D.
39. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/ 1744 A.D.
40. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
41. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi , V.S. 1789/ 1732 A.D.
42. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
43. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
44. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina , V.S. 1789/1741 A.D.
45. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1833/1776 A.D.
46. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
47. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
48. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1788/1731 A.D.
49. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
50. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1800/1743 A.D.
51. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
52. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1800 /1743 A.D.
53. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1803/1740 A.D.
54. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi ,V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
55. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1830/1773 A.D.
56. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1828/1771 A.D.
57. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1800/1743 A.D.
58. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1787/1730 A.D.
59. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
60. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1810/1753 A.D.
61. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1833/ 1776 A.D.
62. *Arsattha*, Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
63. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/ 1741 A.D.
64. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1791/ 1734 A.D.

65. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1830/1773 A.D.
66. *Arsattha*, Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
67. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1784/1727 A.D.
68. Singh, Dilbagh, 'Regulating the Domestic: Notes on Pre Colonial Sate and Family' Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, *Studies in History*, 19, Sage Publication, New Delhi, 2003, p. 74
69. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
70. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1800/1743 A.D.
71. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
72. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1832/1775 A.D.
73. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
74. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
75. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1784/1727 A.D.
76. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1787/1730 A.D.
77. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1800/1743 A.D.
78. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
79. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1807/1750 A.D.
80. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
81. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
82. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
83. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1814/1757 A.D.
84. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/ 1734 A.D.
85. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana , V.S. 1805/1748 A.D.
86. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/1744 A.D.
87. Habib, Irfan, *Agrarian Systems of Mughal India*, Second Revised Edition, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1999, pp. 141-145
88. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S.1803/1746 A.D.

89. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1805/1748 A.D.
90. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
91. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
92. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1832/1775 A.D.
93. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
94. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1805/1748 A.D.
95. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
96. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1810/1753 A.D.
97. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
98. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1787/1730 A.D.
99. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1832/1775 A.D.
100. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S 1815/1758 A.D.
101. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1828/1771 A.D.
102. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
103. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1814/ 1757 A.D.
104. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
105. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
106. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana , V.S. 1810/ 1753 A.D.
107. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/ 1741 A.D.
108. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/ 1744 A.D.
109. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur , V.S. 1801/1744 A.D.
110. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur , V.S. 1798/ 1741 A.D.
111. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana , V.S. 1805/ 1748 A.D.
112. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana , V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
113. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
114. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.
115. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S 1798/1741 A.D.
116. *Arsattha,* Pargana Fagi, V.S. 1800/1743 A.D.
117. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S.1828/1771 A.D.
118. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.

119. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana , V.S. 1815/ 1758 A.D.
120. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1815/1758 A.D.
121. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1833/1776 A.D.
122. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1791 /1734 A.D.
123. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1789/1732 A.D.
124. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1803/ 1746 A.D.
125. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1833/ 1776 A.D.
126. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1832/1775 A.D.
127. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1791/1734 A.D.
128. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1810/1753 A.D.
129. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/1744 A.D.
130. *Arsattha,* Pargana Dausa, V.S. 1832/1775 A.D.
131. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/1744 A.D.
132. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
133. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/ 1744 A.D.
134. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/1745 A.D.
135. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798 /1741 A.D.
136. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/ 1745 A.D.
137. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/ 1745 A.D.
138. *Arsattha,* Pargana Naraina, V.S. 1803/ 1746 A.D.
139. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1810 /1753 A.D.
140. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1802/ 1745 A.D.
141. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/ 1744 A.D.
142. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1801/ 1744 A.D.
143. *Arsattha,* Pargana Ghazi ka Thana, V.S. 1814/1757 A.D.
144. *Arsattha,* Pargana Sawai Jaipur, V.S. 1798/1741 A.D.

Assistant Professor
Zakir Husain Delhi College
University of Delhi, New Delhi