

1. Number of copies 1-26
2. Date of receipt 25-6-37
3. Initials of Receiver

M.E.G. 1-52,400-22-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Local & Municipal DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1170 M	Press Mtg.
Dated	27th October	1892

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 13th March 1891, No. 357 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Calling upon the Collector of Trichinopoly to submit a revised statement of the boundary line of the Trichinopoly Municipality in the light of the remarks made, to refund at once the land-cess erroneously collected, and to expedite the further report promised by him on this subject.

G.O., dated 12th May 1892, No. 830 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the Collector's proposal to exclude certain lands from the limits of the Trichinopoly Municipality.

READ—also the following paper :—

From W. H. WELSH, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trichinopoly, 1st September 1892, No. 87—2.

With reference to G.O., No. 830 M., dated 12th May 1892, I have the honour to submit a fresh map of the Trichinopoly Municipality with the old, existing and proposed boundaries marked thereon.

2. The green line represents the eastern boundary prior to 1874, gamboge the present boundary, lake that proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, and light blue the boundary as now revised by me. The boundary proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, runs too close to the village-sites and I think it desirable to take in some additional land within municipal limits.

3. S.F. Nos. 123 and 124 of Varaganeri are retained within municipal limits in order to bring under control an important drinking-water tank now under municipal conservancy. It is also necessary to keep within municipal limits S. Nos. 30 and 98-B of Devidanam village on account of the important bathing ghât and the burial and burning ground on the bank of the Cauvery.

4. The area given in Mr. Fawcett's letter, No. 6—2, dated 19th January 1891, viz., 683.68 acres, represents the area of Government land alone, while that given in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, viz., 982.48 acres, includes inam lands also. It is now reported that the correct extent of the lands proposed to be excluded in the latter letter referred to above is 990.98, consisting of 684.72 acres of Government and 306.26 acres of inam land.

5. The apparent discrepancy in the figures relating to revenue is due to the circumstance that the loss of revenue alluded to in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, represents the loss of municipal assessment due to the exclusion of lands, whereas the figures in Mr. Fawcett's letter, recorded in G.O., No. 359 M., dated 13th March 1891, represents the Government assessment on the lands.

6. The area of the lands to be excluded according to my revised proposals is 548.44 acres of ayan and 268.61 acres of inam lands, and the loss of municipal revenue about Rs. 2,400.

7. I forward a revised draft notification.

ORDER—dated 27th October 1892, No. 1770 M., Local and Municipal.

The revised boundaries proposed by the Collector in his letter read above are approved, and the following notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* :—

NOTIFICATION.

Under section 4 (1) of the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council hereby declares, in modification of the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 12th June 1874, that the following shall be the boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality with effect from the 1st October 1892 :—

North.—The Cauvery and the Kodamurutti rivers.

East.—Across the Sircarpalaiyam road (S. No. 92) ; then along the outer or eastern limit of S.F. Nos. 97, 115, 114, 113, 112, 110 and 109 of Devadanam village ; then crossing the channel (S. No. 147) and following its southern boundary until it touches S. No. 206 of the same village ; thence along the eastern side of S.F. No. 206 and the eastern and southern sides of S.F. No. 205 of Devadanam village, to the point where it meets the Suttuppannai village boundary ; then along that boundary to its intersection with the boundary of Daranallur in Survey No. 215 ; then along that boundary up to the north-east corner of S.F. No. 17 of Daranallur village ; thence along the eastern sides of S.F. Nos. 17, 18, 19, 40, 41, 58, 59, 81, 185, 156, 155, and 147, of Daranallur village ; then westwards along and excluding the Tanjore road (S. No. 87 of Varaganeri village) up to the north-east corner of S.F. No. 122 of the same village ; then along the eastern limits of S. Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125 and 137 (Devadanam channel) of that village ; then along the eastern limit of the Wyyakondan channel up to south-west corner of S.F. No. 264 of Varaganeri village ; then across the channel in a straight line running south-west-wards to cantonment stone No. 43 ; and then cantonment stones Nos. 44 to 47.

South.—Cantonment limits between stones Nos. 47 to 64.

West.—Cantonment limit between stones Nos. 64 to 68 and the irrigation channel which takes its source from the Wyyakondan channel opposite to the cantonment stone No. 68 and runs north to the mantapam on the south side of the Kodamurutti river.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Trichinopoly.
„ Chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly,
through the Collector.
Gazette.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

12/11

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th Oct. 1892, No. 1770 M.

OCTOBER.

Municipal Limits.

Approving the revised boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality proposed by the Collector and ordering the publication of the necessary notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

27TH OCTOBER 1892, No. 1770 M., LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 13th March 1891, No. 357 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Calling upon the Collector of Trichinopoly to submit a revised statement of the boundary line of the Trichinopoly Municipality in the light of the remarks made, to refund at once the land-cess erroneously collected, and to expedite the further report promised by him on this subject.

G.O., dated 12th May 1892, No. 830 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the Collector's proposal to exclude certain lands from the limits of the Trichinopoly Municipality.

READ—also the following paper:—

From W. H. WELSH, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trichinopoly, 1st September 1892, No. 87—2.

With reference to G.O., Mis. No. 830 M., dated 12th May 1892, I have the honour to submit a fresh map of the Trichinopoly Municipality with the old, existing and proposed boundaries marked thereon.

2. The green line represents the eastern boundary prior to 1874, gamboge the present boundary, lake that proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, and light blue the boundary as now revised by me. The boundary proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, runs too close to the village-sites and I think it desirable to take in some additional land within municipal limits.

3. S.F. Nos. 123 and 124 of Varaganeri are retained within municipal limits in order to bring under control an important drinking-water tank now under municipal conservancy. It is also necessary to keep within municipal limits S. Nos. 30 and 98-B of Devadanam village on account of the important bathing ghât and the burial and burning ground on the bank of the Cauvery.

4. The area given in Mr. Fawcett's letter, No. 6—2, dated 19th January 1891, viz., 683·68 acres, represents the area of Government land alone, while that given in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, viz., 982·48 acres, includes inam lands also. It is now reported that the correct extent of the lands proposed to be excluded in the latter letter referred to above is 990·98, consisting of 684·72 acres of Government and 306·26 acres of inam land.

5. The apparent discrepancy in the figures relating to revenue is due to the circumstance that the loss of revenue alluded to in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, represents the loss of municipal assessment due to the exclusion of lands, whereas the figures in Mr. Fawcett's letter, recorded in G.O., No. 359 M., dated 13th March 1891, represents the Government assessment on the lands.

6. The area of the lands to be excluded according to my revised proposals is 548·44 acres of ayan and 268·61 acres of inam lands, and the loss of municipal revenue about Rs. 2,400.

7. I forward a revised draft notification.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th Oct. 1892, No. 1770 M.

OCTOBER.

Municipal Limits.

Approving the revised boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality proposed by the Collector and ordering the publication of the necessary notification in the *Port St. George Gazette*.

27TH OCTOBER 1892, No. 1770 M., LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers :—

G.O., dated 13th March 1891, No. 357 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Calling upon the Collector of Trichinopoly to submit a revised statement of the boundary line of the Trichinopoly Municipality in the light of the remarks made, to refund at once the land-cess erroneously collected, and to expedite the further report promised by him on this subject.

G.O., dated 12th May 1892, No. 830 M., Local and Municipal.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the Collector's proposal to exclude certain lands from the limits of the Trichinopoly Municipality.

READ—also the following paper :—

From W. H. WELSH, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trichinopoly, 1st September 1892, No. 87—2.

With reference to G.O., Mis. No. 830 M., dated 12th May 1892, I have the honour to submit a fresh map of the Trichinopoly Municipality with the old, existing and proposed boundaries marked thereon.

2. The green line represents the eastern boundary prior to 1874, gamboge the present boundary, lake that proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, and light blue the boundary as now revised by me. The boundary proposed in this office letter, No. 74—2, dated 31st August 1891, runs too close to the village-sites and I think it desirable to take in some additional land within municipal limits.

3. S.F. Nos. 123 and 124 of Varaganeri are retained within municipal limits in order to bring under control an important drinking-water tank now under municipal conservancy. It is also necessary to keep within municipal limits S. Nos. 30 and 98-B of Devadanam village on account of the important bathing ghât and the burial and burning ground on the bank of the Cauvery.

4. The area given in Mr. Fawcett's letter, No. 6—2, dated 19th January 1891, viz., 683·68 acres, represents the area of Government land alone, while that given in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, viz., 982·48 acres, includes inam lands also. It is now reported that the correct extent of the lands proposed to be excluded in the latter letter referred to above is 990·98, consisting of 684·72 acres of Government and 306·26 acres of inam land.

5. The apparent discrepancy in the figures relating to revenue is due to the circumstance that the loss of revenue alluded to in this office letter, No. 104—2, dated 21st December 1891, represents the loss of municipal assessment due to the exclusion of lands, whereas the figures in Mr. Fawcett's letter, recorded in G.O., No. 359 M., dated 13th March 1891, represents the Government assessment on the lands.

6. The area of the lands to be excluded according to my revised proposals is 548·44 acres of ayan and 268·61 acres of inam lands, and the loss of municipal revenue about Rs. 2,400.

7. I forward a revised draft notification.

ORDER—dated 27th October 1892, No. 1770 M., Local and Municipal.

The revised boundaries proposed by the Collector in his letter read above are approved, and the following notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* :—

NOTIFICATION.

Under section 4 (1) of the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council hereby declares, in modification of the notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 12th June 1874, that the following shall be the boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality with effect from the 1st October 1892 :—

North.—The Cauvery and the Kodamurutti rivers.

East.—Across the Sircarpalaiyam road (S. No. 92); then along the outer or eastern limit of S.F. Nos. 97, 115, 114, 113, 112, 110 and 109 of Devadanam village; then crossing the channel (S. No. 147) and following its southern boundary until it touches S. No. 206 of the same village; thence along the eastern side of S.F. No. 206 and the eastern and southern sides of S.F. No. 205 of Devadanam village, to the point where it meets the Suttuppannai village boundary; then along that boundary to its intersection with the boundary of Daranallur in Survey No. 215; then along that boundary up to the north-east corner of S.F. No. 17 of Daranallur village; thence along the eastern sides of S.F. Nos. 17, 18, 19, 40, 41, 58, 59, 81, 185, 156, 155, and 147, of Daranallur village; then westwards along and excluding the Tanjore road (S. No. 87 of Varaganeri village) up to the north-east corner of S.F. No. 122 of the same village; then along the eastern limits of S. Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125 and 137 (Devadanam channel) of that village; then along the eastern limit of the Wyyakondan channel up to south-west corner of S.F. No. 264 of Varaganeri village; then across the channel in a straight line running south-west-wards to cantonment stone No. 43; and then cantonment stones Nos. 44 to 47.

South.—Cantonment limits between stones Nos. 47 to 64.

West.—Cantonment limit between stones Nos. 64 to 68 and the irrigation channel which takes its source from the Wyyakondan channel opposite to the cantonment stone No. 68 and runs north to the mantapam on the south side of the Kodamurutti river.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Trichinopoly.
„ Chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly,
through the Collector.
Gazette.

Gobt. of {1892} Madras.
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th Oct. 1892, No. 1770 M.

OCTOBER.

Municipal Limits.

Approving the revised boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality proposed by the Collector and ordering the publication of the necessary notification in the Fort St. George Gazette.

^{notification}
Revised Draft Notification.

under Section 4(1) of the District Municipalities Act No. 10 of 1884

The Right Honourable
the Governor-in-Council
hereby declares, in modification of the notification ^{published} in the Fort St. George Gazette dated 12th June 1874 that the following shall be the boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality ^{with effect from the 1st October 1890}
South. The Cannery and the Kodamamutti Rivers.

East.. Across the Sincarpalai Yam Road (S. to 92) then along the outer or eastern limit of S. to 97, 115, 114, 113, 112, 110 and 109 of Deva danam village, then crossing the channel (S. to 147) and following its southern boundary until it touches S. to 206 of the same village, thence along the eastern side of S. to 206 and the

eastern and Southern sides of
S. Fr. to 205 of Devadainam
village, to the point where it
meets the Sutturpammar village
boundary, then along that boundary
^{to its intersection with the Boundary of Daranallur, then along that boundary}
up to the North East Corner of S. Fr.

to 17 of Daranallur village, hence
along the Eastern sides of S. Fr.

to 17, 18, 19, 40, 41, 58, 59, 81, 155, 156
155 and 147 of Daranallur village,
then westwards along ^{including} the Tanjore
road (S. to 87 of Varaganeri
village) up to the North East

corner of S. Fr. to 122 of the
same village, then along the
^{Eastern} ~~outer~~ limits of S. to 122, 123, 124
125 and 137 (Devadainam

Channel) of that village, then
along the Eastern limit of the
Ayyakondan Channel up to
South West Corner of S. Fr. to
264 of Varaganeri village, then
across the channel in a straight
line running southwestwards
to Cantonment Stone 12 to 3

and

and then Cantonment Stone
No. 44 to 47.

South. Cantonment limits
between stones No. 47 to 64

West. Cantonment limit between
stones ^{No. 64} 64 to 68 and the irrigation
channel which takes its
source from the Ayyakondan
channel opposite to the Can-
tonment Stone No. 68 and
runs North to the Mantapam
on the South side of the
Kodamarutti River.

Trichingopoly Collectors Office,
10th September 1892 3.

John

at Krishnasamayan
for Collectors

Enclosure to letter
 No 87-2 from the Col-
 lector of Trichinopoly
 to the Chief Secretary
 to Govt. Gt. Ind. Dept.

Revised draft -
 justification.

2/165-11/11

Statement showing the
 extent of Ayan and Inam
 lands in Varaganeri etc
 villages proposed to be excluded
 from the Trichinopoly Muni-
 cipality.

Name of village	Extent of	Extent of	Total
	Ayan lands. A. C.	Inam lands. A. C.	
Varaganeri	276.17	42.97	319.14
Darimallur	58.58	170.89	229.47
Subbupannai	"	"	"
Devadnam	213.69	54.75	268.44
Total	548.44	268.61	817.05

Trichinopoly Collector's Office,
 1st September 1892 3.
 A. Krishnaswamiengar
 for Collector
 J. J.

no I

Enclosure to letter
No. 87-2 from the
Collector of Trichi-
nopoly to the Chief
Secretary to Govt. &
Ind. Departt

Info 41

Statement showing
the extent of lands
proposed to be ex-
cluded from the
Trichinopoly Munici-
pality.

Trichinopoly Collector's Office
1st Sept 1892.

Enclosure 9.

No. 87
2

From, H. H. Welsh Esq.
Collector of Trichinopoly

To, The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Deptt.,
Fort Saint George.

Sir, With reference to G. O. No.
830. M. Mis., I have the honour
12.5.92
to submit a fresh map of the
Trichinopoly Municipality with
the old, existing and proposed
boundaries marked thereon.

2. The green line represents the
eastern boundary prior to 1874,
namely the present boundary,
like that proposed in this Office

letter No. 74-2 and light blue
31.8.91
the boundary as now revised by
me. The boundary proposed in

this Office letter No. 74-2 runs too,
31.8.91

22 1770 M 27/10

Read again the following papers:-

G.O. by 13th Nov. 91 No. 3570-1

" 14th Dec. 92 No. 830-2

20 830 M
12.5.92

- 40 -

close to the village sites and I think it desirable to take in some additional land within municipal limits.

3. S.F. Nos. 123 and 124 of Varaganeri are retained within Municipal limits in order to bring under Control an important drinking water tank now under Municipal Conservancy.

It is also necessary to keep within Municipal limits S. Nos. 30 and 98-B. of Devadanam village on account of the important bathing ghant and the curia and burning ground on the bank of the Camery.

4. The area given in Mr. Fawcett's letter no. 6-2 viz. 683.68 acres 19.1.91 represents the area of Government land alone while that given in this office letter no. 104-2 viz. 982.48 21.12.91 acres includes inam lands also.

It is now reported that the correct extent of the lands proposed to be excluded in the latter letter referred to above is 990.98 consisting of 684.72 acres of Govt. and 306.26 acres of inam land.

5. The apparent discrepancy in the figures relating to revenue

is due to the circumstance that the loss of revenue alluded to in this office letter no. 104-2 represents 21.12.91 the loss of Municipal assessment due to the exclusion of lands whereas the figures in Mr. Fawcett's letter recorded in G. O. 359 M. represents 13.3.91 the Government assessment on the lands.

6. The area of the lands to be excluded according to my revised proposals is 548.44 acres of ayam and 268.61 acres of inam lands and the loss of Municipal revenue about Rs. 2400.

7. I forward a revised draft notification.

I have the honour to be,
Sir

Your most obedt. servant,

A. Krishnaswamy

For Collector.

July

2165 m
21

1892

DEPARTMENT.

FROM

THE — COLLECTOR OF

TRICHINOPOLY.

TO

The Chief Secretary to Government,

Local & Municipal Department,

Fort Saint George,

MADRAS.

Dated

Despd

Recd. 3 SEP 92

No.

27
2

Enclosures. 2 + 7 maps

Sent Separately

Submitting a fresh map of the Trichinopoly Municipality with the old, existing and proposed boundaries marked thereon, together with a revised draft notification.

12/9 2/19/9

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Again 30. d/12th May 1892 no 830 m
Current No. 2165 m.

From

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the notes and orders in
fo. d/12th May 1892 no 830 m.

21 Sep

18
7/9/92

The notification requires two
or three corrections — see my
pencil notes.

Subject to them it may be kept.

del
17 Oct.

The proposed new line of boundary
appears now to be satisfactory. The
maps were sent up in separate
sheets which were troublesome to
deal with so the current was
detained in order that they might
all be put on one sheet which
shows better clearly

11 Oct.

FOR ORDERS.

Again 8.7 d/13th March 1891 No 357 m
and 12th May 1892 No 830 m + No 2162

C.S.
P.S.

Order. d/27.10.92 No 1770 m

The revised boundaries proposed by
the Collector in his letter read above are
approved and the following notification
will be published in the Fort St George gaz.
notification

(i.e. notification as amended by for)

P.S.
20/10/92

1 From orders /
2 2500

To the Collector of Trichinopoly 1820
Chairman of Trichinopoly
thru the Collr.

Gazetted 11/11
15/11

Draft 11/11

C. 12/10
E. 18/10

HEAD ANDER ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
18. No.

IN PAPER, No.

FURTHER PAPER, No.

ENCLOSURES

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH INFO.

ORDER, NO. OF GOVERNMENT - A

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DISCUSSION IN ORIGINAL
(not printed)

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED

Order complete 70
Letter only
Order complete with Letter

N.B.

A = Print in full
B = Not to be printed
P = Print abstract only
Q = Print heading only
R = Print, but not for monthly volume

17-10-12
12-6-37

PRESS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED 27.10.92

No. 1770 M

First copy sent to Press. 27/10

Returned for signature. 10/11

Despatched in print. 11/11

[Despatch Abstract.]

Maul limits.

Approving the revised boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality proposed by the Collector and ordering the publication of the necessary notification in the Fort St. George Gazette.

PRESS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED 27.10.92

No. 1770 M

First copy sent to Press. 27/10

Returned for signature. 10/11

Despatched in print. 11/11

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mamk. limits.

Approving the revised boundaries of the Trichinopoly Municipality proposed by the Collector and ordering the publication of the necessary notification in the Fort St. George Gazette.