-8-96.

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 386 M

DATED 7th March 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Encroachments at Vaniyambadi.

Requesting the Superintendent Revenue Survey;to prepare,when the Survey of Vaniyambadi town is being carried out charts and registers in view of the application of the Rivers Conservancy Act Vl of 1884,to the river Palar at that town and requesting,with remarks,the Municipal Council to report the amount of compensation,if any,that would have to be paid to land-holders if the Rivers Conservancy Act were introduced

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G O.	No.	Department.	Date.
[illegible]	733	M. L. & M.	2-5-96				
Circ	1877	M/98					

Ref: on no 771/Eng.

Municipal Office Vaniyambadi
Dated 4 November 1895.

From

M. Ghose Esqr.
Chairman Municipal Council
Vaniyambadi

To

The Collector of Salem.

Sir

With reference to your Endorsement no: 1751/Mt. dated 9. 10. 95 (herewith returned for submission to Government) I have the honor to inform you that although the municipal Council is willing to survey the town and the Palar river and to apply the River Conservancy Act to the latter, it cannot come to a conclusion whether

or not it is in a position to do so unless the probable cost of applying the act is —
!! informed, I forward herewith a copy of the Council's resolution passed at its meeting held on the 22nd instant for favour of your compliance.

I have &c

Sd/. M Ghose

Chairman

(True copy)

[illegible]

Ag Collector

Wd ElK
26/11

Rd 2°
26/11

3656 [illegible] of 95

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council Vaniyambadi dated 22nd October 1895.

—

Present.

M. Ghose Esquire; C. S. Chairman

Official Councillors.

MRRy A. Sundara Rao Garu, Deputy Tahsildar.

" M. Gurusami Sastria avergal B.A. Sub Registrar

Non Official Councillors.

MRRy. Amara appia chetiar avergal.

Middaikara Jainulabdin Sahib

Rahul Khan Sahib.

Nawabab Jaffar Sahib

Kannyambadi Abdul Kader Sahi

× × ×

4. Read Collector's Endorsement returning the Chairman

letter Ref: on no: 507/Eng dated 12.9.95 And requesting to state if the council is now in a position to bear the cost of applying the River Conservancy act to the Palar river.

Resolution: The council consider it highly desirable to have the town and river surveyed and the River Conservancy act enforced. The Collector will be requested to inform the council what the approximate cost will be.

× × ×

Signed M L Ghose
Chairman

(True extract)

(Sd) M L Ghose
Chairman

2/656 no of 95

FOR COPIES ONLY

TWO ANNAS

In the court of the Second class Magistrate Vaniyambody

Calendar No 97 of 1895

Complainant
Empress.

Defendant
Altham Sahib

Offence - Making an encroachment in the Palar river within the Municipal limits under Section 229 of the District Municipal Act IV of 1884.

This case was taken on file on the Sanction of Municipal council Vaniyambody

The defendant in the year 93 and 94 purchased a cocoanut garden (attached to Tirumanjolai Village Amboorpett Mittah) Situated by the Side of Palar river at Periapett within Municipal limits from one Ramanuja Aiyangar and Ramagoundan respectively vide exhibits 4 and 3 and puttah runs in the name of the former

The extent of the garden as per puttah No II granted by the Mittadar is 2 acres and 20 cubies assessed at Rupees 4

The 1st witness Municipal Inspector deposes that he inspected the defendants coco garden on the 18th

125

648
6 8 95

STAMP DEPARTMENT
4 JY
1895
SALEM

[illegible]

FOR COPIES ONLY
INDIA
TWO ANNAS
THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON

19th November 94 and found that the defendant had encroached upon Palar river to the extent of 530 x 20 ft formed a fence and included the portion with his garden and that on this he reported the case to the authorities as it would likely to cause danger to the town during the time of floods in the river

Witness did not measure the defendants' garden nor he aware of its extent and assessment

Witness says that the Division Councillor and Sub Registrar also inspected the garden but the defendant produced no tittle deeds of any kind before him

Witness alleges that when he measured encroached portion the defendant was not present

Witness says that the defendant after obtaining summons from this court removed thrown hedge he newly formed and substituted sand bund in its place to the extent of 1 or 2 cubits in height and 550 x 4 ft about 550 ft in length

The defendant totally denies the charge and states that he purchased the garden in question from one Ramanuja Aiyangar and Ramagoundan vide exhibits III and IV and produces puttah No II granted by the Mittadar He calls witnesses

6 50
6.8.95
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
SALEM
896

7-

FOR COPIES ONLY
TWO ANNAS

Examined 2 other witnesses for the prosecution and 2 as court witnesses

Though the 2nd and 3rd witnesses depose that the defendant encroached upon a portion of River Poramboke and included the same with his newly ~~formed~~ purchased garden and formed a fence yet they did not scrutinize and arrived at the conclusion by measuring the garden nor they directly aware of its real extent.

The 2nd witness Kurnam of Tirumangolai after ~~purchasing~~ perusing some Jamabandy chittah attached to Tirumangolai Village swears that the coco garden purchased by the defendant includes 2 numbers River side punjai and river Poramboke as shown below No 74. River side Punjai acre 1-10. assessment Rupees 2. No 90. River Poramboke acre 1-10. assessment Rupees 2. Total 2-20. Rupees 4.

Witness says that he directly saw the defendant when forming a new fence to the garden and that the 1st witness measured the encroached portion in his presence. Witness further adds that he was present when the 1st court witness Revenue Inspector had measured the garden in question and its neighbouring one in presence of this court and certifies the sketch

165 3rd 16

649
6-8-95
[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
4 JUL
1895
SALEM

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA
TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

A to be correct one. Witness now swears that in accordance with the measurement now made it appears to him that the actual extent of the land is less than the extent shown in pottah No II granted by the Mittadar.

The 1st court witness (Second class Revenue Inspector who measured the garden and its adjacent one very carefully and prepared sketch A) swears that the actual extent of the defendants coco garden A shown in sketch A is 43 ~~cubits~~ cents less than the extent shown in the exhibit II and that in consequence he could not say that the defendant had encroached upon any portion in Polar river.

Witness states that on observing the sand bund raised by the defendant on the south east side of the river it looks an encroachment but in reality it is not as he measured the garden A including the sand bund and noticed the difference as described above. Witness further states that he also carefully measured the adjacent garden referred to in exhibit 4 and found no encroachment in this as the extent of this garden also seems less than the actual extent.

The 2nd court witness Mittadar certifies

644
6895

[illegible]

ST. [illegible] SALEM
MAY
1895

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA
TWO ANNAS

the extent shown in puttah II granted by one Ramachendra Row who was an Ezaradar under him to be correct as per accounts for fasli 303 and 304 but states that he could not distinguish the very extent of this land from the account Pymaish Jareeb chitta for fasli 1206 now shown to the court and taken back it appears as it contains different parts of A thu punjai lands as detailed in the deposition

Witness says that before Ramanuja Aiyangar he has no reference to show who had possession or held puttah for the land in question

The defendant examined 2 out of 4 witnesses and dispensed with the other absent witnesses at his own accord.

The 1st and 2nd defence witnesses clearly prove that the defendant after purchasing the coco garden has not encroached upon any portion in the river Poramboke but he cut a portion of prickly pear grown in the fence and burried in the sand bund newly formed by the side of his garden

The 1st defence witness who sold a portion of his garden shown in exhibit IV very clearly speaks to the long possession and enjoyment previous to th

645
6 8 95

STAMP DEPARTMENT
4 JLY
1895
SALEM

FOR COPIES ONLY
INDIA
TWO ANNAS

defendants possession.

I have personally inspected the locality on 2 occasions and the 1st court witness Revenue Inspector has measured the garden in question and its adjacent one very carefully in my presence

From the out~~ward~~wald appearence though it looks that the defendant had encroached upon the river yet it would not turn to be a fact if it is regularly surveyed

The Village Tirumanjolai being Mittah Village it is a fact that none of the lands were surveyed and that there is no other alternative to trace out the position of each land but from the boundaries given in the documents as well as from the existing hedges in each locality

Unless the river in this town is properly conserned I think it is very difficult to trace out actual encroachment in any case when the matter brought to the notice of the authorities

Under these circumstances I consid that the charge has not been sufficiently established

6 47
6 8 95

STAMP DEPARTMENT
4 JLY
896
SALEM

[illegible]

FOR COPIES ONLY

TWO ANNAS

against the defendant I therefore acquit him under Section 245 C.P.C.

6th June 1895
Vaniyambody

(Signed) Arooppachari
Magistrate 2d class

(True copy)

Certified that this copy contains 997 words and it cannot be produced in any court of Law without a court fee Stamp of 8 annas for every 360 words or part thereof

By order of the court
Head clerk

copied by [illegible]
compared by

(7th and last sheet)

646

1895

[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
4 JLY
1895
SALEM

M. GHOSE
20 AUG. 95
RECEIVED

Application No. 74 for copy received	on	14-7-95
Stamp Papers called for	„	15-7-95
Stamp Papers produced	„	8-8 95
Copy ready	„	10-8-95
Copy ~~delivered~~ or sent by post to	„	12-8-95

3
3856 M of 95



▬ Fence which was originally put up as the limit of t

▬ Fence subsequently put up, encroaching a portion of rive

▬ Fence put up encroaching further, after prosec

- - - - Path used by the people before encroachment.

- - - - Path in use after encroachment was made

ER

garden.

or which prosecution was sanctioned

was thrown out by the magistrate.

is made

Reference on No. 507

Eng MUNICIPAL OFFICE VANIYAMBADI.

Dated 12 September 1895.

From

Mr. Ghose Esquire, C.S.

Chairman, Municipal Council,

VANIYAMBADI.

3456/M

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT,
MADRAS.

THROUGH THE COLLECTOR OF
SALEM.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to the notice of Government one of the main difficulties that lie in the way of successfully conducting the prosecutions in case of Palar River encroachments within the municipal limits. The special adaptibility of the soil on either sides of the river for Cocoanut plantation is the cause of strong and increasing temptation to the owners of the lands adjoining the river to encroach upon it. Every inch of encroachment under the already narrowed condition of the river places the town nearer and nearer to the expected danger of its being washed away

away by flood. To prevent this result has become an imperative duty of the municipality. And the way in which it could be done under the present circumstances is only by successful prosecution. But the impediments in the way of conducting these prosecutions to successful ends lie in the fact that the portion of the Palar within the municipal limits runs through mittah village where it is as impossible to know the exact extent to which any land owner is entitled as it is to know the width of the river in the several places where encroachments are suspected. In this connection I beg to submit that so far as it has come to my knowledge, the mittadars have been from a long time past giving away on puttah large portions of what in the old Pymash have been classed as River porambokes.

Regulation XXV of 1802 is clear that when these villages had been permanently settled the annual amount

of

of the peishcush was fixed in relation to the actual extent then under cultivation and the probable area which could be brought under the plough. These river porambokes and such others as are necessary for communal purposes by the people, were never intended for assignment and therefore the assignment by the mittadar of any portion of such porambokes are against the terms of the act.

As a consequence of such unchecked assignment of lands classed as river porambokes at the Old Pymash, individuals holding puttahs for fields adjoining the Palar are in actual enjoyment of lands which if measured would extend as far as and well into the bed of the river. Some of the ryots take puttas from the mittadar for River Porambokes which they do not care to bring under immediate cultivation but reserve it for some day in the future when gradually they

Convert

convert even deep sandy beds into a hard tract fit for cultivation. Under these circumstances any case of prosecution for mischievous river encroachments falls to the ground when the magistrate actually measures out the land in the possession of the encroacher and finds it of course much less than he is entitled to according to his putta—which is a putta granted by the mittadar for a tract of land which he has no right to assign.

There is thus no end of these encroachments and there is no hope of prosecuting any case to conviction.— Calendar Case No 97 of 1895 on the file of the 2nd Class Magistrate of Vaniyambady the judgement in which is herewith submitted is one of the cases in point. One Malayalam Adam Saib was prosecuted by the Municipal Council for having encroached on a portion of the river adjoining his tope by putting up a fence, the object of which was to include a certain

sandy

sandy portion of the river, very clearly the riverbed itself, with his own garden. Local enquiry goes to show that the portion so included was clearly until that date a thoroughfare in the riverbed used by the people crossing it and was so sandy that it was generally considered to be the river bed itself. A sketch showing the old limit of the garden and the portion encroached upon is herewith submitted with full details noted therein.

The magistrate did not go into the question whether the portion encroached was ever in the possession or occupatio of the person charged, but thought it essential to measure out the garden of the pattadar including the portion encroached upon, to see whether the whole piece comes up to the extent held by the encroacher on putta. The putta held by the accused showed 2 pieces of lan called (1) "Athoram punjai" "Punja on the border of the river" (2) Athupunjai: "River pun The extent of these according to the putt

Exceed

exceeded the extent measured out and the Magistrate thereupon concluded that it was no encroachment and dismissed the case. The Council also gave him a notice under Section 263 (2) to leave the encroachment within the fixed time and as he did not comply with the notice the Council again prosecuted him under Section 264. This case was also thrown out with reference to the first case.

Emboldened by the mention of the fact in the judgement that the portion measured is less than the extent in the putta, the accused has since encroached on a greater portion of the river.

In the above putta (2) the punjai is evidently River punjai and is a portion of the tract considered at the Pymash of the village or when it was permanently settled to be the river itself. This portion has been since granted by the mittadar on putta which has created a title in favour of the putta holder and is now a warrant

for

for him to encroach to any extent in the Palar river, if only he keeps himself within his putta extent. And again he can hereafter take putta for a greater extent in river poramboke and extend his encroachments without end until in some future day, not very remote should the present state of things be allowed to continue, the entire river will be blocked or a mere trace of a channel will be left.

I therefore request Government to issue orders as to how I should act in the cases of future encroachments and beg to suggest whether it may not be very necessary to prohibit by a strict order of Government all assignments by mittadars of lands which he has no right to assign and to declare all such assignments hitherto made as null and void.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Chairman

Local & Municipal Dept.

1751/Sub

1895.

From The Chairman
Municipal Council
Vaniyambady

To The Chief Secretary
to Government
L & M Department.

Thro' the Collector of Salem.

Collector's Office Salem
13 SEP 95
RECEIVED

Dated 12 } September 1895
Despatched 12 }
Received

Refer No 507/Eng

Enclosures: Two (2)

Subject

~~Forwarding~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~
~~of [illegible] of [illegible]~~

Explaining the difficulties in the way of successfully conducting prosecutions in case of Palar River Encroachments and requesting instructions thereon Ref.

EHG

11-10-95

No 1751/Sub

Respo 771/90f

M. GHOSE
12 OCT 95
RECEIVED

Recd & 9-10-95

Ref to the Chair-
man Municipal Council.

2 His attention is in-
=vited to G. O. dated
18th February 1890, No 1195
communicated with this
office Endt No 484/Bdy dated
3-4-90 and the resolution
of the Municipal Council
No XII dated 24th April
1895, and he is requested
to state if the Munici-
-pal Council is now in
a position to bear the
cost of applying the
Rivers Conservancy Act
to the Palar River –

Collector

Despatched on 27-11-95

Endorsement No 5258 dated 24-11-95

Submitted to Government for orders.

2. In reply to the reference made by my predecessor, the Chairman states that the Council is willing to have the town and the river surveyed and to have the Rivers Conservancy act enforced and that it wants to know what the cost of applying the act would be. I enclose copies of the Chairman's letter and of the Council's resolution.

Ag. Collector

Cpd ESB/26-11

26/11

Ouo 3663 L/90
340 h L, 3-90

Revenue Department.

365f M

From the Collector

and District Magistrate,

Salem.

CHIEF SECRETARY
28 NOV. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Local & municipal
Department
Madras.

Dated 24' November 1895

No. 5258

En. ~~Pa~~ 4

Subject.

Forwarding with remarks ~~copy of~~ letter from ~~of~~ Chairman municipal Council Vaniyambadi explaining the difficulties in the way of successfully conducting prosecutions in case of Palar river encroachments and requesting instructions thereon

---

800—10-7-94.

Salem Collector's Office,
27 November 1895.

Despatched on 28 11 95

No. 5314

From

C H Mounsey Esqr
~~G. STOKES Esq.,~~
Ag Collr. & Dist. Magte. of Salem.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Department,
Madras.

SIR,

Adverting to para 1 of Government Order dated 2' November 1894, No: 1600 M. Mis, I have the honor to state that within the Vaniyambadi municipality the Palar river runs through the limits of the Ambur pett and Devasthanam mittahs and part of Government village of Vaniyambadi. Some cases of encroachment within the limits of Government village have been dealt with this year by imposition of penal assessment. But as regards encroachments in mittah limits, I consider that there is no provision of law by which prohibitory assessment

Department.

Local & Municipal Dept.
Current No. 3663 M

From the Collector

and District Magistrate,

Salem.

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Local & Municipal
Department
Madras.

Dated 27 November 1895

CHIEF SECRETARY
No. 5314
29 NOV. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Ecp
Ed
28.11.

Subject.

Reporting that there is no provision of law by which penal assessment can be imposed in the case of encroachments on the mittah portion of the Palar river.

1600 ML 2-11-94 &
340 ML 1-3-95

can be imposed by the Revenue Department. The only way out of the difficulty seems to be to apply the Rivers Conservancy Act.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant

Ag Collector

---

[28]

N.B.—The reply to this communication should be addressed to the Chief Secretary.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT, MADRAS.

Memorandum.

C Nos. 3656 & 3663 M/95

Dated the 8th January 1896.

No. 7

Reference

The Superintendent, Revenue Survey, will be requested to report the approximate cost of surveying and demarcating that portion of the river Pálár which is within the limits of ~~as it passes through~~ the town of Vániyambádi and of preparing charts and registers in view to the application to it of the Madras Rivers Conservancy Act VI of 1884.

V.R.
13/12/95

WWD
14.xii.95.

25/12/95

Copy & despatch
7.1.96

To,
The Superintendent, Revenue
Survey, through the
Revenue Department.

Desp 8/1/96

Encroachments on riverbanks —
Vaniyambadi municipality

3663 hr

C.S.

7/96

O.M.

(G. O. Form No. 13.)

Survey Office, Madras,
27 January 1896.

No. 369

From

H. O'C. Cardozo, Esq.,
Superintendent, Madras Survey,

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

~~Sir,~~ Reference. Endorsement of the Revenue department No. 59 R dated 11 January 1896, on memorandum from the Local and municipal departments No. 7 dated 8 January 1896, calling for a report of the approximate cost of Surveying and demarcating a portion of the river Palar situated within the limits of Vaniyambadi Town.

Sir,

I have the honor to report that the area of the portion of the river Palar situated within the limits of Vaniyambadi Town is about 100 acres.

The demarcation and Survey of this tract will form part of the town Survey to be made in 1896-97. As the estimated cost of town Surveys is Rs 2000 per Square mile, the approximate cost of demarcation and Survey of this particular portion may be estimated at about Rs. 300.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Superintendent
Madras Survey

Revenue 1896. Dept

Current Number 747

Regr. No. of 189 .

Above the line for the use of the Receiving Office.

Local & Municipal Dept
CURRENT No. 389 M

From

H. O'C. Cardozo, Esq.,

SUPERINTENDENT, MADRAS SURVEY,

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Dated 27
Despatched
Received 28th
January 1896

No. 369

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
1 FEB 1896

ENCLOSURES.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
28 JAN 96

SUBJECT.

Demarcation and Survey of a portion of the River Palar situated within the limits of Vaniyambadi Town—

Reporting that the estimated cost of ——

G.O. 59 R.S 11-1-96

FORMER CASES.

End 7/96
1810 L.G. 27-11-79
1600 L.G. 2-4-94
865 R.D 4-10
1600 R.O 15-2
340 L.G

No. of 189 .

" "

" "

RECEIPT No.

Dated

LATER CASES.

No. of 189 .

Local & Municipal Dept
CURRENT No. 389 M

Endorsement No: 266

Transferred to the Local and Municipal Department

Lionel Davidson
Ag. Under Secy to Govt.

Fort St. George
30th January 1896

Dit
PRM
29.1.96

---

[5]
509—27-3-95.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 3656 M. of 1895, dated 24th November from the Collector of Salem.
Current No. 3663 of 1895, dated 27th — Do — from the — Do. —
Current No. 389 M. of 1896, dated 27th January from the Superintendent, Madras Survey

Here we have the old poramboke question again—

I don't see the use of acting under Act VI of '84 unless the limits of the river are marked out to correspond with the paimash— Even when that is done the persons who are occupying land within the paimash river bed will have to be compensated if they are to be prevented from cultivating— Who is to pay the compensation, I should like to know.

JMS
19/2/96

Order.

The Government agrees with the Collector in considering that the best way of dealing with the [illegible] the bed of the Palar river within the limits of the Vaniyambadi municipality will be by the application of the River Conservancy Act VI of 1884. He will, accordingly, be requested to submit formal proposals to this effect as soon as the survey of the town has been completed.

V.R.
13/2/96

W.W.D.
13.ii.96

~~[illegible]~~
of the Palar river within municipal limits
[illegible] forms part of the [illegible] survey of the [illegible]
which is to be carried out at the cost of [illegible]
the municipal council will have [illegible]
no additional expenditure on this account

To The Chairman, M.C. Vaniyambadi
" Collector of Salem.
" Superintendent of Rev: Survey:
(thro' the Rev: Deptt)

H.M.

Only a very small portion of the river bank appears to be

PR

govt. poromboke, and these have apparently been already dealt with by prohibitory asst. – vide Mr Munsey's letter of 27 Novr. (with the present current). The island itself is Nittah – see Mr Cordays letter of 07.12.89 (in G.O. 1.3.90): and within municipal limits the river is almost wholly in the Ambupett & Devasthanam nittas – see Mr Munsey's letter already quoted.

I do not know whether these Nittas are on a Zamindari tenure (as Nittas generally are) or are on inam or jahir tenures (Cf. Nittas in N. Circars). If zamindari the banks wd. belong to the Zamindar; & even if inam or jahir they wd. still be, I fear, even tho' the river is a public river, the property of the proprietor of the tenure at any rate so far as to give him the right to lease the lands & so confer title to compensation on the occupier in the event of interference under the Riv. Consy. Acts (M. VI. of 1884 & II of 1885)

Since writing the above, I see from the Salem Manual that the Salem Nittas are Zamindari. The claims for compensation must therefore be faced. The Mty. may be asked if they are prepared to do so, & the amount on a rough estimate. The survey for the Act can be carried out as part of the survey of the Mty. charts & the re-notation, I understand.

S.V.S.
2/3/6

Encroachments on river banks
Vaniyambadi municipality

3656 – 3663 & 3894

Yes.

Very well. Ask the Munl. Ct. as proposed. In the meanwhile the survey proceeds.

My point, however, is that these poramboke in Zemies don't belong to the Zemrs., but to the public, on behalf of which they should be in charge of the Dt. Bd. or the Ml. Cl., as the case may be. The poramboke question is, I believe, now under Consn. again in the R.D. – we shall see what happens. In my opinion legislation will be needed.

* If I have always thought the same & I am glad the question is being taken up but I fear legislation will be necessary

S.V.S. 6/3/96

KS
5/3/96

DEPARTMENT.

[G. / 24.]
200—5-10-95.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 3656m of 1895, dated 24.11.95 from the Collector of Salem
" " 3663m " 1895, " 27.11.95, "
" " 3894 " 1896, " 27.1.96, " Superintendent, Madras Survey

ORDER. No. 386 mis. of 7.3.96

The Supt. Revenue Survey will be requested, through the Revenue Dept., to prepare charts & registers in view of the application of the Rivers Conservancy Act VI of 1884 to the river Palar at Vaniyambadi when the survey of that town is being carried out.

2. The Munl. Council will be requested to report approximately what amount of compensation if any would have to be paid to land holders, if the Rivers Conservancy Act were introduced, & whether it is prepared to pay that amount.

(from orders)

WOD
6-3-96

To the Supt. Madras Survey
~~Rev.~~ the Rev. Dept. (Pom only)
" the Ch. M.C. Vaniyambadi thro' the Collector of Salem. P.T.O.

Despd. 9/3/96

Encroachment at Vaniyambadi

IX.

5°

3656, 3663 + 38 gh

FROM ORDERS.

C. S. June

3862

n given for copying
en copied
hen examined
when signed
189 .

EAD AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

URRENT No.

NCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
ETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.