

Recd 4045

Gobt. of {1886} Madras.
REVENUE.

No. 178 Wd/ Jany. 22-1886
B

Communicated
to the Superintending
Engineer II Circle.

18/1/86



Issued

Recd. 18/1/86

Encl. 3

G.O., 7th January 1886, No. 9.

No. 178 Wd/ Jany. 22-1886
Vide Ch 390

JANUARY.

Fort walls of Trichinopoly.

Orders passed regarding the demolition of the —.

To the S.E. II Circle
with one enclosure
22-1-86
E.M. 572

2 Copies to City
With disposal

E.M. 572

216/1



6.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 3rd CIRCLE,
Trichinopoly 16th June 1886.

No. 514.T.C.

From

6.
Superintending Engineer, 3rd Circle,

To

The Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Sir,
I have the honor to request
you will be good enough to return
to me the copy of judgment
forwarded to you as an enclosure
to my letter No. 237.T.C. dated 6.
August 1885 regarding the Citadel
wall of Trichinopoly Fort. As
the Collector who forwarded it
to me for perusal & return now
requires it for record in his office.
2. I request that the question
as to whose charge the Citadel wall
is in, maybe decided soon.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most obedt Servt
M. M. Colke
Suptg Engr 6th Cir

P. W. D. ^{Circle} CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

^{6th} Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 514, T.C.

Dated 16: } January 1886.
Received 18 }

Enclosures.

*Request to return
the copy of Judgment
forwarded with no
237 T.C. of 6: August
1885. regarding the
Citadel wall of
Trichinopoly Fort &
to decide the question
as to whose charge
the wall is in —*

With disposal

7TH JANUARY 1886, No. 9, REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue :—

Read—the following letter from Colonel H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 6th August 1885, No. 237 T. C. :—

I have the honor to report that there has been a correspondence between the Executive Engineer of Trichinopoly and the Municipality regarding the maintenance of what is called the citadel wall of Trichinopoly fort. This wall was part of the fortification of Trichinopoly, and it now consists of a massive revetment wall built round a portion of the Trichinopoly rock and supporting streets, houses, &c.

2. In G.O., No. 240, dated 25th January 1865, and Proceedings of the Public Works Department, No. 500, of the 25th January 1865, it is stated in paragraph 3 that letter No. 1802, of 12th September 1846, from the Assistant Quartermaster-General, directed that the fort walls of Trichinopoly should no longer continue on the military returns. I suppose this refers to the citadel wall as well as to the outer walls of the fort. The outer walls have been removed, the materials used on various works and those left and the land were handed over to the Trichinopoly municipality; but there is no record to show that the citadel wall (which is, as before stated, now a revetment wall holding up a portion of the town) ever was formally handed over to the municipality.

3. In 1865 some of the stones of this wall were removed by Captain Palmer, then District Engineer, I believe, to prevent damage, and a suit was brought in the court by the "Audinakartar" (I believe trustee) of the Rock Temple, and Rs. 999 claimed as damages, being the alleged value of the stones removed; the plaintiff asserted that the wall in question was the property of the pagoda and not the property of Government. The court decided that the wall in question was Government property.

4. In November 1883, the Vice-President of the Municipality addressed the Executive Engineer, and requested him to repair the wall which was said to be in a dangerous state, and again in January and July 1884, asked that the wall should be repaired at the cost of Government. The Executive Engineer on emergency expended Rs. 170 on repairs, and pointed out to the Commissioners that he considered that the wall should be kept in repairs by the municipality, and requested repayment of the amount expended. At a meeting held on the 29th July 1884, the Commissioners declined to pay the amount, and asserted that the wall in question was in the charge of the Public Works Department.

5. I addressed the Collector on the subject and proposed that, should the citadel wall not have been (as I believe was the case) handed over to the municipality at the same time that the other old fortifications were, he should address Government and have it handed over without delay. In reply, he forwarded to me an extract of proceedings of the Municipal Commissioners, dated 23rd September 1884, asserting that the citadel wall never had been handed over to them, and stating their opinion that it should remain in charge of Government and be repaired at the expense of Government. I again addressed the Collector and pointed out that the above was no reply to my letter asking for information and for his opinion as Collector, and also that if the wall was Government property, it was in his charge and not in that of Public Works Department.

6. I enclose a copy of his letter and enclosure No. 2582, dated 22nd July, and request instructions. I most certainly do not agree with the Collector in his opinion that the wall in question is, and always has been, in the charge of this department.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Superintending Engineer, Trichinopoly, dated 22nd July 1885, No. 2582.

With reference to your letter, No. 525-T.C., dated 9th October 1884, I have the honor to forward, for your perusal and return, copy of judgment in original suit No. 3 of 1865, which I obtained from the Trichinopoly District Court. The suit was brought by the trustees of Rock Fort pagoda against the then Executive Engineer for the recovery of Rs. 999, the value of the granite stones removed from what is called the citadel wall. You will notice from the judgment that the suit was dismissed with all costs, and that the wall was pronounced Government property. It has continued to be in charge of your department both previous to and since the decision.

2. The residents of the northern street in the Rock Fort have presented a Mazar complaining that the citadel wall on the northern side is in such disrepair that the next rains might bring it down with a run. I forward it in original for such action as you may deem necessary. A perusal of the decision will, I think, make it clear to you that the citadel wall is Government property. It has never been made over formally to the municipality, who appear to be unwilling to take charge of such a white elephant. Even if Government insisted on their taking charge, it would, I think, be only fair that your department should put it in good order before the transfer.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Judgment.

No. 509-E.

Referred to the Revenue Department for favor of opinion whether, under G.O. in that department, dated 21st September 1868, No. 2436, paragraph 2, clause 1, the citadel wall at Trichinopoly should not be regarded as being under the care of the Collector.

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

Order—dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue.

Referred to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, for the favor of information as to whether, referring to the correspondence quoted in paragraph 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, on which the present reference by the Department of Public Works is made, the "fort walls" of Trichinopoly, which, it was directed, should no longer be borne on the military returns, included the *citadel* walls.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Military Department, with original papers to be returned.

No. 5165.

Referred for favor of early report.

(By Order.)

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mil. Dept.

18th September 1885.

To the Quartermaster-General.

READ—also the following letter from Brigadier-General R. C. STEWART, Quartermaster General, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Ootacamund, 16th October 1885, No. 2507-B:—

In returning the papers regarding the fort and citadel walls at Trichinopoly, referred for report under endorsement No. 5165, dated 18th ultimo, I have the honor, by order, to state, for the information of Government, that the returns furnished to

this office include only "buildings" and never walls only of forts, unless they contain chambers or casemates on which these are shown.

2. The returns of Trichinopoly for years 1845, 1846, therefore do not include either the citadel or fort walls, and it is not clear therefore what was meant when in this office letter, No. 1802, dated 12th September 1846, the removal of the "walls of the fort of Trichinopoly" from the returns was authorized.

3. A copy of this office letter, No. 648, dated 19th December 1845, recommending the demolition of the fort walls is attached, and the order of Government which was passed on that letter is No. 109, dated 8th January 1846.

4. The sketch which accompanied the enclosure of this office letter, mentioned in the previous paragraph, might perhaps give some information which will be of value in connection with the matter.

No. 5927.

Transferred to the Revenue Department and the referred papers returned with file of previous correspondence.

(By Order.)

FORT ST. GEORGE,
28th October 1885.

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mily. Dept.

ORDER—dated 7th January 1886, No. 9, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

E.M.C., Military Department, No. 3696, dated 19th August, and No. 3858, dated 31st August 1846.

From the papers marginally noted, the entire fortifications at Trichinopoly appear to have been abandoned by the Military Department. The citadel walls referred to in the foregoing correspondence must, therefore, be held to be in charge of the Collector with reference to the terms of clause 1, paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 2436, dated 21st September 1868.

2. The Collector, in consultation with the officers of the Public Works Department, will have an estimate prepared for the demolition of the wall and for stacking the stone in view to its being subsequently sold by auction, unless it is recommended that the materials be sold *in situ*, in which case an agreement should be made with the purchasers for the removal of the materials within a specified time and a deposit, to be forfeited in case of failure, should be taken.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department, with three original papers returned.
,, the Military Department.
,, the Board of Revenue.
,, the Financial Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

100 Copies.

No 178 Wd Jan 22 1886

Communicated to
the Superintending
Engineer II Circle.

Sd/- Dm C. G.
Dm

Gobt. of (1886) Madras.
REVENUE.

Issued
Recd. Encl.

G.O., 7th January 1886, No. 9.

No 178 Wd Jan 22 1886

JANUARY.

Fort walls of Trichinopoly.

Orders passed regarding the demolition of
the —.

With order

S. E. II Circle.



No. 237, T.C. Superintending Engineer
II Circle
Trichinopoly 6th Aug 1885

From

The Superintending Engineer
II Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

Encls: 2

1 copy of
Order No.

2582
22-9-85

1 copy of
Indgement.

I have the honor to
report that there has been a corres-
pondence between the Executive
Engineer of Trichinopoly and the
Municipality regarding the main-
tenance of what is called the
Citadel wall of Trichinopoly Fort.
This wall was part of the forti-
fication of Trichinopoly and it
now consists of a massive revet-
ment wall built round a
portion

portion of the Trichinopoly
Rock and supporting streets
houses etc

2 In G. O. No. 240 dated
25th January 1865 and Proceedings
of the P. W. Department 500 of
the 25th January 1865, it is stated
in para 3 that letter No. 1802 of
12th September 1846 from the Asst.
Quarter Master General directed
that the Fort walls of Trichino-
poly should no longer continue
on the Military Returns. I
suppose this refers to the cita-
del wall as well as to the outer
walls of the Fort. The outer walls
have been removed, the materials
used on various works and those
left and the land were handed
over

over to the Trichinopoly Muni-
cipality; but there is no record
to show that the Citadel wall
(which is as before stated now a
revetment wall holding up a por-
tion of the town) ever was
formally handed over to the Mun-
icipality

3 In 1865, some of the
stones of this wall were removed
by Capt. Palmer, then District
Engineer, I believe, to prevent
damage and a suit was brought
in the court by the "Ardinakar" (I believe trustee) of the Rock
Temple and Rs 999 claimed
as damages being the alleged
value of the stones removed,
the plaintiff asserted that the
wall in question was the property
of

of the Pagoda and not the property of Government. The Court decided that the wall in question was Government property.

4. In November 1883 the Vice President of the Municipality addressed the Executive Engineer and requested him to repair the wall which was said to be in a dangerous state, and again in January and July 1884 asked that the wall should be repaired at the cost of Government. The Executive Engineer on Emergency expended Rs 170 on repairs, and pointed out to the Commissioners that he considered that the wall should be kept in repairs by the Municipality, and

and requested repayment of the amount expended. At a meeting held on the 29th July 1884, the Commissioners declined to pay the amount and asserted that the wall in question was in the charge of the D. P. W.

5. I addressed the Collector on the subject and proposed that should the Citadel wall not have been (as I believe was the case) handed over to the Municipality at the same time that the other old fortifications were, that he should address Government and have it handed over without delay. In reply he forwarded to me an extract of Proceedings of the Municipal Commissioners.

Commissioners dated 23rd Septem-
ber 1884, asserting that the Cita-
del wall never had been hand-
ed over to them, and stating
their opinion that it should re-
main in charge of Government
and be repaired at the Expense
of Government. I again ad-
dressed the Collector and point
out that the above was no
reply to my letter asking for
information and for his opinion
as Collector, and also that if
the wall was Government pro-
perty, it was in his charge
and not in that of P.W. Depart-
ment.

7. I enclose a copy of his
letter and enclosure No 2582
dated 22nd July and request
instruction



instruction. I most certain-
ly do not agree with the Col-
lector in his opinion that the
wall in question is and always
has been in the charge of this
Department.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedt Servant

M. M. M. Col. R. E.

Superintending Engineer
C. Circle

99

Ootacamund, August 24th 1885.

No. 509 E.

Referred to the
Revenue Department for
favour of opinion whether,
under G.O. in that depart-
ment dated 21st September
1868, No. 2436, para 2,
clause 1, the citadel
wall at Trichinopoly
should not be regarded
as being under the care
of the Collector.

Marshallmont
24.8.85
Colmel R.E.
Secretary to Govt. S.W.D.

W
25-8-85

Revenue Department

No. 6232

Trichinopoly

(8)

The Sup^r Engineer
6th Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 237 T.C.

Dated 6: August 1885

Recd. 25th

encl^r 2
Recd from Govt. - 28/8

Citadel wall of
Trichinopoly fort

Report regarding
the —

Referred
29/11/85

29/11/85

29/11/85

PP 2-9

Former papers.

22-10-68-629/31
6-6-61-24.1410
P.H.P. N. 240 of 25-1-65.
806-18-3-64-
408-17-2-64-

MILITARY (1885) DEPARTMENT.

No.

5277

From

THE

P. G. Rev. H. C.

No. 4778

Dated

7 Sept.

Recd.

9

Registered

ENCLOSURES.

P. G., No.

, dated

Enquiring whether
the "Fort walls" of
Trichy, which, it was
directed should no
longer be borne on the
mily. returns, included
the citadel walls

No.

3
P. W. S. 20/10/60



No. 2582

Enclosure
Collector's office 78

Trichinopoly 22 July 1885

From

The Collector of Trichinopoly

To

The Superintending Engineer

Trichinopoly

Sir

With reference to your
letter No. 525 J.C.
9-10-84, I have the
honor to forward for your per-
usal and return copy of Judg-
ment in O. S. No. 3 of 1865, which
I obtained from the Trichinopoly
District Court. The suit was
brought by the Trustees of Rock
Fort pagoda against the then
Executive Engineer for the re-
covery of Rs 999-... the
value of the granite stones
removed

removed from what is called
the Citadel wall. You will notice
from the judgment that the suit
was dismissed with all costs
and that the wall was pro-
nounced Government property.
It has continued to be in charge
of your Department both previous
to and since the decision.

The Residents of the northern
Street in the Rock Fort have
presented a Mazhar complaining
that the Citadel wall on the northern
side is in such disrepair that
the next rains might bring
it down with a run. I forward
it in Original for such action
as you may deem necessary.
A perusal of the decision will, I
think, make it clear to you that
the

the Citadel wall is Government
property. It has never been
made over formally to the
Municipality who appear
to be unwilling to take charge
of such a white Elephant.

Even if Government in-
sisted on their taking charge,
it would, I think, be only
fair that your Department
should put it in good order
before the transfer.

I have etc

/Signed/ Henry Sewell
Collector

/True copy/

M. M. Collier

Superintending Engineer
C. Circle

7TH JANUARY 1886, No. 9, REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue :—

Read—the following letter from Colonel H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 6th August 1885, No. 237 T. C. :—

I have the honor to report that there has been a correspondence between the Executive Engineer of Trichinopoly and the Municipality regarding the maintenance of what is called the citadel wall of Trichinopoly fort. This wall was part of the fortification of Trichinopoly, and it

now consists of a massive revetment wall built round a portion of the Trichinopoly rock and supporting streets, houses, &c.

2. In G.O., No. 240, dated 25th January 1865, and Proceedings of the Public Works Department, No. 500, of the 25th January 1865, it is stated in paragraph 3 that letter No. 1802, of 12th September 1846, from the Assistant Quartermaster-General, directed that the fort walls of Trichinopoly should no longer continue on the military returns. I suppose this refers to the citadel wall as well as to the outer walls of the fort. The outer walls have been removed, the materials used on various works and those left and the land were handed over to the Trichinopoly municipality; but there is no record to show that the citadel wall (which is, as before stated, now a revetment wall holding up a portion of the town) ever was formally handed over to the municipality.

3. In 1865 some of the stones of this wall were removed by Captain Palmer, then District Engineer, I believe, to prevent damage, and a suit was brought in the court by the "Audinakartar" (I believe trustee) of the Rock Temple, and Rs. 999 claimed as damages, being the alleged value of the stones removed; the plaintiff asserted that the wall in question was the property of the pagoda and not the property of Government. The court decided that the wall in question was Government property.

4. In November 1883, the Vice-President of the Municipality addressed the Executive Engineer, and requested him to repair the wall which was said to be in a dangerous state, and again in January and July 1884, asked that the wall should be repaired at the cost of Government. The Executive Engineer on emergency expended Rs. 170 on repairs, and pointed out to the Commissioners that he considered that the wall should be kept in repairs by the municipality, and requested repayment of the amount expended. At a meeting held on the 29th July 1884, the Commissioners declined to pay the amount, and asserted that the wall in question was in the charge of the Public Works Department.

5. I addressed the Collector on the subject and proposed that, should the citadel wall not have been (as I believe was the case) handed over to the municipality at the same time that the other old fortifications were, he should address Government and have it handed over without delay. In reply, he forwarded to me an extract of proceedings of the Municipal Commissioners, dated 23rd September 1884, asserting that the citadel wall never had been handed over to them, and stating their opinion that it should remain in charge of Government and be repaired at the expense of Government. I again addressed the Collector and pointed out that the above was no reply to my letter asking for information and for his opinion as Collector, and also that if the wall was Government property, it was in his charge and not in that of Public Works Department.

6. I enclose a copy of his letter and enclosure No. 2582, dated 22nd July, and request instructions. I most certainly do not agree with the Collector in his opinion that the wall in question is, and always has been, in the charge of this department.

29/1/86

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Superintending Engineer, Trichinopoly, dated 22nd July 1885, No. 2582.

With reference to your letter, No. 525-T.C., dated 9th October 1884, I have the honor to forward, for your perusal and return, copy of judgment in original suit No. 3 of 1865, which I obtained from the Trichinopoly District Court. The suit was brought by the trustees of Rock Fort pagoda against the then Executive Engineer for the recovery of Rs. 999, the value of the granite stones removed from what is called the citadel wall. You will notice from the judgment that the suit was dismissed with all costs, and that the wall was pronounced Government property. It has continued to be in charge of your department both previous to and since the decision.

2. The residents of the northern street in the Rock Fort have presented a Mazar complaining that the citadel wall on the northern side is in such disrepair that the next rains might bring it down with a run. I forward it in original for such action as you may deem necessary. A perusal of the decision will, I think, make it clear to you that the citadel wall is Government property. It has never been made over formally to the municipality, who appear to be unwilling to take charge of such a white elephant. Even if Government insisted on their taking charge, it would, I think, be only fair that your department should put it in good order before the transfer.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Judgment.

No. 509-E.

Referred to the Revenue Department for favor of opinion whether, under G.O. in that department, dated 21st September 1868, No. 2436, paragraph 2, clause 1, the citadel wall at Trichinopoly should not be regarded as being under the care of the Collector.

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

Order—dated 7th September 1885, No. 4778, Revenue.

Referred to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, for the favor of information as to whether, referring to the correspondence quoted in paragraph 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, on which the present reference by the Department of Public Works is made, the "fort walls" of Trichinopoly, which, it was directed, should no longer be borne on the military returns, included the *citadel* walls.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. WILSON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Military Department, with original papers to be returned.

No. 5165.

Referred for favor of early report.

(By Order.)

(Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mil. Dept.

18th September 1885.

To the Quartermaster-General.

READ—also the following letter from Brigadier-General R. C. STEWART, Quartermaster General, to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, dated Ootacamund, 16th October 1885, No. 2507-B:—

In returning the papers regarding the fort and citadel walls at Trichinopoly, referred for report under endorsement No. 5165, dated 18th ultimo, I have the honor, by order, to state, for the information of Government, that the returns furnished to

this office include only "buildings" and never walls only of forts, unless they contain chambers or casemates on which these are shown.

2. The returns of Trichinopoly for years 1845, 1846, therefore do not include either the citadel or fort walls, and it is not clear therefore what was meant when in this office letter, No. 1802, dated 12th September 1846, the removal of the "walls of the fort of Trichinopoly" from the returns was authorized.

3. A copy of this office letter, No. 648, dated 19th December 1845, recommending the demolition of the fort walls is attached, and the order of Government which was passed on that letter is No. 109, dated 8th January 1846.

4. The sketch which accompanied the enclosure of this office letter, mentioned in the previous paragraph, might perhaps give some information which will be of value in connection with the matter.

No. 5927.

Transferred to the Revenue Department and the referred papers returned with file of previous correspondence.

(By Order.)

FORT ST. GEORGE, (Signed) A. KENNEY-HERBERT, Lt.-Col.,
28th October 1885. Offg. Secy. to Govt., Mil. Dept.

ORDER—dated 7th January 1886, No. 9, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

E.M.C., Military Department, No. 3696, dated 19th August, and No. 3858, dated 31st August 1846.

From the papers marginally noted, the entire fortifications at Trichinopoly appear to have been abandoned by the Military Department. The citadel walls referred to in the foregoing correspondence must, therefore, be held to be in charge of the Collector with reference to the terms of clause 1, paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 2436, dated 21st September 1868.

2. The Collector, in consultation with the officers of the Public Works Department, will have an estimate prepared for the demolition of the wall and for stacking the stone in view to its being subsequently sold by auction, unless it is recommended that the materials be sold *in situ*, in which case an agreement should be made with the purchasers for the removal of the materials within a specified time and a deposit, to be forfeited in case of failure, should be taken.

(True Extract.)

Reddick

Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department, with three original papers returned.
„ the Military Department.
„ the Board of Revenue.
„ the Financial Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

100 Copies.

20 22

No. 178 Waf Jany: 22-1886
B

Communicated
to the Superintending
Engineer II Circle.
At Circle.

19/1/86

19.1.86

Govt. of (1886) Madras.
REVENUE.



Issued

Recd. 18/1/86

Encl. 3

G.O., 7th January 1886, No. 9.

No. 178 Waf Jany: 22-1886
Vide Ch^o 390

JANUARY.

Fort walls of Trichinopoly.

Orders passed regarding the demolition of
the —.

2 Copies to copy
With disposal

To the S.E. II Circle
with one enclosure
E 26 1/3 1/2 Dec 22-1-86
E 26 1/2

Dec 22-1-86