

Political (1896) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 854

Dated 11-12-96

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating to the Resident in Travancore & Cochin, proceedings; Res. dept, notifying the decision of the Boundary Commissioners in regard to a dispute about a portion of the Ponnani Taluk between the Govt and the Cochin State.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
M	728	Leas	6-4 144				

CURRENT No 1616 212

Government { 1896 } of Madras.

REVENUE.

604: 5-9-96
191: 19-3-94

Recd. 9 12 }
Regd. 10/12 } 1896

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 634, 16th November 1896.

Order No 854 of 11-12-96
Mis

Communicated to
the Resident in Travancore

NOVEMBER. and Cochin.

Cut
mis
12.12.96

To
the Resident in Tr (500)

Boundary Disputes.

The decisions of the Boundary Commissioners contained in G.O., No. 150, dated 22nd February 1894, as modified by the British and Cochin Governments, ordered to be published in the Fort St. George and the Malabar District Gazettes.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., No. 150, Revenue, dated 22nd February 1894.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the final report on the settlement of the boundary disputes between the Ponnáni taluk of Malabar and the Cochin State.

READ—again G.O., No. 568, Revenue, dated 4th August 1894.

ABSTRACT.—Accepting the decision of the Commissioners in regard to the boundary dispute between Cochin and Malabar, and requesting the Resident in Travancore and Cochin to ascertain and report whether His Highness the Rajah's Sirkar is willing to confirm all the decisions passed by the Commissioners.

READ—again G.O., No. 397, Revenue, dated 8th August 1896.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on papers relating to the settlement of a portion of the boundary between the Ponnáni taluk of the Malabar district and the Cochin State and inquiring whether the Cochin Sirkar accepts the rectification of the boundary line therein suggested.

READ—also the following letter from the Honourable J. D. REES, C.I.E., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Ootacamund, dated Trivandrum, 7th October 1896, Ref. on C. No. 3135.

With reference to G.O., No. 397, Revenue, dated 8th August 1896, communicated with Political Order No. 604 of the 5th ultimo, I have the honour to report, for the information of Government, that the Cochin Sirkar accepts the rectification of the boundary line between Ponnáni and Cochin therein referred to. Copy of the Dewan's letter on the subject is herewith submitted.

ENCLOSURE.

From M.R.Ry. V. SUBRAMANYA PILLAI, Avergal Dewan, to the Acting British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Trichur, 28th September 1896, No. 2330/P-317.

In returning herewith G.O., No. 397, Revenue, dated 8th August 1896, forwarded with your demi-official letter of the 14th instant, I have the honour to inform you that this Government accepts the rectification of the boundary line consented to by the Madras Government in respect of the boundary settlement therein referred to.

Endorsement No. 2090.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

(Signed)

W. W. PHILIPS,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

14th October 1896.

ORDER—No. 634, Revenue, dated 16th November 1896.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The decisions of the Boundary Commissioners contained in G.O., No. 150, dated 22nd February 1894, as modified by the British and Cochin Governments, will be published in three successive issues of the Fort St. George and the Malabar District Gazettes.

(True Extract.)

Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin (through the Political Department). ✓

„ the Superintendent, Government Press.

APPENDIX.

NOTIFICATION.

The following decisions passed by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes between the Ponnáni taluk of the Malabar district and the Cochin territory and the final orders passed by those Governments are published for general information.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

50 Copies.

[Appendix]

REGISTER of decisions by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes between British territory (Ponánni taluk) and Cochin territory.

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravirthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claim advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
1	Panangad amsam, Ala desam.	Kotungannallur Pravirthi, Pullattu desam.	The British amsam officials admit that the land has not been registered in their amsam, nor assessment collected on it; but as it is in the middle of the stream, it is contended that it should form part of their amsam.	The land is in the possession of Kallamparambil Kunjapi, who pays assessment for it to the Cochin sirkar, and has been doing so for several years.	The island in dispute is situated in the middle of the canal, which is the boundary according to Ward and Connor between British and Cochin territory at this place. Though it has been in the possession of a tenant of the Cochin sirkar, we do not think that this materially affects the question whether it should be viewed as British or Cochin territory. We think that the canal being a tidal and navigable one and being the admitted boundary between the two States, a line running in the middle of the canal is the true boundary, and such part of the island as would fall to the west of this line should be viewed as British territory and the portion falling to the east as Cochin territory. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.	All the decisions of the Commissioners are confirmed subject to the modification of the whole of the island involved in dispute No. 3 has been allotted to the Malabar district and the whole of the islands involved in disputes Nos. 1, 9, 11 and 12 to the Cochin State, the boundary line being rectified in such a way as to pass along the eastern shore of the island in No. 3 between the points at which the line as recommended by the Commissioners enters and quits that island and similarly along the western shores of the other islands above specified.
2	Panangad amsam, Ala desam.	Mukundapuram Pravirthi, Karuvapadantha desam.	The land is in the possession of Pichanthora Yasoo, but it is not registered in the British or Cochin amsam accounts.		The island being clearly on the British side of the boundary canal, we decide that it is British territory. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.	
3	Pappinivattam amsam, Pappinivattam desam.	Arivipalam Pravirthi.	The island is in the possession of Mutharakal Panikar under a jenni by name Kunjipayri, who holds the patta, and pays assessment to British Government.	The Cochin officials do not claim possession, but say that the island being in the stream, the Cochin sirkar is entitled to it.	For the reasons given in our decision in dispute No. 1, we think that the true boundary line is the middle of the canal, and such portion of the island as falls to the east or west of it must be viewed as Cochin or British territory. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.	
4	Pappinivattam amsam, Pappinivattam desam.	Arivipalam Pravirthi, Padiyur desam.	The land is claimed to form part of the patta of Kunjipayri, who has been paying assessment for it since fash 1296.	The land is claimed to be the jennum of Kudalmanikam devasam and Kunjipayri is claimed as the tenant under that jenni. The assessment is being paid to the sirkar.	The boundary line claimed by the British amsam officials is marked in red, and that of the Cochin officials in yellow. It will be observed that the line, as claimed by the Cochin officials, is in accordance with the well-understood rule that the canal is the boundary between the two States. The claim of the British officials appears to be a recent one, and is wholly groundless, and must be disallowed. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.	

6	Edathiruthi amsam, Edathiruthi desam.	Peringattukara Pravi- rthi, Kilpillikara desam.	The patta for the land is in the name of Kallungal Raman since fash 1287; a cowle appears to have been granted to him for the land which is now registered in the accounts partly as nanja (wet land), and partly as paramba (garden land). The land is assessed only when cultivated, which it is not every year. It appears that the jennam has been sold to one Naduvapedi- kal Aseph about five years ago by the Escheat department. The Escheat Deputy Collector appears to have sold the jennam to the Blahail Nair about five years ago. The land is claimed to be in the possession of Blahail Nair (who pays assessment when he cultivates it, which he does not do every year), Paikkattu Raman Nair (who pays assessment when he cultivates, which he does not do every year), and Kondan Nair, in whose name a portion is registered as permanent nanja or wet land. The land has been granted on quit-rent last year by the Escheat Deputy Collector to Kunhi Kela- van.	The Cochin officials ad- mit that they have no pos- session of the land which is not entered in their ac- counts.	We pass a single decision in cases Nos. 5 to 8. On carefully inspecting these four islands, we find that the deep-water canal runs along the line marked by us in red ink on the plan. We find further that at low water and in the hot months the island No. 5 is connected with the mainland on the British side, and similarly the island Nos. 6 to 8 with each other and with the mainland on the Cochin side. We think that the boundary should be taken as the canal along the line marked by us. The island No. 5 will therefore be British territory and Nos. 6, 7 and 8 Cochin territory.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.
7 & 8	Edathiruthi amsam, Edathiruthi desam.	Do. ..	The land has been in possession of Raman Nair, uncle of Kondan Nair, till 1864 as nanja land, and the Cochin officials have col- lected assessment from him. Then the Blahail Nair is said to have trespassed, and the land has been in dispute ever since. The Cochin Revenue authorities have been attempting to grant the land on quit-rent.	The Cochin officials have not entered the land in their revenue accounts.	We think that a line run along the middle of the canal should be taken as the boundary, and the portions of the island which may fall east or west should be viewed as Cochin or British territory.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.
9	Pallipuram amsam, Kuttamangalam de- sam.	Peringattukara Pra- virthi, Thaniam desam.	The patta for this is in the name of Kunhi Kelavan, who pays assessment in British terri- tory. It is registered as wet, and the jennam appears to have been sold to this man about ten years ago by the Malabar Collector.	The Cochin officials say that the matter being under dispute, they have not been collecting any assessment.	The island like the others is of recent formation, and we think that a line must be run along the middle of the stream, and the portions of the island on either side will go to the Cochin or British territory respectively.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.
10	Nattika amsam, Tripayar desam.	Peringattukara Pra- virthi, Padinhare muri desam.	The patta for this is in the name of Kunhi Kelavan, who pays assessment in British terri- tory. It is registered as wet, and the jennam appears to have been sold to this man about ten years ago by the Malabar Collector.	The Cochin officials say that the matter being under dispute, they have not been collecting any assessment.	The island like the others is of recent formation, and we think that a line must be run along the middle of the stream, and the portions of the island on either side will go to the Cochin or British territory respectively.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.
11	Nattika amsam, Nattika desam.	Peringattukara Pra- virthi, Padyanad desam.	The patta for this is in the name of Kunhi Kelavan, who pays assessment in British terri- tory. It is registered as wet, and the jennam appears to have been sold to this man about ten years ago by the Malabar Collector.	The Cochin officials say that the matter being under dispute, they have not been collecting any assessment.	The island like the others is of recent formation, and we think that a line must be run along the middle of the stream, and the portions of the island on either side will go to the Cochin or British territory respectively.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.
12	Nattika amsam, Nattika desam.	Do. ..	The patta for this is in the name of Kunhi Kelavan, who pays assessment in British terri- tory. It is registered as wet, and the jennam appears to have been sold to this man about ten years ago by the Malabar Collector.	The Cochin officials say that the matter being under dispute, they have not been collecting any assessment.	The island like the others is of recent formation, and we think that a line must be run along the middle of the stream, and the portions of the island on either side will go to the Cochin or British territory respectively.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ENAMAKAL, 14th April 1893.

Register of decisions by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes, &c.—cont.

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravirthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claim advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
13	Venkitangam amsam, Toyakavoo desam.	Enamakal Pravirthi, Karamukku desam.	The island is called "Koil madu" and is registered as wet land in the British accounts, the registered area being about 26½ acres, and the assessment Rs. 30-3-4. The pattadars are Changathu Thachu Nair, Chetti Govindan, Konathur Savankutti, Karokaram, Paranjia, Veetil Aydrumakutti, and two others, Seyd Ahamed and Chakkunni. The land has been British territory since the paimash, which took place long ago.	The island is called "Koil madu." It is admitted that it has not at any time been paying assessment to Cochin sirkar, but it is contended that it was in the Cochin paimash accounts or olugu (more than 80 or 90 years' old), and a Cochin accounts of 60 years' old is produced, which, though it does not mention the name of the island, describes it in a way which identifies it as the island now in dispute. The island is included in "Koil madu" and the same claim as that advanced in dispute No. 13 is advanced to this island.	We pass a single decision in disputes Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 16. The question involved in these, is whether the true boundary canal is the narrow stream between the disputed islands and the Cochin mainland, or the broader stream to the north of the islands. We have referred to Ward and Connor's memoirs, and find that the boundary line which they describe from the north is stated as follows:—"Skirting the northern border of the Yanamakal district and taking a southern direction passes along a narrow arm or channel of the Chetwai estuary." The wording "narrow arm of the estuary" might at first appear to favour the British contention, but on referring to Ward and Connor's map, we find that the boundary line plotted by them agrees exactly with the Cochin claim. We tested the angles and distances given in the memoirs and find that they agree with the line as plotted in the map. Further, we find on referring to a vernacular account of the boundary between Cochin and British territory (which, though it bears no date, appears to be an old document and has come from proper custody, viz., the Malabar Collector's office) marked Exhibit A, that the canal is described as the "branch canal or Enamakal thodu which has turned from the main canal," the latter being obviously the canal running from Cranganore to Chetwai (Exhibit A-1). Thirdly, we have before us an old map (Exhibit B) sent to us from the Forest Records of the Collector's office, which had obviously been written before the present Enamakal dam was constructed (more than 50 years ago), and in this map the island comprised in dispute No. 13 (Koil madu thirutha) is clearly shown as Cochin territory—vide the line drawn to the north of the island. We therefore decide to adopt the line as claimed by Cochin in the disputes Nos. 13 to 16. We should also mention that though the British ryots have been in possession of island No. 13 for a long time, the Cochin village officials have always maintained their claim, though they never enforced it, and in the case of the islands 14 and 16, the possession of the British ryots is comparatively recent date, and the island No. 16 is not in the British accounts at all. We therefore decide disputes Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 16 in accordance with the Cochin claim.	Vide supra.
14	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Do.	Entered in the British amsam accounts by the name of "Madu stalam" as wet land (nilam), the patta being in the name of Cheruvathur Pulichern. Registered extent about 2½ acres and assessment Rs. 2-14-10. Land appears to have been on quit-rent to the pattadar in fasli 1299, and before and given on quit-rent to the pattadar in fasli 1299, and before that jemmam from fasli 1286. Before him from fasli 1286, the island was not fore fasli 1286, the island was not shown in the revenue accounts.	Same claim as per Nos. 13 and 14.		
15	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Do.	Entered in the British amsam accounts as follows:—In the name of Madu, son of Payili, three parambas named "Nilam Thuruthu paramba," extent about 1½ acres, assessment Rs. 8, quit-rent Rs. 8; Puthannadu quit-rent Rs. 14-8 and quit-rent As. 4-2, in the name of Ayyappan, son of Kunjappan, and Kuttan, son of Veloo, as Puthannadu kilakke As. 14-3, and Tharasu paramba, about ½ acre, quit-rent As. 3 and a Tharasa stalam in the name of the above pattadar, extent about ½ acre, and a Tharasa stalam in the name of the above pattadar, extent about ½ acre, quit-rent Pies 6, and a paramba in the name of the above pattadar, extent about ½ acre, assessment Rs. 1-8-8 and quit-rent Rs. 2-8-3. The quit-rent in all the above cases was imposed by the Escheat Deputy Collector in fasli 1299. None of the above lands or parambas figure in the revenue accounts at all before fasli 1272.			

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
() J. C. KOHLHOFF.ENAMAKAL,
29th April 1893.

16	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Enamakal Pravirthi, Karamukku desam.	Admittedly not entered in the British amsam accounts. Not in the British accounts. On the other hand, the island is called "Kodankulli madu," and though it is shown as British territory in the old paimash, it is shown in the nilam account of fasli 1272 as included in Cochin territory, and omitted from that fasli from the British accounts.	Same claim as for Nos. 13, 14 and 15. The island is called "Mamalur Vadakke paramba," and is shown as such in the Cochin accounts, and one Kunnamthuli Kunjiparan pays an assessment of As. 3-4 for a portion of the land to the Cochin sirkar.	Do.	This is clearly Cochin Territory, as shown by the fact that it is well within the Cochin side of the canal, and the British amsam accounts show that in fasli 1279 the Cochin right was recognized, and since then admitted. In this connection we must observe that the boundary line must touch the middle of the Enamakal embankment, and as the Cochin claim to take it to the north is inadmissible, we have marked the line as decided by us in purple at this place—vide line a-b in the eye-sketch.
17	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Enamakal Pravirthi, Manalur desam.	Of the area contained in this, the western half is entered as waste in the nilam register of fasli 1272 and continued to be so entered ever since. It has never paid any assessment. The eastern half has been under temporary cultivation since fasli 1294, and has been paying assessment under that head. The western half is contended to be jemmam of Thindieth Nair, and to form a portion of his land called Karumpadath nilam. The eastern half is said to be partly the jemmam of the Irimbranallur devasam and partly of Thindieth Nair.	The western half is a portion of Valinkole land and belongs to Manalur devasam in Cochin territory. No assessment was, however, collected (the matter being under dispute) till last year when assessment was paid for cultivation of a portion of the land by Pottankot Kandunni and another. The eastern half is included in the land called Rajamattakole, and is Cochin sirkar jemmam. Assessment was collected for the first time last fasli from Pallikunnam Devasi, Vaid, Brahmakulath Kunjiparanju and Cherayathur Anthony.	do.	The disputes numbered 18 (a) to 18 (f) are really one, and depend for their decision on the question what line the boundary should take through the Enamakal lake. This lake is a very broad sheet of water, and covers a large extent of ground in the Venkitangam and Annakara amsams of British territory, and the Enamakal, Arunbur and Chittalally Pravirthies of Cochin territory. The lands in this area can be cultivated only during the dry season (December to May), and even then a considerable portion remains under water. Bunds are thrown up in different directions about December every year, and the water within the areas surrounded by bunds is baled out, and then the lands are cultivated. For about eight months in every year, the whole area is covered by water in some places to a great depth. The result is that land marks are difficult to retain, and the ryots have great difficulty after each rainy season in identifying their lands. Of recent years, however, owing to improved methods adopted by the ryots both in Cochin and British territory, cultivation has been rapidly extending on both sides, with the result that boundary disputes constantly occurred in different parts of the lake. The files of correspondence marked Exhibits E and F and I, show that the disputes in most places have been of recent origin. This, we think, accounts for the fact that Ward and Connor, who must have seen very little of cultivation in this area, have run the boundary by a few straight lines across the Akanthiruthu islands, giving to Malabar a large extent of the lake in the channel called Kuttychhal to Irimbranallur, thence pursues its course after issuing from the lake. They give seven bearings for a distance of 3 miles 7 furlongs 160 yards. We attempted to trace Ward and Connor's line across
18 (a)	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Do.	Entered in the accounts as wet (nilam) land, and called Villankole alias Thirinjikole alias Kallinkole. Included in the jemmam of Thindieth Nair noted in 18 (a). Entered in fasli 1272 as waste, but temporary assessment was charged in some years after fasli 1285.	The land is circar jemmam. Has paid assessment for a small portion in M.E. 1026 (1851). No assessment, however, was after that paid till last year when assessment was collected for a small portion from Karaiparambudi Chekkunni.	do.	
18 (b)	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Arimbur Pravirthi, Eravam desam.	Entered in the accounts as wet (nilam) land, and called Villankole alias Thirinjikole alias Kallinkole. Included in the jemmam of Thindieth Nair noted in 18 (a). Entered in fasli 1272 as waste, but temporary assessment was charged in some years after fasli 1285.	The land is circar jemmam. Has paid assessment for a small portion in M.E. 1026 (1851). No assessment, however, was after that paid till last year when assessment was collected for a small portion from Karaiparambudi Chekkunni.	do.	
18 (c)	Venkitangam amsam, Irimbranallur desam.	Do.	Entered in the accounts as wet (nilam) land, and called Villankole alias Thirinjikole alias Kallinkole. Included in the jemmam of Thindieth Nair noted in 18 (a). Entered in fasli 1272 as waste, but temporary assessment was charged in some years after fasli 1285.	The land is circar jemmam. Has paid assessment for a small portion in M.E. 1026 (1851). No assessment, however, was after that paid till last year when assessment was collected for a small portion from Karaiparambudi Chekkunni.	do.	

Conservative number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	
64	
65	
66	
67	
68	
69	
70	
71	
72	
73	
74	
75	
76	
77	
78	
79	
80	
81	
82	
83	
84	
85	
86	
87	
88	
89	
90	
91	
92	
93	
94	
95	
96	
97	
98	
99	
100	

Vide supra.

[illegible]

The land is shown as Cochin sirkar jenmam and waste. A very small bit was attempted to be assessed last fasli, but this was not however done.

The north-west portion of this is said to be entered in the permanent nilam register in the name of Lonppan and about nine others, the jennam being Thindhi Nair's. For this portion permanent assessment is said to have been in force since M. E. 1027 (1852), and a remark in the nilam register of 1862 is shown in support of this. The other portion of 18 ($\frac{1}{2}$) is said to be waste land belonging to Thindhi Nair, and Vellangu Madathil Nair, and entered as such from fasli 1272 onwards; but it has paid no assessment.

Arimbur pravirthi,
ravum desam and
adakumbam desam.

18 (d) Venkitangam am-
sam, Irimbranallur
desam.

direction (slightly inclining to the west), till we reach the boundary line claimed by the British officials, and hence we run a short distance to the west till we come to the undisputed boundary. The result is that the oblong patch along the north-west of 18 (*f*) becomes British territory, and the balance of 18 (*f*) becomes Cochin territory. We have marked the line as decided by us throughout dispute No. 18 in purple on the sketch. We started from the centre of the Eranakul dam, and we have posted six coconut pegs at the different bends for the guidance of the Survey officers, when they proceed to survey the boundary as settled and demarcated by us. To provide against the mischance of the next rains washing these pegs away, and thereby causing trouble in identifying the positions, we have taken angles at each station fixed by us to known points in different directions, (one of them being a trigonometrical station) and these angles are shown in the sketch.

ENAMAKAL, (Sd.) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
2nd May 1893. () J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We find that the British claiming line is in accordance with Ward and Connor's line; and as the land has been evidently waste till recently, and is now in the possession of a ryot claiming under the British Government, we declare it British territory.

ENAMAKAL, (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
and May 1893. () J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We find on inquiry that this small bit of land has been cultivated for more than 12 years by one Chappakkutti Menon who holds it under Ulanattu Panikar, the tenant paying the Cochin Government assessment to the landlord. We think that the Cochin claim is

correct, and decide accordingly. P. RAJAGOPALA CHARL.
 ENAMAKAL, (Signed) J. C. KOHLHOFF.
 22 May 1893

On our inspection of the stream which runs along the line claimed by Cochin, we find no indications that it was turned in that direction within any measurable period of time. On the other hand the line claimed by the British side is hardly likely to have been a stream. We therefore decide that the land is Cochin territory.

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARL.
J. C. KOHLHOFF.

AKTHOR,
4th May 1893.

This is a portion of the Ammuthankole nilam, and the jenmam of Vadakunathan devasani, permanent assessment being collected from Kalluvakaran Kungiala since last year.

The land is called Annunthakole, a portion is private jennam and the balance is the jennam of Vadakuntham devasam. Assessment paid on a few occasions on different bits.

Entered in the nilam register in Thindieth Nair's name in fasli 1272, the land being called Kuttolathu vattakole nilam. Patta is in the name of Thindieth Nair, who pays assessment of Rs. 5-14-8

The whole land is said to go by the name of Vallakole, and Exhibit D is filled in support; a narrow oblong patch along the north-west corner is under cultivation, and is said to be entered in the revenue records as a wet land. The jennam for this patch is said to belong to Vallankandath Nair, and patia is in the names of Elavanthangal Chakkoo, Kotharamathu, Kunni Menon, and Venu, son of Manan. The balance of the land is waste, and is entered as such in the nizam register of fasli 1272, but no assessment has been paid for it.

Shown in the accounts as Vilanoki ebarchu (*i.e.*, under temporary cultivation) in the name of Ulanattu Panikar for the last three or four years.

The land is included in the patta of Nalapurakal sanku as palliyal or seed bed, and is the property of Ayyur Thamburam.

The land is called Punnakattu Cherai Vadaṅṅu bhagann nillam, and the pattadar is Kunju Naachiar (now deceased). The assessment is being paid by Karduṁṁ Nair (Naachiar's son). In regard to the fact that the stream is the admitted boundary and is against the British claim, it is contended that the stream originally ran along the line as shown in the British claim, but it has since changed its course, and this alteration is said to have taken place more than 40 years ago, having been effected by Ulanattu Panikar.

Chitlapally Pravi-
thi, Parapoor desam.

Annakarai amsam,
Annakara desam.

is being paid by Kandamni Nir (Nachiar's son). In regard to the fact that the stream is the admitted boundary and to the British claim, it is contended that the stream originally ran along the line as shown in the British claim, but it has since changed its course, and this alteration is said to have taken place more than 40 years ago, having been effected by Ulanattu Panikar.

Register of decisions by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes, &c.—cont.

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravirthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claim advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
22	Annakara amsam, Kadavallur desam.	Chundal Pravirthi, Vaduthalai desam.	This dispute comprises three plots of ground called "Tharagandipadi nilam," entered in the nilam register from fasli 1272, and it is therein stated to have borne a number in the old paimash account. Patta is in the name of Ulanattu Kunhikoma Panikar, and the assessment is As. 12-7.	The land is called "Pat-tathil padi Nilathindi Kilakapurath nilam," entered in the old paimash account. Assessment Rs. 1-6-4. The jenmam belongs to the Mekkatu Nambudiri. Patta stands in the name of Chathadath Chathu Ukkandan. The assessment is being paid by the Nambudiri.	We find that this land is apparently regarded as a portion of other lands on either side held under the British and Cochin Governments. It is impossible to find out to which land on either side the disputed land really belongs; and we therefore adopt a straight line as the boundary at this place from one undisputed point to another, which we have marked in purple on the plan. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	<i>Vide supra.</i>
23	Vylathur amsam, Pukkodi desam.	Kunnankulam Pravirthi, Arthoot desam.	This is a paramba on which an assessment of As. 15-4 has been charged for the last two years on account of the coconut trees on it.	The paramba is the jenmam of the Arthoot devasam, and is a portion of the Ambala paramba, which includes the Chathakulam tank, the Arthoot temple, &c. Noted in the paimash accounts as Cochin sarkar jenmam. Pattadar is one Shangunni, who pays an assessment of three pice. The paramba is called "Thara paramba."	In regard to disputes Nos. 23 and 24 we decide on adopting the line as laid down in the vernacular plan marked Exhibit B. This clearly shows the road as the boundary at the disputed places, and we therefore decide both these disputes in favour of the British claim. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	
24	Vylathur amsam, Pukkodi desam.	Kunnankulam Pravirthi, Chitayur desam.	The paramba is in British territory. No assessment is charged, because there are no fruit-bearing trees on it.	Noted in the paimash accounts as Cochin sarkar jenmam. Pattadar is one Shangunni, who pays an assessment of three pice. The paramba is called "Thara paramba."	We find on inquiry into this dispute that different portions of the land comprised in it are claimed as portions of adjoining lands on the British or Cochin side, and it is impossible to say whether assessment on any particular bit has been collected in British or Cochin territory. We therefore decide on adopting a line which will have the least number of bends, and will fit in with the actual possession of the various tenants, and we indicate on the plan the line (in purple) adopted by us. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	
25	Vylathur amsam, Namanakad desam.	Kunnankulangara Pravirthi, Vaduthalai desam.	Entered as nilam or wet land in the accounts by the name of Variathadath nilam, which is a general name for this and other lands. Pattadar is Mallangil Aydoskuttil, who pays an assessment of Rs. 1-6-3. The jenmi is Thekkevittu Pukkoteseri Panikar.	The land is entered as Kaiathadan nilam. Pattadars are Kandannallukoppa, Thekkeveetil Kittunni Sanru Panikar, and Pokar Aydos. Assessment collected on the disputed area is Rs. 4-7-9.	We find on inquiry into this dispute that different portions of the land comprised in it are claimed as portions of adjoining lands on the British or Cochin side, and it is impossible to say whether assessment on any particular bit has been collected in British or Cochin territory. We therefore decide on adopting a line which will have the least number of bends, and will fit in with the actual possession of the various tenants, and we indicate on the plan the line (in purple) adopted by us. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	

26	Punnayur amsam, Kochanur desam.	Kunnankulangara Pravirthi, Vaduthalai desam.	Entered in the accounts as "Cherayil nilam." Assessment charged Rs. 1-12-7. Patta is in the name of Puthiavetil Esaff, and the pattadar is said to be the jenmi. Esaff says that his father purchased the land about 60 years ago from Manakulath Raja in Cochin territory, but is unable to produce any document in support of his statement.	Entered in the paimash accounts as Cochin sarkar jenmam and by the name of Tharaparamba. The pattadar is Chembil Elawan Tharakem Kundan.	<i>The land was claimed to be British territory along with other lands (admittedly in British territory) of the Mullamangalath Nambudiri, who has lands adjoining in both territories. We learn on inquiry that the Nambudiri, on being pointed out the disputed land, says it is Cochin territory; and as there is no evidence to show that it is otherwise, we decide in favour of the Cochin claim.</i> (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	
27	Punnayur amsam, Kochanur desam.	Kunnankulangara Pravirthi, Muthukunam desam.	The land is entered in the accounts as "Thadathil nilam." Assessment Rs. 3-13-5. The jenmam belongs to Valakathu Arakal Ammadu, who is also the pattadar and the cultivating tenant.	The land is Cochin sarkar jenmam, and is shown in the Cochin paimash accounts. It is a portion of Pazhewa Thadam land. The patta is in the name of Pokar Ali, but cultivation is done by Ammadu who also pays the assessment.	The British tenant Esaff admits that he is not in possession of the land; but that, on the other hand, Kundan, the Cochin pattadar, has been in possession for more than 30 years. Esaff says he has been paying assessment to keep his claim alive; but he produces no evidence in support of his claim. We decide that the land is Cochin territory, whose Government has been collecting the assessment from the occupying pattadar for a long period. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	
28	Punnayur amsam, Kochanur desam.	Kunnankulam Pravirthi, Vaduthalai desam.	The disputed area is entered as nilam in the accounts in three bits bearing an assessment of Rs. 11-2-6 paid by Valakathugal Ammad (the same individual mentioned in dispute 28). There is also another bit of land comprised in this dispute for which the patta is in the name of Chujanoo, who pays an assessment of As. 4-4.	The area is called "Valakuli nilam," and is the jenmam of the Elayangattil Thamburan. Patta is in the name of Valakathu Arakal Ahmad's father Esaff.	We found that Ammadu, the man admittedly in possession of the land, is dead, and have examined his son and heir Moidunni, who tells us that he has lands on both sides adjoining the disputed land and pays assessment to both sarkars, that it is impossible for him to say what assessment he pays for any bit of land, or under what Government he holds it. We are unable from the amsam accounts of either territory to identify the lands mentioned in them precisely. We therefore adopt a boundary with the least number of bends, and have marked the line so adopted by us in the plan (in purple). (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	
29	Punnayur amsam, Kochanur desam.	Kunnankulangara Pravirthi, Muthuvannam desam.			Moidunni, the son of the deceased Ammad, makes the same statement in regard to this dispute, as he did in regard to the last. For similar reasons, we have adopted a boundary of our own, which we have marked on the sketch (in purple). (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. ARTHNOT, 4th May 1893.	

Register of decisions by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes, &c.--cont.

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravirthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claims advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
30	Palikara amsam, Namamukku desam.	Porkalam Pravirthi, Kattagumpal desam.	The whole area in the disputed tract is wet land, and a statement of the same presented by the British amsam officers is filed as Ex.-G. The area is about 17 and odd acres and the assessment is Rs. 22-15-7. The lands have been in the possession of the British ryots for a very long time, and they have been entered in the permanent nilam register when it was first prepared.	The area is shown in the Cochin paimash accounts as sirkar jennam, and assessment was collected till M.E. 1003 (A.D. 1828), when there was a rove, and in M.E. 1004 assessment was collected in Cochin territory on a portion of the disputed area. From M.E. 1005 no assessment has been levied in Cochin territory. The Cochin claim is based on the Cochin collection accounts of the back fash as well as the arrear accounts.	We find that the disputed tract had been admittedly in the enjoyment of the British ryots for more than 60 years, and, though it is alleged that, on account of some row which took place before that date, possession was transferred from Cochin to the British territory, we find no proper proof of this, and in the absence of any such proof we shall not be justified in disturbing the very long possession of the British ryots (<i>vide</i> file of correspondence marked Ex.-H). We therefore decide in favour of the British claim.	<i>Vide supra.</i>
31	Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.	Porkalam Pravirthi, Kadavallur desam.	The land in dispute is entered as "Pandarukari nilam" in the amsam accounts. The land is noted in the permanent nilam register ever since it was prepared. The jennam belongs to the Kadavallur Devassam, and the patta is in the name of Edathu Madathil Venkateswara Pattar. The assessment of Rs. 9-7-0 is being paid by the pattadar.	The land is included in the Pallada nilam, which is in the paimash accounts. No assessment, however, is being collected on the land in dispute, and it is admitted that the British pattadar is in possession.	In view to the admitted possession of the ryot, who claims under the British Government which has also been collecting the assessment on the land for a long time, we decide in favour of the British claim.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. KATVALUR, 5th May 1893.
32	Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.	Porkalam Pravirthi, Kadavallur desam.	Entered in the British amsam accounts as Kaithalavu nilam; of this land one portion bearing an assessment of Rs. 2-13-8 is in the patta of Churuthapuvadatha Narayana Nambudiri, who is also the jenni; the other portion is in the patta of Puthiavettil in the Puthen Valapal Avudalla who pays an assessment of Rs. 3-13-8.	Inasmuch as the desam boundary in the Cochin paimash accounts is shown so as to include the land in dispute, the claim is made; but it is admitted that no assessment has been collected on the land in Cochin territory, but that, on the other hand, the possession is with the two British ryots.	In view to the admitted possession of the British ryots, which has apparently existed for a long time, we decide in favour of the British claim.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. CHALASHERRY, 6th May 1893.

We have examined the man in possession of the tank, Ahamed, and he tells us that, though the tank water is on rare occasions used for the wet land in Cochin territory, he mostly uses it for the garden land in British territory. As the jenni of both lands is one individual, namely, the Devassam, and the tenant also a single individual, it is difficult to come to a definite conclusion whether the tank is in British or Cochin territory from the mere user of the water. We have no hesitation, however, in rejecting the claim of the Poliyur Nair, none of whose lands or gardens the water of the tank could in any way benefit. We have examined some of the

the demises of the land and parun'va next to the tank, and find that the tank is not mentioned in any of them. British claim, as the tenant assures us that the water is mostly used for the garden in British territory.

The Cochin claim is that the tank is an appurtenance to the adjoining wet land in Cochin territory held by the man Ahamed.

This is a small tank which is in the possession of Thekkara Ahamed, who holds the adjoining nilam or wet land in Cochin territory under the Kadavallur Devassam, and also an adjoining paramba under the same Devassam in British territory. The tank is said to be the jennam of the Poliyur Nair.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kadavallur desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

33

On the whole, we think it safe to decide in favour of the (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands comprised in this dispute are noted in the statement filed by the British amsam officials marked Ex.-J., which are all entered in the British amsam accounts, and the assessment for which are all being collected in British territory.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

34

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Entered in the nilam register as Puluri Kadavallur nilam. The assessment is Rs. 5-8. The jennam belongs to the Punmathar family (female branch). Patta is in the name of Pathumma who pays the Government assessment.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

35

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

36

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

37

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

38

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

39

(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI.
(") J. C. KOHLHOFF.

We see no reason to disturb the very long enjoyment of the British ryots who have been paying assessment in British territory; and we therefore decide in favour of the British claim.

The lands are noted in the Cochin account of M.E. 998 (A.D. 1822). In the above account it is stated in regard to some of the lands that they are not assessed in Cochin territory, because the assessment is being collected in British territory. It is admitted that no assessment has been collected on any portion of the disputed area ever since.

Porkalam Pravirthi, Kollancherri desam.

Othalur amsam, Othalur desam.

40

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravarthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claim advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
39	Kothachira amsam, Chalashcherri desam.	Porkalam Pravarthi, Kollancherri desam.	This dispute comprises three bits of land all called "Manikaran nilam," and the assessment thereon is Rs. 11-11-4. The jemmies are the Kamsayathu Nambudiri and Puvallie Mana. The pattadars are Thekkakara Chakkunni and Thombra Unichira who pay the assessment.	Same of claim as in dispute No 37.	We resolve on recording a single decision in disputes Nos. 35 to 39. Through the Cochin accounts show that there was some dispute more than 70 years ago regarding these lands, we are unable to see what the dispute was, and we do not think that it is proper to disturb the very long possession of the British Government, which has been collecting the assessment throughout. We therefore decide these disputes in favour of the British claims. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. CHALASHCHERRI. 19th May 1893.	<i>Vide supra.</i>
40	Kothachira amsam, Kothachira desam.	Porkalam Pravarthi, Thippilashcherri desam.	The land in dispute is entered as Vellatil paramba in the accounts. The jemmam belongs to the Vengathur mana. The land has not been brought to permanent assessment, and is only under temporary assessment in the years in which it is cultivated.	The land is called Vadukannu paramba and is the jemmam of the Malayakavil Ayapan Devassam. The assessment is As. 1-9, and has been entered in the accounts for a long period.	We find on inquiry that this is a portion of an old dispute settled in 1849 (<i>vide</i> files of correspondence marked Exs. K and L). We have identified the land in dispute as situated at the eastern extremity of the line laid down in 1849 by the British and Cochin officials, and we find that the line claimed by Cochin is in accordance with that line. We therefore decide in favour of the Cochin claim. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. KADUNGODE HILL, 20th May 1893.	
41	Kothachira amsam, Kothachira desam.	Porkalam Pravarthi, Thippilashcherri desam.	A portion of the area in dispute is entered as Palliyal land in the accounts and an assessment of Rs. 1-2-9 is charged thereon. The pattadar of this bit is the jemm, the Venkathur mana. The remaining and larger portion of the area in dispute is paramba, of which only a small portion (is under modern temporary) cultivation, and is charged in the years in which it is cultivated.	The land in dispute is entered in the accounts by the name of Karunkunnuide Padinhamuri paramba. The jemm is the Mullapully Nambudiri and the assessment is As. 3-10 which has been in force since the paramash.	We find that the area entered in the British amsam accounts as "Palliyal" has been paying assessment to the British Government for a long time, and hence decide that it is British territory. The remaining portion of the area in dispute is hilly country which does not appear to have been paying assessment in British territory, but has been so paying in Cochin territory, and we therefore award it to Cochin. The line, as decided by us, is marked in purple on the sketch. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. KADUNGODE HILL, 20th May 1893.	
42	Kothachira amsam, Kothachira desam.	Porkalam Pravarthi, Thippilashcherri desam.			This small bit of ground is all rock, and has been paying no assessment either in Cochin or British territory. We adopt the line as claimed by Cochin as the most natural boundary. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. KADUNGODE HILL, 20th May 1893.	

43	Kothachira amsam, Kothachira desam and Nagalashcherri amsam, Agalavam desam and Chaziyattiri desam.	Eyyal Pravarthi, Kadungode desam and Mundauparamba desam.	A statement of the lands and hills involved in this dispute and claimed to belong to the Kothachira amsam is filed as Ex.-M, and a similar statement of the lands and hills involved and claimed to belong to the Nagalashcherri amsam is filed as Ex.-N. The various jemmies who claim under the British Government have filed statements of the documentary evidence they rely upon, which have been filed as follows: statement of the Venkathur Manakal Namburipad, Ex.-O; statement of the Akala-uath Mussad, Ex.-P; statement of the Pukannia mana, Ex.-Q; statement of the Pemaicherri Manakal Namburipad, Ex.-R. The claim advanced on the British side is that the lands included in the dispute have been included in the British accounts from a remote period, and have been paying assessment in British territory, and the hills included in the dispute have been in the possession and enjoyment of the British jemmies.	The Cochin officials claim the whole Kadungode hills and the lands included in it as Cochin territory, and they have drawn their claiming line at the foot of the hills in such a way that the whole area of the hills falls in Cochin territory. It is contended that the Cochin amsam boundary is stated in the Cochin accounts to be a path called "Pothival," and this is said to have run at the foot of the hills along the claiming line now laid down by Cochin.	This dispute comprises an area of nearly 8 square miles mostly forest and hill, but comprising also a considerable area of paddy and dry land. The cultivated land is known as the Malayakam Padam, Malayadujan Kunda, Mundanchola, Kunnankulam and Pallanthadam, all paying assessment in the Nagalashcherri amsam, and there is further a narrow strip of cultivation at the west of the disputed area paying assessment in Kothachira amsam. In regard to the forest which does not pay assessment in either territory, it is contended on behalf of the British jemmies that they have been in possession and enjoyment of it, and on behalf of the Cochin Government that its Forest Department has been enjoying the forest. We find on inspection that the forest is mostly worthless, and the claims advanced by the British jemmies and the Cochin sikars are both in a measure true, as our inquiry shows that the hill slopes on the British side have been worked by the British jemmies, and those on the Cochin side by the Cochin officials; the middle portion being periodically a source of contention. We attempted to decide this dispute in accordance with the line as laid down in Ward and Connor's memoirs which runs as follows: "Leaves it (a nullah) and runs on the crest of a woody ridge of hills of moderate height. Falling abruptly is crossed by a small nullah and after keeping on open ground is reversed by it, &c." The line above laid down proceeds from the east to west and the bearings and distances are thus given:—	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. The tank is not entered either in the British or Cochin accounts; but, as the water of it runs mostly into the paddy fields in British territory, we decide in favour of the British claim. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.
44	Kothachira amsam, Nagalashcherri amsam, Pallipadam desam.	Chengazhikode Pravarthi, Tichur desam.	The tank in dispute belongs to the Valakode nilam and is the jemmam of the Nilayangottu Nambudiri.	The tank is called Thoyankulam and is in Cochin territory.	We have carefully explored the hills, and find that the only continuous ridge which can be said to fulfil the description "the crest of a woody ridge of hills," so runs, as to leave the large extent of paddy land known as Malayampadam on the Cochin side of it; and we have therefore been compelled to give up the idea of a continuous ridge on the boundary. We should also point out that it is very doubtful if this ridge would fit in with all the bearings and distances given by Ward and Connor. For the above reasons we have been compelled to give up the idea of tracing Ward and Connor's line in its integrity over the disputed area. We think that the safest course is to trace a line on the crest of the hills, wherever possible in such a way as to fit in with the actual possession and enjoyment on either side, and in accordance with the general direction given by Ward and Connor. We have not been able to fulfil all the above requisites; but the line adopted by us fulfils as much of them as possible under the circumstances. Beginning from the east, it will be observed that the line decided by us tallies with the British claiming line till it descends the ridge and falls into the valley. From this point our line keeps to the west of the Malayampadam lands till it catches the ridge again at the Malayatingankundu. Here again our line runs up the ridge till it again touches the British claiming line, and it then proceeds on the top of the ridge till it abruptly leaves it and crosses the stream which runs into the Kothachira amsam. It thence proceeds in a straight line to the undisturbed boundary. We have prepared a sketch showing our decision, and we have filed it as Ex.-S. It will be seen from the above sketch that the cultivated area which has to be transferred to Cochin. It will be seen that the tracts of forest on the British slopes in that territory, excepting a small portion in the Kothachira amsam which has to be transferred to Cochin, and also portions inside fall on the Cochin side of our line. This decision is in general accord with the documents filed by the various jemmies. It will be observed on referring to the old vernacular plan marked Ex.-B that the line as laid down by us tallies to a considerable extent with the boundary as laid down in it. The line adopted by us has been carefully demarcated, and the boundary marks laid down by us (B.C.M.) on the rocks are indicated in the sketch and have been numbered.	(Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. () J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.

Register of decisions by the Commissioners appointed by the Madras and Cochin Governments to decide the boundary disputes, &c.—cont.

Consecutive number of dispute.	Name of amsam and desam in British territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Name of pravirthi and desam in Cochin territory to which the disputed land is claimed to belong.	Substance of claim advanced on the British side.	Substance of claim advanced on the Cochin side.	Decision of the Commissioners and grounds therefor.	The final orders of the Madras and Cochin Governments.
45	Naglasherri amsam, Pallipadam desam.	Chengazhikode Pravirthi, Tichur desam.	The area in dispute comprises four items of wet land entered in the permanent nilam register and assessment at Rs. 5-12-8, 1-1-1, 2-8-0 and 3-4-9, respectively.	Entered in the Cochin nilam accounts as jenmam of Tichur Devassam, but no assessment collected since M.E. 998.	In view to the very long possession and enjoyment on the part of the British sarkar, we decide in favour of the British claim. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.	<i>Vide supra.</i>
46	Naglasherri amsam, Ittonam desam.	Chengazhikode Pravirthi, Ittonam desam and Chulur desam.	The cultivated area comprises wet land which appears in the permanent nilam register, garden land which appears in the permanent paramba register, and the remaining area which is waste is in some years under temporary cultivation and charged as such.	No items of land in the area are entered in the Cochin accounts as wet land, but some are entered as parambas and the balance is waste.	We have made careful inquiries as to the possession on both sides and find that the wet lands have been paying assessment in British territory for a considerable period; the parambas are partly assessed in British territory and partly in Cochin territory. We have drawn our line in accordance with the actual possession so far as the wet and garden lands are concerned. In regard to the waste we have adopted Ward and Connor's line which takes up the boundary to the top of the Puidali hill. The line as settled by us is shown in purple. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.	
47	Thirumithakode amsam, Feringanur desam.	Chengazhikode Pravirthi, Tuleprom desam.	This is a paramba charged in the British accounts at As. 6 from fasli 1301.	The paramba is permanently assessed in Cochin territory at As. 1-9 and has been so for more than 35 years.	The Cochin claim is clearly made out and we decide accordingly. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.	
48	Thirumithakode amsam, Iringathur desam.	Chengazhikode Pravirthi, Kadugasherri desam.	The wet lands in the area are in the permanent nilam register, and the gardens are also claimed to be in the permanent paramba register, the balance is under temporary cultivation.	On the wet lands the assessment is not collected in Cochin territory, but the gardens bear assessment and the area under temporary cultivation is included in the Cochin accounts.	We proceed in accordance with what we consider to belong possession and enjoyment. We therefore award the wet lands to British territory. The parambas, we find, have been assessed in Cochin territory much longer than in the British and the waste land is clearly a portion of the Cochin high ground. The line, as decided by us, is marked in purple on the sketch. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.	
49	Thirumithakode amsam, Thirumithakode desam.	Cheruthiruthy Pravirthi, Cherugatta desam.	The wet and garden lands are included in the permanent nilam and paramba registers, and pay assessment in British territory.	The Cochin officers claim the area as included in their peimash account, but admit that no assessment has been collected for more than 60 years.	We decide in favour of the British claim. (Signed) P. RAJAGOPALA CHARI. (") J. C. KOHLHOFF. THIRUMITHAKODE, 7th June 1893.	

No.

DATED

No. O. No

GOVERNMENT

GOVERNMENT.

NOT WITH DITTO.

NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

R.E.

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
F = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

for copying 11/12
1896

A A A A A A A