

Political (1897) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 124

Dated 25-2-77

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Declining to take any action regarding the boundary dispute between Palakurichi, Pudukkottai State, and Neduvayal, Sivapanga, Tennidari, until the appeal put in is disposed of.

C.F. 73.

[illegible]

The file was determined as follows

OFFICE OF THE
POLITICAL AGENT FOR PUDUKOTA.

Trichinopoly 30th January 1897

Depl. 3.2.97.

No.

FROM

J. K. Bullen ESQUIRE,

POLITICAL AGENT FOR PUDUKOTA,

TRICHINOPOLY.

TO

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to
report that in 1884 Mr Pope who
appears to have been in charge
of the duties of arbitrating the
boundary disputes between Palakurichi,
a village of Pudukkottai State, and
Neduvayal & villages of ^{the} Sivaganga
Tehsildary, in the Madurai District,
awarded to the Sivaganga Tehsildary
nearly 250 acres of land in 1884 against
which the Pudukkottai Darbar
protested, and intimated, as appears
from the correspondence before me,
that it would appeal to Govt.

Durbar required in 1886 the status quo
ante be maintained with reference
to the tract so awarded. The
same request was repeated in 1887
by the late Diwan. The Gudukkotai
authorities after the last communication
on the subject in 1887 appear to have
lapsed into a state of apathy as
regards their own interests, until
1891, in which year the late Diwan
complained to the effect that the
ryots of the Sivaganga Zemindari
had encroached upon lands forming
part of the boundary between
Palakurichi of ^{the} Gudukkotai State
and Kunathur of the Sivaganga
Zemindari, and that upon the
Gudukkotai ryots preventing the
encroachment, a suit had been
filed against them by the Sivaganga
people in the District Munsiff Court

of the Lemindari people. The late
Diwan in concluding the above complaint
reiterated his previous request to
maintain the status quo ante pending
the disposal of his appeal against
Mr Pope's award. No further
correspondence appears to have taken
place after this representation till
27th May 1895 on which date the
Diwan represented that the Sivaganga
Lessee had sued the Gudukkotai ryots
in ^{the} Sivaganga District Munsiff's in 1892,
for possession of certain lands, which
though lying within the limits of the
Tondiman State and in the actual
enjoyment of the State ryots, had,
however, been awarded to the Sivaganga
Zemindari by Mr Pope in 1884, and
that the Lessee had obtained a decree
which the Court authorities failed
to execute, owing most probably to
resistance on the part of the
Gudukkotai ryots, for which the late

appear & have been prosecuted in
a criminal court. The Diwan requested
that proceedings in civil and criminal
courts ^{in connection with this matter}. The Diwan requested that
proceedings in civil and criminal
courts in connection with this matter
might be stayed, considering the un-
settled character of our Pops's boundary
line which was left under a protest
and liable to revision if the State
established its objection. After some
more correspondence Mr. Andrew, my predecessor,
on 27th February 1896, requested the Diwan
to send up a memorandum showing clearly
and precisely his grounds for appeal.
Before the receipt of this appeal,
complaints of various encroachments
by the State, and counter complaints
by the Zamindary ryots were brought
to my notice which showed that the
feelings of the State and Zamindary
ryots were highly excited and likely
lead to breaches of the peace. To

To prevent actual breach of the
peace there has been considerable
correspondence between this office
and the Madura collector.

2. The Diwan sent his memo-
-randum of appeal only on the 16th
November 1896 and it was followed
by a letter from him reiterating
the request made in previous letters
that all proceedings in the court
of the District Munsiff of Sivaganga
regarding the execution of all decrees
in connection with suits regarding
the land in dispute might be stayed
until after ^{the} final decision by
Government of the appeal which
is now for the first time actually
before me. I request therefore that
Government will be pleased to pass
orders as to whether the request
of the Diwan can be complied
with. His request practically is
that until the appeal is decided

British Courts shall not have jurisdiction over the disputed tracts, which are said to be in actual possession of Pudukkottai ryots.

3. No steps ~~has~~ appear ever to have been taken to give effect to Mr. Pope's decision as to the boundary, nor does the decision appear to have received the formal assent of either the Madras Government or of the Pudukkottai Darbar. I propose that the Political Agent should go to the spot and inquire into the matter and report on Mr. Pope's award either for confirmation or modification. This will take a long time and meanwhile I request order as to what should be considered the jurisdiction of the British and Pudukkottai Courts respectively over the tracts concerned in the appeal.

I have the honor to be
your most obedient servant,

W. H. K. Kottai

[G.]
24.

200-5-10-95.

Political DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated	189	No.
Again G.O., dated	189	No.
Current No.	209	of 1897, dated 30/1, from the Pol. Agent, Pudukkottai
" "	189	" "
" "	189	" "

C.S. ORDER. N^o 124 of 25-2-97
 With ref to para 3 of Mr. Battag's letter read above the Polt Agent, Pudukkottai, will be informed that, until a decision has been arrived at regarding the appeal which has been put in, ^(is disposed of) the Govt feels itself precluded from taking any action in the matter.
 From orders

24/2/97

Pol Agent Pudukkottai (9)
 C.S. 24/1/97 23/2/97