[Poll. / 8.]
1,613—24-8-97.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

Political (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 187

DATED 6 - 3 - 99

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Coming to the Resident in T & C pro & Rev dept accepting certain proposals of the Coll^r of Tinnevelly for the settlement of the boundary between Tinnevelly & Travancore, & requesting the former to report whether the Travancore Darbar agree to those proposals.

T 6-3-99

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

CURRENT NO 293 Poll

Government {1899} of Madras.
REVENUE.

24 FEB. 1899

Recd. 24-2- } 1899. *Enclosures*

Regd. 24-2- } 1899. *Spare copies*

G.O., Nos. 130, 130A, 18th February 1899.

Order No 187 dt 6-3-99

~~Communicated~~ ~~Forwarded~~ to the Resident Travancore & Cochin with ~~his~~ ~~letter~~ para 6 of the foregoing proceedings ~~(Extract Enclosure)~~, ~~which is~~ ~~requested to advise with the Darbar on the subject of paras 5 & 6 of the Order & report the result to Govt in due course.~~

FEBRUARY.

S.W.G. 1/3/99. Cmb 2322

To the Resident Let Cto Lr C with 2 Maps. 6 to 7 & 10

—Rev Dept (gd)

Stating that the Resident in Travancore and Cochin will be instructed in the Political Department to ascertain whether the Travancore Darbar agree to accept the settlement of the boundary between Tinnevelly and Travancore on certain lines.

Desp to 8/3/99

1 map ret^d Cr 75-33

Resp to Rev for Travancore file 8/3/99

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Reference of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 577, dated 23rd May 1898:—

Read—the following letter from R. B. CLEGG, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 14th March 1898, Dis. No. 494-Gl.:—

I have the honour to address the Board regarding a boundary dispute on the Travancore frontier adjoining the Nángunéri taluk of this district.

2. The boundary between Mahendragiri and Arambuli pass was settled by Messrs. R. K. Puckle and Raja Sir T. Madhava Rau in 1868, and a clear description of it is given in G.O., No. 1257, Revenue, dated 7th May 1869, communicated with Board's Proceedings, No. 3493, dated 19th May 1869. This settlement was ratified by Government in G.O., No. 816, Revenue, dated 10th May 1871, communicated with Board's Proceedings, No. 1552, dated 13th May 1871, and also by the Secretary of State (G.O., No. 315, dated 19th February 1872, in Board's Proceedings, No. 1346, dated 22nd February 1872). With regard to the boundary from Mahendragiri northwards it was decided in the Government orders above quoted that the watershed line should be adopted as the boundary.

3. The first-named boundary, *i.e.*, from Mahendragiri southwards, is described as starting from a rock called "Nalikal" and was substantially demarcated in 1868, as will be seen from Mr. Puckle's letter to Government, No. 362, dated 26th August 1871, in which he stated that all that was necessary was to survey the Government villages according to the demarcation of 1868, and that the Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey had been addressed in the matter. A map showing the boundary as settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau is enclosed (marked A).

4. The demarcation of the second boundary, *i.e.*, from Mahendragiri northwards was commenced in 1874 by a survey party under the supervision of Commissioners deputed by both Governments, Messrs. Bird and Munro. It will be seen from Deputy Conservator Mr. Hayne's letter in Board's Proceedings, No. 3062, dated 8th November 1875, that the party worked from the Tirukarangudi pass southwards as far as "Nalikal," a point which was supposed to be the starting point of the boundary settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau in 1868, but which was really different from the "Nalikal" fixed by them. Plans in three sections marked B showing the demarcation of this boundary are enclosed. Subsequently it was brought to the notice of Government that the boundary line, instead of being run along the watershed from "Nalikal" up to Mahendragiri peak and thence to the Tirukarangudi pass and Assumbu pass, was taken by Messrs. Bird and Munro along the side of the hill from the pass to "Nalikal" (G.O., No. 1716, dated 14th November 1881, communicated with Board's Proceedings, No. 3294, dated 15th December 1881). The Travancore Durbar was then addressed and officers were appointed by both Governments for effecting a rectification of the boundary (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 3139, dated 16th December 1882), and the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, was also requested to depute a surveyor to accompany the Commissioners. In February 1882, Mr. Hayne made a proposal that he should be permitted to carry out the alteration of the boundary in question, independently of the Travancore Commissioner and subject to his subsequent verification and approval. This proposal was advanced in consideration of the fact that a similar course was accepted by the Travancore Durbar with regard to the boundary near Shencottah (Dewan's letter, No. 3127—P-618, dated 2nd December 1882, printed in Board's Proceedings, No. 692, dated 10th March 1883). The Travancore Durbar, however, did not accept Mr. Hayne's proposal, but desired a joint inspection and settlement by the officers of the two Governments, subject to ratification by "His Highness" and the Madras Government (Resident's letter to Collector, No. 248, dated 20th March 1883). On this occasion they appointed Mr. Ferguson, Superintendent and Magistrate, Coffee Districts.

5. Some correspondence passed in March 1883 between Messrs. Ferguson and Hayne about arrangements for joint inspection, but it does not appear that they ever met or that a joint settlement was ever made. It appears, however, that Mr. Hayne went on with the rectification, clearance and demarcation of the boundary line. Detailed instructions were issued by him on the 26th March 1883 to the taluk forester to clear and mark the boundary running it from "Nalikal" to the crest of Mahendragiri and then joining it with the old line. The sketches (C and D) submitted by the forester during the progress of the work in May 1883 show roughly the positions of the original and altered boundary. These are enclosed. It appears from the above that Mr. Hayne demarcated the boundary himself independently of any Travancore official and left it to that State to satisfy itself as to the correctness of the revised boundary. Mr. Bourdillon, Conservator of Forests, in his letter to the Dewan of Travancore, No. 183,* dated 2nd March 1891, makes the same observation.

* Copy enclosed.

6. The upper and lower slopes of the hills were notified as reserved forests in 1884 and 1891, respectively (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 258, dated 25th January 1884, and No. 33, dated 22nd January 1891, Forest), and the reserved forests were surveyed by the survey of India party in 1891. The map (E) prepared by that department is enclosed. It appears therefrom that this survey has followed Mr. Hayne's demarcation.

7. The present dispute relates to a tract of forest land between the points A, B, C now marked in Mr. Puckle's plan (A). The point A is the rock from which Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau started their boundary line and although it was called by them "Nalikal" it is said to be really known as "Ondikkal," so named from its peculiar shape resembling that of a bloodsucker's head. The rock really known by the name of "Nalikal" is at the point B from which Messrs. Bird and Munro started the boundary up the Mahendragiri and on which a boundary stone bearing a broad arrow mark and the shell of Travancore has been fixed. The dispute relating to this tract arose in 1890 when certain forest clearings were made by the Forest Department. The Travancore Durbar drew attention to the matter. Mr. Brasier, District Forest-officer, Tinnevelly, and Mr. Bourdillon, Conservator of Forests, Travancore, met in February 1891 and examined the boundary. Mr. Brasier, in his report, dated 25th April 1891, No 371, reported that he was convinced that the starting point of the boundary settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau was the "Ondikkal" and that he had not the slightest hesitation in acknowledging the justness of the Travancore claim. He added that he had instructed the India Survey Department to undertake the survey of the disputed tract at once and that he would be in a position to ascertain the area in September following. Mr. Thornton who succeeded Mr. Brasier again inspected the place with Mr. Bourdillon, verified the description of boundary as settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau and found that it ended at the point A "Ondikkal," though wrongly named by them as "Nalikal." He, however, questioned the desirability of accepting the Travancore claim as Messrs. Bird and Munro had clearly fixed the boundary stone at the real "Nalikal" (B) and it was therefore inadvisable to re-open the question. The Survey of India map does not show completely the area in dispute, but it shows the boundary in dispute from B to C and Mr. Puckle's boundary is also marked in it at Mr. Thornton's instance up to "Ondikkal." Information regarding the actual extent of the disputed tract is not available. Mr. Bourdillon has estimated the area at about one and a-half square miles.

8. From a perusal of the boundary description in G.O., No. 1257, dated 7th May 1869, and of the reports of Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau, there can be no doubt that the point A, by whatever name it was called, was intended to be the starting

point. It appears that they walked over the line at the time and had it demarcated. The "Nalikal" is described, in their boundary description, as situated at the north-east declivity of the Tiruvannámalai hill. The demarcation on the ground from "Ondikkal" corresponds with the original description. Even supposing that the "Nalikal" referred to in the original boundary description was the "Nalikal" at B, the boundary line from B to C finds no corresponding description in the boundary settlement. I consider that the settlement of 1868 must be accepted in toto and that the boundary line from the rock on the north-eastern declivity of the Tiruvannámalai hill should be taken by the most direct course possible to the watershed. If the Board and Government approve of my proposal, I request that orders may be issued for the rectification of the boundary under the supervision of officers deputed by both Governments subject to final ratification. This opportunity may also be taken to formally confirm the line of the revised boundary along the watershed up to Tirukarangudi pass, demarcated by Mr. Hayne and shown as the boundary in the map of the Survey of India.

Enclosure.

From T. F. BOURDILLON, Esq., Acting Conservator of Forests, Travancore, to the Dewan of Travancore, dated Nagercoil, 2nd March 1891, No. 183.

With reference to my letter No. 96, dated 3rd ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that I reached Panacoody on the 26th ultimo and met Mr. Brasier, the District Forest-officer there, when we discussed the subject of the portion of the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly near Mahendragiri now under dispute.

2. On the following day we proceeded to the spot where the two boundaries claimed by the different parties diverge, and from there followed the line claimed by me to its northern limit. On the 28th we examined the Tinnevelly village maps and compared them with the map supplied to me from the Huzur and came to the decision stated below.

3. As the whole question is rather complicated, it will be well to state the case clearly from the beginning.

4. In March 1868, Sir T. Madhava Rau, Dewan of Travancore, and Mr. R. K. Puckle, Collector of Tinnevelly, met at Panacoody and decided on the line which should be henceforward regarded as the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly, and a description of it was subsequently clearly laid down in the Proceedings of the Madras Government G.O., No. 1257, dated 7th May 1869. This boundary was accepted by the Secretary of State for India in his No. 5 of 18th January 1872, and the selection of the line from the Nalikal rock near Mahendragiri south to Cape Comorin was thus finally settled.

5. In his letter of 21st August 1871, No. 3282—R-1008, the Dewan wrote to the British Resident for a copy of the map of the boundary as settled upon by him and Mr. Puckle and in his letter No. 598 of 26th August 1871, Mr. Puckle replied that the line had been "substantially demarcated" and would be surveyed, and that he would forward the maps of the frontier villages as soon as they were lithographed.

6. On 7th September 1871, the Dewan wrote in his No. 3524—R-1081, that the boundary was not permanently marked at the time of examining it and that a survey was highly necessary in order to prevent future disputes and that at the same time it should be properly demarcated. I have no records on the subject after this date, but I have been supplied with a map ostensibly marking the boundary as laid down in the description mentioned above dated 23th November 1879, and signed by Messrs. R. K. Puckle (Collector of Tinnevelly) and A. Macgregor (Resident of Travancore). There is no scale in this map nor have any papers been supplied to me showing how and when it was forwarded to the Huzur. Perhaps this could be ascertained in the Resident's office.

7. The Nalikal as shown in the map and description I have marked (A). This stone is now known as Ondikkal.

8. Meanwhile, the Commissioners appointed to the work had begun cutting the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly in the year 1875 or 1876. Their instructions were distinct and directed them to commence cutting from the Nalikal south of which the boundary had been already settled and to follow the watershed.

9 Now the stone commonly known as the Nalikal (B) is quite different from the Nalikal (A) mentioned by Mr. Puckle and it rises to the south or south-west of the Tiruvannámalai hill instead of to the north-east of it. This Nalikal (B) is now marked with the broad arrow and Travancore shall presumably by Messrs. Bird and Munro and I conclude from this that instead of beginning to cut the boundary from the point (A) they began to cut it from (B) the rock commonly known to the public as the Nalikal. Beginning here, then, they made a slight deviation from the exact watershed, and as the ridge along which they should have cut is very exposed, they allowed the line to be taken along the northern slope of the hill instead of along the ridge, Tinnevelly thus losing a trifling portion of territory.

10. In 1881, Mr. Hayne, Deputy Conservator of Forests, Tinnevelly, discovered this trifling loss to his district and began to urge the Madras Government that the line between the Nalikal rock and the Tirukarangudi gap should be revised and recut. After some correspondence the Travancore Government agreed to this and deputed several officers in turn to co-operate with Mr. Hayne in this work. None of these officers were able to be present to act in conjunction with Mr. Hayne and finally that gentleman recut the boundary alone leaving it to the Travancore Government to depute some one to check the work. Until the present time this has never been done.

11. Besides cutting the boundary from Nalikal (B) along the watershed to the Tirukarangudi pass, Mr. Hayne, as I am informed by the present District officer of Tinnevelly, also cut the line from Nalikal (B) south to the point marked C on the Travancore-Tinnevelly boundary, thus clipping off (if the line of boundary we claim is correct) about four square miles of Travancore. In any case, Mr. Hayne had no authority to do this, as he was told, and he himself admits that he could not interfere with the boundary settled by Sir T. Madhava Rau and Mr. Puckle (see the Deputy Conservator's letter of 28th March 1881).

12. Matters were in this state when I visited the locality in August 1888. The Amenadar of Mahendragiri reported the encroachment to me, and having examined the line of boundary we claim, I wrote to you on the 21st August 1888, No. 3, pointing out that there was likely to be a dispute. Since then a lengthy correspondence has taken place, and finally to settle the matter Mr. Brasier, the District Forest-officer of Tinnevelly, met me on the 26th instant and as already stated we went over the ground on the next day. His contentions are that Nalikal (B) is the rock known as Nalikal at the present time and that it is much larger than Nalikal (A), and secondly that the broad arrow and Travancore shell are cut in this rock. I admit both contentions; but I assert that the rock Nalikal (B) cannot possibly be the Nalikal rock alluded to by Mr. Puckle and Sir T. Madhava Rau, because the former is to the south or south-west of the undoubted land mark Tiruvannámalai, while the former is stated to be the north-east of it, and as regards the marks, these were probably put on by Messrs. Bird and Munro who were misled by the name and had not the description of the boundary mentioned above to locate their starting points.

13. On the other hand the rock Nalikal (A) now known as Ondikkal exactly corresponds with the description of the Nalikal rock mentioned by Mr. Puckle, and the boundary as shown in the map exactly corresponds to the description of the boundary already referred to. Further, the map is authenticated by Mr. Puckle. Unfortunately, its value is depreciated by the fact that no scale is attached to it; that the draftsman's name is not entered, and that the portion of the Mahendragiri hill is incorrectly sketched in, but inasmuch as the map is only a map of the boundary line itself, this want of correctness outside that line should not militate against its real value.

14. I was so far able to convince Mr. Brasier of the correctness of the case. I maintain that while hesitating to take on himself the responsibility of altering the boundary, he expressed himself as quite willing that the matter should be decided by some superior officer.

15. The dispute then is narrowed down to a very simple one and now resolves itself into a question of *which is the Nalikal rock referred to by Mr. Puckle*—the rock marked (A) or that marked (B), and I have the honour to suggest that the Collector of Tinnevelly be requested to meet any one that you may depute from this side to settle the question.

16. As soon as the exact position of the real Nalikal rock is decided the final settlement of this long-pending dispute can easily be effected, for southwards from it, an exact description of the boundary is given in G.O., No. 1257 of 7th May 1869, while to the north of it the boundary has to run along the watershed about which there can be no question.

When this point has been decided, a surveyor and settlement officer should be sent along the line to put up boundary stones and to make an accurate survey of the line and henceforth the boundary should be kept clear and well marked—, a work which could be easily undertaken by this department if the necessary funds were allowed for it.

17. I have one more suggestion to make, and it is this. It will be observed from Mr. Puckle's plan (if it is correct) that the line of stones set up by the Revenue Survey Department of British India to mark the boundary between the hills, and the cultivation at their foot runs sometimes just within and sometimes just without our boundary. If then the Travancore-Tinnevelly boundary, as laid down by Mr. Puckle, was rigidly adhered to, there would in some places be a double boundary which would lead to much confusion and annoyance and not only so, but where the revenue survey land marks came within our territory the British Government would still collect tax right up to those land marks even though a portion of the land was partly in Travancore. In some places where the revenue survey land marks are well outside boundary there is land belonging to Tinnevelly on which no tax is levied. I have the honour to suggest therefore that in order to avoid confusion and as an equitable settlement

for both parties that the line of Revenue Survey demarcation stones be accepted as the real Travancore-Tinnevelly boundary throughout this portion of the line, and by this arrangement neither side would lose or gain appreciably.

18. The map and all the papers sent to Quilon in connection with this dispute and given to me in Trivandrum are herewith returned to the Huzur, with the exception of those relating to the Alwarkurichi and Shencottah disputes which are still unsettled.

Reference—No. 577, dated 23rd May 1898.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. In the letter read above, the Collector of Tinnevelly submits proposals for the settlement of a boundary dispute on the Travancore frontier adjoining the Nángunéri taluk of that district. The disputed tract is a piece of forest land near Mahendragiri mountain about 1½ square miles in extent between the points A, B and C in the plan marked A forwarded by the Collector. The land is now included within British territory, but the Travancore authorities represent that it is an encroachment.

3. The boundary line between Tinnevelly and Travancore south of Mahendragiri mountain was demarcated in 1868 by Sir T. Madhava Rau, Dewan of Travancore, and Mr. R. K. Puckle, Collector of Tinnevelly, and the settlement was ratified by the Madras Government and the Secretary of State (*vide* G.Os., No. 1257, Revenue, dated 7th May 1869, No. 816, Revenue, dated 10th May 1871, No. 1123, Revenue, dated 29th June 1871, and No. 315, Revenue, dated 19th February 1872). The line, as then settled, started from a rock on the north-east declivity of the Tiruvannámalai hill, marked A in Mr. Puckle's plan forwarded by the Collector, and ran southwards along the eastern base of the range of hills. The starting point was described as "Nalikal, a pointed rock." The land mark commonly known by this name is situated at a different point marked B in Mr. Puckle's plan. The rock at the point A is reported to be known not as "Nalikal" but as "* Ondikkal" and to have been so named from its likeness to a bloodsucker's head. Messrs. Bird and Munro who in 1874 were deputed by the British and Travancore Governments to demarcate the line between Tinnevelly and Travancore north of Mahendragiri and south of the Tirukarangudi pass made the southern end of the boundary coincide with the Nalikal marked B in the plan and not with the point A which had been the starting point of Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau's line. Subsequently Mr. Hayne, the Deputy Conservator of Forests, who was deputed in G.O., No. 105, Revenue, dated 10th January 1883, to rectify a mistake made by Messrs. Bird and Munro in the boundary north of the Nalikal marked B also extended the demarcation from the point B in the plan to the point C so as to meet the boundary line settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau; this extension he was apparently never authorized to make *vide* paragraph 11 of letter from Mr. Bourdillon, the Conservator of Forests, to the Dewan of Travancore, No. 183, dated 2nd March 1891-F.). The space enclosed between the three points A, B and C was thus included within British territory; this is the space now disputed by Travancore.

* Malyalam—Ondi = bloodsucker.

4. It is clear that Messrs. Bird and Munro intended their line to meet that of Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau at the point B, but it does not appear that they had any other reason for locating the junction at B beyond the fact that it was known as *Nalikal*. The geographical description of Nalikal given in the original reports printed in G.O., No. 1257, dated 7th May 1869, corresponds with the rock at the point A (Ondikkal), being on the north-eastern declivity of the Tiruvannámalai hill, an undoubted land mark, and does not coincide with the point B which is on the south or south-west of that hill. Messrs. Brasier and Thornton, the District Forest-officers, as well as Mr. Bourdillon, the Travancore Conservator of Forests, all of whom inspected the several places in question and verified the description of the boundary as settled by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau agree that that boundary started from the point A "Ondikkal," although the point was (wrongly) referred to by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau as "Nalikal."

5. In these circumstances the Board agrees with the Collector in considering that the original settlement made by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau in 1868 should be accepted and that orders should be issued for the necessary rectification of the boundary under the supervision of officers to be deputed by both Governments. The officers so deputed will have to connect the point A with the Mahendragiri watershed. Mr. Clegg proposes that this should be done by taking the most direct course between A and the watershed. The Board concurs in this view as it was settled in G.O., No. 1123, Revenue, dated 29th June 1871, that the watershed should form the boundary north of the line settled by Mr. Puckle and Sir T. Madhava Rau. As Messrs. Bird and Munro started their boundary from a point some distance to the west of the Ondikkal marked A, the rectification now recommended will probably have the effect of making a further transfer of territory to Travancore.

6. In the letter read above the Collector requests orders on another point in connection with the demarcation of the boundary between Tinnevelly and Travancore, north of Mahendragiri. As pointed out in Mr. Hayne's letter printed in G.O., No. 1716, Revenue, dated 14th November 1881, a mistake was made by Messrs. Bird and Munro in demarcating their boundary line, for, instead of running it from Tirukarangudi pass along the watershed down to Mahendragiri peak and thence to Nalikal, they took it along the side of the hill from the pass to Nalikal. The Government directed that the boundary should be revised by Mr. Hayne in conjunction with an officer deputed by the Travancore Government (*vide* G.Os., No. 1716, Revenue, dated 14th November 1881, and No. 105, Revenue, dated 10th January 1883). The Collector now reports that owing to the inability of the officers deputed by the Travancore Government to meet Mr. Hayne, the boundary was revised by that officer alone and that Mr. Hayne's demarcation has been adopted in the map of the Kalakad reserved forests, Nángunéri taluk, prepared by the Survey of India in 1891 (*vide* map marked E forwarded by the Collector). Mr. Hayne's boundary has never been formally ratified by Government or by the Travancore Darbar, and this opportunity may be taken advantage of to secure the confirmation of the line laid out by him, subject to such modification as may be necessitated by the change in the starting point of the line settled by Mr. Puckle and Sir T. Madhava Rau.

(Signed) LIONEL DAVIDSON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with letter and enclosures, in original, to be returned.

Read—also Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 331, Routine, dated 6th February 1899.

Order—No. 130, Revenue, dated 18th February 1899.

Miscellaneous.

In the first of the Proceedings read above the Board of Revenue submits, for the orders of Government, certain proposals by the Collector of Tinnevelly for the rectification and the final determination of certain disputed portions of the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly.

2. The boundary line from the Mahendragiri mountain to the Arambuli pass was settled in 1868, after a joint inspection, by Mr. Puckle, Collector of Tinnevelly, and Mr. (afterwards Rajah Sir) T. Madhava Rau, Dewan of Travancore, and the line demarcated by these officers was accepted by the Government and ratified by the Secretary of State. In accepting this settlement, the Government suggested that, north of the Mahendragiri hill, the watershed on the ghât range should be taken as the boundary line between Travancore and Tinnevelly. This suggestion was agreed to by the Travancore Darbar and the boundary north of Mahendragiri was accordingly demarcated on this principle in the years 1874 to 1877.

3. In the description by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau of the boundary settled by them in 1868, the starting point on the north is described as "Nalikal (a pointed rock) on the north-east declivity of the Tiruvannámalai hill;" but it is now

reported that the rock answering to the position thus described is known by the name of *Ondikkal*, while the land mark commonly known as *Nalikal* is situated at a different point. When the demarcation northwards was resumed in 1874, the survey party, consisting of Messrs. Bird and Munro, started from the real Nalikal, which is near the south-west corner of the Tiruvannámalai hill; and the boundary was thus taken some distance to the west of the point which had been accepted as Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau's terminus, thereby bringing within Tinnevelly a small area of land which, the previous settlement, had shown as within Travancore. On the other hand, the party of 1874 made a deviation from the true line of watershed between Nalikal and Tirukarungudi pass and followed a line to the east of the watershed between these two points. This latter error which resulted in some loss of territory to the British Government was brought to notice in 1881, and Mr. Hayne, Deputy Conservator of Forests, Tinnevelly, was appointed to effect a revision of the line in conjunction with an officer to be nominated by the Travancore Darbar. The officer appointed by the Darbar was not able to meet Mr. Hayne and the latter officer appears to have proceeded with the revision of the boundary and to have further connected the real Nalikal, the southern terminus of the demarcation of the Survey Party of 1874, with a point on the line settled in 1868. Mr. Hayne's demarcation has not been formally ratified by this Government or accepted by the Travancore Darbar, but has been adopted in the map of the Kalkad reserved forest in the Nángunéri taluk, prepared by the Survey of India in 1891.

4. The Collector of Tinnevelly now proposes and the Board of Revenue recommends—

(i) that the starting point of the boundary settled in 1868 by Messrs. Puckle and Madhava Rau, by whatever name it was then called, should be taken as the rock at present known as Ondikkal; and

(ii) that the boundary line from this point should be continued by the most direct course to the watershed which has been accepted by the British Government and the Travancore Darbar to be the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly to the north of Mahendragiri.

These proposals are now accepted.

5. The Darbar will further be moved to accept the boundary line north of the Mahendragiri hill demarcated by Mr. Hayne and adopted by the Survey of India. This line was run on the principle, already accepted by the Darbar, of taking the watershed as the dividing boundary. If the Darbar so wish, they may depute an officer to perambulate the line in company with an officer of this Government. On receipt of the joint report of these officers, steps will be taken to fix the boundary finally.

6. The Resident in Travancore and Cochin will be instructed in the Political Department to ascertain if the Darbar agree to the settlement of the question on the above lines.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
„ the Political Department, with two maps (to be returned).

Endorsement No. 130A.

Copy to the Government of India, Revenue and Agricultural Department.

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,
Ag. Under Secretary to Government.

Md. Shaik Karim.

Copies.

When given for copying 6/3
When copied 6/3
When examined 7/3
When signed 1899

Read again G.O., No. 189 , dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government.	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
Letter of Government.								
Statement with ditto								
Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch in original.								

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