CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 318 Press ~~Mis.~~

151—152

Dated 12—2—~~19~~1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 191. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th January 1863, No. 224:—

Read the following letter from P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 15th November 1862, No. 242.

SIR,

1. For the last forty or fifty years a boundary dispute between Mysore and this District has existed near a place called the Bilicalrangam Pagoda in latitude 12° on the west of the Colligal Talook. In the years 1826 and 1835 Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Drury respectively issued orders directing that the Arrack Renters should be allowed to sell Arrack there, and in the latter year the Commissioner of Mysore directed the Superintendent of Astagram, on the complaint of the Ellandoor Jaghiredar, to prevent the Colligal Renter from trespassing on the Mysore frontier. The survey of the Mysore territory was made by Major Mackenzie in the early part of the century about 1803. According to this survey, which tallies with the Trigonometrical Atlas sheets, the disputed place is situated within the Mysore limits. On this point there is no doubt.

2. Coimbatore was surveyed in the years 1807 to 1813, and according to this survey the disputed place seems to be within the limits of this province. The dispute has existed as already observed for the last forty or forty-five years, and at this distance of time I believe it will be impossible to decide it on its true merits; but I think from the fact of the Mysore Map and Trigonometrical Atlas sheet coinciding, that the probabilities are in favor of the disputed place being situated within the Mysore limits, and as it is of importance that a question of this kind should not be left open, I think it will be well, unless the Government records throw any further light on the subject, to accept the boundary indicated in the Mysore Map and Trigonometrical Atlas sheet, as the correct one. For the last forty-five years the disputed spot has been entered in the list of places at which the Abkarry Renter is permitted to open a shop; hitherto there has been little trouble on the subject, but this year the rents went up to a high figure,* and were knocked down to one a Capilasawmy Chetty, a stranger; he has, I suspect, had some difficulty in realizing his money, and has adopted the present dispute as a pretext for not paying up his Kists, 3,201† Rupees of which are now in arrears. The dispute is a *bonâ fide* one, although I do not believe that the Renter has suffered to the extent alleged. He has been sent for, but in the meantime I beg to place the matter before the Board, and request their early decision on the boundary in question. The original correspondence on the subject is enclosed for perusal and subsequent re-transmission to this Office.

* Rupees 12,800 for Fasli 1272.

† Three Kists.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From B. COOPPA ROW, Deputy Collector of Coimbatore, to P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, dated 26th September 1862, No. 550.

SIR,

To the Superintendent Astagram Division dated 4th June 1859, No. 204.
From do. 2nd September 1861, No. 355.
From do. 14th March 1862, No. 257.
From Collector to Head Assistant Collector 4th June 1858, No. 222.

1. With reference to the correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to state for your information that during my late visit to Colligal for Revenue Settlement, I went up to the Beligheri Rungum hills for the purpose of inspecting the locality consequent upon a complaint preferred by the Abkarry Renter of Colligal.

2. This complaint necessarily involves the question of boundary between this District and Mysore comprising an area of some 5 or 6 miles of hill land, which up to this period remains unsettled.

3. With a view to convey as clear an idea of the locality as possible, I beg leave to enclose a sketch of it as extracted from the Survey Map of this District furnished by the late Surveyor General under the orders of Government.

4. The Abkarry Renter complains of obstruction to the sale of Arrack at a spot contiguous to a large well known as "Kallany," which is marked in the sketch with an asterisk.

5. A reference to the records shows that the parties periodically renting the Abkarry Farm of Colligal were always permitted by their license to have Arrack shops established here ; every license issued since 1817, forty-five years, contains an entry to this effect. In like manner the present Renter also is authorized to have a shop at this locality ; but to this, the Officers of the Yelundoo Jaghire object, as they have always done so before, on the grounds that it is within the limits of their Estate, and not in those of Coimbatore as asserted by the Renter.

6. So far back as in 1826, Mr. Sullivan, former Principal Collector, sent an order directing the Tahsildar of Colligal to permit the Abkarry Renter to sell Arrack on the disputed spot, inasmuch as it was not only specified in his license, but was also considered to be within Coimbatore.

7. This order was repeated by Mr. Drury on two different occasions in 1835, and in the same year, it also formed the subject matter of a complaint on the part of the Jaghiredar to the Commissioner, who, in a letter dated the 4th April 1835, requested the Superintendent of Astagram Division to prevent encroachments of the Colligal Renter on the Mysore limits. Copy of this communication was furnished to the Collector's Office by Captain Chalmers on the 7th idem, and in his reply* thereto Mr. Drury clearly pointed out that " the collection of Sayer in the " place noticed by the Jaghiredar of Yelundoor is prohibited ; duties being only leviable by the " Sayer Renter on articles passing the Mysore frontier. At the same time there can be no just " ground of objection to the levy of Abkarry taxes within limits of the village of Modahully " included in the Talook of Colligal adjacent to the Jahghire of Yelundoor." I need hardly remark here that the place where the Abkarry Renter has permission to establish a shop, appears to be the one referred to by Mr. Drury, as being in Colligal. Nothing having transpired subsequently, the matter was allowed to drop until 1857, when it was revived in its old shape.

* To Superintendent Astagram Division, 25th April 1835.

8. There can be no doubt that according to the terms of his license the Abkarry Renter is entitled to have a shop on the spot alluded to, but the main question to be disposed of is whether that spot is within the Coimbatore or the Yelundoor limits.

9. The Tahsildar of Yelundoor, who was with me on the hills, asserted that it was within the Jaghire, and in support of his assertion furnished me with copy of three papers, viz. :—

I. A Memorandum of supposed boundary marks.

II. A Sunnud issued by Sreemunt Purniah, late Minister of His Highness the Rajah of Mysore.

III. A Statement of Revenue said to have annually been derived from the hill produce.

10. The first is not a very clear one ; it appears to be a Memorandum drawn out several years after the grant of the Jaghire. If the boundaries therein set forth were correct, they might have been pointed out to the Surveyors who surveyed that part of the country.

11. The second is also wanting in clearness. It authorizes the grant of certain villages for the maintenance of the Rungaswamy Pagoda, but whether it includes the disputed portion or not is not explicit.

12. The third purports to show the revenue annually derived, but how far its correctness can, in the absence of other proof, be admitted, is a matter for consideration.

13. On the side of Coimbatore, the Survey Map and the Pymash account are the sole evidence. One of the old Surveyors (Mr. C. R. McMahon) who has retired from the public service, and is now at Coimbatore, informs me that when he surveyed this part of the country, the village Officers of Yelundoor and of Modahully in Colligal were both present and pointed out the boundaries, and that the line of demarcation drawn in the map was to the best of his knowledge correct, the Pymash account, with some slight difference also corresponds with this map.

14. Under these circumstances it appears to me that a further reference to the Superintendent of Astagram Divison is necessary. Should the correctness of the Survey Map be admitted as it has been done on like occasions formerly, the question is at once disposed of whether as respects the boundary or the claim of Abkarry Renter.

15. I beg leave to return the original papers connected with this subject.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12*th February* 1863.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From the Secretary to the Commissioner for the Government of the Territories of His Highness the Maha Rajah of Mysore, to P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, dated Bangalore, 29th October 1862, No. 1,177.

SIR,

1. In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 378 of the 21st instant, I have the honor, by desire of the Commissioner for the Government of the Territories of His Highness the Maha Rajah of Mysore, to forward herewith a tracing of Major Mackenzie's Map, from which it will be seen that the boundary marked in it, corresponds exactly with that given in the Atlas sheet, according to which the Mysore boundary extends fully two miles due east of the Bilical-rangam Pagoda. It is evident from this, that the spot marked in your sketch with an asterisk is in fact in Mysore. It would appear in consequence that this spot has been wrongly included in the Colligal Abkarry Contract. In fact unless a claim were made to the effect that the Bilical-rangam Pagoda is within the limits of Coimbatore, a claim which is clearly refuted by the tenor of the correspondence connected with the Sunnud granted to Dewan Poorniah, and which it seems needless to discuss, it is evident that an Abkarry shop which depends upon the custom of pilgrims to the Pagoda, could not be maintained by the Contractor.

2. I am therefore desired to state that unless the correctness of Major Mackenzie's Map is questioned, which the Commissioner concludes it would not be without sufficient grounds, there appear to him to be no doubt whatever that the spot referred to is really within the Yelundoor boundary.

3. The tracing, which accompanied your letter under reply, is herewith returned.

---

1. Ordered to be submitted for the decision of Government. The Board see no reason to object to the proposed recognition of the boundary at this point as laid down in Major Mackenzie's Survey Map.

2. They do not however admit that Major Mackenzie's Survey is an infallible or unquestionable authority in all questions relating to the Mysore boundary, as they have reason to know that the boundary claimed on behalf of Mysore at some points in the Western Ghauts, which they presume to be that defined by the survey in question, does not respect the reservation so strongly insisted on by Lord Wellesley of all heads of passes leading from the Mysore table land to the British territory, as belonging to the British, and they think it is not unlikely that the same may be the case in other localities.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed.) W. HUDLESTON, *Secretary.*

No. 192. ORDER THEREON, 12th February 1863, No. 318.

1. Under the circumstances stated by the Collector of Coimbatore the Government consent to the boundary between Mysore and that District near the Biliculrungum Pagoda being decided according to the Trigonometrical Atlas sheet.

2. The Government concur in the remarks made by the Board of Revenue in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings regarding Major Mackenzie's Survey.

(Signed.) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

service, and is now at Coimbatore, informs me that when he surveyed this part of the country, the village officers of Yelundoor and of Modahully in Colligal were both present and pointed out the boundaries, and that the line of demarcation drawn in the map was to the best of his knowledge correct, the Pymash account, with some slight difference also corresponds with this map.

14. Under these circumstances it appears to me that a further reference to the Superintendent of Astagram Division is necessary. Should the correctness of the Survey map be admitted as it has been done on like occasions formerly, the question is at once disposed of whether as respects the boundary or the claim of Abkarry Renter.

15. I beg leave to return the original papers connected with this subject.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From the Secretary to the Commissioner for the Government of the Territories of His Highness the Maha Rajah of Mysore, to P. GRANT, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, dated Bangalore, 29th October 1862, No. 1,177.

1. In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 378 of the 21st instant, I have the honor, by desire of the Commissioner for the Government of the Territories of His Highness the Maha Rajah of Mysore, to forward herewith a tracing of Major Mackenzie's Map, from which it will be seen that the boundary marked in it, corresponds exactly with that given in the Atlas sheet, according to which the Mysore boundary extends fully two miles due east of the Billikul Rungum Pagoda. It is evident from this, that the spot marked in your sketch with an asterisk is in fact in Mysore. It would appear in consequence that this spot has been wrongly included in the Colligal Abkarry Contract. In fact unless a claim were made to the effect that the Billikul Rungum Pagoda is within the limits of Coimbatore, a claim which is clearly refuted by the tenor of the correspondence connected with the Sunnud granted to Dewan Poorniah, and which it seems needless to discuss, it is evident that an Abkarry shop which depends upon the custom of pilgrims to the Pagoda, could not be maintained by the contractor.

2. I am therefore desired to state that unless the correctness of Major Mackenzie's Map is questioned, which the Commissioner concludes it would not be without sufficient grounds, there appears to him to be no doubt whatever that the spot referred to is really within the Yellundoor boundary.

3. The tracing, which accompanied your letter under reply, is herewith returned.

---

1. Ordered to be submitted for the decision of Government. The Board see no reason to object to the proposed recognition of the boundary at this point as laid down in Major Mackenzie's Survey Map.

2. They do not however admit that Major Mackenzie's Survey is an infallible or unquestionable authority in all questions relating to the Mysore boundary, as they have reason to know that the boundary claimed on behalf of Mysore at some points in the Western Ghauts, which they presume to be that defined by the survey in question, does not respect the reservation so strongly insisted on by Lord Wellesley of all heads of passes leading from the Mysore able land to the British territory, as belonging to the British, and they think it is not unlikely that the same may be the case in other localities.

(True Copies and extract.)

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.,
with 2 enclosures (tracings).

Copy to P. Grant, Esq, Collector of Coimbatore, with 2 enclosures.

Exd. J. Wright.

26-6-92

21-8-95

7-2-95

Pro Bd of R. 17 Jan 1863
No 224

1863. Department.

Pro: of Govt. for Feby.

No. 172

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 15*th January* 1863.

Despd 19-do-

Rec'd 20th

2 Sheets.

No. 224.

Submitting for decision a letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, respecting a boundary dispute between Mysore and Coimbatore with the Board's remarks on the subject.

No 318 12th Feby

With an order

Pro Bd of Revenue 12th Feby 1863

No. 318.

Under the circumstances stated by the Collector of Coimbatore the Govt consent to the boundary between Mysore and that District near the Bilicul rungum Pagoda being decided according to the Trigonometrical Atlas sheet.

2. The Govt concur in the remarks made by the Bd of Rev in para 2 of their Pros: regarding Major Mackenzie's survey.

Fort St George
12th Feby 1863

Bd of Revenue