M.R.O. 14—13,000—27-9-24

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2036 Press ~~Mis.~~

6364

Dated 4—11— 1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 4th November 1864.

No. 63. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th October 1864, No. 6,913.

Read again letter from the Collector of Malabar, dated 8th December 1863, No. 263, in Board's Proceedings 17th December 1863, No. 7,991.

Read also the following letter from G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Maliapuram, 20th July 1864, No. 173A :—

1. With reference to the correspondence noted, I have the honor to report the result of an inquiry held by the Deputy Collector of Wynaad into the claims brought forward by the Kurumbranad Rajah.

To Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1863, No. 263.
From do. of do. dated 17th do.

2. The claims refer to a tract of country called "Paraka Mete," comprizing the whole of the Gunnapathiwattum, Chevangode, and Munad Amshoms, and also to certain lands in the Mupeinad and Nambolakodi Amshoms in Wynaad.

3. The forest land in the three first mentioned Amshoms was declared Government property about five years ago, and sundry lots of such land lying in these Amshoms were, on applications, received, advertised* for sale as Government land under the Rules received with the Board's Proceedings, dated 15th May 1863, No. 2,893.

Under Government Order, dated 12th July 1859, No. 925.

* 24th August 1863, 9th December 1863,
1st December ,, 7th January 1864,

But the sale was postponed in consequence of the Rajah unexpectedly preferring the claims now discussed. I deemed it best to have a full and careful investigation made in the matter, even at the risk of increased delay to the present applicants, so that I might be in a position to pass a mature decision, and avoid similar delay in future cases.

4. The Deputy Collector lately submitted a very full report, and I, arriving at the same opinion as he had done, which again supported the conclusion that had been come to by Government five years ago, rejected the claims advanced by the Rajah, and sent him a copy of my order† in the case.

Dated 16th May 1864, No. 261, copy enclosed, Appendix A.

† Dated 23rd June 1864, copy enclosed.

He has since given me notice, within the prescribed time, of his intention to contest the order. He must therefore be left to establish his title if he can in the manner provided by Act XXIII of 1863.

5. The Rajah asserts his claims in connection with a temple denominated "Koliadi Devassom," and bases them on the alleged conquest by his ancestors of the tract above-mentioned from its former rulers ; but the claims are very vague both as to origin, nature, and extent of territory.

6. No evidence has been adduced to prove the allegation of conquest; but it is not disputed on the part of Government that a branch of the Kotiote family was established in that part of the country before the invasion of Tippo Sultan. All that has been adduced in the shape of documentary evidence of the exercise of seigniorial rights consists of three copper deeds said to be written in Kol tamil, together with their alleged translations in Malayalam.

7. The first of these deeds, as shown by the translations, is a document executed by a supposed ancestor‡ of the Rajah to one "Nagava Kartava" some three centuries§ ago, mortgaging the hills, paddy lands, and hill slopes within certain boundaries vaguely described.

‡ Aranad Vana Tekunkur Ramangalat Kowilagom Muta Tamburan, or senior Rajah.

§ M. E. 720 (1543-44.)

In what Amshom the property lies it is impossible to gather from the whole deed.

M. E. 800 (1623-24.)

Second is a writing which purports to have been executed by another supposed ancestor of the Rajah, declaring that the writer had conferred on some parties not named certain ranks and

All, or most part, of these tracts are apparently included in the Kurumbranad Rajah's claims above disposed of.

The Gownden's claim was also referred to the Deputy Collector, and has been carefully investigated by that Officer.

Sidhi Gownden, as will be seen by the accompanying report,* has utterly failed to establish his claim. I have therefore rejected it, and have forwarded to him a copy of my order† on his case. Having every reason to believe that he will contest the order, I deem it proper to lay the matter before the Board.

* From Deputy Collector of Wynaad, dated 24th June 1864, No. 236 Appendix C.

† Dated 6th July 1864. Transcript enclosed.

19. This man founds his claim principally on two copper writings said to have been granted by Tekenkur Ramangalat Rajah (i. e., Kurummenad Rajah) to his ancestor (name not given) some 300 years ago, transferring three Kovilagoms, or palaces, denominated "Yeddakel, Padri Chana Vail, and Kayamban" with hills, houses, lands, Devassoms, &c., appertaining thereto, as well as another Kovilagom called "Pudusheri" with lands, &c.

In M. E. 730 (1553-54).

As in the Kurumbranad Rajah's case, the writings are stated to be in Kol Tamil.

The originals, with their alleged translations in Malayalam, have been produced.

Considerable doubt exists as to the genuineness of these writings.

They were never produced before, although there were ample opportunities‡ for their production.

‡ During Revenue and Revenue Settlement enquiries.

The first of them, as is evident by their translations, does not specify the name of the grantee. The second purports to have been granted to one "Yaddakel Madeswava Oddiar."

Even supposing the writings to be genuine, it is a question whether the grantee was actually the ancestor of Gownden. No evidence has been adduced to prove this important point.

Moreover, the writings contain only a nominal specification of rice-lands, but not of hills transferred.

The claims now discussed refer to hills alone.

The writings therefore are of no avail as evidence in his case.

20. To show the sort of matter these men attempt to claim upon, I must mention that Sidhi Gownden has further produced three documents. Two of them are Deeds§ executed by the party noted,‖ mortgaging to Sidhi Gownden Coffee trees planted on a portion of hill called "Mankombu Kunu," stated in one of the Deeds to be his (Sidhi Gownden's) "Jenm" property, and to have been assigned by him on simple lease to the individual who executed the Deeds.

§ Dated 22nd Kavkardagom 1038, 5th August 1863.

‖ Somalli Kavi Vassuvaya Gownden

The other document produced is copy of a Deed¶ executed by Sidhi Gownden to a Mr. Anthony Lopez of Wynaad, mortgaging to him the property specified in the two writings mentioned in paragraph 19.

¶ Dated 24th Kavkardagom 1038, 7th August 1863.

21. Sidhi Gownden has produced no oral evidence to substantiate his claims; while the statements of several of the persons examined on behalf of Government in the Kurumbranad Rajah's case tend to prove that he (Sidhi Gownden) has never exercised nor possesses any right over the hills he claims in the Gunnapathiwattum and Mupeinad Amshoms, and that he merely holds some paddy lands in Gunnapathiwattum on account of the "Yeddakal Devassom" temple.

6th witness Agantha Putter.
7th do. Eriah Gownden.
11th do. Sheshan Putter.
12th do. Viapury Pillay.
See Abstract of Evidence (Appendix B.)

22. Sidhi Gownden, it will be observed, at first claimed all the hills applied for by Mr. J. Gordon, under the waste land rules; while only *one* of them appears among the hills subsequently named by him in his deposition. At the same time another individual, Eriah Gownden,* one of the persons examined as above stated,† claims the same hills (those applied for by Mr. Gordon) in connection with another temple, "Chengueri Devassom," and asserts that Sidhi Gownden has no right at all to them.

* Vide Deputy Collector's Report, Appendix C, paragraph 5.

* 7th witness, see Abstract of Evidence.

† Paragraph 21.

23. It would appear from the statements of some‡ of the parties examined that Sidhi Gownden had claims on some of the hills in the Yeddakal Deshsom,§ and possesses lands and hills in Chinguer¡ ‖ Tarra"; but these statements are very vague and imperfect. They appear to me quite insufficient to substantiate the claims advanced.

‡ 8th witness Shantharajee Taragan.
9th do. Chuliat Rama Menoky.
10th do. Kaviampathy Kanna Paniker.

§ In Gunnapathiwattum.

‖ In Mupeinad Amshom.

24. Before concluding this report, I must particularly notice that both the Rajah and Sidhi Gownden have failed entirely to account for their omission to bring forward and establish their claims during the several inquiries that were held by the Revenue authorities, on the spot, in regard to Government escheats.

The excuses attempted are puerile.

Sidhi Gownden states that he was under the impression that his lands would be exempted, as he had deposited his copper writings on which he founds his claims as security to Government for the former Abkarry Contractor of Wynaad. The fact is, these writings were tendered as security but were rejected as valueless.

He pretends to have known nothing of Mr. Robinson's inquiry in 1857 into the claims of private parties to Government lands in Wynaad.

Before Mr. Stuart, he was not called on, he says, to establish his claim.

The Kurumbranad Rajah, through his Vakil, also asserts ignorance of the inquiries.

Both Mr. Robinson's and Mr. Stuart's inquiries were as public as they well could be; all claimants were duly called on by Mr. Stuart to prove their claims.

Ignorance that such inquiries were being held therefore seems proof positive that the present claimants had no connection with the subjects of inquiry.

Failure to attend indicates, clearly, conscious weakness of claims.

25. Awaiting the Board's instructions.

P.S.—The individuals noted in the margin have also claimed certain forests and hills in the Munad and Gunnapathiwattum Amshoms in Wynaad. The claims have been referred for inquiry to the Deputy Collector. The result will be duly reported.

1. Kotiote Teke Kowilagom Veer Verma Rajah.
2. Nudnvat Karuman Nambudripad of Ernad.
3. Koliwailil Eatail Urni Chena Paniker of Wynaad.

(Signed) G. A. BALLARD,
Collector.

Appendix A.

From H. RICHARDSON, Esq., Deputy Collector of Wynaad; to G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector of Malabar, dated Manantoddy, 16th May 1864, No. 201.

Dated 22nd December 1863, No. 4,395.
Dated 11th April 1864, No. 1,198 A.

1. With reference to your letters, noted marginally, I have the honor to submit my Report on the claims set forth by the Kurumbranad Rajah to the tract of land called "Paraka Methel," together with a Statement and 19 Depositions connected therewith.

2. The papers and correspondence received with the letters above alluded to are, together with their respective Lists, re-transmitted in two separate packets.

3. With regard to Sidhi Gownden's claim, I beg to state that I am just proceeding to Sultan's Battery to institute further local inquiries, and the Report will be submitted as soon as possible.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) H. F. HEWETSON,
Deputy, for Collector.

Manantoddy, 16th May 1864.

Copy.

Yedathil Kunhuny Nair.

The Vakil of the Kurumbranad Rajah presented an Urzi on the 12th October 1863, dated 27th Kani 1039, claiming certain lands called "Paraka Methel" (which includes the whole of the Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangode, and Munad Amshoms) as his Jenm property, connected with the Koliady Chedatil Amah Devassom, and was ordered to produce any documentary evidence in support of his claim as soon as possible.

Did not appear again till the 4th December, and pleaded in excuse, for the delay in appearing, to having had to go to the Tellicherry Court, and also to search the Rajah's palace for the records in his case.

2. Stated also that the Rajah's ancestors acquired the country by conquest from Irapen and Vaden, the then rulers. Had no documents to prove his claim; but offered to do so by oral evidence.

3. Claimed lands in the Gunnapathiwattum, Mupienad, Cherangode and Numblacode Amshoms.

Although he had time from the 12th October 1863 to 4th December to obtain the necessary information.

Did not remember the names of the lands, boundaries, or extent; but promised to do so in four days, viz., 8th December.

4. Stated that the Rajah gave twelve miles of land to the Chedathil Amah, *alias* Koliady Devassom; but could not then tell the boundaries, but would do so in four days.

5. Did not appear again till the 20th January 1864, when he produced three copper deeds said to be written in Kole Tamil with their alleged translations in Malayalum.

Deed No. 5 dated Magram 720, about 1543-44.

Deed of Mortgage from the Ramunugalath Mutha Kamuran to Nagara Kartava for lands mentioning certain boundaries.

Deed No. 6, dated Yedavum 803, about 1626-27.

Patom Chit from Kuriden Beemo to the Rajah for certain paddy lands and slopes of the hills adjoining.

Deed No. 7, dated Medono 800 (1623-24.)
From Tekenkur Ramangalat Kovilagom Tamburan.

Deed of gift to the Koliady Devassom land in Koliady and Gunnapathiwattum, exclusive of those given to others in Paraka Methel.

Produced also a list* of 206 hills claimed in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, and stated that several others had been leased to parties; but could produce no documentary evidence, *as it was not customary in those days to take Marapatoms.*

* No. 4.
If such were the case how came he to obtain Deed No. 6?

6. Further stated that he had not leased any of the hills lately. That some of the lessees used to pay something for the expenses of the ceremonies in the Devassom, and others, direct to the Rajah through his Kariasten. Could not say how much, but they had not done so for the last three years.

Fancy a native landlord not knowing what his tenants paid him!!

7. The present claim was not brought forward *before*, as neither the Kariasten or tenants informed the Rajah of the circumstance; besides which the Rajah was engaged in a law suit about the succession to the Raj.

i. e., at the former Revenue and Revenue Settlement enquiries.

The suit was decided in 1856, appealed against and rázeed in 1034 (1859).

8. Did not know the names of the hills he claimed in the Munad, Cherangode, and Numblacode Amshoms. Had no documentary evidence; but cited four parties to prove the Rajah's claim.

Statement No. 8, 1st, Kurnalur Vyni Pathian Mupen, dated 21st January 1864.

Stated that he held 50 pothy Kandum of paddy land for the last forty years from Government, also four hills and some paddy lands from the Koliady Devassom, and paid 16 fanams annually for the hills.

Statement No. 9, 2nd, Mogavyle Permal Chetty, dated 21st January 1864.

Cultivated paddy lands, and paid patom to the Koliady Devassom. That the Ramangalath gave fifteen hills to his ancestors.

Stated also that the Ramangalath and Pychee Rajahs were relations, and all the lands on the other* side of the Sultan's Battery belonged to the Pychee Rajah.

* North and eastward.

That when Mr. Baber assumed charge of the country, the inhabitants, by the intercession of the Kurumbranad Rajah, were permitted to reside in the place.

Statement No. 10. 3rd, Valiah Valather Chungan Chetty, dated 21st January 1864.

Stated that he cultivated paddy lands and paid patom to the Koliady Devassom, and that one hill was given to his Karnaven by the Ramangalath Rajah.

Had heard that the Rajah and Koliady Devassom were the Jenm owners of the hills; and about ten years ago when Kulloor Gownden and Echacoonoo Kaloo Chetty caught Elephants they were delivered to the Rajah.

Statement No. 11, 4th, Koopady Kaloo Chetty, dated 21st January 1864.

Stated that he cultivated seven and half pathy cundum of paddy lands, and paid patom to the Gunnapathiwattum Devassom; also held two hills which he heard the Ramangalath Rajah gave to the Devassom. That all the Elephants caught were to be delivered to the Rajah.

That Annantha Putter caught one ten years ago, but did not know whom he delivered it to.

Statement No. 12, Ramen Nair, Kariasten to the Kurumbranad Rajah, dated 4th December 1863,

Had been Kariasten for the last six years, and his duty was to conduct the cultivation and collect the rents. Gave the names of some paddy lands and a few grass hills adjoining, and stated that until two years ago he received patom for dry cultivation on the Hills.

Had no list of the hills; but ascertained them from the villagers.

Received a list of the paddy lands from the Rajah.

9. The above is all the evidence the Kurumbranad Rajah was able to produce in support of his claim to a tract of country that would form a principality.

That he has not the shadow of a right, and that his present claim is an attempt at usurpation will I think, be clearly proved from the following reasons.

10. In the first place the Vakil, on presenting his Petition on the 12th October 1863, was ordered to produce his evidence as soon as posssible. Does not make his appearance again till the 4th December, and then promises to produce the necessary proof in four days. The four days however extend to the 20th January 1864, when he appears with three copper deeds (which no one can read) with their alleged translations, dated 720 (1545) 803 (1628) and 800 (1625) which he wishes to palm off as genuine, but which I have no doubt were fabricated to suit his own views; and for his oral evidence he brings forward four of the poorest Ryots, instead of the most respectable class of inhabitants.

11. The Rajah's Vakil, although claiming all the country called Paraka Methel, knows nothing of what the tenants paid, neither does he know the names of the hills claimed in the Munad, Cherangode and Numblacode Amshoms.

12. The Kariasten Ramen Nair, who ought to know (if anybody does) the names and extent, &c., of his Master's property, he being duly appointed to look after the cultivation and collect the rents, knows nothing. Never had a list of the hills given him; whereas a list of the paddy lands was furnished by the Rajah himself. If the Rajah thought he had a right to the hills and forests also how comes it that a list was not furnished to his agent?

13. The Rajah's Vakil also states that this claim was not preferred before, as the Rajah was engaged in a Law Suit, and was also not informed of the lands having been declared escheats. This is a very lame excuse, for he admits that the suit was rázeed in 1859, and the tenants paid no patom for the last three years.

The order of Government declaring the whole of the Gunnapathiwattum and Munad Amshoms to be escheated was dated July 1859, and Jenmabhogum was collected in 1860.

Does it stand to reason to suppose for a moment that a landlord would submit quietly to a reduction of receipts of rent from his tenants without instituting some inquiry as to the cause? The Kariasten also admits that the tenants refused to pay the rent for two years before, saying the lands had been escheated.

14. Mr. Robinson in his report dated 22nd August 1857 states—

Paragraph 7. That in 1783-84 Tippoo Sultan took possession of the Province by exacting sorely against the will of the Kotiote Rajah a written deed of relinquishment of his country above the Ghats called the Wynaad District, and it was registered as a dependency of Seringapatam under the name of "Chakanatoor" from September 1787; but Tippoo's power was never really consolidated therein; and the Kotiote Rajah and other Proprietors who joined in the British war in 1791-92 availed themselves of the occasion to annex Wynaad to Kotiam, which was ceded at the peace of 1792. The Rajah was found in quiet possession in 1793. Tippoo's Vakeels complained to the Commissioners who decided that although the annexation was forcible, yet as the District had not been included in the Schedule of cession it could not be considered as belonging to the British Government, and disapproved in strong terms of the Rajah's having proceeded to such daring extremities as to repel Tippoo by force of arms, and in 1793 intimated to the Rajahs of Kotiote and Kurumbranad (who being relatives were both equally interested) that the British will neither support nor countenance them in violating, in respect of the District, the sovereignty of Tippoo Sultan.

Paragraph 9. 15. In the year 1795 the Pychee Rajah, a subject of the Company and a junior branch of the Kotiote family, commenced open rebellion against Tippoo, sympathized in by the Kotiote and Kurumbranad families and all the Malabar Jenmies holding possessions in Wynaad.

This rebellion continued till the second war commenced. Wynaad fell in 1799 to the share of the Company under the treaty of Seringapatam.

Paragraph 10. The Malabar proprietors (Jenmies) re-occupied their ancient properties on the tenures ordinarily prevailing in Malabar. The right however of the Princes to Mali Kanum (one-fifth of the revenue) was not admitted; the sovereignty of the country of course vested with the Company.

Paragraph 11. 16. The rebellious spirit of the Pychee Rajah and other inhabitants broke out and was not suppressed till 1806, when the Pychee Rajah and his followers were destroyed and peace restored.

The properties of the actual rebels were declared escheats, and to a certain extent taken possession of by Mr. Baber. The hills and waste lands were not formally escheated, all the documents of the rebel proprietors having been suppressed or destroyed.

17. Mr. Robinson again in his report, dated 4th June 1858, No. 90, states thus:—

Paragraph 25. *Mupinad Amshom.*—In this Amshom the Pychee Rajah had considerable amount of property, and a number of dependants. The neighbourhood was largely implicated in the rebellion.

The hills and forests of the Mootatel Devassom were not confiscated.

Paragraph 27. *Cherangode Amshom.*—This Amshom was largely implicated in the Pychee rebellion. The ancient Jenmies were the Pychee Rajah and the Cherambady Nair. The palace of the former at Cherbalur and a large quantity of cultivated land were confiscated; but only one range of hills was included.

The Cherangode Nair was an usurper.

A tradition exists that the Pychee Rajah was sole Jenmi, and that with one exception the Cherangode Nair, the *soi disant* Jenmies of the present day, were one and all dependants of the Pychee Rajah.

Paragraph 31. *Munad.*—The principal ancient Jenmi was Paka Suruven, an ancient escheat taken possession of by the Kotiote (Pychee) Rajah prior to the cession of Wynaad (1799.)

The hills and forests to the Mysore boundary are believed to have thus become escheated to Government.

Paragraph 32. *Gunnapathiwattum.*—Very extensive forests were always considered to belong to the Pychee Rajah whose rights have descended to Government.

18. Reports that Neminee Achudu Warriar caught an elephant on Puinah Mallah in the Munad Amshom and Nellacotah Dessom the property of Government, and forwards several Statements.

No. 4, Urzee of the Wynaad Tahsildar, dated 29th September 1831.

States that Puinah Mallah is in the Nellakottah Dessom, the whole of which belonged to Paka Suruven, whose family becoming extinct the Kotiote Rajah took possession of all his property. After the Kotiote Rajah had been killed all the lands and property were escheated to Government.

Thalumbatta Vella Mupen, aged fifty-five years, one of the four hereditary Conservators of Forests under Paka Suruven, dated 16th September 1831.

Achuda Warriar, who dug the elephant pit on Puinah Mallah, was Kariesten to the Kotiote Rajah.

Whenever any game was killed the proprietor's share (Oop) as well as all Tigers' tails were given to Paka Suruven.

Paka Suruven possessed ten forts and eighteen Edapad (temporary dwellings) four of which, viz., Nellakotah, Ponjin (Ponguly) Kotah, Tirumanglatta Kotah and Mootil Kotah, as well as Varajoor Eddum, were held by himself; and deponent heard that the others were given to other parties.

The Kekanhetta Kopan Mupen, aged 70, dated 16th September 1831, and Kurnalur Chingan Pathyan Mupen, aged 70, dated 15th September 1831. These were both Conservators under Paka Suruven, and repeat the above statement.

States that the Nellakotah Dessom was the jenm property of Paka Suruven, at whose death the Kotiote (Pychee) Rajah took possession, and when he was caught by Government all his property was escheated.

Nelialum Rajah, dated 16th September 1831.

Remonstrated with Achuda Warriar about taking possession of the elephant from Puinah Mallah.

Thinks it was in 984 (1808-9,) that the Nellakotah Kurmum (paddy lands) alone were given over by Mr. Baber for the up-keep of the ceremonies of the Nellakotah Devassom, and any balance remaining was to be made over to Government.

Had heard that the Nellakotah Ponjin (Ponguly) Kotah, Tirumuglath Kotah, and Mutil Kotah, as well as Vanagur Eddom were not given by Paka Suruven to any one, but that others were.

Kumilady Chetty Ramoo, aged 48, dated 16th September 1831, and Patavyle Chapoo, aged 45, dated 16th September 1831. } Repeat the statement of Pathy and Thalambatta Vella Mupen.

Panamkuty Chandu, aged 50, dated 14th September 1831, Koonivyle Villey, Malaingal Permal Majoor Thavoo, and Paroor Devassom. } Repeat the above statement.

Neminee Achuden Warriar, aged 38, dated 21st September 1831. States that the Mukias ten Koonivyle Villey and other villagers gave him permission to dig the elephant pit.

Order from Mr Hudleston, Collector of Malabar, to the Tahsildar, dated 10th December 1831.

Ordering the 30 Rupees received for Jenmabhogum, on account of the elephant caught by Neminee Achuda Warriar in Puinah Mallah, to be credited to Government.

No. 7, Proceedings in 1831-32.

19. It appears that the Paduyan and Theka Kovilagom Kotiote Rajahs leased some Teak forests in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom on Kuti Kanum to Ravaporathan Ramaswamy and Komuty Davayen of Wynaad.

That some Mysore people felled and carried away timber from the said forests.

The case was reported to the Collector, who ordered an investigation, and the Tahsildar reported that the Rajahs had no right to lease the forests, as they originally belonged to the family of Paka Suruven, which became extinct and the property was escheated by the Pychee Rajah whose possessions were afterwards confiscated.

The amount received by the Rajahs on account of the lease was recovered, but afterwards returned. Still no further leases were allowed to be entered into by them, as they were shown to have no right at all to do so.

The names of the hills are as follows :—

By deposition of Nellivyle Raroo Paniker, dated 31st October 1830.

* No. 205 in the Kurambranad Rajah's List
† No. 121 in the List.

1. Nalur.		
2. Karur.		
* 3. Pongui Kotah.	At Pongoli Kotah.	
4. Rampully.		
† 5. Alatur.	At Yeddatarah Kotah.	
6. Mungala.		
7. Oolakal.		
8. Mudapalli.	At Echa Coonoo.	
9. Kaluratti.		

Deposition of Tiruvanur Pathian Korman Mupen, aged 75, dated 26th December 1849.

Was seven years old when the Pathans came into Wynaad, and all the people ran into the jungles.

The Tamuran (meaning the Pychee Rajah) conquered the Pathans, took possession and ruled the country, viz., Yeddakul, Gunnapathiwattum, Echa-Coonoo, Thirunur, Pongai Shorumangalath Kotah, Cherankotah, and the Devassoms. He had a Kariasten called Paroli Yemman Karia Kraren, who lived at Kaliady Koilah Paramba Amavil Koilah, and also at a place called Thekkat where he held property.

During the rebellion of the Pychee Rajah all the inhabitants ran into the jungles. The English then took Wynaad, arrested Yemman Kariakaren and Pothian Shalampatoo Chanthoo, and took them to Manantoddy.

Chanthoo was afterwards released. Several parties then took possession of the escheated property, and fabricated documents to show that they belonged to them.

Further states that the Pychee Rajah lived at Cherankotah, Ponjui Kotah and Tirumangalath Kotah, and leased lands to parties, but never gave the jenm, or on konum, to any one, as it was not the custom to do so. Paraka Methet belongs to some Devassoms and the Pychee Rajah, but the largest portion to the Rajah. The Ramangalath Rajah had only a few paddy fields.

Desposition of Thekkamakum Davasa Gowden, aged 82, dated 25th December 1849.

Had heard that the first time Tippoo came into Wynaad he entered into a treaty with the Kotiote Rajah to give up Wynaad to him. After which he went away. Deponent was then fifteen years old.

The country was first conquered from Aripen and Vadan by the Kotiote Rajah.

Two years after the treaty, a war broke out, and several of the inhabitants having been taken by Tippoo to Seringapatam their properties were taken possession of by other parties.

The Kotiote (Pychee) Rajah repulsed Tippoo and ruled the country, and after that it came into the hands of the English Government.

During the Rajah's reign no Jenm rights were given to any one; but the lands may have been rented. He (deponent) also rented some property. Those parties who claim the lands have no right to them. They all belonged to the Devassom and Rajah.

Pemthi Reddy Kristna Warriar and Machelettah Peramby were the only two persons who held putolahs (lists of property). No one else held them.

The Rajah who signed the Treaty to Tippoo and other Rajahs went away to Travancore.

The Maliathayatha (Pychee) Rajah alone remained, and the great war was between him and Tippoo.

No. 6, Yadast from the Sub-Collector, dated 4th May 1850.

20. Submitting tenders to the Collector from parties for cutting teak trees on ten escheated hills in Wynaad, viz.,

Kuthrakoti Mullah.	Ellornad Amshom.
Musala do.	
Pulpulli do.	Kupathode do.
* Vadangode.	
Chalatoyah.	In the Gunapathiwattum Amshom.
Koorchayat.	
Echa-Coonoo.	
† Pongui.	

* Nos. 11 and 32 in the Kurumbranad Rajah's list.

† No. 205 in the List.

Four of these hills were claimed, viz., one in Kupathode by the Palpally Devassom, one in Ellornad by the Tyrenhelli Devassom, and two in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, two by Veeravermah and Kotiote Moothee Rajahs on account of the Chedathil (Koliady) and Melur Thalachil Devassoms.

Mr. Chatfield rejected all these claims except the Palpulli Devassom, as he considered all these and other forests belong to the Pychee Rajah whose rights have descended to the British Government.

No. 3, Urzee from the Wynaad Tahsildar, dated 22nd May 1854.

21. Reports that Jenmabhogum had been collected for an elephant that was caught by Mayuvan Kaloo on Theka Mulah in the Cherangode Amshom, and forwards Statement given before him by certain parties.

Statement of Mayavan Kaloo, Conservator of Forests under the Kotiote Rajah, dated 16th November 1852.

The elephant was caught on Theka Mullah which he (deponent) heard belongs to the Cherangode Thamuran. Had charge of the forest, and an elephant pit dug. Does not know how the property came to the Cherangode family. Holds no written order for the Conservatorship.

Kullagan Mullah, which is Government property, is about eight miles from Theka Mullah. Pays no taxes to the Jenmi.

Second Statement, dated 29th April 1854.

Having heard from the Cherangode Thamuran that the land up to the water-shed of Theka Mullah was escheated, the land on which the elephant was caught belongs to Government.

The eastern water-shed of Theka Mullah belongs to the Cherangode family. With this exception all the rest of the land belongs to Government.

Kumbara Mullah also belongs to Government.

Kullagum Mullah is not one hill alone, but a range of hills in which are included

Koochary Moody.
Thumbaran Mullah.
Theka do.
Chengathura.
Mulain Moody.
Putchaypuddy.
Vengporah.

There are also several hills connected with Kullagom Mullah. Was not certain when he gave his first statement, as he had only heard from other parties; but having since seen the boundaries can vouch for the correctness of his present statement.

Letter from Mr. Robinson, dated 11th September 1857, No. 4,378, to the Superintendent Astragram Division.

Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, by Oorally Kurman Ketan.

Letter from Captain Pearse, Officiating Superintendent Astragam Division, to the Collector of Malabar, dated 24th December 1857.

Mr. Robinson's reply to the above, dated 31st December 1857, No. 5,519.

Proceedings of Government, dated 22nd June 1859, No. 822.

Proceedings of Government, dated 12th July 1859, No. 925.

Jenmabhogum has been collected in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom since 1860.

Mr. Stuart's Yadast to the Magistrate of Malabar, dated 14th August 1860, No 44.

* No. 122 in the Rajah's List.

as they did so from ignorance, recommending they should be made to pay Kuti-Kanum.

In Case No. 266 of 1861.

This was sanctioned and carried out; Vellay Chetty and three others were fined for felling Government jungle near Nellacottah.

Case No. 267 of 1861.
† No. 209 in the Rajah's List.

Koruman Baden and fifteen others were fined for felling beyond Yeddathapoyah.†

Case No. 37 of 1862.

Kurpoo Ramen Chetty was fined for felling jungle on Kallooketoo Koonvo, adjoining Karripur Mullah.

Case No. 38 of 1862.
‡ No. 150, in the Rajah's List called Thowary.

Kurman Cooppen and five others were fined for felling jungle on land adjoining Thowaren‡ Munglalum Mullah.

Statement of Ananthen Putter, former Adighary of Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, and present Manager of the Devassom, dated 27th January 1864.

26. States that the Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangode and Munad Amshoms belonged originally to the Kurumbranad Rajah, but were conquered by the Kotiote Rajah. By a mutual arrangement however some lands were given over to the Kurumbranad Rajah; but does not know which.

All the lands belonging to the Kotiote Rajah, except the Devassom lands, were escheated when he was killed.

Mentions the names of some paddy lands, and states that there were about 100 lands, hills and forests, belonging to the Ramangalath Rajah also escheated. Was Adighary of the Amshom for sixteen years. With the exception of the Devassom and Bramasum lands, all the rest were escheated.

Caught several elephants himself before the lands were escheated, but since then paid Jenmabhogum to Government for one caught on Echa Coonoo.

No. 15, Statement of Shantharajee Tanesa, dated 27th January 1864.

27. His ancestors have lived in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, and had charge of the Mariamah and Busthy Devassom.

Knows that for the last three or four years all the hills in the Gunnapathiwattum, Munad and Cherangode Amshoms were declared escheats, before which they were claimed by private individuals and Devassoms.

Never knew or heard from his ancestors that the Kurumbranad Rajah claimed any of the hills.

Three or four years ago, Mr. Stuart was at Sultan's Battery, and issued a notice that parties should appear and prove their claims to lands, but nobody did so.

No. 16, Statement of Chuliote Ramen Menoky, dated 27th January 1864.

28. Had lived in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for the last twenty-five years, and his ancestors have lived there for the last three or four hundred years.

The Kurumbranad Rajah owns the Koliady Devassom with the paddy lands and hills connected with them, but does not exercise any right over any other lands or hills.

Heard about eighteen months ago that the Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangode and Munad Amshoms were escheats. Pays nothing himself to the Rajah for the lands in his possession.

No. 17, Statement of Kariampathy Kana Punikar, Adighary of the Mupinad Amshom, dated 25th January 1864.

29. Has been Adighary for the last six years. His ancestors and himself always lived in the Mupinad Amshom where they have Tarvad property.

The Kurumbranad Rajah has no property in the Amshom at present, as all his lands were escheated.

Does not know when, but heard it from his Karnaven.

Never knew or heard that the Kurumbranad Rajah exercised any right over any hills or lands in the Amshom, as they have always been entered in the accounts as escheats.

No. 18, Statement of Shaushen Putter, dated 27th January 1864.

30. States that his father and himself came from Palghat, and have been Menans of the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for the last twenty-nine years. This, as well as the Cherangode and Munad Amshoms, belonged to the Kotiote Rajah; all the teak forests were escheated in 1026 (1850-51), and the others, three years ago. Very many years ago all the Kullums (Royal residences) were escheated. This was in 984 (1808-9), and the Pymash was prepared from the Rajah's own accounts; one piece of land called Poothadynilom, which was in the possession of Ramangalath Kurumbranad Rajah, was also escheated, as it was proved to be the property of the Kotiote Rajah. There were some lands also escheated.

Never knew that the Kurumbranad Rajah had any lands in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom except those belonging to the Koliady Devassom.

Was Menom at the time when the order was read, and duly proclaimed that the Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangode, and Munad Amshoms were declared escheats, and no one disputed it.

Mr. Stuart held Kacheri at Sultan's Battery three years ago, and called on the inhabitants to prove their title to the land they held, but no one came forward.

The Rajah's Kariasten was there at the time, and took no notice of it.

No. 19, Statement of Viapury Pillay, Mukiasten of Sultan's Battery, dated 27th January 1864.

31. Has lived in the Amshom for thirty years, and has been Mukiasten for twenty years. Had always known that all the hills and forests in the Amshom belonged to the Kotiote Rajah, and were escheated three or four years ago. Before that, however, several, portions were escheated.

Echa-Coonoo was escheated when Anantha Putter was Adighary.

The Kurumbranad Rajah has authority only over the Koliady Devassom Paddy lands, but never exercised any right regarding the hills.

When Mr. Chatfield instituted inquiries some years ago, the Kurnum Beeman Rajah did not come forward to prove his claim. Sidhi Gownden did but could not produce any proof.

When Mr. Stuart held Kacheri at Sultan's Battery, some people came forward but could not prove their claims.

The inhabitants were all made acquainted with the order that Gunnapthiwattum, Cherangode and Munad Amshoms were escheats.

32. It will be seen by the above quoted documentary evidence that Government has been publicly exercising all the rights of possession (undisputed till now) in the hills and forests of the three Amshoms claimed by the Kurumbranad Rajah, denominated Paraka Methil.

33. From the Proceedings in 1831-32 (no less than thirty-two years ago) it is clearly proved that when the Puduyara and Tekekovilagom Kotiote Rajahs leased some teak forest they were made to pay over to Government the sums they had received from the lessees, and although these sums were afterwards re-paid to them no subsequent leases were allowed, and the Rajahs never attempted to do so again.

34. And again in 1850 leases were granted by the Sub-Collector for felling teak trees in the forests in the three Amshoms, when claims were set up to those in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom by Veeranernamah and Kotiote Moothoo Rajah on the part of the Chedathil Koliady and Melur Talachil Devassoms, but were rejected and the claims never after revived.

Of the hills then leased the Kurumbranad Rajah now claims two, viz., Vadankote (Nos. 11 and 32) and Pongni No. 205.

35. In 1854, Jenmabhogum was collected for an elephant caught on Echa-Coonoo.

36. In 1857, Mr. Robinson demanded from the Superintendent of the Astragam Division an elephant that was caught on Echa-Coonoo and taken to Mysore.

In the same year the Acting Superintendent of the Astragam Division claimed teak forests that were leased by the Proprietors of Devashinarum Pagoda to the Rajah of Mysore.

Mr. Robinson ignored the right of the parties who sold, and stated that all the teak forests in the Gunnapathiwattum and Munad Amshoms were the property of Government.

37. In 1859 the Government requested the Collector to call on all claimants of land to produce their Deed before the Survey Officers for examination, and subsequently in the same year declared Munad* and Gunnaputhiwattum Amshoms escheats.

* Mellacottahturrah and Cherangole Ool Desum are in the Munad Amshom.

Jenmabhogom has been collected in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom since 1860 unchallenged.

38. In 1860, Koorchyat Coopen and another were made to pay Kutikanom for felling teak trees in Koorchyat and Mamoot† Moody.

† No. 122, in the list of hills claimed.

In 1861-62, several parties were fined for felling jungle in the hills in the Gunnapathiwattum and Munad Amshoms.

39. That some of the temples were endowed for the up-keep of the ceremonies and feeding of travellers there is no doubt; and Government, from political motives, have not interfered with or questioned their right, although I am certain if the question was raised, and an investigation took place that one-half of them will be ousted; but as for the forests it is indisputable that they were royalties of which no doubt the Pychee Rajah was (as all Native Princes are) exceedingly jealous, as they were reserved for hunting.

40. If coffee cultivation had not been introduced into Wynad, I have no doubt that the present claim would never have been brought forward; but seeing that the land is required by European Planters, parties attempt to prove their claims by means of fabricated documents.

41. Having given the matter my best consideration, I am firmly of opinion that the Kurumbranad Rajah has not the slightest proof in support of his claims.

(Signed) H. RICHARDSON,
Deputy Collector.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. F. HEWETSON,
Deputy, for Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Read Petitions from the Kurumbranad Rajah, dated 12th and 30th October 1863.

1. After a full and patient inquiry into the claim of the Rajah of Kurumbranad to the Amshoms of Gunnapathiwattum, Munad, Mupeinad, Nambulacode and Cherangode, in the Wynad Talook, and especially with reference to the lands noted, proposed to be sold on

1. Kudukalur Kunu (Hill.)
2. Naiketu do.
3. Adachiladi do.
4. Kaimbikara do.
5. Poracheri Chal.
6. Kalagan Chola.
7. Morapi Mala.
8. Elambilacheri Kunu.
9. Kudaravetat Kunu, and ninety other hills, &c.

account of Government, I have determined to reject the claim as (firstly) no claims were advanced when claimants were called on and formal inquiries made on previous occasions, and especially in the Revenue Settlement inquiries in 1860, 1861 and 1862; and (secondly) because no evidence is adduced now.

2. Unless the steps required by Law are taken in due course, this order will be final, and the advertized sales will proceed forthwith.

3. Copy of this order is sent this day to the Rajah of Kurambranad.

CALICUT,
23*rd June* 1864.

(Signed) G. A. BALLARD,
Collector.

From G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to the Rajah of Kurumbranad.

I enclose copy of an order passed by me this day.

If within one week from receipt you do not intimate to me that you intend to contest this order as prescribed by Law it will, under Section 5, Act XXIII of 1863, be final.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. F. HEWETSON,
Deputy, for Collector.

Appendix B.

Abstract of Evidence in Kurumbranad Rajah's case.

Evidence in favor of the Rajah.

Three Copper Deeds, 1st, Panayam Deed, dated Magarom 720 (1543-44.)

* West Vanpatur.
East Kaipanjeri.
North Gunnapathiwattum Kunre.
South Vatiambam Madi.

Granted by Aranad Vana Tekunkur Ramangalat Kowilagum, reigning Muta Tamburan or senior Rajah to Nagapa Kartava, mortgaging the hills, rice lands, and hill slopes situated within the boundaries* specified in the Deed for 5,000 gold fanams.

2nd Deed, dated Medum 800 (1623-24).

Purports to be a writing executed by Teken Row Ramangalat Kowilagom, reigning Tamburan, declaring his having conferred on some parties, not named, certain ranks and privileges as well as religious institutions (Devassom) in the Tekenkur country belonging to him, with lands for the support of such institutions, and declaring also his having conferred the remainder of his lands, three Kadoms or leagues in extent, situated at Koliady in Gunnapathiwattum, within the aforesaid Tekenkur country, on a deity styled "Chedatil Amah."

3rd Deed, dated Yedavom 803 (1626-27.)

† 70 Pothy Kandoms or paddy lands denominated "Iripu Porom," and adjoining (waste land) situated near "Kapu within the Tirumangalate Kotta."

Is a Marupattom, or counterpart Deed, given by one Kuriden Beemu to the Ramangalat Muta Thamburan (Rajah) for certain lands† granted to him on Anabava Avagashom, or perpetual lease.

Witnesses.

1st. Kurvalur Vyni Pathiar Mupen.

Holds land belonging to Government in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for forty years, and pays rent and kist to Government. Holds also four hills belonging to Koliadi Devassom and the Rajah. Does not know how the Rajah obtained the hills; pays sixteen gold fanams to the Devassom for the enjoyment of the hills. The Ramangalat Rajah (Kormenod Rajah) brought his ancestors originally from the eastern country, and gave them land to settle in Wynaad. The Rajah appointed his Karnavers as headmen of the caste, and he has succeeded to the rank.

2nd. Magayle Permal Chetty, residing in Gunnapathiwattum.

Cultivates paddy lands in Gunnapathiwattum, for which he pays rent to Koliadi Devassom. The paddy lands may have been given to the Devassom by the Kurumbranad Rajah. Deponent and other inhabitants are the jenm owners of the hills in the Amshom which were given to them by the Rajah. Deponent holds fifteen hills which were given by the Rajah to his Kar-

navers. No documents were granted by the Rajah when he made the gifts. Has heard that all the land on the other* side of Sultan's Battery belonged to Pychee Rajah. Has heard also that when one Kurnool Mupan caught an elephant, about twenty years ago on Yeddatava Malah hill, he paid Jenmabhogum to the Kurumbranad Rajah.

* North and eastward.

3rd Valia Valatha Chungan Chetty.

Cultivates a paddy land in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for which he pays rent to Koliadi Devassom. Holds, he says, one hill which was given to his Karnavers by the Ramangalat Rajah (Kurumbranad Rajah). Does not know how the Rajah obtained this land and hill. Has heard that the Rajah and Koliadi Devassom were the jenm owners of the hills which have been escheated. Two elephants, caught about ten years ago by Kulloor Gownden and Echacumk Kalu Chetty respectively, were delivered to the Rajah. Does not know if the Kotiote Rajah held any lands in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom.

4th. Kupady Kallu Chetty, residing in Gunnapathiwattum.

Cultivates paddy lands for which he pays rent to the Gunnapathiwattum Devassom. Holds two hills, the jenmi of which he says is the Gunnapathi Devassom. Has heard that the Ramangalat Rajah gave these lands and hills to the Devassom. Has heard also that if any elephants were caught in the Amshom they were given to the Rajah. Has heard that all the hills in Amshom belonged to the Rajah, but does not know how he obtained them.

5th. Ramen Nair, Kariasten of the Rajah.

Conducts the cultivation and collects the rent of paddy lands belonging to the Koliadi Devassom. Names the paddy lands cultivated by him for the Rajah. Names also the paddy lands cultivated by Ryots for which they pay rent to the Devassom. Names also some grass hills as belonging to the Rajah adjoining the paddy lands.

Evidence on behalf of Government.

6th. Anantha Putter, former Adighari of Gunnapathiwattum and now residing in that Amshom.

Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangod, and Munad Amshoms belonged originally to the Kurumbranad Rajah, but were conquered by the Kotiote Rajah (meaning Pychi Rajah) who held possession for several years. Has heard that by mutual arrangement some lands were given to the Kurumbranad Rajah, and others kept by the Kotiote Rajah. Does not know what lands were given; but *all* the lands held by the Kotiote Rajah, with the exception of the Devassom lands, were escheated at the time the Rajah was killed.

Names eight lands as having been escheated. States that there are many other lands, 120 and odd, and neighbouring hills and forests that were escheated.

Besides, there were above 100 lands, hills, and forests belonging to the Ramangalat (Kurumbranad) Rajah that were escheated.

The Kotiote Rajah was killed in 979 (1804), and in 981 and 83 (1806 and 1808) the Pymash was made, and all the above lands and hills were escheated.

Deponent was Adighari of the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for about sixteen years, and found by Revenue accounts that the lands were escheated. He discovered some more lands that ought to have been escheated, and included them in the accounts.

With the exception of the Devassom and Bramasom property, all the lands in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom were escheated.

Most of the Devassoms existed long before the time of the Rajahs; but some of them were endowed by the Kotiote and Ramangalat Rajahs.

Kotiote Rajah.

The Kotiote Rajah's family holds lands in Wynaad now—*i. e.*, in Nellakotta.

Sidhi Gownden.

Deponent names the lands.

Deponent has heard that Sidhi Gownden holds a Copper deed; but all the time deponent was Adighari of Gunnapathiwattum, Gownden did not exercise any right whatever over the hills

he claims in that Amshom and Mupeinad Amshom, except that on one occasion in 993 (1817-18) or 94 (1818-19) Gownden's father, deponent has heard, caught an elephant on one of these hills.

Deponent himself caught several elephants before the lands were declarede scheats; but since then he caught one in Echa Kunu Malla for which be paid Jenmabhogam to Government.

7th. Erish Gownden, one of the Uralers of Chingueri Devassom, residing at Chengara Tarra, Mupeinad Amshom.

Holds, he says, the hills demarcated on Mr. J. Gordon's application. Holds them under the Chingueri Devassom. Pays rent to the Devassom. Sidhi Gownden has no claim whatever to these hills.

Sidhi Gownden.

Has heard that the Kotiote Rajah is the jenm owner of this Devassom, and the Kariasten who now manages it does so under the Kotiote Rajah's orders.

Sidhi Gownden holds some lands and also hills, but all from the Chingueri Devassom.

* Note.—Gownden prefers his claim in connection with Yeddakel Devassom.

The Yeddakel* and Chingueri Devassoms are distinct.

8th. Shantharaje Teavagan, residing in Gunapathiwattom Amshom.

Knows that within the last three or four years all the hills in the Gunnapathiwattum, as well as in Munad and Chevangode Amshoms, were declared escheats. Never knew nor heard from his ancestors that the Kurumbranad Rajah claimed any of the hills. Has heard that the Rajah owns Koliady Devassom.

Sidhi Gownden.

Has heard that Sidhi Gownden has a claim to the hills in the Yeddakel Deshom, which were given by the Ramangalat Rajah to the Yeddakal Devassom in charge of Sidhi Gownden's ancestors. About ten or fifteen years ago Gownden's father sold a hill to some Mysore people.

9th. Chuliot Ramen Menoky, residing at the Chuliot Ambalom in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom.

States he is the jenm owner of the Chuliot Devassom; was told by his ancestors that they had bought the jenm of the Devassom from one Chanthrath Nair. The Kurumbranad Rajah owns the Koliady Devassom paddy lands and the hills connected with them. With this exception the Rajah does not exercise any right over any other lands or hills. Deponent pays nothing to the Rajah for the lands be holds.

Sidhi Gownden.

† Supposed to be Yeddakal Devassom.

Has heard that the Kurumbranad Rajah gave to Sidhi Gownden's Karnavers lands and hills on account of the Devassom,† but does not know what they are. Gownden has leased some of the hills to others; but pays Jenmabhogam to the Rajah up to this time.

10th. Kariampathy Kanna Painkar, residing in Mupeinad Amshom.

Has been Adighari of the Mupeinad Amshom for the last six years. Was Adighari of Edanarasur for five years.

The Kurumbranad Rajah has no hills or forests in the Mupeinad Amshom, as all his lands were escheated. Deponent heard this from his Karnavers.

Has never known or heard that the Rajah ever exercised any right over these hills and lands. They have always been entered in the Amshom accounts as escheats.

Sidhi Gownden.

Has heard that Sidhi Gownden has lands and hills in Chingueri Tavra in the Mupeinad Amshom. They will all appear by the Amshom accounts as the property of the Chingueri Devassom, of which deponent has heard Sidhi Gownden and other Gowndens are the proprietors. Both the Chingueri and Mutil Devassoms are managed under the orders of the Kotiote Rajah. The Gowndens must have obtained the lands from this Rajah.

11th. Sheshan Pattar, residing in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom.

His father and himself came from Palghaut, and have been Menons or village Accountants in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for twenty-nine years. This Amshom as well as Cheangode and Munad belonged to the Kotiote Rajah (Pychi Rajah). In 1026 (1850-51) all the teak forests were declared escheats, and three years ago all the hills were escheated. In 984 (1808-9) all the

navers. No documents were granted by the Rajah when he made the gifts. Has heard that all the land on the other* side of Sultan's Battery belonged to Pychee Rajah. Has heard also that when one Kurnool Mupan caught an elephant, about twenty years ago on Yeddatava Malah hill, he paid Jenmabhogum to the Kurumbranad Rajah.

* North and eastward.

3rd Valia Valatha Chungan Chetty. Cultivates a paddy land in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for which he pays rent to Koliadi Devassom. Holds, he says, one hill which was given to his Karnavers by the Ramangalat Rajah (Kurumbranad Rajah). Does not know how the Rajah obtained this land and hill. Has heard that the Rajah and Koliadi Devassom were the jenm owners of the hills which have been escheated. Two elephants, caught about ten years ago by Kulloor Gownden and Echacumk Kalu Chetty respectively, were delivered to the Rajah. Does not know if the Kotiote Rajah held any lands in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom.

4th. Kupady Kallu Chetty, residing in Gunnapathiwattum. Cultivates paddy lands for which he pays rent to the Gunnapathiwattum Devassom. Holds two hills, the jenmi of which he says is the Gunnapathi Devassom. Has heard that the Ramangalat Rajah gave these lands and hills to the Devassom. Has heard that if any elephants were caught in the Amshom they were given to the Rajah. Has heard also that all the hills in Amshom belonged to the Rajah, but does not know how he obtained them.

5th. Ramen Nair, Kariasten of the Rajah. Conducts the cultivation and collects the rent of paddy lands belonging to the Koliadi Devassom. Names the paddy lands cultivated by him for the Rajah. Names also the paddy lands cultivated by Ryots for which they pay rent to the Devassom. Names also some grass hills as belonging to the Rajah adjoining the paddy lands.

Evidence on behalf of Government.

6th. Anantha Putter, former Adighari of Gunnapathiwattum and now residing in that Amshom. Gunnapathiwattum, Cherangod, and Munad Amshoms belonged originally to the Kurumbranad Rajah, but were conquered by the Kotiote Rajah (meaning Pychi Rajah) who held possession for several years. Has heard that by mutual arrangement some lands were given to the Kurumbranad Rajah, and others kept by the Kotiote Rajah. Does not know what lands were given; but *all* the lands held by the Kotiote Rajah, with the exception of the Devassom lands, were escheated at the time the Rajah was killed.

Names eight lands as having been escheated. States that there are many other lands, 120 and odd, and neighbouring hills and forests that were escheated.

Besides, there were above 100 lands, hills, and forests belonging to the Ramangalat (Kurumbranad) Rajah that were escheated.

The Kotiote Rajah was killed in 979 (1804), and in 981 and 83 (1806 and 1808) the Pymash was made, and all the above lands and hills were escheated.

Deponent was Adighari of the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for about sixteen years, and found by Revenue accounts that the lands were escheated. He discovered some more lands that ought to have been escheated, and included them in the accounts.

With the exception of the Devassom and Bramasom property, all the lands in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom were escheated.

Most of the Devassoms existed long before the time of the Rajahs; but some of them were endowed by the Kotiote and Ramangalat Rajahs.

Kotiote Rajah. The Kotiote Rajah's family holds lands in Wynaad now—*i. e.*, in Nellakotta. Deponent names the lands.

Sidhi Gownden. Deponent has heard that Sidhi Gownden holds a Copper deed; but all the time deponent was Adighari of Gunnapathiwattum, Gownden did not exercise any right whatever over the hills

he claims in that Amshom and Mupeinad Amshom, except that on one occasion in 993 (1817-18) or 94 (1818-19) Gownden's father, deponent has heard, caught an elephant on one of these hills.

Deponent himself caught several elephants before the lands were declarede scheats; but since then he caught one in Echa Kunu Malla for which be paid Jenmabhogam to Government.

7th. Erish Gownden, one of the Uralers of Chingueri Devassom, residing at Chengara Tarra, Mupeinad Amshom. Sidhi Gownden. Holds, he says, the hills demarcated on Mr. J. Gordon's application. Holds them under the Chingueri Devassom. Pays rent to the Devassom. Sidhi Gownden has no claim whatever to these hills.

Has heard that the Kotiote Rajah is the jenm owner of this Devassom, and the Kariasten who now manages it does so under the Kotiote Rajah's orders.

Sidhi Gownden holds some lands and also hills, but all from the Chingueri Devassom.

* NOTE.—Gownden prefers his claim in connection with Yeddakel Devassom. The Yeddakel* and Chingueri Devassoms are distinct.

8th. Shantharaje Teavagan, residing in Gunapathiwattom Amshom. Knows that within the last three or four years all the hills in the Gunnapathiwattum, as well as in Munad and Chevangode Amshoms, were declared escheats. Never knew nor heard from his ancestors that the Kurumbranad Rajah claimed any of the hills. Has heard that the Rajah owns Koliady Devassom.

Sidhi Gownden. Has heard that Sidhi Gownden has a claim to the hills in the Yeddakel Deshom, which were given by the Ramangalat Rajah to the Yeddakal Devassom in charge of Sidhi Gownden's ancestors. About ten or fifteen years ago Gownden's father sold a hill to some Mysore people.

9th. Chuliot Ramen Menoky, residing at the Chuliot Ambalom in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom. States he is the jenm owner of the Chuliot Devassom; was told by his ancestors that they had bought the jenm of the Devassom from one Chanthrath Nair. The Kurumbranad Rajah owns the Koliady Devassom paddy lands and the hills connected with them. With this exception the Rajah does not exercise any right over any other lands or hills. Deponent pays nothing to the Rajah for the lands be holds.

Sidhi Gownden. Has heard that the Kurumbranad Rajah gave to Sidhi Gownden's Karnavers lands and hills on account of the Devassom,† but does not know what they are. Gownden has leased some of the hills to others; but pays Jenmabhogam to the Rajah up to this time.

† Supposed to be Yeddakal Devassom.

10th. Kariampathy Kanna Painkar, residing in Mupeinad Amshom. Has been Adighari of the Mupeinad Amshom for the last six years. Was Adighari of Edanarasur for five years.

The Kurumbranad Rajah has no hills or forests in the Mupeinad Amshom, as all his lands were escheated. Deponent heard this from his Karnavers.

Has never known or heard that the Rajah ever exercised any right over these hills and lands. They have always been entered in the Amshom accounts as escheats.

Sidhi Gownden. Has heard that Sidhi Gownden has lands and hills in Chingueri Tavra in the Mupeinad Amshom. They will all appear by the Amshom accounts as the property of the Chingueri Devassom, of which deponent has heard Sidhi Gownden and other Gowndens are the proprietors. Both the Chingueri and Mutil Devassoms are managed under the orders of the Kotiote Rajah. The Gowndens must have obtained the lands from this Rajah.

11th. Sheshan Pattar, residing in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom. His father and himself came from Palghaut, and have been Menons or village Accountants in Gunnapathiwattum Amshom for twenty-nine years. This Amshom as well as Cheangode and Munad belonged to the Kotiote Rajah (Pychi Rajah). In 1026 (1850-51) all the teak forests were declared escheats, and three years ago all the hills were escheated. In 984 (1808-9) all the

lands attached to Kollams (royal residences) were escheated. The Pymash was prepared from the Rajah's own accounts. One piece of land called Puthady Nelom, which was in the possession of the Ramangalat (Kurumbranad) Rajah was also escheated, as it was proved to be the property of the Kotiote Rajah.

Sidhi Gownden. Does not know if Sidhi Gownden has any right to any of the hills in the Gunapathiwattom Amshom. He should have known if Gownden had any such right. Gownden's father (Mullay Gownden) sold a hill in Gunapathiwattum to some Mysore people about ten or fifteen years ago.

The Gownden holds some paddy lands on account of the Yeddakel Devassom, which are entered as property of that Devassom in the Sirkar books.

Deponent has never heard that the Kurumbranad Rajah has a right to any of the hills in Gunapathiwattum Amshom.

Deponent was Menon of the Amshom when it was declared escheat with other two Amshoms Cherangode and Munad. The fact was duly proclaimed to all the inhabitants.

Mr. Stuart, (Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement), called on the people to prove their titles to lands. Nobody came forward. The Kurumbranad Rajah's Kariasten, Ramen Nair, took no notice of it.

12th, Viapury Pillay, Mukiasten of Gunapathiwattum Amshom. Has lived in the Gunapathiwattum Amshom for thirty years, and has been Mukiasten or Headman of the village for the last twenty years.

Has always known that all the hills and forests in this Amshom belonged to the Kotiote Rajah (Pychi Rajah), and were escheated three or four years ago. Before that, several portions were escheated. Echa Kunu was escheated when Avantha Putter was Adighari of the Amshom.

All the ceremonies of the Temples in the same Amshom used to be conducted under the authority of the Kotiote Rajah.

The Kurumbranad Rajah has authority only in the Koliadi Devassom, and no authority whatever in regard to the hills.

Sidhi Gownden. Sidhi Gownden holds some paddy lands in connection with Devassom; but has never exercised any right regarding the hills.

When Mr. Chatfield instituted inquiries some years ago, as regards the ownership of lands, the Kurumbranad Rajah did not come forwad, but Sidhi Gownden did. He could not however adduce any proof of his claim.

Mr. Stuart held his Cutcherry in Gunapathiwattum, and issued orders calling on claimants to come forward and prove their titles. Some parties appeared, but could not prove their claims.

The inhabitants were all made acquainted with the fact that the Gunapathiwattum, Cherangode, and Munad Amshoms were declared escheats.

(True Abstract.)

(Signed) G. A. BALLARD, *Collector.*

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

Read Petition from Yeddakal Sidhi Gownden of Wynaad, dated 18th October 1863.

1. After a full and patient inquiry into the claim of Yeddakal Sidhi Gownden, to certain lands in the Gunnapathiwattum, Munad, and Mupeinad Amshoms in the Waynaad Talook, and especially with reference to the lands noted proposed to be sold on account of Government,

Pudi Kadavu Kunu, Kali Kandom Munu, and 12 other Hills.

I have determined to reject the claim, as (firstly) no claims were established when claimants were called on and formal enquiries made on previous occasions, and especially in the Revenue Settlement inquiries in 1860, 1861 and 1862; and (secondly) because no reliable evidence is adduced now.

2. Unless the steps required by law are taken in due course, this order will be final, and the advertised sales will proceed forthwith.

Copy of this order is sent this day to Sidhi Gownden.

(Signed) G. A. BALLARD,
Collector.

CALICUT,
6th July 1864.

To YEDDAKAL SIDHI GOWNDEN, Wynaad.

1. I enclose an order passed by me this day.

2. If within one week from receipt you do not intimate to me that you intend to contest this order as prescribed by Law it will, under Section 5, Act XXIII of 1863, be final.

(Signed) G. A. BALLARD, *Collector.*

CALICUT,
6th July 1864.

(True Copy)

(Signed) W. F. HEWETSON,
Deputy, for Collector.

Appendix C.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.

From H. RICHARDSON, Esq., Deputy Collector of Wynaad; to G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector of Malabar, dated Manantoddy, 24th June 1864, No. 236.

I have the honor to submit my report on the claim made by Yeddakal Sidhi Gownden to the hills in the Gunnapathiwattum and Mupeinad Amshoms.

MANANTODDY, 24th June 1864.

1. In October 1863, while certain escheated lands in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom were being demarcated on Mr. Gordon's application, Yeddakal Sidihi Gownden claimed the whole extent as the property of the Yeddakal Devassom, and on the 18th idem presented a Petition mentioning the boundaries of the lands so claimed. On which he was requested to produce any documentary evidence in his power to prove it.

2. Appeared on the 27th October, and stated that his Karnavers purchased the lands in question from the Kurumbranad Rajah, and produced two Copper Deeds* alleged to be written in Kole Tamil, which nobody could read.

* Dated Medom 730 (1553-54).

On being asked why he did not assert his claim when all the lands in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom were declared escheats, stated that he was under the impression that his lands would have been exempted, as his Deeds had been deposited as security for the Akbarry Contractor.

Stated also that he did not know of Mr. Robinson's inquiry into the escheats in 1857-58, and was not tcalled upon by the Acting Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement to prove his claim.

Stated also that he had leased some of the hils to parties, and had also mortgaged his Deeds and Leases to Mr. Anthony Lopez.

Dated 22nd Karkadagom 1038 (5th August 1863.) Produced two Deeds of Mortgage from Sumalli Kari Napuryar Gowden to himself.

3. Sidhi Gownden appeared again on the 21st January 1864, and named nineteen hills in the Gunnapathiwattum Amshom, and stated that there were others but did not remember their names. Had not leased or mortgaged any of them to parties.

Claimed one hill in the Munad, and thirty-one in the Mupeinad Amshoms, some of which he had leased to parties.

4. It will be seen from the above that Sidhi Gownden asserts his claim in the alleged translation of two Copper Deeds said to have been granted by the Thekka Koor Ramungaloth Rajah, dated 730—more than 300 years ago.

5. When I first took charge of the Talook in 1860 all the land applied for by Mr. Gordon, was claimed by the Managers of the Ganapatty, Manikni, and Mariamah Canne Devassoms; and moreover, Sidhi Gownden in the first place claimed all the land applied for by Mr. Gordon, which

comprises nine hills, which in comparison with the hills named by Sidhi Gownden, I find that only one of them is included in his (Sidhi Gownden's list).

6. It will be seen from the statement of Eriah Gownden, that he claims the same lands on account of the Changari Devassom.

In re Kurumbranad Rajah's claim, No. 14.

7. The acceptance of this same property when tendered by Soobiah Gownden* as security for the Abkarry Contractor (Goondulpet Goothian) for Fuslies 1266 to 1270 forms the basis of Sidhi Gownden's claim as to the genuineness of the alleged deeds and his right to the lands. It will be seen however by the copies of Mr. Robinson's orders, and the Tahsildar's reports Nos. 11 to 14, that Soobiah Gownden did tender the property as security, but that it was rejected, and the Contractor was obliged to furnish other security.

* Brother of Sidhi Gownden.

8. It will be seen by Shashum Putter's statement† that he would have known if Sidihi Gownden had any right to any hills in the Amshom. That his father sold a hill ten or fifteen years ago to some Mysore people; stated also that Sidhi Gownden holds some paddy lands which are entered in the Sircar accounts as belonging to the Yeddakel Devassom.

† Vide Kurumbranad Rajah's case, No. 18.

9. Viapoory, the Mukiasten of Gunnapathiwattum, stated that when Mr. Chatfield instituted inquires some years ago, Sidhi Gownden came forward but could not produce any proof. When Mr. Stuart also held Cutcherry at Sultan's Battery some people came forward but could not prove their claims.

Vide Kurumbranad Rajah's case, No. 19.

10. The inhabitants were all made acquainted with the order that the Gunnapathiwattum Charangode and Munad Amshoms were escheats.

11. Thus it will be seen that Sidhi Gownden's excuse that he knew nothing of the inquiries that had been instituted, and that his deeds had been accepted by the Collector as security for the Abkarry Contractor, are falsehoods, and under these circumstances I have no doubt whatever that the deeds have been fabricated for the purpose of obtaining possession of a large tract of country to which he has no right whatever.

12. That Temples have been endowed with Paddy lands is undisputed, and Government have therefore not interfered with them. The Revenue derived from these lands however are supposed to be used for the up-keep of the ceremonies, and feeding of travellers. I happened, in January last, to visit the Yeddakel Devassom, which I found in a most dilapidated state, and must have been abandoned at least fifty years ago. Had it not been that the jungle had just been burnt, I should not have been able to get near it at all.

(Signed) H. RICHARDSON,
Deputy Collector.

---

1. The Board of Revenue have given their best consideration to the above papers, and resolve under Section 5, Act XXIII of 1863, to confirm the Collector's orders rejecting the claims of the Kurumbranad Rajah and of Sidhi Gownden to the waste lands in question.

2. The papers will be submitted to Government in view to the issue of the necessary orders under Section 7 of the Act for constituting the Special Court contemplated by the Act.

No. 64. ORDER THEREON, 4th November 1864, No. 2,036.

Forests, No. 4.

The Board will communicate with the Collector, and submit a list of persons (not less than seven in number) qualified to form a Special Court.

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

No. 7,991.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th December 1863.

Read the following letter from G. A. BALLARD, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 8th December 1863, No. 263:—

1. I have the honor to bring to the notice of the Board that, on applications received, a number of lots of Government Forest land in Ganipattiwattom Amshom, Wynad Taluk, were duly advertised for auction sale some three months ago.

The sales were to be made by the Deputy Collector of Wynad at Sultan's Battery on the 30th ultimo.

2. I have just received a letter from the Deputy Collector, informing me that in consequence of the Kurambranad Raja having preferred a claim to the whole of the Ganipattiwattom, Cherangod, and Munad Amshoms, the Deputy Collector has been obliged to postpone the sale.

3. I have yet to learn on what the Raja pretends to found his claim.

The Ganipattiwattom and Munad Amshom forest lands were declared Government property years ago.

Subsequent inquiries in details by the Revenue Settlement Department have only tended to strengthen the Government claims. I have not heard the Kurambranad Raja's name even mentioned in connection with these lands in any of the exhaustive inquiries that have been made by the Revenue Officers, and yet at the last moment as all is prepared for sale a claim, which I cannot but consider frivolous and vexatious in the last degree, is put forward which, if allowed to be entertained, will cause great inconvenience, loss and delay. I do not so much consider the immediate loss to Government, but the loss and confusion caused to parties who had calculated on being put in possession of, and clearing considerable extents of land this season.

4. Under the circumstances, considering that much inquiry has been made, that the lands have long been declared the property of Government, and that the present claimant has never appeared to the present time, I would recommend that the sales be proceeded with, and the Raja allowed to sue Government if he sees fit to do so.

5. As, however, the rules do not appear to me expressly to allow any latitude to the Collector as to the absolute rejection of, and conclusion of sale notwithstanding, an advanced claim, and as the Deputy Collector has directed the sale to be postponed, I refer the matter, and request I may be favored with early instructions for my guidance.

The Collector is referred to Act XXIII of 1863. He must proceed strictly in accordance with its provisions.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To G. A. Ballard, Esq., Collector of Malabar.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

8. It will be seen by Shashum Putter's Statement* that he would have known if Sidhi Gownden had any right to any hills in the Amshom. That his father sold a hill ten or fifteen years ago to some Mysore people; stated also that Sidhi Gownden holds some paddy lands which are entered in the Sircar accounts as belonging to the Yeddakel Devassom.

* Vide Kurumbranad Rajah's case, No. 18.

9. Viapoory, the Mukiasten of Gunnapathiwattom, stated that when Mr. Chatfield instituted inquiries some years ago, Sidhi Gownden came forward but could not produce any proof. When Mr. Stuart also held Cutcherry at Sultan's Battery some people came forward but could not prove their claims.

Vide Kurumbranad Rajah's case, No. 19.

10. The inhabitants were all made acquainted with the order that the Gunnapathiwattom, Charangode, and Munad Amshoms were escheats.

11. Thus it will be seen that Sidhi Gownden's excuse that he knew nothing of the inquiries that had been instituted, and that his deeds had been accepted by the Collector as security for the Abkarry Contractor, are falsehoods, and under these circumstances I have no doubt whatever that the deeds have been fabricated for the purpose of obtaining possession of a large tract of country to which he has no right whatever.

12. That Temples have been endowed with Paddy lands is undisputed, and Government have therefore not interfered with them. The Revenue derived from these lands however are supposed to be used for the up-keep of the ceremonies, and feeding of travellers. I happened, in January last, to visit the Yeddakel Devassom, which I found in a most dilapidated state, and must have been abandoned at least fifty years ago. Had it not been that the jungle had just been burnt, I should not have been able to get near it at all.

(Signed) H. RICHARDSON,
Deputy Collector.

---

1. The Board of Revenue have given their best consideration to the above papers, and resolve under Section 5, Act XXIII of 1863, to confirm the Collector's orders acting the claims of the Kurumbranad Rajah and of Sidhi Gownden to the waste lands in question.

2. The papers will be submitted to Government in view to the issue of the necessary orders under Section 7 of the Act for constituting the Special Court contemplated by the Act.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Secretary.

To J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.,
with copy of Board's Proceedings dated 17th December 1863, No. 7,991.
„ G. A. Ballard, Esq., Collector of Malabar, with an original enclosure returned.

Exd. R. H. Lee.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

1863. Department

No.

Dated 17th December 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 7,991.

Referring the Collector to Act XXIII of 1863 in regard to the sale of certain Forest land in the Wynad Taluk, and requesting to proceed strictly in accordance with its provisions.

Pro: 22 June/59 № 2..35
" 12 July " " 28
" 9 May/60 " " 18.19.

№ 2035

4 Papers

The Bd. write Collr. with the Collr. and Sub with a list of persons fit but less than seven in number of qualified to form a Special Court. ~~in the~~ ~~that for them~~ ~~elect~~ J. D.S.

List to be № 63 & 64 -
29 Oct/60 RB Nov.

Rev 2 1864. Department
Pro: of Govt for 1859.

No. 2805.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Pro: Bd of Rev. dated 22 Sept
& № 3096

Dated 20th October 1864.

Despatched 25 do -

Received 27 do.

E-1-

Pro: Board of Revenue
dated 21st July 65 (№ 1200)
No. 6,913.

Confirming the Collector's orders rejecting the claims of the Kurumbranad Rajah and of Sidhi Gownden to certain waste land in the Malabar District, and submitting papers on the subject for orders of Government.

№ 2036. 2 Nov.

With an Order

For Orders.

The Collr. under the Bds instruction has acted in accordance with the Waste Lands Act № 23 of 1863 - and there seems no alternative but to appoint a Special Court. Shall the Bd be asked to submit a list of names of persons communicating with the Collr.? the selection rests absolutely with Govt. save that the C. & S. Judge must be & the Collr must not be appointed J.D.