

123
CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

M.R.O. 14-18,000-27-9-24.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 634

Press
~~Mis.~~

239.240

Dated 15. 4. 1918

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
15th April 1864.*

No. 239. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd March 1864, No. 1,755.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Kurnool, dated Doopaud, 2nd March 1864,
No. 28 :—

1. I have the honor to return the enclosures, forwarded with the Proceedings of Government, dated 5th February 1864, No. 224, concerning the boundary dispute between the villagers of Devamada and Singavaram, belonging to His Highness the Nizam.

2. The Deputy Collector, Ragoonatha Row, has inquired into the statement of the Singavaram villagers that they have no other way of driving their cattle to the river, except over the disputed portion of ground, and finds that from the configuration of the river banks the fact is as stated, but applies equally to the villagers of Devamada.

3. The piece of land in question has always been used as a thoroughfare to the river for the cattle of both villages, and if this right be clearly upheld for both parties, it is a matter of no consequence to which village it be allotted.

4. I beg to forward copy of the Deputy Collector's report fully explanatory of the case, and the probable grounds of the dispute.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From R. RAGOONATHA ROW, Deputy Collector of Kurnool, to J. I. MINCHIN, Esq.,
Collector of Kurnool, dated 26th February 1864, No. 301.

In reply to your Memorandum of the 18th instant, No. 16, calling for a report regarding a dispute between the villagers of Devamada and Singavaram, I have the honor to inform you that I inspected the spot in question and find that the statement of the villagers of Singavaram that "their cattle have no other way of going to the river to drink" is true; but it is equally true that there is no other way for the cattle of Devamada if the use of this road be not allowed them; no passage to the river exists for at least a mile below and above this road, the former being situated in the Singavaram and the latter in the Devamada villages. The ground itself is perfectly useless for any agricultural purpose, and I fancy this question about it has risen simply on a desire on the part of both the villagers to secure the exclusive possession of the only road to the river in that part of the country. On both sides of this road the river bank is so rocky and steep and thereby impassable for the cattle, that it is highly necessary and perfectly just to secure the use of this road for the cattle of Devamada, to whatsoever village the ground in question may be eventually ordered to be attached. It appears that it has been used by both the villagers from time immemorial as a road for their cattle, and I do not see why any demarcation should interfere with this long usage. The road in question is something like what I have marked in pencil on the plan received with your Memorandum. The enclosures of your Memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. I. MINCHIN, *Collector.*

1. Ordered to be submitted to Government with reference to their Proceedings quoted by the Collector, and with the Board's recommendation that the land in question be assigned as common to both villages for access to the river, but as exclusively the right of neither.

2. There seems to be no sufficient evidence to establish an exclusive right on either side, and the right of way is essentially necessary to both alike.

(True Copies.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
15th April 1864.

No. 634.

No. 240.

From

J. D. SIM, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George,

To

The Resident at Hyderabad.

SIR,

1. I am directed to acknowledge your letter, dated 18th January 1864, No. 44A, respecting a boundary dispute between the village of Devamada in the Kurnool District and of Singavarum belonging to His Highness the Nizam.

2. In reply, I am desired to forward the accompanying Proceedings* of the Board of Revenue, recommending, for reasons stated, that the land in dispute should be assigned as common to both the villages in question for access to the river, but as exclusively the right of neither. As this arrangement will remove all difficulties, the Government trust that His Highness the Nizam will concur in its adoption.

* Dated 22nd March 1864, No. 1,755.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) J. D. SIM,

Secretary to Government.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

(Copy)

Karnool-Sollicitors Office
30th July 1863.

No. 249.

From

James James Minchin Esquire
Collector of Karnool

To

The President at

Mysore

Sir

With reference to your letter of the 1st June 1863
No. 657 forwarding a note from the Minister on the
subject of the Boundary dispute between the Villages
of Devamada and Singavaram. I have the honor
to forward copy of a letter from the (Deputy) Director of
Revenue Settlement, and of a plan which accompanies
the same, for transmission to the Minister.

2. The 4th of an Acre which is in dispute, is
quite worthless and as stated by the (Deputy) Director,
although there is no satisfactory proof to allot it to
either Village, it appears to belong to the Village of
(Devamada).

3. Considering that the Demarcation and Settlement
of the Village are completed, I trust that the Minister
will be satisfied with the full enquiry that has taken
place, and allow the marks placed by the Settlement
Department to remain undisturbed.

J. J. Minchin
Collector.

the two numbers contain 10.46 + 9.82 = 20.28 acres.
 This does not exhibit any encroachment on
 the part of the Devanades Villagers.

4. On the whole, it appears to me that if the
 boundary be the sharp angle BAC that
 the Singavaram Villagers say it does, some
 notice would have been taken of it either in the
 accounts or on the ground, and without some
 evidence to the contrary, it is in my opinion,
 natural to suppose that the boundary runs straight
 on. If our operations had not been done, I would
 have recommended that these rocks be given over
 to the Singavaram Village as the simplest way of
 ending the dispute; but as the demarcation and survey
 of the Village of Devanades is done, I recommend
 that the marks be left undisturbed.

5. The Paimash Shilla of Devanades is herewith
 returned.

Yours faithfully
 J. H. Morris
 Esq. Director of Revenue Settlement
 Madras City
 Esq. James James Munichini
 Collector

Two Copies
 All and sundry
 J. H. Morris

Dec: 23rd 1864.
 Jan 10 694 of 1864

Jan 10 694 of 1864

Dec: 23rd 1864

the two numbers contain 1.46 + 9.82 or 11.28 acres.

This does not exhibit any encroachment on the part of the Devamadw. Villagers.

4. On the whole, it appears to me that if the Boundary to the sharp angle **BAC** that the Singavaram Villagers say it does, some notice would have been taken of it either in the accounts or on the ground, and without some evidence to the contrary, it is in my opinion, natural to suppose that the boundary runs straight on. If our operations had not been done, I would have recommended that these rocks be given over to the Singavaram Village as the simplest way of ending the dispute; but as the demarcation and survey of the Village of Devamadw is done, I recommend that the marks be left undisturbed.

5. The Paimash Chitta of Devamadw is herewith returned.

Shaw
Sef. J. W. Morris
Sef. Director of Res. Settlement

True Copy
Sef. James James Munichin
Collector

True Copies

W. L. and W. L.
Off. 2 Assist. Settlement

Immo by 4 of 1864
Rev: 235/1864

True Copy
W. L. and W. L.
Off. 2 Assist. Settlement

Translation of Note from H. H. the Nizam's
Minister to the Resident Hyderabad. Dated

23rd Ruziah 1280 A.
16th January 1866.

No. 29.

I hereby acknowledge the receipt of your letter
of the 16th Saffar 1280 Hyr, No 1195 with in-
closure from the Collector of Karnool, regarding
the boundary dispute between the Villages of
Devenmader and Singwarim, regarding
to comply with the requisition of the Collector
of Karnool, if no objection exists.

This subject was enquired into by the
Talookdar of Raichur & a report re-
ceived from the 2nd Talookdar of that place
with enclosure is forwarded, from which you
will learn that exclusively of the reasons ad-
duced to prove that the land belongs to Sing-
warim, there is no other way for the cattle
of Singwarim to pass to and fro for water,
as shown to the Talookdar. Therefore after
perusing

will.

James 694. of 1864

Dec 28 1862

perusing the papers, if you should deem
it expedient. They now will request the
Collector of Kurnool to allow the land
in question to remain as hitherto in
the possession of Singavaram. —

Abstract of a report from the 2nd
Class Talookdar of Alipore. —
of 17 Semadecool Aoul 1280 Hyeri —

States as follows: —

It appears from the report of the
Scheildar of Alipore that the ground in dispute
measures 30 fountahs, and the grass grown
on it is grazed on by the Cattle of Singavaram.
It forms also the road for the cattle in question
to go to the river for water. The ground is
proved to belong to Singavaram by the following
reasons. 1st By the measurement made
during British Administration it is included
in Singavaram by H. S. — 2nd By the Razee-
namah executed between the two Villages

in 1267. Foulce. — 3rd By the Muzzen
executed before the Inspector of Kurnool
and the former Scheildar of Alipore. —
Encloses report from the Scheildar of
Alipore to the above effect. — Also the Razee-
namah and Muzzen above referred to, in
which, according to which, the Scheildar
states the ground in question belongs to Singa-
varam. —

True Translation

George J. J. J.
Offg. Secy. to Govt.

W. 634-

2 April 16



2. In reply, I am
desired to forward the
accompanying Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue,
recommending, for reasons
stated, that the land in
dispute should be co-
assigned as common
to both the villages in
question for access to the
rivers, but as exclusively
the right of neither.
As this arrangement
will

2/11/19

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "M. J. ...". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "M" and a trailing flourish extending towards the top right corner of the page.

810-
Dec-~~23~~54.

634 Pine

7981-6-97

Jan^y 6th 1864

will remove all diffi-
culties, the Gov. trust
that His Highness the
Nizam will ^{concur in} not object
to its adoption.

L. A. P.

Fort St. George
15th Apr. 1802

14 Copies to the
Gov. of the
Pres. 16

Revenue 1861 to 1864
no. of years 2 of 1861

2 1861 1864

15.4.1864

To the President at
the National
Office

31.3.25 II

2 1861 1864

From the C. 1861 1864
in 1861

No. 122-123
5-2-1864

Regarding a
boundary dispute
between the Village of
Devenade in the
District of... and
the... belonging
to the...
Hoping...

2 1861 1864

separate

1861 1864

1861 1864