CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

M.R. O. 1—89,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2360. Press ~~Misc~~

140-141

Dated 19th September 1868.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2360/19

Rev - Board's Proc
G.O. No. 2360
21-9-1868
Rev
25.7.63

G.R. Old No. 73, New No. 24—563,834—20-10-29.

Paper taken out of the Records fr

Press
Miscellaneous No.
Outline
, dated

Date taken out	Name of person taking out.	Department.	O. No.	Year.	Date returned.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th September 1868.

No. 140. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Political Department:—

Informing the Collector of Bellary that the orders passed, nominating Mr. Kelsall to settle boundary disputes between certain districts will not be re-considered. } (Here enter 31st August 1868, No. 195.)

No. 141. ORDER THEREON, 11th September 1868, No. 2,360.

Miscellaneous. Communicated to the Revenue Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. SEWELL,
Acting Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, with Proceedings Political Department, No. 195.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 43. Read the following letter from the Collector of Bellary, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Bellary, 6th August 1868, No. 52.

With reference to the Order of Government,* dated 1st instant, No. 171, directing me to arrange for deputing Mr. Kelsall to meet an officer to be deputed by the Mysore Government for the settlement of the boundary disputes between that province and the Bellary District, I have the honor to request that the Government will instead nominate Mr. Foster, the Sub-Collector, for the duty. The boundary disputes, which have already arisen, lie principally in the Sub-division, and from his local knowledge of that part of the country, and from his standing in the service, I consider that he is the most fitted for the work. The only occasion on which Mr. Kelsall was engaged in a settlement of a similar description was when he had temporary charge of the Sub-division during Mr. Foster's absence on privilege leave.

* Political Department.

2. I will make arrangements for the efficient discharge of such portion of Mr. Foster's work as it may be necessary to relieve him of during his employment on the special duty referred to.

3. In case it should not be yet before Government, I have the honor to enclose, for their information, copy of a letter bearing on the subject, addressed by me to the Board of Revenue on the 28th ultimo. The present letter would have been forwarded through the Board had it not appeared to me desirable that arrangements for the demarcation of the boundary should be made without delay.

From the Collector of Bellary, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras; dated Bellary, 28th July 1868, No. 174.

I have the honor to submit, for the consideration of the Board, in view to such steps being taken as may seem to them expedient, translation of an Arzi addressed to the Sub-Collector by the Tahsildar of Madakserah Taluq, with reference to the operations of the Mysore Survey Department on the boundary. I also enclose translations of correspondence between the officers of the villages concerned and the Tahsildar above mentioned, and between him and the Paraghur Tahsildar in the Mysore country.

2. A glance at the map will suffice to show the magnitude of the interest involved in a proper demarcation of the boundary between the two countries. Five Taluqs of the Bellary District border on Mysore, and the Board will, I am sure, agree with me that the boundary line along such an extensive tract of country cannot be fairly or accurately laid down, unless all parties interested are properly represented At present, the work is being carried on without any reference to the officers of this district, who only appear on the scene when summoned by the ryots to resist an invasion of their rights by the Mysore demarcators, and that when they do their remonstrances are unheeded may be gathered from the letter of the Revenue Inspector, marked B.3, addressed to the Madakserah Tahsildar.

3. A question of this importance can never be satisfactorily settled by subordinates. In a recent report, on another boundary dispute, I suggested the expediency of a Commission being appointed to dispose of the whole matter finally. If there were only a few cases the Division officer, in communication with an officer deputed by the Mysore Government, might dispose of them, but looking at the length of the frontier line it is clear that, to determine satisfactorily all the disputes which must of necessity arise as the work of demarcation proceeds, undivided attention must be given to the subject. Should the Board concur in the view I take of the case, and recommend the appointment of a Commissioner to watch the interests of the ryots of this district as the work of demarcation is being carried out on the frontier, I would suggest the duty being entrusted to Mr. Foster, the Sub-Collector, whose division is principally concerned. It would be necessary to relieve him of his ordinary work, but if the special duty did not occupy him more than two or three months, I could, if another assistant was sent, make provision for that being carried on during his absence.

4. The ryots of this district naturally resent portions of their holdings being annexed to Mysore, and one instance has already occurred of their taking the law into their own hands by

removing the new marks set up by the demarcation party. I have caused it to be notified to them that their interests will be scrupulously guarded, and have warned them against having resort to illegal means of redress; but, nevertheless, in order to avoid the risk of any hostile collision, I trust that the question may have the early attention of the Board.

Translation of Madakserah Tahsildar's Arzi, dated 25th June 1868, *No.* 127.

The Tahsildar begs to inform the Acting Sub-Collector of the arbitrary modes of marking boundary limit of Mysore (by people settling the boundary) in the lands of the villages of Madakserah Taluq in this district, bordering the Mysore territory, without showing the accounts on which they base their right when asked, and without referring to the Pymash accounts of this district when they were requested.

2. This was informed to the Tahsildar by Vencoba Rau, Revenue Inspector, and Reddi of Gowdanahully.

3. Though the Pymash accounts of this district have been shown to the Taluq officials of Paraghur and people settling the boundary when they were asked to show their accounts relative to the boundary they said, it appears, they do not care for the Pymash accounts of this district, and said they had no accounts of their own with reference to boundaries. Thus the cultivated lands of this district have been added to the Mysore territory. It seems there exists a boundary dispute between the villages of Gowdanahully of this district, and Neeralacoonta of Mysore territory. Though the Tahsildar of Madakserah frequently requested the Tahsildar of Paraghur to come in person and settle with him the dispute in question, yet the latter failed to appear, and now they (officers settling boundary) are marking the boundary limit of Mysore in the lands of Gowdanahully of this district, though the villagers questioned their right of doing so. In conclusion, the Tahsildar begs him (Acting Sub-Collector) to communicate to the authorities of Mysore, requesting them to order the officers settling the boundary not to settle boundary limit without referring to or seeing the Pymash accounts of this district; further, begs for requisite orders on the matter.

Forwarded to the Collector for his information. There are now ten boundary disputes between this district and Mysore to be settled. The Acting Sub-Collector intends going to inspect the places at the beginning of next month, but he would strongly suggest that the boundary be settled by a Commission.

ANANTAPOOR, 21*st July* 1868. (Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Sub-Collector.

A. 1.

From MALAGONDA, of the Village of Gowdanahully, to D. RAMA RAU, Tahsildar of Madakserah; dated 2nd June 1868.

I beg to inform you that boundary marks are being fixed in lands, regarding which there is a boundary dispute between Jembimaradhully, hamlet of Gowdanahully (Madakserah), and Neeralacoonta, Taluq Pavagada. The authorities would not care for us if we prevent them from fixing the marks. I beg that instructions may be issued as to the course to be pursued by me.

A. 2.

Madakserah Tahsildar's Yadast, 4th June 1868, No. 33, to Pavagada Tahsildar, reporting the above.

As the Potail of Gowdanahully of my Taluq reports that the Surveyors at Neeralacoonta of your Taluq are forcibly fixing the boundary marks on the fields of Jembimaradhully, a hamlet of Gowdanahully (Madakserah Taluq) against his remonstrances, I request that you will issue instructions to them to fix the marks in a lawful manner, as the Government of both Taluqs is the same, and inform me of the date of your arrival at the spot, so that I may meet you there for the settlement of the dispute.

(Signed) D. RAMA RAU,
Tahsildar.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
31*st August* 1868.

No answer was received to this.

A. 3.

From LACHIMI NARASAPAH, Curnum, and MALAGONDA, of the Village of Gowdanahully, to D. RAMA RAU, Tahsildar of Madakserah; dated 8th June 1868.

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your Takeed, intimating that the Tahsildar of Pavagada Taluq has been written to about the fixing of boundary marks on the lands of which there is a long standing dispute between the villagers of Jembimaradhully and Dyalahully (hamlets of Gowdanahully, Madakserah Taluq) and Neeralacoonta, Pavagada Taluq. It is not known what orders will be issued by that Tahsildar. We beg to inform you that Mozimidar,* of the boundary works, has included in his measurement the cultivated land referred to in our Pymash accounts belonging to the puttahs of our ryots, and fixed boundary marks accordingly, which he will complete in two or three days. Although we remonstrated with him against that measure, affecting our lands, he turned a deaf ear to our solicitations, and never even condescended to refer to our accounts. We request your instructions to prohibit the fixing of boundary marks on the lands above referred to.

* Azmaishdar.

A. 4.

From the Tahsildar of Madakserah, to the Tahsildar of Pavagada; dated 9th June 1868, No. 89.

Having received reports from the village officers that the Mysore Mozimidars† were fixing the boundary marks on lands regarding which there is a boundary dispute between Jembimaradhully, hamlet of Gowdanahully of my Taluq, and Neeralacoonta of your Taluq, I addressed you a Yadast, No. 33, of 4th June last, intimating you of the same, and requested that the work may be postponed till the disposal of the boundary dispute, and to inform me of your convenience to meet me at the disputed spot, so that I may be able to join you there for the settlement of the dispute.

† Azmaishdars.

I beg to state that I have not as yet received your reply to the above Yadast, and that the village authorities of Gowdanahully have again reported to me that the same officers are fixing the boundary marks on the disputed land.

I have to inform you that it is improper to fix the boundary marks without any final settlement.

In order, therefore, to prevent future trouble, I beg to be informed when you will be able to come to the disputed land, to enable me to meet you there, when we shall be able to make a lawful settlement, after which boundary marks might be fixed.

A. 5.

MEMORANDUM.

Reply of the Pavagada Tahsildar to the above, No. 61.

Your first Yadast regarding the boundary dispute was forwarded to Mr. Forbes Coussmaker, Mysore, Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, whose reply to it will be communicated to you on receipt of the same.

PAVAGADA, 11*th June* 1868, (Signed) STREENEVASA RAU,
Mamatdar.

B. 1.

From the Tahsildar of Pavagada, to the Tahsildar of Madakserah, dated Pavagada, 1st June 1868, No. 55.

I beg to inform you that there is a boundary dispute between Kuttaganahully of my Taluq and Tamadihully of your Taluq, and that for the settlement of which Mr. Barker, Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey Department, has directed me, in his Order No. 127, to communicate the same to you, and to furnish him with mutual Razeenamahs, after the boundary dispute is

settled by inquiry in presence of both parties of the village. In view to the settlement of the dispute in question, and Razeenamahs taken from the parties, if you will fix a date on which you would order your Revenue Inspector and the village authorities to be present at the disputed locality, and intimate the same to me, I will make arrangements to despatch a Peishkar and Shekadar from this place to meet them at the appointed time and place. I await your reply to this, and beg that you will despatch your Revenue Inspector and others as soon as practicable.

(Signed) STREENEVASA RAU,
Mamatdar.

B. 2.

Reply of the Madakserah Tahsildar to the above, No 85, 6*th June* 1868.

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 5th June, No. 55, and beg to inform you that I have directed Revenue Inspector Vencoba Rau to proceed in company with the villagers, &c., to be present at the disputed spot on the 12th June 1868, for the purpose of settling the boundary disputes between the villages of Tamadihully of my Taluq and Kuttaganahully of your Taluq. I therefore request you to depute one of your subordinates to the spot on that date.

(Signed) D. RAMA RAU,
Tahsildar.

B. 3.

From the 2nd Revenue Inspector, to the Tahsildar of Madakserah ; dated 16th June 1868.

Upon the report of the village authorities of Tamadihully (Madakserah Taluq) that there is a boundary dispute between their village and that of Kuttaganahully in the Panganah Taluq, you have intimated me to proceed to the spot and point out to the Mysore authorities our boundary line, and to take steps to prevent their encroaching upon our lands. I beg to inform you that I accordingly proceeded to Tamadihully, and pointed out to the Mozimidars and the village authorities of Kadigoonta (Pavagada Taluq), the bordering fields Nos. 28, 29 and 30 of Cusbah Tamadihully, and Nos. 12 to 19 of hamlet Naganhully as belonging to Madakserah Taluq, and mentioned to them that there are other marks of demarcation, such as coontas, path-ways, stones, &c. There are, moreover, lands on the border which have been, and are under cultivation of the Madakserah Taluq. The villagers of Kadigoonta (Mysore) have encroached on our lands, and point out, as their limit of fields, to certain black stones which lie in field No. 28, belonging to Madakserah, and on which shepherd boys had scribbled. These, they say, is their boundary mark. Moreover, the village officers of Kadigoonta, on being questioned to show reference in their accounts in support of their assertions, said that they possess no such accounts, which statement clearly shows that they would not abide by our Paymash accounts. The Mozimidars went away saying that they would report this circumstance to their superiors.

(Signed) VENCOBA RAU,
Revenue Inspector.

No. 44. ORDER THEREON, 31st August 1868, No. 195.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to re-consider the orders passed under date the 1st instant, nominating Mr. Kelsall, on the part of this Government, to settle the boundary disputes between the frontier villages of the Bellary District and of the Chittledroog District in the Mysore territory, nor does he deem it desirable to withdraw Mr. Foster from his own important charge as Sub-Collector of the Bellary District.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Bellary.
,, Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Revenue 1868. Octr.
Pro: of Govt for September
No. 2878.

Proceedings of the
Govt. Political
Dept.

Dated 31st. augt.
Received 5th. Septr. /68

No. 195

Informing the Collr.
of Bellary that the orders
passed nominating Mr.
Kelsall to settle boundary
disputes between adjg. dists.
= trists will not be re-con-
=sidered.

With Order
No 2360. 11 Septr

No. 2360.

Comm.r to the
Revenue Board.

11th. Septr. /68.

5 Copies to the Bd of Revenue Mro. Pd 2 1/2 Sept. 11.