Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 27th January 1873.

Read the following papers :—

No. 206. From the Officiating Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Moodgherri, 11th December 1871, No. 4,510-20.

A DISPUTE, which it is desirable to settle, has lately arisen as to the proper boundary line between Canara and Mysore on the Manjerabad frontier, and as it involves the right of this Government to grant a puttah which has been issued to a European Planter for certain lands on the slopes of the Bhoond Ghaut which have hitherto been considered to be well within Mysore limits, I have the honour, by direction of the Chief Commissioner, to solicit that he may, with sanction of His Excellency the Governor in Council, be favoured with the perusal, or be furnished with copies of any orders defining the boundaries of the "Bullum," now Munjerabad, District, at the time of its incorporation with Mysore in, it is believed, the year 1799.

No. 207. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th August 1872, No. 1,559.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 14th May 1872, No. 775.

Read also the following letters :—

From H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Collector of South Canara, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Mangalore, 31st May 1872, No. 630.

WITH reference to the marginally noted Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, I have the honour to submit, for their information, copies of two letters* received from my Head Assistant, Mr. Sturrock, regarding the boundary dispute therein alluded to.

Dated 19th March 1872, No. 469, paragraph 4.
,, 14th May 1872, No. 775.

* Dated 15th April 1872, No. 91.
,, 24th May 1872, No. 111.

2. He has inspected the disputed localities once in October last in conjunction with Lieutenant Mackenzie, the Deputy Superintendent of Hassan, and again in company with Mr. Webster in January 1872, but has been able to come to no conclusion, as there seems to be nothing reliable to go on.

3. If the Minute by the Marquis of Wellesley, alluded to in the 10th paragraph of his second letter, is forthcoming it may be conclusive.

4. A reference to "A Collection of Treaties, Engagements, and Sanads," Vol. V., throws no light on the subject beyond the probability that the boundary details which are not in this Collection may be discoverable along with the original treaties in the Government Record-rooms.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. STURROCK, Esq., Head Assistant Collector, to the Collector of South Canara, dated Mangalore, 15th April 1872, No. 91.

IN reply to your letter, No. 437 of the 11th April 1872, I have the honour to state that I do not require the papers in question, as they are connected with boundary disputes between certain villages of the taluqs of North Canara above the ghauts and Mysore, and therefore can in no way help us in the present dispute.

2. The chief difficulty I experienced in coming to a settlement with Mr. Mackenzie arose from the fact that neither of us had been able to discover a single reliable record to lead us to believe that any boundary had ever been fixed. A boundary line is shown in the Ordnance map, and both Mr. Mackenzie and myself (as well as Mr. Webster, who subsequently saw the land with me from the Charmady ghaut) are satisfied that the piece of cardamom jungle in dispute lies on the Mysore side of this line, but I do not think it would be advisable to accept the Ordnance map as conclusive evidence in the matter.

3. Mr. Webster was making inquiries with reference to the existence in the Government office of papers bearing on the question, and I think it must have been to this that he referred when he said he was awaiting the receipt of papers from Madras, the marginal reference having been put in by mistake in the office.

This is not a mistake of this office. The correct reference was quoted in the margin of paragraph 1 5of Mr. Webster's letter to the Board, dated 28th February 1872, No. 247.
(Signed) H. S. THOMAS,
Collector.

From the same Officer, dated Karkal, 24th May 1872, No. 111.

With reference to Mr. Webster's letter of the 26th August 1871, No. 1,199, I have the honour to report, for your information, that I inspected the spot in dispute along with Lieutenant Mackenzie, Assistant Superintendent of Hassan, on the 10th October 1871, and three following days, and again in January 1872 in company with Mr. Webster. I had a view of the ground from the Charmady ghaut road, a short distance above the post marking the boundary between Mysore and Canara.

2. The map forwarded with Mr. Webster's letter under reply is not satisfactory, and I prefer referring to the Ordnance map as giving on the whole a more correct idea of the locality, although, as you will observe, the country immediately adjoining the boundary on the Mysore side is left blank as unsurveyed.

3. The disputed jungle lies to the Mysore side of a small stream not shown in the map, which joins the stream running nearly parallel to the Charmady ghaut close to the line shown as forming the boundary between the two countries. This stream I marked roughly in pencil in your office map some time ago.

4. On my arrival at the spot in October last I learned from Lieutenant Mackenzie that the Mysore villagers had come armed with very ancient village accounts to show that not only the jungle in question but the whole of the five extensive villages, known here as the Neriya cardamom jungles, had from time immemorial been attached to Mysore villages ; and I have since heard incidentally that an old Taluq map has been discovered, carrying the Mysore boundary well into what we generally believe to be Canara. Of course I at once intimated that I would confine my inquiries to the jungle to which my instructions referred, but I think it necessary to mention the above as an instance of the very unsatisfactory state in which the whole boundary question now is.

5. As neither Mr. Mackenzie nor myself had been empowered to lay down a new line of boundary our inquiries were merely directed to finding out what had hitherto been the recognized line of boundary in that neighbourhood.

6. The documentary evidence produced was valueless, and in fact I did not examine the Mysore documents (except Mr. Rolland's putta, which being of recent date proved nothing) as they admittedly opened up an infinitely wider question.

7. The only two relevant documents produced on the Canara side were two rough Survey lists, purporting to have been executed in 1822 and 1860, respectively. The former was challenged as unauthenticated, and the latter was of no value as it had been prepared by Canara village officers without any reference to the Mysore authorities.

8. Though admitting that the Survey list of 1822 was of no use, unless its authenticity were proved, we thought it as well to examine it, as it was alleged that the original would be found in the Taluq records ; but the only result of the examination of the document was that I was convinced of the utter hopelessness of getting any reliable information from the villagers. Every point shown by the Canara people as one named in the list was challenged by the Mysore villagers, who pointed to some other spot much farther into Canara. The Canarese Mooktesars evidently knew nothing of the locality except the cardamom-producing tracts, and apparently confined themselves to pointing out such imaginary boundaries as would include all these tracts in Canara ; and in my opinion the points shown by the Mysore villagers were equally inconsistent with the wording of the Survey list. It is, however, unnecessary to discuss the point further, as no trace of the original document has been found in the records of the district. I did not consider it any use attempting to record oral evidence as to the possession of the jungle. Mr. Rolland in his letter to Mr. Webster, dated 4th July 1871, stated that the Neriya Hebbarti had been picking the cardamoms for some years, and it is probable that Mr. Rolland got his information from the Mysore villagers at a time when they had no object to tell anything but the truth. When I was on the spot, however, they were all prepared to swear that the cardamoms not only of this but many other jungles had been regularly gathered by them, and the Canara villagers were equally prepared to depose to the contrary. The records of this district show that the Neriya family have been constantly complaining of the depredations of the Mysore villagers so that it is probable that each party could, with a certain amount of truth, declare that they had something to do with the cardamoms in question.

9. If the Ordnance map boundary line is to be accepted the jungle is undoubtedly almost entirely within the Mysore country, and to prevent disputes in future the little stream which I have mar ed in pencil ought to be declared to be the boundary in that neighbourhood, but before doing so I think it ought to be ascertained whether or not any boundary was specified by treaty when Mysore was given over to the family of the present Rajah.

10. I heard when in Madras that in a Minute written, I think, by the Marquis of Wellesley it was laid down that the heads of all the ghauts should remain in the hands of the British, and on my mentioning this to Mr. Webster he agreed with me that a copy of the Minute should be obtained before the present dispute was settled. I believe, however, that he had not succeeded in obtaining one previous to his departure from the district.

(True Copies.)
(Signed) H. S. THOMAS,
Collector.

From H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Collector of South Canara, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Mangalore, 24th June 1872, No. 751.

As the Board of Revenue are apparently under the impression that the boundary dispute referred to in Mr. Sturrock's letter of the 8th April last, embodied in their Proceedings of the 14th May 1872, No. 775, is the same as that connected with the cardamom jungles in the Uppinangady Taluq, which has formed the subject of the marginally noted correspondence, I have the honour to state that the two disputes are distinct from each other, and that the former relates to several tracts of land adjoining certain villages included in the Hannar Mogany (of the Kundapur Taluq) of this district, which is somewhat detached and situated above the ghauts.

Board's Proceedings, dated 22nd September 1871, No. 4,071.
Do., dated 30th October 1871, No. 4,537.
Do., dated 19th March 1872, No. 469, paragraph 4.

2. I have now the honour to submit, for the Board's information, copy of a letter* addressed to me by my Head Assistant, Mr. Sturrock, (in the Kundapur Taluq, of whose division the above disputes have occurred), and of the further

* Dated 6th June 1872, No. 121.

correspondence which has passed between himself and Lieutenant Lawrence of the Mysore Survey, ending with Mr. Sturrock's letter of the 5th June 1872, No. 120.

3. These boundary questions are identical with those mentioned in Mr. Sturrock's letter to the Board of the 8th April last above adverted to, but it was not then stated by Captain Grant, the Superintendent of Mysore Revenue Survey, that the actual laying down of a boundary was contemplated, and the attendance of our village officers was merely sought for the preparation of a map of the land in dispute with a view to future settlement by duly constituted agents.

4. From the letters now forwarded to me by Mr. Sturrock it appears that the Mysore authorities actually desire a new boundary to be laid down. I have, therefore, the honour to request that I may be authorized to depute an officer from this district for the purpose of settling the boundary, with reference to the instructions contained in the Proceedings of Government, dated the 16th March 1872, No. 462, R. D.

5. As the lands in dispute are situated in the Head Assistant's Division it is most convenient that Mr. Sturrock himself should represent the interests of the Madras Government on this side, that is provided the question be confined to the localities now disputed; but if the Mysore authorities desire to extend the question to the whole boundary line between Mysore and South Canara a special officer on the behalf of the Madras Government will be necessary, for the Head Assistant's Division will suffer if he spends all his time for months on the ghauts.

6. In any case it is important that I should be supplied with the Minute of the Marquis of Wellesley mentioned in my letter, No. 630, dated 31st May 1872; for it would be a great pity that we should for want of proof be forced to part with any of the hill sides which are now much more valuable than they formerly were, for timber is a greater want than it was, and cardamom has a special value.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. STURROCK, Esq., Head Assistant Collector, to the Collector of South Canara, dated Mangalore, 6th June 1872, No. 121.

ADVERTING to my letter, No. 418, dated 8th April 1872, addressed to the Board while in charge of your office, I have the honour to forward, for your information, the enclosed correspondence which has taken place between Mr. Lawrence and myself in connection with the boundary disputes now existing between the inhabitants of certain Mysore villages and those of several of the villages of the Hannar Mogany of this district.

2. You will observe that Mr. Lawrence proposed that a new boundary line should be summarily laid down, but as the Superintendent of Revenue Survey spoke of Mr. Lawrence's inquiry as a mere preliminary proceeding I did not consider it necessary to propose to meet Mr. Lawrence at the spot, or to refer to you before replying to the effect that I had no authority to proceed in the matter.

3. Although I was within ten or twelve miles of Mr. Lawrence's camp for nearly a fortnight previous to the 3rd March, it was not until I had returned to Mangalore to take over charge of the district that I heard of the existence of the dispute in question, and since that time, owing to my absence on privilege leave and other causes, I have been unable to inspect the locality. I propose doing so, however, on my return to Kundapur after the monsoon, or at any earlier date you may think advisable, so that I may be able to give an opinion as to whether there is any objection to the adjustment proposed.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th January 1873.

4. In G. O., No. 462, dated 16th March 1872, it is laid down that such disputes should be settled by officers deputed from either State. If this means that the officer from Canara must be specially empowered by Government I would ask that orders may be obtained before I leave Mangalore, so that the matter may, if possible, be disposed of without a second visit to the locality being required. Mr. Lawrence speaks of the land in dispute as being of no great value.

5. I take this opportunity of pointing out that the boundary dispute alluded to in paragraph 4 of my letter to the Board of the 8th April 1872 is quite different from the one now referred to. I merely mentioned it with the view of showing how difficult it is to get satisfactory information from the villagers in such cases.

From Lieutenant J. B. LAWRENCE, Assistant Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey, to the Assistant Collector in charge of Kundapur Taluq, South Canara, dated Sagur, 28th March 1872, No. 26.

I HAVE the honour to forward for your inspection a Survey map,* representing 236 Acres of jungle land, the possession of which is at the present time disputed by the village of Bylegee, Kundapur Taluq, adjoining the eastern side of the disputed land, and the village of Mulloor, Sagur Taluq, adjoining on the western side.

Marked A. and appended.

2. Each side claims the whole of the land in dispute, which is comparatively of little value, being only waste jungle land which had hitherto apparently been regarded by both villages as their common property.

3. The small tract of land, however, situated about the centre of the disputed land, a quadrangle in shape and comprising $2\frac{1}{5}$ Acres, belongs to Mulloor, as it has long been cultivated by that village.

4. After long inquiries made by me, extending over many weeks, I am unable to discover the existence of any documentary evidence whatever on the side either of Bylegee or of Mulloor, as to which village has the better right to the possession of the disputed lands; both sides in fact, as I have already stated in paragraph 2, have hitherto evidently regarded the lands now disputed as their common property and possessions lying intermediately between them.

5. Such being the case there is clearly but one method of settling the dispute in question open to us, viz., the very simple and natural one of dividing the lands equally between the two villages.

6. With this view then I have the honour to propose two separate lines of boundary shown in red lines, A. B. C. and D. E. F. Either one of these divisions if adopted will be found to divide the land equally as nearly as possible, giving to each side 118 Acres.

7. D. E. F. is perhaps the simpler, and therefore the better boundary of the two, as the one the justice of which will be the more readily understood by the villagers.

8. I shall be thankful if you will be so good as to inform me which line of boundary meets with your approval, and the measurements shall be carried out and the boundary marks erected accordingly forthwith.

9. I shall take the liberty of making one or two further references to you regarding unimportant boundary disputes with the Kundapur Taluq in a few days.

From J. STURROCK, Esq., Head Assistant Collector of South Canara, to the Assistant Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey, dated Mangalore, 18th April 1872, No. 94.

WITH reference to your letter, No. 26, dated 28th March 1872, I regret to say that, unless specially empowered by Government, I have no authority to lay down any boundary line not previously defined.

From Lieutenant J. B. LAWRENCE, Assistant Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey to the Assistant Collector in charge of Kundapur Taluq, South Canara, dated Shemoga, 20th April 1872, No. 35.

I HAVE the honour to forward for your inspection a map, representing a boundary dispute between the village of Burwy, Sagur Taluq, Mysore State, and the villages of Hebgee, Oodchee, Guntgymuny and Poora; Kundapur Taluq, South Canara, and also a vernacular explanation of the said map; both marked E. and appended.

2. It will be seen that the disputed land consists almost entirely of rocky hills of little or no value, and of a small patch of jungle.

3. From the Canarese explanation it will be seen that there is no proof on either side.

4. I therefore beg to propose the equal division of the disputed lands, consisting of 116¾ Acres, between the two sides according to the red line shown in the map, giving to each side 58⅜ Acres.

5. Also I have the honour to submit the map of a further dispute between the village of Nadwad Mytewully, Sagur Taluq, and Rattyhully, Kundapur Taluq, South Canara, and vernacular explanation of the same; both marked F. and appended.

6. There being no proof on either side I beg to propose an equal division of the 16½ Acres comprising the disputed land, consisting of rocky hill, giving to each side 8¼ Acres according to the red line.

7. A line expressive of your concurrence will oblige.

From Lieutenant J. B. LAWRENCE, Assistant Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey, to the Head Assistant Collector of South Canara, dated Mysore, 29th May 1872, No. 40.

As my proposed decisions of boundary disputes between the Sagur Taluq and South Canara do not meet with your concurrence and approval I have the honour to solicit the favour of your being so good as to return to me the maps and Canarese explanations which I forwarded to you for your consideration, as they are called for by the Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey for his examination and consideration.

From J. STURROCK, Esq., Head Assistant Collector of South Canara, to the Assistant Superintendent of the Mysore Revenue Survey, dated Mangalore, 5th June 1872, No. 120.

As requested in your letter of the 29th May 1872, No. 40, I have the honour to return, herewith, the maps and Canarese documents forwarded with your letters of the 20th April 1872, No. 35.

2. In my letter of the 18th April, No. 94, I did not mean that it should be inferred that I disapproved of your suggestions regarding the disposal of the boundary question, but merely that I had no authority to decide the matter in the way proposed.

3. I would further add that as I have not inspected the locality I hardly feel myself competent even to offer an opini[illegible].

(True Copies.)

(Signed) H. S. THOMAS,
Collector.

IT is clear that th[illegible]e are several boundary disputes between the Kundapur Taluq of South Can[illegible], and Mysore which ought to be settled at once, and the Board resolve, wi[illegible] reference to G. O., dated 16th March 1872, No. 462, to request Government to ask the Chief Commissioner to depute an officer to meet Mr. Sturrock and settle the boundary.

2. If it is found that this special duty will prevent Mr. Sturrock from attending to his ordinary work or take him beyond the limits of his division, the Board will be prepared, on receiving a full report on the subject, to address Government with the view of obtaining such extra assistance as may be required in the district.

3. It appears that Mr. Sturrock has heard that "in a Minute written, he thinks, by the Marquis of Wellesley, it was laid down that the heads of all the ghauts should remain in the hands of the British," and Mr. Thomas believes it possible that there is some such document with the original treaties amongst the Government records. No trace of a specification of the boundary can be found in the Board's office, but a search in the Government office may be more successful.

No. 208. ORDER THEREON, 27th January 1873, No. 104.

Miscellaneous.

THE papers above recorded refer to disputes at different parts of the boundary line between Canara and Mysore, one being in connection with certain Cardamom jungles between the Upinangadi Taluq of Canara and the Manjerabad Taluq of the Hassan District, and the others between the Hannar Magany of the Kundapur Taluq and the district of Shimoga.

2. With reference to the former a letter has been received from the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, requesting to be furnished with copies of any orders defining the boundaries at the time of the incorporation of the "Bullum," now Manjerabad, District with Mysore. Copies of all papers bearing on the matter which can be traced in the Government records will now be forwarded to the Chief Commissioner as requested, but as it appears from the Collector's letter, embodied in the Board's Proceedings of the 22nd September 1871, No. 4,071, that Neriya Devakamma Hebbarti, a Canara ryot, has been in occupation of the disputed tract for some years, and is still in occupation (the crop being picked under supervision), it seems unnecessary for this Government to move further in the matter, unless requested to do so by the Mysore authorities. The Chief Commissioner will be informed that unless he intimates his intention of claiming the land as Mysore territory, the supervision now exercised over the gathering of the crop will be discontinued from the end of the present revenue year, and the tract treated in all respects as the property of this Government.

3. The disputes on the boundary line of the Kundapur Taluq appear to be of minor importance, and capable of easy adjustment, but as no complaints appear to have been received from the Canara villagers, the Government will await the action of the Chief Commissioner on the subject. The Assistant Superintendent of Mysore Revenue Survey probably exceeded his instructions in proposing that a line of boundary should be newly defined and boundary marks erected without reference to either Government.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th January 1873.

4. The Collector of South Canara will be furnished with a copy of the papers sent to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Collector of South Canara.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
27th January 1873.

No. 105.

No. 209.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER
OF MYSORE,

Miscellaneous.

SIR,—With reference to your letter of the 11th December 1871, No. 4,510, I am directed to transmit copies, as per memorandum accompanying, of all records in any way bearing on the subject which can be traced in this Office. Application was made to the Government of India for a fac-simile of the Map alluded to in the letter from Lord Clive to the address of the Earl of Mornington, dated 24th April 1800, but a reply has been received to the effect that it cannot be traced.

2. In connection with the dispute referred to in your letter under reply, the Collector of South Canara has reported that Neriya Devakamma Hebbarti, a Canara ryot, is now picking the crop on the disputed tract under supervision. I am directed to state that the supervision in question will be continued up to the end of the present revenue year, after which it will be withdrawn and the tract treated in all respects as the property of this Government, unless the Chief Commissioner intimates his intention of claiming it as Mysore territory.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Further Cr 782/73

General No 4510
Revenue 20

132

Mysore Chief Commissioners' Office.

From

The Offg. Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Fort Saint George. —

Dated Camp Moodgherri 11th December 1871.

Sir,

A dispute, which it is desirable to settle, has lately arisen as to the proper boundary line between Canara and Mysore on the Manjerabad frontier, and as it involves the right of this Government to grant a puttah which has been issued to a European Planter for certain lands on the slopes of the Bhoond Ghat, which have hitherto been considered to be well within Mysore limits, I have the honor, by direction of the Chief Commissioner, to solicit that he may, with sanction of His Excellency the Governor in Council, be favored with the perusal, or be furnished with copies of any

orders defining the boundaries of the "Bullum" now Mungirabad - District, at the time of its incorporation with Mysore in, it is believed, the year 1799. —

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

J. Buckle

Offg. Secretary. —

W.B.

Revenue.

From The Offg Secy to Chief Comr
To The Secy to Government
Revenue Department

Dated 11th
Despatched 16 } Fort St George. December
Received 16

Enclosures No.

General No. 14510 } 1871/72.
No 208

For reasons assigned solicits to be furnished with copies of any orders defining the boundaries of the "Bellum" now Munzerabad District passed in 1799.

~~S.R.Do 75 - 13 February~~
1872

S.O. No 104 - 27 Jany 173

1871 Oct. No. 4006.

Memorandum 172

With reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Sim's remarks on the concluding part of the 2? para of the accompanying Draft the Board's Vol. for September (87)1 is forwarded containing (at page 6964) Mr Webster's letter of the 21st August 1871 in para 4 of which it is stated that Veerija Devalamma Vellanti is in possession and that the crops will be picked under the superviision of the Company Chamberpet. - The matter

being thus on record
orders are requested
as to whether the draft
need be altered.

AL

Revenue Department

W-104-

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 27 Jany. 1873.

Read the following Pro-
-ceedings of the Board of Revr.

Requesting Govt. to ask Chief Commissioner of Mysore to depute an Officer to meet Mr Sturrock for settlement of Boundary disputes between Kundapur Taluq of South Canara District and Mysore territory

} H.C. 12 August 1872 No. 1559.

The papers above recorded refer to disputes at different parts of the boundary line between Canara and Mysore, one being in connection with certain cardamom jungles between the Alpinangadi Taluq of Canara and the Manjerabad Taluq of the Hassan District,

Memo
pr orders

Chittle Secretary

C. 8: Jany/73 R 23: Jany

and the others between
the Hannar Magany
of the Kundapur Talug
and the District of Shimoga.

2. With reference to the
former a letter has been
received from the Chief
Commissioner of Mysore
requesting to be furnished
with copies of any orders
defining the boundaries
at the time of the
incorporation of the
"Bullum" now Manjarabad
district with Mysore.
Copies of all papers
bearing on the matter
which can be traced
in the Government
records will now be
forwarded to the Chief
Commissioner as
requested, but as it
appears from the Collector's
letter

letter, embodied in the
Board's Proceedings of
the 22nd September 1871
No. 4071, that a ~~the Canara~~ a Canara Raiya ~~being~~ Swatcamya Hebbarti has
been in occupation
of the disputed tract
for some years and
is still in occupation
(the crop being picked
under supervision) it
seems unnecessary
for this Govt to move
further in the matter unless
requested to do so
by the Mysore Authorities.
The Chief Commissioner
will ~~however~~ be informed
that unless he intimates
his intention of claiming
the land as Mysore
territory, the supervision
now exercised over the
gathering of the crop will
be

Hebbarti means a kind of title.

owing to a quarrel between the Canara & Mysore people.

I do not see what
this is stated. I
would rather omit
the para. & in lieu
request early intimation of Chief Comr's
intentions.
I see no objection to stating a
fact within Mr Sherwood's knowledge

be discontinued from the end of the present Revenue and the tract treated in all respects as the property of this Government.

3. The disputes on the boundary line of the Kundapur Taluq appear to be of minor importance and capable of easy adjustment, but as no complaints appear to have been received from the Canara Villagers the Govt will await the action of the Chief Commissioner on the subject. The Assistant Superintendent of Mysore Revenue Survey probably exceeded his instructions in proposing that a line of boundary should be newly defined and

11 Board's Rev Dec 28 Jany 73
1 Coll of South Canara

and boundary marks erected without reference to either Government.

The Collector of South Canara will be furnished with a copy of the papers sent to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore

H.

29/11/72

Note.

The boundary in the neighbourhood of the Neriya Cardamom jungles is in a very unsatisfactory state and the absence of satisfactory data to go on would make it a very difficult one to settle if the question were opened along the whole line. The present disputed tract is in the possession of a Canara ryot Kowlwen and the Coffee planter who obtained it on lease from the Mysore Authorities has admitted

admitted that our
lessee had picked
the Cardamoms there
for some years prior
to the commencement
of the dispute. He
probably got his information
from the Mysore Villagers
before they had realised
that the land was being
claimed as Mysore
property. Now they are
ready to swear that
they have always picked
the cardamoms not
only in that jungle
but in many others
which we have always
considered to be
Canara property.

The papers of which
copies are now being sent
to the Chief Commissioners
merely go to show that
when
when the adjustment
of territory took place
at the end of the war
with Tippoo Sultan it
was clearly laid down
that the heads of all
the passes should re-
main in the hands
of the British. The tract
in question is below the
head of the Ghauts and
if the Madras Govt
merely stand on the
possession asserted by
the Collector. no record
to be found in this office
would tend to oust them.
Possibly the claim may
be dropped by the
Mysore Authorities but
at any rate, I submit,
the first proposal
for a settlement by
formally deputed Officers
should

should emanate from those claiming and not from those in possession

The disputes on the Kundapur boundary are of trifling importance and I proposed when in Canara that I should be authorized to settle them at once. This has led to the Board of Revenue's present recommendation with reference to the other dispute also, but a consideration of the difficulties of the Neriya Cardamom dispute leads me now to think that the first proposals in the Kundapur disputes also should come from

from the Mysore Authorities as the Canara Villagers have made no complaint.

H

Mors

R.C. to Hon: Mr. Sims 8th Jany R 23d Jany
C 30th Jany/72 R 4th Jany/73

[illegal] remainder from

G O

Boundary disputes
between Kurg Dept
Taluq of South Canara
Dist & Superintendency

3 Copies
Desp 28 Jany 1873

Revenue Department
27th Jany 1873.
33

To

No 105.

The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner
of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 11th December 1871 No 4510 I am directed to transmit copies, as per Memorandum Catalogue accompanying, of all records in any way bearing on the subject which can be traced in this Office. Application was made to the Govt of India for a fac-simile of the map alluded to in the letter from Lord Clive to the address of the Earl of

Mar

I. D.

W. R.

941

Mornington dated 24th April
1800 but a reply has been
received to the effect that
it cannot be traced.

2. In connection with
the dispute referred to in
your letter under reply
the Collector of South Ca-
nara has reported that
the Neriya Holbarti is
now picking the crops on the disputed tract
under Supervision. I am
directed to state that the
Supervision in question
will be continued up to the
end of the present Revenue
year after which it will
be withdrawn and the
tract

tract treated in all
respects as the property
of this Government unless the
Chief Commissioner intimates
his intention of claiming
it as Mysore
territory.

H
22-11-1

35½

25

R. C. to Hon: Jr. Sim. 8th Jany R 23d. Jany
C 26 Dec 72 Rm R 4th Jany 73.

Govt. of {1873} Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated January 27th.

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 27th January 1873, No. 104.

JANUARY.

No. 206—208.

Boundary between South Canara and Mysore.—Copies of papers bearing on the subject of the disputes in connection with it ordered to be forwarded to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.