

(1) Number of Pages..... 12/12
(2) Date of repair..... 8.6.66
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... [Signature]

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 163
B.P. No. _____

Press
Mis. _____

Dated

5. 2.

1874
196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

163

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th February 1874.*

No. 39. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th January 1874, Miscellaneous No. 356 :—

Read the following letter from H. E. SULLIVAN, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 18th December 1873, No. 521.

In forwarding copy of my Proceedings, dated 17th instant, in connection with the boundary-dispute between Velidiampett and four other villages in Cuddalore Taluq, I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to obtain sanction for writing off in the accounts the sum of Rs. 4,277-1-8 for reasons stated in the above Proceedings.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Collector of South Arcot, dated 17th December 1873, No. 1,498.

Read letter from the Assistant Collector Mr. Thomson, dated 27th September 1873, No. 289, and the Cuddalore Sheristadar's Arzi, No. 8, dated 20th May, and the Tahsildar's Arzi, No. 672, of 11th September last, and the enclosures thereto.

2. This is a long-standing boundary-dispute between five villages of the Cuddalore Taluq as detailed below :—

- (1.) Between Velidiampett and Vadakkumelur.
- (2.) „ „ and Perumattur.
- (3.) „ „ and Shorattur ; Marungur and Vadakkumelur.
- (4.) „ „ and Shorattur.
- (5.) „ „ Perumattur and Shorattur.

3. It appears that in 1835 the dispute was referred to arbitrators. Their award bears date 16th December 1835, but relates only to the three villages noted in the margin. This award has left undetermined the disputes between Velidiampett and Vadakkumelur and Marungur. It was indefinite as to the extent of land which should be added to the village of Perumattur, and which should be transferred therefrom. The award was, therefore, not carried into execution. It is observed that the original award is not forthcoming, but an unauthenticated copy thereof forms part of the record.

4. Several Tahsildars, Sheristadars, and other officials were subsequently deputed to investigate the matter, but no final report appears to have been made. Thus irrecoverable arrears for the ten past faslis due on lands charged in two different villages, but collected in one of them, have been allowed to stand in the public accounts. The late Taluq Sheristadar, Arunachella Iyer, was, therefore, specially deputed to measure the lands in dispute in conjunction with the village-officers of each of the disputant villages, and the Collector now proceeds to adjust the claims of each village as entered below. These adjustments are agreed to by the respective village-officers, and can, therefore, be carried into execution from the current fasli 1283, *vide* Statement No. 9.

The following extent of land, which is in dispute, should be added (*vide* Fieldwar Statements Nos. 2, 7, 16, and 36,) to the villages of—

Dispute No.	I.—Velidiampett	II.—	III.—Marungur	IV.—Velidiampett	V.—Shorattur	V.—Perumattur	Extent added.			Assessment.		
							CS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
	I.—Velidiampett	II.—	III.—Marungur	IV.—Velidiampett	V.—Shorattur	V.—Perumattur	21	14	2	61	9	9
		II.—Perumattur					72	14	3	205	2	1
							1	5	0	4	9	6
							201	5	1	221	3	7
							331	8	3	931	13	0
							0	8	3	0	13	2
							2	8	3			
Total							632	1	3	1,425	3	1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th February 1874.*

The following extent of land should be deducted (*vide* Fieldwar Statement Nos. 1, 2, and 6,) from the part cut of the villages of—

	CS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
Dispute No. III.—Velidiampett	45	15	1	144	4	4
„ „ IV.—Shorattur	46	4	2	93	7	4
„ „ III.— „	36	9	0	79	8	5
„ „ V.—Perumattur	0	8	3	1	14	8
„ „ III.—Shorattur	3	11	0	8	5	3
„ „ V.— „	2	8	3	5	12	0
Total...	135	9	1	338	4	0

5. The extent in dispute having thus been distributed over the several villages to which they properly belong according to the recent measurement and the mutual consent of the village-officers, it remains, finally, to adjust the amounts standing in the accounts as nominal arrears as they appear in Statement No. 10. The total amount of arrears outstanding on account of the

	RS.	A.	P.
Velidiampett	3,091	4	4
Shorattur	1,241	13	8
Marungur	58	13	3
Perumattur	24	10	1
Total...	4,416	9	4

boundary-dispute under notice is Rs. 4,416-9-4 as noted in the margin, of which the amount found to be recoverable is Rs. 139-7-8, leaving a balance of Rs. 4,277-1-8,† which is irrecoverable having been already collected and nominally charged in other villages, *vide* Statement marked A, and signed by the Taluq Sheristadar and Head Goomastah. This amount, as detailed below fasliwar will be struck off the accounts with the sanction of the Board of Revenue, who have been addressed on the subject.

	RS.	A.	P.
† Amount charged in two villages, but collected in one of them	2,962	3	6
Amount charged in two villages, but land relinquished in one of them and nominally charged in the other	1,314	14	2
Total	4,277	1	8

Fasli.	Velidiam- pett.	Shorattur.	Marungur.	Perumattur.	Total.
1273	3 11 8				3 11 8
1274	17 6 4				17 6 4
1275	90 15 7	134 5 3			225 4 10
1276	276 13 3	150 12 1			429 8 8
1277	184 13 0	158 8 11	1 5 10	1 15 4	345 6 2
1278	148 14 5	102 13 0	5 0 9	0 10 5	257 4 0
1279	540 11 2	155 9 10	17 12 11	0 7 10	714 1 11
1280	603 5 0	160 7 6	10 4 5		785 12 5
1281	540 14 9	181 14 0	12 2 8	11 11 6	740 4 1
1282	562 3 10	181 14 6	12 2 8	5 4 8	758 5 7
Total...	2,969 13 0	1,226 5 1	58 13 3	22 2 4	4,277 1 8

6. The enclosures to the Tahsildar's and the late Sheristadar's Arzis, referred to in paragraph 1 of these Proceedings, are herewith returned, and the Assistant Collector is requested to cause the Tahsildar to expedite the submission of his report on the other boundary-disputes, owing to non-settlement of which a sum of Rs. 256-7-2 appears in the accounts as arrears of revenue.

(Signed) H. E. SULLIVAN,
Acting Collector.

THE Board resolve to request Government to allow Rs. 4,277-1-8, shown to be outstanding in consequence of a boundary-dispute which has now been settled, to be written off the accounts.

2/163

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
5th February 1874.*

No. 40.

ORDER THEREON, 5th February 1874, No. 163.

Miscellaneous.

THE Collector here asks that the sum of Rs. 4,277-1-8 may be written off the accounts "for reasons stated" in the enclosure to his letter. This mode of application is opposed to the standing order regarding official correspondence, which directs that the covering letter shall give a clear explanation of the leading facts of the case. But the Collector here gives absolutely no information whatever, and the remark by the Board that the money must be written off "in consequence of a boundary-dispute having now been settled" does not go far enough either. Attention to the rule is the more imperative, because such enclosures as this are not brought on record.

2. Sanction is, however, given to the application, it appearing, from the enclosure, that for the past *ten* faslis the revenue payable on the lands included in the dispute has been charged in the demand against two different villages, although collected annually from one.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Obt. of 11874 *ST*ndras.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Ac, Ac, Ac

Dated February 5th.

Recd.

G. O., 5th February 1874, No. 163.

FEBRUARY

NO. 39-40.

Outstanding in Accounts of South Arcot District—Granting sanction to write off Rs. 4,277-1-8 being the amount — in consequence of the settlement of a boundary dispute between certain villages, with remarks.





3/53
Revenue Department.
Miscellaneous No. 356.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 20th January 1874

Read the following:-

No. 321.

From

H. E. Sullivan Esquire

Acting Collector of

South Arcot

J. Grose Esquire

Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

In forwarding copy of my
Proceedings dated 17th Instant in con-
-nection with the boundary dispute
between Velichampett and 4 other
villages in Cuddalore Taluk, I have
the honor to request that you will
be

be good enough to obtain sanction for
writing off in the accounts, the sum of
Rupees 4277-1-8 for reasons stated in
the above proceedings.

South Arcot
Collector's office
Cuddalore
18th December
1873

I have &c.
(Signed) H. E. Sullivan
M. Collector.

The Board resolve to request
Government to allow Rupees 4277-1-8
shown to be outstanding in conse-
quence of a boundary dispute which
has now been settled to be written
off the accounts.

True copy & Extracts

J. G. G. G.
Secretary.

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department.
Off. M. G. G. G.
with one original enclosure to be
returned

Revenue 1874 & 1875
No 193
Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 20th
Decr 21 } January 1874
Revenue 220
S.O. No 103 - 5th Feby '74.
Miscellaneous No 356.

Subject

Requesting Government
to a Memo No 4294-18 to be
issued off the accounts, the
amount being the same as the
standing in consequence of
a boundary dispute between
certain villages in South
Coast District.

Misc

No 163 Rev. Secy
5 Feb 74

Recd Progs Encl - Rev.
Misc. No 356 of 20-1-74.

The Secy here asks that the sum of
Rs 4277-1-8 may be withdrawn off the
accounts, "for reasons stated" in the
Enclosure to his letter, ~~being~~
~~the~~ ~~standing order~~ ~~of the~~ ~~revenue~~
~~of the~~ ~~revenue~~ ~~of the~~ ~~revenue~~ - This mode
of application is opposed to the standing
order regarding Official Correspondence,
which directs that the covering letter
shall give a clear explanation of
the leading facts of the case. But the
Colr here gives absolutely no informa-
tion whatever, and he remarks by the
Post that the money must be withdrawn off
"in consequence of a boundary dispute
"having now been settled" does not
go far enough either. Attention to the
Rule is the more imperative, because
such Enclosures as this are not brought
on record -

Public Secy
G.O. 21-5-59
No 801.

J.D.S.

14 to H. of Secy
6 - Secy of Secy 3 des. 6 Feb 74.

Consider whether the
application could arise
in this form of order where
Colr has not been directly
mentioned as Secy
Priority not
but in my opinion
it is in my opinion
L.S. 22/1-10

2. Sanction is, however, given to the
application, it appearing from the Enclosure
that for the past few years the revenue
payable on the lands included in the dispute
has been charged in the demand against two
different villages, although collected annually from one.

Sum Stuck off
he aced. S. road

Handwritten notes, possibly "Pine" and "Rice".