

(1) Number of Pages 58 + 1 Map
 (2) Date of repair 20-11-67
 (3) Initials of the Referencer 22.2.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1093.	Press
B.P. No.		Mis-
Dated	20. 7 - 1875 - 196	.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1093

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th July 1875.*

No. 218. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th June 1875, No. 1,809 :—

Read again Board's Proceedings dated 4th October 1873, No. 2,023, and 28th November 1873, No. 2,434 :—

Read also the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 7th June 1875, No. 884, Revenue Department :—

ABSTRACT.—*Boundary between Mysore and Coimbatore.*—Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Mysore Government regarding the —, and requesting the Board to call on the Collector of Coimbatore to report with reference to paragraph 3, as the Government cannot trace any intimation of the decision arrived at on the spot having been made.

From Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Collegal, 10th May 1875, No. 1,390-49.

WHEN I received the Proceedings of the Board, dated 12th April 1875, No. 901, I was not aware that any portion of the boundary of the Collegal Taluq bordering on Mysore was in dispute with the exception of the line running over the Balirangam hills. I have since learned, however, that the disputed boundaries referred to in Proceedings of 4th October 1873, No. 2,023, and 28th November idem still remain unadjusted, the Board having declined to ratify the decision reported by the Collector of Coimbatore in his letters quoted in the above Proceedings.

2. It appears that in July 1874 the Collector requested the Deputy Commissioner to permit no action to be taken until the final orders of the Madras Government were received; the Jaghiredar has meanwhile taken possession (and marked the line according to Mr. Wedderburn's settlement by digging a trench along it in the case of the Coontoor dispute); the Collegal ryots in some instances claim compensation for their putta lands handed over to Mysore; in others, have relinquished their Collegal puttass and taken out fresh ones from the Yellandoor Jaghiredar, and the Deputy Commissioner, in reply to the Collector, refers him to the Chief Commissioner's approval of the proposed settlement, and states that he has no power to reopen the question which was regarded as finally and amicably disposed of.

3. Although, under these circumstances, the Survey Department cannot now take up these cases, yet, as the Collector says that, if he had, at the time he wrote his memorandum, been in possession of information he has since obtained, it would have made a difference, I have deemed it proper when on the spot to visit the locality and collect what information I could by an examination of the fields and of the accounts of the Collegal villages concerned (for I have no authority to summon or question the inhabitants of villages in the Mysore territory); and, with a tolerably accurate sketch of the disputed line and of the ground on each side, to submit it to the Board as an aid to them in determining their recommendation to Government.

4. I have further the honor to report that in the meantime, in order to avoid delay, I have instructed Captain Cloete to make a survey of the disputed ground,

and, with the concurrence of the Deputy Commissioner, to demarcate the line provisionally with unmarked stones, which, on the settlement of the dispute, can either be removed and placed elsewhere or can be duly marked on the spot, in either case having served the purpose of the survey by enabling them to continue their work over the space in dispute.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.
MEMORANDUM.

THE land in dispute between the village of Teramballi in Collegal and Agara in the Yellandoor Jaghira of Mysore is situated in two numbers of the Teramballi Pymaish 182 and 183, containing respectively about Acres 5 and 24.

2. The village accounts show that one bullah* of land in No. 183 was formerly held on putta by a ryot of Teramballi named Mahanta Thevar.

*About four acres.

3. There are four boundary-stones pointed out by the Teramballi villagers, of which only two (one at each end of the disputed boundary) are, it is said, acknowledged by the Agara villagers.

4. The existence of the tank-bund probably prevents the Agara ryots from claiming land inside it, but it may here be noted that, while the Collegal villages bring in evidence a pymaish in which measurements are recorded, there exists on the Agara side (according to the statements of the British village officers and ryots) no record of measurements whatever, and that what on the Mysore side is termed a pymaish is in reality a loose inexact enumeration of limits. If the Teramballi pymaish is to be believed, the boundary of the village and of the fields 182 and 183 are coincident. If the boundary-stones are accepted as genuine, the boundary-line will run nearly in a straight line south-west from the second boundary-stone on the east side of No. 182 to that placed at the south-west corner of 183.

5. If the waste-water channel be declared the boundary, the whole of No. 182 and a little more than half of 183 will be assigned to Agara, and at the same time Agara will lose a small irrigated portion of this number at present cultivated by Agara ryots. As far as can be ascertained at present the line decided on by Mr. Wedderburn surrenders the whole of the numbers in dispute (182 and 183) with the exception of the small piece of the latter number under wet cultivation by Teramballi ryots.

327 to 339 inclusive.
341 to 346 "

6. Between Agara and Coontoor the numbers in dispute according to the pymaish accounts of the latter village are eighteen.

7. It appears that as far back as Fasli 1265 the Coontoor village authorities made representations of the encroachments on their lands by the Agara villagers, and a reply, dated 26th July 1856, No. 13, was received from the Collector ordering an investigation. The result of the investigation was submitted on 30th November A.D. 1857, and on it was issued takeed No. 97 of 15th December 1857, saying that the dispute would be settled at the coming jamabandi.

8. It is to be remarked, as far as can be ascertained without reference to the records of Agara, that no claim was set up by the Agara ryots to more than Nos. 332, 333, and 334 of the Coontoor pymaish until 1873, when the matter was inquired into by the Collector of Coimbatore and the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore. If this be the case, the alacrity displayed by the Yellandoor Jaghiredar in acquiescing in the decision arrived at and in marking out the line so decided by a trench is intelligible.

9. It will be observed that all three of these numbers lie on the Agara side of the channel numbered 331.

10. The claim of the Agara villagers to the land between this channel and the two lines marked AB and BC in the sketch is stated to rest on no account of measurements, nor can the tree itself be a land-mark as it is only ten or fifteen years old and no boundary-stone exists near it.

11. The three numbers originally in dispute containing about twenty-nine acres are now cultivated by Agara ryots, and since 1873 portions of Coontoor pymaish Nos. 331, 335, and 343 have in like manner been appropriated by Agara for cultivation.

332, 333, 334.

12. The three fields Nos. 344, 245, and 246 are cultivated by the same Coontoor ryots as formerly, but they now refuse to pay kist to Coontoor for them, and have obtained puttass from the Yellandoor Jaghiredar.

13. The recent claim advanced by the Agara villagers to the land east and south of the lines AB, BC, supported, it would appear, by no trustworthy evidence, nor by any existing boundary-stone, can hardly be considered worthy of serious consideration.

14. Their claim to the three fields originally in dispute is believed to be better founded.

332, 333, 334 of Coontoor Pymaish.

If the Coontoor pymaish and accounts are accepted, the boundary-line includes in that

village these three fields and all the land in dispute west of them.

15. If the boundary-stones are accepted as evidence, much the same result is arrived at.

16. If the new claim of the Agara villagers be ignored, and the inquiry confined to the original land in dispute, the concession of the three fields to Agara will leave No. 331 of the Coontoor pymaish the boundary between the two villages.

17. Looking at the map it will be seen that the Coontoor claims in both cases are supported by pymaish measurements and by a line of boundary-stones which corroborate them, while the new claim of Agara in Coontoor is not so supported. The Agara original claim in Coontoor is, however, backed up by possession, and, although termed encroachment by the opposing villages, has undeniably existed for a considerable time.

18. There can be little doubt that Mr. Wedderburn is right in considering the channel to have been originally the boundary-line between Mysore and Collegal, and it is probable, or at any rate possible, that the line of boundary-stones at that time bordered the channel. That No. 331 of Coontoor pymaish represented the bed of the channel at one time is evident, and probably the change in the course of the channel was the cause of the three fields originally in dispute being taken possession of by Agara.

19. There does not appear at any time previous to 1873 that any land has been occupied by Agara in No. 331 or west of it.

COLLEGAL,
10th May 1875.

(Signed) C. C. SARGEANT, Captain,
Second Assistant Superintendent,
for Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Sketch.

From A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq.,
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 17th June 1875,
No. 183.

WITH reference to the Official Memorandum, No. 813, of 27th May 1875, requesting a reply to Revenue Board's Proceedings, No. 2,434, of 28th November 1873, regarding the boundary-dispute between Mysore territory and the Terampully and Coontoor villages of Collegal Taluq, as the Revenue Survey Department are now engaged in demarcation and have been furnished with all the correspondence on the subject, I have the honor to suggest that the matter might be left for their settlement.

THE boundary-disputes referred to in paragraph 3 of the letter from the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner recorded in the Government Order was first brought to the Board's notice by the Collector of Coimbatore in September 1873, and in the first Proceedings above read the Board, remarking that the nature of the dispute was unintelligible from Mr. Wedderburn's description and map and that the settlement which he proposed apparently surrendered to the Jaghiredar of Yellandur in Mysore all the land in dispute, remanded the matter for further inquiry, and called upon the Collector to explain why he took upon himself to propose a settlement for the approval of the Chief Commissioner before obtaining the assent of the Board and Government.

2. Mr. Wedderburn replied in the letter recorded in the Board's Proceedings dated 23th November 1873. He explained that, being on the spot, he drew up a memorandum about the dispute, copy of which he gave to the Deputy Commissioner, and he forwarded some fresh depositions which had been taken. The Board summed up in their Proceedings the information which was then placed before them; but the dispute and the settlement being still far from clear, they called for further report before addressing Government on the subject.

3. These Proceedings were not replied to till the 17th June 1875, when the Collector wrote suggesting that the disputes in question should be settled by the Revenue Survey Department. In the meantime the Superintendent of Revenue Survey had visited the place and forwarded to the Board an accurate map and a memorandum on the case. From these the matter becomes intelligible, and it clearly appears that the settlement proposed by Mr. Wedderburn and actually carried out cannot be accepted without further inquiry. These papers were on the point of being sent to the Collector when his last letter was received. They will now be submitted to Government.

4. The two disputed boundaries are immediately contiguous. The northernmost is between Agara (Mysore) and Taramballi (Coimbatore) and refers to two numbers 182 and 183, measuring 29.01 acres, of which 28.96 acres only are in Taramballi puttas. There are four old boundary-stones with which the British pynaish measurements very nearly coincide, three of which, as stated in Colonel Priestley's memorandum, run nearly south-west from the second stone near the tank-bund. What the Collector's settlement was is not apparent. His south-westerly line from a stone recognised by both villages must have proceeded from the first stone near the tank-bund, but in that case it would not, according to Colonel Priestley's map, "have secured the cultivation of the Agara village from dispute," nor "partitioned off" the land "as near as could be with regard to the interests of both parties." From the Tahsildar's arzi and the depositions it would seem that the line follows the course of the channel, but to what point does not appear, and the channel would not "divide the disputed land respecting all existing cultivation" as described in the Collector's memorandum. It was stated to Colonel Priestley that there is no record of measurement in the Agara village, while in Taramballi there is. As far as actual occupation goes, the line of the stream, if that be the boundary settled by Mr. Wedderburn, transfers some Mysore cultivation to the British village, but no British cultivation to Mysore.

5. It is otherwise, however, in the case of the other dispute between Coontoor and Agara. The fields here surrendered to Agara measure 65.36 acres, of which

36.33 acres are held on putta by Coontoor ryots, some of whom have now taken attas in Agara from the Yellandur Jaghiredar, and some claim compensation for the loss of their lands to that village. According to Colonel Priestley no claim was made up to 1873 to any of the numbers 332, 333, and 334, in extent about 29 acres, of which the Agara ryots have unquestionably had possession for a number of years. They claimed in addition a tract of land about equal to that surrendered to the north-west of the line settled by the Collector, but to this, as shown by Colonel Priestley, they had not the shadow of a claim, the tree claimed as a boundary-mark being only a few years old. The settlement of this dispute is most unduly favorable to the Mysore village, and explains the alacrity with which the Jaghiredar has proceeded to treat it as final and to mark the line by a trench. The boundary-stones of which the existence is denied in the memorandum, but which are marked in Colonel Priestley's map, confirm remarkably the Coontoor pynaish. The old channel bed (No. 331 registered in the pynaish as *Vaikal Poramboke*) must have been originally the limit of the Agara cultivation.

6. As the Board have before remarked, Mr. Wedderburn had no authority to agree to a settlement of the disputes, and he ought to have taken care that his exact position in the matter was known to the Mysore authorities. It appears that he did not till July 1874 inform them that the settlement had not been approved of. His unauthorized proceedings, however, cannot bind the Government, and the Board recommend that the Chief Commissioner be informed that the settlement proposed by him cannot be accepted, and they suggest that arrangements be made for another meeting between an officer of the Mysore Commission and the Collector of Coimbatore, or an officer of the Survey Department, in view to a more complete investigation and final settlement of the matter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 219.

ORDER THEREON, 20th July 1875, No. 1,093.

Miscellaneous.

The Government are prepared to recommend to the Chief Commissioner the adoption of the Board's proposal for a new Commission to settle the dispute.

2. Before addressing the Mysore Government, however, they desire that the Board will, after communication with Colonel Priestley, name an officer to act on this side.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. MACGREGOR,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

No. 1,809.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th June 1875.

Read again Board's Proceedings dated 4th October 1873, No. 2,023, and 28th

November 1873, No. 2,434:—

Read also the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 7th June 1875, No. 884, Revenue Department:—

ABSTRACT.—*Boundary between Mysore and Coimbatore.*—Communicating to the Board of Revenue letter from the Mysore Government regarding the —, and requesting the Board to call on the Collector of Coimbatore to report with reference to paragraph 3, as the Government cannot trace any intimation of the decision arrived at on the spot having been made.

From Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Collegal, 10th May 1875, No. 1,390-49.

When I received the Proceedings of the Board, dated 12th April 1875, No. 901, I was not aware that any portion of the boundary of the Collegal Taluq bordering on Mysore was in dispute with the exception of the line running over the Balirangam hills. I have since learned, however, that the disputed boundaries referred to in Proceedings of 4th October 1873, No. 2,023, and 28th November idem still remain unadjusted, the Board having declined to ratify the decision reported by the Collector of Coimbatore in his letters quoted in the above Proceedings.

2. It appears that in July 1874 the Collector requested the Deputy Commissioner to permit no action to be taken until the final orders of the Madras Government were received; the Jaghiredar has meanwhile taken possession (and marked the line according to Mr. Wedderburn's settlement by digging a trench along it in the case of the Coontoor dispute); the Collegal ryots in some instances claim compensation for their putta lands handed over to Mysore; in others, have relinquished their Collegal puttass and taken out fresh ones from the Yellandoor Jaghiredar, and the Deputy Commissioner, in reply to the Collector, refers him to the Chief Commissioner's approval of the proposed settlement, and states that he has no power to reopen the question which was regarded as finally and amicably disposed of.

3. Although, under these circumstances, the Survey Department cannot now take up these cases, yet, as the Collector says that, if he had, at the time he wrote his memorandum, been in possession of information he has since obtained, it would have made a difference, I have deemed it proper when on the spot to visit the locality and collect what information I could by an examination of the fields and of the accounts of the Collegal villages concerned (for I have no authority to summon or question the inhabitants of villages in the Mysore territory); and, with a tolerably accurate sketch of the disputed line and of the ground on each side, to submit it to the Board as an aid to them in determining their recommendation to Government.

4. I have further the honor to report that in the meantime, in order to avoid delay, I have instructed Captain Cloete to make a survey of the disputed ground,

No. 18092
1875
1093

GOVT. OF 1875

REVENUE

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Dated July, 20th

JULY
No. 218-219

Boundary dispute between Mysore and Coimbatore. With reference to Board's proposal for a new Commission to settle the —, requesting them, after communication with Colonel Priestley, to assign an officer to act on this site.



and, with the concurrence of the Deputy Commissioner, to demarcate the line provisionally with unmarked stones, which, on the settlement of the dispute, can either be removed and placed elsewhere or can be duly marked on the spot, in either case having served the purpose of the survey by enabling them to continue their work over the space in dispute.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.
MEMORANDUM.

THE land in dispute between the village of Teramballi in Collegal and Agara in the Yellandoor Jaghire of Mysore is situated in two numbers of the Teramballi Pymaish 182 and 183, containing respectively about Acres 5 and 24.

2. The village accounts show that one bullah* of land in No. 183 was formerly held on putta by a ryot of Teramballi named Mahanta Thevar.

*About four acres.

3. There are four boundary-stones pointed out by the Teramballi villagers, of which only two (one at each end of the disputed boundary) are, it is said, acknowledged by the Agara villagers.

4. The existence of the tank-bund probably prevents the Agara ryots from claiming land inside it, but it may here be noted that, while the Collegal villages bring in evidence a pymaish in which measurements are recorded, there exists on the Agara side (according to the statements of the British village officers and ryots) no record of measurements whatever, and that what on the Mysore side is termed a pymaish is in reality a loose inexact enumeration of limits. If the Teramballi pymaish is to be believed, the boundary of the village and of the fields 182 and 183 are coincident. If the boundary-stones are accepted as genuine, the boundary-line will run nearly in a straight line south-west from the second boundary-stone on the east side of No. 182 to that placed at the south-west corner of 183.

5. If the waste-water channel be declared the boundary, the whole of No. 182 and a little more than half of 183 will be assigned to Agara, and at the same time Agara will lose a small irrigated portion of this number at present cultivated by Agara ryots. As far as can be ascertained at present the line decided on by Mr. Wedderburn surrenders the whole of the numbers in dispute (182 and 183) with the exception of the small piece of the latter number under wet cultivation by Teramballi ryots.

327 to 332 inclusive.
341 to 346 ..

6. Between Agara and Coontoor the numbers in dispute according to the pymaish accounts of the latter village are eighteen.

7. It appears that as far back as Fasli 1265 the Coontoor village authorities made representations of the encroachments on their lands by the Agara villagers, and a reply, dated 26th July 1856, No. 13, was received from the Collector ordering an investigation. The result of the investigation was submitted on 30th November A.D. 1857, and on it was issued takeed No. 97 of 15th December 1857, saying that the dispute would be settled at the coming jamabandi.

8. It is to be remarked, as far as can be ascertained without reference to the records of Agara, that no claim was set up by the Agara ryots to more than Nos. 332, 333, and 334 of the Coontoor pymaish until 1873, when the matter was inquired into by the Collector of Coimbatore and the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore. If this be the case, the alacrity displayed by the Yellandoor Jaghiredar in acquiescing in the decision arrived at and in marking out the line so decided by a trench is intelligible.

9. It will be observed that all three of these numbers lie on the Agara side of the channel numbered 331.

10. The claim of the Agara villagers to the land between this channel and the two lines marked AB and BC in the sketch is stated to rest on no account of measurements, nor can

the tree itself be a land-mark as it is only ten or fifteen years old and no boundary-stone exists near it.

11. The three numbers originally in dispute containing about twenty-nine acres are now cultivated by Agara ryots, and since 1873 portions of Coontoor pymaish Nos. 331, 335, and 343 have in like manner been appropriated by Agara for cultivation.

12. The three fields Nos. 344, 345, and 346 are cultivated by the same Coontoor ryots as formerly, but they now refuse to pay kist to Coontoor for them, and have obtained puttass from the Yellandoor Jaghiredar.

13. The recent claim advanced by the Agara villagers to the land east and south of the lines AB, BC, supported, it would appear, by no trustworthy evidence, nor by any existing boundary-stone, can hardly be considered worthy of serious consideration.

14. Their claim to the three fields originally in dispute is believed to be better founded.

332, 333, 334 of Coontoor Pymaish.

If the Coontoor pymaish and accounts are accepted, the boundary-line includes in that

village these three fields and all the land in dispute west of them.

15. If the boundary-stones are accepted as evidence, much the same result is arrived at.

16. If the new claim of the Agara villagers be ignored, and the inquiry confined to the original land in dispute, the concession of the three fields to Agara will leave No. 331 of the Coontoor pymaish the boundary between the two villages.

17. Looking at the map it will be seen that the Coontoor claims in both cases are supported by pymaish measurements and by a line of boundary-stones which corroborate them, while the new claim of Agara in Coontoor is not so supported. The Agara original claim in Coontoor is, however, backed up by possession, and, although termed encroachment by the opposing villages, has undeniably existed for a considerable time.

18. There can be little doubt that Mr. Wedderburn is right in considering the channel to have been originally the boundary-line between Mysore and Collegal, and it is probable, or at any rate possible, that the line of boundary-stones at that time bordered the channel. That No. 331 of Coontoor pymaish represented the bed of the channel at one time is evident, and probably the change in the course of the channel was the cause of the three fields originally in dispute being taken possession of by Agara.

19. There does not appear at any time previous to 1873 that any land has been occupied by Agara in No. 331 or west of it.

COLLEGAL,
10th May 1875.

(Signed) C. C. SARGEAUNT, Captain,
Second Assistant Superintendent,
for Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Sketch.

From A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq.,
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 17th June 1875,
No. 183.

With reference to the Official Memorandum, No. 813, of 27th May 1875, requesting a reply to Revenue Board's Proceedings, No. 2,434, of 28th November 1873, regarding the boundary-dispute between Mysore territory and the Terampully and Coontoor villages of Collegal Taluq, as the Revenue Survey Department are now engaged in demarcation and have been furnished with all the correspondence on the subject, I have the honor to suggest that the matter might be left for their settlement.

THE boundary-disputes referred to in paragraph 3 of the letter from the Secretary to the Chief Commissioner recorded in the Government Order was first brought to the Board's notice by the Collector of Coimbatore in September 1873, and in the first Proceedings above read the Board, remarking that the nature of the dispute was unintelligible from Mr. Wedderburn's description and map and that the settlement which he proposed apparently surrendered to the Jaghiredar of Yellandur in Mysore all the land in dispute, remanded the matter for further inquiry, and called upon the Collector to explain why he took upon himself to propose a settlement for the approval of the Chief Commissioner before obtaining the assent of the Board and Government.

2. Mr. Wedderburn replied in the letter recorded in the Board's Proceedings dated 28th November 1873. He explained that, being on the spot, he drew up a memorandum about the dispute, copy of which he gave to the Deputy Commissioner, and he forwarded some fresh depositions which had been taken. The Board summed up in their Proceedings the information which were thus placed before them; but the dispute and the settlement being still far from clear, they called for further report before addressing Government on the subject.

3. These Proceedings were not replied to till the 17th June 1875, when the Collector wrote suggesting that the disputes in question should be settled by the Revenue Survey Department. In the meantime the Superintendent of Revenue Survey had visited the place and forwarded to the Board an accurate map and a memorandum on the case. From these the matter becomes intelligible, and it clearly appears that the settlement proposed by Mr. Wedderburn and actually carried out cannot be accepted without further inquiry. These papers were on the point of being sent to the Collector when his last letter was received. They will now be submitted to Government.

4. The two disputed boundaries are immediately contiguous. The northernmost is between Agara (Mysore) and Taramballi (Coimbatore) and refers to two numbers 182 and 183, measuring 29.01 acres, of which 28.96 acres only are in Taramballi puttass. There are four old boundary-stones with which the British pymaish measurements very nearly coincide, three of which, as stated in Colonel Priestley's memorandum, run nearly south-west from the second stone near the tank-bund. What the Collector's settlement was is not apparent. His south-westerly line from a stone recognised by both villages must have proceeded from the first stone near the tank-bund, but in that case it would not, according to Colonel Priestley's map, "have secured the cultivation of the Agara village from dispute," nor "partitioned off" the land "as near as could be with regard to the interests of both parties." From the Tahsildar's arzi and the depositions it would seem that the line follows the course of the channel, but to what point does not appear, and the channel would not "divide the disputed land respecting all existing cultivation" as described in the Collector's memorandum. It was stated to Colonel Priestley that there is no record of measurement in the Agara village, while in Taramballi there is. As far as actual occupation goes, the line of the stream, if that be the boundary settled by Mr. Wedderburn, transfers some Mysore cultivation to the British village, but no British cultivation to Mysore.

5. It is otherwise, however, in the case of the other dispute between Coontoor and Agara. The fields here surrendered to Agara measure 65.36 acres, of which 36.33 acres are held on putta by Coontoor ryots, some of whom have now taken puttass in Agara from the Yellandur Jaghiredar, and some claim compensation for the transfer of their lands to that village. According to Colonel Priestley no claim was made up to 1873 to any of this land except Nos. 332, 333, and 334, in extent about 29 acres, of which the Agara ryots have unquestionably had possession for a number of years. They claimed in addition a tract of land about equal to that surrendered to the north-west of the line settled by the Collector, but to this, as shown by Colonel Priestley, they had not the shadow of a claim, the tree claimed as a boundary-mark being only a few years old. The settlement of this dispute is most unduly favorable to the Mysore village, and explains the alacrity with which the Jaghiredar has proceeded to treat it as final and to mark the line by a trench. The boundary-stones of which the existence is denied in the memorandum, but which are marked in Colonel Priestley's map, confirm remarkably the Coontoor pymaish. The old channel bed (No. 331 registered in the pymaish as *Vaikal Poramboke*) must have been originally the limit of the Agara cultivation.

6. As the Board have before remarked, Mr. Wedderburn had no authority to agree to a settlement of the disputes, and he ought to have taken care that his exact position in the matter was known to the Mysore authorities. It appears that he did not till July 1874 inform them that the settlement had not been approved of. His unauthorized proceedings, however, cannot bind the Government, and the Board recommend that the Chief Commissioner be informed that the settlement proposed by him cannot be accepted, and they suggest that arrangements be made for another meeting between an officer of the Mysore Commission and the Collector of Coimbatore, or an officer of the Survey Department, in view to a more complete investigation and final settlement of the matter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with a sketch and copies of Board's Proceedings, dated
4th October 1873, No. 2,025, and 28th November 1873, No. 2,434.
Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore, with copy of G.O.,
dated 7th June 1875, No. 884.
„ to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, with copy of G.O.,
dated 7th June 1875, No. 884.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 4th October 1873.

Read the following letter from A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 18th September 1873, No. 207:—

THERE has been a long-standing disputed boundary between the Jaghiredar of Yellandoor and the authorities of the Coimbatore District in respect of a piece of waste land lying between the Agara village of Yellandoor and the Coontoor village of Collegal Taluq, which runs into the Mysore territory.

1. The question of boundary lately came into prominence in consequence of the Jaghiredar bringing to notice of the Mysore Government that some earth, forming an extension of the Tarempully tank in Collegal (not shown in the map), had been placed on what was considered disputed boundary.

2. Until the matter was duly settled I desired the range officer to stop work, and directed measurement to be made in communication with the Yellandoor authorities.

3. There was an absence of boundary-stones in regard to the disputed land, and measurements were made of the ayacut of the respective villages, from which it appeared that the boundaries overlapped to a very considerable degree.

4. I then requested the Deputy-Commissioner of Mysore to meet me, along with the Yellandoor Jaghiredar, and endeavour to arrange the matter.

5. The Tarempully tank receives the surplus water of the Agara tank, which, as well as the other irrigation-works to the south, is supplied by the Honally river, which takes its rise in the above ghaut, part of Sattimungalam Taluq, and runs nearly due south to the Cauvery.

6. As regards the probable original boundary, it was doubtless the waste channel of the Agara tank, which, flowing through soft and saline soil, had probably changed its course in time.

7. On the part of the British Government, the land in dispute, except for the small portion on which the extension of the Tarempully tank-bund was placed, was of little value, worthless for dry cultivation, but capable of irrigation under the Agara waste channel. It could not, therefore, be utilized by us. The agreement come to by Captain Hill and myself was to draw a straight line from the only boundary-stone on the north-east corner of the Tarempully bund,—a stone recognized by both districts, in a south-western direction, which secured the cultivation of the Agara village from dispute, and also obviated any question as to the site of the extended Tarempully bund-extension.

8. Further to the south-west a similar dispute existed, owing to which land capable of cultivation, and which by measurement was equally within the Agara and Coontoor village limits, remained uncultivated.

9. Most probably, in this case also, the variation of the Agara waste channel further up and an absence of boundary-stones were the cause of difficulty. On the western extremity of this disputed land an undisputed boundary-

1875.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH JUNE 1875, No. 1,809.

Encl.

Received

JUNE,
No. 1,809.

Boundary-dispute — between Yellandoor Jaghirdar in Mysore and certain villages in Coimbatore District.—Papers relating to the settlement of — made by Collector and letter from Superintendent of Revenue Survey on the subject submitted to Government with remarks. Opinion expressed that this settlement is not binding on Government, and that arrangements should be made for another meeting between officers of both Governments for a final settlement of the matter.

stone was found, and we agreed to draw a straight line from this to a well-defined mark at the bend of the channel, dividing as it were the disputed land. As regards this land, it is not of much value to Coontoor, being incapable of irrigation from its tank, which already waters as much land as it is capable of; indeed, its ayacut was circumscribed owing to defective water-supply; still the portion assigned to Collegal might bear dry crops, and it was advantageous to the extension of the Agara cultivation to have the boundary-line decided.

11. As the Revenue Survey would not reach this distant taluq probably for some years, and it was of importance to have the dispute settled at an early date, the memorandum drawn up by me was forwarded to the Mysore authorities, and has met with their concurrence. Copy whereof is enclosed. I have the honour to request the sanction of Government to this arrangement of the dispute.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department of Agriculture, Revenue, and Commerce, dated 25th June 1873.

From the Officiating Commissioner of the Ashtagram Division, to the Officiating Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, dated 16th June 1873, No. 148-30.

In forwarding herewith copy of letter, No. 176, dated 31st ultimo, from the Deputy-Commissioner, Mysore, together with its enclosure,* I

* Memo. drawn up by the Collector of Coimbatore.

have the honour to state that the arrangements proposed by the Collector of Coimbatore regarding settlement of the boundary-dispute between the villages of Coontoor in the Coimbatore District and Agara in the Yellandoor Jaghire are acquiesced in by both the Deputy-Commissioner and Yellandoor Jaghire who were present on the occasion of the inspection of the boundaries alluded to by the Collector of Coimbatore; and to request you will have the goodness to obtain the sanction of the Chief Commissioner to the same being carried out.

Copy of the Jaghiredar's docket, No. 41, dated 10th instant on the subject, is enclosed.

From the Officiating Deputy-Commissioner of the Mysore District, to the Officiating Commissioner of the Ashtagram Division, dated Agara, 31st May 1873, No. 176.

In forwarding copy of a memorandum drawn up by the Collector of Coimbatore on the boundary-dispute between the villagers of Coontoor in his district and the villagers of Agara in the Yellandoor Jaghire, I have the honour to inform you that the arrangement referred to appears a fair settlement of the dispute, and is concurred in by the Jaghiredar, Mr. Krishna Murti, who was present. The sanction of Government to its adoption is requested.

Memorandum on the boundary-disputes between Coontoor and Agara, dated Agara, 31st May 1873.

In repairing the bund of the Tarempully tank, which receives the waste or surplus water of the Agara tank, the Jaghiredar of Yellandoor complained that embankment-earth was being thrown upon land claimed by the Agara village; the work was thereupon stopped by the Collegal range officer, and village measurements made, from which it appeared that the Agara villagers claimed land up to a yard of this tank-bund; whereas the measurements of the Collegal village showed a boundary more than a hundred yards to the south, a considerable portion of which land had been occupied and cultivated by the Agara ryots. There is only one stone which lies on the north-west corner of the tank-bund at a long distance from the disputed land. There is little doubt that the original boundary, if any, was the surplus or waste channel of the Agara tank, and that as cultivation extended under this tank, it came nearer the Collegal boundary. The surplus channel even is not a permanent boundary; for there are indications of its having changed its course, running as it does through soft and saline soil.

To effect a settlement of the dispute at this point, it would be advisable to divide the disputed land, respecting all existing cultivation, the Deputy-Commissioner was struck by the petty nature of the claim made to a yard or two of land on which the Tarempully embankment was laid, and stated his intention to recommend the withdrawal of the opposition made by the Yellandoor authorities:

2. Another boundary-dispute, apparently arising also from the meanderings of this surplus channel, appears contiguous, and to the south, between the dry land of Coontoor and the alleged nunjah ayacut of Agara. In this case also, the accounts of both villages claimed the disputed land, which is consequently not cultivated. Here one stone as a boundary-mark alone is found at the southern extremity of the disputed land; the dispute runs N.E. by S.W. It was agreed to draw a straight line from this stone to a corner of the waste channel N.E., where there is a little bridge thrown over it by the Agara ryots, and to allow of cultivation of this tract a great deal on the N.W. On Coontoor side is salt-soil of little value for dry cultivation. The land might be irrigated by surplus water from the Agara tank, in which case whatever ryots cultivate with tank-water, would have to pay water-cess to Agara village.

From the Jaghiredar of Yellandoor, to the Officiating Commissioner of the Ashtagram Division, dated 10th June 1873, No. 41.

His docket, No. 183, of the 7th instant, regarding the boundary-dispute between Coontoor and Agara.

In reply, begs to state that the arrangement alluded to has his concurrence.

No. 1,562-19, Rev., dated BANGALORE, 25th June 1873.

ORDER THEREON.—As the complainant, the Jaghiredar, is satisfied, the Officiating Chief Commissioner assents to the arrangements proposed by the Collector of Coimbatore in his memorandum, dated 31st May 1873, for the settlement of the boundary-dispute between the village of Coontoor, in the Coimbatore District, and Agara in the Jaghire of Yellandoor in Mysore.

(Signed) H. W. WELLESLEY,
Officiating Secretary.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Survey Map.

The Board are quite unable to understand the particulars of the dispute from Mr. Wedderburn's description and map; nor is sufficient reason assigned for his settlement, which, as far as the Board can make out, surrenders to the Jaghiredar all the land in dispute.

2. The Board desire that Mr. Wedderburn will cause depositions in regard to this dispute to be taken from the village-officers and ryots of the two Coimbatore villages named in his letter, and that he will forward them for perusal of the Board as soon as possible, together with a clear account of the dispute and reasons for the decision adopted. Mr. Wedderburn will also explain why he took upon himself to propose a settlement for the approval of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore before obtaining the assent of the Board and Government.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

Exd. F. R. Bantlement.

9
1093

No. 2,434.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 28th November 1873.

Read the following letters:—

From A. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 1st November 1873, No. 258.

In reply to Proceedings, dated 4th October 1873, No. 2,023, requesting me to

1. Translation of an Arzee from the Collegal Tahsildar, No. 72, of 17th October 1873, and of depositions from the ryots, etc.
2. Lists of fields.

explain why I took upon myself to propose a settlement of a boundary-dispute for the approval of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, etc., I have the honour to state that, when on the spot, I wrote a memorandum on the situation and merits of the dispute, copy of which I gave to the Deputy-Commissioner for his information, and he countersigned and forwarded the same to his official superiors for their information. I had to get a map prepared by the range officer, which delayed my report to the Board for 3½ months.

2. It would have been very absurd if two officers met to settle a dispute and left without a memorandum on the subject; and a memorandum by one party without the information of, or agreed to by, the other would have been, in reference to settlement, simply waste paper.

3. I enclose the translations of an Arzee from the Tahsildar and depositions required taken from the ryots on our side.

4. The waste land in dispute in one part was divided; in another part, partitioned off as near as could be with regard to interests of both parties.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Translations of Arzee from Collegal Tahsildar and of depositions from ryots.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 and 3.—Lists of Fields

From the same officer, dated 12th November 1873, No. 264.

I HAVE the honour to inform the Board that the extent of fields in the two lists, which accompanied my letter, No. 258, of 1st November 1873, was given in bullabs. I enclose two revised lists showing the extent in acres.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2.—Revised Lists of Fields.

1873.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 4TH OCTOBER 1873, No. 2,023.

Encl.

Received

OCTOBER.
No. 2,023.

Boundary-dispute—between Jaghirdar of Vallabdur and authorities of Coimbatore District, in respect of waste land lying between a village of the Jaghirdar and another of Collegal Taluk.—Further information requested from Collector regarding. Collector to explain why he took upon himself to propose a settlement for approval of Chief Commissioner of Mysore before obtaining assent of Board and Government.

The Board must request the Collector to make the dispute and the proposed settlement of it intelligible before they address Government on the subject.

2. There appear to be two places in dispute:—

I.—A dispute between the English village of Coontoor and the Mysore village of Agara. The Agara villagers cultivated portions of fields claimed by the Coontoor villagers as Nos. 332, 333, and 334 of their paimash, and claimed other land also.

3. The proposed line runs from a Caroovala tree and a bridge to a demarcation stone near Yedamoolay. This gives the whole of the three fields already mentioned and thirteen others to Agara, so that the whole land in dispute and more would seem to be surrendered.

4. The surrendered land is said to be 65.36 acres, assessed at Rupees 78-2-8; but this is probably the amount of the land given up according to the paimash, and, as the measurement boundaries overlap, this gives no information. The overlapped space may be more or less than that surrendered, and it is probably that the whole of it was not in dispute. In paragraph 10 of his letter of the 18th September, the Collector said the new boundary line divides the disputed land. He will report how much of the *disputed land* goes to each side in the division.

5. This dispute seems to be the only one shown in the map, which places the boundary stone on the north-east of the disputed land. The Collector says in his letter that it is on the west of the land, and his memorandum that it is on the south. The Tahsildar and the villagers think it is south-west of the land. The Collector will explain this, and state what is meant by the line marked A, B, C, D, E, F, and etc., on the map.

II.—A dispute between the English village of Tarempully and the Mysore village of Agara:

6. The amount of the land in dispute is not stated, nor can it be ascertained whether the whole of it, except the yard or two wanted for an extension of the Tarempully tank-bund, or part only was assigned to Agara. According to the paimash, 28.89 acres, assessed at Rupees 25-13-2, were taken from Tarempully and given to Agara, but as the paimash boundaries overlap and the amount in dispute is not shown, this gives no information.

7. In his letter, the Collector states that the proposed new boundary is a straight line from a boundary-stone on the north-east corner of the Tarempully tank-bund in a south-western direction, so that it must apparently fall within the tank. The Tahsildar says the line runs along the side of a stream from a stone south of the Tarempully tank, and surrenders two fields claimed by Tarempully. The villagers say that "the land situated between a stone with a circular mark south of the tank-bund and the stream near the bund have been fixed on as the boundary line * * *. The settlement that the sides of the stream should be the boundary line, and that the southern bank of it should belong to Agara and the northern bank to Tarempully is a sound one." These accounts of the line seem to be a little inconsistent, and none of them corresponds with any part of the map. In the memorandum which has been submitted to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore no line is described. The map will be returned to the Collector, and he will be requested to explain these difficulties.

8. The Board think the Collector was judicious in seizing the opportunity of his visit to the neighbourhood to get the Mysore Deputy-Commissioner to come and examine the disputes with him, but he ought to have taken care that his exact position in the matter was known. It seems to have been misunderstood by the Chief Commissioner.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore, with Map returned.

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 1390
49

10/93
Revenue Survey Office
Camp. Calicut.
10th May 1895.

From
The Superintendent
Revenue Survey
To
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue.

Sir,
When I received the
Proceedings of the Board dated
12th April 1895 at 2.9.01, I was
not aware that any portion of the
boundary of the Calicut Taluk as
bordering on Mysore was in dispute,
with the exception of the line run-
ning over the Ballirungum
Hills. I have since learned however
that the disputed boundaries
referred to in Proceedings of 4th
October 1893 at 2.23 and 29th 1893
idem still remain undisputed
the Board having declined to ratify

1873.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 28TH NOVEMBER 1873, No. 2,434.

Encl.

No. 2604/75

Received

NOVEMBER.

No. 2,434.

Boundary Disputes—between Mysore Terri-
tory and Calicut Taluk of Coimbatore District
in respect of certain waste land.—Further
explanation requested from Collector regarding—

the decision reported by the collector of Coimbatore in his letter quoted in the above Proceedings.

2. It appears that in July 1874 the collector requested the Deputy Commissioner to permit no action to be taken until the final orders of the Madras Government were received, the Jaghirdar has meanwhile taken possession (and marked the line according to Mr. Wedderburn's settlement by digging a trench along it in the case of the Coontor dispute) the Collector says in some instances claims compensation for their puttah lands handed over to Mysore, in others have relinquished their Collegial puttahs and taken out fresh ones from the Yellandur Jaghiredar, and the

1/10/93
the Deputy Commissioner in reply to the Collector refers him to the Chief Commissioner's approval of the proposed settlement and states that he has no power to reopen the question which was regarded as finally and amicably disposed of.

3. Although under these circumstances the Survey Department cannot now take up these cases, yet as the Collector says that if he had at the time he wrote his memo been in possession of information he has since obtained it would have made a difference, I have deemed it proper when on the spot to visit the locality and collect what information I could by an examination of the fields and of the accounts

Counts of the Collegal villages
Concerned (for I have no authority
to summon or question the inha-
bitants of villages in the Mysore
territory) and with a tolerably
accurate sketch of the disputed
line and of the ground on each
side to submit it to the Board
as an aid to them in determin-
ing their recommendation to Govern-
ment.

4. I have further the honor to re-
port that in the meantime in order
to avoid delay, I have instruct-
ed Captain Floete to make a
survey of the disputed ground and
with the concurrence of the Deputy
Commissioners to demarcate the
line provisionally with unmarked
stones, which on the settlement
of the dispute can either be re-
moved

12/10/93
removed and placed elsewhere
or can be duly marked on the
spot, in either case having served
the purpose of the Survey by ena-
bling them to continue their work
over the space in dispute.

I have &c
Sgt. C. C. Sergeant Captain
2nd Ap^t Superintendent
for Superintendent Revenue
Survey.

Incurs.

The land in dispute between
the village of Terampalli in Colle-
gal and Chigara in the Yellam-
door Jaghira of Mysore is situated
in two numbers of the Terampalli
Pannash 182 & 183 containing re-
spectively about acres 5 & 24.

The village account shows
that one bullah of land in 183

about 4 acres.

was formerly held in puttali by a
myth of Teramballi named heah.
-anta Thivar.

There are four boundary stones
pointed out by the Teramballi vil-
-lagers, of which only two (one at each
end of the disputed boundary) are
it is said acknowledged by the
Agara villagers.

The existence of the tank bund
probably prevents the Agara myth
from claiming land inside it, but
it may here be noted that while
the Collegal villagers bring in evidence
a pyramish in which measurements
are recorded there exists on the
Agara side (according to the
statements of the British village
officers and myth) no record
of measurements whatever and
that

13/93
that what on the Mysore side is
termed a painwash is in reality
a loose inexact enumeration of
limits. If the Teramballi pai-
-wash is to be believed the
boundary of the village and of
the fields 182 & 183 are coincident.
If the boundary stones are accept-
-ed as genuine, the Boundary
line will run nearly in a straight
line S.W. from the second boundary
stone on the E. side of CV-182
to that placed at the S.W. or
Corner of 183.

If the waste water channel
be declared the Boundary the
whole of CV-182 and a little
more than half 183 will be assign-
-ed to Agara and at the same
time Agara will lose a small
it.

irrigated portion of this ^{14/93} ~~at~~ ^{present} cultivated by Agara
ryots. As far as can be ascer-
-tained at present the line divi-
-ded on by Mr. Wedderburn ser-
-vices the whole of the numbers
in dispute (182 & 183) with the ex-
-ception of the small piece of the
latter ~~at~~ under wet cultivation
by Temballi ryots.

Between Agara and
Lontor the ~~at~~ in dispute
according to the Paimash as-
-sents of the latter village, as 18.

It appears that as far back
as Faci 1265 the Lontor ^{village} ~~are~~
-thorities made representations of
the encroachments on their lands
by the Agara villagers, and
a reply dated 26th July 1860 ~~at~~ 13
was received from the Collector order-
-ing an investigation. The result
of

of the investigation was submitted
on 30th Nov. A.D. 1857 and
on it was issued Taked ~~at~~ 197
of 15th December 1857 saying that
the dispute would be settled at
the Coming Jamabundij

It is to be remarked as far
as can be ascertained without
reference to the records of Agara
that no claim was set up by the
Agara ryots to more than h^{rs} 332,
3 and 4 of the Lontor Paimash
until 1873 when the matter was
enquired into by the Collector of
Lombard and the Deputy Com-
-missioner of Mysore. If this be
the case the alacrity displayed
by the Yellandor Jaghirdar
in acquiescing in the decision ar-
-rived at and in marking out the

the line so decided by a trench
is intelligible.

It will be observed that
all 3 of these numbers lie on the
Agara side of the Channel,
numbered 331.

The claim of the Agara
villagers to the land between this
Channel and the two lines marked
A. B & B. C. in the Sketch, is
stated to rest on no account of
measurements nor can the line
itself be a land mark as it is only
10 or 15 years old and no Boundary
stone exists near it.

The 3 numbers originally in
dispute containing about 29 acres
are now cultivated by Agara ryots
and since 1843 portions of Coontor
Painash numbers. 331, 335 & 343 have
in like manner been appropriated
by

by Agara for cultivation.

The three fields No. 344, 5 & 6
are cultivated by the same Coontor
ryots as formerly, but they now re-
fuse to pay tribute to Coontor for
them and have obtained permission
from the Gellendor Jaghirdar.

The recent claim advanced
by the Agara villagers to the
land E and S of the lines A. B.
B. C. supported it would appear
by no trustworthy evidence, nor
by any existing boundary stone,
can hardly be considered worthy
of serious consideration.

Their claim to the 3 fields
originally in dispute is believed
to be better founded. If the Coontor
Painash and accounts are ac-
cepted the Boundary line includes
in

332, 3, 4 of
Coontor Painash

in that village these 3 fields
and all the land in dispute
west of them.

If the boundary stones are
accepted as evidence much the
same result is arrived at.

If the new claim of the Agara
villagers be ignored and
the enquiry confined to the original
land in dispute, the concession
of the 3 fields to Agara will
leave C 12 331 of the Coontoor
Painwash the Boundary between
the 2 villages.

Looking at the map it will
be seen that the Coontoor claims
in both cases are supported by
Painwash measurements and by
a line of Boundary stones which
corroborate them, while the new
claim of Agara in Coontoor is
not.

15/23
not so supported. The Agara
original claim in Coontoor is how-
ever backed up by possession
and although timely encroach-
ment by the opposing village
has undeniably existed for a
considerable time.

There can be little doubt
that Mr. Wedderburn is right
in considering the channel to
have been originally the Boundary
line between Mysore and Collegal
and it is probable at any rate
possible that the line of Bound-
ary stones at that time bordered
the channel. That C 12 331 of
Coontoor Painwash represented the
bed of the channel at one time is
evident and probably the change
in the course of the channel

was the cause of the 3 fields &
originally in dispute being taken
possession of by Agara.

There does not appear at
any time previous to 1873 that
any land has been occupied
by Agara in C 12 331 or W of it.

Sgt. C. C. Sargeant & Captain
2nd Assistant Superintendent
for Superintendent Revenue
Survey.

True Copy

W. H. Thomas

By Secretary

C. C. Sargeant

cc

18/93
Coimbatore Collector's
Office 17th June 1875

N^o 183

From A. Wedderburn Esq^r
Collector of Coimbatore

To H. C. Stokes Esq^r
Acting Secretary to the Board
of Revenue, Madras.

Sir,

With reference to the Official
Memorandum N^o 813 of 27th May 1875
requesting a reply to Revenue Board's
Proceedings N^o 2434 of 28th November
1873 regarding the boundary dispute
between Mysore territory, and the
Terampully and Coontoor Villages of
Collegal Taluk; as the Revenue Survey
Department are now engaged in demar-
cation, and have been furnished
with all the correspondence on the
subject

Enclosure in Original.

Copy of the Board of
Revenue to the same.

Copy to Government.

P. S. dated 30th June
1875

Rev 3
2604/75

Rev 607/75

Copy of letter from the
Superintendent Revenue
Survey to the Secretary
to the Board of Revenue
dated 10th May 1875 N^o 1390
49.

subject I have the honor to suggest that
the matter might be left for their
settlement.

I have &c
(Sig.) A. Wedderburn
Collector.

(True Copy)

H. H. H.
Acting Secretary

C. H. H.

C. H. H.

Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 30 June 1875. No 1502

Read again Board's Proceedings, 4th
October 1873, No 2023

Read again Board's Proceedings, 28th
November 1873, No 2434

Read also Proceedings of the Madras
Government, Revenue Department, dated 7th
June 1875, No 884, communicating to the Board
letter from the Mysore Government regarding
boundary between Mysore and Coimbatore
and requesting the Board to call on the
Collector of Coimbatore to report with refer-
ence to para 3, as the Government cannot
trace any intimation of the decision arrived
at on the spot having been made.

Read also letter from the Superin-
-tendent, Revenue Survey, dated 10 May
1875, No $\frac{1390}{149}$, submitting for orders a sketch
of

Enclosed in Pro-
ceedings of the Board of
Revenue to the Secretary
to Government (Revenue)
Department dated 30th
June 1875.

No $\frac{4}{2604}$ /25
Rev 601/25

Copy of Collector's letter
dated 17th June 1875
No 183.

of the disputed boundary of the Collegal
Taluk bordering on Mysore with a Memo.
of the results of his enquiry.

I read also letter from the Collector of
Coimbatore, dated 17 June 1875, No. 183, suggest-
ing that the boundary dispute between
Mysore territory and Coantoor villages of
Collegal Taluk might be left for the settle-
ment of the Revenue Survey Department.

The boundary disputes referred to in
para 3 of the letter from the Secretary
to the Chief Commissioner recorded
in the Government Order, was first
brought to the Board's notice by the
Collector of Coimbatore in September
1873, and in the first Proceedings above read,
the Board remarking that the nature of
the

the dispute was unintelligible from Mr.
Wedderburn's description and map, and that the
settlement which he proposed apparently
surrendered to the jaghiredar of Galthindoor in
Mysore all the land in dispute, remanded
the matter for further enquiry, and called upon
the collector to explain why he took upon
himself to propose a settlement for the
approval of the Chief Commissioner before
obtaining the assent of the Board and
Government.

2. Mr. Wedderburn replied in the
letter recorded in the Board's Proceedings
28 November 1873. He explained that
being on the spot he drew up a
memorandum about the dispute copy
of which he gave to the Deputy
Commissioner.

Commissioner, and he forwarded some fresh depositions which had been taken. The Board summed up in the proceedings the information which was then placed before them; but the dispute and the settlement being still far from clear, they called for further report before addressing Government on the subject.

3. These proceedings were ^{not} replied to till the 14th June 1875, when the Collector wrote suggesting that the disputes in question should be settled by the Revenue Survey Department. In the meantime the Superintendent Revenue Survey had visited the place, and forwarded to the Board an accurate map, and a Memorandum on the case. From these

22/1093
these, the matter becomes intelligible, and it clearly appears that the settlement proposed by Mr Wedderburn and actually carried out cannot be accepted without further enquiry. These papers were on the point of being sent to the Collector when his last letters were received. They will now be submitted to Government.

4. The two disputed boundaries are immediately contiguous. The northern most is between Agara (Mysore) and Laramballi (Coimbatore) and refers to two numbers 182, and 183, measuring 29.01 aers, of which 28.96 aers only are in Laramballi puttahs. There are four old boundary stones with which the British Pymaish measurement very

nearly coincide, three of which as stated
in Colonel Priestley's Memorandum run
nearly South West from the second stone
near the tank bund. What the Collector's
settlement was is not apparent. His South
Westerly line from a stone recognized
by both villages must have proceeded
from the first stone near the tank
bund, but in that case it would not,
according to Colonel Priestley's map,
have secured the cultivation of the
Agara village from dispute, nor
"partitioned off" the land "as near as
could be with regard to the interest of
both parties". From the Tahsildar's
Arazi and the depositions it would
seem

seem that the line follows the course of
the channel, but to what point does
not appear and the channel would not
"divide the disputed land respecting
all existing cultivation" as described in
the Collector's memorandum. It was stated
to Colonel Priestley that there is no record
of measurement in the Agara village,
while in Saramballi there is. As far
as actual occupation goes, the line of the
stream, if that be the boundary settled
by Mr. Wedderburn, transfers some
Mysore cultivation to the British village,
but no British cultivation to Mysore.
5. It is otherwise however in the
case of the other dispute between Cootoor
and

and Agara. The fields here surrendered to Agara measure 65.36 acres, of which acres 36.33 are hit on putta by Coontoor ryots, some of whom have run taken puttahs in the Agara from the Gellam-door Jaghiredar, and some claim compensation for the transfer of their lands to that village. According to Colonel Priestley no claim was made up to 1873, to any of this land except Nos 332, 333, and 334, in extent 29 acres, of which the Agara ryots have unquestionably had possession for a number of years. They claimed in addition a tract of land about equal to that surrendered, to the South West of the line settled by the Collector but to this as shown by Colonel Priestley they

I think the Board will find the Collector's Memo. P. 4, Oct 1873. 2023

Col. P. does not seem to understand the distance between the two lines. It is possible that the boundary line is not the same as the line shown on the map. The line shown on the map is the line of the Agara village or claim.

24/93
they had not the shadow of a claim, the tree claimed as a boundary mark being only a few years old. The settlement of this dispute is most unduly favorable to the Mysore village, and explains the clarity with which the Jaghiredar has proceeded to treat it as final, and to mark the line by a trench. The boundary stones of which the existence is denied in the memo. are hand-drawn, but which are marked in Colonel Priestley's map, confirm remarkably the Coontoor pymaish. The old channel bed (No 331) registered in the pymaish as Saithal Porumboke) must have been originally the limit of the Agara cultivation.

10. As the Board have before remarked Mr. Moserburn

Mr. Wedderburn had no authority to
agree to a settlement of the disputes and
he ought to have taken care that his exact
position in the matter was known to the
Mysore authorities. It appears that he
did not till July 1874 inform them that
the settlement had not been approved of.
His unauthorized proceedings however
cannot bind the Government; and the
Board recommend that the Chief
Commissioner be informed that the
settlement proposed by him cannot be
accepted; and they suggest that arrange-
ments be made for another meeting
between an Officer of the Mysore
Commission, and the collector of Coimbatore,

7/1893
or an officer of the Survey Department,
in view to a more complete investigation
and final settlement of the matter.

True Extract

J. H. M.

Ag Secretary

To The Secretary to Government, Revenue
Department with a sketch and
copies of Board's Proceedings dated 4 October
1873, No 2028 and 28 November 1873,
No 2434, & also copies of letters from
Superintendent Revenue Survey &
Collector of Coimbatore.

J. H. M.
Capt.

Rev 2.11

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 2604

From B^d of Rev.

Dated 30 June 1875.

FOR ORDERS.

I enclose the papers to
propose & recommend
adoption of Mr. Jackson
that a sub-committee
be appointed to settle the
dispute.

The J. D. W. is much
pained out that the J. D. W.
wrong in saying that Mr.
J. D. W. is wrong.
that would show
he is wrong in his opinion
that he is wrong.

I agree with the Hon.
Mr. Audleston in the
action proposed with
reference to this boundary
dispute. RM
J. D. W. 10/1

30 June 1875

Dec: 1195: 20/1/75

Proceedings of the

Board of Revenue

Dec: 20 June 1875

Dec: 30

Jan: 30

Feb: 30

Mar: 30

Apr: 30

May: 30

June: 30

July: 30

Aug: 30

Exclusively refers to them -
In the large then area
was from the line
A. B. & M. S. the
Ryann villages claimed
& near W. the map
shows town.

M. S. of J. L. had
the same town
from our
side. I act on the
Commission: I find
some for the Ryann
but none for the J. L.

Do not the Board
refer to Mr.
Wedderburn Memo
printed with them
Per 4 Oct 1873 -
in 2023 -

Alm

sent on this side
Alm

FOR ORDERS.

Resolved by dispute
between Holland
Jaghu in his own
+ certain villages
in Cambodia.

Per: H^d of Rev: No 1093
of 20 July 1875
14. 9. 30, June /75
Subj: with remarks, papers relating to
settlement of boundary dispute between Holland & Jaghu
in Mysore and certain villages in Cambodia. H^d, made by
C. W. S. expressing opinion that this settlement is not binding
on Jaghu.

Resolved an order
to the Chief Secy.
to recommend the
adoption of the
Board's proposal
for a new Commission
& settle the dispute.

Before addressing
the Mysore Jaghu
they desire & think
the Board will after
consultation with the
P. name an officer
sent on this side.
All

1 To the Board of Dec 30 July

6-2
Banning Inspect. but no sign
Humboldt

Despatch -
from minutes -

