M.

(1) Number of Pages 70.

(2) Date of repair 8-2-68.

(3) Initials of the Referencer 24.4.68.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	1506.	Press / Mis.
Dated	15-10-1875	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following :—

No. 118. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th August 1875, No. 2,259.

Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Kodakanal, 31st July 1875, No. 2,211-89 :—

I BEG to submit a letter* from the Deputy Superintendent of Survey in Coimbatore reporting the existence of some unimportant boundary disputes on the Collegal frontier, which, however, cannot be decided without the presence of a Mysore Revenue Officer with power to inquire into them, and to agree to a settlement conjointly with an officer to represent the Madras Government.

* Dated 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

2. Under these circumstances, I have the honor respectfully to recommend that the Madras Government should be represented either by Captain Cloete or his Assistant, who is on the spot (Mr. Baber), and that steps should be taken to secure the presence of a Mysore Assistant Commissioner at as early a date as possible.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Captain J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1, Revenue Survey, to Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent, Revenue Survey, dated Coimbatore, 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

I HAVE the honor to forward copy of Mr. E. M. Baber's report on the demarcation of a portion of the Mysore and Collegal boundary, together with illustrative sketches and abstract statements of the dispute cases with my opinion on some of them.

2. Five minor disputes have been amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties.

3. In eight other cases (excluding the old Agara dispute reported on by you) the opposing parties would not come to terms.

4. Those numbered II., III., V., and VI. are very trifling, and I think that in these cases the Mysore Government would agree to abide by the decision of the Assistant Superintendent on the spot.

5. The other four cases could, I am confident, be decided without difficulty, if the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore and the Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, myself or a Revenue Officer of this district were authorized by our respective Governments to act on their behalf.

6. It is clearly advisable that the Mysore boundary should be demarcated and surveyed once for all without delay.

7. I take this opportunity of requesting that, if you think advisable, information may be obtained from the Mysore administration as to the exact limits claimed where the Cauvery river is marked on the old maps as the boundary: as far as I have been able to ascertain, the centre of the river bed between the banks forms the boundary, and where the river divides, the island so formed and half the Mysore or Northern branch belongs to us.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. C. SARGEAUNT, Captain,
2nd Assistant Superintendent,
for Supt., Revenue Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Report upon the Demarcation of the Boundary Line between Collegal and Mysore Territory.

THE line operated upon leaves the river Cauvery at a point about two miles east of Malingi, latitude N. 12° 10′, longitude E. 77° 6′ 30″, and, after winding about in the plains for a distance of more than thirty-six miles, joins the range of the Billigirangams at a point one mile south of Arepalayam.

2. The Amildars of the three* adjacent taluqs of Mysore attended on behalf of that Government, the interests of the British Government being watched by the Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, and the local Revenue authorities.

*Talakadu, Shamrajnagger, and Yellandur.

3. Work was commenced at the junction of Talakadu, Shamrajnagger, and Collegal Taluqs. The Yellandur boundary was then taken up and completed as far as the western limit of the old Agara and Kuntur boundary dispute. The Talakadu line was then commenced, and finally the remainder of the Yellandur line from the eastern limit of the disputed boundary referred to was taken up and carried on till operations were brought to a standstill at a point two miles from the base of the hills by the discovery of what appears to be an important dispute.

4. The following is a brief report of those cases where a difference of opinion existed as to how the exact boundary ran, and which cases were all disposed of amicably, the line agreed upon being demarcated according to the settlements arrived at :—

Case I., marked K to L, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This was said to be a dispute of some six or seven years' standing. The Shanbogue of the Collegal village reported the matter to the local Revenue authorities, but it does not appear that any steps were taken to inquire into the case.

On the side of the Collegal villagers it was contended that the Mysore ryots had encroached upon and cultivated Bullahs 2-5-3 forming part of Pymash numbers 255 and 262 of Hosamalingi village. The Mysore ryots also showed accounts for the cultivation, and they pointed to an old boundary stone in support of their claim. As the land now under cultivation had never at any period paid assessment to the British Government, being entered in the village accounts as *waste*, and as it was shown that the Mysore ryots had occupied and cultivated the land for more than fifteen or twenty years, it was decided that the same should be included in the Mysore village. To the south of this cultivation was Bullahs 1-8-0 of waste forming part of No. 262 of Hosamalingi; and as the Mysore ryots could show no accounts for this bit of land, it was settled that the line should run to the west of this waste and include it in the Collegal village. The line was demarcated accordingly, and the agreement marked A was drawn up and signed by both parties and the authorities present.

Case II., marked M to N, in Shamrajnagger Taluq Sketch.—In this case there was a difference of opinion regarding a stream about 18 feet in breadth, and which ran along the boundary for the length of two fields. The accounts threw no light on the subject; and, as the cultivators on both sides laid claim to one-half of the stream, it was settled that the centre of the same should be considered the boundary, the stones for better security being placed on the Collegal side. The agreement marked B was accordingly executed and signed by all concerned.

Case III., marked O to P, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was a case similar to the last, and was settled by both parties agreeing to consider the centre of the stream as the common boundary. The stones here were also placed on the Collegal side, and the document marked C was executed and duly confirmed.

Case IV., marked Q to R, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was said to be a dispute of some four or five years' standing, and regarding which much correspondence had taken place between the Yellandur Amildar and successive Tahsildars of Collegal. The land in dispute measured 3 acres, and had been cultivated at irregular intervals during the past half dozen years by the Collegal ryots. The accounts on both sides threw no light on the point at issue, and when the contending parties had satisfied themselves of the weakness of their respective claims, they agreed to abide by the decision of an influential ryot of an adjacent village, and one who was well acquainted with the locality. The individual thus chosen marked out the boundary, and the written agreement marked D was drawn up and signed by both parties and ratified by the representatives of the two Governments.

Case V., marked S to T, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was another case in which a small stream was the bone of contention, and was disposed of in a manner similar to cases II. and III., the centre of the stream being considered the boundary. In this case however it was found necessary to fix the stones on the Mysore side of stream. The document marked E was then written out and attested by all concerned.

5. The following is a summary of the cases in which no settlement was arrived at, and regarding which orders will be required :—

Case I., marked A to B, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a dispute between the Inam village of Kaliyur in Mysore and Kuntur of Collegal, and comprises about 120 acres of waste land forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur Tank. The whole of the tract in controversy is entered in the Pymash accounts of Kuntur, and nine old numbers, aggregating acres 100, are registered as "waterspread" of Kaliyur Tank; the rest of the land is waste, never having been cultivated, and is liable to be submerged on occasions. The boundary claimed by the Kuntur ryots is shown by the blue line (*vide* Sketch No. 1), and is defined by two old boundary stones. These old marks are accepted by both sides; but the Kaliyur ryots point to two other old stones situated further south in the middle of cultivation belonging to Kuntur, and they argue that, as the tank itself belongs to their village and irrigates the lands of the same, the waterspread of the tank should by rights be handed over to them, and they claim according to the red line shown in Sketch 1.

6. With reference to the two last named stones, it is necessary to state that they have nothing to do with any line of boundary, for an old account produced by the Kaliyur ryots shows that these stones define the course of the channel which feeds the Kaliyur tank.

7. This channel has its source in the Honna Holai near Yellandur, and at intervals along its course are placed sets of similar stones, one stone being fixed on either bank.

8. The Collegal ryots do not dispute the fact of the land claimed by them forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur tank; for, as already stated, the same is registered as such in the accounts of their village. But they naturally object to the boundary claimed by the Kaliyur ryots on the ground that their old established right of grazing cattle will be infringed. On the other hand, it seems an anomalous state of things that the waterspread of the tank belonging to the people of one territory should be so situated as to be placed entirely out of their control.

9. One of the two settlements might be *arrived at in* this case without damaging the interests of either sides,—

First.—The boundary might be marked as claimed by the Collegal people, who should bind themselves not to interfere with the waterspread of the tank.

Secondly.—The waterspread might be handed over to Mysore, an agreement being written out to the effect that the Collegal ryots be allowed to use of the water, and free access to the land for the purpose of grazing their cattle.

Case II, marked C to D, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a dispute about a low rocky hill known as Kuntur Bettah (*vide* Sketch 2). This is entered in the accounts of Collegal village as Pymash No. 115, consisting of Bullahs 28-12-0. The accounts produced by the Mysore ryots show clearly that the hill belongs to Collegal, for the measurements of the Mysore villages are said to extend "*up to the hill.*" Five old boundary marks are shown by the Mysore ryots; three of these, marked A, B, and C, are admitted by the Collegal ryots, the remaining two being untrustworthy; for one of them is a mark on a piece of rock which shows signs of having been recently detached from a large rock situated high up the slope of the hill, the other is an old inscription which no one can make head or tail of.

10. The sketch will show that a part of the hill on the west projects beyond the direct line drawn from the old marks B and C. The red line is the boundary claimed by Mysore; the objection to it is that in some places it is an impassable line of boundary running as it does along the middle of the slope of the hill, the points in some places being invisible one from another. As the hill is entered in the accounts of Kuntur, and as the three old marks admitted by both parties are situated at the base of the hill, this should be included in the Collegal village, and, in order that the Mysore villagers may gain something, the Kuntur villagers should sign an agreement allowing the former the right to as much stone as they may require at any future time.

Case III., marked D to E, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a trifling dispute about acres 8 of waste land entered in the accounts of the Collegal village, and for which the Mysore villagers also produced records. It should be settled by dividing the tract in controversy equally between the two villages (*vide* Sketch 2).

Case IV., marked E to F, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is an old standing dispute, and is reported to have first come to light in 1859. Up to the year 1864 it formed the subject of much correspondence between the authorities on both sides, and appears then to have died a natural death.

11. The dispute arose in this way. Some ryots of Kuntur in Collegal durkhasted for some of the land in 1859. The Curnam of the Collegal village allowed them to cultivate, and promised to take out putta for them in the coming amabundy. This was done; but in the meanwhile the Curnam of Malingi in Mysore took out putta on his side for the same land in the name of the same ryots, and these latter continued to pay tax on both sides till the year 1863. When the collection of the tax on the Mysore side was discontinued by order, since then the land has been continuously cultivated, and the ryots have paid tax to our Government alone.

12. From information furnished by the local Revenue authorities, it appears that this case was gone into by Cooppa Row, Deputy-Collector in charge of the division, who inspected and measured the ground in the presence of the Talakadu Taluq authorities. From an original order of Mr. Collector Grant's No. 63, dated 19th September 1862, it is seen that the Commissioner (then Superintendent) of the Ashtagram Division was addressed on the subject and informed that the land in dispute belonged to this taluq. This is all that the Collegal ryots can produce in the shape of records bearing on the case in question, and they argue that this order of the Collector's settle the point at issue in their favor; for from the year 1859 to 1863 the ryots cultivating paid tax to both Governments, but in 1863 the collection of the tax was discontinued on the Mysore side. With regard to this latter point the Shanbogee of the Mysore village states that in 1863 the land was Bungar (waste), and that accounts for the issue of the order directing the non-collection of the tax.

13. Finally, it must be noted that all the land in dispute was measured in fields at time of Pymash in the Collegal village. The Mysore ryots say that they can also show accounts for the land. But these are not to be depended upon, for the measurements made ran far into cultivated land, regarding which there was never any dispute. But their great standby is an old boundary stone marked Z in Sketch No. 2. Regarding this stone the Collegal ryots say that it works the boundary between two of their villages, and has nothing whatever to do with the Mysore line of boundary.

Case V., marked G to H, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—The next dispute is about a small piece of cultivation measuring about 2 acres. This is entered in the accounts of the Collegal village as Pymash No. 327, and is held on putta by a ryot of the Mysore village, who also holds some land on the other side of the boundary (*vide* Sketch No. 3). The Mysore ryots produced accounts from which they made out that the field in question was measured in their village. Accounts being doubtful in this case, it was proposed by me to set them aside and to allow occupation to decide the day. But the Amildar objected to this arrangement, because an old boundary stone was found along the line claimed by this villager. The land in dispute, as already stated, has for more than fifteen years been cultivated by an inhabitant of the Mysore village. This man himself admitted that he had always paid tax on the Collegal side, and was very clear in his

3/1506.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
15*th October* 1875.

statement about never having paid anything to the Mysore Government for the land in question. I am therefore of opinion that the field should be included in the Collegal village.

Case VI., marked I to J, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—In this a small tank known as the Ammajeeawanee Kuttai is the bone of contention. The Collegal ryots claim the whole tank on the grounds that it is situated in Pymash No. 326 of the village of Hosamalingi, and that it was dug by an inhabitant of the same. The Mysore ryots say that the boundary runs through the middle of the tank, which they declare was originally dug partly in Mysore ground and partly in Collegal land. Village accounts in this case are useless, and from them it is impossible to prove that the whole tank belongs to Collegal. The Mysore ryots in support of their claim point to an old stone (marked Z in Sketch No. 3) with a lingum cut on it, but they are unable to prove that this stone has anything to do with the boundary. In my opinion, one point favors the case of the Collegal ryots, and that is the fact of their laying claim to the whole tank. That both villagers have a right to the use of the water of the tank is a question which is not disputed by either party. If the boundary is marked so as to include the tank in the Collegal village, an agreement can be taken from the ryots on our side to the effect that the Mysore ryots and their cattle shall have free access to the water at all times.

Case VII., marked U to V, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—Here the right and title of Kuntur villagers to the whole of a tamarind tope shown in Sketch No. 4 is called in question by the Mysore ryots. Our Pymash accounts do not quite support our claim, for after measuring the old numbers in the vicinity there was still a small strip of land which did not fall within the limits assigned in the accounts. The Mysore people claim up to the blue line, but they can produce no evidence in support of their case. The Kuntur villagers declare that they planted the tope, and that the collection of the fruit is entirely in their hands. As the Mysore ryots can produce neither accounts for the land, nor evidence to show that they enjoy the use of the fruit collected, I consider that our people have the best of the case.

Case VIII., marked Y to Z, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This is an important case, comprising about 2,000 acres of hill and waste land, the greater part of the former being valuable forest land. I have not yet gone into the particulars of this case; for the interests of the Forest Department being concerned here, I consider it advisable that the officer in charge of this range should be present when the matter is properly taken up. This dispute extends to the Hebbara Halla to a point very near Karidi Sone, the first point in the great dispute on the Billigirangams. I understand that the Deputy-Collector in charge of this Division intends paying the taluq a visit in September next. I would therefore suggest that arrangements be made for taking up this case when Mr. MacGregor next comes to Collegal.

13. The non-settlement of this dispute will not interfere with our Circuit work; for the Northern boundary of Arepalayam can be demarcated, and along this the Circuit line can be run temporarily.

REVENUE SURVEY OFFICE,
COLLEGAL,
16th July 1875.

(Signed) E. M. BABER,
Assistant Superintendent, R. S.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) N. CRAEN, Captain,
Deputy Superintendent, R. S.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Abstract Statements.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Sketch.

SUBMITTED to Government, with reference to G. O., dated 20th July 1875, No. 1,093.

2. The Board recommend that Captain Cloete, Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, be nominated as a Commissioner on behalf of the Madras Government to meet an officer of the Mysore Commission for the settlement of the disputes, including those referred to in the Government Order, subject to ratification by the two Governments, and that the Chief Commissioner be addressed accordingly.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

No. 119. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th August 1875, No. 2,317.

Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 7th August 1875, No. 2,260-94.

REFERRING to paragraph 7 of letter from the Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, of which a copy was submitted with my letter of

Dated 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

the 31st ultimo, No. 2,211-89, I have the honor to submit copy of another letter from the same officer, forwarding for orders a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery River giving detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Captain J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Komaralingum, 31st July 1875, No. 975-413.

IN continuation of the last portion of my letter, No. 944-400, dated 24th instant, I have the honor to forward a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery River, in which is given detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims.

2. It will be seen that the Terambalai villagers claim none of the river, and that Hampapuram claims the whole bed, but that their claim has been disposed of by Government.

3. In other parts, our accounts and claims extend to the centre of the main channel excepting only by Shivasamudram.

4. The whole of the large island called Edookoora is, I believe, acknowledged to be ours, but we claim also the smaller island "Hegoora," and affirm that the centre of the most westerly branch of the river is the boundary. This claim I am given to understand is disputed by Mysore.

Our village accounts favor our claims; the coloring of the old ordnance sheet omits the small island from both territories, and Mysore has built a bridge over the western branch.

5. I have the honor to request instructions; a copy of this letter has been sent to the Collector.

(True Copy.)

CHEPAUK,
7th August 1875.

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

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Sketch.

SUBMITTED to Government in continu Board's Proceedings, dated 11th August 1875, No. 2,259.

(True Copi Extract.)

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

No. 120. Proceedings of the Boar ve ue, dated 2nd September 1875, No. 2,472.

Read the following letter from Capta ARGEAUNT, Assistant Superintendent, for Superintendent Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Boa ue, dated Chepauk, 23rd August 1875, No. 2,438-105.

WITH my letter of the 7th inst 30-94, I submitted a sketch of the Cauvery river from the point whe touches the Coimbatore District to where its waters unite after flowing island of Sivasamudram.

2. I now do myself the honor ng another sketch of the remaining portion of the Cauvery river between and Collegal; the boundary line claimed by Coimbatore throughout t of the river is the centre between the banks.

ENCLOSURE tetch.

SUBMITTED to Government in c tion of Board's Proceedings, dated 17th August 1875, No. 2,317.

(A true C tract.)

Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 121. ORDER THEREON, 15 tober 1875, No. 1,506.

Miscellaneous.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in ncil resolves to recommend that the uty Commissioner of Mysore and tain Cloete, whose meeting has already n arranged*, be empowered to form themselves into a Commission for the ation and settlement of all disputes along the boundary line between Mysore mbatore.

* G. O., 30th April 1875, No. 666.
„ 7th June „ „ 884.

(T .)

d) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd W. J. Lewis and

Govt. of 1875 Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

&c., &c., &c.

Dated October, 15th.

Read

Ewd.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 118—121.

Boundary Disputes between Mysore and Coimbatore.—Resolving to recommend that the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore and Captain Cloete be empowered to form themselves into a Commission for the investigation and settlement of all —

S/1506

No. 2,259.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th August 1875.

Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Kodakanal, 31st July 1875, No. 2,211-89:—

I BEG to submit a letter* from the Deputy Superintendent of Survey in Coimbatore reporting the existence of some unimportant boundary disputes on the Collegal frontier, which, however, cannot be decided without the presence of a Mysore Revenue Officer with power to inquire into them, and to agree to a settlement conjointly with an officer to represent the Madras Government.

* Dated 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

2. Under these circumstances, I have the honor respectfully to recommend that the Madras Government should be represented either by Captain Cloete or his Assistant, who is on the spot, (Mr. Baber), and that steps should be taken to secure the presence of a Mysore Assistant Commissioner at as early a date as possible.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Captain J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, to Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent, Revenue Survey, dated Coimbatore, 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

I HAVE the honor to forward copy of Mr. E. M. Baber's report on the demarcation of a portion of the Mysore and Collegal boundary, together with illustrative sketches and abstract statements of the dispute cases with my opinion on some of them.

2. Five minor disputes have been amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties.

3. In eight other cases (excluding the old Agara dispute reported on by you) the opposing parties would not come to terms.

4. Those numbered II., III., V., and VI. are very trifling, and I think that in these cases the Mysore Government would agree to abide by the decision of the Assistant Superintendent on the spot.

5. The other four cases could, I am confident, be decided without difficulty, if the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore and the Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, myself or a Revenue Officer of this district were authorized by our respective Governments to act on their behalf.

6. It is clearly advisable that the Mysore boundary should be demarcated and surveyed once for all without delay.

7. I take this opportunity of requesting that, if you think advisable, information may be obtained from the Mysore administration as to the exact limits claimed where the Cauvery river is marked on the old maps as the boundary: as far as I have been able to ascertain, the centre of the river bed between the banks forms the boundary, and where the river divides, the island so formed and half the Mysore or Northern branch belongs to us.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. C. SARGEAUNT, Captain,
2nd Assistant Superintendent,
for Supt., Revenue Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Report upon the Demarcation of the Boundary Line between Collegal and Mysore Territory.

THE line operated upon leaves the river Cauvery at a point about two miles east of Malingi, latitude N. 12° 10′, longitude E. 77° 6′ 30″, and, after winding about in the plains for a distance of more than thirty-six miles, joins the range of the Billigirangams at a point one mile south of Arepalayam.

2. The Amildars of the three* adjacent taluqs of Mysore attended on behalf of that Government, the interests of the British Government being watched by the Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, and the local Revenue authorities.

*Talakadu, Shamrajnagger, and Yellandur.

3. Work was commenced at the junction of Talakadu, Shamrajnagger, and Collegal Taluqs. The Yellandur boundary was then taken up and completed as far as the western limit of the old Agara and Kuntur boundary dispute. The Talakadu line was then commenced, and finally the remainder of the Yellandur line from the eastern limit of the disputed boundary referred to was taken up and carried on till operations were brought to a standstill at a point two miles from the base of the hills by the discovery of what appears to be an important dispute.

4. The following is a brief report of those cases where a difference of opinion existed as to how the exact boundary ran, and which cases were all disposed of amicably, the line agreed upon being demarcated according to the settlements arrived at :—

Case I., marked K to L, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This was said to be a dispute of some six or seven years' standing. The Shanbogee of the Collegal village reported the matter to the local Revenue authorities, but it does not appear that any steps were taken to inquire into the case.

On the side of the Collegal villagers it was contended that the Mysore ryots had encroached upon and cultivated Bullahs 2-5-3 forming part of Pymash numbers 255 and 262 of Hosamalingi village. The Mysore ryots also showed accounts for the cultivation, and they pointed to an old boundary stone in support of their claim. As the land now under cultivation had never at any period paid assessment to the British Government, being entered in the village accounts as *waste*, and as it was shown that the Mysore ryots had occupied and cultivated the land for more than fifteen or twenty years, it was decided that the same should be included in the Mysore village. To the south of this cultivation was Bullahs 1-8-0 of waste forming part of No. 262 of Hosamalingi; and as the Mysore ryots could show no accounts for this bit of land, it was settled that the line should run to the west of this waste and include it in the Collegal village. The line was demarcated accordingly, and the agreement marked A was drawn up and signed by both parties and the authorities present.

Case II., marked M to N, in Shamrajnagger Taluq Sketch.—In this case there was a difference of opinion regarding a stream about 18 feet in breadth, and which ran along the boundary for the length of two fields. The accounts threw no light on the subject; and, as the cultivators on both sides laid claim to one-half of the stream, it was settled that the centre of the same should be considered the boundary, the stones for better security being placed on the Collegal side. The agreement marked B was accordingly executed and signed by all concerned.

Case III., marked O to P, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was a case similar to the last, and was settled by both parties agreeing to consider the centre of the stream as the common boundary. The stones here were also placed on the Collegal side, and the document marked C was executed and duly confirmed.

Case IV., marked Q to R, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was said to be a dispute of some four or five years' standing, and regarding which much correspondence had taken place between the Yellandur Amildar and successive Tahsildars of Collegal. The land in dispute measured 3 acres, and had been cultivated at irregular intervals during the past half dozen years by the Collegal ryots. The accounts on both sides threw no light on the point at issue, and when the contending parties had satisfied themselves of the weakness of their respective claims, they agreed to abide by the decision of an influential ryot of an adjacent village, and one who was well acquainted with the locality. The individual thus chosen marked out the boundary, and the written agreement marked D was drawn up and signed by both arties and ratified by the representatives of the two Governments.

Case V., marked S to T, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This was another case in which a small stream was the bone of contention, and was disposed of in a manner similar to cases II. and III., the centre of the stream being considered the boundary. In this case however it was found necessary to fix the stones on the Mysore side of stream. The document marked E was then written out and attested by all concerned.

5. The following is a summary of the cases in which no settlement was arrived at, and regarding which orders will be required :—

Case I., marked A to B, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a dispute between the Inam village of Kaliyur in Mysore and Kuntur of Collegal, and comprises about 120 acres of waste land forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur Tank. The whole of the tract in controversy is entered in the Pymash accounts of Kuntur, and nine old numbers, aggregating acres 100, are registered as "waterspread" of Kaliyur Tank; the rest of the land is waste, never having been cultivated, and is liable to be submerged on occasions. The boundary claimed by the Kuntur ryots is shown by the blue line (*vide* Sketch No. 1), and is defined by two old boundary stones. These old marks are accepted by both sides; but the Kaliyur ryots point to two other old stones situated further south in the middle of cultivation belonging to Kuntur, and they argue that, as the tank itself belongs to their village and irrigates the lands of the same, the waterspread of the tank should by rights be handed over to them, and they claim according to the red line shown in Sketch 1.

6. With reference to the two last-named stones, it is necessary to state that they have nothing to do with any line of boundary, for an old account produced by the Kaliyur ryots shows that these stones define the course of the channel which feeds the Kaliyur tank.

7. This channel has its source in the Honna Holai near Yellandur, and at intervals along its course are placed sets of similar stones, one stone being fixed on either bank.

8. The Collegal ryots do not dispute the fact of the land claimed by them forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur tank; for, as already stated, the same is registered as such in the accounts of their village. But they naturally object to the boundary claimed by the Kaliyur ryots on the ground that their old established right of grazing cattle will be infringed. On the other hand, it seems an anomalous state of things that the waterspread of the tank belonging to the people of one territory should be so situated as to be placed entirely out of their control.

9. One of the two settlements might be *arrived at in* this case without damaging the interests of either sides,—

First.—The boundary might be marked as claimed by the Collegal people, who should bind themselves not to interfere with the waterspread of the tank.

Secondly.—The waterspread might be handed over to Mysore, an agreement being written out to the effect that the Collegal ryots be allowed to use of the water, and free access to the land for the purpose of grazing their cattle.

Case II, marked C to D, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a dispute about a low rocky hill known as Kuntur Bettah (*vide* Sketch 2). This is entered in the accounts of Collegal village as Pymash No. 115, consisting of Bullahs 28-12-0. The accounts produced by the Mysore ryots show clearly that the hill belongs to Collegal, for the measurements of the Mysore villages are said to extend "*up to the hill.*" Five old boundary marks are shown by the Mysore ryots; three of these, marked A, B, and C, are admitted by the Collegal ryots, the remaining two being untrustworthy; for one of them is a mark on a piece of rock which shows signs of having been recently detached from a large rock situated high up the slope of the hill, the other is an old inscription which no one can make head or tail of.

10. The sketch will show that a part of the hill on the west projects beyond the direct line drawn from the old marks B and C. The red line is the boundary claimed by Mysore; the

6/1506

objection to it is that in some places it is an impassable line of boundary running as it does along the middle of the slope of the hill, the points in some places being invisible one from another. As the hill is entered in the accounts of Kuntur, and as the three old marks admitted by both parties are situated at the base of the hill, this should be included in the Collegal village, and, in order that the Mysore villagers may gain something, the Kuntur villagers should sign an agreement allowing the former the right to as much stone as they may require at any future time.

Case III., marked D to E, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is a trifling dispute about acres 8 of waste land entered in the accounts of the Collegal village, and for which the Mysore villagers also produced records. It should be settled by dividing the tract in controversy equally between the two villages (*vide* Sketch 2).

Case IV., marked E to F, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—This is an old standing dispute, and is reported to have first come to light in 1859. Up to the year 1864 it formed the subject of much correspondence between the authorities on both sides, and appears then to have died a natural death.

11. The dispute arose in this way. Some ryots of Kuntur in Collegal durkhasted for some of the land in 1859. The Curnam of the Collegal village allowed them to cultivate, and promised to take out putta for them in the coming Jamabundy. This was done; but in the meanwhile the Curnam of Malingi in Mysore took out putta on his side for the same land in the name of the same ryots, and these latter continued to pay tax on both sides till the year 1863. When the collection of the tax on the Mysore side was discontinued by order, since then the land has been continuously cultivated, and the ryots have paid tax to our Government alone.

12. From information furnished by the local Revenue authorities, it appears that this case was gone into by Cooppa Row, Deputy-Collector in charge of the division, who inspected and measured the ground in the presence of the Talakadu Taluq authorities. From an original order of Mr. Collector Grant's No. 63, dated 19th September 1862, it is seen that the Commissioner (then Superintendent) of the Ashtagram Division was addressed on the subject and informed that the land in dispute belonged to this taluq. This is all that the Collegal ryots can produce in the shape of records bearing on the case in question, and they argue that this order of the Collector's settle the point at issue in their favor; for from the year 1859 to 1863 the ryots cultivating paid tax to both Governments, but in 1863 the collection of the tax was discontinued on the Mysore side. With regard to this latter point the Shanbogee of the Mysore village states that in 1863 the land was Bungar (waste), and that accounts for the issue of the order directing the non-collection of the tax.

13. Finally, it must be noted that all the land in dispute was measured in fields at time of Pymash in the Collegal village. The Mysore ryots say that they can also show accounts for the land. But these are not to be depended upon, for the measurements made ran far into cultivated land, regarding which there was never any dispute. But their great standby is an old boundary stone marked Z in Sketch No. 2. Regarding this stone the Collegal ryots say that it works the boundary between two of their villages, and has nothing whatever to do with the Mysore line of boundary.

Case V., marked G to H, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—The next dispute is about a small piece of cultivation measuring about 2 acres. This is entered in the accounts of the Collegal village as Pymash No. 327, and is held on putta by a ryot of the Mysore village, who also holds some land on the other side of the boundary (*vide* Sketch No. 3). The Mysore ryots produced accounts from which they made out that the field in question was measured in their village. Accounts being doubtful in this case, it was proposed by me to set them aside and to allow occupation to decide the day. But the Amildar objected to this arrangement, because an old boundary stone was found along the line claimed by this villager. The land in dispute, as already stated, has for more than fifteen years been cultivated by an inhabitant of the Mysore village. This man himself admitted that he had always paid tax on the Collegal side, and was very clear in his statement about never having paid anything to the Mysore Government for the land in question. I am therefore of opinion that the field should be included in the Collegal village.

Case VI., marked I to J, in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.—In this a small tank known as the Ammajeeawanee Kuttai is the bone of contention. The Collegal ryots claim the whole tank on the grounds that it is situated in Pymash No. 326 of the village of Hosamalingi, and that it was dug by an inhabitant of the same. The Mysore ryots say that the boundary runs through the middle of the tank, which they declare was originally dug partly in Mysore ground and partly in Collegal land. Village accounts in this case are useless, and from them it is impossible to prove that the whole tank belongs to Collegal. The Mysore ryots in support of their claim point to an old stone (marked Z in Sketch No. 3) with a lingum cut on it, but they are unable to prove that this stone has anything to do with the boundary. In my opinion, one point favors the case of the Collegal ryots, and that is the fact of their laying claim to the whole tank. That both villagers have a right to the use of the water of the tank is a question which is not disputed by either party. If the boundary is marked so as to include the tank in the Collegal village, an agreement can be taken from the ryots on our side to the effect that the Mysore ryots and their cattle shall have free access to the water at all times.

Case VII., marked U to V, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—Here the right and title of Kuntur villagers to the whole of a tamarind tope shown in Sketch No. 4 is called in question by the Mysore ryots. Our Pymash accounts do not quite support our claim, for after measuring the old numbers in the vicinity there was still a small strip of land which did not fall within the limits assigned in the accounts. The Mysore people claim up to the blue line, but they can produce no evidence in support of their cas. The Kuntur villagers declare that they planted the tope, and that the collection of the fruit is entirely in their hands. As the Mysore ryots can produce neither accounts for the land, nor evidence to show that they enjoy the use of the fruit collected, I consider that our people have the best of the case.

Case VIII., marked Y to Z, in Yellandur Taluq Sketch.—This is an important case, comprising about 2,000 acres of hill and waste land, the greater part of the former being valuable forest land. I have not yet gone into the particulars of this case; for the interests of the Forest Department being concerned here, I consider it advisable that the officer in charge of this range should be present when the matter is properly taken up. This dispute extends to the Hebbara Halla to a point very near Karidi Sone, the first point in the great dispute on the Billigirangams. I understand that the Deputy-Collector in charge of this Division intends paying the taluq a visit in September next. I would therefore suggest that arrangements be made for taking up this case when Mr. MacGregor next comes to Collegal.

13. The non-settlement of this dispute will not interfere with our Circuit work; for the Northern boundary of Arepalayam can be demarcated, and along this the Circuit line can be run temporarily.

REVENUE SURVEY OFFICE,
COLLEGAL,
16th July 1875.

(Signed) E. M. BABER,
Assistant Superintendent, R. S.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) N. CRAEN, Captain,
Deputy Superintendent, R. S.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Abstract Statements.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Sketch.

SUBMITTED to Government, with reference to G. O., dated 20th July 1875, No. 1,093.

2. The Board recommend that Captain Cloete, Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, be nominated as a Commissioner on behalf of the Madras Government to meet an officer of the Mysore Commission for the settlement of the disputes, including those referred to in the Government Order, subject to ratifica-

tion by the two Governments, and that the Chief Commissioner be addressed accordingly.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with two enclosures, to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore.
,, to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Rxd. W. J. Lewis.

1875.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

Proceedings, 11th August 1875, No. 2,259.

Enel.

Received

AUGUST.

No. 2,259.

Boundary disputes—between Mysore and Coimbatore.—Recommendation made to Government that Captain Cloete, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, be nominated as a Commissioner on behalf of Madras Government to meet an officer of Mysore Commission for the settlement of certain — and that the Chief Commissioner be addressed accordingly.

No. 2,317.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th August 1875.

Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 7th August 1875, No. 2,260-94 :—

Referring to paragraph 7 of letter from the Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, of which a copy was submitted with my letter of Dated 24th July 1875, No. 944-400.

the 31st ultimo, No. 2,211-89, I have the honor to submit copy of another letter from the same officer, forwarding for orders a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery River giving detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims.

Enclosure No. 1.

From Captain J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to Colonel F. J. B. PRIESTLEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Komaralingum, 31st July 1875, No. 975-413.

In continuation of the last portion of my letter, No. 944-400, dated 24th instant, I have the honor to forward a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery River, in which is given detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims.

2. It will be seen that the Terambalai villagers claim none of the river, and that Hampapuram claims the whole bed, but that their claim has been disposed of by Government.

3. In other parts, our accounts and claims extend to the centre of the main channel excepting only by Shivasamudram.

4. The whole of the large island called Edookoora is, I believe, acknowledged to be ours, but we claim also the smaller island "Hegoora," and affirm that the centre of the most westerly branch of the river is the boundary. This claim I am given to understand is disputed by Mysore.

Our village accounts favor our claims; the coloring of the old ordnance sheet omits the small island from both territories, and Mysore has built a bridge over the western branch.

5. I have the honor to request instructions; a copy of this letter has been sent to the Collector.

(True Copy.)

Chepauk, 7th August 1875.

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

Enclosure No. 2.—Sketch.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 11th August 1875, No. 2,259.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with a Sketch, to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore.
,, to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Rxd. W. H. French.

1875.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 17TH AUGUST 1875, No. 2,317.

Encl.

Received

AUGUST.

No. 2,317.

Boundary Disputes—between Mysore and Coimbatore.—Letter from Superintendent of Revenue Survey, forwarding copy of one from Deputy Superintendent giving cover to a sketch of a portion of Cauvery River involved in certain —, submitted to Government.

Revenue Department.

9/1506

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 18th August 1875

No. 2211/89 Read the following

From The Superintendent

Revenue Survey

To The Secretary to the

Board of Revenue.

Sir,

Dated 24 July 75 No. 644/400

I beg to submit a letter from the Dy Supt. of Survey in Coimbatore report-ing the existence of some unimportant boundary disputes on the Collegal frontier which however cannot be de-cided without the presence of a Mysore Revenue Officer with power to en-quire into them & to agree to a settle-ment conjointly with an officer to represent

represent the Madras Government

2. Under these circumstances, I have the honor respectfully to recommend that the Madras Government should be represented either by Captain Cloke or his Assistant who is on the spot (Mr Baber) and that steps should be taken to secure the presence of a Mysore Assistant Commissioner at as early a date as possible.

I have &c
by C.C. Sargeaunt
Captain
Supdt for Supdt
Revenue Survey

Revenue Survey Office
Camp Kodaikanal
31st July 1875.

Submitted to Government with reference to Government Order, 20 July 1875, No 1093.

The Board recommend that Captain Cloke Deputy Superintendent Revenue Survey be nominated as a Commissioner on behalf of the Madras Government to meet an officer of the Mysore Commission for the settlement of the disputes including those referred to in the Government Order, subject to ratification by the two Governments; and that the Chief Commissioner be addressed accordingly.

True Copy & Extract

H Elton
Acting Secretary

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department with 2 Original Enclosures to be returned & copies of others

Rec'd 15th Oct. 1875 with Collr's No 3263 Enclosure No 2 of the Board of Revenue

Rec'd 18th Oct. 1875 with reference to Collr's No 3263 Enclosure No 2 of the Board of Revenue

Submitting for Govt. sanction the accompanying Map and Field Book of the Survey of the Kamaraligum Estate in the Coimbatore District, and requesting that the Survey Officer may be directed to proceed to the Cauvery River, and to settle certain disputed boundaries on the Cauvery Frontier.

Sd. H. Stokes Dy. Supt. 15th Oct. 1875.

Revenue Survey Office.
Camp. Komaraligum.
31st July 1875.

No 975/413

From The Deputy Superintendent
No 1. Revenue Survey.

To The Superintendent
Revenue Survey.

Sir,

In continuation of the last portion of my letter No 244/400 dated 24th Instant, I have the honor to forward a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery river in which is given detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims

2. It will be seen that the Tecambalai villagers claim none of the river and that Kampapuram claims the whole bed but that their claim has been disposed of by Government.

3. In other parts our accounts and claims extend to the centre of the main channel excepting only by Shivasamudram

The

4. The whole of the large island called Edookoora is I believe acknowledged to be ours but we claim also the smaller island "Hegoora" and affirm that the centre of the most westerly branch of the river is the boundary. This claim I am given to understand is disputed by Mysore.

Our villages accounts favor our claims the coloring of the old ordnance sheet omits the small island from both territories and Mysore has built a bridge over the western branch.

5. I have the honor to request instructions a copy of this letter has been sent to the Collector

I have &c

(Sigd) J. G. Clarke. Captain
by Supt Rev: Survey.

(True Copy)
(Sigd) C. C. Sargaunt Captain
Asstt Supt for
Supt Rev: Survey

Revenue Survey office
Chepauk 5th August 1875

(True Copy)
H Ellerton

Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 17 August 1875
Read the following

No. 2260/94.

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

Sir,

Dated 24 July 1875
No 944/400

Referring to Para 7 of letter from the Deputy Superintendent No 1 Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, of which a copy was submitted with my letter of the 31st Ultimo, No 221/89, I have the honor to submit copy of another letter from the same officer forwarding for orders a sketch of a portion of the Cauvery river giving detailed information as to the Coimbatore claims.

I have &c.

Revenue Survey office
Chepauk. 7 August 1875

Signed J. Priestley. Col.
Supdt. Revenue Survey.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings,

1st

Rev 1032/75

Copy of letter from the Superintendent Revenue Survey Coimbatore.

Rev 3264/75.

Enclosure in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary Govt dated 17th August 1875.

11th August 1875.

(True Copy & Extract)

H. Ellis
Ag Secretary.

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with a Sketch to be returned.
and copy of Enclosure.

Copied.

Rec'd 15 Jan 1875

Proceedings of the 3264
Board of Revenue
dated 17th August 1874
Rec'd 19 Jan 1875
Encl 1 Map

Submitting for Govt
letter from the Supt
of Revenue Survey forwarding
for orders a sketch
of a portion of the Cauvery
River giving details
information as to the
boundaries claimed
by Coorg & Mysore

No 119.

Report upon the demarcation of the boundary line between Coorg & Mysore Territory.

The line operated upon leaves the River Cauvery at a point about 2 Miles East of Malingi. Lat: N 12° 10' Long E. 77° 6' 30" and after winding about in the plains for a distance of more than 36 miles, joins the range of the Billigirangams at a point one Mile South of Avepalayam.

2. The Amildars of the 3 adjacent Talukas of Mysore attended on behalf of that Government & the interests of the British Government, being watched by the Apts Supt Rev: Survey and the local revenue authorities.

* Talakadu
Chamrajnuggar
Yellandur

3. Work was commenced at the junction of

of Talakadu, Shamrajnuggar and Kollegal Talegs. The Gellandur boundary was then taken up and completed as far as the Western limit of the Old Agra and Kunter boundary dispute. The Talakadu line was then commenced, and finally the remainder of the Gellandur line from the Eastern limit of the disputed boundary referred to, was taken up, and carried on till operations were brought to a stand still at a point 2 miles from the base of the Hills by the discovery of what appears to be an important dispute.

4. The following is a brief report of those cases where a difference of opinion existed as to how the exact boundary ran and which cases were all disposed of amicably, the line agreed upon being demarcated according to the settlement arrived at.

Case I. Marked K to L in Talakadu Taleg Sketch.

This was said to be a dispute of some 6 or 7 years standing. The Shambogue of the Collegal village reported the matter to the local Revenue Authorities but it does not appear that any steps were taken to enquire into the case.

On the side of the Collegal villagers it was contended that the Mysore ryots had encroached upon and cultivated Pallahs 2-5-3 forming part of Kaimash numbers 255 & 262 of Kosamalingi village. The Mysore ryots also, showed accounts for the cultivation and they pointed to an old boundary stone in support of their claim. As the land now under cultivation had never at any period paid a peshcush to the British Government being entered in

in the villages accounts as Waste and as it was shown that the Mysore ryots had occupied and cultivated the land for more than 15 or 20 years it was decided that the same should be included in the Mysore village. To the South of this cultivation was Bullahs 1-8-0 of waste forming part of No 262 of Thavarahalli and as the Mysore ryots could show no accounts for this bit of land it was settled that the line should run to the west of this waste and include it in the Collegal village. The line was demarcated accordingly and the Agreement Marked A was drawn up and signed by both parties and the authorities present.

In this case there was a difference of opinion regarding a stream about 18 feet in breadth and which ran along the boundary for the length of 2 fields. The accounts threw no light on the subject, and as the cultivators on both sides laid claim to one half of the stream it was settled that the centre of the same should be considered the boundary the stones for better security being placed on the Collegal side. The Agreement Marked B was accordingly executed and signed by all concerned.

Case II. Marked B to No in Shavarajanagar Taluq Sketch.

Case III Marked C to No in Gopalandra Taluq Sketch

This was a case similar to the last and was settled by both parties agreeing to consider the centre of the stream as the common boundary. The stones here were also placed on the Collegal side and the document marked C was executed and duly confirmed.

This

This was said to be a dispute of some 4 or 5 years standing and regarding which much correspondence had taken place between the Gellandra and Amibar and successive Tahsildars of Collegal. The land in dispute measured 3 Acres and had been cultivated at irregular intervals during the past half dozen years by the Collegal ryots. The accounts on both sides threw no light on the point at issue and when the contending parties had satisfied themselves of the weakness of their respective claims they agreed to abide by the decision of an influential ryot of an adjacent village, and one who was well acquainted with the locality. The individual thus chosen marked out the boundary

Case III Gram. 7 Q to R in Gellandra Taluq Sketch.

boundary and the written agreement marked D was drawn up and signed by both parties and ratified by the representatives of the two Governments.

Case V. Marked S to T in Gellandra Taluq Sketch.

This was another case in which a small stream was the bone of contention and was disposed of in a manner similar to Cases II & III the centre of the stream being considered the boundary. In this case however it was found necessary to fix the stones on the Mysore side of the stream. The document marked E was then written out and attested by all concerned.

5. The following is a summary of the cases in which no settlement was arrived at and regarding which orders will be required.

This

Case I marked A to B in Salakadu Labeg Estate.

This is a dispute between the inhabitants of Kaliyur in Mysore and Kunbur of Hollegal and comprises about 120 acres of waste land forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur Lauk. The whole of the tract in controversy is entered in the Paimaish accounts of Kunbur and nine (9) old numbers aggregating Acres 100 are registered as "Waterspread" of Kaliyur Lauk - the rest of the land is waste, never having been cultivated and is liable to be submerged on occasions. The boundary claimed by the Kunbur ryots is shown by the blue line (vide Sketch No 1) and is defined by two old Boundary stones. These old Marks are accepted by both sides, but the Kaliyur ryots point to two other old stones situated further south in the middle of cultivation belonging to Kunbur and they argue that as the Lauk itself belongs to their village, and irrigates the lands of the same, the waterspread of the Lauk should by rights be handed over to them and they claim according to the red line shown in sketch 1.

With reference to the two last named stones it is necessary to state that they have nothing to do with any line of boundary for an old account produced by the Kaliyur ryots shows that these stones define the course of the channel which feeds the Kaliyur Lauk.

This channel has its source in the Konna Holai near Gellandur and at intervals along its course are placed sets of similar stones

stones; one stone being fixed on either bank.

The Collegal ryots do not dispute the fact of the land claimed by them forming the waterspread of the Kaliyur Tank for as already staked the same is registered as such in the accounts of their village. But they naturally object to the boundary claimed by the Kaliyur ryots on the ground that their old established right of grazing cattle will be infringed. On the other hand it seems an anomalous state of things that the waterspread of the tank belonging to the people of one Territory should be so situated as to be placed entirely out of their control.

Now of the two settlements might be arrived at in this case without damaging the interests of either sides, first the boundary might be marked as claimed by the Collegal people who should bind themselves not to interfere with the waterspread of the Tank.

Secondly- The waterspread might be handed over to Anyone- An agreement being written out to the effect that the Collegal ryots be allowed to use of the water and free access to the land for the purpose of grazing their cattle.

Case II marked C to D in Talakadu Taluq Sketch-

This is a dispute about a low rocky Hill known as Kuntur Bettah (vide sketch 2). This is entered in the Accounts of Collegal village as Painaish No 115 existing of buffaloes 25-12-0. The accounts produced

produced by the Mysore ryots show clearly that the Hill belongs to Collegal for the measurements of the Mysore villages are said to extend "up to the Hill". Five old Boundary marks are shown by the Mysore ryots - three of these marked A. B. & C are admitted by the Collegal ryots, the remaining two (2) being ambiguous worthy - for one of them is a mark on a piece of rock which shows signs of having been recently detached from a large rock situated high up the slope of the Hill - the other is an old inscription which no one can make head or tail of.

The sketch will show that a part of the Hill on the west projects beyond the direct line drawn from the old marks B & C. The red line is the boundary claimed by Mysore, the objection to it is that in some places it is an impossible line of boundary running as it does along the middle of the slope of the Hill, the points in some places being invisible one from another. As the Hill is entered in the accounts of Kunkur and as the 3 old marks admitted by both parties are situated at the base of the Hill, this should be included in the Collegal village and in order that the Mysore villages may gain something the Kunkur villagers should sign an Agreement allowing the former the right to as much stone as they may require at any future time.

The

Case III marked D to E in Talakadu Taluq sketch.

This is a trifling dispute about 4 acres of waste land entered in the accounts of the Collegal village, and for which the Mysore villagers also produced records. It should be settled by dividing the tract in controversy equally between the two villages (vide sketch 2)

Case II. marked E to F in Talakadu Taluq Sketch.

This is an old standing dispute and is reported to have first come to light 1859. Up to the year 1864 it formed the subject of much correspondence between the Authorities on both sides, and appears them to have died a natural death.

The dispute arose in this way some ryots of Kinture in Collegal purchased for some of the land in 1859. The Curnam of the Collegal village allowed them to cultivate and promised to take out

out puttahs for them in the coming Jamabundy. This was done, but in the meanwhile the Curnam of Hatinge in Mysore took out puttahs on his side for the same land in the name of the same ryots, and these latter continued to pay tax on both pieces till the year 1863. When the collection of the tax on the Mysore side was discontinued by order since then the land has been continuously cultivated and the ryots have paid tax to our Government alone.

From information furnished by the local Revenue Authorities it appears that the case was gone into by Coopoo Row, Deputy Collector in charge of the division who inspected and measured the ground

ground in the presence of the Talakada Talaq Authorities. From an original order of Mr Collector Grants No 63 dated 19 September 1862 it is seen that the Commissioner (then Superintendent) of the Ashtagram Division was addressed on the subject and informed that the land in dispute belonged to this Talaq. This is all that the Collegal ryots can produce in the shape of records bearing on the case in question, and they argue that this order of the Collector's settle. the point at issue in their favor, for from the year 1859 to 1863 the ryots cultivating paid tax to both Governments, but in 1863 the Collection of the tax was discontinued on the Mysore side. With regard to this latter point the Shanbogue of the Mysore village

village states that in 1863 the land was Bunger (waste) and that accounts for the issue of the order directing the non-collection of the tax.

Finally it must be noted that all the land in dispute was measured in fields at Srinivasapur in the Collegal village. The Mysore ryots say that they can also show accounts for the land. But these are not to be depended upon for the measurements made part for into cultivated land regarding which there was never any dispute. But their great standby is an old boundary stone marked Z in Sketch No 2. Regarding this stone the Collegal ryots say that it works the boundary between two of their villages, and has nothing whatever to do with the Mysore

Mysore line of boundary.

The next dispute is about a small piece of cultivation measuring about 2 Acres. This is entered in the accounts of the Collegal village as Paimaish № 327 and is held on puttah by a ryot of the Mysore village who also holds some land on the other side of the boundary (vide Sketch № 3) The Mysore ryots produced accounts from which they made out that the field in question was measured in their village. Accounts being doubtful in this case it was proposed by one to set them aside and to allow occupation to decide the day. But the Amildar objected to this arrangement because an old Boundary stone was found along the line claimed by the villagers. The land

Case II Marked G. to H in Talakadu Taluq Sketch

land in dispute as already staked has for more than 15 years been cultivated by an inhabitant of the Mysore village. This man himself admitted that he had always paid tax on the Collegal side and was very clear in his statement about never having paid anything to the Mysore Government for the land in question. I am therefore of opinion that the field should be included in the Collegal village.

In this a small bank known as the Ammajeeawanee Kuttai is the bone of contention. The Collegal ryots claim the whole bank on the grounds that it is situated in Paimaish № 326 of the village of Hosamalige and that it was dug by an inhabitant of the same. The Mysore ryots say that the boundary runs through the middle of the

Bank

Tank which they declare was originally dug partly in Mysore ground and partly in Collegal land. Village Accounts in this case are useless, and from them it is impossible to prove that the whole Tank belongs to Collegal. The Mysore ryots in support of their claim point to an old stone (Marked Z in Sketch No 3) with a lingum cut on it, but they are unable to prove that this stone has any thing to do with the boundary. In my opinion one point favors the case of the Collegal ryots and that is the fact of their laying claim to the whole Tank. That both villagers have a right to the use of the water of the Tank is a question which is not disputed by either party. If the boundary is marked so as to include the Tank in the Collegal village an agreement can be taken from the ryots on our side to the effect that the Mysore ryots and their cattle shall have free access to the water at all times.

Case VIII marked A to U in Gellandur Talug Sketch.

Here the right and title of Kunbur villagers to the whole of a Tamarind Tope shown in Sketch No 4 is called in question by the Mysore ryots. Our Paimaish accounts do not quite support our claim for as measuring the old numbers in the vicinity there was still a small strip of land which did not fall within the limits ap.ed in the accounts. The Mysore people claim up to the blue line but they can produce no evidence in support of their cas The Kunbur villagers declare that they planted the tope and that the collection of the fruit is entirely in their hands. As

the

the Mysore ryots can produce neither accounts for the land nor evidence to show that they enjoy the use of the fruits collected, I consider that our people have the best of the case

This is an important case comprising about 2000 acres of hill and waste land. The greater part of the former being valuable forest land. I have not yet gone into the particulars of this case, for the interests of the Forest Department being concerned here, I consider it advisable that the officer in charge of this range should be present when the Matter is properly taken up.

Case VIII bounded G to Z in Gollandoor Taluq Sketch.

This dispute extends to the Kebbara Halla to a point very near Karidi Sone, the first point in the great dispute on the Billigerangams I understand that the Deputy Collector in charge of this Division intends paying the Taluq a visit in September next. I would therefore suggest that arrangement be made for taking up this case when Mr. Macgregor next comes to Collegal.

The non-settlement of this dispute will not interfere with our Circuit work for the Southern boundary of Arepalayam can be demarcated and along this the Circuit line can be run temporarily.

Rev. Survey Office
Collegal
16 July 1875.

(Signed) C. M. Baber
Apptt Supt. R. S.

(True Copy)

(Signed) J. G. Cloete. Captain
Dy Supt Rev: Survey

(True Copy)

A Rivers
Ag Secretary

Copd

Revenue Survey Office

Coimbatore

24th July 1875.

No 944/400

From

The Dy Superintendent

No 1 Revenue Survey.

To

The Superintendent

Revenue Survey. Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward copy of Mr C. M. Baber's report on the Demarcation of a portion of the Mysore and Collegal Boundary together with illustrative sketches, and abstract statements of the dispute cases with my opinion on some of them.

2. Five Minor Disputes have been amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties.

3. In 8 other cases (excluding the old Agara dispute reported on by you), the opposing

Enclosures in Revenue Dept
of the Board of Revenue to
the Secretary to Government
Revenue Dept dated
August 1875.

Copy of Report upon the
Demarcation of the Boundary
Pay this between Collegal
and Mysore Territory.

Rev 2/3263/75.

opposing parties would not come to terms.

4. Those numbered II, III, IV, and VII are very trifling, and I think that in these cases the Mysore Government would agree to abide by the decision of the Assistant Superintendent on the spot.

5. The other 4 cases could, I am confident, be decided without difficulty, if the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore and the Assistant Superintendent Revenue Survey, myself, or a Revenue Officer of this District, were authorized by our respective Governments to act on their behalf.

6. It is clearly advisable that the Mysore boundary should be demarcated and surveyed once for all without delay.

I

7. I take this opportunity of requesting that, if you think advisable, information may be obtained from the Mysore Administration, as to the exact limits claimed where the Cauvery river is marked on the old Maps as the boundary as far as I have been able to ascertain, the centre of the river bed between the banks forms the boundary, and where the river divides, the island so formed, and half the Mysore or Northern branch belongs to us.

I have &c.

(Sd) J. G. Clarke Captain
Deputy Superintendent
No. 1. Revenue Survey.

True Copy
Revenue Survey office (Sd) C. C. Sargeaunt Capt.
Chepauk 2nd Asst to Supdt for Supdt
8th August 1875 Revenue Survey.

True Copy

H. Stokes
Ag Secretary

Copy

Enclosure in Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 2nd September 1875

Copy of Papers
Canteen Letter

Rn 1/3263/75

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
dated 2nd September 1875

Read the following

No. 2438/105

From,
The Superintendent
Revenue Survey

To,
The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

Sir,

With my letter of the 7th Instant No. 2280/94, I submitted a Sketch of the Cauvery river from the point where it first touches the Coimbatore District to where its waters unite after flowing round the island of Sivasamuderam.

2. I now do myself the honor of forwarding another Sketch of

of the remaining portion of
the Cauvery River between
Mysore and Collegal, the boundary
line claimed by Coimbatore through-
out the length of the River is
the centre between the banks.

Revenue Survey Office
Chopank
23d. August 1875

I have &c
Sd/ C. C. Sargeant Capte.
Apte. Supte. for Supte.
Revenue Survey

Submitted to Government
in continuation of Board's Pro-
ceedings dated 17th August 1875
No. 2317.

True copy & Extract

H Thuras
Acting Secretary

To,
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with sketch to be returned.

Rec'd: 18 Sept. 1875

No. 3574

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 2nd Septr 75
Rec'd 9th ditto
ent/Ob

Submitting to Govt
Letter from Supt. Rev. &
Survey forwarding another
sketch showing the re-
maining portions of the
Cauvery River between
Myaree & Collegal.

50 15 Octr 75 No 1506

B 120

C 30 Septr 1875

Note

In April of this year the Survey & Settlement Commissioner of Mysore (Col: Anderson) gave his award in the matter of a boundary dispute affecting the Poligiri = rangan hills between Coimbatore & Mysore. This award which was founded on Reports from the Collector of Coimbatore & the Settlement Commissioner of Mysore has been accepted by the Govt: of India & by this Government so this dispute is settled.

2. In May of

Ⓞ See Letter from Mysore d: 18th August 75. No: 3 Gen/Rev. 7.

T f.o. 7th June 75 No 882

this year reference was made by Mysore to another dispute between Coimbatore which they called the Agra Parampalli dispute. It was stated that Col: Meade had concurred in "the conclusions arrived at by the Collector of Coimbatore & the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore" and "the reopening of the question on purely technical grounds" was deprecated.

3 Of this dispute nothing

+ See para 3 of letter in P.C. 7th June 7 sch: 884

See in P.C. 25th July 7 sch: 1093.

See in P.C. 12th Aug. 7 sch 1215.

was known by this Government but a reference to the Board elicited the fact that they had not approved of the settlement proposed but had been requiring further information from the Survey Department and Mr. Wedderburn also wrote to say that his proposals had been misunderstood and their meaning perverted by the Jaghiredar concerned

4 This dispute is between the villages

of Tarampally } in Coimbatore.
Coontoor }

& Ayara in Mysore.
And as it has not
yet been authoritatively
settled it is necessary
to point this out to
Mysore & to recommend
a Settlement Commission

5. In the meantime
the Survey Department
who are at work
demarcating in those
parts have discovered various other
places in which there
are disputes as to
the boundary & these
also have to be
settled by a Commission.

6. The Board
recommend that
Capt. Clerke should

See in B.P. 11th August No: 221/89.
— — 17 — 2260/94.

See in G.O. 30th April 95 No 666
— 7th June 95 No: 884.

be appointed on
this side and as
it has already been
settled by Mysore
& this Government
that this officer &
a Dept. Commissioner
should cooperate in
matters to the demarcation
& settlement of the
boundary wherever
disputed, all that
seems necessary now
is to suggest to
Mysore that these
officers should
further be empowered
to settle the boundary
where it is in dispute
or to report upon it
if necessary Lac

No 1506 Rev: Dept

Proceedings of the Executive Government
Under date the 15 Oct. 1875
Read the following Rev: of the Bd

Revenue.

Sub. with refce to G.O. 20 July 75 No. 1093
Letter from Supt Rev: Survey reqsting nomination of Capt Clarke or Lieut Baker to act on behalf of Govt to settle certain matters in dispute on the Mysol frontier } M. E. 11th Aug: 1875

Sub. letter from Supt Rev: Survey for orders,
a sketch of a portion of the Tenasserim Rivers giving detailed information as to the Tenasserim claims } " 17th "
6 Sub. letter from Supt Rev: Survey forwarding another sketch of the remaining portion of the Tenasserim Rivers in Mysol } " 2nd Sept: "

M. E. the Governor in Council desires to recommend that the Deputy Commissioner of Tavoy & Capt Clarke, whose meeting has already been arranged, be empowered to form themselves into a Commission for the investigation & settlement of all disputes along the boundary line between Tavoy & Tenasserim.

Sd

+ P.D. 30 April 75 No. 666.
— 7 June 75 No. 884.

14 To the Bd of Revenue
13 Supt of Rev: Survey } dated 26/10.

50