

(1) Number of Pages 50
 (2) Date of repair 14 (18) 7. 1969
 (3) Initials of the Referencer 8/2

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1620	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10. 11.	1876 196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 136. From A. O. HUME, Esq., C.B., Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, (Forests,) to the Honorable D. F. CARMICHAEL, Secretary to the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated Simla, 31st July 1876, No. 684.

THE attention of the Governor-General in Council has been directed to two letters by the Conservator of Forests recorded in the Proceedings of the Government of Madras in the Revenue Department (Forests) for the month of February 1876.

2. In paragraph 6 of his letter, dated the 4th February 1876 (Entry No. 208), Colonel Beddome remarks that "Government has lately given up very large tracts of forests to certain Zemindars in Tinnevely," that "Government ryots living in their vicinity have enjoyed certain rights or privileges on the outskirts of these tracts in common with the Zemindars' ryots, and that both these rights are likely to be entirely disallowed." I am directed to request that, with the permission of His Grace the Governor in Council, the Government of India may be favored with a report regarding the position and extent of these forests, and the circumstances under which they were given up.

3. In paragraph 13 of his letter, dated the 31st January 1876 (Entry No. 246), the Conservator, in speaking of the inquiry which is being instituted into the rights of Government in forest lands in South Canara, states it as his opinion that "the result of the inquiry and settlement, if carried out as it has been commenced, will leave Government without an acre of forest in South Canara, either in the plains or line of ghauts." He also quotes a remark by Mr. Cherry, the Deputy Conservator of Forests in that district, to the effect that "upwards of 740 square miles of well-situated ghaut and lowland forest, containing a wealth of bamboos, poon-spars, and other good timbers, besides two cardamom tracts, are claimed by a single family on the ground of long enjoyment and previous payment of Rupees 12-8-0 per annum for the privilege of cutting kumari."

4. The Governor-General in Council is aware, from the papers recorded in former Proceedings of the Madras Government, that the forest rights of the State in South Canara have, for some time past, been the subject of prolonged deliberations by the Board of Revenue and the Madras Government. His Excellency in Council has no means of judging whether the Conservator's opinion is based upon a complete knowledge of the facts of the case, and whether Mr. Cherry's statement, as quoted by Colonel Beddome, is correct. But so much is evident from the letter recorded in the Proceedings of the Madras Government that the Conservator seriously apprehends that those forests in South Canara, which have hitherto been regarded as Government forests, will now be claimed as private property, and will be given up to the claimants.

5. The expression in an official document of such an opinion by the responsible head of the Forest Department seems to call for explanation, and can obviously not be ignored by the Government of India. Accordingly, I am directed to request that, with the permission of His Grace the Governor in Council, the Government of India may be favored with a report explaining fully the present state of the question. It should be stated in the report whether the opinion expressed by the Conservator is warranted by the facts of the case, and it should be explained what progress has been made with the inquiry instituted into the Government forest rights in South Canara.

6. It is inferred from the orders of the Madras Government on this subject that one object of this inquiry was to determine in an authoritative manner what blocks of forest may be regarded as State property, and that it was intended to demarcate such blocks as Government forests. Should any forests have already been demarcated in this manner, the report now asked for should state their position, their area, and the character of the forest vegetation.

(True Copy.)

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

Ed. F. R. Bantleman.

No. 137.

No. 120.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,

AGRICULTURE, AND COMMERCE.

Forests, No. 5.

regard to certain forests in Tinnevely and
ment in regard to the Canara forests will
tion. Respecting the forest tracts referred
to state as follows:—

2. When this district came into the p
found, to a great extent, parcelled out
Zemindars. Much of the western portion of
tains, whose estates embraced a considerable
which form the great dividing line between
that line was perhaps in few places distinct
great extent, covered by impenetrable fores
slopes may roughly be regarded as appertai
Tamil country. Over portions of these
possibly, to some extent, usurped control. B
appears to have been put forward by the Brit
does it appear that any active interference w

G.O.,	6th January 1868,	No. 29.
"	16th April "	" 986.
"	12th July "	" 2,009.
"	20th August "	" 2,382.
"	19th July 1870,	" 1,106.
"	3rd June 1871,	" 981.
"	29th "	" 1,123.
"	16th March 1872,	" 467.
"	21st May "	" 810.
"	24th October "	" 1,475.
"	22nd April 1873,	" 423.
"	16th June "	" 614.
"	4th July "	" 685.
"	27th October "	" 1,187.

result was hardly to be regarded as favor
Government resolved to take the opinion
in extenso in the Proceedings, 3rd June 18
case of four of the Zemindaris, (1) Sing
Sivagiri, but is really generally applicable
to Zemindari forests in the southern dist
summed up in paragraph 3 of this Order, to
dars rested on no very satisfactory evidence,
from interference, the possession of the Z
Government.

3. The Government, however, resolve
deciding upon the course to be pursued, obs

SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter, No. 684, 31st
July 1876, calling for information in
outh Canara. The action of this Govern
m the subject of a separate communica
by the Conservator in Tinnevely, I am

session of the British Government it was
among the ancient Tamil Poligars and
the district was ruled by these petty chief
ortion of the eastern slopes of the ghats,
e Tamil and Malayalam peoples, though
defined. The whole range was, to a
but for territorial purposes the western
ig to the Malayalam, the eastern to the
est tracts the Poligars exercised and
it, on the other hand, no claim thereto
sh Government. Nor in the early days
with the rights and privileges asserted by
the Zemindars was either contemplated
o attempted. The policy of abstinence
a opted appears to have been both wise
a d conciliatory. From the papers noted in
the margin it will appear that claims of
overnment in these forests were, for the
first time, put forward by Government in
connection with the supply of fuel for the
Great Southern Railway in the year 1867.
During the following three years much
information was obtained, but the general

le to Government. Accordingly, the
its law-officers. That opinion is given
No. 981. It relates especially to the
atti, (2) Chokampatti, (3) Sattur, (4)
the position of Government in respect
s of the Peninsula. The opinion is
t that, though the claims of the Zemin
Government were seemingly debarred
dars being adverse to the rights of

obtain still further information before
ing that where they "determine finally

Agriculture (1876) Department.

Government of Fort St. George.

Dated 10th November 1876. } No. 1,620.
Received } Enclosures.
5 spare copies.

D. No. Progs.

D. No. No.

Submitting the information called regarding
certain forests in the Tinnevely District, and
stating that the action of Government in
regard to the Camero forests will form the
subject of a separate communication.

No. 684.

FROM

A. O. HUME, Esq., C.B.,
Secretary to the Government of India,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Department of Revenue,
Agriculture, and Commerce.
Forests.

SIMLA, the 31st July 1876.

SIR,

THE attention of the Governor General in Council has been directed to two letters by the Conservator of Forests recorded in the Proceedings of the Government of Madras in the Revenue Department (Forests) for the month of February 1876.

2. In paragraph 6 of his letter dated the 4th February 1876 (entry No. 208) Colonel Beddome remarks that "Government has lately given up very large tracts of forests to certain zemindars in Tinnevely," that "Government ryots living in their vicinity have enjoyed certain rights or privileges on the outskirts of these tracts in common with the zemindars' ryots, and that both these rights are likely to be entirely disallowed." I am directed to request that, with the permission of His Grace the Governor in Council, the Government of India may be favoured with a report regarding the position and extent of these forests, and the circumstances under which they were given up.

3. In paragraph 13 of his letter dated the 31st January 1876 (entry No. 246) the Conservator in speaking of the enquiry which is being instituted into the rights of Government in forest lands in South Kanara, states it as his opinion that "the result of the enquiry and settlement if carried out as it has been commenced will leave Government without an acre of forest in South Kanara, either in the plains or line of ghâts." He also quotes a remark by Mr. Cherry, the Deputy Conservator of Forests in that district, to the effect that "upwards of 740 square miles of well situated ghât and lowland forest, containing a wealth of bamboos, poon spars, and other good timbers, besides two cardamom tracts, are claimed by a single family on the ground of long enjoyment and previous payment of Rs. 12-8 per annum for the privilege of cutting kumari."

4. The Governor General in Council is aware, from the papers recorded in former Proceedings of the Madras Government, that the forest rights of the State in South Kanara have for some time past been the subject of prolonged deliberations by the Board of Revenue and the Madras Government. His Excellency in Council has no means of judging whether the Conservator's opinion is based upon a complete knowledge of the facts of the case, and whether Mr. Cherry's statement as quoted by Colonel Beddome is correct. But so much is evident from the letter recorded in the Proceedings of the Madras Government that the Conservator seriously apprehends that those forests in South Kanara, which have hitherto been regarded as Government forests, will now be claimed as private property and will be given up to the claimants.

no doubt:
but we do
mean

1 February 1876 - 2nd. 47

12/6/82

Revenue 1876 Depart.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
AGRICULTURE, AND COMMERCE.

FORESTS.

To
THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MADRAS.

No. 684.

Dated Simla, the 31st July 1876.
Recd 14 Aug.

14-8-76

Rev. Secy

for the Govt.

1. The Govt. has been asked to
2. The Govt. has been asked to
3. The Govt. has been asked to

SUBJECT.

CALLS for an explanation regarding certain re-
marks made by Colonel Beddome, Conservator
of Forests, Madras, regarding an enquiry that
is being instituted in that Presidency into the
rights of Government in the forests of South
Kanara. Asks for a report on the progress of
such enquiry, and also on the position and
extent of forests ceded in Tinnevely and the
circumstances under which they were given up.

N^o 136-

GO 10 November 76

12/1620

Rev. Dept

1520
6

Memo for orders
on N. 3327.

by J. G. Giff

From Govt India

31-7-76

No 684 Forests

The question of the
rights of the Government in
the Tinnevely Forests was,
apparently for the first
time, the subject of a
careful investigation during
the years 1869-70. In
the Dec. of 1871 3rd June 1871
N. 581, the result of the
enquiries to that date are
given, together with the
opinion of the Govt. Member
on the state of the case.
It was found in
that

that order that
"what information there
was, went to show
that the reservation of these
lands is, in each case, attended
with much difficulty," and that
"Govt. must wait till a
more favorable opportunity
occurs for securing the
dispossession of these lands."

The opinion of the
Govt. Pleader had been
obtained on claims of Govt.
in the case of

(1) Simpanputty, (2) Chokampur,
(3) Pottur, (4) Sivapuri

that opinion was
briefly as follows:-

(1) that there was very little
evidence at all as to
possession in the part of
the Reminders, and that in
the case of Simpanputty, the
great extent and value of
the

the forests claimed are not
of all proportion to the area
of the Reminders, but that
there is still some evidence
of possession of the whole area
for a considerable period of
time sufficient to bar a
claim by Govt. if the Twelve
year rule applies.

(2) That, in some cases, the
rights of the Reminders appear
to be superior in point of
possession, which has been
averse as against Govt., the
Govt. not having clearly enforced
their right or opposed the
encroachment of the Reminders.

The Govt. drew that the
general conclusion is that
some arrangement should be
attempted for purchasing
the rights of Reminders, or for
using the forests, and that
this would, in the end, prove
the cheapest and most
expedient course. "The

The Collector was
ordered to continue the
inquiry, the Govt. stating
that when they determined
finally to withdraw their
claims in respect of any
particular estate, it will
remain for the Collector, in
due course, to buy out or
take on lease the hereditary
rights to the forest.

Mr Puckle continued
this inquiry, and his reports
were finally disposed of by
Govt. in their order 24th
Oct/72 N. 1475. The
result of Mr Puckle's inquiry
was, in the words of the Board,
"that all the hereditary
of this District have
undoubtedly exercised some
rights of ownership (however
vague and undefined)
over the forest in
their

their neighbourhood
and have always asserted
a claim to the primeval
forests extending as far as
the boundary of the District
from times anterior to
British rule."

The Board therefore
thought it out of the question
to get possession of any
of them without payment
of some reasonable com-
pensation to the hereditary
possessors.

The Board suggested
two courses to Govt.

(1) the obtaining of Forest
Lands on pattas from
the hereditary, which
pattas they thought would
be binding on the future
successors under the
Act VIII of 1865.

(2) to take up the Forest
for "public purposes,"
which would be
advisable if the Forest
Bill

Bill became law,
or perhaps might be
advisable even now
under the existing law

The Gov. remarks that
"the claims of the Reminders
are doubtless in many
places well founded,
but in many other instances
there seems to be little doubt
that equally good claims
could be maintained
on behalf of free holders.

The rights of property would,
however, appear to have
been very generally exercised
by the Reminders, and the
Gov. has come to the
conclusion that the best
course to adopt is to induce
them to surrender their
claims to such extent
as may be necessary for
securing the object
in

in view (circumstances)
in consideration of a
reduction of purchase

The Directors of Gradua
and Linnecoll were
instructed to
prepare definite
proposals with
a statement
showing "the present
and proposed
purchase of
such estate, the nature
and extent of the demands
proposed", stating
at the same
time whether each
reminder concerned
apart to the proposal,
with

Zemindari forests, Chettam
putti now split up into
numerous small Mittahs.
Sagiri, hopelessly involved
in litigation and likely soon
to be similarly divided.

Settur, the Zamindar of which
place declines to part with
his forest, and Saptur, whose
Zamindar has just gained
his suit in the Madras
Court and is unlikely to
come to terms. "This northern
range", he continues, "is
altogether inferior to the
other and yields no water
supply of any consequence
to the Villages. I do not
therefore think it worth-
while taking any steps
to acquire the forest lands
on this northern range
of hills". The Board
supported the collector's
views as regards the
northern forests, and
also

G.O. 4 July 1873. C. 685

also in respect to ¹⁵²⁰the
acquiring or leasing of
Singampatti and Kattalai
malai. As regards Singam-
patti it was stated that
the forest could not be
acquired but only leased
from the Court of Wards,
as the Zamindar was
still a minor. The Govt.
observed that "as the ac-
quisition of the northern
forests seems in no way
imperative in the inter-
ests of Govt. nothing further
need be done regarding
them". The Board's pro-
posals regarding the
southern forests were
approved.

Meanwhile the forest
Department had trespassed on
a piece of forest lying
within the Saptur Ze-
mindari's boundary.
The Zamindar filed a
suit

Suit in the Madras Court.
The dispute was inquired
into by two Revenue Officers.
The result was that on
the advice of the Govt.
Plender Govt. admitted
the Zemindar's claim, and
finally paid him Rs. 2500
as compensation for meane
profits during the period
of their trespass.

From the foregoing
statement it is submitted,
will appear that Govt. simply
thought it incumbent on
them, after the most
careful enquiry from
legal advice, not to
go to law against the
Zemindars, and have
not as Col Beddome
says "given up any large
tracts of forests." The
possession at least was
with the Zemindars, what
their absolute right might
be.

G.O. 21 May 1872 No 810
G.O. 30 Oct 1874 No 1380.

X Unnecessary as we
have no title, we can't
make or give one to our people.

Notes 3 April/76
31 July/76

1820
As regards the invasion
of the privileges of Govt.
and other ryots by the
Zemindars, it is submitted
that a report may be
called for from the (then)
of Trincomally.

The South Canara
forests have been fully
dealt with in the Pro-
ceedings of Govt. No 1361
October 1874 and No 271,
20 February 1875; Mr Webster
is now conducting the
enquiry into forest rights.
Perhaps it may be
thought desirable to
forward Col Beddome's
letter of 31 January 1876
to that Officer for his
remarks - in other words, to
elicit from him the detailed
information required by the
Govt. of India.

18/8/76.

[Faint, illegible handwriting, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side]

Memorandum
to the Secretary to the Govt of India
Department of Revenue

Separate note 11 Nov 1876
with the 1st Encl.
J. P. Poon

To

The Secretary to the Govt of India
 Dept of Revenue & Finance

Sir

I am directed to
 acknowledge the receipt
 of your letter N 684
 31st July 1876 calling for
 information in
 regard to certain tracts
 in Simserilly and Lath
 Canals. The action of
 this Govt in respect to
 these tracts is directly with
 from the subject of a
 separate communication.
 Respecting the tracts
 referred to by the Commission

Note

The information about the
 Tinnivelly forests is ready, up
 to date, & can be sent at once;
 or in conjunction with that
 about Tanjore forests, as may be
 preferred.

2 - As the Govt of India are
 alarmed at our Progs, will
 it not be proper to direct Mr. M. L. to
 do nothing further w^h may
 prejudice any possible order
 w^h the Govt of India may wish to
 pass in the matter.

D. L. - Aug 18/76

Care
 Special

cc 4 H. & L. 6/10/76 N 7/11/76
 C. 10/8/76 N 8 10/76

31/7/76 N 1120

in Tinnivelly, I am
to state as follows:-

When this District
came into the possession
of the British Govt. it was
found, to a great extent,
parcelled out among the
uncivilized Tamil Poligars
and Revenue men.

Much of the western
portion of the District was
ruled by these petty
Chieftains, and still
embraced a considerable
portion of the Western Slopes
of the Ghats, which form
the great dividing line
between the Tamil and
Malayalams people, though
that line was perhaps in
few places distinctly

defined. The whole range
was to a great extent
covered by impenetrable
forest, but for territorial
purposes the western
slopes may roughly be
regarded as appertaining
to the Malabar, the
Eastern to the Tamil Country.
One portion of these forest
tracts the Poligars to some
extent exercised control.

On the other hand, no
claim thereto appears to
have been put forward
by the British Govt. -
Nor in the early days
does it appear that any
active interference with
the rights and privileges of
the Zemindars was either

contemplated or attempted.
The policy of abstinence
adopted appears to have
been both wise and conciliating.

From the papers noted
in the margin it will
appear that ^{claims} rights of Govt.
in these forests were
for the first time put
forward by Govt. in
connection with the
supply of fuel for the

Great Southern Railway
in the year 1867 -
During the following
three years much
information was
obtained, but the
general result was
hardly

- G.O. 6 Jan 1868 No. 29
- " 16 April - " - 986
- " 12 July - " - 2089
- " 20 Aug. - " - 2382
- " 19 July 1870 - " - 1106
- " 3^d June 1871 - " - 981
- " 29th June - " - 1123
- " 16 Mar 1872 - " - 467
- " 21st May - " - 810
- " 24 Oct - " - 1475
- " 22^d April 1873 - " - 423
- " 16 June - " - 614
- " 4 July - " - 685
- " 27 Oct - " - 1187

hardly to be regarded
as favorable to
Govt. Accordingly, the
Govt. resolved to take
the opinion of its
Law Officers. That
opinion is given
in extenso in the
Proceedings 3^d June
1871 No. 981 -
It
The opinion relates
especially to
the case of
four of the
Dominaries

Zemindari (1)
Sinfampatty (2)
Chokampatty (3)
Pattur (4) Sivagiri,
but is really
generally applicable
to the position of
Government in
respect to Zemini-
dari. I must
in the
Southern
Districts of
the Peninsula
The

4
163
The opinion is summed
up in para 3 of this Order to
effect that the ^{the} claims of
the zemindars rested on no
very satisfactory evidence, the
Government were seemingly
debarred from interference, the
possession of the zemindars
being adverse to the rights
of Government.

The Government how-
ever resolved to obtain still
further information before
deciding upon the course
to be pursued, observing
that when they determined
finally to withdraw their
claims in respect of any
particular

particular estate, it will
remain with the collectors
in due course, to endeavour
to buy out or take on lease
the zemindar's rights to the
forest. The further reports
^{were} submitted and disposed of
in the Proceedings of
Government 24 October
1872 No. 1475. The result
of the ^{subsequent} further inquiries of
the collector of Linnvelly
was in the words of the
Board "that all the
zemindars of this district
have, undoubtedly,

increased

1870⁵
exercised some rights
of ownership (however
vague and undefined)
over the forests in their
neighbourhood, and have
always asserted a claim
to the primeval forests
extending as far as the
boundary of the district,
from times anterior to British
rule. The Revenue Board
now thought it out of
question to get possession
of any of the forests
without payment of some
reasonable compensation

to the zemindars, and suggested two courses to Government, (1) the obtaining of forest lands on puttahs from the zemindars which puttahs they thought would be hindering on the grantors' successors under Sec. 2 Act VIII, 1863. (2) to take up the forests for public purposes which would be advisable, if the Forest Bill became Law, or even under the existing Law.

The Govt. however were not then disposed fully to endorse the opinion of the Board, observing that "the

claims of the zemindars were doubtless in many cases well founded, but in many other instances there seems to be little doubt that equally good claims could be maintained on behalf of Government villages. The right of property ^{rights} however appear to have been very generally exercised by the zemindars and the Government have come to the conclusion that the best course to adopt is to induce them to surrender their claims to such extent as may be necessary for securing the object in view (Conservation) in consideration of a reduction of peshkash. The

The Collectors of Tinnevely and Madurai were instructed at the same time to prepare definite proposals with a statement showing "the present and proposed pishoush of each estate, the nature & extent of the surrender proposed," stating at the same time whether each Zamindar concerned agreed to the proposal, with a view to the Govt. framing a definite scheme for the approval of the Government of India.

Mr. Puckle, the Collr. of Tinnevely at the time submitted a report on the

Bd. Pro. 28. March 73. 477.
recorded in G.O. 22nd April 1873
No. 423

AL
11th Dec^r. 1872, stating that
in the smaller block of hills
between Courtallam and
Cape Comorin there are
only three forests to be
leased out, the hill side
south of Mahendragiri
offered by the Durum
where the boundary was
defined for Rs. 1000 per
annum, the forest claimed
by Singampatti which will
be under the management
of the Court of Woods for the
next four years, and the
Kattai Malai, for which
I have already taken an
agreement. He did not refer
to the forest north of
Courtallam and was called
on

for
on further report which
he submitted 4 April 1873

N^o 174 together with a
rough sketch of the Hills.

He remarked that it was
"the southern block only as
yielding our water supply,"

that he cared to conserve
and that nothing could be
done with the only Zemindar

(Singampatti) who claims
any portion of the Hills,

as he was a minor under
the Court of Wards. On the

northern range he stated

there were four Zemindary
forests, Chokumpatti now

split up into numerous

small Mittals, Sivagiri,

hopelessly

printed with G. O. 4 July 1873.

hopelessly involved in
litigation and likely soon
to be similarly divided.
Settur, the zemindar of
which place declines to
part with his forest; and
Saptur, whose zemindar
has just gained his suit
in the Madras Court and
is unlikely to come to terms.

"This northern range," he
continues, "is altogether
inferior to the other and
yields no water supply

of any consequence to Govt.
Villages; I do not therefore

think it worthwhile taking
any steps to acquire the forest
lands on this northern range

of

of Hills." The Board supported the Collector's views as regards the northern forests and also in respect to the acquiring or leaving of Singampatti and Kottalai hills. As regards Singampatti it was stated that the forest could not be acquired but only leased from the Court of Wards, as the Zamindar was still a minor. The Govt. observed that as the acquisition of the northern forests seems in no way imperative in the interests of Government nothing further

G. O. 4 July 1885

further need be done regarding them." The Board's proposals regarding the Southern forests were approved.

Meanwhile the Forest Department had trespassed on a piece of forest lying within the Supt. or Zamindar's boundary. The Zamindar filed a suit in the Madras Court. The dispute was inquired into by two Revenue Officers. The result was that on the advice of the Government Pleader, Government admitted the Zamindar's claim, and finally paid him Rs. 2500

as compensation for mesne
profits during the period
of their trespass.

His Grace the Governor
^{General}
in Council ~~thinks~~ that
the Govt. of India will
gather from the foregoing
narrative that the action
of the Govt. throughout
has been marked by a
studious care, not only for the
interests of the people concerned
^{for them}
but also of the State. The steps
taken were decided on after a
patient inquiry, extending
over several years, and on
legal advice. To have brought
the question before the Courts
of Law would have been their opinion
neither wise nor expedient.
Then

1520/10
They regard it as highly
impolitic for the State to
raise pretensions which it may
not be able to substantiate,
and to call in question rights
and privileges which have
been exercised by the zemindars
and ^{the} people without hindrance
for generations. And whilst
admitting the advisability
of securing some of these
forests for the State, they
are emphatically of opinion
that the plan, adopted by
them for attaining this end,
is, under all the circumstances
of the case, the most expedient.

As regards the alleged
infringement by Zemindars
of the communal rights
of the inhabitants of villages
outside the limits of their
estates,

estates - the Govt are
aware that many proprietors
are seeking to limit the actual
privileges which have been
exercised by the people
in respect to the proprietors
forests in their vicinity.
For their protection a
Forest Law is needed
and until such a law
is passed the efforts of
Government ^{to secure such privileges} must prove
in the main ineffectual.
The ^{important} subject however
of forest legislation in
this Presidency will form
the subject of a separate
letter.

The information
asked for regarding the
extent and value of these
forests

1620
24

forests will be found
GO. 6 Jan 2/68, No 29 recorded in the papers
do 16 April/68 = 986
do - 12 July/69 = 2009 marginally noted
do - 20 Aug/69 = 2382
do 19 July/70 = 1106
do 3rd June/71 = 981.

*
8.11.76

E. H. H.

estates - the Govt are
aware that many proprietors
are seeking to limit the actual
privileges which have been
exercised by the people
in respect to the proprietors
forests in their vicinity.
For their protection a
Forest Law is needed
and until such a law
is passed the efforts of
Government, ^{to secure such privileges} must prove
in the main ineffectual.
The ^{important} subject however
of forest legislation in
this Presidency will form
the subject of a separate
letter.

The information
asked for regarding the
extent and value of these
forests

1520/24
forests will be found
GO. 6 Jan 2/68, No 29 recorded in the papers
do 16 April 68, No 986
do - 12 July 69, No 2009 marginally noted.
do - 20 Aug 69, No 2382
do 19 July 70, No 1106.
do 3rd June 71, No 981.

8.11.76

E. H. H.

To Govt of India
Financially and
Revenue Dept

for [unclear] [unclear]

1. [unclear] [unclear]

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>1621</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	<u>10 - 11 - 196</u>	<u>876</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
(2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
 (2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
 (3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12✓
(2) Date of repair 9. 7. 1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9. 7. 1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1621

Press
Mis.

Dated

10 - 11 - 1968

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
(2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1621

Press
Mis.

Dated

10 - 11 - 1968

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
(2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
(2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12✓
 (2) Date of repair 9.7.1969
 (3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1621

Press
Mis.

Dated

10 - 11 - 196 ⁸⁷⁶

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9. 7. 1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>1621</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	<u>10 - 11 - 196</u>	<u>876</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages.....12✓
 (2) Date of repair.....9.7.1969
 (3) Initials of the Referencer.....Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	10 - 11 - 196	876

21

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9. 7. 1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>1621</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	<u>10 - 11 - 196</u>	<u>876</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9.7.1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1621

Press
Mis.

Dated

10 - 11 - 1968

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(1) Number of Pages 12 ✓
(2) Date of repair 9. 7. 1969
(3) Initials of the Referencer Y

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	<u>1621</u>	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	<u>10 - 11 - 196</u>	<u>876</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

with the view of the Govt.
framing a definite
proposal for the sanction
of the G.L. of India.

Mr. Puckle submitted
a report on the 11th

Decr. 1872, stating that

Brands Pass. 28. hand / 73. 477

"in the smaller block

of hills between

Comballum and Cape

Comorin there are

only three forests to

be leased out, the

hill side south of

Arakendragiri forest

by the Devan when

the boundary was

defined for Rs 1000

per annum, the forest

claimed



printed with G.O. 4. July 73

1620
claimed by Singampatti
which will be under the
management of the Court of
Wards for the next four years,
and the Katlai Malai, for
which I have already taken
an agreement." He did
not refer to the Forests
south of Comballum and
was called on further report
which he submitted 4th
April 1873 & 1874 together
with a rough sketch
of the hills. He remarked
that it was "the Southern
block only as yielding our
water supply", that he
acted to conserve and that
nothing could be done
with the only Zamindar
(Singampatti) who claims
any portion of these hills,
as he was a minor under
the Court of Wards. On
the Southern range he
stated there were four
Gumdary