Archives 1—10,000—8-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 14

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	102	Press. / Mis.
Dated	12-1-1877	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
12th January 1877.

No. 214. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 6th September 1876, No. 2,276:—

Read the following letters:—

From J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of Nilgiris, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ootacamund, 24th August 1876, No. 61.

BOARD'S Proceedings, 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, on the subject of the boundary line between the Nilgiri and Coimbatore Districts, state that the line has been adopted by the Revenue Survey Department in communication with the Revenue Authorities, and recommend its adoption, calling, at the same time, for a report on the extent and tenure of land on the Nilgiri slopes purchased by planters from Irulers and Kurumbers.

2. On the subject of the boundary I am addressing a letter to Colonel Cloete. The line proposed has not my concurrence, neither has it apparently the concurrence of the Collector of Coimbatore, who, in his letter in Proceedings of the Board, No. 1,975, dated 4th August 1876, desires the boundary should add more of the slopes to the Coimbatore District. My object, on the other hand, is to secure the slopes for the Nilgiri District. The Board, in the latter Proceedings quoted, themselves point out that the slopes cannot be kept out of the hands of intending cultivators, and if cultivation spreads on them, it will [illegible] coffee, which [illegible] preserve the [illegible] within the Nilgiri jurisdiction [illegible] the Coimbatore jurisdiction. Kumari cultivation, of Irulers, [illegible] adjoining the Pilloor Estate. It appears to me much simpler that the whole of the slopes should be given to the Nilgiris; otherwise estates may be cut in half, and land adapted for coffee be put in the hands of Irulers. There can be no question that estates are more profitable to the country than Kumari clearings. I long ago advocated the Bhowany as the boundary. Such a boundary would solve all difficulties. I shall address the Board further on the subject when I hear from Colonel Cloete. Meanwhile, I would venture to draw the attention of the Board to the school-map of the Nilgiris. A glance will show how convenient it would be if the Moyar as well as the Bhowany were adopted as boundaries. The argument that there is paddy cultivation between the hills and these rivers, and the land of ryots should not be severed from Coimbatore, is an argument of no great force in itself, as it has merely reference to climate, and the Nilgiri District has paddy land in the Seegur Valley.

3. The Board observe, in the first Proceedings quoted in this letter, their impression to be that Irulers and Kurumbers hold varying pattas subject to an express stipulation that the land may not be sold. This is the case only as respects the thirty bullahs of land granted under the Proceedings, dated 4th June 1872, No. 898, to which the Board refer, and which are on the Kotagherry side. No additional land whatever has been granted since under the Proceedings in question or at all to Irulers or Kurumbers.

4. I enclose a statement showing the land on the hills purchased by planters from Irulers and Kurumbers. This land was held by their first owners on puttas dated prior to the Proceedings of the 4th June 1872, and the puttas contained no stipulation against sale. The Iruler and Kurumber owners were at full liberty to dispose of the land.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Statement showing the Particulars of the Land sold by Irulers and Kurumbers to Planters.

Village.	No.	Names of Persons who sold Land.	Name of the Land sold.	Bullahs.	Assessment.	Name of the first Purchaser.
No. 7—Vellary Combay.	1	Kalun	Athimara Punjah	1 5 2	0 9 5	It appears to have been purchased by Mr. Sherman.
			Kothoo ,, ...	1 11 0	0 11 8	
	3	Moondy	Kothoo ,, ...	0 6 2	0 2 10	
			Vagamara ,, ...	0 12 3	0 5 11	
	4	Siran	Nagamara ,, ...	1 4 3	0 8 7	
			Kothoo ,, ...	0 2 2	0 2 2	
	5	Komarun	Solamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	
	2	Parama Siran	Nanimara ,, ...	0 2 2	0 3 0	
			Kothoo ,, ...	0 11 0	0 12 10	
	6	Komaran	Salamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	
	6	Kary	Nagamara Kothoo..	0 4 0	0 2 6	
			Kothoo Punjah	0 4 0	0 7 0	By Mr. Wormald.
	7	Karupputy	Nerimara ,, ...	1 7 1	0 10 3	
			Surivoo	0 2 0	0 0 7	
	11	Kurumberkary	Nagamara Kothoo Kaadoo	1 0 0	0 14 1	
	11	Do.	Kothoo Punjah	0 8 0	0 7 0	Kristnan.
	11	Do.	Nagamara Kothoo Kaadoo Punjah	1 9 0	1 6 2	Rungasawmy.
			Do. do.	4 0 0	3 8 5	Mr. Deane.
	13	Kurumber Pothay ...	Kararay Punjah	3 0 0	1 12 2	Mr. Ryal.
				19 10 3	13 3 7	
No. 17—Aryood Combay.	2	Sadyan...	Malaimail Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 7 1	Singara Lingum Pillay and Komorasawmy Pillay.
No. 8—Seral Combay	8	Linganood Mussanar ...	Nagamara Kothoo ,, ...	2 0 0	1 12 10	It appears to have been purchased by Mr. Hall.
			Nakamara Koadoo	1 0 0	0 9 5	
			Sekai Kody Nagamara Punjah...	1 5 2	0 12 9	
			Kothoo Punjah	0 5 0	0 2 10	
	9	Manien...	Mamara ,, ...	1 0 0	0 9 5	Mr. Wormald.
	7	Koodakari Nujjah ...	Kodamamotto Punjah	6 4 0	3 10 6	Narainier.
	5	Pulian	Kootoo Peeamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	Fakeer Mohamed and Sons.
				14 15 0	9 0 2	
	10	Aundy	Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	Cassim Sahib.
		Rungan	Do.	0 2 0	0 8 9	
	4	Kurumber Bellan ...	Manalada Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	
			Koodakulloo Yeruthoo Kullooputtamara Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 2	Mr. F. Cockburn.
	4	Kurumber Bellan ...	Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	
			Athimara ,, ...	1 0 0	0 9 5	One Rary.
			Selamara Koondoo Parai Punjah.	1 0 0	0 14 9	
				6 2 0	5 9 4	
			Total...	41 11 8	28 4 2	

24th August 1876.

(Signed) J. R. COCKERELL,
Commissioner.

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 4th September 1876, No. 2,650-91.

I HAVE the honor to send, for the orders of the Board of Revenue, a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete, the Deputy Superintendent of No. 1 Party, enclosing correspondence between him and Mr. Cockerell on the subject of the southern boundary of the Nilgiri Hills.

No. 983-502 of 2nd September 1876 and enclosures; originals to be returned.

2. The matter of the boundary has already been before the Board, and has been considered in Proceedings, No. 1,975, of the 4th August 1876.

3. The boundary has been demarcated and surveyed after most careful inquiry on the part of the Deputy Superintendent, who states that the sketch given by the Deputy Talisildar is incorrect, and gives no idea of the correct relative distance between the different points. In order to enable the Board to judge of the real state of the case, I beg permission to send, for their inspection, the office-copy of a map showing the boundary to which Mr. Cockerell now objects.

4. The change suggested by the Deputy Tahsildar is, in my opinion, most ill-advised. The boundary now cleared and surveyed gives to the hills all the land capable of being cultivated with tea or coffee, and runs along the base of the main range.

5. I trust that the Board will consider that Mr. Cockerell was not justified in making the remarks contained in paragraph 3 of his letter, and protested against by Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Superintendent, Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 2nd September 1876, No. 983-502.

I HAVE the honor to forward, for your consideration, copy of a letter I have received from the Commissioner of the Nilgiris.

In paragraph 3 of his letter the Commissioner states that I reported the proposed boundary and the N[illegible]

The words in my report are, i[illegible] has been demarcated and surveyed. I did *not* state that either officer concurred, and did not intend that my report should have been so interpreted, although I see now that it is capable of that interpretation.

The Commissioner can hardly have intended to have charged me with having made a wilfully incorrect report, and will, I have no doubt, acknowledge this.

4. The enclosed copy of my letter to the Commissioner, No. 626-328, of 23rd June, will show that I had been in constant communication with him on this subject since *May* 1874; it will also be seen that in August 1874 I informed the Commissioner that the greater part of the proposed line had been cleared, and I requested that it might be inspected at an early date, and that I might be informed if there was any objection to it.

5. To this letter I have never received any reply, and, in explanation of this, the Commissioner in his letter of the 22nd instant (now forwarded) states that the reason of the delay in answering mine of the 31st August 1874 was that he was anxious that a European officer should visit the boundary; that he then waited to consult the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar who was expected to return to his appointment; and that, finally, the matter slipped out of notice.

6. The Commissioner's dissent from the proposed bound[illegible]ted in his letter of the 31st March 1875, is based *solely* on the report of one K. Latchma[illegible] Row who had been a Nazir and was then temporarily in charge of the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's Office, the boundary has, I believe, even now never been inspected by any European officers on the part of the Nilgiris.

7. The Acting Deputy Tahsildar's report was accompanied by a sketch, of which I enclose a copy, from this it will be seen that in March 1874 the Commissioner agreed to the proposed boundary from Kallar to a point marked C near Birkal, but from that point he claimed a straight line south-west to a bend in the Moyar river; *no grounds whatever* were given for this claim, which, if allowed, would have thrown into the Nilgiris the Coimbatore village of Chinna Muli and its cultivation.

I may mention that this sketch is quite incorrect, and gives no idea of the correct relative distances between the different points.

8. In the present communication the Commissioner requests my further views regarding the inclusion of the slopes on the Nilgiri District; he does not seem to be aware that the line marked and surveyed by me does throw the slopes into his district; my views are embodied in my report printed with Board's Proceedings, No. 1,167, of the 3rd May 1876.

9. The Commissioner says he would wish the Bhowany to be the boundary, but the Nilgiri officers would find it difficult to visit the tract between the Bhowany and the foot of the hills.

10. I beg to solicit attention to one other statement made by the Commissioner. He says, in paragraph 5, that Mootoosawmy, the present Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor, reports that he did *not* tell me that he disagreed from his *locum tenens*, whereas I had stated that he did so disagree. I think it is very possible that there may have been some confusion in Mootoosawmy's mind as to what line his predecessor did claim when asked by the Commissioner in his Office; but my statement was not made carelessly or in haste; on being shown by me on the ground the tract claimed by his predecessor as shown in the sketch, Mootoosawmy distinctly told me that, as far as he knew, it did not belong to the Nilgiris, and this, I am confident, he would repeat if I took him to the spot again.

11. I have the honor to request that such notice may be taken of the Commissioner's letter as you may deem desirable. I have thought it advisable not to reply to the Commissioner direct.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

[illegible], Esq., Commissioner of [illegible] Nilgiris, dated Coimbatore, 23rd June 1876, No. 626-328.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, No. 24, on the subject of the district boundary between Coimbatore and the Nilgiris.

2. On the 19th May 1874 I informed you that I was about to mark this boundary, and requested you to be good enough to name a representative for your district.

3. In reply (28th May) you requested to be informed whose attendance it was that I required, and when I intended to visit the hills for the purpose of settling the boundary.

4. I replied on the 5th June that I had then no intention of visiting the Hills, that I believed the boundary ran, for the most part, at the foot of the hills, and that I had applied to you in view to some official of higher standing than a Curnam or Revenue Inspector being present.

5. You stated, in reply (11th June), that reference had better be made to you when I come up to demarcate the boundary.

6. On the 19th June I informed you that I would commence operations about the end of the month at the Malabar tri-junction, and would give you due notice of the exact date.

7. Again on the 22nd June I reported that the work would commence on the 15th July.

8. On the 8th July you informed that the Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor and the Curnam of the Hill Nads would be at Sundapatti on the 13th July.

9. On the 18th July I directed Captain Baynes, Assistant Superintendent, to go over the line and settle it with the representatives of the two districts.

10. Captain Baynes completed the work, and on 31*st August* 1874 I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date, and that I might be informed whether there was any objection on your part to the boundary marked.

11. To this letter I received no reply, but on 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed.

12. I informed you in reply (6th March) that the work had been completed.

13. On 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with tha shown on a sketch enclosed in your letter.

14. I replied on the 18th March showing which of the lines on the sketch had been adopted as the boundary.

15. On the 31st March 1875 you wrote to inquire why a portion of land had been severed [illegible] difficulty [illegible] the necessary information; one Tahsildar was nearly six months replying to my call for information. I had also to visit the place myself and to obtain reports from my Sub-Assistant on the Hills.

17. I can only now state that the claim set forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar as set forth in his report, and sketch on which your letter is based, is altogether groundless.

The permanent Tahsildar, who has for so many years been at Coonoor, acknowledges this, there are hamlets and cultivation within the piece claimed, which have always been in undisputed possession of Coimbatore ryots, and if village accounts were to be followed the boundary would run all along the *crest* of the hills instead of across the lowest spurs as now demarcated.

The straight line C D on the sketch herewith returned would in any case be an impassable boundary.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. G. CLOETE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Deputy Supt., Rev. Survey.

[illegible]

IN the matter of the boundary between this district and Coimbatore I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, recommending the adoption of the boundary you propose, and I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,975, containing a protest from Mr. Wedderburn against your boundary, and expressing his wish that it may run higher up the slopes. I have addressed the Board, stating I do not concur in the proposed boundary, and that I am addressing you on the subject.

2. In your letter to me, dated 23rd June last, you state: "Captain Baynes completed the work (of the boundary line) on the 31st August 1874. I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date. To this letter I received no reply, but on the 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed. On the 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with that shown in a sketch enclosed in your letter."

3. From this quotation it would appear that before making your recommendation to the Board you had become aware that I dissented from the boundary proposed. As your recommendation is dated 18th March, I am at a loss, therefore, to understand the grounds on which you reported that the line had my concurrence.

4. The reason of the delay in answering your letter of the 31st August was that before expressing my views I was anxious that a European officer should visit the boundary, as it was manifest to me it ought not to be accepted without further inquiry, inasmuch as it altered the old boundary. Later on in the year I learnt that Mootoosawmy, the Deputy Tahsildar, was about to re-occupy his appointment, and I put off the matter in order to consult him, but the matter slipped out of notice.

5. You state the claim put forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar is altogether groundless, and refer to the opinion of the permanent Deputy Tahsildar. But Mootoosawmy now reports

that he visited your boundary line in your company in February last, and that he did not tell you that he did not agree with his *locum tenens*.

6. In the last Proceedings of the Board quoted above, the Board appear to think, as I think, that the slopes should all be included in the Nilgiri District, and I shall be glad to receive your further views on the subject. In my opinion any part of the slopes being alienated to Coimbatore will be a fruitful cause of difficulty if planting spreads as I anticipate.

7. In order to illustrate the difficulties which may arise from a line on the slopes, I may state that recently Irulers claiming the jurisdiction of Coimbatore have felled for Kumeri forests adjoining the Pilloor Estate. I should prefer the boundary line to be the Bhowany river as the most natural and easily recognised boundary, but at all events would have it follow the foot of the slopes.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) J. G. CLOETE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Deputy Supt., Rev. Survey.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 and 5.—Maps.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,975.

2. Mr. Cockerell states that the boundary line between the Nilgiris and Coimbatore District demarcated by the Survey Department has not his concurrence, and proposes that the Bhowany and Moyar should be adopted as the boundaries. Although these rivers would, no doubt, form very convenient boundaries, and a saving of labor [illegible] affected, that inconvenience [illegible] the measure, and the Board cannot support the proposal. Mr. Cockerell appears, however, to be under a misapprehension as to the line which has been followed, as he states that he is anxious to secure the slopes for the Nilgiri District, which is exactly the object which influenced the selection of the line already taken, as the Board understand the matter. The line follows the foot of the main range, excluding the outlying spurs, and all the estates and land suitable for tea and coffee planting fall to the Nilgiris. The Pilloor referred to by Mr. Cockerell is the village of that name at the foot of the hills, not the estate on the slopes. The Board concur, therefore, with the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, in thinking that the line which has been followed should be confirmed.

3. The Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, justly takes exception to the tone of Mr. Cockerell's letter, which the Board entirely disapprove; although the expression used by the former conveys the impression that the Commissioner of the Nilgiris and Collector of Coimbatore assented to the line adopted, the Commissioner was not justified in imputing a deliberate mis-statement. The Board are surprised to find that, although repeatedly addressed on the subject, whilst operations were in progress, Mr. Cockerell took no steps to ensure that the correct line was followed. There does not appear to be any ground for supposing that the boundary should cross to the Manaar from C to D as shown on the sketch; at any rate, it was Mr. Cockerell's duty to see that the claim was urged at the proper time.

4. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, it now appears, from the letter above recorded and from the Coimbatore Collector's letter, dated 31st May 1876, No. 112, that all the land alienated by

Irulers and Kurumbers to European planters is putta land, and at the disposal of the holders.

(True Copies and Extract.)
(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 215. ORDER THEREON, 12th January 1877, No. 102.

Miscellaneous.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council determines to accept the line demarcated, as the future boundary between the Nilgiri and Coimbatore Districts as it follows, as nearly as can conveniently be arranged, the old boundaries of the Nilgiri Taluq. Where these are not exactly followed, it will be understood that the grazing and other privileges of the villages on the Coimbatore side are in no way interfered with.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Rd. F. B. Bantleman.

No. 2,276.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 6th September 1876.

Read the following letters:—

From J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of the Nilgiris, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ootacamund, 24th August 1876, No. 61.

BOARD'S Proceedings, 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, on the subject of the boundary line between the Nilgiri and Coimbatore Districts states that the line has been adopted by the Revenue Survey Department in communication with the Revenue Authorities, and recommends its adoption, calling at the same time for a report on the extent and tenure of land on the Nilgiri slopes purchased by planters from Irulers and Kurumbers.

2. On the subject of the boundary, I am addressing a letter to Colonel Cloete. The line proposed has not my concurrence, neither has it apparently the concurrence of the Collector of Coimbatore, who, in his letter in Proceedings of the Board, No. 1,975, dated 4th August 1876, desires the boundary should add more of the slopes to the Coimbatore District. My object, on the other hand, is to secure the slopes for the Nilgiri District. The Board in the latter Proceedings quoted themselves point out that the slopes cannot be kept out of the hands of intending cultivators, and, if cultivation spreads on them, it will be tea or coffee, which it appears to me ought to fall within the Nilgiri jurisdiction. I may observe the proposed line adds Pilloor to the Coimbatore District, and there is a question pending now regarding the appropriation, for Kumari cultivation, of Irulers claiming the Coimbatore jurisdiction, of forest adjoining the Pilloor Estate. It appears to me much simpler that the whole of the slopes should be given to the Nilgiris, otherwise estates may be cut in half and land adapted for coffee be put in the hands of Irulers. There can be no question that estates are more profitable to the country than Kumari clearings. I long ago advocated the Bhowany as the boundary. Such a boundary would solve all difficulties. I shall address the Board further on the subject when I hear from Colonel Cloete. Meanwhile I would venture to draw the attention of the Board to the school map of the Nilgiris. A glance will show how convenient it would be if the Moyar as well as the Bhowany were adopted as boundaries. The argument that there is paddy cultivation between the hills and these rivers and the land of ryots should not be severed from Coimbatore is an argument of no great force in itself, as it has merely reference to climate, and the Nilgiri District has paddy land in the Seegur valley.

3. The Board observe in the first Proceedings quoted in this letter their impression to be that Irulers and Kurumbers hold roving puttas subject to an express stipulation that the land may not be sold. This is the case only as respects the thirty bullahs of land granted under the Proceedings, dated 4th June 1872, No. 898, to which the Board refer and which are on the Kotagherry side. No additional land whatever has been granted since under the Proceedings in question or at all to Irulers or Kurumbers.

4. I enclose a statement showing the land on the hills purchased by planters from Irulers and Kurumbers. This land was held by their first owners on puttas dated prior to the Proceedings of the 4th June 1872, and the puttas contained no stipulation against sale. The Iruler and Kurumber owners were at full liberty to dispose of the land.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

Statement showing the particulars of the land sold by Irulers and Kurumbers to Planters.

Village.	No.	Names of persons who sold land.	Name of the land sold.	Bullahs.	Assessment.	Name of the first purchaser.
					Rs. A. P.	
No. 7—Vellry Combay.	1	Kalun	Athimara Punjah	1 5 2	0 9 5	It appears to have been purchased by Mr. Sherman.
			Kothoo ,, ...	1 11 0	0 11 8	
	8	Moondy	Kothoo ,, ...	0 6 2	0 2 10	
			Vagamara ,, ...	0 12 3	0 5 11	
	4	Siran	Nagamara ,, ...	1 4 3	0 8 7	
			Kothoo ,, ...	0 2 2	0 2 2	
	5	Komaran	Selamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	
	2	Paramia Siran	Narimara ,, ...	0 2 2	0 3 0	
			Kothoo ,, ...	0 11 0	0 13 10	
	[illegible]	[illegible]maran	[illegible]lamara	0 0 [illegible]	0 3 2	
	6	Kary	Nagamara Kothoo	0 4 0	0 2 6	By Mr. Wormald.
			Kothoo Punjah	0 4 6	0 7 0	
	7	Karuppaty	Nerimara ,, ...	1 7 1	0 10 3	
			Sarivoo	0 2 0	0 0 7	
	11	Kurumberkary	Nagamara Kothoo Kandoo	1 0 0	0 14 1	
	11	Do.	Kothoo Punjah	0 8 0	0 7 0	Kristnan.
	11	Do.	Nagamara Kothoo Kandoo Punjah	1 9 0	1 6 2	Rungasawmy.
	11	Do.	Do. do.	4 0 0	3 8 5	Mr. Deane.
	13	Kurumber Pothay ...	Kararay Punjah	3 0 0	1 12 2	Mr Ryal.
				19 10 3	13 3 7	
No. 17—Aryood Combay.	2	Sadyan...	Malaimail Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 7 1	Sungara Lingum Pillay and Komorasawmy Pillay.
No. 8—Seral Combay.	3	Sellan	Nellimara Punjah	2 0 0	0 15 3	It appears to have been purchased by Mr. Hail.
	6	Saran	Yellaipattymara Punjah	0 8 2	0 3 8	
	8	Linganood Musanar ...	Nagamara Kothoo ,, ...	2 0 0	1 12 10	
			Nagamara Kandoo...	1 0 0	0 9 5	
			Sekai Kody Nagamara Punjah ...	1 5 2	0 12 9	
			Kothoo Punjah	0 5 0	0 2 10	
	9	Manien...	Mamara ,, ...	1 0 0	0 9 5	Mr. Wormald.
	7	Koodakari Nujjah ...	Kodamamotto Punjah	6 4 0	3 10 6	Narainier.
	5	Pulian	Kootoo Pelamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	Fakeer Mohamed and Sons.
				14 15 0	9 0 2	
	10	Aundy	Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	Casim Sahib.
		Rungan	Do.	0 2 0	0 3 9	
	4	Kurumber Bellan ...	Manalada Punjah	4 0 0	3 14 1	
	4	Kurumber Bellan ...	Koodakulloo Yeruthoo Kullooputtamara Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 2	Mr. F. Cockburn.
			Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	One Rary.
			Athimara ,, ...	1 0 0	0 9 5	
			Selamara Koondoo Parai Punjah,	1 0 0	0 14 9	
				6 2 0	5 9 4	
			Total...	41 11 3	28 4 2	

24th August 1876.

(Signed) J. R. COCKERELL,
Commissioner.

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Superintendent, Revenue Survey, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 4th September 1876, No. 2,650-91.

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the information of the Board of Revenue, a letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete, the Deputy Superintendent of No. 1 Party, enclosing correspondence between him and Mr. Cockerell on the subject of the Southern Boundary of the Nilgiri Hills.

No. 983-502 of 2nd September 1876 and enclosures; originals to be returned.

2. The matter of the boundary has already been before the Board and has been considered in Proceedings, No. 1,975, of the 4th August 1876.

3. The boundary has been demarcated and surveyed after most careful inquiry on the part of the Deputy Superintendent, who states that the sketch given by the Deputy Tahsildar is incorrect and gives no idea of the correct relative distance between the different points. In order to enable the Board to judge of the real state of the case I beg permission to send for their inspection the office copy of a map showing the boundary to which Mr. Cockerell now objects.

4. The change suggested by the Deputy Tahsildar is, in my opinion, most ill-advised. The boundary now cleared and surveyed gives to the hills all the land capable of being cultivated with tea or coffee and runs along the base of the main range.

5. I trust that the Board will consider that Mr. Cockerell was not justified in making the remarks contained in paragraph 3 of his letter and proposed against Lieutenant-Colonel Cloete.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HESSEY, Superintendent, Madras Survey, dated Coimbatore, 2nd September 1876, No. 983-502.

I HAVE the honor to forward, for your consideration, copy of a letter I have received from the Commissioner of the Nilgiris.

2. In paragraph 3 of this letter the Commissioner states that I reported that the proposed line between Coimbatore and the Nilgiris had his concurrence, while I knew that he dissented from the proposed boundary.

3. The words in my report are, in communication with the Collector of Coimbatore and the Commissioner of the Nilgiris the boundary has been demarcated and surveyed. I did *not* state that either officer concurred, and did not intend that my report should have been so interpreted, although I see now that it is capable of that interpretation.

The Commissioner can hardly have intended to have charged me with having wilfully incorrect report, and will, I have no doubt, acknowledge this.

4. The enclosed copy of my letter to the Commissioner, No. 626-328 of 23rd June, will show that I had been in constant communication with him on this subject since *May* 1874; it will also be seen that in August 1874 I informed the Commissioner that the greater part of the proposed line had been cleared, and I requested that it might be inspected at an early date, and that I might be informed if there was any objection to it.

5. To this letter I have never received any reply, and, in explanation of this, the Commissioner in his letter of the 22nd instant (now forwarded) states that the reason of the delay in answering mine of the 31st August 1874 was that he was anxious that a European Officer should visit the boundary; that he then waited to consult the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar who was expected to return to his appointment; and that finally the matter slipped out of notice.

6. The Commissioner's dissent from the proposed boundary as stated in his letter of the 31st March 1875 is based *solely* on the report on one K. Latchmana Row who had been a Nazir and was then temporarily in charge of the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office; the boundary has, I believe, even now never been inspected by any European Officers on the part of the Nilgiris.

7. The Acting Deputy Tahsildar's report was accompanied by a sketch, of which I enclose a copy, from this it will be seen that in March 1874 the Commissioner agreed to the proposed boundary from Kallar to a point marked C near Birkal, but from that point he claimed a straight line south-west to a bend in the Moyar river; *no grounds whatever* were given for this claim, which, if allowed, would have thrown into the Nilgiris the Coimbatore Village of Chinna Muli and its cultivation.

I may mention that this sketch is quite incorrect and gives no idea of the correct relative distances between the different points.

8. In the present communication the Commissioner requests my further views regarding the inclusion of the slopes on the Nilgiri District; he does not seem to be aware that the line marked and surveyed by me does throw the slopes into his district; my views are embodied in my report printed with Board's Proceedings, No. 1,167, of the 3rd May 1876.

9. The Commissioner says he would wish the Bhowani to be the boundary, but the Nilgiri Officers would find it difficult to visit the tract between the Bhowani and the foot of the hills.

10. I beg to solicit attention to one other statement made by the Commissioner. He says in paragraph 5 that Mootoosawmy, the present Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor, reports that he did *not* tell me that he disagreed from his *locum tenens*, whereas I had stated that he did so disagree. I think it is very possible that there may have been some confusion in Mootoosawmy's mind as to what line his predecessor did claim when asked by the Commissioner in his office, but my statement was not made carelessly or in haste; on being shown by me on the ground the tract claimed by his predecessor as shown in the sketch, Mootoosawmy distinctly told me that as far as he knew it did not belong to the Nilgiris, and this I am confident he would repeat if I took him to the spot again.

11. I have the honor to request that such notice may be taken of the Commissioner's letter as you may deem desirable. I have thought it advisable not to reply to the Commissioner direct.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, to J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of the Nilgiris, dated Coimbatore, 23rd June 1876, No. 626-328.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, No. 24, on the subject of the District boundary between Coimbatore and the Nilgiris.

2. On the 19th May 1874 I informed you that I was about to mark this boundary and requested you to be good enough to name a representative for your district.

3. In reply (28th May) you requested to be informed whose attendance it was that I required and when I intended to visit the hills for the purpose of settling the boundary.

4. I replied on the 5th June that I had then no intention of visiting the Hills, that I believed the boundary ran for the most part at the foot of the hills, and that I had applied to you in view to some official of higher standing than a Curnam or Revenue Inspector being present.

5. You stated in reply (11th June) that reference had better be made to you when I come up to demarcate the boundary.

6. On the 19th June I informed you that I would commence operations about the end of the month at the Malabar tri-junction and would give you due notice of the exact date.

7. Again on the 22nd June I reported that the work would commence on the 10th July.

8. On the 8th July you informed that the Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor, and the Curnam of the Hill Nads, would be at Sundapatti on the 13th July.

9. On the 18th July I directed Captain Baynes, Assistant Superintendent, to go over the line and settle it with the representatives of the two districts.

10. Captain Baynes completed the work, and on 31*st August* 1874 I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date, and that I might be informed whether there was any objection on your part to the boundary marked.

11. To this letter I received no reply, but on 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed.

12. I informed you in reply (6th March) that the work had been completed.

13. On 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with that shown on a sketch enclosed in your letter.

14. I replied on the 18th March showing which of the lines on the sketch had been adopted as the boundary.

15. On the 31st March 1875 you wrote to inquire why a portion of land had been severed from the Nilgiri District, and under what circumstances the boundary had been altered.

16. I much regret that your letter should have remained unanswered. I have had great difficulty in obtaining the necessary information; one Tahsildar was nearly six months replying to my call for information. I had also to visit the place myself and to obtain reports from my Sub-Assistant on the Hills.

17. I can only now state that the claim set forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar as set forth in his report, and sketch on which your letter is based, is altogether groundless.

The permanent Tahsildar, who has for so many years been at Coonoor, acknowledges this, there are hamlets and cultivation within the piece claimed, which have always been in undisputed possession of Coimbatore ryots, and if village accounts were [illegible] boundary would run all along the *crest* of the hills instead of across the lowest spurs as now demarcated.

The straight line C D on the sketch herewith returned would in any case be an impassable boundary.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. G. CLOETE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Deputy Supt., Rev. Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of Nilgiris, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, dated Ootacamund, 22nd August 1876, No. 37.

IN the matter of the boundary between this district and Coimbatore I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, recommending the adoption of the boundary you propose, and I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,075, containing a protest from Mr. Wedderburn against your boundary, and expressing his wish that it may run higher up the slopes. I have addressed the Board, stating I do not concur in the proposed boundary and that I am addressing you on the subject.

2. In your letter to me, dated 23rd June last, you state, "Captain Baynes completed the work (of the boundary line) on the 31st August 1874. I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date. To this letter I received no reply, but on the 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed. On the 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with that shown in a sketch enclosed in your letter."

3. From this quotation it would appear that before making your recommendation to the Board you had become aware that I dissented from the boundary proposed. As your recommendation is dated 18th March I am at a loss therefore to understand the grounds on which you reported that the line had my concurrence.

4. The reason of the delay in answering your letter of the 31st August was that before expressing my views I was anxious that a European officer should visit the boundary, as it was manifest to me it ought not to be accepted without further inquiry, inasmuch as it altered the old boundary. Later on in the year I learnt that Mootoosawmy, the Deputy Tahsildar, was about to reoccupy his appointment and I put off the matter in order to consult him, but the matter slipped out of notice.

5. You state the claim put forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar is altogether groundless and refer to the opinion of the permanent Deputy Tahsildar. But Mootoosawmy now reports that he visited your boundary line in your company in February last and that he did not tell you that he did not agree with his *locum tenens*.

8. In the present communication the Commissioner requests my further views regarding the inclusion of the slopes on the Nilgiri District; he does not seem to be aware that the line marked and surveyed by me does throw the slopes into his district; my views are embodied in my report printed with Board's Proceedings, No. 1,167, of the 3rd May 1876.

9. The Commissioner says he would wish the Bhowani to be the boundary, but the Nilgiri Officers would find it difficult to visit the tract between the Bhowani and the foot of the hills.

10. I beg to solicit attention to one other statement made by the Commissioner. He says in paragraph 5 that Mootoosawmy, the present Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor, reports that he did *not* tell me that he disagreed from his *locum tenens*, whereas I had stated that he did so disagree. I think it is very possible that there may have been some confusion in Mootoosawmy's mind as to what line his predecessor did claim when asked by the Commissioner in his office, but my statement was not made carelessly or in haste; on being shown by me on the ground the tract claimed by his predecessor as shown in the sketch, Mootoosawmy distinctly told me that as far as he knew it did not belong to the Nilgiris, and this I am confident he would repeat if I took him to the spot again.

11. I have the honor to request that such notice may be taken of the Commissioner's letter as you may deem desirable. I have thought it advisable not to reply to the Commissioner direct.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent, No. 1 Revenue Survey, to J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of the Nilgiris, dated Coimbatore, 23rd June 1876, No. 626-328.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, No. 24, on the subject of the District boundary between Coimbatore and the Nilgiris.

2. On the 19th May 1874 I informed you that I was about to mark this boundary and requested you to be good enough to name a representative for your district.

3. In reply (28th May) you requested to be informed whose attendance it was that I required and when I intended to visit the hills for the purpose of settling the boundary.

4. I replied on the 5th June that I had then no intention of visiting the Hills, that I believed the boundary ran for the most part at the foot of the hills, and that I had applied to you in view to some official of higher standing than a Curnam or Revenue Inspector being present.

5. You stated in reply (11th June) that reference had better be made to you when I come up to demarcate the boundary.

6. On the 19th June I informed you that I would commence operations about the end of the month at the Malabar tri-junction and would give you due notice of the exact date.

7. Again on the 22nd June I reported that the work would commence on the 10th July.

8. On the 8th July you informed that the Deputy Tahsildar of Coonoor, and the Curnam of the Hill Nads, would be at Sundapatti on the 13th July.

9. On the 18th July I directed Captain Baynes, Assistant Superintendent, to go over the line and settle it with the representatives of the two districts.

10. Captain Baynes completed the work, and on 31*st August* 1874 I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date, and that I might be informed whether there was any objection on your part to the boundary marked.

11. To this letter I received no reply, but on 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed.

12. I informed you in reply (6th March) that the work had been completed.

13. On 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with that shown on a sketch enclosed in your letter.

14. I replied on the 18th March showing which of the lines on the sketch had been adopted as the boundary.

15. On the 31st March 1875 you wrote to inquire why a portion of land had been severed from the Nilgiri District, and under what circumstances the boundary had been altered.

16. I much regret that your letter should have remained unanswered. I have had great difficulty in obtaining the necessary information; one Tahsildar was nearly six months replying to my call for information. I had also to visit the place myself and to obtain reports from my Sub-Assistant on the Hills.

17. I can only now state that the claim set forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar as set forth in his report, and sketch on which your letter is based, is altogether groundless.

The permanent Tahsildar, who has for so many years been at Coonoor, acknowledges this, there are hamlets and cultivation within the piece claimed, which have always been in undisputed possession of Coimbatore ryots, and if village accounts were [illegible] boundary would run all along the *crest* of the hills instead of across the lowest spurs as now demarcated.

The straight line C D on the sketch herewith returned would in any case be an impassable boundary.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. G. CLOETE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Deputy Supt., Rev. Survey.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From J. R. COCKERELL, Esq., Commissioner of Nilgiris, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. G. CLOETE, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, Coimbatore, dated Ootacamund, 22nd August 1876, No. 37.

IN the matter of the boundary between this district and Coimbatore I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, recommending the adoption of the boundary you propose, and I have received Proceedings of the Board, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,075, containing a protest from Mr. Wedderburn against your boundary, and expressing his wish that it may run higher up the slopes. I have addressed the Board, stating I do not concur in the proposed boundary and that I am addressing you on the subject.

2. In your letter to me, dated 23rd June last, you state, "Captain Baynes completed the work (of the boundary line) on the 31st August 1874. I informed you that the greater part of the line had been cleared, and requested that it might be inspected at an early date. To this letter I received no reply, but on the 4th March 1875, or six months afterwards, you requested to know if the boundary had been fixed. On the 17th March you requested to be informed if the line decided on agreed with that shown in a sketch enclosed in your letter."

3. From this quotation it would appear that before making your recommendation to the Board you had become aware that I dissented from the boundary proposed. As your recommendation is dated 18th March I am at a loss therefore to understand the grounds on which you reported that the line had my concurrence.

4. The reason of the delay in answering your letter of the 31st August was that before expressing my views I was anxious that a European officer should visit the boundary, as it was manifest to me it ought not to be accepted without further inquiry, inasmuch as it altered the old boundary. Later on in the year I learnt that Mootoosawmy, the Deputy Tahsildar, was about to reoccupy his appointment and I put off the matter in order to consult him, but the matter slipped out of notice.

5. You state the claim put forth by the Acting Deputy Tahsildar is altogether groundless and refer to the opinion of the permanent Deputy Tahsildar. But Mootoosawmy now reports that he visited your boundary line in your company in February last and that he did not tell you that he did not agree with his *locum tenens*.

6. In the last Proceedings of the Board quoted above the Board appear to think, as I think, that the slopes should all be included in the Nilgiri District, and I shall be glad to receive your further views on the subject. In my opinion any part of the slopes being alienated to Coimbatore will be a fruitful cause of difficulty if planting spreads as I anticipate.

7. In order to illustrate the difficulties that may arise from a line *on* the slopes I may state that recently Irulers claiming the jurisdiction of Coimbatore have felled for Kumeri forest adjoining the Pilloor estate. I should prefer the boundary line to be the Bhowany river as the most natural and easily recognized boundary, but at all events would have it follow the foot of the slopes.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. G. CLOETE, Lieut.-Colonel,
Deputy Supt., Rev. Survey.

Enclosures Nos. 4 and 5.—Maps.

Submitted for the orders of Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,975.

2. Mr. Cockcrell states that the boundary line between the Nilgiris and Coimbatore District demarcated by the Survey Department has not his concurrence and proposes that the Bhowani and Moyar should be adopted as the boundaries. Although these rivers would, no doubt, form very convenient boundaries, and a saving of labor and expense would be effected by this solution of the difficulty, the transfer of so large a tract of low country to the great inconvenience of the villagers is a fatal objection to the measure, and the Board cannot support the proposal. Mr. Cockerell appears, however, to be under a misapprehension as to the line which has been followed, as he states that he is anxious to secure the slopes for the Nilgiri District, which is exactly the object which influenced the selection of the line already taken, as the Board understand the matter. The line follows the foot of the main range, excluding the outlying spurs, and all the estates and land suitable for tea and coffee planting fall to the Nilgiris. The Pillur referred to by Mr. Cockerell is the village of that name at the foot of the hills, not the estate on the slopes. The Board concur, therefore, with the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, in thinking that the line which has been followed should be confirmed.

3. The Deputy Superintendent, Revenue Survey, justly takes exception to the tone of Mr. Cockerell's letter, which the Board entirely disapprove; although the expression used by the former conveys the impression that the Commissioner of the Nilgiris and Collector of Coimbatore assented to the line adopted, the Commissioner was not justified in imputing a deliberate misstatement. The Board are surprised to find that, although repeatedly addressed on the subject, whilst operations were in progress, Mr. Cockerell took no steps to ensure that the correct line was followed. There does not appear to be any ground for supposing that the boundary should cross to the Manaar from C to D as shown on the sketch; at any rate it was Mr. Cockerell's duty to see that the claim was urged at the proper time.

4. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings, dated 3rd May 1876, No. 1,167, it now appears from the letter above recorded and from the Coimbatore Collector's letter, dated 31st May 1876, No. 112, that all the land alienated by Irulers and Kurumbers to European planters is putta land and at the disposal of the holders.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

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

Copy to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey,
with three original enclosures returned.

" to the Collector of Coimbatore.
" to the Commissioner of Nilgiris.
" to the Collector of Malabar.

Exd. A. Grubert.

No. 3822.

Prop: Bd of Revenue
& 6: Sept 1876

The guiding principle in these things should, I submit, be to alter as little as can be reasonably avoided the 12/6 ancient landmarks of the Country or to attempt to turn the true & immemorial interests of the people — which are likewise those of the administration — and then currents more especially in interests which I venture to call alien — offer interests are quite as safe in the hands of the Govt., whether they are administered by the Collector of Coimbatore or by the Commissioner of the Hill plateau.

Practically all the interests of the Planters even on the Slopes of the Hills as well

---

N. 3822
Rev: 1876: Dept
No. 949

1876.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 6TH SEPT. 1876, No. 2,276.

Dep. 13 Sept 76

Encl. 2

SOD. 102. 12 January 1877

Received 18: Sept.

SEPTEMBER.
No. 2,276.

Boundary—between Coimbatore and Nilgiri Districts.—Submitting to Government letters from Superintendent of Revenue Survey and Commissioner on subject of —, and concurring with former officer in thinking that the line which has been followed should be confirmed.

For Orders

R.C. 7: Dec 12-12-76
C.16 Hi-grace. 15: Nov R 4: Dec
C. 18: Sept 76 R 27: Sep

well as of the indigenous
races tribes & adjacent
Communities are Connected
with Coimbatore, where
the finishing works of
the former lies and their
railways are joined,
whence their Capital
labor & supplies are
obtained and the results
of their industry go. It
is I believe scarcely
reasonable from an
administrative or
working point of view to
make even the slopes
of the Hills appenages
of the Commissionership
of the Hill Plateau and
to attach them to the
Sick & recreation retreat
of Ootacamund. I
regret that I am unable
to

to accept Mr Cockerell's
judgement on this matter
and prefer the practical
facts before us as Evidence
of what is needed. The
first thing a Slope Estate
owner does is to connect
his Estate with the plains
and thousands have
been laid out in this object
on Every Estate that is
lucky Enough to be able
to trace one down. Nor only
so the owners on the
South Verge of the Plateau
Even [illegible] Generally
objected absolutely
to connection with
Ootacamund by a
road already partly
opened & have preferred
the nearest line to the
plains. [illegible]

changes

102/10

102/10

102/10

I confess that I think that the transfer of any portion of the plains or even of the slopes to the jurisdiction of the Hill Plateau presents to my mind something like the ~~peoples~~ hopeless task of turning the rivers of the low country back on their sources on the Hills, where after 50 years of occupation, we scarcely now see how to turn the land to account from an economical point of view. I am led to these reflections by Mr. Cockerell's proposal to bring the living working people of the Bhowany & Moyer Valleys up to these Hills for

for the administration they need.

The sound principle of guidance in these matters was enunciated by the Honble. the Court of Directors as far back as 1804, when dealing with the administration of the West Coast Districts "great care will be necessary to be observed "in dividing these provinces "into Collectorships & & "lest you should interfere "with rights which have "hitherto been considered "as inviolable, or disturb "these ancient boundaries "or landmarks which "to this time have "determined the extent of conditions among [illegible] that I think that these changes

102/11

102/11

Before the planting interests were in existence - AM

102/11

of private property, and by which the proprietors of land have been secured from time immemorial. I hold that the principle applies with even more force to the ancient boundaries, landmarks of fields & population lines.

We have before us the clearest guides as to administrative arrangements which are in accordance with these views in the limits of the ancient tribal conditions and divisions of communal property in both Districts. The indigenous races not only do not ask for changes but resent them. The boundaries of the Mottahs as well as the ancient village limits of the residents of the plains should

for

should be followed, for I do not think that the existence or fitness of the tracts for special species of cultivation never can indicate the safe and permanent [illegible] of a District or administration. So far then as the proposed tract follows these lines I would accept it.

This has been done (Vide Para 4 of letter from the Collector of Coimbatore) in part — the Collector of Coimbatore proposes preserving all pasture rights when the ancient permanent boundaries have been lost sight of. I would accept the new boundary subject to these conditions although I confess that I think that these changes

of private property, and

changes of administration, these ruptures of ancient things & traditions, these desseverances (not amalgamations) of the immemorial adjustments of society & property, imperil [illegible] people — but the tract is inhabited chiefly by wild tribes where the true line of demarcation is lost sight of.

The question of Kadumalla has already been referred to the Collector of Coimbatore. I would ask further information about the ancient boundaries of Pelletoray & Soondapatty

20/9 [illegible]

Boundary bet. Coimbatore & Nilgiri

Gov Ord

3822

I confess that I can see no objection to the Revenue Survey line which takes a middle course & keeps within the Nilagiri limits the slopes of the hills while excluding the outlying spurs. — I would not interfere with grazing so long as the land is not required for tea or coffee estates.

The people at the base of the hills are now accustomed to visit the plateau and I cannot agree with my fourth colleague in any arrangement which would ignore the new agricult. interests. [illegible]

26/9

Sent to His Exce 15: Nov. R.L. Dec.

No 102

12 January 1877

His Exce the Govr. in Council determines to accept the line demarcated as the future boundary between the Nilagiri & Coimbatore Dist. — as it follows as nearly as can conveniently be arranged the old boundaries of the Nilagiri Taluk — where these are not exactly followed it will be understood that the

102/13

102/13

102/13

102/13

[illegible]

& other
Grazing privileges
of the villages in
the Lim[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

14 To the Boarding Academy
13 The Sulphur Academy

6/4

[illegible] 15 Nov. R. L. Dec. 26/9