Archives I—10,000—6-10-78

(1) Number of pages 141

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Rev Revenue DEPARTMENT

102
14

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

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 [illegible] hands of intending cultivators, and if cultivation spreads on them, it will [illegible] offee, wh[illegible] [illegible] in the Nilgiri jurisdiction [illegible] serve t[illegible] [illegible] Kumari cultivation, of Iru[illegible] [illegible] the Coimbatore jurisd[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 rowing 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
No 7—Pellary 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 6	
	3	Moondy	Kothoo ,, ...	0 6 2	0 2 10	
	4	Siran ..	Nagamara ,, ...	0 12 3	0 5 11	
			Nagamara ,, ...	1 4 3	0 8 7	
	5	Komaran ..	Kothoo ,, ...	0 2 2	0 2 2	
	2	Parama Siran ..	Selamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	
			Nalimara ,, ...	0 2 2	0 3 0	
	6	Komaran	Kothoo ,, ...	0 11 0	0 12 10	
	6	Kary	Salamara ,, ...	0 8 0	0 3 6	
			Nagamara Kothoo	0 4 0	0 2 6	
	7	Karuppuly	Kothoo Punjah	0 4 0	0 1 7	By Mr Wormald
			Nerimara	1 7 1	0 10 3	
	11	Kurumberkary ..	Sarivoo	0 2 0	0 0 7	
	11	Do ..	Nagamara Kothoo Kandoo ..	1 0 0	0 14 1	
	11	Do	Kothoo Punjah	0 8 0	0 7 0	Kristnan
			Nagamara Kothoo Kandoo Punjah	1 9 0	1 6 2	Rungasawmy
	11	Do	Do. .. do. ..	4 0 0	3 8 5	Mr Deane
	12	Kurumber Pothay ..	Kararay Punjah	3 0 0	1 12 2	Mr Ryal
				19 10 3	13 3 7	
No 17—Arvood Combay	2	Sadyan	Malaimail Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 7 1	Sungara Lingum Pillay and Komo rasawmy Pillay
No 8—Seral Combay	6		Pillalputtyzem a			
	8	Liuganood Mussanar	Nagamara Kothoo	2 0 0	1 12 10	appears to have been purchased by Mr Hall
			Nakamara Kondoo ,,	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	
	7	Koodakari Nujjah	Kodamamotto Punjah ..	6 1 0	3 10 6	Mr Wormald
	5	Pulian ..	Kootoo Peeamara ,, ..	0 8 0	0 3 6	Narainier
				14 15 0	9 0 2	Fakeer Mohamed and Sons
	10	Aundy	Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	
		Rungan	Do	0 2 0	0 3 9	Cassim Sahib
	4	Kurumber Bellan ..	Manalada Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	
			Koodakulloo Yeruthoo Kallooputtamara 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	
			Total ..	6 2 0	4 0 9 4	
				41 11 3	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 No 983 502 of 2nd September 1876 and enclosures, originals to be returned.

correspondence between him and Mr Cockerell on the subject of the southern boundary of the Nilgiri Hills

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 has objected

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 Combatore, 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 [illegible] proposed boundary and the N[illegible] he words in my report are, [illegible] 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 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, th[illegible] slipped out of notice

6 The Commissioner's dissent from the proposed bound[illegible]ed in his letter of th[illegible] 31st March 1875, is based *solely* on the report of one K Latchm[illegible] Row who had been a Naz[illegible] 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 Combatore 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 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 [illegible] on the 19th 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 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, 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 [illegible] 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 CLOLTE, 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 [illegible] 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] 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

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 12th January 1877 7

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

Exd F. R. 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 such land 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 ps	
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	Komaran	Selamara ,, ,, ,,	0 8 0	0 3 6	
	2	Paramia Siran	Narimara ,, ,, ,, ,,	0 2 2	0 3 0	
			Kothoo ,, ,, ,,	0 11 0	0 12 10	
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	6	Ra y	Nagamara Kothoo ,,	0 4 0	0 2 6	By Mr Wormald
			Kothoo Punjah ,,	0 4 0	0 7 0	
	7	Karuppaty	Nerimara ,, ,, ,,	1 7 1	0 10 3	
			Sarvoo ,,	0 2 0	0 0 7	
	11	Kurumberkary	Nagamara Kothoo Kaudoo ,,	1 0 0	0 14 1	
	11	Do ,, ,,	Kothoo Punjah ,,	0 8 0	0 7 0	Krishnan
	11	Do	Nagamara Kothoo Kaudoo Punjah	1 9 0	1 6 2	Rungasawmy
	11	Do do ,, ,, ,,	Do do ,, ,, ,,	4 0 0	3 8 5	Mr Deane
	12	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 Hall
	6	Saran ,, ,,	Yellaiputtymara Punjah	0 8 2	0 3 8	
	8	Linganood Musanar	Nagamara Kothoo ,, ,,	2 0 0	1 12 10	
			Nagamara Kaudoo ,, ,,	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 9	3 10 6	Narainier
	5	Fulan ,, ,, ,,	Footoo 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
		Bungan	Do ,, ,,	0 2 0	0 3 9	
			Manalada Punjah ,,	1 0 0	0 14 1	
	4	Kurumber Bellan	Koodakulloo Yeruthoo Kullooputtamara Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 2	Mr F Cockburn
	4	Kurumber Bellan ,,	Kothoo Punjah	1 0 0	0 14 1	One Bary
			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 [illegible] the Board of Revenue, a letter from No 983 502 of 2nd September 1876 and enclosures, originals to be returned 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

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 [illegible] 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. [illegible] 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 Muk 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 view 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 what 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 [illegible] the piece claimed, which have always been in undisputed possession of Coimbatore ryots, and if village accounts were to be followed the boundary 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. Codderburn 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 1th 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 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.

N. 3822
Rev. 1876: Dept No. 649
1876.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 6TH SEPT 1876, No 2,276

Desp. 13 Sept/76
Encl 2

G.O. No. 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

102/G

No 3822

Procs. Bd of Revenue
of 6: Sept 1876

The guiding principle in these things should, I submit, be to alter as little as can be reasonably avoided the 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 these currents more especially in interests which I venture ~~to call attention~~ Coffee interests are quite as safe in the hands of this 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

well as of the indigenous races tribes & adjacent Communities are connected with Coimbatore, where the furnishing 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 appendages of the Commissionership of the Hills Plateau and to attach them to the Sick & recreation retreat of Ootacamund. I regret that I am unable

to

102
10

102
10

102
10

to accept Mr Cockerell's judgment on this matter and prefer the practical facts before us as evidence of what is needed. The first thing a Slope Estate ... does is to connect its Estate with the plains and thousands have been laid out in this style on every Estate that is lucky enough to be able to trace one down. ... So the owners on the South Verge of the Plateau even ... objected absolutely to connection with Ootacamund by a road already partly opened & have preferred the nearest line to the plains.

changes

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 Schowany & 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 District "great care will be necessary to be observed "in dividing these provinces "into Collectorships &c. &c. "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 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 governed from time immemorial. I hold that the principle applies with even more force to the ancient boundaries & landmarks of races & population.

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 change but resent it. The boundaries of the Hills as well as the ancient village limits of the residents of the plains should

for

102/12

should be followed, for I do not think that the existence of or fitness of the tract for special species of cultivation never can indicate the safe and permanent [illegible] of a District or administration. So far then as the proposed trace 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 properly reserving all passing 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 dissonances (not amalgamations) of the immemorial adjustments of society & property, imperil [illegible] people - but the tract 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 Pilletorary & Soondapatty

20/9 W.R.

Boundary betn Coimbatore & Nilgiris

For Orders

3822

Lordships that I can see no objection to the Revenue Survey ~~band~~ line wh. 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 would agree with my South colleague in any arrangement which would secure the new agriculture interests. - W.E.

26/9

R.E. [illegible] No 12

Sub: [illegible] Govt 15: Nov - [illegible]

No 102

12 January 1877

102/13

102/13

102/13

102/13

Lr from the Govr. in Council determining to accept the line demarcated as the future boundary between the Nilagiri & Coimbatore Dist. — as ~~it~~ it follows as nearly as can conveniently be arranged the old boundary of the Nilagiri Taluk — where these are not ~~about~~ exactly followed it is to be understood that the

[illegible]

To Mrs
Greening [illegible]
of the [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

14 To the Boarding [illegible]
13 [illegible] Alexander [illegible] 5

60/4

[illegible] 15 Nov - [illegible] 26/9