

(1) Number of pages 14
(2) Date of repair 9.8.73
(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Rev. DEPARTMENT

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

2008

Press
Mis.

Dated

16-6-1977

1977

Not to be folded or roughly handled

155

2008
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

16th June 1877, No. 2,008.

Read the following paper:—

No. 325 Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 12th May 1877, No. 2,187.

Read the following letter from G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 19th April 1877, No. 797.

At the close of the last Jamabandi, I directed the Head Assistant Collector to proceed along the boundary between this district and His Highness the Nizam's dominions, and see what boundary disputes exist.

2. *Statement I.*—There are twelve of these, of which a list will be found in the Statement No. 1 herewith sent.

3. There is one case where a boundary stone has been moved, and must be replaced in its proper position at Bhagavanillapuram.

4. *Statement II.*—There are three disputes about the waterspread of two tanks.

The actual boundary disputes are not, as far as I judge, likely to lead to any trouble, but it would certainly be well to have the boundary defined. Once defined by a broad track cut through the jungle, there would be no difficulty about keeping it open if proper care is taken in succeeding years, and if the Revenue Officer of each taluq or division is held responsible for his boundary.

5. In regard to the tank-disputes, in some cases the boundary is well and clearly defined, but in consequence of repairs to the tank the waterspread is increased, and in one it is a disputed point whether or not the tank waterspread has been increased. I presume in neither case should the boundary line, if it be known, be altered, but it would be well that some arrangement were made for the payment of the sist of the land submerged if such be legally claimable.

6. These tanks are in Lingagiri and Munagala Zemindaris, and, as far as that question is concerned, it seems to me that Government can only advise the Zemindar and the Nizam to arrange; but where the boundary line is doubtful, the Government must move.

7. If the line is to be defined as I recommend, it would be well for the Government to depute a skilled officer for the purpose on behalf of the British Government. None of my district officers can be spared for the work, which would require a knowledge of the use of surveying instruments.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2. —Statements.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The disputes are apparently of no great importance, but as the boundary line is uncertain in several places for distances varying from half a mile to twelve

Revenue Department, 16th June 1877, No. 2,008.

miles, it is advisable that it should be definitely settled, and the Board accordingly recommend that the Nizam's Government be moved to appoint an officer to define the line in communication with an officer of the Survey Department.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

No. 326.

ORDER THEREON, 16th June 1877, No. 2,008.

Miscellaneous.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council considers it undesirable to move the Nizam's Government in the way suggested, until a settlement has been made of the matter referred to in G.O., 5th March 1874, No. 312, which is still undisposed of pending a final reply from that Government.

2. In the mean time, the Collector need not interfere unless attempts are made to occupy land within the boundary reasonably presumed to define the limits of British territory. It is not desirable that he should inquire "what boundary disputes exist," as such a course is likely to give rise to them. The officials on either side will hear soon enough if any real difficulties of the kind arise.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Boundary List between Kistna District and
His Highness's Nizam's Dominions—Consider-
ing it undesirable to move the Nizam's Govern-
ment to depute an officer to define the — in con-
junction with an officer of the Survey Depart-
ment, until a settlement has been made of the
matter referred to in G.O. 6th March 1877, No.
212, and directing the Collector, in the mean time,
not to interfere with any dispute made to occur
within the boundary reasonably presumed to define
the limits of British territory.

JUNE
No. 626-328

G.O. 15th June 1877, No. 2,008

Dated June, 1877

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

REVENUE.

Govt. of 1877 Hyderabad

No. 2,187.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 12th May 1877.

Read the following letter from G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Collector of the Kistna District, to
H. E. STODOLSKY, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 19th
April 1877, No. 797:—

At the close of the last Jamabandi, I directed the Head Assistant Collector to proceed along
the boundary between this District and His Highness the Nizam's Dominions and see what
boundary disputes exist.

2. *Statement I.*—There are twelve of these of which a list will be found in the Statement
No. 1 herewith sent.

3. There is one case where a boundary stone has been moved and must be replaced in its
proper position at Bhagavanillapuram.

4. *Statement II.*—There are three disputes about the waterspread of two tanks.

The actual boundary disputes are not, as far as I judge, likely to lead to any trouble, but it
would certainly be well to have the boundary defined. Once defined by a broad track cut through
the jungle, there would be no difficulty about keeping it open if proper care is taken in succeeding
years, and if the Revenue Officer of each taluq or division is held responsible for his boundary.

5. In regard to the tank disputes, in some cases the boundary is well and clearly defined,
but in consequence of repairs to the tank the waterspread is increased, and in one it is a disputed
point whether or not the tank waterspread has been increased. I presume in neither case should
the boundary line, if it be known, be altered, but it would be well that some arrangement were
made for the payment of the sist of the land submerged, if such be legally claimable.

6. These tanks are in Lingagiri and Munagala Zemindaries, and, as far as that question is
concerned, it seems to me that Government can only advise the Zemindar and the Nizam to
arrange; but where the boundary line is doubtful, the Government must move.

7. If the line is to be defined as I recommend, it would be well for the Government to
depute a skilled officer for the purpose on behalf of the British Government. None of my District
Officers can be spared for the work, which would require a knowledge of the use of surveying
instruments.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2—Statements.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The disputes are apparently of no great importance, but as the boundary line is uncer-
tain in several places for distances varying from half a mile to twelve miles, it is advisable that it
should be definitely settled, and the Board accordingly recommend that the Nizam's Government
be moved to depute an officer to define the line in communication with an officer of the Survey
Department.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with two original Statements to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of the Kistna District.
" " Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Encl. W. H. French.

move

N. 2008 R.D.
Proceedings of the Madras Government.
Under date the 16 June 1877

Read Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue,
dated 12th May 1877, No. 2187,
submitting letter from
Collector on subject of Bound-
ary Disputes between Kistna
District and His Highness
the Nizam's Dominions,
and recommending that
Nizam's Government be
moved to depute an officer
to define the boundary line
in communication with
an Officer of Survey Depart^{ment}

His Grace the
Governor in Council Con-
siders it undesirable to

move

Revenue Department

No. 2645
1877.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 12TH MAY 1877, No. 2187.

Copy to the Nizam's Govt.
Encl. 2

Received
18.6.77
as above

M A Y.
No. 2,187.

Boundary Disputes—between Kistna District
and His Highness the Nizam's Dominions—
Submitting to Government letter from Collector
on subject of —, and recommending that Nizam's
Government be moved to depute an officer to
define the boundary line in communication with
an Officer of Survey Department.

R.C. 12. June 1877. R.D. 12 June 1877.
C.D. 12 June 1877. R.D. 12 June 1877.

move the Mizamis Govt.
in the way suggested
until a settlement has
been made of the matter
referred to in G.O., 5 March
1874, No 312, which is still
undisposed of pending a
final reply from that
Govt.

2 In the meantime
the Collector need not inter-
fere unless attempts are
made to occupy land
within the boundary
reasonably presumed to
define the limits of
British Territory. It
is not desirable that he
should enquire what

boundary

boundary disputes
as such a course is likely
to give rise to them
officials on either side
will hear soon enough
if any real difficulties
of the kind arise

to the Mizamis Govt. 20.6.77.
2 lines 25.6.77.
60

40

Boundary dispute
between the State of N. & His
Highness the Nizam's Do-
minions.

2006/6
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 304

From Secy to Govt. Nizam, 1874

Dated Dec 25th 1874

FOR ORDERS.

I think that I had
better be on the
side of the Nizam's
Govt. as shown in the
conclusion alluded to
& I will wait more
courteous times
At all events
we can scarcely more

settle the Nizam's
Govt. to be in the
office in the Nizam's
Govt. as shown in the
conclusion alluded to
& I will wait more
courteous times
At all events
we can scarcely more

The Honble Secy to Govt. Nizam
1874

