(1) Number of pages 4

(2) Date of repair 28-5-1984

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1195 Press.
~~B.P. No.~~ Mis.

Dated 31-7-1878 ~~197~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives I—5,806—24-2-78.

1195/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1st July 1878, No. 1,195.

Read the following paper :—

No. 390. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th June 1878, No. 1,773.

Read the following letter from W. LOGAN, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 20th June 1878, No. 168 :—

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge receipt of G.O., Revenue Department, No. 777, dated 22nd May 1878, regarding the Mavinahalla boundary dispute.

2. I consider it my duty to point out that the main argument on which the Chief Commissioner relies in coming to a decision is based on a fallacy.

3. He says that my line "runs across land which was not in dispute" in 1868, that is to say, that the land lying *north* of the stream called Mavinahalla was not in dispute.

4. I allude pointedly in paragraph 11 of my report to the facts—

(*a*) That the place where the timber was cut in 1866 which originally led to the dispute was on a "hill" close to the Gundry Depôt road,

(*b*) That there is such a "hill" in such a position to the *north* of the Mavinahalla and lying between it and the Owkalhalla, and

(*c*) That there is *no* such "hill" in such a position between the Mavinahalla and Ponganitode, which according to Captain vanSomeren's present contention was the locality in dispute in 1868.

5. These facts cannot be questioned, and the conclusion is irresistible that the land across which my line runs *was* in dispute in 1868.

6. The Chief Commissioner in short begs the whole question in assuming the contrary.

7. I trust it is not yet too late for this to be pointed out to him. The Government Order in question reached me only to-d[illegible]

SUBMITTED for the consideration of Gove[illegible]ment. It seems that the assumption on which the line was accepted by Governme[illegible] was unfounded.

(A true Copy a[illegible] Extract.)

[illegible]igned) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 391. ORDER THEREON, 31st J[illegible]y 1878, No. 1,195.

Miscellaneous.

THE decision of Government was not based as supposed. His Grace the Governor in Council sees no reason to re-open the matter.

(True Ext[illegible]act.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Conservator of Forests
Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

1195/2

No. 1,773.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 27th June 1878.

Read the following letter from W. LOGAN, Esq., Collector of Malabar, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 20th June 1878, No. 168 :—

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge receipt of G.O., Revenue Department, No. 777, dated 22nd May 1878, regarding the Mavinahalla boundary dispute.

2. I consider it my duty to point out that the main argument on which the Chief Commissioner relies in coming to a decision is based on a fallacy.

3. He says that my line "runs across land which was not in dispute" in 1868, that is to say, that the land lying *north* of the stream called Mavinahalla was not in dispute.

4. I allude pointedly in paragraph 11 of my report to the facts—

(*a*) That the place where the timber was cut in 1866 which originally led to the dispute was on a "hill" close to the Gundry Depôt road,

(*b*) That there is such a "hill" in such a position to the *north* of the Mavinahalla and lying between it and the Owkalhalla, and

(*c*) That there is *no* such "hill" in such a position between the Mavinahalla and Ponganitode, which according to Captain vanSomeren's present contention was the locality in dispute in 1868.

5. These facts cannot be questioned, and the conclusion is irresistible that the land across which my line runs *was* in dispute in 1868.

6. The Chief Commissioner in short begs the whole question in assuming the contrary.

7. I trust it is not yet too late for this to be pointed out to him. The Government Order in question reached me only to-day.

SUBMITTED for the consideration of Government. It seems that the assumption on which the line was accepted by Government was unfounded.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of Malabar.
" " Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. A. Grubert.

1195/2

Govt. of 1878 Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated July 31st.

Printed August 6th.

Read.

JULY.

Nos. 390-391.

Mavinahalla Dispute in the Malabar District
—Observing that the decision of Government
regarding the — was not based as supposed, and
seeing no reason to re-open the matter.

Revenue Deptt
No. 2914

1878.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 27TH JUNE 1878, No. 1,773.

Encl.

Received

JUNE.

No. 1,773.

Mavinahalla Boundary Dispute — in Malabar District. — Submitting to Government letter from Collector offering remarks regarding the —.