

(1) Number of pages 52 chs. (104 Pages)

(2) Date of repair 22-3-80

(3) Initials of the Referencer af

# TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

*Revenue* DEPARTMENT

|                |           |        |
|----------------|-----------|--------|
| G.O. No.       | 2941      | Press. |
| B.P. No.       |           | Mis.   |
| <i>Revenue</i> |           |        |
| Dated          | 3-12-1878 | 197    |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives 1-5,806-24-2-78.

*af*

*Gx*

No. 94

2991

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,

Ootacamund, 6<sup>th</sup> August 1878

FROM R. W. Barlow Esquire  
COMMISSIONER, NILGIRIS.

TO C. G. Master Esquire  
Secretary to Government  
Revenue Department  
Ootacamund

SIR,  
As the Forest report will be before Government in the course of a day or two, I have the honor to forward for information copy of my No. 96 A dated 31<sup>st</sup> July 1878 and enclosures, addressed to the Board of Revenue, as showing the difficulties attending the land question, and illustrating my reasons for the minute of dissent that I have forwarded.

2. I venture to submit these papers direct, because though they



will come before government  
in ordinary course for orders, the  
subject treated of therein is such  
an important one, that there must  
be some necessary delay in the  
Board's office, and they therefore  
may not reach government till  
the Forest report has been consi-  
dered and disposed of.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

M. W. Brown

Ag Commissioner

2941  
✓

✓



2901

Algiers Commissioners Office  
Algiers 31<sup>st</sup> July 1878

N<sup>o</sup> 96 A.

From

R. M. Barlow Esquire  
Algiers

To  
C. A. Barlow Esquire  
Ag. Secretary to the  
Board of Revenue  
Madras

I have the honor to forward  
for the information and orders  
of the Board and Government,  
the enclosed copies of letters as  
per margin from Colonel Cloete  
Deputy Superintendent of  
Revenue Survey, reporting re-  
garding certain frauds in  
the occupation of Government  
forest.

- 1. Letter N<sup>o</sup> 880 dated 27<sup>th</sup> Feb 1878
- 2. Letter N<sup>o</sup> 881 dated 28<sup>th</sup> Feb 1878
- 3. Letter N<sup>o</sup> 882 dated 28<sup>th</sup> Feb 1878

June 1878. O. J. Barlow  
N<sup>o</sup> 3142  
8<sup>th</sup> Aug 1878

Commissioner's Office  
Algiers

C. J. Barlow Esquire  
Secretary to Government  
Algiers

STUDENT  
2802941

Submitting for the an-

formation of Government

3<sup>rd</sup> of Feb 1878

at the Board of Revenue

regarding certain frauds in

the occupation of Government  
forest. (Barlow)

2802941  
2802942  
2802943  
2802944  
2802945  
2802946  
2802947  
2802948  
2802949  
2802950  
2802951  
2802952  
2802953  
2802954  
2802955  
2802956  
2802957  
2802958  
2802959  
2802960  
2802961  
2802962  
2802963  
2802964  
2802965  
2802966  
2802967  
2802968  
2802969  
2802970  
2802971  
2802972  
2802973  
2802974  
2802975  
2802976  
2802977  
2802978  
2802979  
2802980  
2802981  
2802982  
2802983  
2802984  
2802985  
2802986  
2802987  
2802988  
2802989  
2802990  
2802991  
2802992  
2802993  
2802994  
2802995  
2802996  
2802997  
2802998  
2802999  
2803000



forest, together with a memo giving details as to particular instances.

I have entered in the last opposite some of the cases, my own remarks from personal inspection.

2. Colonel Cloete has gone at some length into the past Revenue practice in this district, and before making proposals as to how these cases should be treated and such practices put a stop to hereafter, I will touch briefly on the past Revenue history and procedure of the Nilgiris, which has resulted in and facilitated the commission of these frauds, through the collusion of pottahdars with the Government Subordinates

Subordinates, and sometimes also with Purchasers from the former.

3. As far back as 1857 Mr. Thomas the then Collector of Coimbatore, brought to the notice of the Board of Revenue the inconvenience of the "Barby" or "fallow" system, and in their Proceedings of the 28th of July 1862, No 4881, the Board when disposing of a subsequent letter of his observe at para 2, "the immemorial practice had been to allow land to lie fallow for a long time to recover its productive capability and that the cultivators had enjoyed the privilege of holding and cultivating lands under shifting



"Shifting Puttaks, styled Burtz in  
"the plains, changing their cultiv-  
"ation every year from plot to  
"plot, paying only for the extent  
"actually cultivated, but retain  
"a lien without payment on  
"the land left fallow - the  
underlining is mine - and at  
para 3 "It resulted that each  
"Burgker village has been recog-  
"nized as possessing a right to  
"about ten times the area of its  
"actual cultivation in any one  
"year, but the increasing influx  
"of European settlers has forced  
"on our consideration how this  
"roving system may be restricted  
without

(2) 292/5  
"without ignoring the ancient  
"rights of the Burgkers."  
"In disposing of the question  
in Government Order No 306 of  
the 22<sup>nd</sup> September 1862, however  
-ment remarked at para 3. "The  
"consequence is that dormant claims  
"exist to a large extent; land is  
"locked up and disputes constantly  
"arise between settlers and Burgkers  
but (para 9) "The new rates now  
"sanctioned afford ample compensation  
"for the loss of the Burtz privilege,  
"which will absolutely cease, direct  
"by they are brought into effect.  
"They will of course apply only  
"to the Burgker lands properly



"So called (29,912 besides Inams supra  
"paragraph 5) and will not therefore  
"interfere with the operation of the  
"New Rules for the Sale of Waste  
"lands" - Had the exact locality  
of the Burgher lands above referred  
to been at once defined the "operation  
of the New Rules" would not have  
been interfered with, but a different  
state of things resulted.

5. Government in this order  
in 1863, laid down that the  
Burghers should be restricted to  
the actual holdings they paid  
for, but nothing was done to  
define or demarcate such bound-  
aries, and the Burghers, though  
puttahs were issued, went on  
forever

\*Vide G. O. No.  
366 of 27 April  
1865.

294/6  
pretty much - So far as I can  
learn as they did before - and I  
doubt whether the bulk of them  
ever understood the scope  
of the Order\*, and whenever applica-  
tions were put in by settlers  
they were met by puttahdars' claims, often really untenable, which were admitted owing to the partiality of the subordinate Revenue and village officials in reporting, and to the extreme difficulty of ascertaining (in the absence of a survey) where the objecting puttahdars' lands really lay, and the operation of the Waste land Rules was seriously retarded, and often rendered



rendered a dead letter.

6. I may observe here that the  
Mills Establishment is very in-  
adequate, there are two Revenue  
Inspectors on Salaries of <sup>R.</sup> 30 and  
<sup>R.</sup> 25, and under them 4 Curnums  
with monthly pay of Rupees  
3 per mensem, yet these latter  
officers are the only authorities  
as regards the boundaries of  
native holdings, and possess  
great power though drawing  
petty pay, and have used this  
advantage to add to their scanty  
Salary. The Revenue Inspectors  
and Curnums here, in fact do  
respectively, much of the work  
performed

(8) 29th/1  
performed by Deputy Tahsildars  
and Revenue Inspectors elsewhere.

7. Partly from the above causes,  
and partly because the authorities  
seem to have been inclined to give  
the benefit of the doubt, to  
what was supposed to be the  
weaker side, in disputes between  
intending settlers and native  
occupiers, the latter often had  
the best of it, and land was  
not forthcoming, and the Planters  
seem to have come to the conclusion  
that their best way of obtain-  
ing land was to do so through  
the natives, and to have formed  
a mistaken idea as to the importance  
of



of, and the elasticity of rights  
conferred by native puttahs. I  
may notice here as an instance  
Sir Havelock's case, - in which the <sup>+ vide my</sup> No 96 B dated  
late Ag Commissioner recommended <sup>31<sup>st</sup> July 1878.</sup>  
that his State should be confirmed  
as held - here, a much larger  
tract was purchased than  
entered in the puttah, including  
forest, and the larger tracts  
paid for to the Sellers, the whole  
circumstances showing bona-fides.  
When the Survey and demarcation  
at last came into active operation,  
matters were as above described,  
and when demarcating; a much  
larger area was assigned to each  
puttahdar than what was actually  
in

294  
in his puttah - on an average <sup>about</sup>  
80 per cent in excess, - this was  
all very well as regards grass  
and open lands, really previously  
in occupation - so called - under  
the Burtay System, as it benefited  
the State, all the lands held on  
puttah being thereafter paid for,  
in fact the state of things -  
brought about, intended to  
result at once, on the promul-  
-gation of the orders of Govern-  
-ment No 2060 dated 22<sup>nd</sup> Sept-  
-ember 1862, alluded to at para-  
4; but it was as regards  
forest lands that frauds -  
resulted in Makenad and the  
Khondabs - possibly in some  
cases



cases elsewhere - and this brings  
me to the point now for the  
disposal of Government.

8. The old system of "Orkad"  
and "Kottakad," or so much for  
each plough or hoe possessed,  
alluded to by Colonel Blatch  
at para 3, is not peculiar  
to the Nizams. I have met  
with it on the farwardie.

Hills, and is a tenure necessary  
in unknown and unsurveyed  
wild tracts of country, but  
such tenures could never have  
given, from their very nature  
any permanent right of occu-  
-pancy, whatever Government  
may

(4) 294/6  
may have chosen to concede, and  
when converting such tenures  
to puttah holdings, only what  
had been actually occupied  
and cultivated at sometimes or  
other, should - at most - have  
been entered, but to include  
heavy forest, never specifically  
assigned, was clearly a fraud;  
yet this has been done.

9. The anxiety of the Planters  
to obtain puttah rights has  
been already explained. When the  
Survey commenced the post of  
Command of Brekenad was held by  
"Komaratawmy Moodley," who has  
been 40 years in the Service,  
and



and who knew full well from  
past experience how easy it  
was to baffle enquiry as to  
letters' applications, and locality  
of alleged holdings. Further  
the Surnum of Khondah was  
his son, and these two men checked  
by only one Revenue Inspector  
for both Divisions - virtually  
held all information as to locality  
of pattahs locked up between  
them, and turned it to their  
own advantage by disposing  
of forests as pattah lands.

10. I may observe here that  
the haste with which the  
Khondahs were transferred  
from Malabar to Coimbatore  
in

204/10  
in 1863, was another element  
in facilitating, if not suggesting  
fraud; I understand that the  
present Surnum of Meknad  
was directed to assign all  
pattah holdings in a very  
limited time (he says 15 days)  
to bring the assessments within  
the then Lushy, so that no  
attempt at proper measure-  
ments could be made, and  
only approximate areas in-  
dicated.

11. The conduct of the Surnum  
of Meknad, as set forth  
in Colonel Bloet's letter No. 327  
501  
of the 28<sup>th</sup> Ultimo, and of the  
24<sup>th</sup> Ultimo, requires no comment.

J.



I have already sometime since  
suspended both him and his  
son "Venkatasoopen", the Thondah  
Curum, and shall now dismiss  
both, subject to the approval  
of the Board of Revenue, and  
it is for Government to decide  
whether the former should not  
be criminally prosecuted. I  
propose also to dismiss the  
2nd Class Revenue Inspector in  
charge of Mekenad and Thondah,  
as he has been culpably negligent.

12. As regards the coffee  
estate held by the Mekenad-  
Curum, I propose to withdraw  
all title deeds, to issue a notice  
to

5. 294/11  
to him to refrain from all further  
selling and interference, stating  
forth that Government will  
not be responsible for value  
of any further improvements.

13. With reference to the action  
of the Survey establishment,  
while admitting all the offi-  
-cials alluded to by Colonel  
Cloete, I consider the Depart-  
-ment to blame for having  
demarked areas out of all  
proportion to the pattahs'  
entries, and particularly as  
regards forest - without  
reference on the part of -  
Subordinates to the head of  
the



the Party. Copy of a letter I  
have addressed to the Superintendent  
Revenue Survey No 54 dated 14<sup>th</sup>  
June 1878, in view to stopping  
similar frauds in future is  
enclosed for information. In  
their Proceedings No 653 dated  
8 March 1876 the Board has  
specially enjoined that "as  
"regards differences between the  
"areas of lots as estimated by  
"the applicants and as deter-  
"mined by Survey, there is  
"considerable reason in the  
"Commissioner's statement that  
"he is in a great measure -  
"dependent upon the Survey  
officers

24/12  
"officers, whose duty it is to bring  
"to notice such discrepancies."  
but I may add that no further  
frauds are likely to be attempted  
as those hitherto implicated, or  
likely to attempt such, have  
been thoroughly frightened  
by recent action.

14. To return to the general  
question of dealing with Bees  
in demarcation. In cases of  
pattals held over open grass  
and scrub land, I would  
not interfere with occupation  
for the reasons already stated.  
the Bees is charged for and  
the State benefitted; in  
cases



cases, however, where the area  
is very large, title deeds might  
be withheld at the discretion  
of the authorities, till so much  
of such areas as might be  
ordered, was paid for, at the  
prices obtained for similar  
land at public auctions of  
Waste lands. I would treat  
Scrub and second growth the  
same, if certified as such by  
the Forest Department, or  
personally inspected by the  
Commissioner. For primaval  
Forest I would - except in  
special cases - altogether withhold  
grants of deeds, and give notice  
to the parties to desist from  
further

294/13  
C  
further interference. Such forest -  
in the absence of specific grants -  
could never have been in the  
holding of the vendors, or occupying  
even under the "Party" system.  
I solicit the earliest orders of  
Government on the points raised  
above, and request attention at  
the same time to the opinions  
expressed by the late Commissioner  
Mr. Webster - in his Memo on Mr  
Havelock's Polihit case forward  
-ed. with my No. 96 B dated  
31st July 1878.

15. I beg to submit a Memo  
in parallel columns, showing  
Colonel Blocher's cases, and my  
recommendations for treating each.

I



I also forward the explanations  
given by Mr. Hillier, and my 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Correspondence Clerk, in cases  
Nos 2 and 6 respectively.

16. In conclusion I would observe  
that a similar state of things,  
I believe, exists in South East  
Wynard, but as part of the  
land there has been acquired  
from petty Rajahs, and part  
from Government - each case  
must be separately enquired  
into and dealt with.

I have the honor to be  
Sir  
Yours most obedt Servt

Signed J. R. W. Barlow.

Ag Commissioner

(True copy) J. R. W. Barlow.  
Ag Commissioner

2961  
14



Statement of lands in Silkhunda Circuit purchased from real or nominal puttadars, the areas of which very much exceed the extent according to the Puttas.

Case No. 1.

Putta No. 84. Putta area 8 acres, surveyed area 227.90 acres, of which about 30 or 40 acres are covered with forest, not however very heavy.

In this case Mr. Haulelock made special application to the Commissioner for the survey of certain putta lands purchased by him, the application was sent to the Survey Department for compliance, the limits pointed out by the Curram and Mr. Haulelock as the boundaries of the land purchased were demarcated & surveyed, and the vast discrepancy in areas brought to the notice of the Commissioner.

The land appears to have passed through several hands before it became Mr. Haulelock's, he eventually appears to have purchased it from the Curram, & the amount he paid was certainly not intended for 8 acres as shown in the putta, but for the extent marked, and then estimated at 150 acres.

The Curram has had this land

Copy

Subd. 3rd July 1878

Mr. Haulelock, the

Boarding Mr

July 6 4

Enclosure.

Dec 31/78

Submitting for Mr

Certain correspondence

relating to the

in the occupation

of land & forest

land.

Mr. J. D. Haulelock 1891-



registered as Putta No. 84. Name of land  
"Attimara." "Pegamha appra." owners names  
Rakkamalla, Kaliai Jan, Bellan; the two  
last named are younger brothers of the first,  
who manages for all three.

Rakkamalla states that he knows  
nothing of the sale of this land to Mr.  
Havelock that the land was not his to  
sell. that his "Attimara" land is included  
in Mr. Havelock's "Colint" estate, adjoining  
& above the land now in question, it having  
been sold to Mr. Havelock some years  
ago, & that his "Pegamha appra" land, said  
to be in Mr. Havelock's new purchase is  
2 miles away across another ridge & in  
a valley which takes its name from a  
well known "Pegamha" stream.

This real "Pegamha appra" land, he  
says has not been demarcated at all, it  
is now fallow, but used to be cultivated  
by his father.

The people say that the Curman  
sold the land for 400 Rupees. and Rakka-  
malla states that the Curman tried  
to make him say that his Pegamha  
appra land was in the Gathalla valley  
below

below Havelock's Colint estate, and that  
the Curman took away his putta & kept  
it for about 3 days.

Mr. Havelock is now in possession  
of the land, he states that he informed  
the Commissioner some time ago that he  
had bought very much more than was  
shown in the putta.

It would now appear that no portion  
of the piece purchased was ever putta land,  
and that 227 acres of Government property  
have been sold by the Revenue authority  
of the Division on the strength of a Putta  
for a small portion of land situated  
elsewhere.

#### Case No. 2.

Two pieces of land aggregating about  
150 acres of which about half was covered  
with good forest on the banks of the  
Gathalla stream (a feeder of the Rowani  
river) have been purchased by Mr. Miller,  
a Clerk in the Commissioner's Office; the  
title deeds for these lands are puttas Numbered  
39, 75 & 57 and according to those title  
deeds the total area of the land purchased  
should be 13 acres.

Some of the Forest has been felled  
and planted over & huts have been  
built



built on the land.

Putta No 39, for one portion of this purchase shows that the owner's name is Munnijir Kanjan & the name of the land "Mattalarthutti." On enquiry as to the situation of "Mattalarthutti," a scrub-covered hill close to the village of Munnijir was pointed out & inasmuch as the word "thutti" signifies a hill or rising ground, it is impossible that any portion of Mr. Willier's purchase, situated as it is, in the low valley of the fathalla stream, can be the same as the land described in Putta No 39 which is said to give him the title to the land.

The puttadar of No 39 says that Mr. Willier bought no land from him, but that he was some time before taken to the Commissioner's Office by the Curram, that he was there asked his name & told to go.

Whether this Munnijir Kanjan's statement be true or not, there seems no doubt that in this case a putta for a small piece of land has been used as the instrument for alienating from Government and handing over to Mr. Willier a considerable piece

2941/1  
piece of good Forest well situated for the protection of an important stream.

For Mr. Willier's 2<sup>d</sup> piece the Putta Registers show No. 75 "Manaladdu Kanri" & "Putta Kilinji Mara," Puttadar Kechagat Kandri & No. 7 "Bikkimara," Puttadar Mullyur Kadam. Kechagat Kanri died a year ago, his son & heir, Relli, states that his "Manaladdu Kanri" land is not near Mr. Willier's clearing but close to the village of Mulimalai, that it has not been demarcated, and is now scrub land, having been cultivated about 10 years ago. He says he did not sell this land & now owns it, & there is no other land of that name near.

He says that his "Putta Kilinji Mara" land, a small piece on the other side of the fathalla, has now been included in Willier's property, he had a hut & kraal used to graze his cattle there in the monsoon; he did not sell the land nor receive any money for it, he & the Mulimalai Bramhar objected to the appropriation of his land but he was told to go to a Civil Court if he liked & the Demarcator said he had to follow



follow the lines shown by the Curman.

Regarding the other putta No 57 "Reikki-mara" the puttadar died a month ago; his son there is a boy employed in Havelock's estate. The Mulligiri Mowigat however says that the late Puttadar's "Reikkimara" land is not near Hillier's place, but on the road between Mulligiri & Analauche. -

Comments in this case appear unnecessary. a Clerk in the Commissioner's Office has with the aid and connivance of the Curman obtained possession of and proceeded to exercise rights of ownership over a valuable tract including some good Forest, his title being supposed to have been obtained from Puttadar who deny that they disposed of it or that they had any land there to dispose of. -

A Mr. Ariss has commenced Case No 3 to fell a tract of Forest on the banks of the Kundu River, low down, not far from the Malabar trijunction. This claim extends over 200 acres of good Forest and is based on the alleged purchase of certain puttas of which the aggregate area is 24 acres of

294/8  
Of the 9 Puttadar who are said formerly to have owned this land, one is dead & several others are away in Malabar & other places.

Two of the puttadar however, who are registered as having owned some of this land, deny that they ever had any land in the Kundu Valley and state that the fields of theirs named in the Register opposite to Mr Ariss' alleged purchase are still in their possession & are situated some miles away near Karipadi village. They sold no land to Mr Ariss but one of them says he sold one lot to the Curman about 6 months ago for 20 Rupees, of which he has been paid only 5.

This property is registered in the name of one Kamachi Mudej who is said to be living in the Curman's house.

Jogi, a nephew of the Kilimunda Mowigat has agreed to fell this Forest for Mr Ariss at 16 Rupees per acre, he says that the Curman supplied the funds for clearing & demarcating the boundaries of this land.

He also contracted for felling & planting Mr Hillier's land.

On the right bank of Fathalla stream, Fakier Mahomed has obtained

Case No 4



proportion of about 200 acres, nearly all heavy Forest. The puttars which this land is supposed to represent are numbered 3 & 46 and the aggregate putta area is 12 acres.

Nathan one of the puttadar, says that his "Jundhada" land is on the right bank of the Jothalla stream that he sold it to the Kilkunda Mungar for 50 Rupees who again disposed of it for 100 Rupees to Fakher Mahomed. but the Mungars of Mulimalai & Muligur both declare that there is only one "Jundhada" land about there and that it is situated not on the Jothalla but high up in the Kunda river, in Zeddakad village, and that Nathan had no land in the Jothalla to sell.

Another part of this 200 acre block of Forest is registered as "Jvatibarra" or "Athivamara" land, puttadar M. Sivaram. This puttadar says that he sold his lands known by the above names to the Curman & Kilkunda Mungar for 20 Rupees, but that these lands are on the Kunda river  $\frac{1}{2}$  a mile from Zeddakad & not near the Jothalla stream, where Fakher Mahomed's claim is. he says he has no land near Jothalla.

No

Case No. 5.

Case No. 6.

Case No. 7.

2941  
No felling has been done in this land yet, it has the appearance of virgin Forest & has in all probability never been cultivated.

The Kilkunda Mungar has recently acquired 2 pieces of land about 100 acres in all, half Forest, the 2 puttars which are said to give him the title to the land show an aggregate area of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres; in one case the puttadar says that his Jundhada land now registered in the Mungar's name is near Karepad village, in another direction, that he has not sold it, and that it has still to be demarcated.

A Head Gunmaster in the Commissioner's Office has 2 pieces of land registered in his name, estimated at 120 to 150 acres the corresponding putta area is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres.

One Mutusamy Mudali an Alkarsi Contractor has lately acquired about 120 acres of grass and some scattered Forest on the strength of several puttars of which the aggregate area is 24 acres some of the fields named as part of Mutusamy Mudali's land are said to be situated elsewhere.

Opposite



Opposite one portion of the land, the  
name of the Demarcator is entered in the  
column of the Register headed "Name of  
Agent or occupant." This matter is under  
Departmental enquiry.

Revenue Survey Office  
Camp Cotacambur  
26<sup>th</sup> May 1878  
Deputy Supt. Survey

Capt. D. H.  
Comd.  
H. S.

2941  
20



N<sup>o</sup> 636  
389

Revenue Survey Office  
Camp Cotacamund  
27<sup>th</sup> May 1878

Ms. 1  
1 JUN 78

From The Deputy Superintendent  
N<sup>o</sup> 1 Revenue Survey  
To The Commissioner  
Nilgiris

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for your consideration a Memorandum giving in detail the particulars of each of the cases where puttas for small pieces of land on the Kumbas have been made use of, lately, as the means of acquiring large tracts of Government Forest; you will observe that in nearly all of the cases there is evidence forthcoming to show that the lands acquired & taken possession of with the concurrence, if not assistance, of the subordinate Revenue Authorities, have no connection with those described in the puttas, which can form the only title to those lands; the areas are far more in excess than is usually the case, even on the hills; the land for the most part bears no marks of ever having been occupied or cultivated, & the discrepancies in the names of the fields seem to afford proof of fraudulent misappropriation of Government lands, characterised by

an



an utter disregard of any possible consequences; if it is not for me to adjudge what blame may be due to individuals, or how far the system is in fault.

2/ Regarding the general subject of the demarcation by this Department of areas in excess of those entered in Puttas, you are aware that in the Brokenad Division the result of the survey was to add over 80 per cent to the assessed area; the discrepancies in individual cases were however greater than this; the reason for the large excess by survey is that, (excepting immediately round village sites, where manure is available, or in specially well favoured spots) the land must be fallow for some years (3, 5, 7 or more), the Baduga with his 10 acre putta has from time immemorial been cultivating about that area in a different spot each year, coming back to the same land every 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> year he thus, while paying for 10 acres, has always considered that he had in his occupation 30, 50, or 70 acres; when the Demarcator came to his village he accordingly pointed out the limits within which he had been in the habit of selecting his land for cultivation. These were marked out, the whole land registered in his name and he became thenceforth liable for the tax on the whole. There were also many cases where the annual cultivation was more than was paid for, all such cases

naturally came to light after the survey.

3/ The Revenue system on the Hills seems to be very difficult to master, it appears to be traditionary, the knowledge of details being confined to certain families, and the secrets handed down to each succeeding generation, the records kept being intelligible only to the few initiated.

The following as far as I have been able to gather, is the history of the Revenue system of the Kurdas.

Up to, & for some time after, 1867 (when the Kurdas were transferred from Malabar to Coimbatore) the system known as "Erkad" or "Kattakad" was in force; under this system a tax was levied on each "Er" or plough, and each "Kothu" or digging implement, for the use of each plough 1 or 1½ Rupee was paid per annum, & each man not having a plough but cultivating with the "Kothu" paid a tax of 4 to 8 annas, for these sums each villager used his plough or "Kothu" as much as he liked & wherever he chose, there appear to have been no restrictions of any kind, not even in the matter of felling Forests, so that many hill sides and Valleys were cleared; solitary Forest trees in the grass or cultivated land still remain to show where extensive woodlands once existed.

The puttas then were distinguished as



as either 'Erkad' or 'Kathukad,' the name of the Ryot was given, & the amount of assessment he was liable for was entered, but nothing more; in no case was the extent or situation of the land he was supposed to cultivate specified; the putta was nearly a receipt for so much money in payment for a license to use so many ploughs or spades.

This system was continued till 1862, when Mr. Grant the Collector of Coimbatore gave orders that all who wanted lands were to take them up before 1865.

In 1862 it seems that a Tahsildar & Revenue Inspector came to the Kumbas and measured a few lands, the next year they came again, & some more lands were given to villagers without measurement, & after that in 1864 & 1865 other lands were given away at the Cutchery, on the application of the inhabitants, and registered in their names, the particulars as to the extent and local designation of each piece being entered in the accounts exactly as given by the applicants, and without any reference to the actual area occupied in each case. Puttas were then given in 1865, & have since only been altered by sales or transfers.

The Manager of Kulkunda taluk

2 Puttas for 44 pieces of land scattered about in different Kumba villages. 29/12

Under the 'Erkad' 'Kathukad' system the total Revenue of the Kumbas was from 250 to 300 Rupees it is now 546 Rupees.

4/ There are particular circumstances connected with the putta survey of the Kumbas, with which I think it proper that you should be acquainted, especially as some of them will be brought forward in the course of any enquiry you may make into the cases I have now reported.

Last year, shortly after the demarcation commenced, an Agent of the Elia Raja of Calicut appeared in the Kumbas & claimed the whole tract on behalf of his master, he either induced the resident Badugas to withhold all information & assistance from our Demarcators, or the villagers, in order to escape the enhanced assessment which they knew from experience in the Pokenad Division would follow an accurate survey of their lands, induced the Elia Raja to put forward his claim & so stop the survey operations; the result of the Raja's claim & consequent resistance of the villagers was much annoyance, trouble & delay to the work, we got on as best we could, and the Raja having failed to attend to a notice issued by the Commissioner, the question is I presume finally decided against him.



While the dispute was pending, the Manager of Kilkunda alone put himself in opposition to all the rest of the Kunda Badgas, and assisted us in every way, it was said at the time that there was enmity between him & the others because he had disposed of some of the Kunda lands to European planters, now that he has been proved to have been concerned with the Curman and others in attempting the alienation of tracts of Government Forest, he pleads that his loyalty last year has brought upon himself the ill-will of all the villagers; that great enmity exists there can be no doubt, it is probable also that but for the ill feeling I should have been able to ascertain something regarding the proceedings of the last <sup>few</sup> months, but making every allowance for exaggeration & there still remains the fact that summaries have been put forward and sales of valuable tracts effected nominally by puttadars, who deny having sold, & who undoubtedly had no right to sell.

5/ The dispute alone referred to & the difficulties that ensued from the non assistance of the villagers had another evil result.

Some time after the demarcation was supposed to have been completed it was

294/94  
was reported by the Curman that many putta lands had not been demarcated. The work remaining was <sup>not</sup> more than enough for one man to do, & it was impossible to exercise efficient supervision over one isolated demarcation; the man who was sent followed the lines pointed out to him by the Curman; after he had done one or two of these <sup>puttas</sup> he reported that there were large discrepancies in the areas of that Forest was being marked out as putta land; he was ordered not to demarcate any Forest & to send in a statement of estimated excess areas.

The limits of the lands in the cases given in the enclosed Memorandum had meanwhile been demarcated.

On my obtaining further information from a Sub Assistant specially deputed to enquire into the matter, I directed that the demarcation should be cancelled & the stones removed from around all the Forest lands, excepting Mr. Davelock's which case should I think be dealt with by you.

6/ Regarding the responsibility of the survey, in cases of this kind I would submit that our guides always are (1) occupation & (2) accounts.

Where occupation is claimed & not objected to by the collector's representative. the Curman we are bound to follow it, our rules on this point are strict, and again where the only interpreter of the accounts, the



the accountant, points out certain lands as by his accounts belonging to certain individuals, it is perhaps too much to expect that a subordinate demarcator should set himself up against the landholder & the local Government official, & refuse to be guided by them; in extreme cases we have gone beyond the letter of our instructions, & on the Kumbas, as in Bakenad, we have stopped the work & brought the matter to the notice of the Commissioner.

7/ I would mention in connection with this subject and with my remarks on the whole system that the Curman of Bakenad has held the post for 40 years, that his father & grand father held it before him & that one of his sons is the Curman of the Kumbas.

8/ I would also mention that there are only 4 Curmans for the Hills, the average area over which each has jurisdiction being nearly 200 square miles, and all being possessed of considerable landed property in different parts of the Hills.

9/ Before the introduction of the Rules for the Sale of Waste lands, the additional lands taken up annually & were entered in the accounts on the report of the Curman & without any measurement, and it was always the custom to allow a puttadar to hold in occupation 5 or 6 Bullas of land, cultivating

24/3  
cultivating annually 100 more Bullas in different parts of the tract paying for one Bulla only. The old Bakenad Curman told me that he sometimes saw the land applied for, but not always, that he gave the area given by the applicant, which had not necessarily any reference to the area taken possession of on the strength of the putta.

10/ As connected with the general land question I would also take this opportunity of bringing to your notice that wholesale transfers of puttas from native holders to European planters are now taking place, in one case a planter having by degrees obtained possession under the Waste Land Rules of otherwise of most of the land surrounding a village, has now bought up the whole village itself & the land immediately adjoining & the villagers have removed elsewhere.

11/ I understand also that some Soda puttas, granted on specially favourable terms (2 annas an acre) & declared inalienable, have been transferred, and that in other cases, to avoid the penalty for alienation, they have been given over on 99 years leases -

The



The whole subject is I think worthy  
of very full investigation.

I have the honor to be

Yours most obed<sup>t</sup> servant

W. C. C. Vinitfal

Depy Supt. Ind.

26

W. C. C.  
Depy Supt. Ind.



1871  
The City of London  
No. 1, King's Bench

Copy

dated 27<sup>th</sup> Aug 1878  
Recd 14<sup>th</sup> June

Printed  
No. 34, 21/18  
Dun. 10

Amos's 200, 17, 18  
Thames Street, 21, 18

Small 10 100000

London 1878

Printed the London

Street 1878

where — for small

pieces of land in the

London 1878

Small 10 100000

London 1878



Prepared by Alvin Smith  
Compared by W. H.

McCree Lieut. Col.  
Depy Supt. Revenue Survey



N<sup>o</sup>  
M. S. S. S.  
25 JUN 78

Revenue Survey Office  
Camp Ootacamund  
24<sup>th</sup> June 1878.

From

The Deputy Superintendent  
N<sup>o</sup> 1 Revenue Survey

To The Commissioner  
Tilgiri.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice that in the course of the demarcation of woodlands in the Brekenad Division, we have found an estate open on what appears to be Government waste.

On the matter being reported to me I visited the place and have since made full enquiry into the matter; the facts are as follows.

1/ When putta lands were demarcated in Brekenad in the year 1871 no claim was laid to the land above referred to, and our Register, showing it as a portion of Government waste, bears the signature of the Brekenad Curram.

2/ In October 1876 & April 1877 deeds of Sale were made out transferring to the Curram of Brekenad and his sons, the land held under Puttas Nos 298 & 418 situated within certain boundaries specified.



specified in the deed, and said to measure 2.79 acres; the sum paid for the two pieces is said to be 20 Rupees.

The Putta for one of these pieces was transferred to the Curman and his sons in May 1877 & has been re-numbered 643.

4/ It is on the strength of the above two deeds of sale that the Curman has opened a coffee estate & built a house in a very pleasant and fertile looking valley near Demad. a sketch showing the property is enclosed.

The land now under coffee, and cleared is about 25 acres in extent, a portion of it felled forest; there was a further claim by the Curman for about 50 acres, of which some is heavy forest, but the Curman, who was with me on the ground, said he would be satisfied of the portion in his occupation were given to him.

5/ The boundaries shown in the deed of sale point approximately to the land taken possession of by the Curman, but these boundaries are not given in the putta, which he says he bought, and the Puttadar could tell nothing but what was in his Putta.

6/ Now the only entries of any kind in the putta, to aid one in identifying the land represented by the Putta are the

the names of the lands. in this case Putta No 298 is said to be for "Pari. thutta" <sup>954</sup> area 4.06 acres & No. 418 for "Bikkai. thutta" <sup>950</sup> area 5.73.

7/ On examination I find that one piece named "Pari. thutta" Putta No. 298 area 4.06 acres, has already been demarcated in the village of Granhalli and is included in Survey No. 49 of that village.

8/ The other piece Bikkai. thutta appears not to have been demarcated; but I have had depositions taken from the old & respectable men of the villages near & there is no doubt.

1st That the land taken by the Curman is generally known as "Briammakandi" and "Gerathorachalla."

2nd That Pari. thutta & Bikkai. thutta are not there at all.

3rd That the names of the people who are said to have been the Puttadars for the land occupied by the Curman are not known to any of the villagers near.

9/ I would in conclusion request your attention to the fact that the two puttas now put forward by the Curman as his title to the land taken possession of by him are included in the list of so-called "omitted" puttas, prepared by the Curman, and forwarded to me for survey by your predecessor on the 24th April 1877.

of Mr. Comp.

Have the honor to be  
Your most obedt. Servt.  
A. Crooke  
Deputy District Officer.



No 827  
561

25/13

Revenue Survey Office  
Camp Octacammund  
28<sup>th</sup> June 1878

Memorandum  
5 July 78

From  
The Deputy Superintendent  
No 1 Revenue Survey  
To The Commissioner  
Nilgiris.

Sir,

In continuation of my former letter on the subject of the appropriation of Government lands by so called puttadars I have the honor to bring to your notice two other cases in which have since come to light.

1. In the Southern extremity of Madras, near the crest over the Kunda river, one Chinmayy opened a small estate which he has on land marked and registered by us in 1870 as Government waste, he has occupied about 60 or 8 acres, of which 2 or 3 acres are under Coffee and Rice cultivation.

2. His title deeds, which I called on him to produce, consist of 2 deeds of sale, one purporting to transfer from Rangin the holder of putta No 340, to Komarasaami Bunder, Curum for the sum of 5 Rupees, his putta land known as "Ramanda-attu" measuring 1.44 acres, and the other purporting to transfer the same land from the Curum to Chinmayy the

The Deputy Superintendent  
No 1 Revenue Survey  
Camp Octacammund  
28<sup>th</sup> June 1878  
No 2 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 3 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 4 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 5 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 6 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 7 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 8 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 9 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 10 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 11 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 12 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 13 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 14 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 15 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 16 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 17 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 18 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 19 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 20 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 21 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 22 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 23 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 24 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 25 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 26 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 27 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 28 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 29 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 30 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 31 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 32 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 33 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 34 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 35 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 36 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 37 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 38 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 39 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 40 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 41 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 42 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 43 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 44 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 45 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 46 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 47 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 48 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 49 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 50 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 51 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 52 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 53 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 54 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 55 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 56 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 57 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 58 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 59 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 60 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 61 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 62 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 63 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 64 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 65 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 66 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 67 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 68 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 69 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 70 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 71 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 72 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 73 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 74 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 75 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 76 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 77 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 78 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 79 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 80 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 81 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 82 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 83 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 84 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 85 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 86 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 87 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 88 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 89 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 90 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 91 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 92 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 93 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 94 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 95 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 96 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 97 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 98 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 99 26<sup>th</sup> 1878  
No 100 26<sup>th</sup> 1878



the present occupant for Rupees 50.

4/ Now the land occupied on the strength of the above title appears never to have been cultivated before; and a piece of land corresponding in every particular to the description above given has already been demarcated and registered in No 149 H Division of the Calacannund Settlement, 15 miles away from Chinnacann's present estate.

5/ This is one of the so called omitted puttas which was requested by the Commissioner to survey in his letter No 45. 24<sup>th</sup> April 1877.

6/ In another case, not far from the above, one Nathan has occupied and built on a piece of land demarcated & registered as Government waste.

He states that he was absent from his village for some time & did not know that the land he now occupies was his putta land, until about 2 years ago when the Curman told him it was his and he might occupy it.

7/ He produced before me a putta purporting to be for this land, area 0.76; he states that another putta for the rest of it is with the Curman.

8/ The area of the land occupied or claimed is about 15 or 20 acres of which a small portion is cultivation and a portion Forest.

9/ I have not been able to ascertain yet whether any portion of this land is really putta land or not, it is included in the list of omitted puttas referred to in Para 5- ante.

Have the honor to be  
Sir  
Yours most obed<sup>t</sup> Serv<sup>t</sup>  
Urooce Urooce  
Deputy Supt Dist.

Comp<sup>d</sup>



294/37

Statement of lands in Kilkunda  
Circuit purchased from real or nominal  
puttadars the areas of which very much exceed the  
extent according to Puttads.

Remarks by the Dy Supy      Remarks by the Dy  
N<sup>o</sup> 1 Revenue Survey      Commissioner of Nilgiris

Case N<sup>o</sup> 1. Puttah N<sup>o</sup> 34. Case N<sup>o</sup> 1. I inspected this,  
Putta area 8 acres, surveyed as well as Mr. Havelock's  
area 227.70 acres of which about 200 acres reported on  
30 or 40 acres are covered with by the late Commissioner  
forest, not however very heavy. and for the same reasons  
In this case Mr. Havelock made as those set forth by Mr.  
Special Application to the Master. I would recom-  
Commissioner for the survey - mind that titled deeds showing  
of certain putta lands purchased be issued to Mr. Havelock.  
ed by him, the Application who evidently was acting in  
was sent to the Survey Dept. good faith; he himself  
- went for compliance, the appears to have brought the  
limits pointed out by the excess area to notice, and, as  
Curran and Mr. Havelock as observed by Col. Blotto, paid,  
the boundaries of the land - not for the small area esti-  
purchased were demarcated and - rated in the putta, but for  
Surveyed      the

Rec<sup>d</sup> 31/1/78  
Mr. J. C. Daulton & Co. Agents  
Evidence to Mr. Daulton & Co.  
of 30th July 1878 of the 1300  
of the 1300



Surveyed and the vast discrepancy in areas brought to the notice of the Commissioner. The land appears to have passed through several hands before it came to Mr. Havelock; he eventually appears to have purchased it from the Curumun, and the amount he paid was certainly not intended for 8 acres as shown in the putta, but for the extent marked, and then estimated at 150 acres.

The Curumun has had this land registered as Putta N° 84 - name of land 'Athimara' - Pegamba Appra'; owners names abundance of wood, and Kakkamalla, Kahadjan, Bellan Appra; in this locality - the two last named are younger brothers of the first who manages for all three. Kakkamalla states that he knows nothing of the sale of this land to Mr. Havelock, that the land was not his to sell, that his 'Athimara' land is included in Mr. Havelock's 'Colicut'.

284/34  
'Colicut' Estate, adjoining and above the land now in question, it having been sold to Mr. Havelock some years ago, and that his 'Pegamba Appra' land, said to be in Mr. Havelock's new purchase is 2 miles away across another ridge and in a valley which takes its name from a well-known 'Pegamba' stream. This real 'Pegamba Appra' land, he says, has not been demarcated at all, it is now fallow, but used to be cultivated by his father.

The people say that the Curumun sold the land for 400 Rupers and Kakkamalla states that the Curumun tried to make him say that his Pegamba Appra land was in the Gothalla Valley below Havelock's Colicut Estate and that the Curumun took away his putta and kept it for about 3 days.

Mr. Havelock



Mr. Havelock is now  
in possession of the land,  
he states that he informed  
the Commissioner some time  
ago that he had bought very  
much more than was shown  
in the Putta.

It would now appear that  
no portion of the piece pur-  
chased was ever putta-land,  
and that 22.7 acres of  
Government property have  
been sold by the Revenue  
Authority of the Division on  
the strength of a Putta for a  
small portion of land sit-  
uated elsewhere.

Trase No. 2. Two pieces of land  
aggregating about 150 acres. One  
of which about half was covered  
with good forest on the bank. I only viewed it from the op-  
of the Gothala stream (a feeder - opposite side of a valley, I  
of the Pravani river) have been purchased by Mr. Hillier again. I enclose Mr. Hillier's  
a clerk  
inspection  
a clerk  
explanation

24/5  
a clerk in the explanation. It is clear  
Commissioner's that he has no title what-  
Office; the titled deeds for ever even for a portion and  
these lands are puttas Kumbha puttas, and it is open to  
ed 39.75857 and according Government to refuse title  
to those titled deeds the total deeds altogether and  
area of the land purchased resume if so disposed -  
should be 13 acres. Some of the  
forest has been felled and  
planted over and huts have  
been built on the land.

Putta No. 39, for one portion  
of this purchase shows that the  
owner's name is Munja, Nanjan  
and the name of the land  
"Mattalor thittu". On inquiry  
as to the situation of "Mattalor  
thittu", a forest covered hill  
close to the village of Munja  
was pointed out and inasmuch  
as the word "thittu" signifies  
a hill or rising ground, it  
is impossible that any portion  
of Mr. Hillier's purchase, sit-  
uated as it is in the low  
valley of the Gothala stream



Can be the same as the land described in Putta N<sup>o</sup> 39 which is said to give him the title to the land.

The puttadar of N<sup>o</sup> 39 says that Mr. Millier bought no land from him, but that he was some time before taken to the Commissioner's Office by the Curum, that he was there asked his name and told to go. Whether this Kurja Nanjan's statement be true or not, there seems no doubt that in this case a putta for a small piece of land has been used as the instrument for alienating from Government and handing over to Mr. Millier a considerable piece of good forest well situated for the protection of an important stream.

For Mr. Millier's 2<sup>nd</sup> piece the

284/36  
the putta Registers show N<sup>o</sup> 75 'Inanaladdu Kandi' & Putta Kilingi Inara - Putta da. Ketchaget Kandi & N<sup>o</sup> 57 'Bikkimara'; Puttadar Mullyu Kadan. Ketchaget Kandi died a year ago, his son & heir, Belli states that his 'Inanaladdu Kandi' land is not near Mr. Millier's clearing but close to the village of Mulimalai, that it has not been demarcated, and is now scrub land having been cultivated about 10 years ago. He says he did not sell this land and now owns it and there is no other land of that name near.

He says that his 'Putta Kilingi Inara' land, a small piece on the other side of the Gollalla has now been included in Hillier's property, he had a hut and Kool and used to graze his cattle there in the

his son



monsoon; he did not sell the land  
nor received any money for it,  
he and the Mullimalai  
Innagar objected to the  
appropriation of his land  
but he was told to go to Civil  
Court if he liked and the de-  
marcator said he had to  
follow the lines shown by  
the Gurram.

Regarding the other Putta  
N<sup>o</sup> 57. Pikkimara. the putta-  
dar died a month ago; his  
son and heir is a boy employed  
in Havelock's Estate. The  
Mulligar Innagar however says  
that the late Puttadar's Pikk-  
imara land is not near  
Hillier's place, but on the  
road between Mulligar and  
Avalanche.

Comments in this case ap-  
pear unnecessary, a clerk  
in the Commissioner's Office  
has with the aid and con-  
-sistance of the Gurram  
obtained

294/37  
obtained possession  
of and proceeded  
to exercise rights of ownership  
over a valuable tract including  
some good forest, his title  
being supposed to have been  
obtained from Puttadar  
who deny that they disposed  
of it or that they had any  
land there to dispose of.

Case N<sup>o</sup> 3. J. M. Arries This is a very bad case,  
has commenced to fell a tract there is no question whatever  
of forest on the Banks of the As to forest here. Inspects  
Kunda river, low down, not the trees are a dense mass  
far from the alluvial tri- of virgin forest. Felled  
-junction. This claim extends should be withheld and  
over 200 acres of good forest notice of resumption sent  
and is based on the alleged  
purchase of certain puttas  
of which the aggregated area  
is 24 acres.

Of the 9 Puttadars who are  
said formerly to have owned  
this land, one is dead and

Several



Several others are away in Malabar and other places.

Two of the puttaders however who are registered as having owned some of this land, deny that they ever had any land in the Kundah Valley and state that the fields of their names in the Register of-  
posite to Mr. Arries' alleged purchase are still in their possession and are situated some miles away near Haripadi village. They sold no land to Mr. Arries but one of them says he sold one lot to the Curum about 6 months ago for 20 Rupees, of which he has been paid only 5.

This property is registered in the name of one Kamachi Munday who is said to be living in the Curum's house. Jagg a nephew of the Kilkunda Monegar has agreed to sell this

294/38  
this Forest for Mr. Arries at 16 Rupees per acre, he says that the Curum supplied the funds for clearing and demarcating the boundaries of this land.

He also contracted for felling and planting on Hillier's land.

Case N<sup>o</sup> 4. On the right bank of Gathalla stream, Taker Mahomed has obtained possession of about 200 acres, nearly all heavy forest. The puttas which this land is supposed to represent are numbered 3, 4, 6 and the aggregate putta area is 1 1/2 acres.

The same course as in N<sup>o</sup> 3 is recommended

Nathan one of the puttaders says that his "Gundheda" land is on the right bank of the Gathalla stream, that he sold it to the Kilkunda Monegar for 50 Rupees who again



again disposed of it for 100  
Rupers to Fakker Mohammed  
but the Dhonegar of Mulimalai  
and Muligar both declare  
that there is only one 'Gundhara'  
land about there and that  
it is situated not on the  
Gothalla but high up in  
the Kunda river, in Yedda-  
-Kad village, and that  
Masthan has no land in  
the Gothalla to sell.

Another part of this 200  
acre block of Forest is  
registered as 'Jawalibarra'  
'Athivamara' land, putta-  
-dar Mr. Sivaman. This  
puttadar says that he sold  
his lands known by the  
above names to the Gummam  
and Kilkunda Dhonegar for  
20 Rupers, but that these  
lands are on the Kunda  
river 1/2 a mile from Yedda-  
-Kad and not near the Go-  
-thalla stream where Fakker  
Mohammed's claim is. he  
says

294/39  
says he has no  
land near Gothalla.  
No felling has been done in  
this land yet, it has the ap-  
pearance of Virgin Forest  
and has in all probability  
never been cultivated.

Case N° 5. The Kilkunda Dhonegar has recently ac-  
quired 2 pieces of land. I would strike all the  
forest out of this claim, and  
about 100 acres in all, half open and grass land only.  
Forest; the 2 puttas which this Dhonegar of Kilkunda  
are said to give him the did good service by afford-  
title to the land showing information and  
aggregate area of 3 1/2 acres; assistance when the Bada-  
in one case the puttadar says - gas were intriguing in  
that his Genghada land the Elia Rajah's case, to  
now registered in the Dhone which he now points, and  
gas's name is near Hanepad says the ryots of his village  
village, in another direction, owe him a grudge -  
that he has not sold it,  
and that it has still to be  
demarked

Case



Case N<sup>o</sup> 6. A. Head - The Head Gumastas ex-  
 - Gumasta in the Commissioner's - planation is forwarded.  
 Office has 2 pieces of land. It is not alleged that the  
 registered in his name esti- land is forest. I think in  
 mated at 120 to 150 acres this and similar cases of  
 the corresponding putta area open lands where much  
 is 7 1/2 acres. more than the putta area  
 is occupied, that it might  
 be made a condition  
 previous to giving title-  
 deeds, should Government  
 be disposed to grant them  
 at all, that the excess or  
 such portion of the acreage  
 as is ordered be paid for  
 at the average rate that  
 lands of a similar descri-  
 -ption sell for at public  
 auction.

Case N<sup>o</sup> 7. One Muttu - Same recommendation  
 - Sawing Muddelji an ikkari as for N<sup>o</sup> 6. The Demarcator  
 Contractor has lately ac- in this case is being pro-  
 -quired about 120 acres of - secuted for forgery and  
 grass and some scattered framing an incorrect record  
 Forest on the strength of under Sections 463 and 218  
 several puttas of which of the S. P. Code respectively  
 - the

the aggregate area is 24  
 acres. Some of the fields  
 named as part of Muttu-  
 - Sawing Muddelji land are  
 said to be situated else-  
 where. Opposite one portion  
 of the land, the name of the  
 Demarcator is entered in  
 the Column of the Register  
 headed "Name of Agent or  
 occupant". This matter is  
 under Departmental inquiry.

Note. Titled deeds should also be withheld until  
 notice issued in the cases alluded to in Col.  
 - lated letter of the 14<sup>th</sup> ult. and in 1887  
 of the 28<sup>th</sup> idem - 501

[Signed] R. W. Barlow  
 Nilgiri Commr Office  
 Ootacamund 31<sup>st</sup> July 1878. By Commissioner  
 [True copy]  
 M. M. M.  
 As Commissioner



29<sup>th</sup>  
Colacamund 29<sup>th</sup> July 1878

To

R. W. Barlow Esquire  
Commissioner  
Nilgiris

Sir

With reference to your Memo  
No 702 of 19<sup>th</sup> Instant I beg to offer  
the following remarks on Col. Claret's  
Statement regarding my land on  
the <sup>old</sup> Kundaaks

With reference to the acreage  
I beg to state that the land was  
bought by me from the ryots after  
it was demarcated. I considered  
then that the extent was about 150  
acres and paid a proportionate  
price viz 500 Rupees. The right and  
title by the ryots to the land was  
verified by the Curnam and  
Munigar

Recd 5/24/78

Miss J. C. D. 29<sup>th</sup> July 1878

Enclosure to letter No 702

to the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> of 1878



Monigar. Regarding the dis-  
-proportion between the area  
according to the puttaks and  
that ascertained by Survey I  
beg to state that the case is not  
exceptional. Similar dispro-  
-portions are the rule and have  
been admitted by the Revenue  
authorities in every division of  
the District.

Col Cloete says that "half  
of the land was covered with  
good forest some of which has  
been felled and planted over"  
I beg to state that there is no  
forest on the land, the present  
growth being secondary except  
a fringe of jungle around the  
cattle kraal reserved for shelter  
during the hot months of the year.

24/2  
There can be no doubt whatever  
that the land was originally  
cultivated. It was left fallow for  
a few years on account of the  
drought. On inspection will prove  
the correctness of my statement.

I may state here that I  
personally asked Col Cloete whether  
he had been to the land. That  
gentleman said "no I have not."  
Mr Thompson, Sub assistant Revenue  
Survey (who I presume was Col Cloete's  
informant since that gentleman had  
not visited the land) told me that  
he had informed Col Cloete that there  
was no doubt that my land was  
puttak that there were many signs  
of cultivation on it and that the  
growth on the land (with the  
exception



exception noted) Could not be  
called forest. How after this Col  
Cloete could have said "Half the  
land is covered with good forest"  
is not explainable

With reference to the remarks  
regarding the name of the lands  
and the assertion that it is not the  
land referred to in the puttahs.

I beg to state that the names of  
Burgher holdings are altogether  
conventional. The names are  
given at hazard according to the  
Title deeds copies of which are  
sent to Col Cloete the situation  
of the land is correct. This is  
certified to by the Carnani and  
Moungas and as no other authority  
on such a subject is in existence,

29/1/83  
a purchaser has no body else to refer to.  
I may add that the information given  
by the Burgher to the Deputy Superin-  
tendent is quite unreliable as these  
people have quite a different story to  
tell now and moreover they are not  
the original puttahdars and have  
no interest in the lands.

I beg to remain  
Sir

Your most obedient servant

(Signed) H. Hillier

(True Copy)

W. W. Hillier

As Commissioner



Ootacamund  
29<sup>th</sup> July 1878

To,

A. W. Bartow Esquire  
By Commissioner of the Nilgiris

Most Respected Sir,

With reference to your Memo No. 73 of the 19<sup>th</sup>  
Instant I beg to offer the following remarks on the  
remarks of Lieutenant Colonel Collette in case to be.

With reference to acreage I beg to state that  
the land was bought by me after demarcation. Colonel  
Collette states that the extent is 120 to 150 acres. I beg  
to state that in any case the land will not be more  
than 115 acres. The disproportion between the actual  
extent and that given in the Puttah is of common  
occurrence in the whole District in as much as the  
figures were entered in the Puttahs at random and  
not after careful measurement and it was on this account  
that the Revenue Survey was introduced on the hills  
and in almost all demarcation throughout the District  
the Survey Department are well aware that the  
extent considerably exceeds that entered in the  
Puttah. As I purchased the land after demar-  
-cation I beg to state that it was the land demar-

Mr. S. C. Deodappa Esquire  
in charge of the Nilgiris  
at the Nilgiris

Per 3/24/78



8/21/98  
 Mrs. J. L. Taylor  
 New York City  
 100 100

Sig Hea.  
Signed / Lt. Venkateramamiah  
Agst English clerk  
W. M. S.  
Asymmetric

Signed / Lt. Venkataramamiah  
Asst Engr. in ch.



Nilgiri Commissioners Office  
Coimbatore 14<sup>th</sup> June 1878

No 57

25/4/78

From,

A. W. Barton Esquire

Ag: Commissioner Nilgiris

To,

The Superintendent

Revenue Survey

Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No <sup>1943</sup>/<sub>516</sub> of the 9<sup>th</sup> Instant only received yesterday I have the honor to observe that Colonel Clarke's letter alluded to by you was received by me on the 1<sup>st</sup> Instant, and a full report on the matter is now being drafted for submission to Government copy of which will be furnished to you for information by me.

I. The parties in fault will be suitably dealt with when the orders of Government are received but I would observe with reference to your query that it is difficult to take "measures" to prevent wilful misrepresentation and collusion on the part of Subordinates and pullahdars as has been the case "prima-facie" in the instances reported



More especially in remote tracts such cases can only be dealt with as brought to light.

3. Demarcation is I understand from Colonel Cloete nearly completed but I would suggest as one great safe-guard against fraud that the Subordinates of your Department be warned not to demarcate where the area entered in the Mutlak (which is always before them) is clearly out of all proportion to the area within the boundaries indicated without first making a reference to their Superior. This too would appear the natural course unless they are careless or also in collusion with the paltahdars.

I have &c.  
[Signed] A. W. Barlow  
Ag. Commissioner

(True copy)

A. W. Barlow  
Ag. Commissioner



25th / 48

My dear Master.

I have to-day  
sent you, with my  
No. 98 of 12th inst, the  
Forest Commission  
report. As regards  
my minute of dissent,  
on one point, appended  
to it, I would ask

70

Dec 3rd/98

Amis & Co. 11/19/98

Condon & Co. 11/19/98  
of the 12th inst  
Commissioner to Sup  
Re Survey 11/19/98



that my No 96 A  
dated 31<sup>st</sup> ult to  
the Board of Revenue  
regarding Forest lands  
may be considered  
when disposing of it.  
I have not exaggerated  
the difficulties attend-  
ing the land question.

294/49  
The demarcator alluded  
to in the memo accom-  
panying my 96 A to  
the Bd, has, I hear,  
been sentenced to one  
year's imprisonment  
& 500 Rs fine.

Yrs very sincerely

W Moorlan

ooty  
13.8.70



294/5

REVENUE (FAMINE) DEPARTMENT.

No. 3421-3525

From Commissioner Hilgier

Dated 6-12 Aug 1878

FOR ORDERS.

Circulated for  
perusal send-  
ing receipt of  
Board's review  
of the Forest  
Report. Instead of placing reserve com-  
mission Report  
in the position  
of the old States  
which cultivated  
opened on

Ordered in Council  
16-8-78

E. M.



The trade which has  
there has designated  
for such industry is  
an practically im-  
possible to stop back im-  
provement & throw  
settlers back on  
low bare & dead  
land of exhausted  
soil - which we really  
experienced Planter  
or accept as a gift  
so far as present  
is concerned the  
same bulk of fuel  
can be produced and  
broken forth in 10 years  
of eucalyptus planting  
than every acre of  
old land must

be made available  
to the people. But  
I do call on Col. Boddams  
at once to submit  
proposals for the  
planting on the hills

I doubt however in  
the opinion that such  
planting has produced  
fuel along a stream  
than intended that  
it should be laid bare  
& replaced by fuel  
bushes. I doubt

See any exaggeration  
in the estimate of  
the Commission  
regarding the effect  
of flood or inundation  
on water supply.  
They appear to be on  
the contrary & to be  
more in the matter  
moderation.

L.R.

Quart. B. Boddams

Quart. B. Boddams

Quart. B. Boddams

Quart. B. Boddams

By 20/2

284/51  
in 4 years be producing  
for 200 + 400 lbs of  
Tea a year.  
The writing on the  
water supply question  
describing of road  
etc, of not absolute  
mis-  
piction, is ~~an~~ mis-  
chiefous, exaggeration  
approaching the verge of  
unwitting untruth  
24/8 M.R.