

(1) Number of pages 16
(2) Date of repair 5-1-55
(3) Initials of the Referencer low

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	478	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	25-4-55	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

178
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

28th April 1880, No. 478.

No. 247. READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th February 1880, No. 189.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting for orders of Government letter from Collector regarding the villagers' complaint of their suffering serious injury by the assignment to Tirupati temple of a large portion of jungle lands attached to Pudipatla village in Chandragiri Taluk, North Arcot District.

No. 248. ORDER THEREON, 28th April 1880, No. 478.

Forests, No. 16.

It is not clear that any direct reference has been made to the Temple authorities regarding the rights of the villagers of Pudipatla.

2. The Collector will inform them that no interference with the immemorial communal rights of the neighbouring villagers in the jungle made over to the Temple was sanctioned or contemplated.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. W. H. French.

45 Copies.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 16th May 1879.

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Palmanair, 22nd April 1879, No. 136:—

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, No. 126, dated 18th January last, directing that the line as traced by Mr. Sheffield, Deputy Conservator of Forests, in demarcating the circular tract ordered to be assigned to the Devasthanum on the Tripatty hill should be adopted, I have the honor to report that accordingly the extent of the lands, as demarcated, has been duly made over by that officer to the Temple authorities.

2. I now forward herewith translation of a Mahazar received from the inhabitants of Pudipatta village, Chandragiri Taluk, in which they complain that certain jungle land appertaining to their village has been included in the grant made to the Tripatty Devasthanum. The accompanying copy of letter, No. 158-23, dated 27th ultimo, from the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement shows that the complaint of the villagers is well founded and that their enjoyment of a portion of the jungle lands attached to their village has been interfered with by the above-mentioned arrangement. The Deputy Director, however, states that, in spite of this assignment of their land, there is still a large tract of jungle left to the villagers for enjoyment.

3. I have the honor under these circumstances, to request the instructions of the Board as to whether in this case any further inquiry should be instituted, or the complaint rejected.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. RUNDALL, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, dated Gundlapalli, 27th March 1879, No. 158-23.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 185, dated the 5th instant, requesting information whether the complaint of the Pudipatta villagers as to the inclusion of jungle land appertaining to their village in the Tripatty Devasthanum reserve is well founded.

2. It is true that a certain extent of jungle of the said village was included in the reserve, the tract being within the radius or limits assigned by Government for the temple reserve. This inclusion of the same was approved by you — *Vide* the correspondence marginally noted.

My letter, No. 611-85, dated 17th July 1874.
Your reply, No. 645, of 30th idam.

3. I must remark that the definition of the reserve was assigned to the Forest Department and a Head Classifier was deputed to aid Mr. Sheffield and erect the marks requisite for survey purposes. The work was not done under the supervision of the department, the plans and records being forwarded, I believe, to your office.

4. Though the complaint of the villagers is well founded I do not consider they have any real grounds for objection. There is a vast tract of jungle still left to the village, and though the extent they have been deprived of probably aggregates 200 to 300 cawnies yet it cannot, I understand, be rightly said to contain wood for agricultural purposes. The tract was merely useful for fuel and pasture.

5. The question was settled five years ago and endorsements were then passed to the villagers. The enclosure of your letter is returned herewith.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. WHITESIDE,
Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Translation of Mahazar.

As it appears from the letter from the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement that there is still a large tract of jungle left to the villagers notwithstanding the inclusion of the small area claimed by them in the Tripatty Devasthanum reserve the Board do not consider that any further inquiry is necessary.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.

Copy to the Conservator of Forests.

" Director of Revenue Settlement.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Jungle lands situated in Tripatty hill
North Arcot District. — The Collector is
informed that the villagers of the
village of Pudipatta have been
deprived of a portion of the jungle
lands attached to their village in the
Tripatty Devasthanum reserve. The
Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement
has been requested to enquire into the
matter and report to the Board of Revenue.

APRIL
21 1879

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

REVENUE
DEPARTMENT

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

REVENUE

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

REVENUE

128
3

No. 189.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 5th February 1880.

Read the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 6th December 1879, No. 440:—

ADVERTING to Board's Proceedings, dated 16th May 1879, No. 1,300, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of a further communication* received from the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement on the subject of the complaint of the inhabitants of the Pudipatla village, in the Chandragiri Taluk, of their suffering serious injury by the assignment to the Tirupati temple of a large portion of the jungle lands attached to their village.

2. It will be seen from this letter that, owing to the unfortunate mistake made by the Deputy Conservator of Forests in marking out the grant to the Devasthanam as ordered by Government of a small circular tract on the crest of the hill, the measurement extended all down the slopes to the very foot of the hills, absorbing a large extent of fine jungle lands which were demarcated, and for many years past have belonged, to the surrounding villages. Mr. Rundall is satisfied, after personal inquiry on the spot, that substantial damage has resulted to the villagers of Pudipatla in their being deprived of their ancient communal rights in the jungle in question, such as driving cattle for pasture, cutting fuel, and collecting leaves for manure for their fields. These rights have been exercised by the villagers from time immemorial, and I feel sure that the Government, in sanctioning the grant to the temple authorities of the very large extent of wood land that was by accident demarcated for them, had no intention of extinguishing the ancient communal rights and privileges of the villagers. All that the Government transferred was their own right and title as owner of the land.

3. I think the circumstances of the case call for more definite orders than have as yet been passed. If the jungle land of Pudipatla cannot be restored to the village, the temple authorities should be at least clearly made to understand that their possession of the jungles is subject to the future exercise and enjoyment of the villagers' immemorial communal rights, and that they have no power to obstruct the same as they now do. I have therefore the honor to request that the Board will be good enough to lay the matter before Government and obtain their final orders.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. RUNDALL, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, No. III, North Arcot, to W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, dated Chittoor, 26th November 1879, No. 819-198.

ADVERTING to the correspondence given in the Board's Proceedings, No. 1,300, of 16th May 1879, relative to the complaint of the Pudipatla villagers of the inclusion of the portion of the Tirumala Konda or Hill, appertaining to their village, in the limits assigned to the Tirupati Devasthanam, I have the honor to report that, whilst recently encamped at Pudipatla, the villagers represented to me the full circumstances of their complaint, and as it varies considerably from the particulars given in my letter printed with the above Proceedings, upon which the orders of the Board were based, I herewith submit a further petition that the villagers then presented to me.

2. When writing on the 27th March I had only the correspondence of my office to refer to, and it is not in respect to the limits or radius of the assignment originally made by Government to the Devasthanam—and to mark which a Head Classifier was deputed to aid the Deputy Conservator of Forests—that the villagers appeal. That arrangement they admit did not affect them materially, but subsequently these original limits were modified by the Deputy Conservator of Forests under orders. These enhanced limits in the direction of Pudipatla are not confined to the summit or plateau of the hill, but extend down to southern slope to very near the foot of the hill and the line marked round the base of the hill for survey purposes. This modification, which I was unaware of when I last wrote, as there are no papers on the subject in this office, has deprived the villagers of the bulk of the jungle and grazing appertaining to the Tirumala Konda or Hill. They certainly have good grounds for their complaint, for besides losing a large extent of good pasturage, they have been ejecting from the main source from whence they obtained leaves for manuring their wet land, which is a serious consideration.

3. From an endorsement the villagers submit from the Deputy Conservator of Forests they are held by Mr. Sheffield to be free to take leaves for manure and fuel from the tract, but the villagers declare the Devasthanam decline to allow them any such enjoyment or access to the jungle they are thus deprived of.

4. Unless the right of taking leaves for manure, fuel, and of pasturing their cattle on the hill belonging to their village are conceded to the villagers, they certainly will be very considerably prejudiced by the extended limits assigned to the Devasthanam. The original intention was to assign certain limits to the Devasthanam on the plateau of the hill. Now the slope near Pudipatla has been mostly assigned also, because it happens to fall within an arbitrarily fixed radius of Upper Tirupati, and which unfortunately for the villagers has been wrongly marked in measuring the same, the error being in favor of the Devasthanam and against the villagers.

(True Copy)

(Signed)

W. S. WHITESIDE,

Collector.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. In G.O., dated 18th November 1876, No. 1,713, it was directed, after a protracted discussion, that a tract of $4\frac{1}{2}$ square miles of forest should be made over to the Mahant of the Tirupati temple, although when orders were first passed on the subject it had been intended that about 2 miles only should be made over.

3. The preliminary arrangements for demarcation and survey having been entrusted to the Deputy Conservator of Forests assisted by a Surveyor, a line was traced which on calculation was found to include an area of upwards of 10 miles instead of $4\frac{1}{2}$, the error being due to the use of a chain of 100 feet instead of one of 66 feet and to the difficult nature of the country. In G.O., dated 18th January 1879, No. 126, the Government rejected the recommendation of the Collector and the Board that the tract should be resurveyed and directed that under the circumstances the line traced should be adhered to.

4. In reporting the demarcation of the line traced, the Collector forwarded a complaint from the villagers of Pudipatla to the effect that much of their village jungle had been included in the tract assigned to the temple, but as Mr. Rundall, the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, stated that a large tract of jungle was still left to the villagers, the Board remarked* that they did not consider that any further inquiry was necessary.

5. In the letter above recorded, Mr. Whiteside forwards a letter from Mr. Rundall, stating that when he submitted his former report he was unaware that the area of the tract made over to the temple had been increased from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 square miles, and that he finds that this last modification has deprived the villagers of the bulk of their jungle and grazing ground. Besides losing a large extent of good pasturage, they are unable to obtain their usual supply of leaves for manuring their wet lands. An endorsement from the Deputy Conservator of Forests has assured them that they are still at liberty to take leaves and fuel from the tract, but the temple authorities take a different view of the matter and decline to allow them any access to the assigned tract.

6. Under these circumstances, the Board support the Collector's recommendation that if the jungle cannot be restored to the villagers, the temple authorities should be informed that their possession is subject to the free exercise of all village communal rights.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Shunich
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, dated 16th May 1879, No. 1,300.

Copy to the Collector of North Arcot District.

" " Conservator of Forests.

" " Member, Board of Revenue, in charge of Settlement Department.

Ed. A. Grubert.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

February 1880

Read the following

Proc. of the Board of Revenue 25 Feb 1880, No 189, submitting for orders, Collector's letter regarding the villagers' complaint of their suffering serious injury by the assignment to Tirupattur Temple of a large portion of jungle lands attached to Pudipattla village - North Arcot Dist.

The pt. of the only sanctioned the & chusing a portion area from the operations of the Dist. Dpt. as a commission & the rights of the District Temple authorities. & the order made by the Dist. Dpt. the area & the rights to be given to the

It is not clear that any direct reference has been made to the Temple authorities regarding the rights of the villagers of Pudipattla.

18 Nov 1879 - 109-110
5 Jan 179 - 319-320

Revenue Dept.

No 993
1880.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Dated February 5th.

Printed th.

Received in 16

PROCEEDINGS, 5TH FEBRUARY 1880, No. 189.

FEBRUARY.

No. 189.

No. 478. 25 Feb 1880

Jungle lands - attached to Pudipattla village in Chendragiri Taluk, North Arcot District. - Submitting for orders of Government, letter from Collector regarding the villagers' complaint of their suffering serious injury by the assignment to Tirupattur Temple of a large portion of -

Back No 249

25 Feb 1880

23 Feb 1880

~~Q. 1001~~

+ Vide Deputy Director's
letter in Board of Proc.
of 16 May 1919, No 1300-

but I have not
clear that there is
only disagreement
in this case. altho'
the H. did not
initiate the draft.

As regards the particular
matter the unfortunate
settlement brought about
by the discreditable opinion
of the officers employed
cannot be reopened
I think but the members
should be warned that

Note 21/2/00.
 It was intended that the
 villagers should have all
 their rights in the part
 taken from them by the
 Sheffield & London but
 the act goes beyond that
 & 1871/74.

Isi's self, we gave away a third party's rights - is open to that party to bring suit agt: (a) the temple, who is unwilling to prepare, and agt: (b) us, who, non habentes dedimus.

But I know of no others. Careful to preserve the unity of re-opening the case.

J.L. 23/3/0.

No power was given to him to restrict the legal & established rights of the villagers in the jungle near the temple.

c. 23/p/0 R 24/3/0

No 993

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes]

The Secy Gen has recommended a very high handed action towards the temple authorities: "if they don't buckle under, the grant will be resumed." And I gather that the Govt. substantially concurs in this.

But I say there was no grant: i.e. no charitable grant, as we may understand, or restrict at pleasure like a pension in land (dism) or money.

There was a dispute between Govt & the temple as to which of them had the title in certain lands. This was a matter which the temple might have taken into Court; but it accepted the settlement we offered - of course if in conformity

[Faint handwritten note]

R.D.

No 478

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 28th June 1880

Read the following Proc. of the Board of Rev. 25 Feby: 1880, No 109, submitting for orders, Collr's letter regarding the villagers' complaint of their suffering serious injury by the assignment to Tirupati Temple of a large portion of jungle lands attached to Padipatta village - North Arcot Distth.

It is not clear that any direct reference has been made to the temple authorities regarding

A78
8

regarding the rights of
the villagers of Pudipatta.

2. The Collector will
inform them that no
interference with the im-
-memorial communal
rights of the neighbour-
-ing villagers in the
Jungle made over to
the Temple was sanctioned
or contemplated.

1114

20 Feb 1902

$\frac{3}{4}$

1114

43
Regarding Joseph Lawrence
attested to by the other
village & assigned to the
Tampati Temple. & sent

Print
1-5-80

PRINT
1-5-80

Revenue Department
Proc. Govt. Des. April 80
N. 478.

Hon W.H.

De

247 218

RC 28/3/80 11264-80