

(1) Number of pages 20(2) Date of repair 18-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1175

Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated 25-10-1882

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 10th February 1882, No. 184, Revenue.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on papers relating to the settlement of Coimbatore-Cochin boundary.

READ—also the following letter from J. C. HANNYNGTON, Esq., British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Courtallam, 27th September 1882, No. 100; and endorsement by C. G. MASTER, Esq., Chief Secretary, dated Ootacamund, 4th October 1882:—

With reference to G.O., No. 184, Revenue Department, dated 10th February 1882, I have the honor to forward copy
* Dated 11th September 1882, No. 507. of a letter, No. 1022, dated 14th September 1882, from the Dewan of Cochin, and of a report * from Mr. Hudson, Chief Engineer, together with the original map that accompanied it.

ENCLOSURES.

Letter from T. GOVINDA MENON, Dewan of Cochin, to the British Resident in Travancore, and Cochin, dated Ernacolum, 14th September 1882, No. 1022.

With reference to your letter of the 6th January last, No. 27, I have the honor to forward, herewith, copy of a report from Mr. Hudson, the Chief Engineer, and the original map which accompanied it.

2. I beg to observe that the line from Vengoli Peak to Sheklacund and thence to Palacadavu has already been settled and accepted, and it only remains that the boundary from Palacadavu to Pannimed Kuttu, the trijunction, should be decided.

3. Considering the length of time this dispute has been pending, and the expense and trouble already incurred on it, it is a question whether it is worth while to reopen the whole line from Sheklacund southwards as contemplated in G.O., dated 10th February 1882, No. 184. I beg therefore, in accordance with Mr. Hudson's suggestion, to intimate my acceptance of the boundary from Palacadavu to Kalianipandal, as already surveyed and demarcated by the Madras Revenue Survey, and of the proposal of Major Freeth in regard to the line from the latter place to Pannimed Kuttu.

Letter from H. W. HUDSON, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer, to T. GOVINDA MENON, Dewan of Cochin, dated Trichoor, 11th September 1882, No. 507.

I have the honor to report that, as arranged, I met Mr. Peet (the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore,) at Tunnacadavoo on the 2nd ultimo, for the purpose of settling the Cochin and Coimbatore boundary on the Anairnalais.

2. We were detained at Tunnacadavoo for a few days, as our huts at the next two camps had been knocked down by elephants; as soon as these had been re-erected we proceeded southwards to examine the boundary.

3. From Vengoli Peak to Sheklacund (A to B on the enclosed map), the line was demarcated and recut last year, according to G.O., No. 2033, dated 19th June 1877. Government in their Order, No. 184, of the 10th February 1882, state: "The boundary line between Vengoli Peak and Sheklacund, as now run, is approved and accepted," so that this portion of the boundary from A to B is now in the possession of Cochin.

4. From Sheklacund to Palakadavu (B to C on the enclosed map), the Boundary was surveyed and demarcated by the Madras Revenue Survey, and accepted by Cochin in 1876—vide letter of T. Shungoony Menon, Esq., c.s.i., Dewan of Cochin, to A. MacGregor, Esq., Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Trichoor, 14th September 1876, No. 886, printed in Proceedings of Madras Government of the 7th October 1876.

5. From Palakadavu to Kalianipandal (C to D on map), the boundary line has been surveyed and demarcated by the Madras Revenue Survey. I would beg to recommend that this line be accepted by Cochin.

6. From Kalianipandal to Pannimed Kuttu (D to E in map), I would suggest that the boundary line known as "Major Freeths' compromise" be accepted by Cochin.

Endorsement, No. 1049.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

ORDER—dated 25th October 1882, No. 1175, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

G.O., 7th October 1876, No. 1443.

On reconsideration the Cochin Circar accept the line marked out by the Survey Department in 1876 as far as Kalianapandal, and further agree to accept the line proposed by Major Freeth up to Pannimed Kuttu.

2. The whole length of line from Mengoli Peak to the trijunction is thus agreed upon, and its survey and demarcation should be forthwith proceeded with, and arrangements made for cutting and maintaining a track which may serve for its ready recognition hereafter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

„ Superintendent of Survey, with Map A

„ Conservator of Forests.

„ Political Department, for communication to the
Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

Exd. W. H. French.

80 Copies.

Original
Govt. of (1882) Madras.
REVENUE.

Further Col. 6747. 2.
Further Col. 1200/82.

Order, dated 25th October 1882, No. 1175.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Boundary — Cochin and Coimbatore.—
Passing orders on letter from Resident in Travancore and Cochin intimating acceptance by Cochin Circar of — as settled by the Survey Department.

No 100.

Resident's Office
Courtallam
27th Sept 1882

From,

J. C. Stanington Esq.
British Resident in
Travancore & Cochin

To,

The Honorable C. G. Master
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort St. George

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No 184 Revenue Department dated 10th February 1882, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter No 1022 dated 14th September 1882 from the Dewan of Cochin and of a Report from Mr. Hudson Chief Engineer, together with the Original Map that accompanied it.

I have the honor to be

Sir
Yours Most Obed^t Servt.

Stanington
Resident.

Att.

x Dated 11th September 1882. No 507

Pl. 55-11-212 R
110-17-112 R
19-1-1882

Colasamund
4th Oct 82
No 1019

Transferred to the
Revenue Department.

Created
Chief Secretary

76
4/10/82

Revenue Department
No 55/10

Political 1882 (Dept)

From Boundary
The Resident in
Travancore & Cochin

To,
The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St George

No 10050

Dated 27th September 1882
Recd. 1st Oct
4th
No

Enclosures 2.

Forwards copy of a letter
from the Deputy of Cochin
with its enclosures int
making acceptance by Cochin
of the boundary between
Bombay & Cochin as
surveyed & demarcated
by the Madras Revenue
Survey and as proposed
by Major Green-

CCU

No 1022

To

J. C. Hannington Esq
British Resident in
Travancore and Cochin

Sir,

With reference to your letter
of the 6th January last No 27, I have the
honor to forward herewith copy of a report
from Mr. Hudson, the Chief Engineer and the
Original Map which accompanied it.

2. I beg to observe that the line from
Vengoli Paki to Shetklakund and thence to Pala-
cadava has already been settled and accepted,
and it only remains that the boundary from
Palacadava to Pannimadutta, the trifunction,
should be decided.

3. Considering the length of time
this dispute has been pending and the expense
and trouble already incurred on it, it is a ques-
-tion whether it is worth while to re-open
the whole line from Shetklakund southwards
as contemplated in G.O. dated 10th February
1882, No 184. I beg therefore, in accordance
with Mr. Hudson's suggestion, to intimate

my acceptance of the boundary from
Palacadavu to Kallianipandal, as already
surveyed and demarcated by the Madras
Revenue Survey, and of the proposal
of Major Treeth in regard to the line
from the latter place to Pannimad Muttu.

I have &c
(Sig?) Y. Govinda Menon
Dewan

(True copy)

Manager
Resident.

Rev: 5570/52

Nº 507

Chief Engineer's Office
Trichoor

11th September 1882

To

J. Govinda Menon Esq
Dewan of Cochin
Ernakollam

Sir,

I have the honor to report that
as arranged I met Mr. Ret (the Deputy Conser-
vator of Forests & Cochin) at Tinnacadaros
on the 2nd ultimo for the purpose of settling the
Cochin and Coimbatore boundary on the Anna-
malies.

2. We were detained at Tinnacadaros
for a few days as our Huts at the next two
Camps had been knocked down by Elephants, as
soon as these had been re-erected we proceeded
Southwards to examine the boundary.

3. From Vengoli Peak to Sheklatkund
(A to B on the enclosed Map) the line was de-
marcated and recast last year according to
G. O. Nº 2033 dated 19th June 1877. Government
in their Order Nº 184 of the 10th February 1882
state

"The Boundary line between Vengoli
Peak and Sheklatkund as now run, is approved
and accepted" so that this portion of the Bound-
ary from A to B is now in the possession
of Cochin.

4. From Shetlatund to Palakkadavu (B. to C on the enclosed Map) the Boundary was surveyed and demarcated by the Madras Revenue Survey, and accepted by Cochin in 1876 vide letter of J. Shungong Menon Esqr. to S. F. Dewar of Cochin to A. MacGregor Esqr. Resident in Travancore & Cochin dated Trichoor 14th September 1876 No 886 printed in proceedings of Madras Government of the 7th October 1876.

5. From Palakkadavu to Kaliaupandal (C. to D on Map) the Boundary line has been surveyed and demarcated by the Madras Revenue Survey. I would beg to recommend that this line be accepted by Cochin.

6. From Kaliaupandal to Pannanad Matta (D to E on Map) I would suggest that the Boundary line known as "Major Freeths' Compromise" be accepted by Cochin.

I have the

(Sgd) H. W. Hudson M.I.C.E.

Chief Engineer

(True Copy)

(Sgd) J. Govinda Menon

Dewan

(True Copy)

Resident.

13
Cochin - Travancore - British
Boundary

S.O. 2nd August 1875. no 1170
Demarcation Survey of line of 1854 ordered leaving Cochin to accept or not the demarcation when they could send a representative.

S.O. 30th May 1876. no 708
doi so demarcated much in favour of Cochin: old map on which decision of 1854 rested inaccurate. but Govt. decided not to upon decision of 1854 & directed that Cochin be asked if they accept demarcation from Vengoli Peak to Kaliaupandi & fix the Trijunction point by their officers in conjunction with a Travancore British officer.

S.O. 7th July 1876. no 1076

922
These officers to fix Trijunction only. Cochin objected to line marked as per 1854 as it was not as per the Trijunction survey map - Govt. survey map! & replaced. They did & Cochin was asked to accept the line.

S.O. 7th Oct. 1876 no 1442.

S.O. 30th Jan'y 1877 no 410.

S.O. 4th April 1877 no 1321.

S.O. 19th June 1877. 2033.

meanwhile a map was called for from Survey Dept. and in Decr. the Cochin Sircar said they would accept the line Govt. ordered it to be sent from Vengoli Peak to Kaliaupandi.

S.O. 2nd August 1879: no 1612

The question of the boundary came up again in connection with the names in Comintors and Govt. advising to the S.O. noted in the margin fix their representative & called on Travancore Resident to fix a Cochin man. This was accordingly done S.O. no: 528.

S.O. 9th Decr. 1880: 1675.

* (19th June 1877 no 2033)

1st March
S.O. no: 528 - 29th Feb 1881.

Under S.O. 7th July 1876 (supra) only British & Travancore representatives met but owing to absence of Cochin representative did not decide the line from Kalliapandal to Pannimad Kuttu: D - E in map.

Query as to line from Sheklakund to Kalliapandal C - D ?

see para 10. Major Franks' letter in

S.O. 29th Novr 1881 N. 1831.

Order (margin)

A to B objected to - S.O. 19th June 77.
B to C not surveyed
C to D settled by representatives
T+B but Board want better map.
S.O. 7th Apr 77

S.O. 29th Novr - 1881. no 1831

~~From B to A to be settled by Hudson & Esst. A B agreed:~~

29th Novr 1881. 1831

It was assumed by marginaly noted S.O. assumed that from B to D had been accepted (see Esst's letter in the S.O. para 5).

Govt. is directed to meet A - B as decided by orders 19th June 1877 9th Decr. 80 1st March 81.
(B) settle D to E.

S.O. 10th Feb 1882. no 184 - Part in margin S.O. reports on a to B says Cochin representative has no orders as to D to E + as to B to D. Cochin accepted it by S.O. 7th Oct. 1876 - otherwise he says he could show it was too reasonable to these.

Board say A.B. done by Hudson & Esst. B to D settled in 1877 with B's approval D to E accept Franks' line.

Resident's letter says Cochin only accept from B to C + not from B to D.

Govt. approve A.B. to be as done B.D. representatives to meet again & do it and also D to E at same time

Current No drawn out Part: 3 days

A B B. settled & accepted
B B C. settled & accepted
S.S. 80. 7. 6. 1876.

C B D. done in 1876 - would accept
D B E. would accept Major Franks
line. -

14. 10. 82.

14. 10. 82.

To be filed in this bundle
for use of Under Secretary

15. 10. 82

80. 5. 11. 76 - 2/20/80

14. 10. 82.

14. 10. 82.

14. 10. 82.

14. 10. 82.

14. 10. 82.

No. 5570

From The Resident in Cochin & Travancore

Dated the 27th Sept. 1882.

FOR ORDERS.

S.O. 2nd August 75. no 1170

A Kengoli Peak.

B Sheklakund.

C Palakadavu.

D Kallianapondal.

E Pannimmeduttu.

S.O. 19th June 1877. no 53.

S.O. 7th Oct. 1876 no 1442.

A — B = Kengoli Peak
to Sheklakund

Quod vult
S.O. 9th Dec. 1880. 1675
no: 528 - 1st March 1881

In 1875 the demarcation of the boundary between Cochin & Travancore was decided from A to D on the map, disputes to be settled by a Commission appointed. Cochin objected to the line but was asked to accept it. Subsequently Govt. allowed the objection & ordered the line to be recut that the natural watershed might be followed.

It was understood however that the objection of Cochin only related to Part A - to - B on the map, sent with the Current no: 9. 7. 1. & when representatives of Travancore & British met they demarcated C - D as far as they were concerned, in the absence of Cochin representatives as it was understood

Cochui had no objection
to the part from B to D.

Hence Govt in a subsequent
G.O. assumed B to D was
settled that all that
remained was to run
A to B & carry on from
D to the Trijunction (E).

But the Cochui Circars
objected that they only
agreed to the 1876 line
up to C. Hence Govt
decided that the Boundary
Commissioners should meet
again & settle B C & D.

G.O. 10th Feb 1882. no 184.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| a | Viram |
| b | Shabikund |
| c | P. ... |
| d | Kabir ... |
| e | ... |

G.O. 7th Oct 1876 No 1442

* see para 10. Major Resubmitting
in G.O. 27th November 1881. no 1835

A — E
Kallanspandal — ...

to carry on from D to E - the
Trijunction.

But by the current they say
it is not worthwhile to
run from C to D. They
accept the old line and
Govt thought they had

* before further they agree
except the line known

* as Franks' Compromise
from D to E. This settles

the boundary up to the
Trijunction, it is probable

the Circars now back out
of their objection because

W. Pest, the British

Commissioner's Office
FOR ORDERS.

Commissioner in ignorance of
 the fact that they had
 objected to it, reported to
 Govt that the line of 1876
 from C to D was much to
 advantage to them. Mr.
 Pratt took great pains.

The Hon: Mr. Sullivan

- a Vengoli
- b Shikolokunt
- c Palakadav
- d Kalianapaudal
- e Pannimad Kuttu

11/10/82 25 October 1882

S.O. Read again S.O. 10th Feb
 1882 vs 184 - (abstract)
 The following letter from
 the Resident with enclosure
 (Cement in full)

Print.
 25-10-82

27/10

On reconsideration the Cochin
 Circular accept the line marked out by
 the Survey Dept. in 1876 as far as
S.O. 7th Oct 1876. no 1442 Kalianapaudal
 and further agree to accept the line proposed
 by Major Fresh up to Pannimad Kuttu.

2. The whole length of
 line from Vengoli Rak to the Trijunction
 is thus agreed upon till survey &
 demarcation should be forth proceeded
 with arrangements made for cutting &
 maintaining a path which may serve for its
 immediate recognition.

To Board of Revenue
 7. Supd. Survey with line for
 21. Const. Fences
 5. Pol. Dept. for communication
 to Resident
 27
 11/10/82