M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(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. 1072 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 1. 9. 1883.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1st September 1883, No. 1072, Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from T. W. HOLDERNESS, Esq., C. S., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Revenue and Agricultural Department (Revenue), to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg, dated Simla, the 16th August 1883, No. 785 R—64 :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 738-92, dated 1st instant, and in reply to say that the Governor-General in Council is pleased to confirm Mr. Dickinson's decision with regard to the settlement of the boundary dispute between Malabar and Coorg.

No. 786 R—64.

Copy of the above and of the letter to which it is a reply forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement No. 639, dated the 18th June last.

(By Order.)

(Signed) T. W. HOLDERNESS,
Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Enclosure.

Letter from Major H. WYLIE, c. s. i., Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Revenue and Agricultural Department, dated Bangalore, 1st August 1883, No. 738-92 :—

With reference to your letter No. 638 R.—64-4, dated 18th June 1883, appointing Mr. F. B. Dickinson, Deputy Conservator of Forests in Coorg, to consider and determine the boundary line between Malabar and Coorg, I am directed by the Officiating Chief Commissioner to forward, for submission to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council, a copy of the memorandum from Mr. Dickinson containing his decision on the question, and to state that Mr. Lyall recommends the decision for confirmation, as the reasons given seem to clearly show that it is correct.

Memorandum.

History of the Dispute.—The dispute dates from the year 1881, when Mr. Muttannah, Sub-Assistant Conservator, brought to notice in his letter No. 84, dated 8th September 1881, that at the survey of this part of the boundary by the Coorg Survey in 1876, a mistake had been made by which a long narrow bit of land about 5 miles by ½ a mile had been excluded from Coorg. This opinion was formed on the evidence of residents on both sides.

2. The matter was referred to the authorities in Malabar through the Superintendent, Madras Survey, by whom the evidence of the Adigari was taken on the point, going to show that the boundary claimed by Mr. Muttannah was the correct one, it having been shown to him by the Kurubars. Other evidence was taken of no great importance. On this the Collector of Malabar suggested that an officer from Malabar should go over the line with the Coorg officials and a professional surveyor—see Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, 14th October 1882, No. 2502 (Enclosure No. 1).

3. This suggestion was acted upon. Mr. Ross and I met at Velakote. We had the following evidence before us:—

(1) Lieutenant Connor's map of Coorg made in 1815-16.
(2) The "memorandum of boundary settled on the 1st July 1836, by Dewan Bopu of Coorg and Head Sheristadar Veucataramanaya of Malabar, as per order of Captain Onslow, Superintendent of Coorg, between Malabar and Coorg."
(3) The "General descriptive of the province of Malabar" prepared in manuscript in the Surveyor-General's Office, Madras, 15th December 1832.
(4) The evidence of two aged Kurubars, Soma and Keta, one Bayamanda Kuttappa, formerly a frontier guard, and Mammi Haji, who holds the adjoining forest in Malabar on putta from the Jenmi. From this evidence we formed the opinion that the line traced in 1876 was incorrect, and we laid down in a memorandum (Enclosure No. 2) what appeared to us the correct boundary, recommending that it should be surveyed and mapped. This was done by Head Surveyor Muttannah taking the direction from one boundary to the other from the "General descriptive" above mentioned.

The enclosed map is the result (Enclosure No. 3).

4. Subsequently Mr. Ross and I again met to verify the map and to hear on the spot any objection which might be raised to the proposed demarcation. We were satisfied that the line had been taken in conformity with Connor's map and the other evidence. The only dissentient was Eshwara Bhat, the Jenmi of the adjoining land, who contended that one of the marks, viz., the Karidi Kallur, was not the one which had been shown to us. Mr. Ross's memorandum on his inspection will be found in G.O., 17th May 1883, No. 618 (Enclosure No. 4).

5. *Discussion of the Evidence.*—Description of the boundary of the disputed tract—From about 3 furlongs north-west of the Pambare boundary mark, the two lines diverge at an angle of about 65°. The line claimed by Coorg goes from here along the crest of the Ghâts, past Pambare kalu to the Thumbé malé Soria kalu (Boundary mark No. 75). From this point it descends across the face of the slope as described in the "General descriptive" S. 41° E. about 1 mile 7 furlongs to the Madakai river, crossing the Nikunda Tôdu, and passing the Udukal Peré (Boundary marks 76 and 77), crossing the Kuvalé Tôdu and passing the Karadi kalu (Boundary mark 78) on its left bank and thence keeping in the same direction to the Madaki Polle (stream). From here it keeps along the stream for 1 mile and 5 furlongs as described in the "General descriptive" to a place called "Mukutu" by the Coorgs (that is, the meeting of 3 streams), answering to what is called "a corner" in the "General descriptive," whence it goes southerly as in the "General descriptive."

The boundary marks were pointed out by the two aged Kurubars and Bayamanda Kuttappa, who vouch for their correctness. The boundary put down and surveyed in 1876, keeps higher up the hill, till on crossing the Kuvalé Tôdu (stream) it is within 100 yards of the Karadi Kalu and of the line claimed by Coorg; but then instead of going to the Madakai river, it goes about S. 70° E. across the slope, crossing the Kambadi Tôdu and passing to the north of the Mukutu, *never touches the Madakai river*, and joins the boundary claimed by Coorg in Gejjalu Mundé malé. It is evident to me that the line claimed by Coorg agrees with the two separate descriptions on record, whereas the line made in 1876 agrees with neither. The distances from the Toria Kallu on the top of the ridge to the Madakai river, and from thence along the river to the "corner" measured in Head Surveyor Muttannah's map, agree with the "General descriptive."

6. The part of the line claimed by Coorg disputed by Eshwara Bhat is from the Nikunda Tôdu (stream) to the Gejjalu Mundé, but he admits the crossing of the Nikunda Tôdu claimed by Coorg to be correct. He states that the Karadi kalu pointed out by the Kurubars and Kuttappa is not the right Karadi kalu, and that the proper one is situated at some distance to the north; but he stated his inability to show the place, and I cannot believe his unsupported statements in the face of the evidence of the two Kurubars and of Kuttappa, these persons being perfectly disinterested in the matter. Moreover, if as stated by Eshwara Bhat, the Karadi kalu were situated half a mile to the north of the Coorg Kuvalé Tôdu, the line from Nikunda would follow an easterly direction instead of S. 41° E., described in the "General descriptive," and that followed by the Coorg line.

He further admits that *his* Karadi kallu may be any distance from *his* Kuvaló Tôdu, whereas in the Memorandum of 1836 they are given as one and the same mark, Koogma or Kuvalé Tôdu, Kardi kalu showing that they are close together. This is in fact the position of the Kardi kalu shown by the Kurubars.

The evidence of Eshwara Bhat's own tenant Mammi Haji (Enclosure 5) rebuts the statement that there is another Kuvaló Tôdu. I therefore think Eshwara Bhat's contention groundless.

7. *Decision.*—As the line claimed by Coorg tallies with the two descriptions of the boundary on record, which have been made by independent parties and at different times with an interval of some years between, and as the only objection raised to the new settlement has been proved to be groundless, I confirm that settlement and the line laid down by Head Surveyor Muttannah and award the disputed tract to Coorg.

(Signed) F. B. DICKINSON,
Dy. Conservator of Forests, Coorg.

Order—dated 1st September 1883, No. 1072, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Superintendent, Madras Survey.
„ the Political Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

50 Copies.

Govt. of (1883) Madras.

REVENUE.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 1st September 1883, No. 1072.

SEPTEMBER.

Boundary Dispute

between Malabar and Coorg.—Copy of letter from the Government of India to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg, confirming Mr. Dickinson's decision with regard to the settlement of the —, communicated to Board of Revenue.

No. 785 R.
64-

From

T. W. Holderness Esqre, C. S.
Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of India.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
23 AUG 83
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

Revenue and
Agricultural Dept.
(Revenue)

Simla, the 16th August 1883.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 738/92 dated 1st Instant, and in reply to say that the Governor General in Council is pleased to confirm Mr. Dickinson's decision with regard to the settlement of the boundary dispute between Malabar and Coorg.

I have &c.
sd/ T. W. Holderness.
Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of India

No. 786 R
64-

Copy of the above and of the letter to which it is a reply, forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement No. 639 dated the 18th June

June last.

By order,

T. Holderness

Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of India.

No. $\frac{738}{92}$. Coorg Chief Commissioner's Office
Bangalore dated 1st August 1883.

From

Major H. Wylie, C.S.I.,
Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

To

The Secretary to the Government of India,
Revenue and Agricultural Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. $\frac{138R}{644}$ dated 18th June 1883, appointing Mr. F.B. Dickinson, Deputy Conservator of Forests in Coorg, to consider and determine the boundary line between Malabar and Coorg, I am directed by the Officiating Chief Commissioner to forward, for submission to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General in Council, a copy of the Memorandum from Mr. Dickinson containing his decision on the question, and to state that Mr. Lyall recommends the decision for confirmation, as the reasons given seem to

Clearly

clearly show that it is correct.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) H. Wylie,

Secretary.

1

Rec 5th 6/83

Memorandum

Memorandum

History of the dispute.

The dispute dates from the year 1881 when Mr. Muttannah, Sub-Assistant Conservator, brought to notice in his letter No. 84 dated 8th September 1881, that at the survey of this part of the boundary by the Coorg survey in 1876, a mistake had been made by which a long narrow bit of land about 5 miles by ½ a mile had been excluded from Coorg. His opinion was formed, on the evidence of residents on both sides.

2. The matter was referred to the authorities in Malabar through the Superintendent Madras Survey, by whom the evidence of the Adigari was taken on the point, going to shew that the boundary claimed by Mr. Muttannah was the correct one it having been shewn to him by the Kurubars. Other evidence was taken of no great importance. On this the Collector of Malabar suggested that an Officer from Malabar should go over the line with the Coorg Officials, and a professional Surveyor, see Proceedings of the Board of Revenue 14th October 1882. No. 2552 (Enclosure 1.).

3. This suggestion was acted upon. Mr. Ross and

and I met at Velakote. We had the following evidence before us.

(1) Lieutenant Connor's Map of Coorg made in 1815-16;

(2) the "Memorandum of Boundary settled on the 1st July 1836 by Dewan Bopu of Coorg and Head Shirastedar Vencatar-amanaya of Malabar as per order of Captain Onslow, Superintendent of Coorg between Malabar and Coorg"; (3) The "general descriptive of the Province of Malabar" prepared in manuscript in the Surveyor General's Office Madras 15th December 1832"; (4) The evidence of two aged Kurubars Soma and Keta one Bayamanda Kuttappa formerly a frontier guard and Mammi Haji, who holds the adjoining forest in Malabar on Patta from the Jenmi.

From this evidence we formed the opinion that the line traced in 1876 was incorrect, and we laid down in a memorandum (Enclosure No. II) what appeared to us the correct boundary, recommending that it should be surveyed and

mapped.

mapped. This was done by Head Surveyor Muttannah taking the direction from one boundary to the other from the "General Descriptive" above mentioned.

The enclosed map is the result (Enclosure No. III).

4. Subsequently Mr. Ross and I again met to verify the map and to hear on the spot any objection which might be raised to the proposed demarcation. We were satisfied that the line had been taken in conformity with Connor's map and the other evidence. The only dissentient was Eeshwara Bhatt, the jenmi of the adjoining land, who contended that one of the marks namely the Karidi Kallu was not the one which had been shewn to us. Mr. Ross's Memorandum on his inspection will be found in G. O. 17th May 1883 No. 618 (Enclosure No. 4).

Discussion

Discussion of the Evidence.

5 Description of the boundary of the disputed tract.

From about 3 furlongs North-West of the Pambare boundary mark, the two lines diverge at an angle of about 65°. The line claimed by Coorg goes from here along the crest of the Ghauts, past Pambári Kalu to the Thumbé malé Soria Kalu (Boundary mark No 75). From this point it descends across the face of the slope as described in the "General descriptive" S. 41° E, about 1 mile 7 furlongs to the Madakai river, crossing the Nikunda tōdu, and passing the Udukal Paré (Boundary marks 76 and 77) crossing the Kuvale' Tōdu and passing the Karadikalu (Boundary mark 78) on its left bank and thence keeping in the same direction to the Madaki Polle (Stream). From here it keeps along the stream for 1 mile and 5 furlongs as described in the "General descriptive" to a place called "Mukitu"

2
Rw 5365/83

"Mukutu" by the Coorgs (that is the meeting of 3 streams) answering to what is called "a corner" in the "General Descriptive" whence it goes southerly as in the "General descriptive".

The boundary marks were pointed out by the two aged Kurumbars and Bayawanda Kuttappa, who vouch for their correctness. The boundary put down and surveyed in 1876 keeps higher up the hill, till on crossing the Kuvale Todu (Stream) it is within 100 yards of the Karadi Kalu and of the line claimed by Coorg, but then instead of going to the madakai river it goes about S. 70° E across the slope, crossing the Kambadi todu and passing to the North of the mukutu, never touches the madakai River, and joins the boundary claimed by Coorg in gejjala Munde male. It is evident to me that the line claimed by Coorg agrees with the two separate descriptions on record, whereas the line made in

1876

1876 agrees with neither. The distances from the Toria Kallu on the top of the ridge to the Madakai river, and from thence along the river to the "Corner" measured in Head Surveyor Muttannah's map agree with the "General descriptive".

6 The part of the line claimed by Coorg disputed by Eshwara Bhat is from the Nikunda Todu (stream) to the gejjalu Munde, but he admits the crossing of the Nikunda todu claimed by Coorg to be correct. He states that the Karadi Kalu pointed out by the Kurubars and Kuttappa is not the right Karadi Kalu, and that the proper one is situated at some distance to the North, but he stated his inability to shew the place, and I can not believe his unsupported statements in the face of the evidence of the two Kurubass and of Kuttappa. These persons being perfectly disinterested in the matter. Moreover, if as stated by Eshwara Bhat the Karedi Kalu were

situated

situated 1/2 a mile to the North of the Coorg Koovale Todu, the line from Nikunda would follow an Easterly direction instead of S 41° E. described in the "General Descriptive", and that followed by the Coorg line.

He further admits that *his* Kardi Kallu may be any distance from *his* Koovalé Todé whereas in the Memorandum of 1836 they are given as one and the same mark, Koogma or Koovalé todu, Kardi Kalu shewing that they are close together. This is in fact the position of the Kardi Kalu shewn by the Kurubars.

The evidence of Eshwara Bhat's own tenant Mammi Haji (enclosure 5) rebuts the statement that there is another Koovalé Todu. I therefore think Eshwara Bhat's contention groundless.

7 Decision. As the line claimed by Coorg tallies with the two descriptions of the boundary on record, which have been made by independent parties and at different times with an interval of some years between, and as the only objection raised to the new settlement has been proved to be groundless, I confirm that settlement and the line laid down by Head Surveyor Muttanna and award the disputed tract to Coorg.

(sd) F B. Dickinson.
Deputy Conservator of
Forests. Coorg.

(True Copies)

Registrar.
Revenue and Agricultural Deptt:

[illegible]

3 / Pw 53/15/[illegible]

50 29-6-83 No 795.

REVENUE (1883) DEPARTMENT.

No. 5365

From the Govt. of India
Rev & Agl Dept.

Dated 16th
Recd. 23 } August /83.

No. 786/64 R

Encl: 3

SUBJECT.

Forwarding, for information, Copy of letter to the Chief Commissioner of Coorg confirming Mr. Dickinson's decision with regard to the settlement of the boundary dispute between Malabar and Coorg

Logan

Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

1-9-83

Note.

The settlement is that recommended by Messrs. Logan & Rees on behalf of Malabar.

No. 16 the Board of Revenue
8 " Public Works Department
5 " Political Department } 13-9-83.

57

C.73-8-83.
1-9-83.