M.R.O. 1—77,000—8-5-37.

(1) Number of pages 36

(2) Date of repair 8-11-40

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 881 Press —Mis.—

Dated 5-11- 1890.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No 2323

Huzur Cutcherry
Ernacollum in Cochin
22d September 1890

To

H. B. Grigg Esquire C.I.E
&c. &c. British Resident in
Travancore and Cochin

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your Memo of the 8th instant forwarding copy of G.O dated 1st July 1890, No 510, Revenue Department ratifying, subject to certain remarks, the decisions of the Commissioners appointed to settle the boundary disputes between the Palghaut Taluq of Malabar and this state and to inform you in reply that the Government of His Highness the Rajah of Cochin also ratifies those decisions subject to the remarks recorded by the Madras Government. I beg to suggest that the decisions as ratified by both the Governments may be published in the Fort St. George and Cochin Gazettes so that every one interested may know what they are.

I request that the thanks of this Government may be conveyed to Mr. Dauce for the thorough and careful manner in which he has accomplished the difficult task of settling many boundary disputes of very long standing, in conjunction with Mr. Kohlhoff to whom I have already communicated my thanks.

I have &c
/sd/ C. Thiruvenkata Chariyar
Dewan.

/True copy/
E. L. Dauce Captn
Asst. Resident
for Ag. Resident

Ch 889

No 157

Resident's Office,

Trevandrum, 27th Septr 1890.

From

H. B. Grigg Esquire C. I. E

Ag. Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

To

The Honorable J. F. Price

Chief Secretary to Government,

Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No. 510 dated 1st July 1890, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter from the Dewan of Cochin No. 2323 of 22nd instant intimating that His Highness the Rajah ratifies the decisions of the Commissioners appointed to settle the boundary disputes between the Palghat Taluq of Malabar and the Cochin State, subject to the remarks recorded by the Government of Madras.

2. The Dewan requests the thanks of the Cochin Government may be conveyed to Mr. Dance for the "thorough and careful manner" in which he has effected the settlement of these long pending disputes.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedient Servt.

H. B. Grigg Capln
Asst Resident
for Ag. Resident

Ent Ch 889/90.

Rec'd 1 Oct 90

G.O. 1-7-90 No 570.

Pol. C No. 889
Revenue 1890. Dept.

Political Department.

From No 1289.

The Resident in Travancore & Cochin,

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George.

Dated 27th September 1890

Received 30
" 10 Oct.
No. 151

Enclosure. one

9th October 1890 : Q

Transferred to
the Revenue Dept.

Fredk Price
Chief Sec.

3/10

Forwards copy of a letter from the Dewan of Cochin State intimating that His Highness the Rajah ratifies the decisions of the Commissioners appointed to settle the disputes between Palghat Taluq Malabar & the Cochin State subject to the remarks recorded by the Madras Government.

Encl - 1/11

Read G.O. 570 1-7-90
Revenue Department.

Current No. 7289/90

From

Dated 27-9- 1890

~~FOR ORDERS.~~

Print full

Misc G.O. ~~No~~ dg 5th November/90 No 881

JG 2/11

Communicated to the Commissioner of Land Revenue and to the Supt. Revenue Survey, who will now proceed with the permanent demarcation of the revised boundary as directed in para 15 of G.O. 1-7-90 No 570.

2. The decisions of the Boundary Commissioners will be published as modified by the British and Cochin Governments will be published in three successive issues of the Fort St George and Malabar District Gazettes.

A Rev 30.10.90
31/10

Note
a copy of the Commrs decisions in print up with the necessary entries in the remarks' column.

To 16 The Commrs of L. Rev
5 " P.R. Dept
11 " Supt. Rev Survey
1 " Supt, Govt Press

Rev
Rev 360/6

Dec. 6.11.*
with the decisions of the boundary Commrs returned

Note
* The remarks column of this Statement will be omitted and in its place will be substituted one showing the modifications made by Govt.

Mr. Kohlhoff

Cho. 7289/90

27

Palghat - Cochin

Boundary

The Hon. Mr. Grose -

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 1st July 1890, No. 510, Revenue.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on the report of the British Commissioner appointed to settle the boundary disputes between the Pálghat taluk of Malabar and the Cochin State.

READ—also the following letter from H. B. GRIGG, Esq., C.I.E., Acting Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trivandrum, 27th September 1890, No. 151 :—

With reference to G.O., No. 510, dated 1st July 1890, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter from the Dewan of Cochin, No. 2323, of 22nd instant, intimating that His Highness the Rajah ratifies the decisions of the Commissioners appointed to settle the boundary disputes between the Pálghat taluk of Malabar and the Cochin State, subject to the remarks recorded by the Government of Madras.

2. The Dewan requests the thanks of the Cochin Government may be conveyed to Mr. Dance for the "thorough and careful manner" in which he has effected the settlement of these long pending disputes.

ENCLOSURE.

From M.R.Ry. C. THIRUVENKATA CHARIAR Avergal, Dewan of Cochin, to the British Resident in Travancore and Cochin, dated Ernacollum, 22nd September 1890, No. 2323.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of the 8th instant forwarding copy of G.O., dated 1st July 1890, No. 510, Revenue Department, ratifying, subject to certain remarks, the decisions of the Commissioners appointed to settle the boundary disputes between the Pálghat taluk of Malabar and this State and to inform you in reply that the Government of His Highness the Rajah of Cochin also ratifies those decisions subject to the remarks recorded by the Madras Government. I beg to suggest that the decisions as ratified by both the Governments may be published in the Fort St. George and Cochin Gazettes so that every one interested may know what they are.

I request that the thanks of this Government may be conveyed to Mr. Dance for the thorough and careful manner in which he has accomplished the difficult task of settling many boundary disputes of very long standing in conjunction with Mr. Kohlhoff, to whom I have already communicated my thanks.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

9th October 1890.

ORDER—dated 5th November 1890, No. 881, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Commissioners of Land Revenue and to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, who will now proceed with the permanent demarcation of the revised boundary as directed in paragraph 15 of G.O., dated 1st July 1890, No. 510.

2. The decisions of the Boundary Commissioners as modified by the British and Cochin Governments will be published in three successive issues of the Fort St. George and Malabar District Gazettes.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
„ the Political Department.
„ the Superintendent, Revenue Survey.
„ the Superintendent, Government Press, with the decisions of the Boundary Commissioners (to be returned.)

NOTIFICATION.

Sett'ement by the Commissioners of the Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories.

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
1	Puthuseri.	1	Vadasseri Mannadiar (British subject). Chondatha Mannadiar (Cochin subject).	The original boundary differs from the actual boundary line at present in existence as determined by actual possession. We have, therefore, demarcated the line as it exists at present. There is a dispute about the "Padikada" paramba, which is about 2½ acres in extent. The whole of this paramba is claimed by both sides. In the absence of any precise information (the accounts on both sides being vague), we have run a straight line from the point where possession is first disputed to the point where the dispute ends, so as to take an average. Camp Puthuseri, 17th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
2	Do ..	2	Do. ..	The Vadasseri Mannadiar asserts that the line runs along a channel flowing from Eravatapara and Pambanpara rocks and that the land to the west of this channel belongs to the British Government. In support of his statement he produces a cowle granted to him by the Collector of Malabar in 1838, but in which the boundaries are not mentioned. The map and the account prepared by the Commissioners in 1815 clearly show that the line runs as stated by the Cochin claimants, *i.e.*, a little to the west of the channel in question forming an almost straight line running due north of Pambanpara. Camp Puthuseri, 17th March 1887. (Signed) J. C. KOHLHOFF, („) G. W. DANCE, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
3	Elapalli	3	Ekkanatha Kymal (British subject). Condatha Mannadiar (Cochin subject).	This dispute was hotly contested before the Commissioners in 1815, but no final decision appears to have been arrived at. The parties continued to quarrel about the land, but eventually they seem to have agreed to "let sleeping dogs lie," and when the surveyor came along the boundary two years ago he demarcated according to actual possession, not knowing that there was any dispute, as the parties appear only to have thought subsequently to his visit of reviving their old claims. We are of opinion that, under the circumstances, it will be best to follow the line as demarcated by the surveyor two years ago, which shows actual possession. Camp Elapalli, 17th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
4	Do. ..	4	Yakanat Kymal (British subject). Chondath Mannadiar (Cochin subject).	It is impossible to ascertain from the accounts how the boundary ran originally, as some of the marks, such as trees, &c., have disappeared and there is nothing on record to show how the boundary should be defined. We have, therefore, run a line about half way between the two lines which are claimed as boundaries by the two parties respectively. Some cultivated land on the south, being in possession of Cochin, is shown within the Cochin boundary, while some other land on the north-east, which is admittedly in possession of the British Government, is shown within the British boundary. On the north-west of the line thus run by us, there is some land covered with jungle which is claimed by the Cochin tenant on the ground that he has been paying assessment for it. It is probable that he has done this with a view to create a claim of right as the land is not under cultivation. This portion is also claimed by the British tenant under a cowle from the Collector of Malabar. In settling this dispute on the give-and-take principle, we do not of course interfere with the rights of private parties who can have their claims settled in a Civil Court. Camp Elapalli, 18th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
5	Do. ..	5	Yakanat Kymal (British subject), Vadasseri house (British subjects). Chondatha Mannadiar (Cochin subject).	In deciding this dispute we have been guided to a great extent by the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 as there are three natural features still existing which determine the line up to "Chembilipara rock," viz., a channel through which the boundary runs due north to Jabatkal and from thence due north to Chembilipara. Here the line turns to the north-west as far as the trijunction of three janmies, Chondath, Yakanat, [illegible] Vadasseri. The site of the trijunction is disputed.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
	Elapalli —*cont.*	5	Yakanat Kymal (British subject), Vadasseri house (British subjects). Chondatha Mannadiar (Cochin subject).	It was marked by a stone, which is said by the Cochin claimants, to have been moved and placed in its present position by the British tenants and a report to this effect appears to have been sent to the taluk by the Cochin village officials. It is, therefore, doubtful where the trijunction actually is, but by following the line of boundary as claimed by Cochin from Chembilipara, we arrive at a result very similar to that shown in the accounts, and, as this line corresponds with actual possession, we have resolved to adopt it. Camp Elapalli, 19th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	
6	Do.	6	Chinnappan (British subject). Appavoo (Cochin subject).	A field was disputed when the boundary was first being demarcated, but the claims of the Cochin Government have since been withdrawn and the boundary demarcated in accordance with the British claims; so we will not interfere. Camp Elapalli, 19th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
7	Do.	7	Melevittil (British subject). Variyatha (Cochin subject).	These two cases are closely connected and the dispute commences at the beginning of No. 8 with the question as to which is "Kanjama Chetti's fence," mentioned by the Commissioners of 1815. A fence, at present existing, is said to be "Kanjama Chetti's fence" by the British claimants, while the Cochin claimants assert that the hedge is no longer in existence, but that it ran along a bund a few yards to the east of the site of the present fence. This view is supported by a "Venga tree," mentioned by the Commissioners, which is in the line claimed by Cochin. Starting from this Venga tree and following closely the directions in the Commissioners' accounts, we arrive eventually at a "Pezhu tree," in No. 7 dispute, which is also mentioned by the Commissioners of 1815. Under these circumstances, we are of opinion that the line claimed by Cochin is correct. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
8	Do.	8	M. Achakutty Menon (British subject). M. Kittunni Menon (Cochin subject).		
9	Do.	9	M. Kittunni Menon (British subject).	The janmam of this land is disputed between the two Governments. On following the directions given in the account prepared by the Commissioners of 1815 we arrive at a result which is more in favor of the Cochin than the British claims, though the existing boundary does not exactly correspond with the boundary of the Commissioners of 1815. As, however, owing to the position of the houses, it is somewhat difficult to split the difference, we have demarcated the boundary in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Elapalli, 19th March 1887. (Signed) G. W DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
10	Do.	10	Chondatha (British subject). Variath (Cochin subject).	In this case, we have a palmyra tree which was marked by the Commissioners of 1815 to guide us. The mark has lately been erased by some party interested in these disputes, but this tree is undisputed. Taking this tree, therefore, as a guide, we are of opinion that the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the British claim and we have demarcated the boundary accordingly. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
11	Do.	11	Yakanath (British subject). Melevittil (Cochin subject).	In this case we have followed the boundary shown in the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, which corresponds with actual possession and is in favor of the British claim. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
12	Do.	12	Kytha Kuzhi Melevittil (British subject). Erattakulam (Cochin subject).	In this case we have followed the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, which corresponds with the Cochin claim. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
13	Elapalli —*cont.*	13	Kytha Kuzhi Melevittil (British subject). Erattakulam (Cochin subject).	It is rather difficult to ascertain from the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 how the boundary should run, but, as the assessment of the disputed tract appears to be paid to Cochin, we think the boundary may be demarcated in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
14	Do.	14	Chamiappan (British subject). Melevittil (Cochin subject).	It is rather difficult to ascertain from the accounts where the line should run owing to the marks mentioned by the Commissioners of 1815 having disappeared and to there being two survey marks in different places on the rocks near the road instead of only one as stated by the Commissioners. We have, therefore, included the cocoanut garden within the Cochin boundary as the assessment is paid to Cochin, and we have run a line up the paddy fields along the bund between the two lines claimed by the British and Cochin Governments, respectively, as it is not clear in whose possession the paddy fields are. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
15	Do.	15	Melevittil (British subject). Anantu Pattar (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding the possession of a bandy-track. Each party says that the other has added the original road to his paddy fields and requests that the road may be made over in return for the land now taken up by the road. This cannot be allowed as it would result in the road being cut up by the party to whom it was given. We have, therefore, determined that the road should be common to both States and have placed stones on both sides of the disputed portion to prevent further encroachments. Camp Elapalli, 20th March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
16	Do.	16	V. Kannan Menon (British subject). Vythinatha Patter (Cochin subject). Chondatha (Cochin subject).	We have demarcated the existing boundary which corresponds with actual possession though it is not quite clear that it corresponds with the boundary fixed by the Commissioners of 1815. Camp Elapalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
17	Do.	17	Manikath (British subject). Anantha Iyen (Cochin subject).	Only one field is in dispute, for which assessment appears to be paid both to the Cochin and the British Governments. We have followed the line shown in the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, which includes the field within the British boundary. Camp Elapalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
18	Do.	18	Anna Danam Patter (British subject). Angaratha (Cochin subject).	We have demarcated this boundary in accordance with the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, which is in favor of the Cochin claims. The possession of the tract in dispute is claimed by both parties and it is difficult to ascertain in whose possession it really is. Camp Elapalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
19	Do.	19	Manikatha and Venkuteswara Patter (British subjects). Angarath (Cochin subject).	This dispute was left unsettled by the Commissioners of 1815, but the parties have since settled the dispute among themselves and we have demarcated according to actual possession. Camp Elapalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
20	Polpalli.	20	Arunacham (British subject). Sivakami Ammiyar (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is whether the existing road to Polpalli is the road mentioned by the Commissioners of 1815 as claimed by the British or whether the road ran along a few yards to the south of the existing road as stated by Cochin. The dispute is a most insignificant one and as we have not been able to determine which is the road mentioned by the Commissioners, we have run a straight line from the place where the dispute commences to the trijunction of Elapalli, Polpalli and Nallapalli. Camp Polpalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
21	Polpalli —*cont.*	21	Rengan Patter (British subject). Rama Patter and Azhakan (Cochin subjects).	This dispute was left unsettled by the Commissioners of 1815. We have demarcated in accordance with actual possession which corresponds with the British claims, and, as regards the portion left unsettled by the Commissioners, we have run a straight line through it, so as to take an average. Camp Polpalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
22	Do.	22	Kombi Achan (British subject). Rakkan (Cochin subject).	Only a small paramba is in dispute. The accounts prepared by the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the Cochin claims and assessment appears to be paid to Cochin, so we have included the disputed land within the Cochin boundary. Camp Polpalli, 21st March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
23	Palathulli.	23	Kombi Achan (British subject). Mulli (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding part of the road leading to Palathulli and a paramba adjoining on the north side of the road. The accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the Cochin claims, but the avenue trees are in the possession of the British, so we have included the disputed portion within the British boundary. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
24	Do.	24	Chamiappan (British subject). Eswara Patter (Cochin subject).	The disputed portion is most insignificant. Assessment for it seems to be collected by Cochin and the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the Cochin claims; so we have demarcated the boundary accordingly. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
25	Do.	25	Kykolars (British subject). Sanu Menon (Cochin subject).	This dispute is regarding a channel and part of a paramba on the east side of the channel which is claimed by the British claimant. We have demarcated the channel on both sides as common to both parties, which has the effect of including the disputed portion of the paramba in Cochin territory. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
26	Do.	26	Rama Patter (British subject). Rakkan Vella (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is on which side of the path the boundary should run. We have run a line down the middle of the disputed portion, as it is not clear from the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 how the line should run. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
27	Do.	27	Two States ..	The dispute here is which side of the river the boundary should run. We have placed stones on both sides and left the river common to both parties. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
28	Do.	28	Paramban Beemban (British subject). Madathan Chetti (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is regarding a few yards of path and a small field which is in the possession of Cochin. We have demarcated the path as common by putting stones on both sides and have included the field within the Cochin boundary. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
29	Do.	29	Tirumala Chetti (British subject). Madathan Chetti (Cochin subject).	In this case the Cochin tenant is in possession of land about a yard or two yards beyond the palmyra tree which is the boundary. We do not wish to disturb actual possession and have run the line along the existing fence. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
30	Palathulli —*cont.*	30	Nagan (British subject). Madathan (Cochin subject).	The boundary fixed by the Commissioners of 1815 is a palmyra tree, which has been included in a fence by a British tenant. The latter requests that the boundary may run along his fence. We have sanctioned this as his possession is undisputed and there is only a difference of about a couple of yards between the tree and the fence. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
31	Do.	31	Ramaswami Patter (British subject).	This dispute is regarding a field which pays assessment to both Governments. From the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, it appears that the disputed portion is in Cochin territory and we have demarcated the boundary accordingly. Camp Palathulli, 22nd March 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
32	Peruvemba.	32	M. Chamu (British subject). Malan (Cochin subject).	A paddy field is the subject of dispute, but the Cochin officials have since withdrawn their claims and admitted the field to be within the British boundary; so we have demarcated the line accordingly. Camp Peruvemba, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
33	Do.	33	Veeranna Rowthan (British subject). Kandu (Cochin subject).	The accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are somewhat vague. The disputed land is in possession of a British subject though assessment is paid to Cochin by a Cochin subject, who is, however, not in possession. We have, therefore, included this land within the British boundary. Camp Peruvemba, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
34	Do.	34	Ahamed Rowthan (British subject).	The land in dispute is admittedly in British possession and assessment is collected by the British Government and the land itself was sold by the British Government some years ago as an escheat. The accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are not quite clear, so, in consideration of the admitted possession of the British, we have demarcated the land within the British line. Camp Peruvemba, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
35	Do.	35	Tupula Tengu Menon (British subject). Parakat Kandunni Menon (Cochin subject).	The accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the Cochin claims and the disputed portion is admitted by the officials on both sides to be in the possession of a Cochin subject; so we have demarcated the boundary in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Peruvemba, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
36	Koduvayur.	36	Ramayya Chettiar (British subject). Venkitta Raman Chetti (Cochin subject).	The portion in dispute is very insignificant. From the accounts of the Commissioners of 1815, it would appear that it should be included within the Cochin boundary and we have demarcated accordingly. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
37	Do.	37	Kanur Sankaran Nair (British subject). Anandanarayana Iyer (Cochin subject).	This dispute is most insignificant. We have run the boundary in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
38	Do.	38	British State .. Cochin „ ..	The boundary here is not disputed at all, but there are certain lands on which, although the assessment is collected by Cochin, it is paid to the British Government. We have demarcated the boundary as it is at present. Our decision will not of course affect existing arrangements regarding the payment of assessment or the administration of civil and criminal justice. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	The boundary is confirmed. The assessment on the lands in question, amounting to Rs. 88-13-5 per annum, will be added to the peshcush payable by Cochin to the British Government, and the civil and criminal jurisdiction over the tract will vest in the Cochin State, to which the land has been assigned.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
39	Koduvayur —*cont.*	39	K. Sankaran Nair (British subject). Venkitta Raman (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is regarding the bund which runs along the side of a tank. We have demarcated the boundary along the top of the bund leaving the bund common to both. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
40	Do.	40	Kadar Rowthan and three others (British subjects). Cochin Sirkar.	According to the account of the Commissioners of 1815 the disputed lands are in Cochin territory, but they are admittedly in British possession and assessment is collected by the British Government; so we have included the disputed portion within the British boundary. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
41	Do.	41	Kadersa (British subject). Paracat Achuda Menon (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is regarding the possession of a channel. We have put stones on both sides of the channel so as to leave it common to both parties. Camp Koduvayur, 5th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
42	Do.	42	Kanamkotil Kandu (British subject). Velan (Cochin subject).	The accounts of the Commissioners of 1815 are in favor of the British claims and this corresponds with actual possession; so we have demarcated the boundary accordingly. Camp Koduvayur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
43	Do.	43	Chamu (British subject). Kandu (Cochin subject).	The dispute in this case is regarding two paddy fields. It is impossible to ascertain from the accounts how the line should run and possession is doubtful; so we have given one field to each State. Camp Koduvayur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
44	Do.	44	Chamu (British subject). Raman (Cochin subject).	The dispute is on which side of a small ridge the boundary should be. We have run the line along the middle of the ridge. Camp Koduvayur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
45	Vadavannur.	45	Karuppa Mannadi (British subject). Pattilingan Chetti (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding a very fine old "Puvam tree." We have demarcated the boundary as requested by the British claimant, but we have left the tree common to both parties. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
46	Do.	46	Karuppa Mannadi (British subject). Rama Iyer (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding a tank. We have run the line straight across the middle of it, leaving it common to both parties. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
47	Do.	47	Rama Iyer (British subject). Ramandi Menon (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding the possession of a path. We have put stones on both sides so as to leave it common to both. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
48	Do.	48	Vengannat Valia Amma (British subject). Narayana Menon (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding the possession of a paddy field and parumba. We cannot ascertain from the accounts how the line should run, but the field appears, from inquiries made of both parties, to be in the possession of a Cochin tenant; so we have demarcated in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
49	Vadavannur —*cont.*	49	Seshan Patter (British subject). M. Surapa Menon (Cochin subject).	We are unable to decide who is entitled to the field, but it is almost worthless, so it makes little difference which way the matter is settled. We have run the boundary in accordance with the Cochin claims. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
50	Do.	50	Do. ..	The dispute in this case is whether the boundary should run along the fence of a compound or through the compound. We have run the line along the fence in accordance with the British claims, as it appears to have been in existence for some time and we do not wish to disturb possession. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
51	Do.	51	Seshan Patter (British subject). Ramandi Menon (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding a tree which stands on the boundary line. We have left it common to both parties. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
52	Do.	52	Seshan Patter (British subject). Sankaranth Sankunni Menon (Cochin subject).	This is also a dispute regarding the possession of some trees standing on the boundary line. We have left them common to both parties. Camp Vadavannur, 6th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
53	Do.	53	K. Govinda Menon (British subject). Ambat Samu Menon (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding the possession of a channel. We have left it common to both parties. Camp Vadavannur, 7th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
54	Do.	54	N. Komu Menon (British subject). Narayana Sastri (Cochin subject).	This is a dispute regarding a paddy field. We are unable to ascertain from the accounts how the line should run, but as, from the inquiries made by us on the spot, it appears that it is in possession of a Cochin subject, we have included it within the Cochin boundary. Camp Vadavannur, 7th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
55	Do.	55	Do. ..	This is a dispute regarding the possession of a parumba. It is admitted by the British adigari to be in the possession of Cochin; so we have demarcated the boundary accordingly. Camp Vadavannur, 7th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
56	Do.	56	Do. ..	This is a dispute regarding the bund of a tank. The tank is in British possession and the bund is also admitted to be so. We have therefore demarcated in accordance with the British claims. Camp Vadavannur, 7th May 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
57	Pallavur amsam.	57	Kuthiravattath Nair (British subject) and Cochin. "Kolikarakad paramba."	The boundary follows the course of the river as far as the island, which is the subject of the present dispute. This island was marked "disputed" by Ward and Connor. It is, however, admittedly in possession of a British tenant; so we have included it within the British limits. Camp Vallangi, 16th August 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
58	Chitlangeri amsam.	58	Panikarkolambu between Kallampulli Nayar and Cochin.	The land in question is admittedly in possession of Cochin and has been so for many years. We have, therefore, included it within the Cochin boundary as it is not clear from Ward and Connor's field book how the line ought to run. Camp Vadakancheri, 25th August 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
59	Vadakancheri amsam	59	From Vaniampara up to Ponnala between Pozhakal Edom Kombi Achan and Cochin.	In September 1885 Achuthan Nair, the Malavaram Kariastan of Pozhakal Edom Kombi Achan, put in a complaint before the Head Assistant Magistrate of Malabar charging the Conservator of Cochin Forests and seven others with trespass on the Erumakayom and other places alleged to belong to the Edom and mischief by felling the trees standing thereon. Some correspondence took place between the Collector of Malabar and the Resident of Cochin on the subject and the matter was allowed to lie over pending the decision of the Commissioners. (2) The Commissioners have to-day inspected the place where the trees were felled and find that it is indisputably within the Cochin territory. In G.O., No. 91, dated 20th January 1852, passed on the report, No. 287 of 1850 of Sir William Robinson, who was then Head Assistant Magistrate of Malabar, the Government altered the boundary line as shown in Ward and Connor's map and relinquished all claims to the tract of land now claimed by Pozhakal Edom Kombi Achan and the Achan was warned that "any encroachment or trespass on his part would be punishable by the Malabar authorities." (3) The boundary was accordingly demarcated anew by the representatives of both Governments from Vaniampara to Ponnala and the marks cut on the rocks to show the boundary are still clearly visible. The trees were felled a mile or more to the west of this boundary and in Cochin territory, as shown in the accompanying sketch which was jointly prepared by the British and Cochin surveyors under our supervision. (4) The vakil for Pozhakal Edom Kombi Achan, who accompanied us to-day, admits that the trees were felled to the west of this line and states that the Achan entirely ignores the line on the ground that he was not a party to the decision. This frivolous assertion is entirely at variance with what is stated in Sir William Robinson's report from which it is clear that the Achan was given every opportunity of establishing his claims before the boundary was demarcated. The Commissioners are astounded at the audacity of the Achan in setting up such a defence in defiance of the most stringent orders of Government, and, especially as Erumakayom, the very place now in dispute, was particularly mentioned in Sir William Robinson's report as forming part of the tract claimed by the Achan which was subsequently ordered to be handed over to Cochin. (5) They consider that the Achan or his agent should be prosecuted criminally for lodging a false complaint. In addition to this, he has of course rendered himself liable to pay heavy damages in a Civil Court if the aggrieved parties should bring a suit against him for maliciously causing the detention of their logs. (6) The vakil and one of the Achan's agents declined to accompany the Commissioners to the boundary line on the score of fatigue, but they admitted its existence and they came as far as the foot of the ridge near Erumakayom, along which the line runs. One Dharman Nayar, however, who was admitted by the vakil and the absentee agent to be a competent agent for the Achan, was sent to accompany the Commissioners to the boundary line. Camp Erumakayom, 23rd August 1887. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
60	Chulanur (No. 6 in the sketch)	60	....	The line according to Ward and Connor is in favor of the Cochin claims, but the British claimant is in possession of the paddy fields in the gully. The possession of the jungle on both sides of the gully is disputed. So we have run a line south-west from the top of Poothmala to a rock at the head of the gully and then east to the last undisputed stone including the paddy fields in British territory and dividing the jungle between the British and Cochin claimants. Camp Chulanur, 25th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
61	Chulanur (No. 5 in the sketch).	61	Konikal Edathil Chathu Achan on the British side and Kuttola Sekharen Nair on the Cochin side.	It is impossible to ascertain in whose possession the disputed portion is, as it is all low jungle, and it is difficult to ascertain which (if either) of the parties has been exercising rights of possession. We cannot make out from Ward and Connor how the line should run. So we have run it along a cart-track which goes down the middle of the dispute leaving the cart-track common to both parties. Chulanur, 25th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
62	Chulanur (No. 4 in the sketch).	62	Bavan on the Cochin side and Kunju Menon on the British side, on either side the Cochin Sirkar is the janmi.	According to Ward and Connor's field book the disputed portion is in Cochin territory. (2) The dispute in this case is between the British claimant, Kunju Menon, who asserts that he has obtained portion of the land in dispute on simple lease from the Cochin Rajah who is admitted to be the janmi of the land, and one Bavan. The latter asserts that he has obtained this land direct from the Cochin Sirkar, while Kunju Menon asserts that Bavan is his own tenant. Kunju Menon has obtained decrees from the British Courts supporting his claims and ousting Bavan. It is doubtful whether the decrees of the British Courts were executed as opposition was offered by the Cochin officials. Kunju Menon is afraid that if the disputed tract is included within the Cochin limits he will lose the advantages which he has obtained under the decrees of the British Courts. (3) The assessment for the disputed tract has been collected from Bavan by the Cochin Government and he assessment for the same tract, which stands in Bavan's name in the British accounts, has been paid by Kunju Menon. There is no doubt that, according to Ward and Connor's field book, the disputed tract is within Cochin limits. The Commissioners therefore resolve to run the line in accordance with the Cochin claims with a proviso that the decrees, which Kunju Menon has obtained from British Courts, be considered to be as binding on the Cochin Courts as if they had been passed by the latter and that any further disputes which may arise between Kunju Menon and Bavan or the Cochin Rajah may be decided in the British Courts, which have decided all previous disputes with respect to this portion. The Resident of Travancore and the Collector of Malabar will be addressed with a view to effect being given to the above proviso. Chulanur, 26th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	The boundary is confirmed. The Commissioners first previously regarding the decrees obtained by the British claimant, Kunju Menon, is approved, but the second is unworkable and illegal, and is cancelled. The land in question having been included in Cochin territory, all future claims in respect of it must be settled in the Cochin Courts.
63	Chulanur.	63	Thenalapuram Krishna Patter on the British side and Cochin.	The Cochin State claims the portion in dispute on the ground that the nullah mentioned by Ward and Connor as the boundary has been diverted. As, however, the tract is admittedly in British possession and has been so for many years, we have included it within the British limits. Chulanur, 27th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
64	Do.	64 (1st two disputes).	Subbarayan Patter and Javan on the British side and Enidi on the Cochin side.	This is marked as one dispute, but it consists really of four distinct disputes. The first two disputes were between Subbarayan Patter and Javan on the British side and Enidi on the side of Cochin. The parties did not know their own boundaries; so we ran the line according to Ward and Connor.	Confirmed.
		3rd dispute.	Kavalapara Nair on the British side and the Cochin Government.	The third portion is disputed between the Kavalapara Nair and the Cochin Government. We have given the Kavalapara Nair all that he claims to be in possession of except one small paramba which appears to be in possession of a Cochin tenant.	Confirmed.
		4th dispute.	The British Government and the Tiruvalamala Devasam on the Cochin side.	The fourth dispute is between the British Government and the Tiruvalamala Devasam. The latter is admittedly the janmi of the lands in dispute which appear to have been taxed by both Governments. We have included them in Cochin as the janmam is with that State. Chulanur, 28th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
65	Do.	65	....	The portion in dispute has been admittedly in the possession of Cochin for many years and has paid assessment to the Cochin Government; so we have included it in Cochin territory. Chulanur, 28th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
66	Kannanore pattola.	66	Kothanath Shangaran Nair on the British side and Cochin Sirkar.	Assessment has been collected by the British for the paramba on the west and east of the tank, but the house and garden appear to be in the possession of Cochin. We have included the tank and the eastern paramba in British territory and the western paramba and the house and garden in Cochin. 30th January 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
67	Kannanore pattola (No. 2 in the sketch).	67	Thekkillath Achan on the British side and Cochin.	The first portion of the disputed tract consists of cultivated land. We have demarcated according to possession up to the foot of the Chendacal Hill. We then ran the line up to the ridge following the line of the watershed and the parties appeared to acquiesce in this line until we reached a place where two ridges run west and south meeting again at Chendapara. The British janmi claimed the ridge going west as the boundary, while the Cochin Government claimed the southern ridge. The latter forms a natural boundary and the watershed is distinctly marked, which is not the case with the former. Apart from this, the Cochin Government is in possession of the paddy fields lying in the valley on the eastern side of the ridge claimed by the British janmi which we think is sufficient to show that the British claimant cannot be in possession of the western ridge. We have, therefore, run the line up the southern ridge to Chendapara. Our decision will of course in no way affect the rights of the parties to establish their claims in a Civil Court. 1st February 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
68	Kannanore pattola (3rd dispute).	68	Pudukot devasam on the British side and Vadakanath devasam on the Cochin side.	The first portion of the third dispute in Kannanore pattola is contested between the Pudukot devasam on the British side and the Vadakanath devasam on the Cochin side. The disputed tract is admittedly in British possession and the assessment for the whole portion is paid to the British Government and a small portion pays assessment to Cochin. We have included the disputed tract within the British line. The nullah which forms the boundary along the greater extent is left common to both parties. Pulikode, 3rd February 1888. (Signed) G. W DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
69	Modulamada.	..	Kolangod Nambidi on the British side and Cochin Sirkar.	This dispute, though marked in the sketch as one, consists really of three different disputes.	
		69 (a)	....	The first of these extends from the trijunction of Coimbatore, Cochin and Malabar to a rock bearing the mark of the Commissioners of 1815, called Cavaram Todu Muthepara. The British claimant (the Kolangod-Nambidi) contends first of all that the trijunction is not at Vallian Todu, but at a place 1¼ miles to the west of it. This contention has been found to be unfounded, because, if a measurement of 1¼ miles is taken on the map prepared by the Commissioners of 1815 from Vallian Todu, we arrive at a place to the west of Cavaram Todu, whereas Cavaram Todu is admitted to be to the west of the trijunction stone. There appears therefore to be no reason to doubt that the trijunction stone is at Vallian Todu. Following the bandy Otu Kanakku from here the line goes to the south-west as claimed by Cochin. This, however, does not accord with the map prepared by the Commissioners of 1815, in which the boundary goes north-west. This direction is also followed as far as can be ascertained by Ward and Connor's map. The Commissioners have been unable to reconcile these discrepancies, and they have therefore resolved to run a line from the trijunction down the middle of the disputed portion to the Navalam Todu which is in British possession. From the point where the line strikes the tank we have demarcated round the tank which is in British possession. From the point to the northern end of it, where it adjoins paddy fields in possession of Cochin so as to include it in British limits. From there we have run a line south-west to meet the road to Navalam Todu, which cuts the line claimed by Cochin at right angles. This has the effect of dividing the first portion of the dispute where possession is uncertain, fairly equally between the two parties. From this point we have followed the Cochin line which corresponds with actual possession and with the Bandy Otu Kanakku.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
69	Modulamada —*cont.*	69 (*a*)	Kolangod Nambidi on the British side and Cochin Sirkar —*cont.*	The line claimed by the British claimant is a fantastic one and is not in accordance either with Ward and Connor's map or with the Bandy Otu Kanakku. The documents produced by both parties do not throw much light on the dispute and their claims to the disputed tract must be decided in the Civil Courts.	
		69 (*b*)	....	This dispute extends from Cavaram Todu Mutherepara to a rock marked by the Commissioners of 1815 on the road to Kattupadom. The first portion of the disputed tract consists of teak jungle. We have been unable to make anything of the Bandy Otu Kanakku at this point and we have therefore divided the disputed tract in half as far as Thavalampara. From this point we have demarcated according to possession along the cultivated land up to where the jungle commences again. The boundaries claimed by each party are here only a few yards apart. We have run a line along the middle of the disputed tract until the road to Kattupadom is reached at the point where it is cut by the Nanny Otu road, where the latter has been adopted as the boundary and left common to both parties.	Confirmed.
		69 (*c*)	....	This dispute, which extends from the Nagarepadom marked rock to Kattupadom is regarding which side of the road the boundary should run. We have run the boundary along the existing road, leaving it common to both parties. Camp Kyrati, 28th August 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
70	Vattekhad.	70	Kolangod Nambidi on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar.	The British line runs along the bund of the field whereas the Cochin claimant wants to run it a few yards to the east of the bund through the paddy fields. He states that the British tenant has made an encroachment by adding a channel, the property of the Cochin tenant, to his paddy field. The dispute is of a civil nature and as the field is admittedly in the possession of the British tenant we have demarcated in accordance with the British claims, leaving the Cochin tenant to make out his case in a Civil Court. Camp Kyrati, 28th August 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.
71	Vadakancheri.	..	Nellikal Edom Kunju Achan on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar.	This, though marked as one dispute, consists of three separate ones.	
		71 (*a*)	....	This dispute is regarding the possession of Pannikunnu. The Cochin line runs for the first part in a fantastic manner to the foot of the north-eastern slope up which it goes to the top of the hill. From there it follows the watershed to the undisputed boundary above the cultivation. The British line follows Ward and Connor's line to Ayyappan Theravu, from whence it skirts the Pannikunnu hill till it joins the undisputed boundary on the southern slope. We have adopted the British line as far as Ayyappan Theravu which corresponds with Ward and Connor's map. From there we have drawn a line to the top of Pannikunnu and from thence have adopted the watershed which is the line claimed by Cochin and the more natural boundary. Nanu Patter, the Cochin claimant, objects to the first part of the decision and the Nellikal Edom Achan, the British claimant, to the second part. We have decided the dispute on the "give-and-take" principle, possession being uncertain, and if the claimants on either side are dissatisfied, they can establish their rights in a Civil Court.	Confirmed.
		71 (*b*)	....	From Pannikunnu we have demarcated according to possession down to the Moottath river leaving the trees on the boundary common to both parties. The boundary then follows the river which we have left common until its junction with the Olipara Todu, where the third dispute commences.	Confirmed.
		71 (*c*)	....	It is admitted on both sides that the Olipara Todu is the boundary, but the British claimant asserts that the Olipara Todu is the eastern streamlet, whereas the Cochin Government say that it is the western one. Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Robinson, Mr. Buick, Mr. Sewell, and Mr. Brodie have visited this dispute and reported on it at intervals during the last forty years. Mr. Robinson's report, which is the only one which is not *ex parte*, is in favor of the eastern streamlet.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
	Vadakancheri —*cont.*	71 (*c*)	Nellikal Edom Kunju Achan on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar—*cont.*	The Cochin Sirkar on the other hand base their claims on a map, known as Captain Arthur's, which is alleged to have been prepared specially to illustrate the decisions of the Commissioners of 1815. This map however has never been recognised as a valid authority by any of the British officers who have inquired into the case. The dispute being still as far from being settled as it was when Mr. Robinson reported in 1850, we think that the fairest way will be to adopt Ward and Connor's line from the Olipara rock, which we take to be a rock where two streams unite, one falling over the rock and the other falling in at its base at the south-eastern corner of the paddy fields which are in the possession of the Nellikal Edom Achan and which are bordered by the forest at the foot of Vellatumudi. Palghat, 17th April 1889. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	
72	Do. ..	72	Nellikal Edom and Pozhakal Edom Achans on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar.	PROCEEDINGS of the Commissioners appointed to demarcate the boundary between Cochin and the Palghat taluk. — Read notices issued to the Pozhakal Edom and Nellikal Edom Achans directing them to meet the Commissioners on the boundary between Vaniampara and Vellatumudi and to represent their claims if they had any. Read also statement put in by Vakil P. R. Venkitachala Iyer on behalf of the Pozhakal Edom Achan. Seen also sketch of the claims of the Nellikal Edom and Pozhakal Edom Achans as compared with Ward and Connor's line. — The Pozhakal Edom Achan's vakil admits that the line cut by the Achan and claimed as his boundary is wholly incorrect and he has put in a statement claiming a new line in accordance with his grandavari. (2) The Commissioners note that this grandavari does not appear to have been produced before the Commissioners of 1815. The Pozhakal Edom Achan was then unable to offer any evidence except of the vaguest description in support of his claims. The authenticity of the grandavari now produced is, therefore, open to doubt. It is further impossible to identify in the map any of the places shown as forming the Achan's southern boundary. (3) To support his grandavari the Achan produces one or two cadjan leases purporting to have been granted to contractors to fell timber in the forests to the south of the boundary as shown in Ward and Connor's map between Ponmudi and Combencheri. (4) The Commissioners doubt whether any timber was ever cut under these leases as the ridge from Ponmudi to Vellatumudi is so steep that it would have been hardly possible for the Achan's contractors to convey timber over it into British territory. (5) Ward and Connor's line from Ponmudi to Vellatumudi appears to have corresponded with that settled by the Commissioners of 1815 and no dispute has ever hitherto arisen regarding it. The tract claimed by the Achan is further admittedly in the possession of Cochin. (6) Under these circumstances, the Commissioners see no reason to depart from the boundary as shown in Ward and Connor's map from Ponmudi to Combencheri. (7) As regards the Nellikal Edom Achan he has not sent any one to represent his claims up to date. The Commissioners therefore presume that he has withdrawn his claims, if he had any, and direct that Ward and Connor's line from Combencheri to Vellatumudi be followed as the boundary. This boundary has always been accepted and appears to correspond with that settled by the Commissioners of 1815. The forests to the south of it are also admittedly in the possession of Cochin and *no dispute* regarding it has hitherto arisen. (8) The Commissioners note that the line from Vaniampara to Ponmudi laid down in G.O., No. 91 of 26th January 1852, has only been demarcated to the foot of Ponmudi. They, therefore, direct that it be continued to the top from whence Ward and Connor's line will be followed. Camp Manjacooty, 9th Nov. 1888. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, („) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
	Kannanore pattola.	73	Kannambra Nayar on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar.	This dispute extends from Cheriantodu to the palanquin marked on the rock by the side of the Trichore road near Vaniampara. (2) At the southern extremity, the claim of the Kannambra Nayar, who is the British janmi, extends to the ridge of the hill known as Tirumani or Komblamala. This hill is shown as the western boundary of a tract of land for which the Cochin Sirkar sued the Kannambra Nayar in Original Suit 71 of 1864 in the Principal Sudder Amin's Court, Calicut. This suit was dismissed as the value of the plaint exceeded the jurisdiction of the court. A second suit, No. 83 of 1867, was brought which was also given in the Nayar's favor and confirmed by the High Court on appeal. The Nayar's right to this hill has therefore been conclusively established and the fact that the Cochin Sirkar accepted the jurisdiction of the British Courts in the above suits acts as an estoppel to their present claim, which would include this hill within Cochin territory. (3) Attached to Tirumani is a spur, known as "Varot Kunnu." Here an elephant belonging to the Kannambra Nayar was seized in 1847 on the ground that it was dragging timber in the Cochin territory. The elephant was, however, restored on the representation of the Collector of Malabar and this act is contended by the Nayar to have amounted to an admission of the British claims. (4) At the foot of the northern slope of Varot Kunnu is a tract of paddy land stretching from west to east which pays assessment to Cochin. This tract was given on cowle to the Kannambra Nayar's tenants in 1844 by the Collector of Malabar, but was subsequently encroached upon by the Kudalmanikham Devasam in whose possession it now is. To the east and north of these fields, the Kannambra Nayar claims possession of the whole tract admitted by the Cochin Sirkar to be in British territory in their plaint in Original Suit No. 71 of 1864 above mentioned. (5) For the remainder of the tract in dispute the Kannambra Nayar has for many years past been in the habit of granting leases to collect forest produce and to fell timber. The Kannambra Nayar's possession of the portion which is covered with forest has been thus asserted, but there are several tracts of paddy land in gullies which pay assessment to Cochin and which are in the possession of the Kudalmanikham Devasam although the woody slopes by which they are fringed are alleged by the Nayar to be in his possession. (6) The British Commissioner is of opinion that there is strong evidence in support of the whole of the Nayar's claim but, considering that the dispute has been of long standing and if not now definitely settled may be further protracted for a number of years, he has resolved to accede to the compromise which the Cochin Commissioner has been empowered to offer by the Dewan of Cochin, which, while it decides the territorial dispute on the "give-and-take" principle, is not prejudicial to the interests of the British claimant. (7) In accordance with this compromise the Commissioners have resolved to run the line in accordance with the Cochin claim (with the exception that the lands marked in the sketch of Pankolambu, Pottakollam, and Kokykolambu which pay assessment to the British are included in British territory) from Cheriantodu to where it meets the tract of land included in the decree in Original Suit No. 71 of 1864 above mentioned. The line will then run round the above tract in accordance with the measurements in the decree. From the south-western limit of the tract the line will strike the north-eastern corner of the paddy fields known as Choondapadom which pay assessment to Cochin. The boundary will now follow the line of cultivation including the paddy fields in Cochin territory to the south-eastern corner from which it will run in a direct line to the south-eastern corner of the southern fork of the Varot paddy fields. The boundary will then follow the line of cultivation until it strikes the line claimed by the Kannambra Nayar which will then be adopted to the palanquin marked on the rock near Vaniampara. (8) So much for the territorial boundary. In accordance with the compromise above alluded to, the Cochin Commissioner has been authorised by the Dewan to offer the following terms to the Kannambra Nayar:—	Confirmed.

Settlement by the Commissioners of Boundary Disputes between British and Cochin territories—*cont.*

Number.	Amsam.	Dispute No.	Names of Disputants.	Decision.	Orders passed by the British Government and approved of by the Cochin Government.
	Kannanore pattola —*cont.*	73	Kannambra Nayar on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar —*cont.*	(*a*) The Nayar's janmam title to any portion of forest within the line claimed by him as shown in the map accompanying the decision, which has been included within Cochin territory, will be recognised without restriction by the Cochin Sirkar provided only that, after 15 years, the felling of teak and blackwood by the Nayar will not be permitted. For fifteen years from the date of decision the Nayar will be allowed unrestricted rights of felling teak and blackwood without paying seignirage to the Cochin Sirkar. (*b*) The Nayar shall be at liberty to sue in the Cochin Civil Courts for the recovery of the paddy lands included by our decision within Cochin territory but which are claimed by the Nayar. Palghat, 9th January 1889. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, (,,) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	
74	Modulamada.	74	Kolangod Nambidi on the British side and the Cochin Sirkar.	Decision regarding the boundary line between Cochin and Palghat from the last demarcation stone in the low country near Vala Kolikodom to Manjacooty. At the foot of the ghat there is a small portion of land claimed by the Nambidi over which the British Civil Courts have exercised jurisdiction but which is claimed as the janman of the Cochin Sirkar. The tenant, who claimed under the Cochin Sirkar, is unable to produce a single document in support of his title, whereas the Nambidi can prove by his documents that this piece of land was leased out by him to the Cochin tenant and it was from the Nambidi that the Cochin tenant first obtained possession of the land. Taking this into consideration with the fact that the British Courts have exercised jurisdiction over the disputed portion, we have resolved to run the line in accordance with the British claims to the foot of the ghat. From thence the boundary will be run so as to join Ward and Connor's line at the nearest point from which Ward and Connor's line will be followed until it strikes the Polyampara estate. Ward and Connor's line is the boundary claimed by Cochin, but if this is strictly adhered to, a portion of the Polyampara, Chandra Mutta, Kotangadi and Coomblacodie estates, which have been granted out to planters by the Cochin Sirkar, will be included within British limits. In order not to disturb existing possession, we have resolved to demarcate round the estates including them within Cochin territory until Ward and Connor's line is again struck when the latter is adopted as the boundary up to the junction of the Ootakudal and Vittupura rivers. Ward and Connor's boundary here is a most uncertain and unsatisfactory one which has given rise to endless disputes. It purports to run half a mile to the east of the Vittupura river, but, as the distances in Ward and Connor's field book are usually unreliable and there is no means of defining the boundary except by continually clearing it, constant complaints of trespasses are made on both sides. In return, therefore, for giving to Cochin the portions of the coffee estates which, if Ward and Connor's line be strictly adhered to, should be included in British limits, we have resolved to run the line from the junction of the Vittupura and Ootakudal streams along the Vittupura river to Manjacooty, thus including within British territory the tract hitherto claimed by Cochin extending half a mile to the east of the Vittupura. Palghat, 17th April 1889. (Signed) G. W. DANCE, (,,) J. C. KOHLHOFF, Commissioners.	Confirmed.

Exd. A. Aubert.

60 Copies.

Original.

23/6/98
9-12-98
3-12-98
23-12-98
26-2-18

Govt. of {1890} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Read. Encl.

G.O., 5th November 1890, No. 881.

NOVEMBER.

Boundary disputes.

The ratification by the Government of His Highness the Rajah of Cochin of the decisions o the Commissioners appointed to settle the — between Pálghat taluk and the Cochin State communicated to the Commissioners of Land Revenue and the Superintendent of Revenue Survey; and the decisions of the Commissioners, ordered to be published in three successive issues of the Fort St. George and Malabar District Gazettes.