M.R.O. 1—77,000—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 40

(2) Date of repair 26-5-43

(3) Initials of the Referencer

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1526. ~~Press~~ / Mis.

Dated 26. 4. 1893.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Special Assistant Agent
Office Godavari District
Polavaram, 17th March 1893

No. 10

From

H. F. W. Gillman Esqr.
Ag. Special Assistant Agent
Godavari District

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Through The Collector, Godavari Dist.

Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt, on the 10th February, of G. O No. 75 Revenue, dated 30th January 1893, directing me to attend the enquiry to be held by the Deputy Commissioner, Chanda, into the dispute regarding the river boundary between certain taluks of the Sironcha Tahsil and the Nizam's dominions, and to report the scope of the same and the advisability of instituting a similar enquiry in respect of the Bhadrachalam and Rekapalli Taluks.

2. I met Mr. Skinner, the Deputy Commissioner, at Dummagudem on the 22nd February and proceeded with him to Vyankatapur in the Mugu Taluk, where the enquiry was

was held on the 27th February and two following days. Mr Sorabjee Jamshedjee Chenai, Talukdar of Warangal, was present as the representative of the Hyderabad Government.

3 The desire of Government to be represented at the enquiry was, I believe, due to a hope that some evidence of a general nature, affecting the whole boundary, would be produced at it. Most valuable evidence might, for instance, be found in the correspondence arranging for the cession of the Taluks in 1860 or for the building of the baniers at Dummagudem and Sironcha. I regret, however, to say that no information of any importance was forthcoming at the enquiry, the scope of which was limited to the ascertainment of the local custom of cultivation in the bed of the Godavari, in where it forms the boundary between the Taluks of Cherla, Albáka & Mugúr and the Hyderabad State.

4. An abstract of the evidence recorded at the enquiry is enclosed. The patels of all the riverside villages in the three Taluks were summoned and questioned as to the practice of cultivation in the riverbed - riverbed and their knowledge of the boundary of their villages towards the river. The Agents of the Superior Proprietor of the Taluk and of the Superior Proprietor of Mugúr Taluk were also examined.

5 The evidence was unsatisfactory and conflicting. It was unsatisfactory, because the witnesses summoned were directly and deeply interested in the delimitation of the river bed lands, which, in this portion of the river's course, are extensive & fertile; and also because many of them especially those of the Mugúr Taluk had evidently been previously instructed (probably by the agent) in the answers that they should give.

The statements of the witnesses as to the exact boundary line differed considerably. This will be understood when I say that 12 favored the deep stream as the boundary, 19, the Nizam's bank of the river, while 8, hovered between these two opinions, admitting that they had never cultivated beyond the deep stream, but asserting that they had always considered the opposite bank to be the boundary. In the case of one important lanka, opposite Albaka, to the left of the deep stream, it was admitted by the patel of the village that portion of it is being cultivated by ryots from

from the other side, though they have to cross the stream to do so.

6 Possibly the weight of evidence does favor the view that the deep stream has been considered by the villagers on both sides to be the limit of the exercise of their rights. But it is open to any objector to say that this point is surrounded by a mass of contradiction and by no means conclusively proved. I think, though, that the evidence does establish that our villagers continued to cultivate the same lands after the cession of the Taluks, as they had done prior to it, and that they paid no rent therefor to the proprietors on our side.

7 These conclusions go to show that the Nizam has not attempted to exercise sovereign rights up to the left bank, and are of some value as indicating that it was not the intention of the treaty that he should possess such rights. But there are so many reasons which the Nizam could advance for his omission to check or exercise rights over the cultivation by our ryots — e.g. that it did not clash with the interests of his villagers; that it was not brought

to his notice; that, owing to the difficulties in the way of collecting assessment, it was not thought worthwhile to claim any re — that I do not think that much value would be attached to such cultivation by the authority, which has to decide the general question of the boundary.

8 I have been directed to report whether a similar enquiry in respect of the Bhadrachalam and Rekhapalli Taluks would help in the determination of the boundary between those Taluks and the Nizam's dominions. Save in one unimportant detail, to which I shall refer, I do not think that it would. We have, as I shall endeavour to show, a good case for our claim to equal rights over the river and its bed with His Highness the Nizam, and there is no object in attempting to bolster it up with doubtful evidence of customary occupation.

9 The settlement of the Godavari river boundary must rest upon the interpretation of articles 8 & 9 of the treaty of 1860, and especially upon the construction of the clause in art. 8 that "His Highness the Nizam cedes "to the British Government in full Sovereignty "all the possessions of His Highness on the left "bank of the river Godavari". The question for decision is, does this mean that the left

vide paras. 13 infra.

P.H.

left bank, ie the high bank above the bed, was to be the boundary, and that the nizam was to possess sovereign rights up to it?

(c) The Godavari river was intended to be the general boundary. This is clear from the Resident's telegram to the Commissioner at Nagpur, dated 10th October 1860, in which he says "the new frontier line will "be the Godavari till it reaches the confluence of the Wyna Ganga."

vide page 2 of the first sheet of the printed correspondence Sitabaldi serial C. No. 5218 R.K.

Then comes the question of the precise boundary line. It cannot, I think, be disputed that the nizam, by ceding to us all his possessions on the left bank of the river, also ceded the full sovereignty over that bank, and thereby lost the rights over the entire river, which he had previously possessed, owing to his possession of both banks. Further, the cession of the left bank cannot be understood to mean that the nizam was to possess the bed up to the high bank on the left of the river; for Art. 9 of the treaty, which provides for the free navigation of the river &c, treats both parties as on an equal footing. This would be the case if each party was to possess the bed on its side down to the waters edge

edge, and not so, if the nizam was to have the whole bed. I think, therefor, that it is evident that the provision in art. 8 for the cession of possessions on the left bank was not meant to limit our rights to the high bank above the bed — which would indeed be a most arbitrary boundary —, but was intended to be construed in a general sense, as granting to us also the bed below the bank to the left of the running stream.

8/10

In this connection I would mention that the question of the nizam's rights over the entire bed came up and was settled in 1880 in consequence of the action of the Tahsildar of Palavancha, who, under a mistaken notion that the whole bed belonged to the nizam, issued notices that the contracts granted by our Government for ferrying people from one bank to the other were void, and directed prospective renters to apply for the same to his office. This claim was brought to the notice of the nizam's Government through the Resident, and was admitted by it to be an "unlawful interference" on the part of the Tahsildar, who, it was added, had been removed from office for such "irregular conduct".

The Resident at para 3 of his letter No 236

No 236, dated 17th August 1892, to the Government of India advances some rather abstruse reasons to show that the Nizam's Government did not mean by its action to waive its rights over the entire river. But the claim brought to its notice in Mr Davidson's letter No 529, dated 22nd December 1880, was one "apparently "put forward by the Government of this "Highness the Nizam to absolute sovereignty "of every description over so much of the Goda- "vari river from bank to bank as separates "the Nizam's from British territory." This claim was unreservedly withdrawn by the Hyderabad Government. Surely there could be no more clear admission by it that it had no such right.

12. Such in my humble opinion is the case for our claim to equal rights over the river bed with His Highness the Nizam. If Government consider it weak, it may direct an enquiry, in respect of the Bhadrachalam and Rekapalli Taluks, into the custom of occupation in the bed. But as I have already stated, I think this unnecessary.

13. Such an enquiry would help to determine the minor question whether

vide page 14 of the printed Correspondence & bracketed with C. No. 5218 R.N.

F.D.S. 22.12.80 528-5

But the Resident points out that the Minister merely admitted that the jurisdiction of this Govt. did not include the left bank - vide letters printed R. N. in F.D. 15 3.81 No. 137

in F.D. 29.5.72 873 R.N.

whether the deep stream or the mid bed should be taken as the boundary line. This is, however, a trifling matter, and, moreover, one that has already been settled by the Government of India in its despatch No 976 G, 97 15th May 1872.

In the case of the Godavari, the deep stream would undoubtedly be the best boundary, as it is well marked, and does not change much. Where such changes are feared which would affect our interests — e.g. in the case of the Bhadra- chalam coal field — the present course of the stream may be mapped out and adhered to. A mid bed boundary presents difficulties in the matter of demarcation. It would also lead to disputes about cultivation, as cases would occur in which lands on one side of the stream would belong partly to us and partly to the Nizam.

14. Before concluding there are two matters which I wish to bring to the notice of Government.

The first is that the assertion of the Resident

× vide his letter No 236 of 17.8.92

Hyderabad Government that this Government has decided that its jurisdiction ended at the left bank of the Godavari and that consequently the river belonged to the Nizam, is incorrect. The Resi- dent had in view the order of Government waiving

Para 2 at page 14 of the printed Correspondence bracketed with C. No. 5218. R.N.

waiving all claim to the island of Mokgedda. But what was ruled by Government in its order was that the cession of Talukks on the left bank could not be held to include an island in mid stream. On the question what was ceded by the treaty, no opinion was expressed and in none of the orders of Government, now in force, can I find a decision to justify the opinion formed by the Resident.

The second matter is that judging from Mr. Crawford's letter No 2952 F, of 23rd July 1892, the Government of India appear inclined to admit the Nizam's claim on the ground that the interests involved are not important. It should, I think, be pointed out to them that such a step would involve the abandonment of two important coal fields and consequent loss to our Railways, and be productive of constant friction with the Hyderabad authorities, in regard to the exercise of rights generally over the river & its bed.

I have the honor to be
Sir.
Your most obedient servant
H. Freeman
Ag Special Assistant

Page 13 of the printed Correspondence
Written in 1893

1893

From

The Special Assistant
Agent Godavari District

To

The Secretary to Govern-
ment Revenue Department

Through

The Collector Godavari

No.

Dated 17th
Dropd 20th } March
Rcd Pc 23

Nº 17.

Submitted.
S. Lawder
A. G. Collector
26-3-93

Godavari Dt
Government Central
Office -
Dispatched from
Cocanada 29-3-93

Enclosures (1) Record of
enquiry.

Abstract

Submitting report on the enquiry
held by the Deputy Commissioner
Bhadrachalam into the Godavari river
boundary dispute between the
Central Provinces and Hyderabad
Governments, and stating, for
reasons given, that a similar
enquiry is not necessary in
respect of the Bhadrachalam
and Rekapalli Taluks.

Current Number 2588.

G.O. 75 dt. 30-1-93 (illegible)

Revenue {1893} Department.

From

The Collector of Government Agent
Godavari District.

No. 17.

Dated 26
Despatched 29 } March 1893.
Received 3 April.

Enc-1

Enclosures—One bundle.

No.

SUBJECT.

Submitting, in original
both the record of enquiry,
letter no 81 of 17-3-93 received
from the Special Asst: Govt
Godavari Dt, reporting on the
of such Enquiry held by the Dy: Com-
missioner Chanda, in the
matter of the Godavari river
boundary dispute between
the Hyderabad and Central
Provinces Governments, referred
6 in G.O. no 75 Revenue, dt 30-1-93.

SAN

150

Enclosure

In the matter of the Godavari River
boundary dispute between the Hyderabad and
Central Provinces Governments.

—

Record of enquiry held at Vyamboltapur
in the Nirmal Taluk on the 27 and 28th February and
1st March 1893.

Mr. Sorabjee Jamshedji Chenai, Talukdar of Warangal, the representative of His Highness the Nizam's Government at the enquiry said in answer to questions put to him

My Government relies on art: 8 of the treaty of 1860 as proving that the whole bed of the Godavari belongs to it. I have evidence that in certain places cultivators of His Highness' dominions have cultivated land on the British Side of the deep Stream. The instructions issued to me are merely to attend the enquiry and do not authorize me to discuss the question of the boundary.

After the examination of a few witnesses Mr. Sorabjee said that the enquiry would probably disclose the deep stream to be the boundary of Nizam's on both sides. This was, he considered, due to the fact that prior to the cession in 1860, the villagers had mutually agreed that it should be so.

The following were the questions put to the witnesses.

(1) Is your village on the Godavari?

2 Have you any cultivation in the bed of the river? If so, since when?

3 Do you ever cross the deep stream to cultivate?

4 Do the Nizam's people do so?

5. Does the deep Stream Shift?

6 If So, to what extent?

7 Does the bank Shift?

8 Are there any islands opposite to your Village?

9 On which side are they (a) of the deep Stream (b) of an imaginary line?

10 Who is in possession of them?

11 What boundary was pointed out to you at Settlement?

12 Any disputes with Nizam's people?

27 — 2 — 93

Witnesses from Lolurla Taluk. 190

Wit: No 1 — Raja Bath Hali Koya, Patel of Rallagudem Lolurla Taluk on Solemn affirmation

My Village is on the Godavari. We have no cultivation in the bank of the river. The deep Stream is on the further Side of the river bed and does not change in position. I do not know the boundary of my Village land in the river bed. There has never been any dispute about it.

Wit: No 2. — Karam Kamiya Koya, Patel of Gogulbatta on S.a

I have been in the Village 10 or 12 years. It has no cultivation in the Godavari bed. The deep Stream is midway between the banks and does not Shift about. It is the boundary of our Village

Wit: No 3. — Tellam Bojje Koya, Patel of Ramadigudem on S.a.

We have no cultivation in the bed of the Godavari. My Village boundary extends to the opposite bank. I have been in the Village 20 years.

X Ext! I know nothing of the Stream being our boundary. None of us have ever crossed the Stream and cultivated in any way claimed the land on the other Side.

Our Village is on the Godavari. Where there is alluvial earth in the bed we cultivate it. The deep Stream is on the further Side of the River and does not Shift. We cultivate only on our Side of the deep Stream: not beyond it.

Tella Venkatratnam Koya Patel of Devarapalli on S.A. — Wit: No 4.

28-2-93

I have been agent for 2 years, previous to that I was Karnanga for 10 years. I cannot say what boundary on the River Side was pointed out at Settlement. I understand from the patels of Villages that since the cession by the Nizam, our ryots cultivate on their own Side only of the deep Stream. This Shifts in Some places. When it does So, and if the Lands appears from the Settlement maps to be ours, our ryots cultivate it, even though they have to cross the deep Stream. No quarrel ensues, if they do So. I cannot mention any place where our ryots have crossed the Stream to cultivate and there has not been a dispute in consequence. At Pargipur they cultivate an island in mid Stream.

Sitaram Balaji, agent Superior Proprietor Sriramna Abbasawchilla Nuzvid. — Wit: No 5

We do not cultivate in the bed of the Godavari. I do live in our Village Some way towards the River. The deep Stream is on the Nizams Side and does not Shift

Mantiri Mallayya Parishi Patel of Mantapilli 35 on S.A. — Witness No 6.

Illa Pullu naik. Patel of Thotta gudem on S.A. — Wit: No 7

We have no cultivation in the Godavari bed. I have always resided in the Village. There is only one deep Stream opposite our Village: it is on the Nizams Side. To my knowledge it has once Shifted. When I was a young man it flowed on our Side. At Settlement the whole bed was measured and we were told that half belonged to us.

Vanapalli Venkanna Parishi, Patel of Jettigudem 50 on S.A. — Wit: No 8.

We cultivate in the river bed when alluvial earth is deposited in it. The deep Stream is on the Nizams Side: it does not Shift. We cultivate on our Side of the deep Stream only. At Settlements no boundary was pointed out to us.

Nallapu Ramayya Parishi Patel of Thimdore 35 on S.A. — Wit: No 9

There was cultivation in the river bed up to the Settlement 20 years ago: but none Since then, as it was washed away. The deep Stream is on the Nizams Side: it

has never shifted. We used to cultivate on our Side of the deep Stream. No boundary was shown to us at Settlement.

Mantini Ramayya Pantulu, Patel of Kunimeduram 45 on S.a. — Mukt. No. 10.

We have no cultivation in the Godavari bed. The deep Stream is on the Nizam's Side and shifts once in 10 or 20 years. I have seen it flowing on our Side twice. At Settlement flags were placed on both banks and we understood that the bed belonged to us up to the further one. Before that I never heard of a fixed boundary but we cultivated where we pleased.

Muttavarapu Venkatanarasayya Appavari, Patel of Aingala 40 on S.a. — Wkl: No 11.

We have no cultivation in the Godavari bed. We have had none for 10 years. Previously there was cultivation for as long as I can remember. The deep Streams of the river is on our Side.

Avula Narasayya Kapu, Son of Patel of Gummiyedem 35 — Mkt. No. 12.

We have cultivation in the Godavari bed. The river flows in two Streams opposite our village, but that on our Side dries up in the hot weather, we cultivate between the Streams. This has been the case since Settlement. We were told at Settlement that our boundary extended to the further bank. I cannot say what the boundary was before Settlement.

Kadantaraddi Pullayya Reddi, Patel of Tekada 30 on S.a. — Wkl. No 13.

We cultivate in the Godavari bed. There are two streams: the one on the Nizam's Side is deep: that on our Side dries up in the hot weather. We cultivate between the two Streams and on our Side of both. We do not cultivate beyond the further Stream. There is no cultivable land there. We think that the whole bed belongs to us. My father told me that Glasford Sahib said so. I have never known of our cultivating beyond the further Stream.

Padigala Gangulu Bhima Patel of Kotapalli 45 on S.a. — Wkl. No. 14.

We cultivate one island in the bed of the Godavari. There are two Streams: that on our Side dries up in the hot weather. The



deep stream is on the Nizam's side. We cultivate between the streams and also on our side of the deep stream not beyond the far stream, there being no cultivable land. Our cultivation of the island has not been disputed. At the settlement the bed was measured: but no boundary was pointed out to us.

Vide No 15 — Thirk Rupaiu, Muasalman Lingayeau, 25 on S.A.

We cultivate in the bed of the godavari. There are two streams the deeper one being on the Nizam's side. We cultivate between streams and on our side of that on our side. We once cultivated beyond the deep stream: but there was a quarrel and we ceased doing so. This happened when I was young. We thought that the further bank was our boundary as a flag was planted there at settlement but we now look upon the deep stream as our boundary. The deep stream has not changed to my knowledge.

Vide No 16. — Kotra Ramayya Telaga, patel of Pompalli. 50 on S.A.

We cultivate in the bed of the godavari. There are two streams the deeper one is on the Nizam's side. We cultivate on all land to our side of the deep stream: there has never been cultivable land beyond it. Formerly there was a dispute between the Raja of Cherla and the Zamindar Ashwa Rou. This was prior to the cession to the British. This was settled soon after by Colonel Macleod.

A

A flag was planted on the opposite bank and this we were told was the boundary.

Witness No. 17. Kuppala Lutayya Telaga, Patel of Gummalla-Bajjina-palli 60 on S.A

We cultivate in the Godaveri bed. There is one stream on the Vizagapatam side. We cultivate in the middle of the bed. We have never cultivated beyond the deep stream. The deep stream has not changed to my knowledge.

Witness No. 18. Kuppa Lakshmudu Chowdi Patel of Gollaguddem 35 on S.A.

We do not cultivate in the Godaveri bed. It is sandy. There is one stream on the Vizagapatam side it does not change. I do not know our village boundary towards the river.

Witness No. 19. Yeka Paapudu-Konja patel of Mankuchinlagudem 30 on S.A

There is no cultivation in the bed of the river. There is one stream on our side. It does not change. I don't know our boundary towards the river.

Witness No. 20. Paresaka Pantulamma Chowdi, patel of Padria 50 on S.A.

There is no cultivation in the river bed. The deep stream is on our side of the river. It does not change. I know nothing about the boundary towards the river.

Witness No. 21. Allu Muttyalu Bhoe, patel of Suredu 50 on S.A.

We have no cultivation in the river bed. The deep stream is in the centre of the river. It does not shift. I do not know where the river boundary is

Witness No. 22. Kunnam Sanjeeva Chowdi, patel of Dundupeta 55 on S.A.

Leave 5 or 6 years ago from the Vizagapatam we do not cultivate in the river bed. I know nothing about the boundary on that side.

1-3-93.

Vicinities from Nuguru Lake.

Witness No. 23. Komati Rama Mandari Patwari also as Agent for Prop. Nuguru Zamindar S.A. 55.

I have been looking after the Proprietors affairs for the past 40 years. I have always understood the whole bed to belong to Nuguru Lake. No boundary was pointed out to me at settlement. Our people have cultivated on the other side of the deep stream. The people of Kolcharlapalli now do so. There are two streams at the place and the deep cultivable between them. In no case where there are two streams do our people cultivate beyond the further one. Nor in any case at present where there is a single stream do our people crop & cultivate. But they would, if there was cultivable land on the other side. Previous to the cession the boundary of Nuguru Lake extended to the further bank. We have no samud in which this is set forth.

Witness No. 24. Vasam Kannayya Chowdi, patel of Tekulagudem 30 on S.A.

We have no cultivation in the river bed. The deep stream flows under our bank opposite my village. I have not known it change. 5 or 6 years ago we cultivated some alluvial mud on the other side of the stream and paid the rent to my Zamindar. There was no quarrel in consequence

I understand from old people that the whole bed belongs to us.

I have been in the village 20 years. We cultivated in the river bed three years ago for one year. The deep stream is under our bank. The cultivation was on this side of the stream. I understand from old people that the whole bed belongs to us.

Dhannuru Lammayya Koya, Patel of Gangaram - 60 on S.a. — Vide No. 25.

We cultivate on the river bank. The stream covers the whole bed between banks. At settlement a flag was planked on the opposite bank and we were told that the whole bed was ours.

Ghatta Hammayya Perika, Patel of Laudrupatta 40. on S.a. — Vide No. 26.

We have no cultivation in the bed, which is all covered by the stream. My father & grand father have told me that the whole bed belongs to us.

Tummur Lappanna Bhoe, Patel of Veerapuram 20 on S.a. — Vide No. 27.

We cultivate in the bed. The deep stream is under our bank. We cultivate on our side of it. We have not cultivated beyond the stream. I understand that the whole bed is ours from old people.

Katteru Mallayya Naik, Patel of Chinna Gollagudem 40. on S.a. — Vide No. 28.

We cultivate in the river bed. The deep stream is on our side. It was formerly on the Nizam's; it has been in ours for 20 years. The cultivation is on our side of the stream. 6 years ago we cultivated one year on the

Kalesvaram Papayya Telugu Patel of Ayyavaripeta 20 on S.a. — Vide No. 29.

stream. There was no dispute. I heard that at settlement a flag was planked on the Nizam's bank and we were told that the bed was ours.

Mantala Mallayya Parike, Patel of Koralla 20 on S.a. — Vide No. 30.

We have no cultivation in the river bed. There is no sand there, it is all water. I understand the further bank to be my village boundary: my grand father told me so.

Bolle Chinni Bhoe, Patel of Dharmaram 50 on S.a. — Vide No. 31.

I have been in the village 10 years. There is no cultivation in the river bed. The stream is on the far side and does not change. our boundary extends to the far bank.

Chinta Lamanayya Thoti, Patel of Lingapeta 30 on S.a. — Vide No. 32.

We cultivate in the bed. The deep stream is on the Nizam's side, it has never shifted. Cultivation is on this side of the deep stream. we have never cultivated beyond the stream. The further bank is our boundary. I was told no reason for this.

Neggam Pagulu Naik, Patel of Chinkur 30 on S.a. — Vide No. 33.

We cultivate in the river bed. The deep stream is on the further side. We cultivate on our side of it; we have never cultivated beyond. My elders told me that our boundary extends to the far bank. They assigned no reason. we do not cultivate beyond

beyond the stream: it belongs to the Inizam

We cultivate in Kottapa Satyanna Bhoo Vuttu No 34.
the Godaveri bed. patel of Padigapuram 20 mds

There are two streams. The deep stream has
shifted to our side: it did so five years
ago. Last year we cultivated beyond the
second stream. Our present cultivation
is between the two streams. When we
cultivated beyond the second stream
one Inumthilingam of Mallakatta on the
Inizam's side objected: and now we are
afraid to cross this stream to cultivate
My father told me that the further
bank was our boundary: he gave no
reason.

The stream runs Gondi Lingiah Konja patel Vuttu No 35.
under our bank; of Seda Gollagudem 40 mds
there is a smaller s.a.
stream on the far side. We cultivate between
the streams: we have been doing so for 10 years.
No dispute has arisen in consequence. Once
(12 years ago) we cultivated beyond the
further stream: but our cultivation was
disputed. The whole bed belongs to us:
so old people have told me. A settle-
-ment they planted a flag on the far bank
but did not point out the boundary
to us.

We have no cultiva- Inade Imbyalu Ghondpatel Vuttu No 36.
-tion in the bed. of Inzaram 40 mds s.a.
Four years ago there was alluvial silt in
the bed: but since that there has only been sand.

There are two streams: the deep stream was formerly
on the Nizam's side; but it shifted to ours 10 years
ago. I understand the whole bed to belong to us,
because a flag was planted on the further bank
at settlement and we have paid rent to this
side.

Vuttu No 37. Penem Rammaiah Ghond patel of Wazeda 50 ms s.a. — We have no cultiva-
-tion in the river
bed: have never had any. There are two streams,
the deep one being on our side. It was on the
other side up to 9 years ago. We ploughs the bed
up to the Inizam's bank: so the old people
tell me but gave no reason.

Vuttu No 38. Bodu Lingiah Lingayya Konja patel of Penuru 60 ms s.a. — We cultivate in the
river bed. There are
two streams the deeper being on our side.
It was formerly on the other side. We
cultivate to our side of the deep stream on
the bank. There is none now in the bed: there
was five years ago: this was between the two
streams. It was disputed 6 years ago by
the people of Wazaram in the Inizam's domi-
-nions. Our boundary extends to the further
bank.

Vuttu No 39. Imudem Kanniaya Konja, patel of Bommanapalle 50 ms s.a. — We have no cultivation
in the bed, have never
had any. There are two
streams, the deep one being on the Inizam's side.
The whole river bed is ours. A settlement the
boundary was not pointed out to us.

Vuttu No 40. Bodu Lingiah Pullayya Ghond, patel of Sidekarlapally 60 ms s.a. — We have always
been cultivating
in the river bed. Formerly the deep stream was
on the Inizam's side. Now the stream on that side
is

is the smaller, the deep stream being on our side. The change occured 4 or 6 years ago. We have cultivated for a long time between the two streams, beyond the deep one. — Five years ago our cultivation was disputed. The deep stream was then on the further side. The mosalay is bank is our boundary. my old people told me so without assigning any reason.

There is cultivation in the river bed. | Lal Mohammad Mussalman, patel of Mariklalle 40 on S.a. | Wits No 41.

The deep stream is on the far side, there is a smaller channel on ours. It has changed twice to my knowledge. We have cultivated between the streams for as long as I can remember. We have not cultivated beyond the far stream. My old people have told me that the far bank is our boundary; no river boundary was pointed out at Settlement.

Some times we have cultivation in the river bed. We had some this year. There are two streams the deeper being on the Injaram side the deep stream does not shift. We cultivate between the streams, without dispute & pay rent to the Nuzvid Zamindar. I understand that the deep stream is our boundary.

Ramala Gurrayya Bhoe, Wits No 42. Vesaldagudem patel, 50 on S.a.

The village of Murrigudem is between my village & the Geological

Chittem Mallayya Perike patel of Venkatadrapuram 25 on S.a. Wits No 43.

My

Wits No 44. Panem Muttayya Bhoge, patel of Murrigudem. 50 on S.a.

My village is on a lanka in the Godavari and in the rains is surrounded by water. My village has existed for three generations. Prior to the cession Murrigudem belonged to Nuzvid Taluk. At Settlement a flag was planted at Nagapeta, but the boundary was not pointed out to us. Murrigudem was one of the villages settled at Settlement. We cultivate in the bed of the big channel on our side of the deep stream. there has been no dispute: we pay the rent to our Zamindar.

Wits No 45. Kuppala Muttaku Bhoe, patel of Burugudem 40 on S.a.

My village is on the same lanka as Murrigudem; it belonged to Nuzvid taluk before the cession to the British. We cultivate in the main channel on our side of the deep stream. Our boundary extends to the further bank. My father told me so.

Wits No 46. Balla Muttaku Bhoe, patel of Narasareddigudem 30 on S.a.

My village is on the same lanka as Murrigudem. I do not remember when Nuzvid Taluk was ceded to the British. I remember the founding of my village some 30 years ago. It has always belonged to the British. We do not cultivate in the Godavari bed, but on the slope of the bank. I have understood that the limit of the bank on our side is our boundary.

Witnesses from Albaka Taluk.

Wits No 47. Pandla Basava Roya, patel of Palem 30 on S.a

My village borders on Narasireddigudem, not in Mogalai Territory.

Wits No 48. Sandagoddu Potti Bhoe, patel of Ippagudem, Albaka Taluk, 50 on S.a.

We have no cultivation in the river bed. There is one stream on the Nizams side. We have sometimes cultivated land that has appeared in the bed. There has never been any dispute. The further bank is our

boundary. My parents said that they were so informed by the Settlement Superintendents.

W.Rs. No 49. Kanti Mutyalu Shond. patel of Pujarigudem. 20 or 25.

We have cultivation in the middle of the Godavari. There are two streams, the deeper being on the Nizam's side, the smaller ones ours. We cultivate on the slope of our bank on our side of the smaller stream. We have never cultivated beyond the deep stream. We have done so across the small stream when there has been alluvial earth. We pay Kist to the Zamindar. I understand the further bank of the river to be the boundary, as I was told so.

W.Rs. No 50. Sanganda Abbaji Bhoe. patel of Albaka 40 or 45.

There is a lanka opposite the village which is cultivated both by our people and those of Chinchupilli in the Nizam's Dominions. The deep stream is on the further side of the lanka. The lanka has existed for a long time. The present arrangement of cultivation on it has also been long existent. When I was a child, the deep stream was on our side; it changed then to the far side of the bed. Rent on land cultivated by us go to our Zamindar; those on lands cultivated by the other people to the Nizam. There was once a dispute owing to one Ramasastrulu claiming the whole island for us; the Tahsildar settled the dispute by partitioning the island as before.

W.Rs. No 51. Murram Butchama Shond, patel of Kondapuram, 40 or 45.

We have no ~~cha~~ cultivation in the Godavari bed and have never had any. There is one stream on the further side. This year it changed a little towards our village. They say (my elders) that the further bank is the boundary of our village.

Witness No 52 — Anikana Sanyasi Bhoi patel of Tanekanki, 40 on S.a.

We have never cultivated in the bed of the Godavari. There is a single stream flowing midway between banks. To my knowledge it has not changed. My elders say the Maphalai bank is our boundary — a flag was put there at the settlement.

His Highness the Nizam's representative called no evidence.

1.3.1893.

(Signed) H.W. Gillman
Ag. Special Assistant Agent.

(No 25 88 793.

F.D. Mis Dr. 1526 dy 26. April 1893

Recorded per Mr
reply to the following
telegram which will be
despatched to the Political
dept. & the Resident
at Hyderabad.

"When may reply be
expected to Mr Galton's
letter dy 7th Feby/93 Sec 78.
regarding settlement of
boundary between Nizam's
territory and Bhadrachallam
and Rekapalle taluks Godavery
district."

R.W.
24/4

Lee
25-Apr
AP
26/4/93

Lee

To the Political dept:
Secret
26/4/93.

The Political dept will
please enter here the No
and Date of the letter to
the Resident under F.D.

F. 30.1.93 No 75 Resn.

Lee 4/5/93
before 24/4/93
AP

20/12/15
15-4-17
3-11-28 NE

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

-fo 2405-d 30-6-93
fo 2414-d 1-7-93

1526
26 April 93

C No 2588 of 93.

Re. Boundary between Mizamis territory and Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle talukes of the Godavari dist.