CONCERN[illegible]H BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

M.R.O. 1—30,7-0—16-10-21.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 188 Press Mrs.

75-77
Dated 11-2-1870. N.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11th February 1870.

Read the following papers:—

No. 75. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 21st September 1869, No. 7,014:—

Read again Government Order, dated 7th May 1869, No. 1,257, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 19th May 1869, No. 3,493.

Read also the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 29th June 1869, No. 1,839, Revenue Department.

ABSTRACT.—*Boundary between Tinnevelly and Travancore.*—Resident's letter regarding the dispute, transferred to the Board of Revenue for observations.

From the Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 24th July 1869, No. 294.

I HAVE the honour, in reply to the Board's Proceedings, dated 19th May last, communicating the Order of Government, No. 1,257, dated 7th idem, to report that the Deputy-Superintendent of Revenue Survey, No. 4 Party, states that the survey of the Shenkottah villages attached to the Travancore Territory was temporarily deferred, but that he is now prepared to undertake the task. Of the four accounts as per margin, required by the Travancore authorities with reference to the disputed boundary south of the Arumbuly Pass, Nos. 1 and 2, the only accounts forthcoming from the records, have been forwarded to the Resident.

1. Punjah Fieldwar Accounts from Andu 976 (A.D. 1799-1800) to 978 (A.D. 1801-02) for Karungulam and Palavur.
2. Account showing the total Villagewar extent.
3. Ayacut Account prepared in Andu 972 (A.D. 1795-96) on paper deposited on the Huzoor records.
4. Do. framed in February 1835.

2. Copies of letters addressed by Messrs. Macgregor and Puckle to the Resident, called for in Board's Proceedings, are herewith forwarded.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. MACGREGOR, Esq., Sub-Collector in charge, to the British Resident of Travancore and Cochin, dated 30th May 1866, No. 426.

I HAVE the honour to forward copies of the Maps called for in your letter of the 20th April, and I have the following remarks to make on the general question.

You will observe that between Mahindragiry Peak and the Arumbuly Ghaut a considerable tract is shown as in dispute. The western boundary follows the ridge dividing the rain-fall of east and west, and being merely a continuation of the ridge boundary line which, from Agustiarmallay to Mahindragiry, is, I believe, admitted by both Governments.

3. The eastern line shows the existing boundary as fixed by the limit of the renter tract, and beyond this eastward the Circar makes no claim.

4. This latter line has been surveyed with compass and plotted on a large scale, so as to serve as the basis of whatever settlement may be arrived at.

5. The really important part of the boundary question is with regard to this northern tract. As regards the dispute south of Arumbuly we claim nothing beyond what we possess.

6. I am aware that the Circar claims a certain extent of territory there which is in our possession, but as the Dewan Peishkar failed to point it out, I have been unable to indicate it in the plans.

7. To return to the northern tract. The only ancient landmarks within it consist of two pagodas and two anicuts; the former supported by British endowments, and the latter turning water to British cultivation. The anicuts are at the extreme west of the tract.

8. If we come to account, we find several tracts entered in our old Ayacut Accounts lying within the disputed tract, that is to say, which, judging from the rocks, hills, and rivers, mentioned as their boundaries, must have been situated there, and nowhere else. True the measurement of this tract does not carry us up to the ridge; but this is equally the case in all our villages adjoining the hills. The measurements go up to limit of cultivation; and so much is this principle adhered to, that in the present survey, even in the disputed villages, our boundary stones are confined to the cultivated area, and portions of jungle are left west of our boundary stones, which are admitted by the Circar to belong to us.

9. It may be asked how, if this tract belongs to us, it has been for half a century in possession of the Circar.

10. The Ayacut Accounts contain entries to the effect that portions of our villages are in possession of Travancore; the term used signifying a hostile possession. It would appear that the tract was kept by Travancore as a protection to their forts, the jungle being guarded from wood-cutters and cattle; and to this extent alone is it probable that the possession extended. To this day the tract has never been cultivated or the jungle-products enjoyed, except by the inhabitants of the eastern villages, nor in the nature of things is it possible that it should have been otherwise.

11. No doubt at the time that Travancore held the Calakaad Districts this tract was in their possession as part of it; but from the date that these districts reverted to the rulers of the eastern coast, it became impossible for the Circar to assert any claims, except the vague one of receiving payment from a renter, a British subject.

12. Mr. Hughs appears to have been the first; and his Indigo and Cotton Factories having been destroyed at the time of the war by the Travancore Troops, he and his descendants declined to pay any rent. And at last, in 1851, the post of renter was sold to an inhabitant of Yervady, and, to show how little authority the Circar then possessed, this man was unable to take possession, and the following year it passed into possession of Meranjee Meah. Under him the British subjects have enjoyed the privileges of the jungles as freely as if they had been admitted by British territory; and hence doubtless the matter has so long gone on without being brought to an issue.

13. In the month of March this year, for the first time, the Circar took into its own management this tract under circumstances which rendered it necessary to remonstrate; and here I must protest against the claim made by the Circar to make such arrangements as it may deem proper for the management of the land.

14. The only mode in which possession could conveniently be taken was by placing an armed force in the British town of Panagudy, and I think it will be conceded that when the question is one of placing an armed force in a neighbouring State, you are bound to consider what that State may deem proper also. The very placing such a force is improper; and on the present occasion their duties obliged them to traverse British territory for several miles morning and evening, not along high roads, but across the enclosed and cultivated country.

15. Whether they should suddenly interrupt the existing order of things while the inquiry was in progress, or whether they should leave to a Talook Duffadar the summary adjudication of those rights of British subjects, which the Circar expresses its desire to secure to it, the Circar had an unquestionable right to decide, though as to the mode in which the right was exercised opinions may differ. In this instance, the Duffadar admitted nothing—not the right of a cultivator to gather his ripe crop he had sown; of a wood-cutter to obtain a faggot; or of the herdsmen to drive village-cattle to the pasture where they had from time immemorial grazed. But having resolved to push its right to the utmost, the Circar was bound to station the necessary force within its own territory, and from its not doing so, the natural consequences ensued. In one instance, this force seized property within the limits of undisputed British territory, confiscated it, carried it to the British town of Panagudy, and, so far from their superiors objecting to such illegality, they actually issued orders for the sale at Panagudy. In one way, this interference

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th February 1870.

may be regarded with satisfaction as tending to prove the improbability of an original rightful possession from the impossibility of now legally enforcing possession.

16. Having discussed the claims to this tract, we come next to the consideration of its value.

17. Up to the recent seizure it was held by Meranjee Meah together with adjoining land which we do not claim at a rent of 350 rupees a year.

18. For some years past Coffee has been cultivated in it, and this has now become a valuable property. The tract was delivered over again to Meranjee Meah on a rent of 1,050 rupees, not including the Coffee. It must be remembered that the possession of these Coffee estates tied Meranjee Meah down very much to accept whatever terms might be offered, as had the tract been rented to some one else, the Coffee estates would have gone with them; in fact, I believe the Dewan will not deny that at first it was proposed to deprive him of these Coffee estates.

19. The sum now fixed at 1,050 rupees must be paid by the renter out of British subjects cultivating lands and cutting wood and grazing cattle in the disputed tract, and it is evident that he cannot allow them to do so under the same terms as he could when he paid only 350 for the same advantages in addition to his Coffee estates.

20. In point of fact the increase operates practically as a curtailment of the advantages hitherto enjoyed by our villagers.

21. I may here mention, as illustrating the vague possession hitherto enforced, that in this recent re-adjustment of his rent, Meranjee Meah was charged an *ad valorem* Export-duty on the Coffee estimated to have been produced in arrears for the last four years. It appears to me that the only satisfactory way of adjusting this dispute would be for the Circar to admit our claims to this northern tract, and that the facts enumerated prove these claims to be rightful. Unless this is done, we shall have a piece of territory running along our villages for ten miles or more into which the daily avocations of our subjects take them, and which for all purposes of administration cannot be worked by Travancore officials, except by coming through our territory.

22. Describing the event of 1809, Major Walsh thus writes in his Military Reminiscences: "The southern fortified lines of Travancore, commencing along the rugged hills on the Sea "Coast near Cape Comorin, were carried on joining such hills as came in their way as far as the "mountain range which separates East and West Coast, completing the boundary of that "country."

23. This clearly means that the boundary was the ridge so far as it extended, and that when it was interrupted the line of rough stone fortification completed the boundary. No one had a better opportunity of knowing what the boundary was than this officer, and it may well be considered that the event of 1809 cancelled any claims dependent on a mere hostile possession.

24. In making this proposition, I would point to the liberal manner in which the late Commercial Treaty has been construed by our Government. The admission of Salt duty free was by no means rendered obligatory on us; but by the total abolition of our frontier establishment, we have practically conceded this advantage to the Circar which now enjoys the profit arising from the difference between the cost and monopoly price of all Salt imported into our southern districts.

25. As regards the country south of Arumbuly, there is not the same consideration in respect to the natural boundary, and the concession then sought by the Circar might be allowed in turn by the British Government.

26. Should these propositions be adopted, they will, I hope, serve to settle a question that otherwise appears intermitted, and trusting you will find yourself justified in supporting them.

Enclosure No. 2.

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Resident of Travancore, dated 16th May 1808, No. 1,282.

In continuation of my letter of the 7th ultimo, I have the honour to forward, herewith, a plan of the line selected as the boundary between the two districts north of the Arumbuly Pass; south

of that there is no disputed boundary, though the Travancore Government claim certain fields which have been cultivated by Tinnevelly ryots and included in British territory for the last thirty years, if not longer. A settlement of this claim can be effected by a mere examination of accounts; but the settlement of the boundary shown in the Map was only to be effected by walking down the line and determining the site of each separate station; and this was accordingly done.

2. As explained in my former letter, I agreed to assume the base of the hills as the boundary; the lands along the base paying to the British and Travancore Governments are coloured red and black, respectively, in the accompanying Map. The line actually selected mostly cuts off inconvenient angles, and gives and takes about equal areas on each side. The sum total affected is only some 30 acres. The line laid down is 11½ miles in length, and runs at the foot of low barren hills covered with scrub jungle from the Nalykal (a peculiar rock) and Travancore boundary mark on the eastern spur of the Tiruvanamallay hill to the Travancore boundary stone by the side of the road three miles south of Panagudy.

3. The relative position of these two points is indicated by a dotted line in the Map. The several blocks measured by Mr. Macgregor to the west of the boundary line are distinctly marked, and a letter attached to show the village to which they were said to belong.

4. The red line along the crest of the hills is that proposed by Mr. Macgregor, but it is valueless for all practical purposes, as it could hardly be surveyed.

5. The whole tract of country that has occupied the attention of the Government and Board of Revenue, and successive Residents and Collectors at intervals during the last twenty-two years, is rented out by the Travancore Government to a contractor for 1,000 rupees per annum. Hardly any portion of it is cultivated, and the renter makes his profit by a small Coffee garden, and what he can get out of the jungle. I understand that the Travancore Government are quite willing to rent this tract to the British Government instead of to a contractor when the boundary question is settled; and as it is of consequence that the whole eastern slope of the hills south of Shenkottah should be under the Forest Department, perhaps you will suggest this arrangement when reporting the matter to Government.

6. The Revenue Survey is now going on, and as we are only waiting for a final decision to close the boundary of the Nanguneri Talook, I request that you will be good enough to solicit the orders of Government at as early a date as possible.

From the Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Courtallum, 1st September 1869, No. 340.

As requested in the Board's Official Memorandum, No. 894, dated 25th ultimo, I have the honour to forward, herewith, a copy of the letter addressed by Mr. Kindersley to Mr. Silver, under date the 24th June 1862, regarding the boundary dispute between this district and the Travancore Government.

2. A copy of Mr. Macgregor's letter* was forwarded to the Board with my letter, No. 294, dated 24th July last.

* 30th May 1866, No. 426.

Enclosure No. 1.

From F. M. KINDERSLEY, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, to J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, dated Shermadevi, 24th June 1862, No. 64.

With reference to your letters, Nos. 173 and 212, dated 14th and 24th February last, I have the honour to submit my report on the result of the inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute regarding the boundary line between the British and Travancore Governments.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 11th February 1870.

2. I arrived at Panagudy on the 21st February, and was met by the Travancore Dewan Peishkar on the 24th idem. I inspected the disputed boundary line in company with him, and also discussed the disputed points personally. This occupied me up to the 14th March. The disputed portions of the boundary are comprised in the six villages noted in the margin.

1. Lachminarasingapuram.
2. Virapandiem.
3. Panagudy.
4. Sivacamipuram.
5. Pulavur.
6. Karungulam.

3. I will take them in order as they stand commencing from the northern extremity, and have to refer to a plan herein enclosed, which bears the signature of General Cullen, and which, although not correct in its scale, will serve to make matters a little clearer.

4. In the first village, Lachminarasingapuram, there are two pieces of land under dispute; one containing about 150 chains, and the other 25¼. They are included in our Ayacut Accounts, but are in the enjoyment of the Travancore Government. The Dewan Peishkar acknowledged our right to the latter piece of land, with the exception of 6¾ chains, which he claims for the Travancore Government, together with the 150 chains mentioned above. He bases his claim on the fact that the position of these lands agrees with that given in their Ayacut Account; viz., "to the west of the Anumanady River rising in the southern side of the Tiruvanamallay and a "channel." The river, however, which he points out as the Anumanady is not the true river, but a branch called the Podoomayodiar River mentioned in the Ayacut of Lachminarasingapuram. The real Anumanady is the stream to the west of that marked as such in the plan. Besides, the stream pointed out by the Peishkar as the Anumanady has no channel connected with it, as is stated in their Ayacut Account quoted above, while the river pointed out by us has a channel marked in the plan as a nullah.

5. Our Ayacut Accounts, on the other hand, give the Mahindragiry Hill, marked in the plan, as the western boundary of Lachminarasingapuram, and the 150 chains under dispute lie to the east of this hill. Also, on the southern bank of the Anumanady, about the spot I have marked A. (in pencil) in the plan, there is a stone having the name of the village and the figure of Lachmi engraved on it, denoting that the lands which it faces belong to Lachminarasingapuram. Our Cultivation Accounts also show that 40 out of the 150 chains had been cultivated by British ryots up to 1807. I think therefore that this land may be fairly claimed by us.

6. In the second village, Virapandiem, 1¾ chains of land under dispute are included both in the British and Travancore Ayacut Accounts. Our accounts are, however, of a date prior to theirs, and the hills running in a direct line from the Mahindragiry southwards are given in our accounts as the western boundary of the village. The Dewan Peishkar claimed this land on the ground that it had been measured and entered in their accounts in consecutive numbers and with properly defined limits; but this account is not Ayacut but Pairolugu Account, and I think that our accounts being of a date prior to theirs, may be said to have the preference.

7. In the third village (Panagudy) 174½ chains are claimed by us, lying to the east of the hills running from the Mahindragiry, which are said in our accounts to be the western boundary of the village. The Travancore Government claim this land on the plea that it is entered with well-defined limits in their accounts and in consecutive numbers, while it is not so in our accounts. Their accounts, however, are not Ayacut but Pairolugu, which only contain the measurement of lands from time to time brought under cultivation at the option of the ryots, not all the lands cultivated and waste within the limits of the village. This is the cause of the lands being situated so irregularly as to have frequently a piece of undisputed British land between two of the portions claimed by them. Our accounts, on the other hand, give the line of the hills as our boundary from Lachminarasingapuram to Sivacamipuram.

8. The argument brought forward by the Travancore Government that the lands are not entered in the Panagudy Ayacut in consecutive numbers is explained away by the fact that Panagudy and Sivacamipuram originally formed one village under the name of Panagudy. In the Goshwara Account of this village, 23½ chains of British territory are stated to have been at that time in the enjoyment of the Travancore Government, and 62½ chains of this land appear, with detailed consecutive measurement, in the Ayacut of Sivacamipuram, afterwards formed into a separate village. I think that our claim to the disputed land in Panagudy is just.

9. In Sivacamipuram the hills are entered in the Ayacut as forming the western boundary of the village. Land to the extent of 82¾ chains, situated to the east of the hills, and entered as "Rajacaren Caudoo Cavel" or "jungles for the protection of the Travancore Fort" is claimed by us. The extent of the land is not given in the Travancore accounts, but limits have been mentioned, dividing the land into fifteen numbers; and a remark is appended that, with the exception of two numbers, the land is too rocky, etc., to be measured. These accounts of the Travancore Government is also Pairolugu, and are subsequent to our Ayacut Accounts.

10. One Sivasangararama Pillay of Sivacamipuram stated in a petition that the British possessions extended to places on the hills, and that he could prove his statement by marks on the hills and by entries in certain accounts said to exist in the Huzoor Record-room. He failed, however, to show any marks on the hills. The accounts mentioned by him were called for in my letters of the 8th April and 9th instant. They have not, however, been sent, and if found, they might be inspected in your Office.

11. From Sivacamipuram to Palavur there is about 1,636¾ chains marked yellow in the plan, and purporting to be unquestioned territory of Travancore. From an Arzi addressed to the Collector by the Tahsildar of Valliyur in 1849, it appears that this land had been in the possession of the Travancore Government from (Andu 924) A.D. 1749. This is also corroborated by the Ayacut Account, and as in subsequent reports of Tahsildars and other documents bearing on the subject no further mention of this land has been made, I do not think there is any ground for calling in question the right of the Travancore Government to it.

12. We then come to Palavur, in the Ayacut of which village the larger hills are given as the western boundary. Thus lands to the east of the hills, marked purple in the plan, as claimed by the British Government. In the Ayacut it is entered as 247 chains, forming part of 952¾ chains measured in ten numbers. In the centre of this land, and at its western extremity, there are some smaller hills which are measured in our Ayacut Accounts and not in the Travancore accounts. The Dewan Peishkar claims the land, because 103 chains near the foot of the hills are entered in their Cultivation Accounts for Andu 993, (A.D. 1818) as forming fifty-eight numbers, each of which has been properly defined. Eight of these numbers, however, have not been measured on account, it is said, of their rocky state.

13. In Karungulam, the larger hills are mentioned as the western boundary. In the Ayacut, the land is mentioned as portions of 464 chains, forming three numbers; certain smaller hills in the centre of this land, and one at its western extremity, are also measured in our Ayacut, but not in the Travancore accounts. They claim the land on the ground that about 128 chains, situated near the foot of the hills, appear in their Cultivation Accounts for A.D. 1818.

14. That the Travancore accounts are not very correct may be inferred from the fact that in both the Palavur and Karungulam Accounts, the limits of the numbers are so given that one and the same number is repeatedly defined without any cause.

15. It appears from former records that these lands, in Palavur and Karungulam, were once decided by Mr. Bishop, when Sub-Collector, to belong to the British Government. In his order of the 8th June 1835, he states that the above lands were covered with jungle for the protection of the Travancore fort at Arumbuly, when that Government had the Calakaad Talook in its possession; and that when subsequently assumed by the British Government, the then Collector, Mr. Lushington, and Colonel MacCulley ordered it to be brought under cultivation. Mr. Bishop further directed that the teerwah on 114 chains and some trees standing on the land should be paid into the British Government. In accordance with this order these and other lands subsequently brought under cultivation appear in the Cultivation Accounts, and teerwah was paid to the British Government. I consider our claim to these lands to be beyond dispute.

16. The proceedings and former records which were taken into consideration by me are herewith transmitted for your perusal, as per accompanying list.

17. During the inspection of the boundary line the Dewan Peishkar mentioned that the line at Palavur and Karungulam had been formerly settled by General Cullen, and that wooden pegs had been driven in to mark the same. I saw one of these wooden pegs in Karungulam, but as

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th February 1870.

from your letter, dated 28th March, No. 392, received in reply to mine of the 13th idem, No. 29, no correspondence appears to have taken place on the subject, I do not consider them to be of much importance in the face of our strong claims.

18. I regret that I have been unable to submit a plan with this my report. The late Mr. Bush, Sub-Assistant Engineer in the Department Public Works, had been directed to attend me. He submitted one rough sketch which is utterly useless, and his death interfered with the further prosecution of the plan. I think, however, that it will be necessary only after the boundary is settled (as I think it ought to be according to our accounts,) to have it then marked out in a permanent manner with masonry pillars, as wooden pegs are liable to removal.

19. As it appears that the British Government, when the boundary line was settled about Shenkottah, refunded to the Travancore Government a sum of about a lac of rupees as the amount collected by them on land afterwards shown to belong to Travancore, I would suggest that it would be only fair for the Travancore Government in the same way to refund the collections made by them on those lands which may now be decided to form part of the British territories.

THESE papers relate to land in dispute between the British Government and the Travancore Circar, north and south of the Arumbuly Pass, and east of the range of ghauts.

2. South of the Pass the question is simply whether certain fields now in the possession of British subjects belong to Travancore or not. It is said to be a matter which can be settled by an examination of accounts, which has not yet been made.

3. North of the Pass the dispute resolves itself into the question whether the boundary line should be fixed along the crest of the ghauts as proposed by Mr. Macgregor, or along the base of the hills as proposed by Mr. Puckle and the Dewan. The line is eleven or twelve miles long. The disputed territory consists partly of small pieces of cultivated ground held by British subjects, and principally of jungle and a Coffee garden which are rented out to a contractor by the Travancore Circar for Rupees 1,000.

4. On the side of the British claim it is urged that the boundary line between the two countries usually follows the crest of the ghauts; that the disputed territory is inaccessible to Travancore, except by passing through British territory; that the only ancient buildings in it are two small pagodas which have been supported by British endowments, and two small anicuts supplying British cultivation; that portions of the area are indisputably entered in the accounts of British villages; and that the inhabitants of those villages frequent the jungle for firewood, pasturage, etc.

5. On the side of Travancore it is urged that the disputed territory has been in Travancore possession from ancient times; that portions of it are entered in their accounts; and that the line proposed by Mr. Macgregor cannot possibly be surveyed and defined.

6. The Board consider that the inaccessibility of the crest boundary is no argument against it, because the boundary between the two countries is generally fixed in the same manner, and the result of Mr. Kindersley's investigation in 1862 seems to show that the Travancore accounts are not reliable. Altogether, the evidence of abstract right inclines in favour of the British claim.

7. Nevertheless the Board are of opinion that the undisputed possession of Travancore is a fact which in such a case must outweigh all other arguments, and they recommend that the convention between Mr. Puckle and the Dewan should be ratified as the only probable solution of a most troublesome dispute.

8. The Board consider, however, that this ratification should only be conceded on the Circar agreeing to preserve the rights of all British villagers, whose cultivated lands are thus transferred to them, and to abstain from interfering with the anicuts. Moreover, when the dispute about fields south of the Pass is arranged, it may well be remembered that north of the Pass the settlement was made in accordance with, and in consequence of, possession.

9. With regard to paragraph 3 of Government Order, dated 7th May 1869, No. 1,257, the Collector states that the survey of the Shenkottah villages attached to the Travancore territory was temporarily deferred, but that the Deputy-Superintendent of Revenue Survey is now prepared to go on with it.

No. 76. From the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Peermade, 21st December 1869, No. 109.

I would solicit attention to my letter, dated 2nd June 1869, No. 42, and G. O., dated 29th idem, No. 1,839, passed thereon, with reference to a disputed boundary between Tinnevelly and Travancore virtually settled by Mr. Puckle and the Dewan in March 1868, and to request final orders may be issued, approving of the settlement, if no objection exists.

No. 77. Order thereon, 11th February 1870, No. 188.

Miscellaneous.

The Government observe that a reference to the Extract Minutes Consultation, 14th January 1857, No. 60, and the previous correspondence goes to show that the whole of the disputed boundary line was determined and a Map prepared in 1855. The Board are requested to ascertain and report whether no part of the line proposed by Mr. Puckle and the Dewan, or of that south of the Arumbuly Pass was included in this Map, as it is not forthcoming in the Government Office.

Extract Minutes Consultation, 31st October 1856, No. 1,159.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Lvd. P. R. Pantheman.

Revenue 1869. Despatch

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

No. 3302.

PROCEEDINGS, 21ST SEPTEMBER 1869, No. 7,014.

Dated 27 September 1869 Encl. 1 Docs

Received 28th

SEPTEMBER.

No. 7,014.

Land in dispute—between British Government and Travancore Circar, north and south of Arambuly Pass, and east of range of ghauts.—Certain papers from Collector of Tinnevelly relating to —, submitted to Government, with recommendation regarding line of boundary to be adopted.

Read 188- 11 Feby 1870

75

Govt. of India Separate

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated February 11th,

Read

G. O., 11th February 1870, No. 188.

Forwarding papers relating to Land in dispute between British Government and Travancore Circar, north and south of Arambuly Pass, and east of range of ghauts.

FEBRUARY.

Nos. 75–77.

Boundary between Travancore and Tinnevelly.—Passing orders with reference to the land in dispute.

Revenue Department

No. 188.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 11th July 1870.

Read the following papers:-

Rep. of the Board of Revenue

submg certain papers from Collr of Tinnevelly, relating to land in dispute between British Govt and Travancore Circar, North and South of Arambuly Pass & East of range of ghauts, with recommendation regarding line of boundary to be adopted. } Ho. 21st Septr. 1869, No 1010.

From the Resident in Travancore & Cochin.

Soliciting attention to letter of 30th June last regarding the disputed boundary between Travancore & Tinnevelly. } 21st Decr. 1869

The Govt observe that a reference to the G. M. C. 14th Janry 1857, No 60, and the previous correspondence goes to shew that the whole of the disputed boundary line was determined and a Map prepared in 1855.

G. M. C. 31st Octr 1856, No 1159.

The

The Board are requested to ascertain and report whether no part of the line proposed by Mr Peachle and the Bewan or of that south of the Rombuly Pass was included in this Map as it is not forthcoming in the Port Office.

No. Letter Bo of Recruits on Levée 20th 121

35