I.F. Old No. 73, New No. 24—3,000,000—26-12-30.

DEPARTMENT.

Paper taken out of the records from the charge of the Reference

From
Intelligence & Co
Foreign

, dated 19

Date when sent	From WHAT records. Department	C. No.	Year.	Initials of person taking the paper or of offender.	Date returned.	Initials of offender.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

Revenue (1870) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

No. 24

G.O., Nos 819-820

Dated 28th September

[Despatch Abstract.]

Accepting the recommendations of the Collector of Nadia in respect of the settlement proceedings in Kaveripaky Zemindary, Chingleput District.

The Nizam's Domiciliaries in the Madras Presidency.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.	Department.	No.	Date.

PERMANENT PAPERS.

No.	Date.	Department.	No.	Date.

Cur. 2497/95
Go. 1753 Revenue 22-4-98

Cur. 6642/98
Go. 2259 Revenue 8-8-98

Revenue (189/) Department.

CURRENT No.

22 AUG 97

From

The Board of Revenue, ~~Lnd~~
Land Revenue, Madras.

Order

No. 3139 Mis.

Dated 24th August 1897

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Subng. to Govt. with the Board's support letter from the Collr. of Kistna reporting the settlement of certain boundary disputes between H.H. the Nizam's and the British territory.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cir. 2497/[illegible]			
G.O. 1253 Revenue			22-4-98

B.000
3-7-97.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE
MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

NO.3139 Mis.dated 24th August 1897.

Read letter from J.K.Batten Esq.,Ag.Collector of Kistna to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue,Madras,Ref.on C.No.2812-Ver,dated 9th August 1897.

1210

Resolution.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings Mis.NO.2765 dated 31st May 1895 disposed of in G.O.NO. 371 Revenue dated 15th June 1895.

2. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations in paras 4 and 5 of his letter.

(True Extract)

Secretary.

TO

The Secretary to Government,Revenue Department with Collr's letter & its enclos.in original to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Kistna.

189 .

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

26

Subject.

Read G.O. no 7247 of 97

~~Order~~ Note of orders.

The papers submitted by the Board with its Proc^s read above relate to two disputes on the boundary between the Kistna district and N.R. the Nizam's territory, the existence of which were brought to notice subsequent to the settlement of those referred to in the correspondence ending with G.O. no 649 Rev: dy 24^th Sept 1895. One of the two disputes has since been settled under instructions from the Collector, ~~Mr~~ by Mr Coleridge, Asst Collector, Kistna, in conjunction with Mr Innes-dud-deen, Asst Supt, Rev: Survey, Warangal, and the Collector now recommends that their settlement may be approved. ~~Mr Coleridge~~ The decision arrived at by them, which is mainly based on evidence of possession has the effect of giving 3.75 ~~acres~~ acres of land to Hyderabad and 2.95 ~~acres~~ acres to Kistna and they state that the slight difference in the areas of the lands concerned will be counterbalanced by

that

that in their quality. Mr Cowan & Co. His submitted, That,
his representation in these circumstances,
the receipt the Collector's recommendation
may be accepted and the Resident at
Hyderabad addressed with
a view to ascertain whether H.H.
the Nizam's Durbar has any ob-
jection to confirming the decision
in question. It is observed that in the words and figures "3·75 cents"
"3·32 Guntas" "2·95 cents" and "2·37"
Guntas" occurring in the memo. drawn up by
messrs Coleridge and Muskudeen
the word "acres" should have been inserted
after each of the first figures "3", "3", "2"
and "2"

Note

There has been a point of
two cents — the Nizam's
Survey officers having en-
croached upon 24 cents of
British territory and given
up 26 cents instead.

2 As regards the
second dispute, it is observed
that the action of the Hyderabad
Survey Dept has not resulted in any
actual loss of territory to Govt. the
matter may therefore be dropped, as suggested by the Collector, effect
being given to the Survey Dy Collr's
proposal to substitute the boundary
line as fixed by H.H. the Nizam's
Survey officers for that shown in
the old revenue survey accounts of
Madras.

3 A further following letter
will be addressed to the Resident
at Hyderabad.

2. It is observed that the areas given as "3·75 cents", "3·32 guntas" etc. in the memo drawn up by messrs Coleridge & Muhammad Hussain (both corrected to "acres 3·75 cent", "3 acres 32 guntas" etc.

No 820

The Resident at Hyderabad

Sir,

In continuation of my
letter

P. 2111/38 JS

The following GO is submitted for approval.
Read also his "yes." (also perhaps in full)
GO No 814 dy 28th Septr 1897.
The Govt accept the Collector's
recommendations in both cases.
3. The forgg letter with a
addressed to the Resident at
Hyderabad.

To the Bd (R.P.)
with the records

JS 27/9/97

letter no 1065 dy 5th August 1897,
I am directed to inform you that
a communication has been
since received by this Govt from
the Collector of Kistna reporting
that under instructions from his
predecessor and with the per-
mission of the Hyderabad au-
thorities, Mr F.A. Coleridge, Asst
Collector of Kistna in conjunction
with Mr Muhammad Muzhirud-deen
Asst Supt, Rev. Survey, Warangal,
has recently settled another dis-
pute on the boundary between
his district and H.H. the Nizam's
territory, the existence of which
was brought to notice subsequent
to the date of the correspondence
ending with Col. Mackenzie's letter
No 5030 dy 11th Sept. 1895. The
settlement made by messrs Cole-
ridge and Muzhirud-deen has
been based mainly on evidence
of possession and its effect is to
give to Hyderabad 3·75 acres of
land and to Kistna 2·96 acres.
The two officers add that the
slight difference in the area of
the lands concerned will be

Commissioners

Communicated by that Department in their quality. I am directed to state that the settlement in question has the approval of H.E. the C. in C. and thus to request that it may be ascertained whether H.H. the Nizam's Durbar has any objection to confirming the same.

2 A copy of the memorandum drawn up on the subject by Messrs Coleridge and Mushid-ud-deen with two Sketch maps which have been forwarded therewith are herein enclosed with the request that the maps may be returned when no longer required.

Kistna 19.IX.97

Dated 20th Sept 1897

Note for the Examiner and Despt

A Typewritten copy of the memo with the corrections referred to in para 2 of the Lo. carried out thereon (and not a copy of the Lo. itself) should be sent to the Resd. The maps that should be sent are the one drawn up on tracing cloth and that drawn upon flimsy paper (and not the one subscribed by the Survey & Collector.)

Dated 21st

Kistna 19.IX.97

1897.

RESIDENT AT HYDERABAD.

From

The Government of Fort St. George.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 820, 28th September 1897.

SEPTEMBER.

REQUESTING the Resident at Hyderabad to ascertain whether His Highness the Nizam's Durbar has any objection to confirming the settlement of the boundary dispute effected by Mr. F. A. Coleridge, Assistant Collector, Kistna, in conjunction with Mr. Mushid-ud-din, Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, Warrangal.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. G. STOKES, I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Revenue Department,

To

The RESIDENT at HYDERABAD,

Dated Ootacamund, 30th September 1897.

Sir,

Miscellaneous.

In continuation of my letter No. 4065, dated 5th August 1897, I am directed to inform you that a communication has been since received by this Government from the Collector of Kistna reporting that, under instructions from his predecessor and with the permission of the Hyderabad authorities, Mr. F. A. Coleridge, Assistant Collector of Kistna, in conjunction with Mr. Mahomed Mushid-ud-din, Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey, Warrangal, has recently settled another dispute on the boundary between his district and His Highness the Nizam's Territory, the existence of which was brought to notice subsequent to the date of the correspondence ending with Colonel Mackenzie's letter No. 5030, dated 11th September 1895. The settlement made by Messrs. Coleridge and Mushid-ud-din has been based mainly on evidence of possession and its effect is to give to Hyderabad 3·75 acres of land and to Kistna 2·95 acres. The two officers add that the slight difference in the area of the lands concerned will be counterbalanced by that in their quality. I am directed to state that the settlement in question has the approval of His Excellency the Governor in Council, and to request that it may be ascertained whether His Highness the Nizam's Durbar has any objection to confirming the same.

2. A copy of the memorandum drawn up on the subject by Messrs. Coleridge and Mushid-ud-din with two sketch-maps which have been forwarded therewith are herewith enclosed with the request that the maps may be returned when no longer required.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Prd. Shaik Karim.

20 Copies.

MEMORANDUM of the boundary dispute between Irallapad (British Territory) and Chilukur (Nizam's Territory).

Between the two villages a vanka, the Wyra river, runs for some distance, sometimes forming a boundary and sometimes not.

The lands are in dispute between the two Governments—marked (A), (C) and (D) in the accompanying plan. (A) is claimed by the British Government, (C) and (D) by the Nizam's State.

(A) is a piece of land, acreage 3 acres 75 cents (3 acres 32 guntas), on the Nizam's side of the vanka and surrounded by the vanka on one side and Nizam's fields on the other.

(C) is a small plot of waste land containing babool trees, acreage 10 cents (4 guntas), situated between two portions of cultivated land held by British ryots on the one hand and Nizam's ryots on the other.

(D) is a portion of land, acreage 2 acres 85 cents (2 acres 37 guntas), which lies on the British side of the vanka between the vanka and the line joining the two nearest British survey stones. This will be seen from the sketch.

Of (A) a small portion has been held for many years by a Nizam's subject and revenue has been paid by him to the Nizam for it. The rest of the land is waste.

Of (D) a small portion has been held for some time by a British subject and revenue paid to the British for it.

The Nizam has only made a claim on (C) and (D) since their survey of 1894 when they began to enquire into occupancy and other rights. They included the lands in Nizam's State as they lay beyond the British demarcation stones. (A) had not been claimed by the British prior to the Nizam's survey.

The evidence for either claim is conflicting. The British survey stones are not intact upon (A) and also the area and the distances from the various points in (A) differ in the survey plan from the area and the distances given in the field register and settlement register and according to which is accepted as right so the British claim varies.

Now the area of (A) is almost equal to (C) and (D) and if there is a slight excess it is counter-balanced by the land of (D) being of a better quality than that of (A). The value of (A) is therefore almost identical with (C) and (D). Further the land of (A), though claimed as British, has long been held by a Nizam tenant and revenue paid to the Nizam, while the land of (D) has similarly been held by a British tenant though claimed by the Nizam.

The simplest and at the same time the most satisfactory plan therefore seems to us to be to include (A) in the Nizam's State and (C) and (D) in the British Territory. No one will suffer from this and a convenient frontier will be made, namely, the vanka to be frontier between the two Governments in the two disputed cases (A) and (D), while the patch of babool trees (C) be included in British Territory. In other words fields Nos. 159, 187 and 188 of Irallapad will be bounded by the vanka and will not extend beyond it, while field No. 121 of Irallapad will now include the whole bend of the vanka and will be bounded by the vanka. Also field No. 131 of Irallapad will now include the 10 cents of waste land occupied by the babool trees between the cultivable land of Irallapad and Chilukur. If approved, the boundary should be so demarcated.

A map accompanies this, showing the disputed lands as also a statement of their areas.

(Signed) F. A. COLERIDGE,
Assistant Collector, Kistna.

WARRANGAL,
25th April 1897.

(Signed) MAHOMED MUSHID-UD-DIN,
Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

Government {1897} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. / *Regd.* } 1897. *Enclosures* / *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 819, 28th September 1897.

SEPTEMBER.

Boundary Disputes.

cepting the recommendations of the Collector of Kistna in respect of the settlement of
between His Highness the Nizam's Dominions and the Kistna district.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 3139, dated 24th August 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from J. K. BATTEN, Esq., Acting Collector of Kistna, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 9th August 1897, Ref. on C. No. 2812-Ver. :—

Referring to the correspondence regarding the settlement of the boundary dispute between the British and His Highness the Nizam's Dominions, by Messrs. H. R. Bentley Taylor and Fano, disposed of in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3504, Land Revenue, dated 15th July 1895, I have the honour to report that two more disputes have since been brought to notice by the Tahsildar of Nandigáma, namely, (1) between Irallapad (British village) and Chilukur (Nizam's village) and (2) Polampalli (British) and Choppakatlapalam (Nizam's).

2. My predecessor directed the Head Assistant Collector to settle the dispute in conjunction with the Nizam's representative; but as the Head Assistant Collector could not spare time, Mr. Coleridge, Assistant Collector, was deputed by the permanent Collector to represent the British Government and Mr. Mahomed Mushid-ud-din, the Assistant Superintendent of Survey, was deputed by the First Talukdar of Warrangal to represent the Nizam's Government.

3. The Assistant Collector met the Nizam's representative at Irallapad on the 25th April last and settled the first dispute. The joint report of the two representatives is submitted along with the plan drawn by them.

4. The three plots in dispute are marked (A), (C) and (D) in the enclosed plan. From the report it appears that it was agreed that the British Government should give up its claims to the plot marked "(A)" and that the Nizam's Government should give up its claims to (C) and (D). A copy of the Assistant Collector's letter containing the above recommendation is submitted for the Board's information. I recommend that the arrangement may be accepted.

5. The second dispute was not settled as Mr. Mushid-ud-din stated that he had no orders to settle it. I therefore addressed the Survey Deputy Collector, who has recently completed the survey of Nandigáma taluk, to let me know whether anything has been elicited regarding this case during the course of the re-survey. His reply is briefly this :—

"The Nizam's Survey department encroached upon an extent of 24 cents of the British land and gave up a piece of land measuring 26 cents instead, *i.e.*, 2 cents in excess of the land taken up. This is in no way detrimental to the interests of the British Government. He accordingly recommends the substitution of the Nizam's survey of the boundary line in question for the old revenue survey thereof, which has also been followed in the re-survey. I agree with him and request the Board's orders."

6. The Survey Deputy Collector's letter, No. 895, dated 17th June 1897, is forwarded with a sketch showing the boundary line under dispute.

Enclosures.

From F. A. COLERIDGE, Esq., Assistant Collector, Kistna, to the Collector of Kistna, dated Camp Polampalli, 29th April 1897.

Referring to your Proceedings, No. 1347-Ver., dated 3rd April 1897, I have the honour to report upon the settlement of the boundary disputes at (i) Irallapad and (ii) Polampalli of the Nandigáma taluk—

(i) I met the Nizam's official at Irallapad on 25th instant and we inspected the land in dispute. Enclosed is our recommendation about it. In requesting you to forward the proposal for the sanction of the Board, I here add the following facts and suggestions :—

Though the land we give up is slightly greater in extent than what we get, it is of very poor quality, valued by the Nizam settlement at As. 5 an acre, while the land we get is better quality valued at As. 8. We also get a small piece of land planted with babool trees which have a certain value yearly.

The suggestion to add this to field No. 131 is because No.——is village poramboke and so the trees will remain the property of Government.

As to the portions of Nos. 159, 187 and 188 given up, I would submit that the portion not given up has been held by Pattikonda Ramayya of Irallapad for three years and he has also paid kist for the part to be given up for these three years and has used the land for grazing cattle. Now he has no patta, consequently no rights to be acquired, therefore no compensation need be paid. He should, however, have a deduction made from his yearly kist for the acreage given up. Now since he has had to give up land it seems only fair, even though he has no patta, which was withheld till the land had been sub-divided, that he should be given the first claim on the piece of land to be given to us by the Nizam should he care to darkhast for it.

There can be no injustice to the neighbouring ryot seeing that the land has not been British hitherto and so the ordinary darkhast rules cannot be held to apply.

I suggest that the Board be advised to sanction the exchange of land, have it demarcated properly and entered in the accounts, and also that the first claim for the new land of field No. 121 be entered in the name of Pattikonda Ramayya, should he care to take up the land on darkhast as compensation for the loss of the other land, portions of Nos. 159, 187 and 188.

The reason for suggesting the exchange is that the accounts, herewith enclosed, which deal with fields Nos. 159, 187 and 183, do not tally and consequently it is almost impossible to settle the matter fairly more especially as many of our boundary stones on the land in question are missing.

It is more than likely that if a very careful enquiry were held and the lands accurately measured we should find that all three of the lands really belong to Nizam.

(ii) I came to Polampalli on 28th for the dispute here but no Nizam official has arrived here; no one is expected. The officer engaged at Irallapad told me that he had received no orders to come here and though I wired to the First Talukdar at Warrangal, he has sent no reply. The dispute is only about 16 cents of land, submerged part of the year by the tank here, and even this extent my disappear on a more accurate survey. The value of the land is almost nil. I would suggest that the Nizam's stones be allowed to remain the frontier, especially as our own are missing. The gain in territory will not repay the expense of arranging a second meeting here or even the costs of the stones. I enclose the papers.*

I have also to report that the Surveyor did not reach Irallapad on 25th but reported himself on 26th after work was done. He had had an accident on the road but I do not think, as it turned out, he was really needed.

* 1 Field sketch with one enclosure.
2 Memorandum of settlement.
1 Head Assistant Collector's Dis. No. 1980-Rev. of 1895.
1 Do. do. Dis. No. 2124 do.
1 Do. do. Dis. No. 2423 do.
1 Do. do. Dis. No. 2978 do.
1 Do. do. Dis. No. 2994 do.
1 Do. do. Dis. No. 2994-Rev. of 1895 or C. No. 1501-Rev. of 1896.

Memorandum of the boundary dispute between Irallapad (British Territory) and Chilukur (Nizam's Territory).

Between the [illegible] es a vanka, the Wyra river, runs for some distance, sometimes forming a bo[illegible] times not.

The [illegible]ute between the two Governments—marked (A), (C) and (D) in the accom[illegible] is claimed by the British Government, (C) and (D) by the Nizam's St[illegible]

[illegible]ce of land, acreage 3 acres 75 cents (3 acres 37½ guntas), on the Nizam's side of and surrounded by the vanka on one side and Nizam's fields on the other.

(C) is a small plot of waste land containing babool trees, acreage 10 cents (4 guntas), situated between two portions of cultivated land held by British ryots on the one hand and Nizam's ryots on the other.

Case 4642/98

(D) is a portion of land, acreage 2 acres 85 cents (2 acres 84 guntas), which lies on the British side of the vanka but between the vanka and the line joining the two nearest British survey stones. This will be clear from the sketch.

Of (A) a small portion has been held for many years by a Nizam's subject and revenue has been paid by him to the Nizam for it. The rest of the land is waste.

Of (D) a small portion has been held for some time by a British subject and revenue paid to the British for it.

The Nizam has only made a claim on (C) and (D) since their survey of 1894 when they began to enquire into occupancy and other rights. They included the lands in Nizam's State as they lay beyond the British demarcation stones. (A) had not been claimed by the British prior to the Nizam's survey.

The evidence for either claim is conflicting. The British survey stones are not intact upon (A) and also the area and the distances from the various points in (A) differ in the survey plan from the area and the distances given in the field register and settlement register and according to which is accepted as right so the British claim varies.

Now the area of (A) is almost equal to (C) and (D) and if there is a slight excess it is counter-balanced by the land of (D) being of a better quality than that of (A). The value of (A) is therefore almost identical with (C) and (D). Further the land of (A), though claimed as British, has long been held by a Nizam tenant and revenue paid to the Nizam, while the land of (D) has similarly been held by a British tenant though claimed by the Nizam.

The simplest and at the same time the most satisfactory plan therefore seems to us to be to include (A) in the Nizam's State and (C) and (D) in the British Territory. No one will suffer from this and a convenient frontier will be made, namely, the vanka to be frontier between the two Governments in the two disputed cases (A) and (D), while the patch of babool trees (C) be included in British Territory. In other words fields Nos. 159, 187 and 188 of Irallapad will be bounded by the vanka and will not extend beyond it, while field No. 121 of Irallapad will now include the whole bend of the vanka and will be bounded by the vanka. Also field No. 131 of Irallapad will now include the 10 cents of waste land occupied by the babool trees between the cultivable land of Irallapad and Chilukur. If approved, the boundary should be so demarcated.

A map accompanies this, showing the disputed lands as also a statement of their areas.

(Signed) F. A. COLERIDGE,
Assistant Collector, Kistna.

Warrangal,
25th April 1897.

(Signed) MAHOMED MUSHID-UD-DIN,
Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

From M.R.Ry. D. SESHACHARLU GARU, Special Deputy Collector, No. II Party, Madras Survey, to the Collector of Kistna, dated 17th June 1897, No. 895.

I have the honour to submit herewith a sketch (with other record of enquiry) showing the difference between the old survey boundary of Polampalli in red ink and the boundary of the same in black ink as marked out by the Nizam's Survey Party, at the disputed spot, and that the same was measured and plotted by a responsible Deputy Surveyor of this party in conjunction with the Revenue Inspector of the firka.

Reference.—Your letter R.C. No. 2812-Ver., dated 19th May 1897, calling for report regarding the boundary dispute between No. 138, Polampalli, Nandigama taluk, and Choppakatlapalam of the Nizam's Dominions.

I beg to report that the demarcation, as conducted by this party follows, the old survey measurements, though stones have yet to be planted.

Further, I have the honour to submit that the small portion, coloured green in the enlarged map of the disputed spot, for which penal assessment was levied, clearly does not form part of the Government village of Polampalli as per the old survey. But as the ryot concerned, however, waives his right to dispute the assessment, the levy whereof was clearly due to a mistake on the part of the Revenue Inspector in fixing the correct boundary between Polampalli (Government) and Choppakatlapalam (Nizam), no further action need be taken in the matter.

In conclusion, I beg to state that the demarcation of the boundary by the Nizam's Survey department has caused no loss to Government for, whereas portion (*B*) 0 acres 24 cents in extent has been thereby encroached upon, a slightly greater extent of land, 0 acres 26 cents, portion (A), has, on the other hand, been included into the Government village of Polampalli.

I have the honour, therefore, to suggest that the acceptance of the Nizam's survey of the boundary of Polampalli involves no detriment to Government interests and may conveniently be substituted for the old survey boundary which has been followed in the re-survey.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3139, dated 24th August 1897.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 2765, dated 31st May 1895, disposed of in G.O., No. 371, Revenue, dated 15th June 1895.

2. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 5 of his letter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with Collector's letter and its enclosures,
in original, to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Kistna.

Order—No. 819, Revenue, dated 28th September 1897.

Miscellaneous.

The Government accepts the Collector's recommendations in both cases.

2. It is observed that the areas given as "3·75 cents," "3·32 guntas, &c.," in the memorandum drawn up by Messrs. Coleridge and Mushid-ud-din should correctly be "3 acres 75 cents," "3 acres 32 guntas," &c.

3. The following letter will be addressed to the Resident at Hyderabad.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), with enclosures.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

40 Copies.

B