

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2127

DATED 18th May

[Despatch, Abstract.]

Report regarding the demarcation
of part of the boundary between the Mysore Province
and the Bellary DC. referred to the Board of Revenue
for report as to whether the demarcation now done may
be accepted.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
C.O.	5292/98.						
G.O.	3559	Revenue	3-2-98				

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 2924

Order Endorsement (C.O.) No. 2127 d/18th May 98.

Referred to the Board
of Revenue for report as to
whether the demarcation now
done may be accepted.

Rs
17-5-98

18th
18th

Princ.

From The Superintendent
Madras Survey

No. 39

Dated 8 April 1898

Received

Registered 18th

Enclosures 97

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

To the Board of Rev (L. R) ✓
with enclosures in
original & be returned
(From orders)

Demarcation of part of
the boundary between the
Bellary District and the
Mysore Province
stating that
has been rectified.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
10502	2	13-2	77
10502	8	13-2	78
10502	15	13-5	96m
10502	24	13-5	96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(C. O. Form No. 13-A 2.)

SURVEY OFFICE, *Camp*
8th April 1898.

No. 39
From 9

H. O' C. Cardozo, Esq., C.I.E.,
Superintendent, Madras Survey,

To
The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

REFERENCE. G. O. Revenue Dept. No. 5081 Mis.
dated 28 September 1897, directing
the revision of demarcation of
part of the boundary between
the Bellary District and the
Mysore Territory; also G. O. No. 862 Mis.
dated 19 February 1898, regarding
the deputation of an officer
from Mysore.

for,
I have the honour to report
that Mr. Martin, Deputy
Superintendent, Madras Survey

Bellary, met the Assistant
Commissioner, Chittaldroog District,
on the 12 March 1898, and rectified
the demarcation of the boundary
in question.

2. A copy of their joint report
is submitted herewith.

3. The enclosures to G.O. No. 5081
dated 28 September 1897 are
returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servant,

W. A. S.
Superintendent
Madras Survey.

Ak
5/98

13/4/98.

Letter from the Supt of Madras
Survey, No. $\frac{39}{9}$ 8-4-98
(Cus. 2927)

To Secretary

The Resident in
Mysore brought to the notice
of this Govt. an allegation
made by the Mysore Darbar
that the Madras Surveyors, in
surveying certain villages of
the Hospet Taluk in the Bellary
district, encroached upon a
portion of Survey No. 132 of
Banaravi Village in the
Mysore Province, and re-
quested that the necessary
instructions might be
issued to have the alleged
incorrect demarcation
rectified. The result of the
enquiry ordered thereon by this
Govt. showed that a portion
of the field no 132 ^{of the Mysore Taluk} measuring
1.80 acres was included within
the limits of Survey No. 16 of
the adjoining British Village
of Thammalapuram, and that

So $\frac{5-12}{27-1-97}$

Collier's letter
in G.O. $\frac{5081-82}{28-9-97}$

a small extent of 2 cents pertaining to the latter field was added to the field no 132 of the Mysore Province. The inspection of the fields in question by the Tahsildar of Hosapet further disclosed that portions of a nullah (river bed) in the British territory were shown on the Mysore Survey maps as belonging to that Govt. In these circumstances, it was ordered by this Govt. that the boundary line should be correctly marked out and demarcated by an Officer of the Madras Survey Dept in conjunction with one from Mysore. In pursuance of this order Mr Martin, Dy Supdt of Madras Survey, and the Asst Commissioner, Chitaldrug district accompanied by the Tahsildar of Hosapet Taluk, and the Amildar of Molkalmur Taluk in which the Mysore Village is situated

Ep. 5081-82
28-9-97

Current.

question is situated, inspected the disputed locality on the 12 March 1898, rectified the demarcation of the boundary and have submitted a joint report which forms an enclosure to the Current. The report shows that the Madras Surveyors in demarcating the boundary between Thummalapuram and Bandaravi at the disputed point omitted to observe the survey boundary marks erected by the Mysore Survey and thereby failed to follow the true boundary between the two villages at the above point, and that the necessary alterations have been made on the ground. As regards the nullah referred to above, there was no evidence to show that it was included in the Mysore map beyond showing it as a detail on the map, nor was there any record to show that the nullah

Therapsid. See the collection having seen
 3-5-22 - ^{one} specimen. The sp. ^{very} distinct

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.