

Revenue (189) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES

G.O., No. 1820

DATED 18th May 1889

[Despatch Abstract.]

Transferring to the P. W. & with an
expressing concurrence in the Board's remarks, B. & addressing Govt.
on certain points connected with the claim to compensation for
loss of revenue caused to Govt. by the construction of certain re-
servoirs in the Mysore territory.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Low	4627/99		18-7-99				
Cuo	5347/99		18-7-99				

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2420

Enrolled in 1820 by 18th May 99.

Transferred to the P.W. Dept-
with an expression of concurrence in
the Board's remarks.

18th May 99

From

to the P.W. D. (S) with notes in original
Board's L.R.
Order

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, Madras.

See

The remarks of the P.W.D. have
been made. The matter
is fully stated in the current

No.
REF. No. B.No. 131.

Dated 7th April 1899

Received }
Registered }
Enclosures -
Spare copies -

144726.4.89.

SUBJECT.

Addressing Government on cer-
tain points connected with the claim
to compensation for loss of revenue
caused to Government by the construc-
tion of certain reservoirs in the -
Mysore territory.

Madras, dated 7th April 1899.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
To	162 28	18-2-92	
B.O.	6268	13-11-98	me
"	52483	10-9-94	h.c.
G.O.	2567	18-2-92	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department	Date.

Read endorsement of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement & Department), No. 627 Routine, dated 16th March 1899, transferring to the Land Revenue Department letter from H.O.D. Harding Esq., Ag. Collector of Cuddapah, Ref. No. 674-B & G/98, dated 22nd February 1899.

-----:::-----
Reference B. No. 131, dated 7th April 1899.

In G.O. No. 162 I, dated 18th February 1892, the Madras Government accepted certain rules proposed by the Mysore Durbar regarding the restoration and construction of irrigation works in Mysore which were likely to affect similar works in this Presidency. Under this G.O. the Mysore Government was precluded from undertaking without the consent of the Government of Madras any works which might prejudicially affect the irrigation of Government lands in this Presidency. Government at the same time consented to the construction of certain specified new irrigation reservoirs but a proviso was added in the case of the three works noted in the margin,

(1) Srinivasasagara Reservoir
across the Pennar.

(2) Ramasamudram Reservoir--
across the Chitravati.

(3) Venkatesasagara Reservoir
across the Papaghni.

viz, that "the admissibility

"of any compensation from

"Mysore to Madras on ac--

"count of loss accruing to

"Madras Irrigation Works

"from diminution of supply of water caused by the construction

"of the said works, will be referred to the Government of India

"whose decision will be accepted as final, and should such com-

"pensation be decided to be admissible the decision of the

"Government of India as to the amount thereof will be accepted

"after submission to them of the claims of Madras which would

"be preferred in full detail within a period of 5 years after

"the completion of the said works". Accordingly the Collectors

of Anantapur and Cuddapah were requested in the marginally

marginally

marginally-noted Proceedings to report on the effect of these works on the supply to the river-fed tanks in their districts.

B.P.626 d/ 19-11-95

B.P.5483 d/ 10-9-94

2. In September 1896 the Collector of Anantapur submitted a report on the Ramasamudram Reservoir. The report did not make it clear that a claim for compensation would be admissible: but the Collector, Mr. Mahavedan Raja, suggested that the Mysore authorities should be moved to consent to an extension of the time within which compensation can be claimed, mainly because there was no certainty that the succeeding four or five years would be years of normal rainfall and comparisons of the supply received would be of no value unless the period taken into account were considerably extended. The Collector's report was forwarded to the Chief ^{Engineer} for Irrigation for favour of his remarks with Board's Proceedings No. 5446 Misc. dated 5th December 1896. The Chief Engineer's observations were received in March 1898 and communicated to the Collector with the request that a report might be furnished immediately after the close of fasli 1307, as regards the revenue under the affected tank for a series of years and the statistics of rainfall in the catchment area for each of those years. He was also requested to submit a similar report on the tanks affected by the Srinivasasagaram Reservoir.

3. In January 1897 the Collector of Cuddapah submitted a report on the Venkatesasagaram Reservoir which was also communicated to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. The Collector was at the same time requested to report again after the close of fasli 1306, as the figures for that fasli were not quoted by him. No reply was however received from him & in June last, he was requested to draw up his report on the lines indicated in para 2 ~~supra~~ ^{supra}. The paper read at the head of these Proceedings contains the Collector's revised report. He states that the statistics of rainfall in the catchment area are not available and the date of yearly revenue and remissions furnished by him are not such as to justify a claim to compensation: in other words the Government has not suffered in revenue owing to the construction of the Venkatesasagaram reservoir. But it is possible that the diminution of water supply may have been such as to increase the ryots' cost of cultivation though

though not to cause loss of revenue to Government; and Mr. Harding's conclusions being based on one year's figures are in any case open to doubt.

4. It will be seen from the approximate dates quoted in the margin that the period of limitation agreed upon between the Madras and Mysore Governments (vide para 1 supra) has already expired in the case of the

Name of the irrigation work	Probable date of completion.	Srinivasasagaram reservoir and the greater portion of it in the case of the remaining two -- works, but it has not
1. Srinivasasagaram Reservoir	April 1893	
2. Ramasundram do do	June 1895	
3. Venkatesasagaram do do	June do	

yet been possible for the Board to prefer any claim for compensation on behalf of the Madras Government. This result is partly due to the fact that no arrangement was made in 1892 for the communication to this Government of the date of completion of each of the works in question. In 1894 the Board directed the Collector of Cuddapah to apply to the Deputy Commissioner in charge of the Division for information as to the date of completion of the Venkatesasagaram reservoir. The Collector in his report read above, states that in reply to a communication addressed by him to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar on the subject, he has been informed that application should be made to the British Resident in Mysore. In these circumstances the Board requests that the Government will be pleased to address the British Resident for information as to the precise dates when each of the above works was completed. The Board also recommends for the favourable consideration of Government the suggestion made by Mr. Mahavedan Raja as Collector of Anantapur Viz., that the period allowed in clause V of the rules printed in G.O.No.162 I (P.W.) dated 18th February 1892 for preferring claims for compensation should be extended to the close of fasli 1312.

(Sd) L. Davidson
By Secretary

To Mr. Anglo Port Resident

Note of the Public Works Department

I

The question as to whether claims for compensation could be made out in the three cases referred to was in the note flagged A. (which was submitted to the Board of Revenue) made to depend on the result of certain reports and the collection of certain information in the Revenue Department.

The only additional information now furnished is that given by the Collector of Cuddapah with reference to the third case to the effect that Government has not suffered in revenue owing to the construction of this work.

There would seem to be no objection in this Department to the Resident being asked for the dates of completion of the works and to the extension of time for preferring --- claims for compensation.

(Hd) W. H.

Joint Secretary P.W.D. Rygs

8.5.99

Revenue Department.

The B.P. may now be formally ~~be~~ transferred to the P.W.D. (I) for the necessary action.

(Intd)

M.S.
10.5.99

Secretary.

Please see the P.W.D. note above. Rev. May, I submit, agree. The Resident should presumably be addressed in the P.W.D. as on the previous occasion G.O.162 (I) dated 18th February 1892.

(Intd) N.E.M.

13-5-99

H.M.

Yes.

H.W.

16-5-99

S.F.

15-5-99

To the U.S.

Please see draft endorsement on docket.

(Intd) M.S.

17-5-99

Issue

Send notes in original keeping copy.

(Intd) N.E.M.

18-5-99.

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ } 189
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

ENCLOSURE NO.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

H.B.-

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